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ABSTRACT

Humanitarian military interventions characterized the political atmosphere of the 1990s – legitimizing the phenomenon in which third-party actors use force to end intrastate abuses. While calls for humanitarian military intervention remain numerous, the phenomenon itself is laden with grave skepticism given the large “selectivity gap” in mission patterns. While states and institutions appear to enforce the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in reaction to some internal conflicts such as Kosovo, Bosnia, and Libya, they withhold similar policy options in cases of more intense armed conflict, as in Darfur, Syria, and Myanmar. Much of the research focuses on dichotomous explanations – suggesting that either ethical norms or geopolitical strategies guide patterns of such third-party interventions, but I demonstrate that the “selectivity gap” of humanitarian military interventions is primarily driven by variations in regional institutions and conflict perceptions. Such regional dimensions lead to more probable pathways of intervention within the West, founded upon value-based institutional resources as seen within NATO and EU structures.

This project contributes to both theoretical and empirical debates within international relations and security studies. It introduces a new dataset that offers the first quantitative and systematic analysis of humanitarian military interventions, including 1,110 observations of intrastate armed conflict between 1987-2016, paired with a range of international responses, non-responses, and key theoretical variables. In addition, it introduces an Intervention Index that accounts for the intensity of military interventions across different cases of humanitarian crisis. The aggregated models founded upon this data highlight the importance of regional neighborhoods and conflict perceptions in activating third-party responses, leading to three novel pathways of humanitarian intervention. Using original-language NATO, US, EU, and Balkans archival records and leadership dialogues, I then process-trace how conflict perceptions across Western audiences
– from narrating a distant crisis as either civil war, systematic killings, ethnic cleansing, or genocide – altered international policy responses in Kosovo, Libya, and Darfur. Ultimately, by bridging levels of analysis and comparing several crises, I show how a conflict with favorable perceptions, occurring with a Western neighborhood interlinks with liberal norms and institutional security, activating the missions and resource-pooling of several Western organizations. Once a threshold of humanitarian suffering is met via the existence of an internal armed conflict, powerful states and coalitions will intervene depending on: 1.) whether the conflict occurs in the Western neighborhood; 2.) whether it is denoted as an identity civil war; 3.) and whether the target state is democratized. A Western region coupled with no perceptions of identity-based civil war prompts the greatest odds of humanitarian intervention. Such conclusions carry strong theoretical implications on the role of norms, ethics, and interests in international politics, as biased by region. The findings also offer vital implications for leaders, scholars, and non-governmental actors advocating for or against international military intervention as a policy choice.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION: WHERE DO HUMANITARIAN MILITARY INTERVENTIONS HAPPEN?

Whether we can conceive of a way to think of morality that extends some form of sympathy further than our own group remains perhaps the fundamental moral question of contemporary life.

Jean Tronto 1993, 59

March 24th, 1999 marked the first time since the founding of the United Nations (UN) that a group of states – acting outside of international legal institutions and domestic structures, but under shared expectations of international behavior – overrode another state’s promise of sovereignty primarily on humanitarian grounds. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) use of military force against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY), to prevent humanitarian atrocities in Kosovo, was a dramatic turning point. This act of international humanitarian military intervention hinted at a much more complicated international playing field than so readily assumed in the past – opening room for ethics and human rights to compete against state interests.\(^1\) But as the years followed, such changes did not envelop the world evenly – prompting the question, why do humanitarian military interventions occur in reaction to certain global events while they remain absent in others?

For hundreds of years and across geographies, leaders and scholars have deemed national security interests as the driving force behind international political behavior. Today, this consensus generally remains – states act to maximize power capabilities in an anarchic international arena, regardless of ethical considerations, abstract principles, or norms (Buzan 1996; Donnelly 2009; Dunne and Schmidt 2011; Franck and Rodley 1973).\(^2\) This dominant realist perspective, however, contradicts trends of international military interventions that are seemingly activated by the

---

\(^1\) For a synthesis of greater implications of the NATO intervention in Kosovo, see Wheeler (2001).

\(^2\) Anarchy refers to the lack of an overarching authority that can impose hierarchical relationships and order upon states in the international sphere. Its more intricate features are discussed in later sections. See Buzan (1996) and Dunne and Schmidt (2011).
suffering of distant foreigners (Finnemore 2003; Doyle 1997; Lyon and Dolan 2007). If such state interventions are occurring within the context of perceived humanitarian need, instead of calculated national interests, then the dominant understanding of contemporary international dynamics may require extensive reevaluation.

But military interventions in states experiencing internal humanitarian crisis, largely denoted as humanitarian military interventions within the literature, are not homogenous or equally probable across regions (see Wheeler 2000, 33-8, 105-8; Finnemore 2003). Instead, this phenomenon presents with many inconsistencies, leading to suspicions of veiled reasons (Neack 1995). For instance, why did Western states militaristically intervene to stop human rights abuses in Kosovo, against UN protocol, while ignoring the larger-scale atrocities simultaneously and persistently occurring in South Sudan? Why are certain interventions in regions of internal crisis and civil war more robust and intense than others? Do isolated international relations theories, often emphasizing either geopolitical national interests or evolving humanitarian dimensions as explanations for such perceived humanitarian interventions, continue to account for global patterns, or do they disregard important relationships between interests, norms, and regional variations?

As the most telling example of regional variation, over the past hundred years, the intrastate conflicts within the small Balkan Peninsula have prompted a disproportionate share of the 20th century’s military interventions. The region experiencing over ten back-to-back interventions in the post-Yugoslavia era alone. More specifically, the UN initiated eight peacekeeping missions; NATO conducted four different operations; and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) supplemented the interventions with several assignments throughout the post-Yugoslavilian Balkans (Petersen 2011, 4). At first glance, these patterns seem to reveal the Balkans
as a nexus for the interplay of traditional security interests alongside value-based considerations. In contrast, the genocides and violent intrastate conflicts within Africa, Asia, and the Middle East have largely remained in the realm of domestic politics or delegated to small peacekeeping missions. These international interventions or non-interventions outside of the Western sphere have either served to illustrate a rare, fragile consensus on the protection of innocents or, most often, the indifference of power politics. But the literature on these labeled humanitarian interventions stagnates on dichotomies. In other words, some international relations theorists have interpreted intervention trends as evidence of a more multilateral, ethically-oriented international society – where human rights across the globe may often trump national security considerations or become permanently enjoined within the definition of state security (Finnemore 2003).³ Others have argued that these missions reflect the pursuit of Western national interests, running rampant under the guise of morality, and that in reality, primarily “humanitarian” military interventions do not exist.⁴

Both of these claims introduce generalized, universal arguments, lacking strong contextual foundations. What is required is a foundation that can begin to explain why regions like the Balkans experience military interventions during times of crisis, while systematically suffering African, Asian, Latin American, and some Middle Eastern nations receive less international attention and limited, hesitant intervention. A more nuanced argument that caters to regional differences in the practices and theoretical interactions behind perceived humanitarian interventions is largely missing. In this regard, the literature must look beyond the isolated effects

³ For instance, Martha Finnemore (1996, 2003) argues that humanitarian military interventions have evolved since 1945 – now founded upon multilateral, institutional regulations, instead of direct unilateral use of force. She claims that the legitimacy of force has declined over the decades due to emerging international norms. These norms have also expanded the range of human beings seen as worthy of international military protection.

⁴ Most of these perspectives originate from, but are not limited to, the realist school of international relations.
of traditional variables of security interests, economic benefits, and the scale of human rights abuses to grasp the selectivity gap of humanitarian military interventions.

This is why the following study provides a regionally-sensitive analysis of the driving forces behind the phenomenon of humanitarian military intervention since the end of the Cold War. It distances itself from the assumption that national interests and human rights norms interact in the same manner across global calls for intervention during internal crises. Consequently, in addition to testing the effects of national interests, economic benefits, and humanitarian need on a global perspective, the study examines factors that are not deemed as primary causal forces within main camps of international relations theory – such as constructed regional identities, institutional ties, and perceptions of the origins of the intrastate conflict – as triggers of military intervention (see Campbell 1998). The study focuses on delineating interacting paths between these variables, instead of outright refuting one theory over another.

As future chapters will support, I argue that the selectivity gap of humanitarian military interventions reflects regional bias and varying perceptions of distant conflicts. This regional bias, however, arises from a matrix of forces and is implicit in the benefits that Western governments offer their citizens. A violent crisis occurring in or near a “Western neighborhood” is more likely to receive international attention, relative to one occurring outside of the highly institutionalized neighborhood. But this regional support must be activated by favorable conflict perceptions, such as portraying a crisis as systematic killings or genocide – not ethnic civil wars. Powerful states’ and leaders’ perceptions about a distant conflict can have pivotal effects on what these actors propose as policy solutions to the violence, if any. Thus, when discussing patterns of international interventions, we should be weary of accounts that only focus on national interests or humanitarian norms. Instead, this study shows that both the pursuit of national interests and humanitarian
standards in international relations is a function of regional structures, conditionally activated by very specific conflict narratives.

Following this agenda, the study first reveals the remaining puzzles in our understandings of intervention selectivity through a new quantitative analysis of traditional variables – geopolitical national interests; economic benefits; and humanitarian need/human rights abuses. This initial analytical section highlights the importance of new variables, such as region and conflict perception, as drivers of humanitarian military intervention. It also confirms the need for more in-depth, narrative-based study of the interventions, which offer details on the processes of interest-formation and interacting forces. Next, via an in-depth examination of both positive and negative case studies of international military intervention in instances of intrastate conflict, I can hone in on the relationship between national interests, normative foundations, as interacting with regional institutions, Western neighborhoods, and conflict narratives. In the following sections, I introduce such pathways of regionally-sensitive interventions as contrasted to the general perspective on military interventions.

1.1. Research Question and Approach

The main research question of this study becomes: what drives international actors in the post-Cold War era, primarily the great powers (P5),\(^5\) to intervene militarily in situations of internal conflict in different regions of the world – humanitarian norms, narrow national interests, or perhaps factors unique to the affected region, such as regional institutions, alliances, and historical identities? To some extent, the question attempts to specify the nature of norms-based arguments for humanitarian interventions, in comparison to the reach of power politics. Similarly, the question focuses on degrees of explanatory power and interacting forces – not dichotomies of right

\(^5\) In this case, the Great Powers are synonymous to the P5 – the five permanent members of the UN Security Council: the US, United Kingdom (UK), Russia, China, and France.
and wrong between different theoretical camps. Such delimitations, however, only matter if they create a theoretical and practical space for the investigation of other forces – of a conditional middle-ground between opposing claims. In other words, perhaps there are no such things as humanitarian military interventions within a particular region of the world. Alternatively, perhaps many military interventions that occur within another region of the world, under different catalysts and conflict characteristics, are products of emerging norms of human rights, multilateralism, and calls for a global society (Wheeler 2000; Finnemore 2003).

The nature of humanitarian military intervention remains ambiguous, as the phenomenon currently encompasses a variety of international missions, all with varying degrees of perceived humanitarian need and contexts of selectivity. The West hesitated to intervene in Bosnia until the humanitarian need from the three-way “civil war” reached prospects of genocide, but it intervened in Kosovo within a year of reported mass human rights abuses (Campbell 1998). Humanitarian need was quite evident within these two missions, but when compared to the more widespread and graver atrocities taking place in Darfur, Sudan, or Rwanda, humanitarian need does not seem to explain the selectivity of the missions – leaving room for realist critiques of normative arguments. On the other hand, national interests do not easily explain the trajectory of the chosen regions of military intervention in the 1990s either. Both Bosnia and Kosovo appeared to hold similar levels of interest for Western actors – or no vital interests at all, according to some realists (Mearsheimer quoted in Miller 1999; Mandelbaum 1999; Krauthammer 1999). Furthermore, humanitarian need stands as the strongest reason of Western intervention in Somalia in the early 1990s, thus allowing for the possibility of normatively-driven military interventions (Finnemore 2003). If neither humanitarian norms nor traditional interests provide complete explanations of the selectivity of
these events, perhaps past inactions, “lessons learned,” conflict perception, regional identities, and other underexplored factors may begin to fill in the gaps.

Something is missing in the current analysis and understanding of the phenomenon so readily labeled as humanitarian military intervention. The mechanisms of selectivity behind documented cases of military intervention in intrastate conflict remain blurred, often contradictory, and seemingly random in their probabilistic relations to important theoretical variables. Until these interactions are further untangled, the nature of missions now deemed as humanitarian interventions will remain unresolved. Consequently, even the label of humanitarian intervention will remain rife with suspicion and devoid of practical meaning. Through this study, I illuminate the shortcomings of current understandings of the humanitarian interventions phenomenon and provide pathways in which to move forward.

The main hypothesis that this study tests is that international military interventions in the context of intrastate conflict (denoted as humanitarian interventions) are driven by different pathways within the West versus the non-Western world, making interventions closer to the West most probable and most intense, regardless of relative normative characteristics of the potential intervention. Moreover, certain regions of the world possess strong constructed identities in relation to the West, leading to unique pathways of intervention. Interacting with geographic confines and identity formation, a secondary hypothesis is that the perceived nature of an intrastate conflict produces discrepancies in humanitarian intervention outcomes. Several stages of interaction are proposed and evaluated in both circumstances. This evaluation, however, occurs in the backdrop of initial quantitative analysis of traditional variables, which provides the foundation from which to warrant an investigation of missing dimensions. In other words, after the traditional theoretical hypotheses fail to adequately explain the phenomenon of humanitarian military
intervention, I employ qualitative analysis to explore new forces that may help in resolving emergent puzzles within the research question.

My theoretical framework allows for the strong influence of security interests, yet such interests – including strategic geographical proximity, ties of alliance, primary oil resources, colonial history, and national power capabilities – interact within a normative foundation. This normative foundation, characterized by the duties that states and leaders believe they hold to humans across the globe, is largely materialized via a value-based alliance or geographically-bounded political narrative. In this way, the role of constructed norms isn’t fully dismissed but delegated to regional influence in which it enables the formation and expansion of new interests. In other words, the theoretical framework acknowledges the role of both material and immaterial forces in driving international humanitarian military interventions, but it aims to divest both forces from claims of universality and homogeneity across regions and actors. It also claims different pathways between the necessary and sufficient conditions for intervention in the Western sphere versus the non-Western sphere, primarily differentiated by the existence of a strong value-based narrative, founded on shared institutions and regional context. Below, I offer an outline of the proposed pathways, to be refined and tested in the following chapters.

**Pathways of Intervention**

For states that already have some level of interest in intervention, the normative context of an intrastate conflict in a region of interest, especially the grave humanitarian need for aid, incentivizes greater responses than the context of interstate war or domestic status-quo. Strictly from a rationalist perspective, this context lowers the costs at which a state can intervene in pursuit of interests without great international retaliation or risk – at it can instead appear to intervene for humanitarian purposes. However, when no primary national interests exist in the region of possible
intervention, the normative context becomes a function of other considerations, such as value-based alliances and regional institutions. These institutions allow for a material foundation to a normative mission and create secondary interests in the target region. A value-based alliance, such as NATO or the EU, is founded not only on collective security mechanisms, but also around a set of beliefs that must be promoted and enforced by member states so that the alliance may thrive. These beliefs typically echo the identities that member states must maintain for themselves and their region. For instance, the US and EU must reflect their own domestic identities, centered on the promotion of democracy and human rights, within the international sphere. This is what I denote as “Material Normative Foundations.” Since value-based alliances inherently promote certain normative goals as part of their military missions, they can transform normative beliefs of how things ought to be into material action, promoted alongside tangible geopolitical interests.

In the West, due to the existence of such value-based alliances, humanitarian interventions serve to magnify a normative image for both European and US actors. Thus, in the West, normative causes of intervention are common as they are virtually intertwined with national images, collective security, and economic interdependence. These normative causes range from the need to save innocent lives from brutal dictatorships in nearby regions, returning refugees to their homes, to promoting democracy for the sake of the global community and alliance missions. They propel the creation of secondary interests, in which a state’s traditional interests of security also become functions of how well the state can democratize their regions or can come to the aid of struggling humans outside of sovereign borders. As later analysis will show, such a mechanism has propelled NATO members to action several times in the past decade.

In contrast, normative causes of interventions outside of the West are much more difficult to materialize – standing in opposition of arguments for the emerging influence of international
norms and NGOs and non-state actors. Without robust regional alliances that move beyond military defense, the suffering of strangers across borders cannot be linked to state interests or any truly binding international duty. This dichotomy may be one reason why Western actors readily intervene militaristically during conflict in the Balkan region but are hesitant to involve themselves in non-Western humanitarian military missions, absent of significant differences in vital national interests or humanitarian need. This general dynamic is illustrated in Figure 1, but it requires further elaboration for theoretical and empirical purposes.

**Figure 1: General Pathway to Humanitarian Military Intervention**

In Figures 2 through 4, I differentiate between three distinct pathways that lead to humanitarian military intervention, albeit with different intensities. Any alternative pathways, thus, implicate an absence or very low likelihood of intervention. First, for the activation of all three pathways, the threshold condition of human rights abuses must be present within a unit of intrastate conflict. Once this condition is satisfied, international actors and organizations will consider three main variables regarding potential intervention – variables that are highly interactive, dynamic, and complex in nature: 1.) Geopolitical and economic interests, 2.) Conflict
perception, and 3.) Regional context. The pathways first diverge via the degree of national interest that a target region elicits from key international players capable of intervening. In the first pathway shown in Figure 2, strong national interests, whether in the form geopolitical security interests or vital economic interests, truly drive the decision to military intervene, although the context of humanitarian need is still a required threshold. But other factors related to conflict perception and regional context do not sway the ultimate decision of intervention – just degrees of intervention intensity, ranging from observational peacekeeping mission, air strikes, to complete “boots-on-the-ground” troop incursions.

**Figure 2: Pathway 1 to Intervention during Intrastate Conflict**

In the second pathway shown in Figure 3, national interests exist, but they aren’t vital to state security. In this case, other factors hold the key to intervention selectivity. Conflict perception in the target state, which is also a product of regional identity formation, can alter both cost/benefit analysis of the intervention and prospects of post-intervention success. When national interests remain low, most international actors will stay away from intervening in conflicts denoted as civil wars between equally culpable sides, especially ones with seemingly perpetual, inevitable ethnic or religious hostilities. Reasons behind this pattern will be discussed in detail in later chapters.
International actors may, however, consider intervening in conflicts perceived as international aggression or as manifestations of purposeful, systemic killing by one criminal side. Even then, international parties will also gauge the regional context of these humanitarian abuses. If an intrastate conflict occurs in or near a Western neighborhood, with robust regional institutions available, which also create their own value-based narratives, a humanitarian military intervention becomes much more probable. In contrast, an intrastate conflict far away from a Western neighborhood, lacking linked institutions and political narratives – even if perceived as an example of international aggression or systemic, one-sided killing – will most likely fall to the back of the international agenda or be delegated to a weak, highly limited peacekeeping mission.

**Figure 3: Pathway 2 to Intervention during Intrastate Conflict**

In the most limiting pathway of intervention illustrated by Figure 4, there exist no initial national interests to pursue within the troubled region of possible intervention, hence, perceptions of the conflict alongside regional context and narratives become paramount to selectivity. Only conflicts near or within Western neighborhoods perceived as one-sided systemic killings,
fomenting a narrative of regional identity transformation, will have a high probability of intervention. All others will either receive little international attention of any kind, be remanded to the narrative of intractable conflicts, or incur scattered, often fleeting peacekeeping missions.

Figure 4: Pathway 3 to Intervention during Intrastate Conflict

The next chapter of theoretical and empirical literature review provides greater foundations for some of these predictions, while the following chapters build on concepts such as national interest, economic benefits, and regional context. Ultimately, the two-pronged analysis compares these pathways with both aggregated and in-depth cases of humanitarian military intervention and non-intervention.

1.2. Patterns and Definitions

Before delving further into the research question and next steps, several concepts and goals must be clarified, including the scope of the dependent variable. Although a deeper discussion will be required to deconstruct and reassess the current label of the phenomenon, for the purposes of this study, the measurable definition of humanitarian intervention entails, “the threat of use of force across state borders by a state (or group of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread
and grave violations of the fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied” (Holzgrefe 2003, 18). Similarly, Martha Finnemore (2003) understands humanitarian interventions as “deploying military force across borders for the purpose of protecting foreign nationals from man-made violence” (Finnemore 2003, 53). In keeping consistent with the theoretical literature, this definition excludes two types of behavior occasionally associated with the term: nonforcible interventions such as threat or use of economic, diplomatic, or other sanctions (Holzgrefe 2003, 18; Scheffer 1992, 266; Donnelly 1993, 610ff.), and forcible interventions aimed at protecting or rescuing the intervening state’s own nationals (Holzgrefe 2003, 18; Beyerlin 1982, 213f.). This also excludes interventions to protect foreign nationals from natural disasters (Finnemore 2003, 53; Donnelly 1993, 612f). In sum, the study defines the dependent variable, humanitarian military intervention, as the use of military force by a state or a group of states (including through UN structures) to protect foreign nationals from intrastate abuse and conflict, without the consent of the sovereign power in the given territory.

As will be discussed in more detail, the study differentiates general military interventions from perceived humanitarian interventions via the timing and the region of intervention – serving to insinuate existing motivations beyond common humanitarian rhetorical claims. The chosen unit of analysis, yearly instances of intrastate conflict within a country, allows for the inclusion of interventions that may have potential humanitarian causes, as they occur within the year and within the context of a grave humanitarian crisis. Even if other causes exist within such interventions, they are perceived as directly activated by the drastic humanitarian need of the affected region. Thus, the subsequent occurrence or nonoccurrence of a military intervention in a region experiencing intrastate conflict is considered as an occurrence or nonoccurrence of an international
humanitarian intervention. These patterns of intervention will be compared to patterns of smaller, weaker peacekeeping missions for further theoretical refinement and triangulation of results.

The literature on patterns of humanitarian military intervention tends to treat all regions of the world as equally affected by the national interests of great powers or by emerging international norms. While these dynamics may certainly be large parts of the story, they disregard other important characteristics of the people intervened upon. Regionally-focused studies might provide more nuance while offering some generalizations on patterns of humanitarian military intervention, interacting variables, and the role of less tangible forces, such as political narratives and activated identities.

In addition, most of the existing literature on the selectivity of humanitarian interventions concentrates on qualitative application of theoretical assumptions to individual case studies or conversely, aggregated global trends of humanitarian missions (e.g., Finnemore 2003; Tenbergen 2001; Nardin 2009; Dunne and Schmidt 2011; Bellamy and Wheeler 2011; Latawski and Smith 2003; Doyle 1997; Donnelly 1993). More focused qualitative studies, such as Wheeler’s (2000), investigate the changing norms of humanitarian interventions, deducing motives through analysis of United Nations (UN) Security Council dialogue in multiple country case studies. Many of the quantitatively-oriented studies delve into the outcomes of humanitarian interventions and reasons for success or failure, rather than initial factors of intervention (Seybolt 2008; Kydd and Straus 2013). The same may be said of the literature on peacekeeping operations in instances of civil war or internal conflict (Doyle and Sambanis 2000, 2006; Fortna 2008; Regan 2000; 2002). The few studies that address the phenomenon in a more empirical manner often limit their analysis to individual determining factors for UN interventions/non-interventions, such as the explanatory power of past colonial history and primary export commodities to reflect national interests.
(Gilligan and Stedman 2003). Others rely on coded case study narratives to form theories of humanitarian intervention (Gilligan and Stedman 2003; Perkins and Neumayer 2008; Neack 1995), such as creating typologies of main explanatory factors (public opinion, media, norms) and lists of predicted, ordered relationships between actors involved within different interventions (Lyon and Dolan 2007). Few studies apply a mixed-methods approach to this phenomenon, let alone a regionally-sensitive lens.

The quantitative estimates provided by studies such as Huth (1998) or Perkins and Neumayer (2008), while offering a snapshot of factors with some potential of simultaneously bringing about a UN humanitarian intervention, do not focus on reactions to human rights abuses outside of UN structures and do not assess relative strengths of factors. The studies that begin to account for relative strengths, through their strong logistic regression models, tend to focus on US interventions and do not often combine international and domestic factors, such as regional subtleties, economic benefits, and robust measures of national interests (Mullenbach and Matthews 2008; Choi 2013). Furthermore, the results of these otherwise rigorous studies often contradict each other and differ drastically in their operationalization of variables – with most of them ignoring cases of non-intervention within the analysis. Most importantly, however, these studies do not explore and empirically illustrate the potential relationships between interests, normative foundations, and more regionally-specific forces that may drive modern interventions. As a contribution to this literature, this study’s primary goal is to analyze connections between normative, regional, and traditional security dimensions underlying military humanitarian missions and less intensive forms of peacekeeping. It is one of the few studies that combines quantitative generalizing tools and qualitative exploratory approaches to redefine dynamics of international humanitarian interventions. Past research has failed to capture regional dynamics
between national interests and normative context due to the lack of empirical yet deep examination of individual cases of intervention.

1.3. Contributions

With the crises in Eastern Europe, the advent of the Arab Spring revolutions, the consequent Libyan intervention, and looming interventions in Syria, the international community will have to increasingly make tough decisions related to humanitarian need in regions of ethnic, religious, and security hostilities. These decisions, even if they have the potential to save lives, will be victims of public and political suspicion if humanitarian interventions are not better understood, especially at the regional level. Research should take advantage of the data and narratives arising from these crises to test the interplay between realist factors and other less interest-based international forces. This interplay may be crucial to the acceptability and nature of humanitarian military interventions in our future. Even in terms of mission outcomes, we cannot expect humanitarian success from military missions that do not make human rights protection one of their primary goals. At the very least, academics and policymakers alike must begin to understand why such indifference surrounds questions of ethics, humanitarian rhetoric in military missions, and rhetorical justifications for normatively-laden foreign policy.

Aside from such policy importance, there also exists a consensus in the literature denoting the minimal amount of research done on the main determinants of international humanitarian interventions (Gilligan and Stedman 2003, 38; Perkins and Neumayer 2008, 897; Neack 1995, 187). Noting this deficiency, this study contributes to the understanding of humanitarian interventions in specific regions through quantitative theory-testing and qualitative refinement of causal mechanisms. Unlike the current trend of research, the study is not interested in the success or failure of humanitarian interventions, but on the triggering forces behind the initial decision to
intervene. Also, unlike the majority of works on humanitarian interventions, this research does not characterize humanitarian interventions based on the “humanitarian” outcome of the missions, but on the perception of humanitarian need as the catalyst for humanitarian intentions. It then measures vital factors mentioned in the literature that may increase or decrease the probability of intervention within a confined region – characterized by repetitive intrastate conflict. In this way, the study includes instances of humanitarian need that may not have received substantial international responses. Furthermore, the study updates and enlarges the sample size of cases, not limiting itself to UN or US-only interventions, and proposes more robust measurements of main variables, including an intensity-based measure of intervention. Lastly, the study delves into deep case study analysis of instances of intervention and non-interventions, after refining potential general relationships – seeking out connections that may be less amenable to direct measurement.

1.4. Chapter Overviews

The next chapter introduces the major scholarly contributions to the analysis of humanitarian military interventions. Following a brief discussion of historical trends of humanitarian intervention, this literature review offers a theoretical overview. It examines how major international relations theories of realism, liberalism, and constructivism perceive the phenomenon of international humanitarian military intervention. The focus is on the debate between the contemporary primacy of national interests, norms, and economic interdependence in international politics as well as on the commonly zero-sum relationship between state sovereignty and human rights protection by international actors. In addition, a section on individual-level determinants of international behavior and military intervention is included to pave the way for upcoming case study analysis. After evaluating the theoretical literature, this section then delves into the empirical record of humanitarian military interventions – outlining studies that have
inconsistently proclaimed the supremacy of national geopolitical interests, new international norms, liberal values, geographic proximity, historical milieu, and other commonly assumed factors as drivers of intervention. Lastly, the section discusses less-cited perspectives that begin to move past traditional explanatory factors and allow room for the interplay of complex forces in the selectivity of humanitarian military interventions. These factors include: type of perceived intrastate conflict, Western institutions, and historical narratives.

Chapter three presents the study’s theoretical framework alongside general methodological approaches. Given the mixed-methods research design to test the causal forces behind humanitarian military interventions, this section also operationalizes important concepts and variables, such as geopolitical national interests, humanitarian need, economic interests, and humanitarian military intervention, in preparation for quantitative measurement and analysis. It explains the choices made in sample and case study selection as well as other methodological trade-offs. It then summarizes both the logistics and aims of the upcoming quantitative regression analysis and the qualitative case study examinations. A range of methodological limitations are exposed before beginning this analysis.

Chapter four is the first analytical section of the study. It relies on cross-national, ordered-logistical regression models to test the relationships between literature-relevant variables – geopolitical interests; economic interests; humanitarian need; regional neighborhood – on the occurrence (or nonoccurrence) of military interventions and peacekeeping missions in instances of systemic human rights abuses. The analysis uses a sample of post-Cold War international intrastate conflicts to measure the independent variables; it then quantifies humanitarian interventions through the yearly occurrence or nonoccurrence of an intervention during the progression of each unit of intrastate conflict. The analysis also controls for variables such as
geographic proximity, global economic conditions, democratic status of the afflicted nation, military strength of the nation, and other potential exogenous factors. The chapter reveals and interprets the results of the regression analysis in context with theoretical assumptions and tested hypotheses. Ultimately, the results dismiss the primacy of geopolitical national interests, human rights, and humanitarian suffering as predictors humanitarian military interventions. Instead, regional dimensions and measures of conflict perception and democratization stand as the most powerful explanations of aggregated intervention patterns.

The results of this first analytical section frame the second part of the analysis, starting in chapter five. This chapter, founded upon elite dialogue, archival data, and historiography, relies on the Kosovo Crisis to examine the role of Western neighborhoods and favorable conflict perceptions in driving the NATO military intervention against Yugoslavia in 1999. Chapter six introduces the Libya Crisis as a case of NATO intervention in a region of both national interests and favorable conflict perceptions, albeit not at the center of the Western neighborhood. Finally, chapter seven examines the case of non-intervention in Darfur to compare pathways to intervention and non-intervention in the West and non-Western realms. Regional institutions, Western neighborhoods, and the perceived nature of the intrastate conflict are important realms of analysis in this qualitative section. These dimensions are incorporated into a two-by-two typology of intervention pathways to conclude the case study analysis.

The concluding chapter offers a synthesis of the discovered relationships and trends of third party interventions in intrastate conflict, or humanitarian military interventions. Its biggest purpose is to evaluate the label of humanitarian military intervention in light of previous analysis. Furthermore, it provides a range of theoretical and policy implications for the international community at large, grounded in the results of the mixed-methods analysis. This last section
outlines venues for further research and the social benefits accrued by such endeavors. Greater knowledge would benefit future discussions on humanitarian military missions in war-torn regions, but perhaps most importantly, the knowledge gained from such studies could serve as a general illustration of the factors that continue to matter in contemporary international politics. In other words, have morality and ethical concerns entered the realm of significance in international politics or do state actors continue to vie only for more power, as traditionally assumed? Analyzing the selectivity of humanitarian military interventions across regions, diverse actors, and theoretical dynamics can provide fertile ground for the exploration of such a complex question. It also opens the door to further discussions on the role of ethics and morality in international decision-making – a topic predominantly characterized by silence today.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW: BEYOND DICHOTOMIES OF POWER POLITICS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

*International politics is never about democracy or human rights. It is about the interests of states. Remember that, no matter what they tell you in history lessons.*

*Egon Bahr in a speech at Heidelberg University, 2013*

The dilemma of what to do regarding foreign citizens subject to mass cruelty by their governments or other domestic forces has afflicted the international community for centuries. Along the way, however, the normative context has changed. As a result of legal international obligations written in the UN system, strict limitations were set on how governments could treat their citizens, including international mechanisms of intervention against the gravest of domestic abuses (Wheeler 2000). With the recent adoption of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle within the UN charter, the domestic conduct of governments was further opened to the scrutiny of the international community. The 2005 UN World Summit culminated in world leaders endorsing this international norm of R2P. They agreed that if state governments fail in their responsibilities to ensure the safety of their populations against violence and deprivation, the international community is obligated to take up the responsibility to protect all citizens from genocide and domestic atrocities – regardless of long-held notions of sovereignty.

This norm, however, has proven difficult to enforce in practice, noting the high number of cases of inaction in regions of mass domestic abuses, such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), northern Uganda, Darfur, and Syria. The R2P norm has faced similar contestations as the general concept of humanitarian military intervention from which it arises. Can a military
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6 This quote was originally stated in German. I am grateful to Martin Fieseler for finding, translating, and suggesting the usage of the quote in this project.

7 For an in-depth historical and legal analysis of the development of the R2P norm, see Orford (2011) and Bellamy (2009).
mission activated by interest-wielding states ever be humanitarian? Inescapable contexts of politicization make it difficult to assess whether such trends are widening venues for the pursuit of traditional national interests or strengthening norms of humanitarianism. Perhaps these developments widen the understudied interactions between interests and norms.

Before addressing regional arguments of intervention, the following literature review emphasizes general theoretical and empirical frameworks for understanding the causes of the selectivity of interventions in internal conflict. It then highlights regionally-based perspectives that demand further exploration. This chapter first recalls the definition of humanitarian military intervention – relying on the scholarly consensus that such interventions are characterized by direct military action initiated during or immediately after an escalation of human rights abuses within a foreign land. After a brief historical overview of the phenomenon, it then gives considerable attention to premises of realist theory and its applicability to international military interventions in regions of humanitarian need. Moreover, the review brings to light the limitations of realist theory in relation to the phenomenon under examination. In contrast to realism’s disregard for normative explanations in cases of military intervention, I introduce other perspectives, which position humanitarian military interventions outside the realm of traditional national interests. In other words, this section pays great attention to the debate between ideational-constructivist accounts – which lead us to expect an increase in humanitarian activity and a relatively high degree of consistency in responding to humanitarian crises – and between materialist-realist explanations – suggesting that interventions only occur when substantial security risks or economic interests are at stake, leading to highly selective responses.

Such a debate also serves to discuss the trade-offs and proposed relationships between state sovereignty, human rights, and international interventions. Transgressing unitary state-centric and
universal approaches, supplementing these perspectives is a discussion on regionally-founded mechanisms of intervention and individual-level determinants of international relations. Finally, I delve into studies that move past pure theoretical explanations, and I reveal the ways in which this study contributes to collective knowledge on humanitarian military intervention.

As briefly discussed in the previous chapter, the definition of international humanitarian intervention encompasses the general notion of international military interventions but includes a direct context of humanitarian need. Thus, the definition of “humanitarian” in the context of military interventions possesses two distinct dimensions: the existence of a humanitarian crisis in the region of potential intervention and the consequent perceptions of humanitarian causes in the subsequent intervention. Taking inspiration from Holzgrefe (2003) and Finnemore (2003), we can then define international humanitarian intervention as the use of military force by a state or a group of states (including through UN structures) to protect foreign nationals from intrastate abuse and conflict, without the consent of the sovereign power in the target territory. Therefore, what truly differentiates humanitarian interventions from general military interventions is the humanitarian crisis stemming from the unit of analysis, which leads to perceptions of strong humanitarian motives (which may or may not dominate decisions of intervention or non-intervention). In the post-Cold War literature, the trend in which states militarily intervene in domestic conflict immediately following or during a humanitarian crisis is generally perceived as the phenomenon of humanitarian interventions, regardless of relative factors involved.

An important dimension to recall is that a humanitarian intervention is intended to stop the worst of the human suffering, not to launch a lasting peace, create a new political system, or implement any other post-conflict state-building initiatives. While explicit political objectives tend to follow interventions, they are themselves distinct from humanitarian objectives. This
distinction, however, is often impossible to maintain in practice as most policymakers and leaders demand that potential interventions act to stop human suffering in the short-run and promote political resolutions to crises. In general, any humanitarian intervention is inherently political, ranging from non-military economic and food aid that can disrupt local economies and political systems to peacekeeping military missions that can bolster a violent faction over another.⁸ As Seybolt (2008) summarizes, “Humanitarian intervention is meant to protect fundamental human rights in extreme circumstances; it is not meant directly to protect or promote civil and political rights” (6). But this intention does not hold to reality because interventions almost always promote political interests or ends. In fact, Seybolt (2008) argues that the existence of political goals alongside moral aspirations can produce more robust, resourceful, and ultimately more successful humanitarian missions (20).

2.1. Historical Context of Military Humanitarianism

The norm and institution of nation-state sovereignty, originating in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, have guided international relations into the modern age. Before the institutionalization of sovereignty, international and domestic political behavior was judged by the much older tenets of natural law, based on moral reasoning that recognized the duty of the sovereign to use force to uphold the good of the human community (Nardin 2002, 58; Bellamy 2004, 132). The evolving European Westphalian system, however, activated the use of a new standard – positive international law, founded on the political reasoning and joint will of nation-states (Seybolt 2008, 8). In time, this system proclaimed the nation-state as the autonomous, self-contained unit of international politics, bestowing upon it absolute authority within its own borders along with expectations that it, too, would respect the sovereignty of member states. If a state’s sovereignty

---
⁸ See Anderson (1999).
was violated by another state, as it often was via wars of territorial expansion and economic competition, then it had the right to military self-defense. Furthermore, a state had the right to invoke the support of other allied states to return to the status quo, even if that meant punishing the aggressor state (Krasner 1999; Seybolt 2008). Under the influence of positive law, the view emerged that domestic governments had the right to rule any way they saw fit within their territorial border, without fear of outside intervention – leaving individual human rights at the mercy of the state.

By the end of World War II, the ravages of massive interstate violence and violations of sovereignty prompted the creation of more robust systems of collective security, such as the UN, to oversee the application of the interrelated norms of national sovereignty, self-defense, and collective security. But by this time, the international community was grappling with new norms of state behavior as well – having already experienced the international anti-slavery campaign, the de-colonization movement, and the worst systemic violation of human rights within Europe, the Holocaust (Finnemore 1996, 2003). The bedrock principle of state sovereignty was starting to sway amidst weak but existing international calls against human rights abuses within domestic borders. The tension between state sovereignty and individual human rights was best illustrated in the international system’s most well-known collective agreement: the UN Charter. In it, states and international organizations are prohibited from using military force except in self-defense or when authorized by the UN Security Council to prevent threats to international security. But the Charter, via the Universal Declaration of Human Rights along with the 1948 Genocide Convention, also protects individual human rights outside of sovereign state structures.

---

The Cold War era generally muted this tension in favor of geopolitical, economic, and cultural competitions among the great powers, with a few exceptions. In 1971, due to unfavorable, threatening electoral outcomes, the Pakistani Army killed over one million people and displaced millions more into India. When the Indian military intervened in East Pakistan, it initially justified itself to the UN on humanitarian grounds. But Indian officials quickly changed their rhetoric to fit under traditional national security considerations when other governments objected to the breaching of the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention. On the opposite spectrum, some years later in 1979, Viet Nam overthrew Pol Pot’s brutal regime in Cambodia, and Tanzania overthrew Idi Amin in Uganda – both moves leading to significant humanitarian outcomes. Yet both intervening regimes justified their actions solely on national security grounds and ignored humanitarian arguments (Wheeler 2000; Seybolt 2008, 10). Alternatively, between 1948 and 1983, Arend and Beck (1993) counted 11 instances of military interventions with underlying humanitarian rhetoric and proclaimed motives, yet the authors rejected every instance as practically driven by non-humanitarian considerations (112–37).

In the post-Cold War atmosphere, however, the principle of national sovereignty was confronted with stronger limitations from the expansion of the doctrine of human rights. The concept and practice of humanitarian intervention challenges the scope and condition of state sovereignty by assuming a responsibility to protect civilians outside of domestic state jurisdictions. Repeated proclaimed humanitarian interventions since 1991 have echoed the rise of a new “human security” perspective on the use of force, at least in the West – placing the rights of people, not states, at the forefront of international security (Seybolt 2008, 1). In fact, by 1993 and in the years to follow, some scholars proclaimed the emergence of a “normative consensus” regarding the conditions required for a legitimate international intervention in intrastate conflicts. The agreed
upon conditions include the existence of grave abuses against moral and political standards, a collective military mission, and a high probability of a positive humanitarian outcome (Reed and Kaysen 1993; Damrosch 1993, 1-27; Mertus 2001). Although still highly contested, the perspective borrows greatly from the Just War tradition to legitimate humanitarian militarism (Seybolt 2008, 12). This line of “natural law” thought, which culminated in the acceptance of the R2P principle, declares human rights to be intrinsically more valuable than state sovereignty. Yet, even though bolstered by a changing context, the “normative consensus” must still take a backseat to the positive law tradition of state sovereignty, as this remains the only legal framework of international relations.

While the new normative doctrine has spurred strong, albeit non-unanimous, support in the North, it has incited controversy and fear in the South, where states are still reeling from their heritage of colonial occupation and eager to enjoy their independent state-building. The concept of states’ responsibility to protect civilians, especially as portrayed in the R2P principle, has drawn severe criticisms from many governments in Asia and Latin America, which see in it the encouragement of military intervention by strong states against weak ones. In addition, since the US declared its international “war on terrorism” on September 2001, the notion of humanitarian intervention has further been perceived as either a clever strategy for national security attainment or as an obsolete practice of the 1990s, with governments shifting their focuses to the sole protection of vital national interests (Traub 2004). The US’s use of humanitarian rhetoric to invade Iraq in 2003, after its previous justifications were proven wrong, was a particularly suspicious moment for the doctrine of humanitarian intervention (Human Rights Watch 2004a).

---

11 The Just War tradition encompasses principles for going to war (jus ad bellum) and during war (jus in bello). The criteria for a just military intervention are: just cause, right intention, right authority, last resort, and a reasonable prospect of success. The criteria for legitimacy during war are proportionality and discrimination. See Waltzer (1977) for more details.
This suspicion of ulterior aims reflects more broadly, for example, in the international reluctance to react in instances of grave domestic atrocities. The tension between the emerging norm of human security and the dominance of traditional security concerns and sovereignty remains unaddressed for the most part. Additionally, it is difficult to silence the practical consensus that stopping civil wars, ethnic conflict, and cases of potential genocide is costly, domestically unpopular, and very difficult to bring to successful fruition in the long-run.

The consistent reluctance characterizing the atrocities in Darfur is a sobering reminder of this tension. Since 2003, hundreds of thousands have been killed and millions have been displaced from their homes due to the fighting between Sudanese government-sponsored militias and the indigenous population – with the US even officially accusing the Sudanese government of genocide (Prunier 2008; Seybolt 2008).12 Instead of justifying intervention through state sovereignty or impending disruptions in international order, supporters of intervention in Darfur collectively condemn the mass loss of human life (Prunier 2008). Even with such rhetoric and support, the international responses to the persistent killings in Darfur have proven gravely insufficient to protect civilians, echoing the failures of the international community in preventing mass violence in other places of domestic chaos and death.

The inherent dilemma is that preventive military action on behalf of humanitarian goals is difficult to justify, given the high probability of underlying interests and coupled with the potential destructiveness of a military operation. On the other hand, delayed military action can mean sacrificing thousands of civilian lives. All post-Cold War humanitarian crises have faced this dilemma, repeating itself with different outcomes in places such as northern Iraq in 1991, in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1995, Somalia from 1993-95, Rwanda in 1994, Kosovo from 1998-99, East

---

12 This is the first time in history that one government has accused another of ongoing genocide.
Timor in 1999, and most recently, in Darfur from 2005-06 and Libya in 2011.\textsuperscript{13} Although confronted with similar moral, practical, and political challenges, the international community has stepped up to confront certain humanitarian crises while completely ignoring others. Below, I explore the theoretical foundations of causal factors that may explain the selectivity of third party interventions in regions of humanitarian crisis (overwhelmingly labeled as humanitarian interventions in the post-Cold War era).

2.2. Theories of International Relations

Each dominant theoretical camp in international relations posits different causal factors and pathways for the selectivity of interventions in regions of internal conflict. Some theories contradict, dismiss, or minimize the main causal factors of other perspectives, with few attempts at integration of frameworks and variables. This section introduces theoretical frameworks that place geopolitical national interests, economic interests and democracy-building, human rights, or constructed norms as the main driving force behind decisions to intervene in instances of humanitarian crisis. The empirical record behind these theoretical lenses, however, leaves much to be desired and encourages the implementation of more multi-faceted, currently muted perspectives on the phenomenon of humanitarian military intervention. In other words, without outright dismissing the theoretical variables of main camps, these other perspectives can begin to situate, integrate, and refine multiple causal mechanisms.

\textit{Dominant Realist Perspective - Interests}

While some liberal and constructivist theorists accept the role of morality and a degree of “need” or “responsibility” as related to military interventions (Finnemore 2003; Doyle 1997), most realist theorists remain overwhelmingly skeptical. They note that all interferences in state

\textsuperscript{13} For a detailed historical analysis of these humanitarian crises, including the international community’s response, see Weiss (2007).
sovereignty are mere guises for powerful states’ interests. Realism stands as the strongest example of a theory that distances itself from ethical considerations – serving as the theory’s biggest self-inflicted limitation in dealing with contemporary political questions. The underlying assumption is that ethics must take a secondary role to the power struggle that defines the international system (Carr 1939; Morgenthau 1948; Buzan 1996).

As Morgenthau (1948) argued, politics is rooted in objective laws of a conflictual human nature; the main explanatory variable is the pursuit of national interests, as defined by power; the state’s primary moral goal is survival; and universal ethics and norms can never be applied in the abstract as the moral realm of the state is distinct from the moral realm of the universe. In other words, states behave in their own self-interest and craft foreign policy aimed toward bolstering national power capabilities (Carr 1939; Morgenthau 1948; Mearsheimer 2001). This “prudent” behavior is, in fact, deemed as the highest moral ground for states, according to realist doctrine. Thus, state national interests appear rather fixed and unaffected by trends in domestic politics, ideological leanings, regional variations, or other sources of potential change.

As neo-realist Waltz (1979) further elaborates, norms mean little in international politics because the structure of the system forces states to behave in the same way, regardless of individual or normative attributes. All states must act within the confining structure of international anarchy, in which no higher authority exists to regulate, adjudicate, or support individual state behavior. This self-help system leads to a zero-sum international game, in which states must preserve their security via a constantly changing balance of power. Moreover, the structure of anarchy socializes states to behave in egoist ways to assure their survival – always ignoring ethics for the pursuit of security interests. Regardless of the truthfulness of such realist assumptions, these views create self-fulfilling prophecies of egoistic, non-cooperative states that must block normative
considerations for sake of self-preservation. As will be elaborated below, under such assumptions, it would be foolish to pursue a normative, ethical agenda within the international system. In fact, realists would argue that doing so only leads to further tragedy. By circumventing the only structures that provide fragile order to the international sphere, states would invite chaos. Ultimately, international military interventions in the realist perspective must only occur in the light of strong national interests.

Since realists elevate the state as the most important agent, claims of state sovereignty become paramount as well. Realist theories assume that states in the international system are sovereign, that "states are accorded a set of rights and assume a set of responsibilities, the most important of which is the mutual recognition of each other's autonomy and juridical equality" (Deudney and Ikenberry 1999, 187). Sovereignty serves as the strongest rule, institution and even implicit norm with which realism discourages ideologically-driven state interventions and preserves order. The guarantee of state sovereignty is one of the primary ways in which the international system may be institutionalized against anarchy (Deudney and Ikenberry 1999). Much of the arguments about humanitarian intervention can be summarized with the tension of "sovereignty versus suffering," and for realists, the sovereign state is a necessary condition for the easement of suffering (Tenbergen 2001, 5). A military intervention that breaches the institution of sovereignty for anything other than overriding security interests is not only improbable and unwise; it is an attempt to destabilize an existing system of order meant to ensure a fragile peace. Realist theory then emphasizes that every state is entitled to preserve itself without outside interference (Nardin 2009). Thus, not only are humanitarian interventions futile and misguided, they may also be harmful.

Another realist stance often employed toward humanitarian interventions is that a nation's
external policies should be guided by national interest, the desire to maximize stability and minimize harm, not ethics or morality. The literature equates national interest to: the maintenance and extension of geopolitical influence in the “near abroad” and globally (Bellamy and William 2005), preservation of the distribution of power as also established through former colonial ties (Gilligan and Stedman 2003; Bellamy and Williams 2005; Perkins and Neumayer 2008), and political, military or strategic stakes in a region (Neack 1995, Huth 1998, Finnemore 2003). Realists predict that unless these vital national interests are at stake, states will not intervene internationally as they risk soldiers’ lives and high economic and political costs. Hence, the best the international community can hope for is “a happy coincidence where the promotion of national security also defends human rights” (Wheeler 2000, 30). More specifically, under the realist scope of national interest, states may intervene to bolster another state or aid an ally, block a regional hegemon or counterbalance an internal power situation when another state has intervened. Some cases may include efforts to prevent violent spillovers, whereas others may revolve around economic factors, such as protecting financial interests, promoting market stability, and shielding industries (Roberts 1993, 448). Humanitarian objectives, if they are ever to be considered, should only be pursued if a nation is confident that a success is commensurate with costs and effort (Tenbergen 2001).

For realists, war falls outside the scope of moral judgment as it is an instrument of national policy, and thus, decisions of war are based on prudence (Nardin 2009). It would be imprudent for a statesman to sacrifice self-interest to adhere to ethical conduct internationally (Dunne and Schmidt 2011). The realist self-help concept further enforces anti-interventionist norms by holding that each state must be responsible for ensuring its own well-being (Dunne and Schmidt 2011). Any statesman who engages in humanitarian intervention would not be behaving in a way that
minimizes state vulnerabilities and maximizes opportunities (Buzan 1996). Therefore, when the international community proclaims a new humanitarian mission, realists assume actor rationality and note that the intervention is more likely triggered by calculations of national interest than by what is best for foreign victims (Bellamy and Wheeler 2011).

In one of the earliest works of modern realism, Carr (1939) emphasizes that theories of international morality or legitimacy are always “the products of dominant nations of groups of nations” (111). Consequently, any normative or value-based dimension of a so-called humanitarian intervention still falls under the realist scope of national interests and prudent foreign policy. As Fareed Zakaria further elucidates, "the best solution to the perennial problem of the uncertainty of international life is for a state to increase its control over that environment through the persistent expansion of its political interests abroad" (Donnelly 2009, 44). Moreover, in most versions of realist theory, it is assumed that international law has no effect in legitimatizing or condemning intervention. Realists regard international law with great skepticism since no central authority exists in the international sphere to adjudicate and enforce law (Reus-Smit 2011). Such outlooks severely limit the role of norms, morality, and international conventions on humanitarian decisions; instead, they perpetuate the status-quo and an international realm devoid of transformative change. In this perspective, state sovereignty remains the only robust, institutionalized norm in the international sphere. Hence, Morgenthau, as other contemporary realists, was dismissive of the prospect of international humanitarian norms supplanting national interest when it came to justifying a military intervention (Morgenthau, paraphrased in Latawski and Smith 2003, 22).

As evidenced, there is a large amount of theoretical background on the perceived drivers of humanitarian interventions, especially as seen through the dominant realist lens. But without
empirical, focused research, there is no way to rule out the role of humanitarian intent and whether norms play any role in altering national interests. After all, realist theory may offer a dark perspective on international dynamics. Most importantly, this perspective fails to account for many observed changes in international dynamics since the 1940s and after the end of the Cold War. Contemporary international politics is characterized by more than the linear pursuit of national interests. Especially in the case of military interventions in intrastate conflict, fluid national interests are now just one source of explanatory power, contending against the sway of ethical and normative expectations.

In contrast to realism’s normative blindness, Hedley Bull of the English School envisions circumstances where the norms of international society could lead to value-based intervention, due to growing legal and moral recognition of human rights and increased global interconnectedness (Bull paraphrased in Latawski and Smith, 2003, 23). Although Bull (1977) accepts realist assumptions of unitary states interacting within the confines of anarchy and self-help, he addresses the unwritten rules or norms that have allowed for international order across the ages. He argues for the existence of an international society, in which states conceive themselves bounded by a common set of rules and share common institutions, outside the realm of pure power politics and the orderings of state sovereignty. Such a perspective begins to bridge the gap between a realist state-centric world, characterized by fixed interests, and a more complex world, underwritten by implicit rules and expectations of international behavior. Although not directly addressed, this perspective allows room for the analysis of identity formation between agents and states alongside regional conflict perceptions.

Wheeler (2000) delves further into the normative story of 1990s interventions, weaving in the motives of the actors, their public legitimating reasons, the international response, and the
success of the actions in humanitarian terms.\textsuperscript{14} Countering the realist disregard for international law and normative power, Wheeler (2000) argues that an emerging, legitimizing norm of UN-authorized humanitarian interventions can be seen through analysis of UN Security Council justifications – but this norm permeates at global level. If tested both quantitatively and qualitatively, how do such “imprudent” moral factors, easily dismissed by realism, influence intervention trends, if at all? Additionally, would there be room left for more regional explanations or actor-based differences? The following sections introduce theoretical perspectives that, unlike realism, examine the role of norms and values in international politics to varying degrees – yet individually, neither one of these theories provide a satisfying understanding of the phenomenon of humanitarian military interventions.

\textit{Liberalism – Human Rights and Democratic Interventions}

Liberalism, while primarily acting as an extension of realist thought, allows for some limited normative considerations in international relations. Although the theory accepts the structure of anarchy, the central role of the state, and the pursuit of national interests as the basis of international politics, it disputes many realist conclusions on the probability of cooperation, range of national interests, and the role of domestic politics. Liberals argue that democratic values, economic interdependence, and institutional regulations drive both states and the international system toward cooperative arrangements and perhaps more ethical policymaking (Buzan 1996; Keohane 1984). Neo-liberalism, especially, widens venues for cooperation by highlighting the role of international institutions in mitigating the conflictual, amoral effects of an anarchic international structure (Deudney and John Ikenberry 1999). As Keohane (1984) argues, international

\textsuperscript{14} Wheeler’s analysis, however, introduces a complicated debate on cosmopolitan ethics, practices, and norms in relation to international intervention behavior. In the interest of narrowing the scope of analysis, this thesis engages with this perspective only to a limited extent in upcoming chapters.
cooperation is possible through the benefits of international institutions, founded upon mutual shared state interests. These institutions serve to decrease transaction costs, increase the symmetry of information across state actors, offer opportunities for iterative interactions and compliance monitoring, and diminish the chances of cheating in the international sphere. But in this neoliberal view, institutions don’t directly alter norms, nor do they exist due to ethical dimensions – they merely serve to alter state calculations by decreasing uncertainty and making cooperation more beneficial for state interests.

Liberals also argue that an expansion of democracy will increase international cooperation, as democratic nations may be less likely to fight one another due to both institutional limitations and normative characteristics (Doyle 1997; Russett 1994). This view of democratic peace, however, limits normative explanations to democratic values, economic liberalization, and the benefits of a Western international regime – marking it as the quintessential, generalized Western lens on international relations. Lastly, another liberal perspective on the possibility of cooperation stems from interdependent economic policies, which connect nations to one another in symbiotic ways and decrease chances of conflict (Keohane 1984). In general, the liberal perspective fails to embrace norms as enablers of cooperation or as catalysts of foreign policy trends; instead, the perspective keeps close to realist assumptions and only alters them to leave room for greater economic incentives and internal political dynamics between states. Even liberal theorist Stanley Hoffman (1981), who encourages the introduction of ethical standards internationally, is careful to delineate his argument around the tenets of realism and liberalism – careful not to reach “moral absolutism.”

In the liberal theoretical perspective, humanitarian military interventions reflect international moral obligations, especially for democratic world powers (Lischer 2005; Murdie
and Davis 2010; Pearson et al. 1994). These additional obligations, nonetheless, come at the cost of weakening the institution of state sovereignty under limited circumstances. While the realist international system relies on the belief that state borders are generally inviolable and that sovereign governments exercise wide prerogatives within them, liberals would interject that “there are no state’s rights if the sovereign power has withdrawn its commitment to the very obligations that underwrite the state’s existence” (Herbert 2005, 30). As Herbert (2005) states, “the sovereign’s commitment to use its monopoly on violence wisely, accountably, and exclusively for the common good stands at the foundation of the contract by which states are formed” (32). Thus, in liberal thought, the norm and international institution of sovereignty may become a function of a nation’s domestic political record, not merely a function of the power and national interests of an intervening nation. This understanding of the construct of sovereignty allows liberal theorists to inject some moral considerations, related to humanitarian need, within the debates on the possibility of interventions – albeit without any regional or conflict variations.

Liberal theorists emphasize that military force should be employed against countries that propagate massive human rights violations, given that state sovereignty becomes conditional on internal political dynamics (Hoffmann, 1996; Roberts, 1993; Walzer, 1977). Under such circumstances, classic sovereignty may need to be “unbundled” from its multifaceted definitions and functions so that human rights may triumph (Keohane 2003, 286). Krasner (2001) separates sovereignty into four ideal types that may not always co-exist in reality: 1. Domestic sovereignty, the organization of authority within the territory of a given state; 2. Interdependence sovereignty, a state’s ability to control movements across its borders; 3. International legal sovereignty, the recognition of an entity as a state by other established states; and 4. Westphalian sovereignty, the total exclusion of outside authority structures from the domestic decision-making of a state. In this
conception, sovereignty becomes a variable with a continuum or gradation, not a constant force of the international system (Keohane 2001, 286).

When humanitarian military interventions occur, liberal theorists may condone temporary or even systemic losses in Westphalian (external) sovereignty so that human rights conditions improve in the target state(s) and domestic sovereignty can be reestablished. Some theorists such as Talbott (2005) even believe that universal human rights stand as the minimal necessary and sufficient conditions for domestic political legitimacy. Hence, when massacres, ethnic cleansing campaigns, or genocides occur among opposing groups within a country, humanitarian military intervention becomes an accepted option if it has the potential to stop the killings and restore political legitimacy (Kurth 2006; Talentino 2005).

Bagnoli (2006) takes this argument a step further, moving from calls of legitimacy to calls of duty: “there is a strict moral duty to intervene when fundamental human rights are violated … to protect the victims and to coerce the wrongdoer … [these] duties follow from respect for humanity and hence are a matter of justice, not of mercy” (118-119). Overall, these liberal perspectives have become more common since the end of the Cold War, advancing the stance that states and international organizations are justified and even expected to launch a humanitarian intervention abroad in response to humanitarian catastrophes, absent vital security interests (Talentino 2005). In fact, Pearson et al. (1994) claim that “humanitarian motives usually do little to further interveners’ power interests,” rather, they are invoked against governments that severely violate the human rights of their citizens (208). The problem with this view, however, is that its moral duties and economic incentives do not appear to hold with any consistency across international calls for humanitarian intervention.

Branching off the democratic peace thesis (Doyle 1997; Russett 1994), liberal theorists
also emphasize that democratic states are more likely to participate in humanitarian military operations. Due to their structures of representation and popular accountability, democracies derive greater legitimacy from liberal principles. Plus, in comparison with non-democracies, democracies tend to accept more readily the view that individuals possess intrinsic human rights that must be protected (the natural law heritage), at the expense of state sovereignty (Lebovic 2004). Moreover, democratic governments are likely to export liberal values through humanitarian military interventions. Democratic state-building, the protection of human rights across borders, and economic interdependence become hard to separate from states’ self-interest. In other words, spreading democracy and other liberal principles across the globe is perceived as essential to the attainment of an international harmony of interests (Owen 1996, 118). These goals become so entangled with state interests that they can override the institution of sovereignty, just as realist security interests justify breaching the principle of non-intervention. The concern arises, however, when one notes that liberal democratic states are on average relatively more powerful than others in the international system – bringing some realist doubt to the causal relationship between democracies and higher rates of humanitarian intervention.

But the role of institutions serves as liberalism’s strongest and more adaptable contribution to this debate. Institutional liberals claim that morality and democratic values are most potent when bonded to an institutional framework. Membership in the same regional or international organization encourages states to hold to common norms, rules, and principles, creating international regimes that reframe national interests, international agendas, and dimensions of human rights (Perkins and Neumayer 2008). Institutional membership also alters degrees of sovereignty as states must trade off some dimensions of the classic, unitary concept of Westphalian sovereignty for protection and cooperation. Thus, liberals may argue that common membership in
well-regulated institutional settings can intensify the moral duty towards a country affected by human rights violations, consequently, making international military interventions in regions of internal conflict more likely (Bellamy and William 2005). The independent variable of institutional membership and context can begin to offer us a more regionally-sensitive perspective on humanitarian interventions, noting that robust liberal institutions in themselves are regionally-bounded entities, both in a material and ideational sense.

The general liberal argument for humanitarian military interventions is best exemplified through the introduction of the R2P principle, first outlined by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty in 2001 (ICISS 2001). As outlined above, in line with liberal perspectives on the role of the state, this principle holds that states have a responsibility to protect their citizens from genocide and human rights atrocities. When states fail to do so, the responsibility is transferred to external actors, allowing for military humanitarian interventions as a last resort. This is because unlike realists, liberals advocate that the multifaceted concept of sovereignty partially derives from a state’s internal characteristics and ability to provide for its citizen, not from international structures. The R2P, although unanimously adopted at the 2005 World Summit and a driving force behind UN interventions, remains non-binding and open to endless interpretations by states and the international community. Herein lay the limitations of liberalism in explaining patterns of humanitarian military interventions. If R2P is just a norm, without any institutional or legal support, then how can we explain when this norm becomes activated? After all, many governments still get away with massive atrocities against their people while the international community remains silent, and many governments remain highly undemocratic even when interacting with a range of international institutions and economic actors. For the most part, the liberal perspective, similarly to realism, is too general in its global
applications and ignores the direct influence of norms in potentially shaping patterns of military interventions in regions of humanitarian need. Both the theory of realism and liberalism must be expanded to incorporate the increasing role of norms, non-state actors, and ethical considerations beyond a uniform global lens. The next theory of constructivism partially serves this purpose, but it, too, often generalizes the phenomenon of international humanitarian intervention without regard to unique regional variations.

**Constructivism - Emerging Norms**

The constructivist perspective further rejects the realist worldview but does not rely solely on liberal values to explain international state behavior. Instead, it focuses on the role of international norms and constructed identities in creating and altering state interests, expectations, and interactions. This approach accuses the liberal and realist perspectives of being “undersocialized,” as the two theories pay little attention to ways in which state interests are founded upon ideas, not mere material capacities. Wendt (1999), the founder of Constructivism, argues that all interactions in the international sphere, from the motivations of states to the environment in which states act, are socially constructed. He claims that the realist and liberal assumptions of a self-help international structure stems from the assumption of egoistic states, not from the logic of anarchy. In fact, states don’t always showcase egoistic behavior, and in these cases, different “cultures of anarchy” can evolve. As states’ identities and interests are constructed, anarchy too is a socially constructed international institution that can consequently be altered by other emerging norms and expectations.

Wendt (1999) introduces the Hobbesian culture of anarchy as a portrayal of realist expectations. States perceive each other as enemies and thus focus solely on relative power gains, self-interest, and notions of self-help to survive. But there is also the Lockean culture of anarchy,
in which states see each other as rivals and legitimize basic international agreements and treaties, especially the institution and norm of sovereignty. Thirdly, the Kantian culture occurs when states are socialized to see one another as friends and share in common discourse and cooperative norms. In this third culture, unique, value-laden relationships between states and even non-state actors become possible and indeed commonplace. Unlike the above rationalist theories, Wendt’s constructivism opens the door to important normative dimensions as to how states form their expectations of what is accepted in the international system – including more alternatives for the institutionalization and enforcement of state sovereignty. Alternatives in the norm of sovereignty also signify more pathways for the evolution of international interventions.

Grounding her analysis on similar constructivist perceptions of state behavior, Finnemore (2003) claims that while security-driven international military interventions have been a common occurrence in history, the conditions in which states consider and partake in these interventions have evolved. Finnemore (2003) further argues that the ordering principle of the international system has shifted from a balance of power to today’s multilateral structures with blurred notions of sovereignty – changing the way states perceive and pursue their security interests. Within the current multilateral system, prevailing international norms fundamentally shape state behavior, prohibiting unilateral, illegitimate use of force. In addition, this multilateral system arguably allows more room for normative framings and for breaches in state sovereignty for legitimate means, including the protection of human beings through sanctioned institutions. Finnemore (2003) contends that neither realist nor liberal models of international relations account for such observable trends of military intervention. Realism fails at explanation because the evolution of the practice of all types of intervention, from unilateral debt-collecting military missions to humanitarian multilateral missions, does not match the changes in the polarity, or power
distribution, of the system. For example, she finds that realism cannot account for US involvement in Somalia, as it held no strategic or economic interests. Liberalism also fails because non-democratic, non-free market states appear to follow many of the same norms regarding intervention (Finnemore 2003, 52-56). The liberal camp cannot explain the limited interventions of Iraq (1991) and Kosovo (1999) that did not pursue liberal goals (i.e., democratic state building and free market promotion). Similarly, the idealist/moralistic view cannot explain the lack of involvement in the Rwandan genocide. Instead, Finnemore (1996) details how norms have altered practices of international humanitarian interventions. Before 1945, most humanitarian interventions targeted white, Christian populations, seen as deserving of protection. But after 1945, most humanitarian interventions occurred in non-Western, non-white regions of the world. Aside from a limited regional deviation, these interventions also changed from being overwhelmingly unilateral to being sanctioned by international institutions.

Perhaps the most significant point in the constructivist perspective on military interventions is that national interests, realism’s focal points, are very difficult to objectively determine and are fluid rather than fixed (Wendt 1992). It is always easy to construct interest-based arguments for and against intervention after the fact, but it is difficult to prove the actors’ actual motivations, especially if norms themselves help craft actors’ interests. States calculate their interests based on what is considered legitimate at the time (Finnemore 2003). In the current international system, for example, they may justify military interventions through the authority of international bodies and via the developing norms of protecting innocents.

Keck and Sikkink (1998), in their discussion of Transnational Advocacy Networks (TANs), further expand on the importance of norms in shaping international behavior. They argue that TANs, consisting of a diverse range of international actors bound together by shared purpose,
principles, and a dense web of information and services, act as alternate channels for international access and communication. TANs also serve to blur state boundaries, reshape the meaning of state sovereignty, reframe interests, and spread new norms internationally. Through the provision of information, symbolic campaigns, and pressure strategies against state actors, TANs alter states’ views on what is legitimate and what ultimately requires an intervention.

According to such frameworks, the observed changed in international dynamics – including the growing phenomenon of humanitarian military interventions, the altered understandings of state sovereignty, and enforcement of human rights across state borders – don’t have to occur in the context of strong international law or tangible institutional frameworks, as liberal theorists argue. They also don’t require the existence of vital geopolitical interests, in the realist sense. These changes may instead be driven by abstract, fluid normative interactions between agents’ identities to one another, their expectations of the international structure, and perceived relationship and responsibilities to the international “other”.

But while such a perspective improves upon both realist and liberal limitations, it falls short in explaining the selectivity of humanitarian trends. Variables must be prioritized and further specified. The power of normative interactions is not only difficult to observe and isolate, but it is inadvertently assumed as homogenous across regions and actors. Realists and liberals argue that the main problem with constructivist accounts is that they neglect the effects of power interests and only showcase the successful implementation of norms – not the many cases of failed norms compliance and rampant violations – designated by Krasner (1999) as “organized hypocrisy” (Cardenas 2004, 220). The constructivist framework, however, holds great potential to grapple with more nuanced norm formation – as dependent on conflict context, interests, and institutional effects – especially if it can overcome a state-centric lens and make use of mixed-methods data.
Individuals and Military Interventions

Although different in their underlying assumptions and proposed outcomes, all of the above theories of international relations share one important feature: to varying degrees, they all privilege the unitary state as the main unit of analysis when decisions of intervention or non-intervention must be made. This focus makes it easy to ignore individuals in international relations, but these individuals may prove relevant in the phenomenon of humanitarian military interventions. Even dominant international relations theories recognize this fact, but still push individual-level factors to the background in favor of systems- or state-level analysis (Morgenthau 1948; Russett 1994; Doyle 1997; Finnemore 1996, 1999; Wendt 1999).

As Migdal (2001) has argued, the state is only one institution among many that seeks to exert control over society and consequently, political outcomes. Moreover, the state is not as idealistically unitary as international relations theories presuppose. It can instead be seen as the constructed arena in which individual elites, shifting coalitions, and local strongmen struggle for influence over society (Migdal 2001). Hence, aside from expectations of unity and coherent organization, the state must also be perceived as a fragmented, conflicted entity with many competing interests. In order to investigate such competing interests and fragmentations, the analysis of individuals and groups within the realm of international relations becomes imperative. In the case of military interventions, individuals or groups may play significant roles in blocking, reframing, or initiating particular interventions in regions of internal strife.

Each one of the three main international relations theories touch upon the individual dimension, if only secondarily. Classical and neoclassical realism imparts foreign policy importance to state leaders and their grand strategy formations, personal motivations, and individual traits (Carr 1939; Morgenthau 1948). Indeed, neoclassical realism prioritizes the
relationship between systemic forces and domestic, individual-level factors in political reactions to external events (Wohlforth 1993; Rose 1998; Schweller 2004). The theory highlights two forces that complicate systems-based expected foreign policy outcomes: 1.) elite decision-making and its foundation upon imperfect, ideologically-based information; and 2.) the relationship between the state and society. Thus, **domestic-level forces** – including identity politics, statesmen’s perceptions of power distributions, and the restrictions of national power via public opinion and domestic pressure groups – become key to foreign policymaking variations.

On the other hand, liberalism values individual-based rights as standards of international behavior, attempting to implicate these standards as reasons for military intervention in regions of human rights abuses (Hoffman 1981; Herbert 2005). In addition, as with classical realism, liberalism imbues individual leaders and their specific regime types with the power to alter foreign policy outcomes (Russett 1994; Doyle 1997). Constructivism attempts to use the interaction between individual agents and structural state arenas and internalized norms to formulate understandings of international relations (Finnemore 1996, 1999; Wendt 1999). In the case of TAN formation, constructivist theorists such as Keck and Sikkink (1998) even make a direct causal connection between individuals, their specialized groups, and international policymaking specific to human rights regimes and intervention norms. Other constructivists, such as Checkel (2001), accept the rationalist cost/benefit mechanism incentivized by material benefits or sanctions, but also supplement it with normative transformations to explain individual behavior amidst institutional constraints. Checkel (2001), for instance, claims that agents comply with domestic and international regimes due to traditional coercion and material incentives as well as social learning and processes of socialization pushed by institutions. In other words, the constructivist perspective on individual behavior ranges from a pure focus on ideational forces to a negotiation
with rational choice perspectives – in which agents pursue nonmaterial goals, such as normative or ethical values, while consequentialism—means and ends calculations underlie their choices. These tensions between material-based agency and highly socialized, learned agency also mimic the current dilemma between perspectives on humanitarian military interventions at the state and systemic level of analysis.

The state unit of analysis becomes problematic and limiting at times, prompting the exploration of more individual-level bases of analysis regarding the selectivity of humanitarian military interventions. Individual leaders, bureaucrats, or domestic coalitions are said to directly alter the route of external policymaking via personal ideologies, preferences, or interests. As Jervis (1968) discusses, psychological biases and misperceptions characterize individual-level interactions in state arenas. Among them are the tendencies of decision-makers to fit incoming information within their existing experiences and theories – leading to preconceived expectations of potential political outcomes. The “evoked set” is a particularly powerful and common tool of perception distortion. It occurs when elite actors evaluate new political information, for example on the possibility of military intervention within a foreign civil war, in light of their own presently activated memories of the relevant issue (Jervis 1968). Overall, such types of elite misperception and unintentional deception can amount to failed negotiations and policy escalations between two opposing parties – forcing foreign policy away from an expected diplomatic course down a path that was not initially intended by the individuals involved.

Aside from the inherent misperceptions that arise within individual interactions, there also exist variations within individual leaders that can alter international relations outcomes at the systemic level. Saunders (2009), for instance, finds that different attitudes held by leaders before taking office, particularly on the nature of international threats, may explain different foreign
policy approaches to military interventions. In fact, Saunders (2009) claims that it is impossible to understand the selectivity of military interventions in the domestic affairs of other states unless one also factors in the role of individual leaders (119). More specifically, she compares the responses of two US Cold War presidents, Lyndon B. Johnson and John F. Kennedy, to the Vietnam conflict. While Johnson, an “externally focused” leader, assessed international threats directly from the foreign policies of other states and risks of external aggression, Kennedy, an “internally focused” leader, saw a strong connection between threatening foreign policies, such as communist takeover, and internal state institutions. Due to such personal ideological variation, Sanders (2009) concludes that Kennedy’s military intervention in Vietnam stressed the need to deeply transform war-torn societies and their domestic institutions so as to protect national security. On the other hand, Johnson’s interventions focused solely on military coercion and blocking aggression from the North – eschewing domestic, civil transformations within the target state. Ultimately, such a perspective places strong causal value on the beliefs of leaders, as these beliefs may shape the cost-benefit calculations that are made when confronted with decisions of intervention – including the initial choice to intervene, the probability of success, the allocation of scarce resources, and the intervention strategy and intensity.

The Kosovo Crisis of 1999 serves as a brief example of the relevance of individual-level factors. In this event, the past is said to affect the foreign policymaking choices of elites, as revealed through high-level dialogues, speeches, and interviews leading up to NATO’s military intervention of 1999. Key to the alleged humanitarian foundation in Kosovo was the “Bosnia syndrome” (Bellamy 2002, 69). President Clinton was regretful of his inaction and hesitations in Bosnia and had a genuine personal desire to avoid a repeat of human rights violations in neighboring regions. Hence, he interpreted the unfolding humanitarian crisis in Kosovo, potential
policymaking pathways, and the consequences of non-intervention in the light of the past crises of the 1990s. Clinton recalled in his memoirs that “[t]he killings were all too reminiscent of the early days of Bosnia…I was determined not to allow Kosovo to become another Bosnia” (Clinton 2003, 849). Perhaps a different political leader, surrounded by differing bureaucratic actors, would have propelled alternative pathways of intervention or even non-intervention in Kosovo in 1999. The implicit mechanism of this effect, however, rests in attributing some degree of systemic political significance to perceptions of a domestic crisis – a factor that will be discussed more explicitly in later sections.

Existing within the realm of individual-level factors, the disorganization that often defines collectives of interest-wielding individuals is said to lead to suboptimal foreign policymaking as well, explaining some of the mysterious variations in intervention selectivity. The defects of groupthink and bureaucratic inefficiencies, defined by second-rate solutions, cognitive inconsistencies, imperfect and distorted information, conformity in thought, and ignored policy alternatives, arise as contributing factors.\textsuperscript{15} Power (2001) argues that such factors ultimately cemented the failure of the international community in Rwanda – passively allowing the massacre of hundreds of thousands of Rwandan civilians in 1994.

The US knew of the atrocities occurring in Rwanda in 1994, but partly due to bureaucratic inefficiencies and partly due to greatly lacking willpower of administrations and individuals, it missed countless opportunities to act. It even removed most UN peacekeepers already in Rwanda. As Power (2001) assesses, although US policymakers did not intentionally comply with the evils of the genocide nor did they conspire to allow it to happen, their lack of strong leadership drove

\textsuperscript{15} For more details on the theory and political consequences of groupthink, refer to Janis (1982) and Raven’s (1998) respective analyses of the Bay of Pigs Invasion and the Watergate scandal. More recently, Badie (2010) has argued that groupthink was also a significant factor in shifting the US administration's view on the costs and benefits of the 2003 military invasion of Iraq.
the system of bureaucracy down a path of risk-aversion, limited policy possibilities, confirmed by bureaucratic channels at the UN and US Department of State, and to the implicit removal of attention from the Rwandan crisis. Previous failures in Somalia and conflict perceptions also played a role, as the very mention of a peacekeeping mission in Africa automatically warded off the attention of many policymakers, while the familiarity of ethnic violence and conflict within the region was enough to limit expected narratives for other outside actors (Power 2001).

Moreover, for the most part, the mid-level negotiations and meetings during the Rwandan crisis highlighted the reassuring Rwandan state officials, who were often plotting massacres behind the scenes (Power 2001). This diplomatic prejudice and lack of sufficient high-level involvement blinded the US and the UN to the realities on the ground, as outside actors were predisposed to trust the narratives of the Rwandan government and to subsequently invest in the official peace process – ignoring many inconsistent signs along the way. By the time that the genocide had become too blatant to ignore in official circles, as records reveal, US and UN policymakers were already too focused on scaling back efforts of intervention. In sum, all sources of political pressure at the domestic and individual level were mute when it mattered for Rwanda, and as Power (2001) laments, “the normal operations of the foreign-policy bureaucracy and the international community permitted an illusion of continual deliberation, complex activity, and intense concern, even as Rwandans were left to die.” In other words, the organization of individuals at the domestic and international levels of policymaking perpetuated a path-dependent, inflexible outcome that passively accepted the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of human beings. The selectivity of intervention in this case then primarily relies on the complex interactions between individual agents and their perceptions of the conflict, not the typically irresolvable forces of an international system or state-centric interest.
Hence, relevant individual factors exist within the phenomenon of military interventions and even within dominant theories of international relations, but are they often delegated to the periphery of most analysis and demand a structural context. Alternatively, on their own, the traditional theories of the field fail to offer a coherent understanding of the selectivity of humanitarian military interventions in the post-Cold War era. The realist perspective on national interests and power politics ignores many significant contemporary dynamics, greatly minimizing the role of morals, norms, and non-state agents in international interventions. Liberalism slightly expands upon the notion of national interest and begins to offer some regional demarcations via institutional formation, while constructivism directly introduces the strong influence of global norms in creating and guiding the evolution of national interests. But neither of these frameworks fully explains the phenomenon of humanitarian military interventions, whether due to an outright exclusion of ethical considerations, limited analysis of normative foundations, or a lack of nuanced hypotheses on proposed interactions. More strikingly, none of the theories and approaches explicitly addresses regional variations and parallel conflict perceptions in relation to humanitarian intervention selectivity, preferring to blur these factors within larger, more general themes. In the following section, I highlight empirical studies that attempt to test the strength of the major theoretical approaches to international humanitarian interventions, comparing the explanatory power of interests, liberal values, emerging non-material norms, and even some individual-level factors. As the section will showcase, the current empirical literature on the selectivity of international humanitarian interventions presents with many contradictions and missing pieces – yet it does point to promising pathways for further exploration, especially at the regional level of analysis.
2.3. Empirical Perceptions of Humanitarian Military Interventions

Especially in the post-Cold War era, international responses to humanitarian crises within domestic arenas have been plentiful, but the selectivity gap in missions and aid remains a challenge. On a positive note, Binder (2009) finds that none of the most violent humanitarian emergencies from 1991 to 2004 remained completed unaddressed, sparking at least a wave of non-coercive humanitarian aid from states and NGOs, socio-economic sanctions, and increasingly, peacekeeping missions. In contrast, out of the 27 cases identified in Binder’s (2009) analysis of most severe humanitarian crises, UN and non-UN peacekeeping missions were deployed in only about half of the cases. Economic sanctions were imposed in 16 cases, but this figure drops to ten if only UN sanctions are considered. The international community intervened militarily in only seven of the crises identified. Finally, and perhaps most theoretically telling, the Security Council only considered about half of the crises identified as constituting security threats. Once a crisis has been qualified as a “threat to international peace and security,” however, the Security Council did act under Chapter VII and imposed sanctions or authorized peace enforcement operations (Binder 2009, 344-45). Such empirical patterns demand an explanation of the arising “selectivity gap”, particularly given the above contending theoretical perspectives. The following section examines a range of studies that test the causal factors of military interventions in internal crises, and consequently, reveal more dimensions to the selectivity gap.

In one of the earlier studies of humanitarian trends, surveying pre-1945 and post-1945 cases of possible humanitarian interventions, Franck and Rodley (1973) conclude that in “very few, if any, instances has the right been asserted under circumstances that appear more humanitarian than self-interested and power seeking” (290). In a later study of eighteen UN peacekeeping missions from 1948-1990, Laura Neack (1995) explores the degree to which state
participation in UN peacekeeping results from true commitments to the international community and its norms, or whether state participation greatly correlates with national interests. Her conclusions support the realist interpretation as well insofar as “those states whose interests were better served by the continuation of the international status quo – that is, the states of the advanced industrialized West and non-Western states who have enjoyed some prestige in the international status quo – have dominated the UN peacekeeping” (Neack 1995, 181). De Jonge Oudraat (1996) moderates the force of this interests-based argument by showing that UN military interventions occur when both the interests of one or more of the P-5 are engaged and when a conflict is labeled as a threat to international peace and security (518). Within this empirical trend, we can also begin to spot the implicit role of conflict perception as well.

Interestingly, Seybolt (2008) a staunch supporter of the humanitarian intervention phenomenon claims that the most successful of humanitarian interventions (measured by the number of lives saved) are the ones that hold both humanitarian and political reasons (26). Combing theoretical lenses, Seybolt (2008) insists that states must have political as well as humanitarian interests at stake when committing troops in international crises. This is because an intervening state driven solely by humanitarian interests is likely to withdraw if the level of violence rises and soldiers are killed. In contrast to such weak will, the local insurgents tend to have their most cherished political interests on the line and will fight ardently to protect them. Thus, it would be better for states to not intervene at all than to involve themselves minimally and insufficiently. But an intervener with both political and humanitarian interests at stake is more likely to accept some losses, and consequently, it can better protect civilians and successfully end the crisis (Seybolt 2008, 27).
Standing at the other spectrum of interests, Gilligan and Stedman (2003) find no evidence of dominating national interests in UN interventions, outside of geographical bias. They examine whether the UN intervenes in former colonies of permanent members of the Security Council at a higher rate than otherwise, and whether it intervenes more in countries with high primary commodity exports. The results reveal regional bias in the UN’s mission selections, although the authors fail to provide context or thorough explanation of the potential causes of this regional dimension. Such results could arise from stronger security interests in nearby regions as opposed to distant countries (Gilligan and Stedman 2003, 49 ff.). But they could also manifest due to more complex underlying mechanisms between regional arenas and multifaceted interest-formation processes. Gilligan and Stedman’s (2003) results also show that the UN is less likely to intervene in civil wars in countries with large government armies – echoing realist cost/benefit calculations, as nations may be less prone to send troops to a country with higher capabilities to strike back (47 ff.).

De Nevers (2007) finds a similar pattern in targets of intervention: weak states are more likely to be targeted by great powers, whereas protected or defensible states are less likely to experience third party military force, typically employed for purposes of “norm promotion.” More specifically, in the case of protected states, the strength of their allies determines whether a great power is likely to intervene for norm promotion. Defensible states sometimes tend to avoid intervention if the cost of using force against them is high enough to dissuade strong states.\(^{16}\) But De Nevers (2007) also discovers another compelling, yet less potent, factor: international legitimacy as measured by the standing of the target state in international society. Insider states,

\(^{16}\) Protected states are those that are allied with, or colonies of, major powers, while defensible states are not powerful but possess sufficient abilities to defend themselves or at least make attacks against them costly (De Nevers 2007).
recognized as members of international society and afforded full sovereign status, are less likely than outsider states or those with contested status to be targets of intervention (De Nevers 2007). These dual findings hesitantly bolster realist assumptions that power considerations dominate state decisions in the international arena, while morals, directly tied to the institution of sovereignty, only matter when they don’t clash with power interests.

Hildebrandt et al. (2013) expand the analysis to include domestic factors. They examine sources of US domestic political will for humanitarian interventions through logistical regression models, incorporating partisanship, public opinion, constituent interests, and macroeconomic conditions acting upon congressional willingness to support intervention. Using four episodes of US humanitarian intervention in the 1990s, Hildebradt et al. (2013) find that public support for intervention increases congressional support, while partisanship and ideological distance from the president trump the normative need of the intervention. This study illustrates the strong connections between domestic and international realms as perceived in the liberal framework, but it is limited to domestic dynamics and to interventions already under consideration. Furthermore, the unit of intervention is treated as homogenous when testing domestic reactions – automatically ruling out any regional variations.

Lyon and Dolan (2007) include both domestic and international environments to explore the selectivity of American humanitarian interventions. Their model of coevolution, which incorporates a typology of main causal factors and a list of predicted relationships between actors,

---

 Outsider states are those not viewed as equal members of the existing international society and its constitutive rules, whether due to their “uncivilized” behavior, periphery status, or lack of sovereign recognition. Typically, post-colonial states and the former Ottoman Empire were placed in this category by European society. Contested states are those territories whose status in the international system is challenged by other members of the system. In such cases, the challenge typically arises when another state in the system contests the target's sovereignty for the purposes of territorial expansion and when several great powers compete among themselves for control of the territory. See Krasner (1999), pp. 14-20.
begins to explain the historical trajectory of why the US launches some humanitarian interventions and ignores others. After an application of this model to three case studies, Lyon and Dolan (2007) find that patterns of American humanitarianism are not purely altruistic nor purely interest-driven; they are best understood as a product of changing international normative structures, the influence of historical milieu (one intervention influencing the likelihood of future interventions), as well as institutional and non-institutional domestic political factors, such as public opinion, policy elites, and media (Lyon and Dolan 2007, 47). Yet this study, which focuses only on US actions, relies on the interpretation of a limited number of narrated cases to code its model, not aggregate empirical data. This feature both limits generalizations and narrows the complexity of the forces at play. Like the previous study, it too already rules out regional variations in the phenomenon of intervention.

In a study that comes closest to the aims of this research project, Mullenbach and Matthew (2008) analyze the relative causes of US interventions in intrastate disputes from 1945-2002, weighing the force of international factors against domestic factors. The results suggest that a combination of international factors, including geographic proximity and ideological linkage, influence US decisions to intervene in intrastate disputes, while domestic factors hold little significance. However, Mullenbach and Matthew’s (2008) models include only cases of intervention and use dummy, dichotomous variables to reflect all independent and control variables. Furthermore, the models are limited to US actions, removing multilateral interventions in the process and leaving out variables for economic benefits, national interests, and more. Additionally, regionally-bounded variables are merely limited to the realist notion of geographic closeness as a proxy for national interests, while ideological linkages are defined as domestic similarities between target state and intervener(s) – restricting any potential dynamic process of
identity formation. Choi’s (2013) model of the determinants of US humanitarian interventions supplements the previous research with rigorous cross-national, time-series data for human rights abuses – albeit still limiting the unit of analysis to cases of intervention and introducing no regionally-sensitive variables. He finds that the US is more likely to intervene in intrastate conflict to preserve liberal values (democracy, economic free trade, human rights), rather than protecting national interests. Perkins and Neumayer’s (2008) add support for the hypothesis of humanitarian interventions as a consequence of liberal economic linkages, while Bellamy and Williams (2005) contradict it.

But Choi’s (2013) findings are misleading since indicators of national interests are limited to oil resources, alliances, and geographic distance, and many economic indicators are ignored. Most importantly, the study only analyzes US cases of intervention justified through humanitarian rhetoric, leading to a degree of circular reasoning. Lastly, beyond its regional blindness, the study offers no information on variable interactions, such as norms and interests.

Overall, the empirical literature directs us to the importance of geopolitical interests, liberal values, and vague norms in decisions of intervention in regions of humanitarian need. At the same time, it tells us that national interests may not explain the selectivity of interventions and that not all cases present with normative foundations or the pursuit of liberal values. Hidden within these traditional variables are faint mentions of “geographic” proximity, institutional context, and “ideological linkages” – with little explication or nuance. There are also no explications offered for the passage of time and eras. The literature is mute regarding potential discrepancies between interventions in the 1990s and most recent ones in the post-September 11 era. But there is reason to suspect that in the post-September 11 decades, military interventions target regions that pose a security threat, not the regions where the issue is solely humanitarian (Ignatieff 2003, 306).
Ultimately, this empirical literature provides us with every conceivable path toward a homogenized occurrence of humanitarian military intervention. As it stands, both the theoretical and empirical literature do not allow for any coherent conclusions on pathways or probabilities of international humanitarian interventions. Thus, since the largest sources of explanatory power, in theory and in practice, fail at offering consistent answers, it is justified to look at literature that moves beyond traditional narratives.

2.4. Regional Variables as Distorters of Selectivity

Highlighting regional variations in intervention selectivity may be one method to move beyond the general, often contradictory debate. Instead of focusing on the relative role of power politics, humanitarian norms, liberal institutions, or other commonly discussed factors in propelling all humanitarian military missions in global intrastate conflicts, we can investigate different pathways between these variables, as constrained by region. One way to begin this process is by using the foundations of realism and liberalism to carve out a space for regional lenses – typically molded by the existence of institutions and their ability to alter interest-formation and regional identities. Another more complex way to proceed is to take a direct look at regional identities as fomented by individual and state narratives, without the buffers of institutions and traditional national interest. In the following sections, I first discuss the former perspective as evidenced in Keohane’s (2003) institutionalist work, speckled with some normative insight, before entering the more theoretically multifaceted perspective of Campbell (1999), who due to this complexity, chose to examine only one case of intervention. Both of these perspectives bolster the foundations of a regional analysis on humanitarian interventions, but they also suffer from limitations in generalizability even within regions, and in the case of Keohane (2003), from a lack of strong empirical, real-world evidence.
**Good and bad neighborhoods**

Prospects for successful institutions-building and post-conflict stability are also important for the selectivity of military interventions in regions of internal conflict. The existence of robust multilateral, regional institutions that can design “gradations of sovereignty” or can “unbundle” sovereignty – making temporary alterations to the traditional “winner-take-all” mentality on state control – can change probabilities of intervention success (Keohane 2003, 277). According to Keohane (2003), the effectiveness of these institutions depends on the quality of the “neighborhoods” proximate to troubled intrastate regions, thus, highlighting the importance of regional context. A good neighborhood is an effectively institutionalized region of states that trust one another and may even sometimes voluntarily constrain one another’s sovereignty. A bad neighborhood is characterized by distrust and hatred between different groups and low social capital – leading to the need for high external sovereignty but little inter-state cooperation and low chances of institutional success.

In good neighborhoods, where effective institutions and allied actors can temporarily take the reins of sovereignty in a target state, a military intervention may prompt significant steps toward an internally sustainable liberal democracy (e.g. in Kosovo or Bosnia). Unfortunately, good neighborhoods cannot merely be created in the short-run. Thus, humanitarian interventions with high probabilities of success or with highly transformative goals must occur in or near a good neighborhood (Keohane 2003, 293). In the unique case of the Balkans, a redefinition of borders also took place. The Balkans were perceived as a “bad neighborhood” in the 1990s, but since the

---

18 As Keohane (2003) further argues, alterations in classic sovereignty via foreign actors and institutions are imperative to pre- and post-intervention considerations because even if military intervention temporarily succeeds in halting domestic atrocities, it must still contend against future problems. In ethnically divided regions, for example, traditional implementations of sovereignty after intrastate conflict may place a vengeful faction in power, which will seek to oppress opposing ethnic or religious groups. Even in the best case scenario, immediate full sovereignty within the target state would lead to institutional and political divisions along ethnic, religious, or other highly politicized lines, opening the door to renewed domestic conflict.
Balkans are also a part of Europe (a good neighborhood), both in geographic proximity and political spill-over effects, they could be redefined as part of the bordering, better-off neighborhood of Europe. This possibility only arises, however, when the “good neighborhood” perceives the troubled region as part of its own neighborhood, teaches this redefinition to those in the region, and provides resources and political credibility to combat the internal crisis (Keohane 2003). Conditional institutional memberships that offer economic and political benefits, such as NATO and the EU, can then entice local agents in an intrastate conflict to sacrifice external sovereignty for outside interference from the “good neighborhood.”

Alternatively, in bad neighborhoods of multiple failed states (e.g. in Somalia or Afghanistan), the goals of intervention become much less ambitious for intervening actors, typically limited to reestablishing internal order for the sake of global security or preventing starvation (Keohane 2003, 278). In such cases, the line between humanitarian intervention and self-defense (especially as related to threats of budding terrorist cells) becomes quite blurred. Lastly, interventions in bad neighborhoods risk higher costs as well, by requiring longer periods of external rule or involving higher risks from fragmented, often resentful societies.

The dynamics between good and bad neighborhoods can alter mutual interests and cost/benefit analysis to outside parties and organizations, which may be contemplating intervention. Whether an intervention to stop human rights abuses is the right choice may not only depend on the target society or the interests of the interveners directly, but on whether the troubled society is located near a good neighborhood. If so, the potential interveners may be able to redefine the good neighborhood to incorporate the troubled state, invest in institutional progression, and hence, also redefine national interests and other benefits and norms in relation to the region (Keohane 2003). If an intrastate conflict is instead taking place within a bad neighborhood, far
from any good neighborhoods, potential interveners will have much lower expectations of success and lower mutual interests as well – making intervention a much more cautious, limited, and unlikely endeavor.

Such dichotomies and unique institutional mechanisms between neighborhoods, as envisioned by Keohane (2003), can set the groundwork for more intricate analysis of regional dynamics. We can proceed by extending the causal mechanism beyond pure structures to the political, ideational narratives that these long-standing institutions can foster between state and non-state actors. Unfortunately, such perspectives are not nearly as abundant in international relations as the state-centric narratives of mutually exclusive interests, values, and institutions.

*Regional identities and social learning*

Despite their scarcity in political analysis, the narratives that are quickly constructed and then repeated when crisis overtakes certain regions of the world may also impact the nature of the international response. Moving outside of national interests, level of humanitarian need, and logistical considerations, it also matters whether humanitarian crises are perceived as products of civil wars, ancient, irresolvable hatreds, or as products of international aggression – especially if these perceptions mirror regional, institutional patterns. Although limited to an in-depth analysis of the Bosnian crisis, Campbell’s (1998) post-structural, politically critical interpretation provides convincing evidence of these more muted perspectives. He claims that the problematization of Bosnia through the ethnicization of the political field led to the interpretation of the 1990s conflict as an “intractable” problem, demanding the solution of ethnic partition and ultimately delaying international reactions (xi). Moreover, in Bosnia, Europe was able to construct a robust “Other,” the lawless Balkans that they could not understand, while the US was able to push it off as a “European problem.” In other words, Western actors were redefining the European neighborhood
through ethnic narratives of crisis and drawing in an unequal narrative of the transatlantic alliance (Campbell 1998, 11; Pehar 2014).

Campbell reminds us of the importance in how a humanitarian crisis is labeled by potentially intervening parties. For instance, for Bosnians, the atrocities committed in Srebrenica in 1995 were “ethnic cleansing” or “genocide”; for the Serbs, they were the products of “battle” – labels that automatically denote vastly different responsibilities for outside parties. The international community, media, and the vast majority of academic analysis at the time of the Bosnian crisis adapted the perceptions of the Bosnian Serb community – that the conflict was just a civil war, involving an ethnic struggle between groups who simply could not live together. This uncompromising hatred of coexistence naturally led to ethnic displacement, not ethnic cleansing. As Campbell (1998) illustrates in his analysis, the international community assigned equal culpability to all involved parties and was “deeply infected with the view of the conflict as among three ethnic ‘sides’ with ancient and essentially irresolvable animosities” (Borden 1993, 2). Hence, the narrative of civil war instead of an equally plausible narrative of international aggression or genocide overtook international perceptions of Bosnia from 1994 to 1995 (Campbell 1998, 52).

US President Clinton, UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) commander General Michael Rose, and other policymakers echoed similar sentiments when it came to potential involvement in Bosnia. The international community had no business altering the military balance in domestic civil wars and sacrificing soldiers over repetitive, unstoppable ancient hatreds (Garton Ash 1995; Clymer 1995; Wheen 1997; Campbell 1998, 52-53). The media further bolstered this narrative by portraying Bosnia through the lens of fixed identities, shaped solely by centuries of Balkan hatred, which had defied all outside meddling (e.g. Tagliabue 1991; Whitney 1993).
Western fixed views of the Balkans followed suit. The Balkans was a land of war economies, colonial dependencies, and bipolar populations, “oscillating between extremes, with little propensity for moderation” (Mojzes 1995, 41-60). Cultural norms of revenge reigned supreme while respect for life and the individual were nonexistent due to the land’s “collectivist climate” (Mojzes 1995, 60; Campbell 1998, 66). Consequently, the Balkans was backward, foreign, barbaric, uncivilized, and fundamentally different – separated from civilized Europe (Pehar 2014). These narratives, coupled with perceptions of the Bosnian conflict as an ethnic civil war, limited political possibilities by stagnating on traditional notions of territory and identity, state and nation, and ethnic relations. The removal of human agency in lieu of historical fatalism in Bosnia acted to disenable calls for political or military action. As a conscious Serbian policy to eliminate Bosnian Muslims progressed, the international community merely allowed a presupposed nature to take its course. They muted the emergence of counter-narratives founded on multiculturalism and on an understanding that the violence was a product of strategic plans of political domination, instead of historically inevitable ethnic antagonism (Campbell 1998, Ch. 4). Ultimately, as Bosnia became internationalized as a global problem, it also became an object from which the West could project its own narratives on global issues (Pehar 2014).

The Bosnia narrative serves as a product of standard international relations, with its assumptions of “pre-given agents with autonomous, intractable, and observable identities. [It] allows authors to portray a seamless, ethnically ordered world in which no other conceptions of identity have political import, and where group relations cannot be other than mutually exclusive and conflictual” (Campbell 1998, 124). Moreover, norms of territorial and cultural alignment, tying sovereignty to identity, are central to the construction of the Westphalian system amidst
anarchy. Thus, the political will for an intervention in Bosnia was lacking as there was no way to restore sovereignty and no traditional goal to aim for otherwise.

This shared perspective of a particularly small region of the world propelled five years of diplomacy to resolve the “civil war”, in the backdrop of systematically dying civilians, it and culminated in a weak air intervention and in the ethnic partition of Bosnia itself. Had Bosnia been cast as an instance of international aggression, the strategies may have looked vastly different. But had Bosnia been situated in a different region of the world, these narratives may have never formed into a coherent international political force. Thus, the above review of the standard theoretical literature serves to showcase the limitations that the international community and academics impose in interpreting intrastate crises such as Bosnia. Dominant perspectives are often bound by an outdated conception of the national interest as the impetus for responsibility and intervention. These views, unfortunately, tend to perpetuate delayed or non-existent responses on the ground. In the best-case scenario, they promote interventions with limited airstrikes, weapons exclusion areas, no troops on the ground, and no-fly zones in regions suffering from “civil wars,” “ancient hatreds,” or “displacements.”

Perceptions of internal conflicts, perpetuated by narratives of identity and region, can have real political consequences within the international arena, and yet, few academic studies address these effects in a systematic, direct manner. But if we are unable to explain the variance of humanitarian interventions on a global scale, we must alter our unit of analysis or change the variables that we see as most prominent. Campbell’s (1998) Bosnia study gives us a place to begin, while Keohane’s (2003) institutionalist work allows for an established theoretical foundation beyond standard realist doctrines of military intervention.
The factors now accepted as important catalysts of intervention selectivity, ranging from realist national interests to liberal economic benefits and human rights promotion, may not always suffice in explaining the phenomenon of “humanitarian intervention”, especially in its regional context and variations. But there exist under-examined forces of potential explanatory power as well. These factors don’t directly challenge the relevancy of currently dominant variables, but instead refine connections and pathways between variables. Consequently, this research project first tests the explanatory power of traditional, more quantifiable variables – including geopolitical national interest, economic linkages, and human rights – both in isolation and via interaction with one another, before moving to in-depth case analysis. The case studies then take up the task of exploring the missing pieces of aggregated analysis, focusing on regionally-bounded interactions between norms and interests. In particular, I explore the confounding effects of conflict perception, regional neighborhood, and identity-formation on the national interests and normative obligations of great powers. Such interactions, however, are further dependent on agent-based narratives and corresponding institutional bounds that manufacture unique ties of identity between target region and potential intervener(s). Thus, all levels of analysis become activated in this qualitative endeavor.

In the next chapter, I explicate the study’s methodology and framework. I operationalize key concepts so as to correspond to important theoretical variables. I also introduce hypotheses before interpreting the results of the large-n quantitative analysis on the selectivity of humanitarian military interventions.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY: GENERALIZATIONS OF SELECTIVITY AND REGIONAL NUANCE

The theoretical and empirical literature on humanitarian military interventions tends to treat the appeal of security interests, humanitarian need, and liberal institutions in isolation and as equally relevant across regions. This study, however, refines relationships between significant theoretical variables and distinguishes their relative and interactive explanatory powers via a regional lens. In addition, the expanded quantitative analysis aspires to highlight empirical gaps within the literature and suggest research venues beyond traditional theoretical relationships. In other words, the study’s main goal is to allow different international relations theories to speak to one another in a more fruitful manner regarding the phenomenon of humanitarian interventions. Given such theoretical complexity coupled with a highly contested substantive issue, methodological rigor and exactness become especially vital to this endeavor. In this chapter, I provide detailed information regarding my methodological approaches, including my theoretical assumptions, the conceptualization and measurement of all variables, and selected tools of analysis. Lastly, I provide formal theoretically-grounded hypotheses, originally discussed in chapter one, that are tested in the following analytical chapters – first via statistical modeling, and second, via in-depth case studies.

3.1. Brief Theoretical Framework

As the literature review reveals, the isolated forces of geopolitical national interest, liberal values, or humanitarian norms fail to account for patterns of intervention selectivity in the post-Cold War era. This marks the beginning of the research puzzle and prompts the need to move beyond traditional theoretical frameworks. Thus, instead of holding strong to one theoretical camp, I instead test the most important variables from realist, liberal, and constructivist theories – with an eye toward uncovering interacting and new relationships.
Military interventions within internal conflict may hold to different regional dynamics, challenging the completeness of general theoretical camps. The small Balkans region, for instance, experienced eight UN peacekeeping missions and four NATO interventions following the breakup of Yugoslavia – while larger human rights abuses in Africa and the Middle East were either ignored or grossly underfunded in terms of military missions. Finnemore’s (2003) argument on the emergence of a humanitarian norm of intervention, hence, appears bounded within Western geography, while realist national interests may need further refinement as applied to the frequency of humanitarian missions within the Balkans and other targeted regions.

Given the predominance of realism in shaping basic assumptions across all other theoretical camps, including universal assumptions of unitary states, interests defined in terms of hard power, and security games in the context of anarchic structures, this analysis must proceed in a way that first tests the most foundational of international relations conditions as related to humanitarian military interventions (Morgenthau 1948; Mearsheimer 2001). Only after showcasing the gaps in these relationships can the study move forward to proposing new or interacting relationships across theoretical camps.

Consequently, many concepts and initial hypotheses are catered towards testing foundational realist forces that have been adapted by other theories. Although deviating in terms of degree and proposed solutions, both liberalism and Wendt’s (1999) constructivism, for example, accept the tenets of unitary statehood, the significance of geopolitical interests, the international structure of anarchy, the difficulty of international cooperation, and current systems of self-help (Waltz 1979; Keohane 1984; Doyle 1997). The following sections, thus, maintain these assumptions in concept definition and hypothesis creation as a baseline comparison to any newly discovered relationship or variable – particularly regionally-bounded variations.
3.2. Concepts and Variables

Within the scope of the research question and theoretical approach, the most important concepts demanding rigorous operationalization become: geopolitical national interests; humanitarian need; international humanitarian interventions; economic benefits; and regional categories. To recall, the theory of realism – which provides foundational assumptions to all other theories under consideration – explains the international decisions of states solely through the uninhibited pursuit of national interests, especially geopolitical or security considerations. The theory then disapproves of the inclusion of moral and ethical dimensions when considering these interests (Tenbergen 2001; Wheeler 2000; Dunne and Schmidt 2011). Therefore, to the traditional realist, states vie for military power and key resources as to maximize their strength (Roberts 1993), to ensure state security and progress toward regional hegemony. These realists perceive any military intervention into foreign lands as primarily propelled by existing geopolitical interests in that region, yet often excused through humanitarian rhetoric (Roberts 1993; Buzan 1996; Bellamy and Wheeler 2011).

Hence, it is important to test the explanatory power of existing geopolitical national interests on international humanitarian interventions relative to the explanatory power of other causes or norms, as reflected through other variables. Alternatively, the concept of humanitarian need in a foreign land during the year of a potential or occurring military intervention must be explored to compare its explanatory power to geopolitical interests. This concept serves as a proxy for constructivist norms of protection of innocents, while economic benefits and institutionalization are proxies for liberal variables. It is only after introducing the explanatory power of such variables that I begin to explore regionally-sensitive interactions within the modeling and identity-laden hypothesis within the case studies.
Finally, the unit of analysis in this research is country-year, specifically the occurrence of intrastate conflict in the population of post-Cold War states. Accordingly, the concept of intrastate conflict also demands detailed definition as to allow a strong selection of cases for analysis. Below, I operationalize relevant variables and units of analysis before discussing formal hypothesis catered toward quantitative analysis and case study research.

**Unit of Analysis – Armed Intrastate Conflict**

This study uses post-Cold War (1987-2014) incidents of armed intrastate conflict and denotes whether an international intervention occurred during these incidents.\(^\text{19}\) Thus, this chosen unit of analysis (armed intrastate conflict) makes it possible to differentiate the occurrence of general international military interventions in a target state from military interventions that have perceived humanitarian dimensions (as denoted through humanitarian need caused by armed intrastate conflict). All analyzed cases of intrastate conflict manifest degrees of humanitarian need and crisis, as exemplified by battle-related deaths, civilian deaths, displacements, property damage, and more. Consequently, whenever a state intervenes in a nation that is experiencing intrastate conflict within the year, the intervening state is automatically deemed to be involved in a humanitarian military intervention, given that this pattern characterizes the phenomenon of humanitarian interventions in the post-Cold War period.

According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2014), one of the most widely used databases and encyclopedias for armed conflict analysis, the definition of armed conflict is: “a contested incompatibility that concerns government and/or territory where the use of armed force between two parties, of which at least one is the government of a state, results in at least 25 battle-

\(^{19}\) The timeframe of 1987-2014 allows for some flexibility between the official termination date of the Cold War era and the more practical, gradual shifting of the international system away from the bipolarity of the Cold War and its effects on political behavior.
related deaths in one calendar year.” For the purposes of this research, only three types of armed conflict are relevant: intrastate armed conflict, intrastate armed conflict with foreign involvement, and one-sided armed conflict. Thus, I exclude the category of interstate armed conflicts, as interstate conflicts are outside the realm of this research question.

The traditional definition of armed intrastate conflict is a conflict between a government and a non-governmental party, with no interference from other countries. Integrated in this concept, however, are two distinctive categories that are included in the analysis – intrastate conflict with foreign involvement and one-sided intrastate conflict. An intrastate conflict with foreign involvement or an internationalized conflict is “an armed conflict between a government and a non-government party where the government side, the opposing side, or both sides, receive troop support from other governments that actively participate in the conflict” (Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2014). A one-sided intrastate conflict occurs when the government of a state or formally organized group uses armed force against civilians, which results in at least 25 deaths in a year (Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2014). The study incorporates both traditional and nontraditional categories to obtain the most complete population of data.

Also important is the intensity of the armed conflict within a year. The standard in the literature is to label a conflict “minor” if at least 25 but less than 1000 battle-related deaths occur in one calendar year, and “war” if at least 1000 battle-related deaths occur in a calendar year (Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2014). The category of conflict intensity is significant in selecting cases for analysis. This study must ensure the inclusion of a range of conflict intensities so as to truly explore relationships based on humanitarian need. The following table outlines the most important components of the chosen unit of analysis and its data source.
Table 1: Unit of Analysis – Armed Intrastate Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SUBGROUPS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate Conflict</td>
<td>1.) Intrastate armed conflict</td>
<td>UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.) Intrastate armed conflict with foreign involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.) One-sided armed conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>1.) Minor: between 25 and 999 battle-related deaths in year</td>
<td>UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.) War: at least 1,000 battle-related deaths in year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Intensity</td>
<td>Coded 0 if conflict hasn’t resulting in more than 1,000 battle-related deaths</td>
<td>UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coded 1 once conflict reaches threshold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1 – Europe</td>
<td>UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – Americas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denotes Europe and the US as <em>Western neighborhoods</em> (excluding Russia); extended version denotes Europe and Americas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Humanitarian Military Intervention – Primary Dependent Variable

The overarching purpose of this study is to explain why states intervene in certain suffering areas of the world while largely ignoring other territories, including why certain interventions are more intense than others. In other words, it attempts to explain why some intrastate conflicts become internationalized to varying degrees while others remain domestic concerns only. Therefore, the main predicted concept becomes the occurrence and intensity of a humanitarian military intervention into regions of intrastate conflict. As previously noted, the theory of realism does not account for true humanitarian military interventions, only military interventions driven by nation interests and justified through humanitarian goals. As a result, the concept definition of humanitarian military interventions must begin with the definition of military interventions in general. The study defines military intervention as “the movement of regular troops or forces (airborne, seaborne, shelling, etc.) of one country inside another, in the context of some political issue or dispute” (Pearson and Baumann 1993, 1). So as to separate higher intensity interventions from minor skirmishes, the study excludes paramilitaries, government backed militias, and other security forces that are not part of the regular uniformed military of a state. Similarly, military events must be purposeful, not accidental. Inadvertent border crossings are not included in this definition and neither are unintentional confrontations between fighter planes or naval ships. The definition excludes soldiers engaging in exercises in a foreign land, transporting men or material across borders, or concentrated in foreign bases (Pearson and Baumann 1993). Furthermore, the study categorizes international military interventions by temporal guidelines so that interventions are continuous if repeated acts occur within six months of one another. If a state withdraws troops from a target state and sends them back more than six months later, this becomes a new intervention (Pearson and Baumann 1993).
As also briefly discussed in previous sections, the definition of international humanitarian intervention encompasses the definition of international military interventions but includes a direct context of humanitarian need. Thus, the definition of “humanitarian” in the context of military interventions possesses two distinct dimensions: the existence of a humanitarian crisis in the region of potential intervention and the consequent perceptions of humanitarian reasons behind the intervention. Taking inspiration from Holzgrefe (2003) and Finnemore (2003), this study defines international humanitarian intervention as the use of military force by a state or a group of states (including through UN structures) to protect foreign nationals from intrastate abuse and conflict, without the consent of the sovereign power in the target territory. What truly differentiates humanitarian interventions from general military interventions is the humanitarian crisis stemming from the unit of analysis, which leads to perceptions of strong humanitarian causes (which may or may not dominate decisions of intervention or non-intervention). In the literature, “humanitarian military intervention” generally labels the trend in which states intervene in regions of intrastate conflict immediately following or during a humanitarian crisis. The selected unit of analysis – armed intrastate conflict – fulfills the conditions of humanitarian crisis, as all cases of intervention occur in regions of grave humanitarian need. Lastly, following the literature, the definition of humanitarian military intervention excludes nonforcible interventions such as threat or use of economic, diplomatic, or other sanctions (Holzgrefe 2003, 18; Scheffer 1992, 266; Donnelly 1993, 610ff.), forcible interventions aimed at protecting the intervening state’s nationals (Holzgrefe 2003, 18; Beyerlin 1982, 213f.), and interventions to protect foreign nationals from natural disasters (Finnemore 2003, 53; Donnelly 1993, 612f).

The operationalization of this concept considers the occurrence and nonoccurrence of a humanitarian military intervention, level of mission intensity, measured through the number of
troops and naval and air incursions, and the scope of intervention, measured by the number of missions and states involved. If an intervention is multilateral in nature, the leading state within the coalition serves as the source of dyadic measurements – meaning that in most cases, the independent variables discussed below will refer to the relationship between a target conflict and one or all of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany (P5+1), as these regional powers are the primary international interveners. In the next chapter, I combine these concept dimensions into one additive indicator of intervention as to reduce future problems with multicollinearity in the statistical analysis. The following scales for Military Humanitarian Interventions are adapted from Pearson and Baumann’s (1993) operationalization of international military interventions with some changes to fit this research question. They include measures for the occurrence of intervention and levels of military intensity during intervention. The figure below outlines these ordinal scales. In the following section, I supplement these scales with other measures of third-party interventions to provide more variation and real-world nuance.
Recall that the humanitarian nature of interventions is cross-operationalized through the unit of analysis, instances of armed intrastate conflict. The subjects of the analysis differentiate general military interventions from military interventions with perceived humanitarian intentions.
**Peacekeeping Operations – Dependent Variable**

Another dimension of the dependent variable is the occurrence or nonoccurrence of less militarized, typically less intense peacekeeping interventions, primarily sanctioned by the United Nations (UN) after a conflict ceasefire has been negotiated in the target state. Measuring this dimension of third party intervention in cases of internal conflict in comparison to more intense military interventions, not necessarily defined by the UN Charter standards, allows for more nuanced explanations of real-world patterns and injects variation within the dependent variables. Moreover, UN officials posit that the UN’s legitimacy during times of internal state crisis makes it the ideal source for international peacekeeping, leading to more frequent interventionist missions at lower intensities (Sambanis and Schulhofer-Wohl 2006; Bellamy and William 2005). Lastly, these lower intensity missions may exhibit different patterns than traditional military interventions, perhaps offering further refinement to theoretical relationships.

I employ the standard mandated UN mission categorizations to measure the occurrence and the levels of intensity within peacekeeping missions: observer missions; traditional peacekeeping; multidimensional peacekeeping; and enforcement missions (Sambanis and Schulhofer-Wohl 2006; Doyle and Sambanis 2000). A monitoring or observer mission seeks to preserve a truce and negotiate a peace between warring intrastate parties, with the consent of the target government and the presence of limited-engagement civilian observers. Traditional peacekeeping also occurs with the consent of the host government and includes the deployment of military and civilian forces so as maintain a negotiated settlement of a conflict. Typically, this means the policing of a buffer zone, aiding in the disarmament of military forces, and providing security for humanitarian aid programs. Third, multidimensional peacekeeping operations, while also consent-based, seek to implement a comprehensive, long-term negotiated peace agreement via a mixture of economic, institutional, electoral, and other strategies. The peace enforcement
mission, the “strongest” of the peacekeeping categories, typically consists of a large-scale military intervention without the consent of the target state (Doyle and Sambanis 2000). This last category best parallels the traditional definition of international military intervention in regions of internal conflict, as previously operationalized. The coding of this ordinal variable originates from the similar models of Sambanis and Schulhofer (2006), Doyle and Sambanis (2000), and Fortna (2008). Unfortunately, this data is not available after 2004.

**Figure 6: Operational Indicators for Peacekeeping Missions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Mission</td>
<td>Occurrence and Intensity of any mission (PKPBop)</td>
<td>0-1. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Multidimensional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occurrence and Intensity of Peacekeeping missions (PK)</td>
<td>0. None/Peace-building Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Monitor/Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Traditional/Interpositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Multidimensional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occurrence of Peacekeeping</td>
<td>Dummy variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geopolitical Interests – Independent Variables**

The theoretical definition of national interests varies across time, theories, and nations, but the one consistent concept within this category is the notion of geopolitical national interests. This study uses the concept of geopolitical national interests to denote overall national interests, excluding direct economic interests – which are operationalized separately as proxies for liberal theoretical variables. Geopolitical national interests, as seen through the baseline realist lens, consist of any national pursuit that would directly increase a state’s relative power and influence internationally, hence increasing its security. These interests become the main drivers of state
action in the realist sense and are adapted as underlying assumptions in all other major international relations theories. To recall from the previous theoretical discussion, I define typical geopolitical interests as direct effectors of military capabilities, such as a state’s extension and preservation of geopolitical influence regionally and globally (Bellamy and William 2005), preservation of the distribution of power as also established through former colonial ties (Gilligan and Stedman 2003; Bellamy and Williams 2005; Perkins and Neumayer 2008), and military, resource, or strategic stakes in a region (Neack 1995, Huth 1998, Finnemore 2003). Along this line, realists contend that national governments truly pursue national interests while invoked humanitarianism to justify many military operations. To further illustrate the scope of the concept, some realist examples of geopolitical interests include the intervention in Haiti to prevent a massive flood of refugees due to Haiti’s close proximity to the US, the intervention into Bosnia and Kosovo to preserve NATO’s political credibility (and avoid destabilizing Europe), and the invasion of Iraq in 2003 to secure the US oil supply (Binder 2009, 330; see also Finnemore 2003).

Sometimes, economic interests, measured through trade ratios or foreign direct investment, are incorporated within geopolitical national interests as well. But this research design designates economic interests as a separate concept since placement is often disputed in the literature. When Joseph Nye developed the concept of soft power – state influence or coercion through diplomatic, nonmilitary means – he was careful to stress the dimensions of economic power that could reach into the realm of military, geopolitical capabilities. Governments can convert economic success into hard power, or power linked directly to military capabilities. First, any country needs a strong economic base to sustain large military capabilities in the long-term. Second, governments that regulate large markets can use their economic might to coerce private and public actors, which must act in accordance with the preferences of the gatekeeper government for access to their
markets (Drezner 2012). Economic statecraft occupies a vital middle ground between the extremes of military power and soft power; therefore, it becomes logical to separate economic interests from geopolitical national interests in this research design. Furthermore, the theory of realism tends to consider only primary resource interests, such as oil production, as true geopolitical interests. Other sources of economic interests fit more into the liberal camp of diplomatic, nonmilitary means of influence.

Operationalizing geopolitical national interests has proven difficult and led to very narrow measurement of the multidimensional concept (Choi 2013). Although this study will not be able to account for all dimensions, it uses several variables to improve upon the concept’s operational value. This research operationalizes the concept of geopolitical interests through the variables of: Oil Supply, Exports, Colonial History, Alliances, Geographic Proximity, and Affinity Scores as applied to the states experiencing intrastate conflict. These dimensions reflect the importance of primary natural resources, colonial ties, alliance systems, and geographic concerns (related to refugee spillover/regional destabilization). Ultimately, an ordinal additive index of National Interests is constructed, as denoted in the table below.

*Oil Supply Variable:*

Securing a reliable and cheap oil supply is a vital geopolitical national interest of the US and many other international powers – one that is essential for continued economic growth and military operations. Fordham (2008, 742) even argues that “the need to ensure continuing access to the region’s oil resources might help explain current American security commitments in the Persian region.” Therefore, it is more likely that an international power or group of states will decide to intervene upon intrastate conflict in states that possess great oil resources. For the purposes of measurement, a dummy for oil-exporting countries is used in this research. When a
target country’s oil exports exceed one-third of export revenues, it is coded as “1”. This measure originates from Fearon and Laitin’s (2003) study and Fortna’s (2008) updated datasets.

Export Variable:

Additionally, several existing studies use the ratio of primary commodity exports and GDP as a proxy for the abundance of natural resources (Fearon and Laitin 2003), therefore, this study employs the same measure in a separate model as another reflection for the realist argument on natural resource interests. The study measures the ratio of primary commodity exports in countries experiencing intrastate conflict throughout the range of years as to further clarify the relationship between existing geopolitical interests in a target state and instances of humanitarian interventions.

Colonial History Variable:

Realist theorists place great emphasis on the construction of spheres of influence abroad as to sway the balance of power in a state’s favor, decrease threats stemming from the periphery, and protect access to primary resources. Thus, the colonial history indicator reflects another important dimension of geopolitical interests since previous colonial possessions showcase a once-existing source of national interests for an intervening country. But this variable can also show historical ties between target start and intervener(s). The study measures the colonial history indicator though the following prompt: Does the experiencing intrastate conflict have one of the listed relationships with traditional regional superpowers (P5): the US, UK, France, Russia, and China)? This operationalization is loosely based on Pearson and Baumann’s (1993) and Fortna’s (2008) measurements.

Alliances Variable:
Based on baseline realist premises, it is likely that states use humanitarian interventions in international crises involving allies to protect vested interests that they have in the conflict outcomes. Hence, measuring alliances is a way to also measure the level of geopolitical interest that a state may have in another (if states only form alliances to promote their own national interests). This measurement is based on the Correlates of War Formal Alliance dataset, which seeks to identify each formal alliance between at least two states that fall into the classes of defense pact, neutrality or non-aggression treaty, or entente agreement (Gibler 2009). For the purposes of this study, however, this variable is turned into a dummy, denoting the existence of a military alliance, security treaty partnership, non-aggression pact, or a regional pact between the target state and a P5 member.

*Geographic Proximity Variable:*

The proximity of an intervening state or states to regions of intrastate conflict must also be measured since security concerns or threats of regional destabilization magnify with geographic closeness. For instance, risks of refugee spillover or conflict escalation only become relevant to the states that are relatively close to the source of the problem. Moreover, the literature consistently signals a significant direct relationship between geographic proximity and instances of humanitarian interventions (e.g. Perkins and Neumayer 2008; Gilligan and Stedman 2003). The variable of geographical proximity measures the distance between the P5 powers to the target state. This scale for geographic proximity corresponds to measurements in the literature (Fortna 2008).

- Contiguity with P5+1 member (up to 400 miles)
  0. not contiguous
  1. contiguous by land or up to 400 miles of water

- Contiguity with P5+1 member (up to 150 miles)
  0. = not contiguous
  1. = contiguous by land or up to 150 miles of water
**Affinity Scores:**

Lastly, the maximum Affinity Score variable, originating from Gartzke (2006) and repurposed by Fortna (2008) in her peacekeeping dataset, measures the political affinity and interests alignment between a target state and UN Security Council members. The raw data arises from the UN General Assembly voting records. Ultimately, such patterns can serve as another proxy or reflection of shared national interests, international preferences, or goals between countries.

**National Material Capabilities / State Power – Mitigating Factor:**

Based on previous research, the pursuit of geopolitical interests through international interventions appears to be affected by the army size and military capacities of the target state (Gilligan and Stedman, 2003, 49 ff.). In other words, a state is less likely to intervene upon the sovereignty of another state if the target state has great capabilities to strike back. Therefore, this trend may mitigate the effects of geopolitical interests on international humanitarian interventions and must be accounted for. This research will account for the military power of a target state through the National Material Capabilities Index (Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey 1972, Version 4). The National Material Capability data set contains annual values for total population, urban population, iron and steel production, energy consumption, military personnel, and military expenditure of all state members, currently from 1816-2007. The widely-used Composite Index of National Capability (CINC) index is based on these six variables. This measure is aggregated by summing all observations on each of the capability components for a year, converting each state's absolute component to a share of the international system, and averaging across the components.

**Casualties Incurred by Intervener – Mitigating Factor:**

Another variable that relates to geopolitical national interests is the number of casualties that intervener states incur during an intervention. Even when robust interests exist, high casualty
rates dramatically alter mission length and intensity, especially for the US. This trend relates directly to realist cost-benefit calculations of national foreign policymaking. Even the pursuit of national interests must be balanced against the risks of international intervention. In a pioneering analysis of public opinion on Vietnam, Milstein and Mitchell (1968) found that public support dropped as US military commitment grew and as casualties increased, whereas public support rose when the burden was shifted to the shoulders of the Vietnamese themselves. Mueller (1973) built on this work by evaluating public attitudes towards the wars in Korea and Vietnam, and in a later study, observing the casualty effects in the 1991 Gulf War (Mueller 1994). He concluded that as the total number of casualties increased by a factor of 10, support for the war decreased by about 15 percentage points (Mueller 1973, 59-62). Mueller’s (1994) well-known “casualties thesis” corresponds with more modern humanitarian military intervention trends as well. For instance, it was noted that American participation in the peacekeeping mission to Somalia was initially strong, but immediately following the deaths of eighteen soldiers in Mogadishu, negative public reaction forced President Clinton to withdraw US forces and remain very hesitant of future interventions (Burk 1999, 54).

To test this confounding force on geopolitical national interests, I employ a variable denoting the number of battle-related casualties inflicted upon the intervening country. The variable originates from the International Military Intervention (IMI) dataset (Kisangani and Pickering 2008; Pearson and Baumann 1993). Below are two figures that illustrate the composite of the geopolitical interest variables as well as its two main confounding forces.
## Figure 7: Operational Indicators for Geopolitical National Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geopolitical National Interests</td>
<td>Oil Supply</td>
<td>Dummy: Coded 1 when a target state’s oil exports exceed one-third of export revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>Ratio of primary commodity exports and GDP of target state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonial History</td>
<td>Does state experiencing intrastate conflict have a colonial relationship with P5? Dummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>Is target state in military alliance, security treaty partners, or non-aggression pacts with P5? Dummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>Contiguity with P5+1 (up to 400 miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0. not contiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. contiguous by land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contiguity with P5+1 (up to 150 miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0. not contiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. contiguous by land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Interest Index</td>
<td>Ordinal Index: (Oil + Colonial History + Alliances + (Contiguity400 + Contiguity150)/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Affinity Score</td>
<td>UN General Assembly voting alignment with P5 countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Humanitarian Need – Independent Variables

Although the concept of “humanitarian need” is very blurred in meaning, it is referenced consistently in any discussion of foreign military interventions. In the op-ed, “Why We Shouldn’t Attack Syria (Yet)”, in the New York Times, political scientist Robert A. Pape (2012) argued that “a mass-homicide campaign is under way there, but a means to stop it without unacceptable loss of life is not yet available”. On the other hand, Senator John McCain called for immediate US-led airstrikes against Syria’s armed forces to stop the slaughter and save innocent civilian lives there, much as it did in Libya in 2011 (Cushman 2012). As used above, the concept of humanitarian need can offer support to any international military intervention, but as realist theorists would maintain, this reason may not be genuine and merely hides other factors, such as geopolitical interests. While the realist camp overwhelmingly rejects the idea of state morality and international altruism, most other perspectives acknowledge a “need,” “obligation,” or “responsibility” to intervene in cases of international human rights abuses (Doyle 1997, chapter 11). Therefore, to test the validity of baseline realist assumptions and begin to extend beyond them, this study must test the explanatory power of humanitarian need as affecting decisions to intervene.
The concept of humanitarian need refers to a range of human suffering as directly caused by intrastate conflict, including battle-related deaths, dislocations, and human rights violations. Each unit of analysis in this study (states experiencing intrastate conflict) showcase humanitarian need, but the levels of humanitarian need differ. These differences are imperative in testing the relationship between humanitarian need of a target state and international decisions to intervene in that state for perceived humanitarian reasons. This group of variables serves as proxies for the testing of non-geopolitical interest-based factors of intervention – including norms of protection of innocents and human rights defending, typically core tenets in liberalism and constructivism.

The concept of humanitarian need closely relates to human rights, and in its negative connotations, to the existence of human rights abuses. But the concept serves to encompass more dimensions of human suffering. This study operationalizes humanitarian need through at least four indicators: the Physical Integrity Rights Index, Empowerment Rights Index, refugee flows, and death rates. These indicators may be combined into one “Human Rights Abuses” variable or more variables in different models. They may also be interchangeable in the statistical models.

*Physical Integrity Rights Index:*

The CIRI Physical Integrity Rights Index is an additive index constructed from the Torture, Extrajudicial Killing, Political Imprisonment, and Disappearance indicators created by Cingranelli and Richards (2008a). It ranges from 0 (no government respect for the rights) to 8 (full government respect for the rights). Used over a range of years, this indicator reflects the gravest acts of human rights abuses in intrastate conflict. This index is one of the most widely used indicators of human rights abuses and offers detailed guides of how the coding of the individual variables occurs (please see Cingranelli and Richards (2008a and 2008b) for details).
Refugee Numbers:

The refugee indicator records the total number of refugees and the number of internally displaced persons per year in the country experiencing intrastate conflict. It acts as an alternative variable of human displacement to reflect humanitarian need. This measure is obtained from the Population Data Unit of the United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants’ *World Refugee Survey* (Marshall 2008) until 2008 and from the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2014) since 2008. The study also brings in additional data from Fortna (2008).

Death Rate:

The death rate refers to the number of battle-rated deaths occurring in a target state during the year, per a 1000-person population, and it is estimated at midyear. It offers an alternative measurement for one of the gravest forms of human rights abuses. This measure is taken from the UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset (2015). Below is an outline of the variety of indicators for that are employed for humanitarian need.
Figure 9: Operational Indicators for Humanitarian Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Need</td>
<td>Human Rights Abuses</td>
<td>CIRI Physical Integrity Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of battle-rated deaths occurring during the year, per a 1000-person population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Dislocation</td>
<td>Number of refugees and internally displaced persons per year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source: Number of Refugees (x1000) Originating in country end of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDP: Number of Internally Displaced Persons (x1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Host: Number of Refugees (x1000) hosted by country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic/Liberal Interests**

Up to this point, the study measures liberal theoretical variables in combination with other theoretical camps. The concepts of humanitarian need and human rights abuses, for instance, are shared with constructivism, while measures of economic benefit are shared with realism. Here, I introduce additional concepts that serve as proxies solely for institutional liberal theory. These concepts are: shared membership in intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and economic interdependence. As Keohane (1984) confirms, complex interdependence in international relations primarily functions via shared institutions between states and networks of economic activity that make conflict costly for national economies and private citizens. Such a concept of interdependent economies is measured through a set of indicators taken from the World Bank (2015) and COW (Barbieri and Keshk 2012): Trade flow; Foreign Direct Investment (FDI); and the dollar amount of mineral and natural resources in the target state.
Moreover, membership in similar institutions is measured by COW’s dyadic joint membership in IGOs for paired states. In this measure, an IGO must consist of at least three members of the COW-defined state system; it must hold regular plenary sessions at least once every ten years; and it must possess a permanent secretariat and corresponding headquarters (Pevehouse, Nordstrom, and Warnke 2004). Figure 10 below illustrates the operationalization of all direct, proxy variables for liberal/economic interests.

Although not direct variables in the research question, this study must also control for levels of democracy and regime stability in the target state. These variables capture some confounding effects of liberal ideals of democracy, democratization, and state-building aspirations, which can alter the selectivity of interventions. A control variable for regime stability is also necessary as countries with stable regimes are less likely to experience an outside military intervention because they suffer less from the socio-economic and political ills that supposedly prompt such interventions (Choi 2013). Given the very standardized nature of these measures in political science literature, robust operationalization is not required. Levels of democracy in a target state are measured through the Polity Score, which ranks state regimes from -10 to -6, corresponding to autocracies, -5 to 5 corresponding to anocracies, and 6 to 10 for democracies (Marshall and Gurr 2014). The regime durability/stability variable measures the number of years a country has gone without experiencing a regime change, indicated as a three-point shift in a country’s Polity score for a given year. It is also collected from the Polity dataset (Marshall and Gurr 2014). Finally, several economic indicators, such as GDP per capita and GDP growth are included as control variables.
### Figure 10: Operational Indicators for Liberal/Economic Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Interdependence</td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Trade as % of GDP in target state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Direct</td>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment net inflows and outflows (% of GDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Mineral resource rents % of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural resource rents % of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Membership</td>
<td>IGO Membership</td>
<td>Dyadic number of shared memberships in all existing IGOs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - No Joint Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Joint Full Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(transformed into Average IGO membership; IGO rates; Total IGOs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conflict Perceptions**

Now that the operationalization of several foundational concepts of realism, liberalism have concluded, the study may introduce a small number of factors of intervention selectivity beyond the limits of theoretical camps. If large puzzles in selectivity remain after incorporating the most widely-discussed, theoretical sources of explanation, it can then begin to explore the relationships between conflict perceptions, ties of identity, and intervention selectivity. I unravel these hypotheses in the following sections, but here, I offer a brief operationalization of these “identity-laden” concepts for quantitative analysis. It is important to recall, however, that due to their dynamic, intangible natures, most of the analysis toward such variables and relationships is reserved for the in-depth qualitative case studies.

The perception of an intrastate conflict as either originating from ethno-religious civil strife, international aggression, or one-sided acts of violence may shape international responses.
According to Campbell (1998), an internal conflict perceived as either a product of ancient ethno-religious hatreds between civil populations or as a simple civil war tends to mute international calls for intervention. This is because the moral responsibility and the incentivizing normative context to intervene weaken when two or three equally culpable sides inflict casualties. In addition, the norm of sovereignty is harder to overcome as civil wars are still in the realm of the traditional domestic sphere of conduct. Moreover, the consensus is that ethno-religious civil wars are intractable and inevitable – thus, international actors can do very little in the long-run. Alternatively, an intrastate conflict seen as international aggression or as a campaign of systematic killing allows international actors to employ either national interest to combat the aggressor state or to override sovereignty for the public sake of human rights promotion and protection (Campbell 1998).

Two conflict-type variables may begin to measure, at a very basic level, the perceived dimensions of an intrastate conflict in the eyes of the international community. The data comes from Fortna (2008). The war type measure differentiates identity-based conflict from ideological or political conflict. Another measure differentiates whether the intrastate conflict is an ethnic war – measuring the effect of ethnic-based conflicts on international responses. Figure 1 outlines these categories.

Figure 1: Operational Indicators for Conflict Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Type</td>
<td>Identity Conflict</td>
<td>0 – ideological, revolutionary, or other conflict&lt;br&gt;1 – ethnic, religious, or identity conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic War</td>
<td>0 – ethnic war&lt;br&gt;1 – mixed/ambiguous&lt;br&gt;2 - not ethnic war</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So far, this study has attempted to operationalize the concepts above so as to improve upon some of the narrow operationalizations found in previous literature. In sum, the study first analyzes a sample of armed intrastate conflicts occurring after the Cold War via these quantitative indicators. It measures the level of humanitarian need that arose from each unit of intrastate conflict, the dimensions of geopolitical national interests and economic interdependence and interests from the perspective of the intervener, the influence of conflict perception, several confounding forces within theoretical camps, and finally, whether an “international humanitarian intervention” or “peacekeeping mission” occurred in these regions of intrastate conflict. It is important to note that it may often be the case that no international humanitarian intervention occurred in a state experiencing intrastate conflict (and hence experiencing a level of humanitarian need), but this occurrence is crucial to the research design. In order to discover the main causes of selectivity behind international humanitarian interventions, the research must not only include instances of interventions in areas of humanitarian need, but also instances of nonintervention in areas with grave humanitarian need.

Moreover, aside from the core concepts operationalized above, the study incorporates a range of standard control measures, such as GDP per capita; GDP growth; total population; and urban population. These measures are primarily obtained via the World Bank (2015), and due to their highly standardized natures, they are not directly operationalized or discussed above.

List of Variables

As the above operationalizations of the main concepts suggests, this research must utilize a large number of variables with multiple indicators to fully explore the theoretical nuances of the research question: When and why do states militarily intervene in areas of human rights abuses (reflected through the unit of armed intrastate conflict)? Since much of the main variables have been introduced and fully explained above, this section consolidates the variables and
corresponding indicators into one table. The following tables include all variables and indicators of the previously operationalized concepts. The variables are grouped by function and by the concepts they aim to measure.

Table 2: Dependent Variables – Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN MILITARY INTERVENTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Occurrence & Intensity of Military Intervention | 0. No Intervention  
1. Intervention, but no troops  
2. 1-1000 troops  
3. 1001-5000 troops  
4. 5001-10,000 troops  
5. 10,000+ troops | International Military Intervention Data (IMI) |
| Troop Incursion               | 0. None  
1. Evacuation of troops  
2. Transport or negotiate-observe  
3. Patrol/guard/defend (SAMS)  
4. Intimidation  
5. Combat | International Military Intervention Data (IMI) |
| Naval Incursion               | 0. None  
1. Evacuation of troops  
2. Transport troops or launch forces inside territorial waters for combat  
3. Laying or removing mines in territorial waters/commando raid  
4. Act of intimidation in waters  
5. Shelling/firing | International Military Intervention Data (IMI) |
| Air Incursion                 | 0. None  
1. Evacuation of troops  
2. Transport troops/personnel – supply/support  
3. Act of intimidation/air defense/patrol  
4. Bombing or strafing, firing | International Military Intervention Data (IMI) |
| Scope                         | Number of Missions Involved in intervention to any degree | International Military Intervention Data (IMI) |
| Intervention Index            | Ordinal Additive Index of Troop Activity and Troop, Naval, and Air Incursions | Constructed scale |
Table 2b. Dependent Variables Continued - Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fortna (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence &amp; Intensity of any Mission (BKPop)</td>
<td>0. None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Political Mission Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Multidimensional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence &amp; Intensity of Peacekeeping (PK)</td>
<td>0. None/Peace-building Only</td>
<td>Fortna (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions Only</td>
<td>2. Monitor/Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Traditional/Interpositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Multidimensional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence of Peacekeeping Operation</td>
<td>0. None</td>
<td>Fortna (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Occurrence of Peacekeeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOPOLITICAL NATIONAL INTERESTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Supply</td>
<td>Dummy: Coded 1 when target state’s oil exports exceed one-third of export revenues * Also tested with Fuel Exports as % of merchandise exports in some models.</td>
<td>Fortna (2008) &amp; World Bank (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export Commodity</td>
<td>Ratio of primary commodity exports and GDP of target state</td>
<td>World Bank (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial History</td>
<td>Does state experiencing intrastate conflict have colonial relationship with P5? Dummy</td>
<td>Correlates of War (COW) &amp; International Military Intervention Data (IMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliances</td>
<td>Is target state in military alliance, security treaty partners, or non-aggression pacts with P5? Dummy</td>
<td>Correlates of War (COW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Proximity</td>
<td>Contiguity with P5 (up to 400m)</td>
<td>Fortna (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0. not contiguous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. contiguous by land or up to 400 miles of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contiguity with P5 (up to 150m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0. not contiguous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. contiguous by land or up to 150 miles of water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Interest Index</td>
<td>Ordinal Additive Index = (Oil + Colonial History + Alliances + (Contiguity400 + Contiguity150) /2)</td>
<td>Constructed scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Casualties</td>
<td>Number of battle-related casualties inflicted upon intervener countries</td>
<td>International Military Intervention Data (IMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Affinity Score</td>
<td>Political affinity and alignment between target state and UN P5 – measured via UN General Assembly voting records</td>
<td>Gartzke (2006) and Fortna (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANITARIAN NEED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Rights Abuses</strong></td>
<td>CIRI Physical Integrity Rights</td>
<td>CIRI: Cingranelli and Richards (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of battle-rated deaths occurring during year: low, high, and best estimate measures</td>
<td>UCDP Battle-Related Deaths Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Dislocation</strong></td>
<td>Number of refugees &amp; internally displaced per year in country of intrastate conflict</td>
<td><em>World Refugee Survey</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Source:</em> Number of Refugees (x1000) Originating in country at end of year</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>IDP:</em> Number of Internally Displaced Persons (x1000) in county at end of year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Host:</em> Number of Refugees (x1000) hosted by country at end of year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LIBERAL/ECONOMIC INTERESTS</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Linkages</strong></td>
<td>Trade as % of GDP in target country</td>
<td><em>World Bank (2015)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreign Direct Investment</strong></td>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment net inflows and outflows (as % of GDP)</td>
<td><em>World Bank (2015)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral Resources</strong></td>
<td>Mineral rents as % of GDP Natural resource rents % of GDP</td>
<td><em>World Bank (2015)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental Organizations</strong></td>
<td>0 – No Joint Membership 1 – Joint Full Membership (including Total IGOs; IGO Rate; and Average IGO membership)</td>
<td><em>Correlates of War (COW)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONFLICT TYPE</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity Conflict</strong></td>
<td>0 – ideological, revolutionary, or other conflict 1 – ethnic, religious, or identity conflict</td>
<td><em>Fortna (2008)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic War</strong></td>
<td>0 – ethnic war 1 – mixed/ambiguous 2 – not ethnic war</td>
<td><em>Fortna (2008)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONFOUNDING VARIABLES FOR STATE MILITARY POWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Correlate of War (COW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population of Target State</td>
<td>National Material Capabilities Index</td>
<td>Correlates of War (COW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Expenditures of Target State</td>
<td>National Material Capabilities Index</td>
<td>Correlates of War (COW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel of Target State</td>
<td>National Material Capabilities Index</td>
<td>Correlates of War (COW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Resource Consumption</td>
<td>National Material Capabilities Index</td>
<td>Correlates of War (COW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTROL VARIABLE FOR DEMOCRACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Score for Target State</th>
<th>Polity Durable Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Democracy</td>
<td>Polity Democracy Score for Target State</td>
<td>Polity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Stability</td>
<td>Regime durability: number of years since most recent regime change</td>
<td>Polity Durable Index</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3. Hypotheses: three pathways of intervention

After operationalizing all key variables of analysis, the next step is to explicate expected relationships between the variables. The study’s initial hypotheses are grounded in important theoretical predictions. Given that the theory of realism underlies the most basic understandings of international military interventions, these relationships must be guided by realist assumptions of global politics to test the relevancy of other factors. In brief, the main areas of contention in this study are whether the phenomenon currently labeled as humanitarian military interventions is driven solely by national interests, whether there are ever instances in which norms serve as the primary catalysts of intervention, or whether the interaction between norms and interests takes on a more complex causal pathway depending on region, conflict perceptions, or other dimensions.

After directly testing individual theoretical variables, the study poses its regionally-sensitive primary hypotheses, which correspond with the three pathways of intervention introduced in chapter one and further discussed in chapter two:
Primary hypothesis 1 (pathways): There exist three probable pathways to humanitarian military interventions, ranging in mission intensity.

Primary hypothesis 2 (vital interests): Other states are more likely to robustly intervene in intrastate conflicts when vital geopolitical national interests exist, regardless of other confounding factors.

Primary hypothesis 3 (conflict perception): When only non-vital, secondary interests exist in an internal conflict, states will be less likely to intervene in conflicts perceived as ethnic or identity-based civil wars and more likely to intervene in conflicts perceived as international aggression or systemic killings by one side.

Primary hypothesis 4 (region): Holding humanitarian need and non-vital interests constant, an intrastate conflict occurring in or near a Western neighborhood (with robust regional institutions), is more likely to become a target of an intense humanitarian military intervention.

Primary hypothesis 5 (conflict perception & region): When no initial national interests exist within an internal conflict, states will primarily militarily intervene in conflicts near or within Western neighborhoods that are perceived as products of one-sided, systemic killings. All other conflicts will most likely to be delegated to peacekeeping missions or ignored.

Yet before delving into the above hypotheses and corresponding driving forces, I must test the degree of explanatory power within isolated theoretical variables – ones that have typically been used to explain intervention selectivity and ones that still play an interactive role in the above propositions. The theory of realism, as previously discussed, predicts that any international military intervention – regardless of the conditions of the target state, the stated rhetoric, or the outcomes – is in pursuit of direct national interests and has no correlation to the humanitarian need or other characteristics of the target population. Norms of human rights or international standards of behavior, even if embedded in international documents and institutions, mean nothing unless they can be utilized to pursue state interests. Therefore, realism predicts that only the variables measuring direct national interests will positively affect the probability of a state militaristically intervening in another state. Alternatively, the variables measuring the humanitarian need in instances of intrastate conflict, coverage of the human rights abuses, and the level of economic linkages between states (those not directly connected to military power and primary resources)
will have no effect on the likelihood of intervention in an area of intrastate conflict. It must be noted, however, that the study’s overarching alternate hypothesis is that realist relationships are mitigated by more normative foundations and regional considerations – to be explored once other variable relationships are confirmed or weakened.

This section introduces ten null hypotheses grounded in baseline realist theory, including assumptions shared by both liberalism and constructivism. If the null hypotheses do not hold up to statistical analysis, do not explain much of the variation, or exhibit regionally-bounded or interactive relationships, the study can delve further into the normative and identity-based dynamics of intervention within the case studies. It is assumed that the predictions made within these hypotheses are relevant when all other variables are kept constant. All of the following hypotheses are based on the same unit of analysis, instance of intrastate conflict, as possessing certain attributes in relation to the international community. For example, one unit of analysis in this study is the armed intrastate conflict occurring in Kosovo from 1998 to 1999. The independent variables measure dimensions of geopolitical national interests that the major world powers had in Kosovo, their economic interests, the conflict type, and the humanitarian need that the Kosovo intrastate conflict brought about. The dependent variables then measure whether an intervention or peacekeeping mission occurred in Kosovo during the time of intrastate conflict, and if so, what level of intensity characterized the intervention. This logic applies to all cases of intrastate conflict, including cases of nonintervention.

The first five hypotheses presented relate to the concept of geopolitical national interests as affecting the probability of international interventions in regions of intrastate conflict. As this concept has many dimensions, many variables must be used to test its explanatory power. Geopolitical national interests, represented by variables measuring Oil Supply, Export
Commodities, Colonial History, Alliances, and Geographic Proximity, are the main causes of international political decisions. States, acting in their own self-interest, aim to gain as much power relative to other states through the increase of their global influence and military capabilities. Therefore, any pursuit that could increase a state’s military power and material resources (in which the benefits outweigh the costs of the pursuit) should be undertaken.

To begin with the first variable denoting geopolitical national interests, the greater the amount of oil resources a state possesses, the more valuable it may be to other states, due to the significance of oil in driving economies and military capabilities. As a result, an intrastate conflict within a state with significant oil resources is more likely to be internationalized.

Hypothesis #1: If a state experiencing intrastate conflict has greater oil supplies, they are more likely to be a target of an international intervention with higher intensity.

The next hypothesis continues to predict the relationship between geopolitical national interests and the occurrence and intensity of international humanitarian interventions, through the dimension of primary natural resources. The variable of Export Commodities has been used in past studies to denote the abundance of natural resources in a country, which cannot be measured solely through oil resources (Fearon and Laitin 2003). Similarly to realist predictions about oil supply, the greater the amount of primary commodity exports, the greater the probability of international humanitarian interventions in that state (driven by the pursuit of national interests).

Hypothesis #2: If a state experiencing intrastate conflict has greater levels of export commodities, they are more likely to be a target of an international intervention with higher intensity.

Most international relations theories also emphasize the need to expand state influence globally as to guarantee state survival, access to primary resources, and maintain a balance of power in a region of interest. Hence, the colonial history of a state can showcase the historical trajectory of that state’s value to the international community, noting that states would not otherwise possess colonies if the colonies did not contribute to national interests. Furthermore,
past colonial relationships may continue to serve as significant alliance relationships in the present, offering states a way to further promote security in an anarchical, power-based international system. Consequently, states with strong colonial relationships with other states (especially regional powers), are more likely to be targets of international humanitarian interventions.

_Hypothesis #3:_ If a state experiencing intrastate conflict has stronger colonial relationships to other states in the international community, they are more likely to be a target of an international humanitarian intervention.

While past colonial relationships can measure some dimensions of geopolitical national interests – as related to expanding influence, preserving the balance of powers, or protecting resources – alliance systems also serve the same purpose. Therefore, the next hypothesis tests the relationship between the strength and number of alliances between states and instances of humanitarian interventions. In this case, realist theory is less certain, as other states may intervene in the internal conflicts of states with stronger and more numerous alliances due to signaled geopolitical value, but they may also be less likely to intervene if those allies prevent the international community from acting against the target state’s sovereignty. Liberalism also sees alliances as relevant via shared institutions and concepts of collective security (Keohane 1984; Doyle 1997). Constructivism may also claim greater ties of identity between allies (Wendt 1999). Thus, the following hypothesis is less specific on the direction of causality.

_Hypothesis #4:_ A state’s alliances have a significant causal effect on the probability of intervention.

The last independent variable to measure a dimension of geopolitical national interests is the proximity of an intervening state or states to the area of intrastate conflict. The literature has consistently discovered a significant direct relationship between geographic proximity of the intervening and target states and instances of humanitarian interventions (e.g. Perkins and Neumayer 2008; Gilligan and Stedman 2003). Realists would easily explain this relationship in
terms of national geopolitical interests, as a state would attempt to minimize harm to its own security interests by instilling order in nearby regions of chaos (e.g. initialing a humanitarian intervention in areas experiencing intrastate conflict to prevent refugee spills or escalating violence). Liberals may claim interdependence, economic ties, and shared values as vital in this case, while constructivists might discuss higher likelihoods of shared identities.

Hypothesis #5: Powerful states (P5) are more likely to military intervene within an intrastate conflict if the conflict is geographically closer to their own borders.

The next two null hypotheses test the explanatory power of humanitarian need on the occurrence and intensity of international interventions in regions of humanitarian crisis. While the previous hypotheses all predicted positive relationships in relation to the dependent variables, the following hypotheses predict neither positive nor negative relationships. They instead predict that the independent variables representing humanitarian need in states experiencing intrastate conflict have no effect on the likelihood of an international humanitarian intervention in that state. These predictions stem directly from the realist theoretical disregard for ethics, morality, and humanitarian norms in international political decision-making. This logic is frequently used to explain why the US and the international community intervened for “humanitarian” purposes in Kosovo, while virtually ignoring the greater human rights atrocities occurring in Darfur’s intrastate conflict at the same time (Finnemore 2003). If the following analysis rejects these hypotheses, (especially if it finds a positive relationship), then the study can delve into more nuanced analysis of normative factors in the case study section.

Hypothesis #6: Higher levels of human rights abuses will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.

Hypothesis #7: Higher levels of human displacement will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.
The next set of hypotheses posits null relationships between economic interests, liberal interdependence, and intervention. Given that these represent null hypothesis with realism as their baseline, they predict no relationship between non-vital economic statecraft and the selectivity of intervention. Any discovered relationships will thus bolster liberal theoretical claims and prompts further research on interacting forces of selectivity.

Hypothesis #8: High economic interdependence with other countries will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.
Hypothesis #9: Higher numbers of shared IGOs with other countries will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.

Lastly, a brief null hypothesis is introduced regarding the effect of conflict perception and type on the selectivity of military intervention. The null posits no relationship between conflict type, such as identity-based war, ideological war, or ethnic war. If this hypothesis is rejected, the study can then pursue its primary alternative hypotheses of regionally-bounded, perception-based selectivity of humanitarian military interventions.

Hypothesis #10: The type of intrastate conflict has no significant effect on the probability of international humanitarian military intervention.

To summarize, the above hypotheses at the intrastate conflict unit of analysis predict positive relationships between geopolitical national interests and humanitarian interventions, as assumed by realist theory. In contrast, the hypotheses predict no significant relationships between variables representing greater humanitarian need, economic dependence, conflict type, and probability of interventions. Depending on the outcome of these theoretical null hypotheses, as tested by statistical analysis in the next chapter, further hypotheses on interactive causal pathways, regional variations, and other political forces will be evaluated. Regionally-bounded variations and conflict perceptions can only be tested once the above hypotheses are confirmed or weakened.
3.4. Research Design: mixed methods

Noting the previous discussions on concept definitions, variables, and indicators, it becomes evident that this study requires many sources of cross-national longitudinal data. Additionally, the study must utilize multivariate statistical methods to discover relationships between the proposed variables. This section first summarizes the available data sources relevant to the research design and discusses their reliability. It then delves briefly into the methods of statistical analysis to be employed in the first part of the research design (chapter four) and introduces the case studies used in the second qualitative section (chapter five and six).

Data Analysis

To recall, the units of analysis of this study represent a sample of post-Cold War armed intrastate conflicts measured on a yearly basis. The data for armed intrastate conflicts is collected mainly through the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (2014) and the corresponding UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset (2015), originally collected by Gleditsch et al. (2002). It categorizes armed conflicts by the same definitions applied in this research design. This database of conflicts was established in the mid-1980s through the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University, and it continues to provide strict coding rules for the annual collection of international conflict information, including conflict start and end dates, number of casualties, and conflict categorization. The program caters to an academic audience, thus, the data provided is one of the most accurate and most-used sources on global armed conflicts. Furthermore, the database’s definition of armed conflict is a standard in how conflicts are systematically defined and studied internationally (Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2014).

The indicators for the dependent variables in the study, measuring the concept of international humanitarian interventions, originate primarily from the International Military Intervention Data (IMI), hosted through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social
Research (Kisangani and Pickering 2008; Pearson and Baumann 1993). The database’s definitions of international military intervention and humanitarian intervention correspond to this study’s concept definition of international humanitarian military intervention. The database contains instances of international military interventions since 1989, coded for types of military interventions (including humanitarian purposes), intensity of interventions (troop levels, aerial and naval incursions, etc.), the number of states involved in multilateral interventions, and more. This highly regarded, long-standing database provides most of the required measurements for the variables of “occurrence of interventions” and “intensity of interventions.” In addition, data on the occurrence and intensity of peacekeeping operations are primarily obtained from Fortna’s (2008) datasets – renowned scholar in the field of peacekeeping interventions.

The concept of geopolitical national interests has many variables and indicators, but fortunately, many of their measurements can be obtained through the Correlates of War Project (COW), which hosts a range of academic datasets online. Its Direct Contiguity dataset measures geographical proximity of nations to each other; its Formal Alliances dataset measures alliance relationships (including number of alliances and levels of alliance strength) between the global community since 1816; and its Colonial/Dependency Contiguity dataset registers historical colonial relationships between nations since 1816. Additionally, the “colonial history” indicator is measured through available data from the IMI online dataset (Pearson and Baumann 1993), as the dataset utilizes a similar scale for colonial history as this study. Fortna’s (2008) peacekeeping dataset will also be utilized for supplementation of these indicators.

The COW project also includes the National Material Capabilities Index dataset throughout time, which is used to measure state military power, a confounding variable to the pursuit of national geopolitical interests. Lastly, the geopolitical indicators “oil supply” and “export
commodities” originate from the World Bank (2015) and International Monetary Fund (2015) datasets of economic indicators and Fortna (2008). All of these databases offer detailed codebooks and instructions for coding replication, and they are among the primary data sources for academic research on international conflicts, economic development, and humanitarian missions.

The variable measurements for humanitarian need are also obtained mainly through one reliable data source: the CIRI Human Rights dataset (Cingranelli and Richards 2008a). The CIRI dataset contains quantitative information on governmental respect for 15 recognized human rights for 202 countries, from 1981 to 2011. This database is home to some of the most widely-used international human rights indexes, including the Physical Integrity Rights Index and the Empowerment Rights Index. I supplement this data on human rights abuses with information on refugee numbers and death rates from various United Nations agencies (UNHCR 2013), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (e.g. Amnesty International Human Rights reports), and Fortna’s (2008) peacekeeping datasets.

Many of the measurements on economic benefits (trade ratios, foreign direct investment, and mineral resources) are obtained through the World Bank (2015) databases of economic indicators, with supplements from Fortna (2008). Control variables for levels of democracy and regime stability in a target state come from the Polity datasets (Marshall and Gurr 2014). Finally, the initial indicators for conflict type and perception, including the existence of identity war, ideological war, or ethnic war, are obtained via Fortna’s (2008) peacekeeping datasets.

Given the available, collected data, the main method of analysis in the study consists of ordered logistic multivariate regression models (due to the ordinal nature of the dependent variables). They test multiple relationships between the proposed explanatory factors in intrastate conflict and the resulting intervention or nonintervention in the conflict. Several regression models
are employed to refine the results of the analysis, especially to compare between different sets of dependent variables (e.g. military interventions only; peacekeeping only; and all interventions). Tests of robustness are performed as to check for heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, and multicollinearity errors. Pending the results of this quantitative model, the qualitative case studies to follow expand upon significant variable relationships and aim to discover causal mechanisms that the regression models may have missed. Most importantly, the case studies should shed light on puzzles that the quantitative analysis brings forward or is unable to address via its traditionally distinct theoretical variables.

**Case Studies**

The case studies serve to mitigate the inherent limitations in using fixed quantitative data to analyze fluid interests. More specifically, the case studies focus on the role of the Western narrative, conflict perceptions, and ties of identity that may bridge the gap between traditional theoretical variables weighing on the frequency and intensity of intervention. They also explore potential distinctions between causal pathways to intervention in the Western sphere of influence versus the non-Western sphere – refining the hypotheses discussed above. These case studies rely on a variety of knowledge streams, including archival data, detailed dialogue between officials within governmental documents, public official speeches, historiography of intrastate conflict, and secondary sources of information.

The case selection is dependent on the degree of data access and on the range of desired variation within important variables and outcomes. Thus, I include two positive cases of intervention and one negative case of non-intervention, or very minor levels of intervention. I select cases of intervention and non-intervention in the Western and non-Western spheres so as to test portions of my theoretical framework. Based on such factors, the cases selected are: 1.) High-
intensity non-UN sanctioned military intervention in Kosovo (1999), 2.) High-intensity UN sanctioned military intervention in Libya (2011), and 3.) Non-intervention (minimal UN-African Union peacekeeping mission) in Darfur (2003-present). Ultimately, the case study analysis facilitates the creation of a two-by-two typology of causal pathways toward military interventions or non-interventions in intrastate crises.

The next chapter marks the beginning of this analytical journey – starting with aggregated analysis of isolated, theoretical variables so as to reveal missing pieces and large patterns in the data. The following chapters then utilize the relationships revealed via quantitative analysis to shape the direction and nature of inquiry. It is this researcher’s aspiration to provide a triangulation of results via mixed-methods analysis and offer both generalization and nuance to the study of humanitarian military interventions in the post-Cold War era.
CHAPTER 4. MODELS OF INTERVENTION: PRIMACY OF REGION, CONFLICT PERCEPTION, AND INTERESTS

“... the legacies of geography, history and culture really do set limits on what can be accomplished in any given place. But the experience in the Balkans reinforced an idealist dictum that is equally true: One should always work near the limits of what is possible rather than cynically give up on any place. In this decade idealists went too far; in the previous one, it was realists who did not go far enough.”

Robert Kaplan, 2013

Which theoretical forces increase the probability of humanitarian military interventions, or in other words, make third-party military interventions within a violent intrastate conflict more likely? This section introduces a range of models that test the relationship between intervention outcomes, national interests, humanitarian need, liberal economic benefits, conflict perception, region, democratic governance, and other relevant theoretical variables. First, I outline the technical specifications of these models, including sample selection, data aggregation, choice of time periods, and model types and assumptions. Next, I present several models that differ in their dependent variables, co-variants, and statistical assumptions to triangulate and further verify the study results. Then I interpret the main patterns within the models in light of different theoretical assumptions and the study’s main hypotheses. Overall, the aggregated models eschew the relevance of interests and human rights in favor of the importance of regionally-bounded perceptions in driving humanitarian military interventions. Lastly, I discuss remaining puzzles that quantitative analysis is unable to resolve, and which require further nuanced analysis in later chapters. These puzzles center primarily on the relationship between intervention selectivity, regional variations, and conflict perception.

4.1. Model Specifications

The following statistical models rely on a newly merged dataset, as outlined in detail within the previous chapter. The unit of analysis remains an occurrence of intrastate conflict within a
particular year, from 1987 until 2014 – resulting in 1,110 observations. The time period is selected to maximize sample size and data availability, but also steers clear of pre-Cold War international security dynamics. The beginning year of 1987 is a means of capturing conflicts and interventions that occurred during the transitional period between the Cold War and post-Cold War international arena. 21

Moreover, the main dependent variables of these models are either ordinal or binary in nature, requiring the usage of appropriate ordered logistical regression assumptions. For instance, the first model discussed in this chapter uses the dummy dependent variable of Internationalize. This denotes whether an intrastate conflict within a particular year was in any way intervened upon by other states and secondary parties on one or both sides (Gleditsch et al. 2002; Uppsala Conflict Data Program 2014). Other dependent variables include an intensity-based ordinal Intervention Index, Peacekeeping and peacebuilding variables, and the number of total missions per intrastate conflict – which is tested using both logistical and linear regression assumptions. In addition, these models use robust standard errors to account for heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, and multicollinearity. Consequently, I initially treat each unit of analysis as independent from other units in its intervention outcome. Other versions of the models include clustered standard errors on country units – to test the alternate assumption that intrastate conflict observations within the same country are not fully independent from one another. This specification is also utilized in Doyle and Sambanis (2000, 2006) and Perkins and Neumayer (2008). Lastly, several predictor variables are tested in lagged and unlagged formats; while other variables have been logged to better reflect a normal distribution, as will be detailed below.

21 The year 1987 also marks the practical beginnings of the Soviet Union’s (USSR) policies of Perestroika – denoting a general weakening of the ideological superpower rivalry between the US and the USSR. See Gorbachev (1987) for a symbolic and technical delineation of this transformation.
Several important dataset limitations must become explicit. First, the merged dataset presents with missing values – thus, presenting problems for the maintenance of stable observation numbers while running regressions on different combinations of variables. To ameliorate this concern, missing data within several variables (labeled appropriately within the models) are filled via multiple chained imputation methods. These imputed variables and corresponding models were tested against the non-imputed versions, showing similar findings and distributions. Secondly, the following models do not account for the temporal nature of the phenomenon of intrastate conflict, due to a lack of systematic data that gradually traces the progression of the same internal conflict across time. Similarly, the data does not concern itself with gradual changes in intervention intensity once an intervention has occurred – both due to data limitations and to the scope of the research question. The research question focuses on the primary causes of initial military intervention within a humanitarian crisis, not on the mechanisms of mission trajectory and duration once in place.

4.2. Patterns in Aggregated Intervention Data

Before delving into the predictive models, Table 4 lists the non-dummy, continuous variables of the dataset, so as to give a general overview of measurement ranges. Table 5 then sorts the same variable measurements by region – Western versus non-Western. This regional component will become vital in the upcoming analysis. Already in the regionally-divided table, it is important to note that while the vast majority of armed intrastate conflicts occur in the non-western sphere, and battle-related death numbers (and all other measures of human rights abuses) are much higher in these regions, the Intervention Index and mission numbers are much higher for the Western aggregated observations – as Figures 12 and 13 show. Furthermore, a great discrepancy in Polity scores of democratization as well as refugee numbers can be seen between
these two groups of data – with the West showing drastically greater measures of democratization and much lower numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). Surprisingly, the National Interest Index shows no such regional discrepancies. Further analysis is required for such preliminary regional patterns.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Deaths High</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Index</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Missions</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity Score P5</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Rents of GDP</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>-64.05</td>
<td>88.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI Inflows</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>-82.89</td>
<td>89.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Capita</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>46,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Rents</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Rents</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>53.19</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>199.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>98.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Exports</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.27e-05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>259.30</td>
<td>661.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>547.70</td>
<td>866.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>180.5</td>
<td>399.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGO Rate</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>60.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Integrity Index</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Interest Index</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12: Intrastate Conflict by Region

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Non-West</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>West</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Deaths</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53,948</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Index</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Missions</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity Score P5</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Rents of GDP</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67.33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56.19</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>-64.05</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>-44.90</td>
<td>88.96</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI Inflows</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>-82.89</td>
<td>89.48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP capita</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>2.639</td>
<td>6.502</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>46.405</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.862</td>
<td>7.977</td>
<td>523.00</td>
<td>33.635</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Rents</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Rents</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>51.36</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>199.70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74.23</td>
<td>28.62</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>166.90</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>98.76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>86.20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Exports</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>97.08</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>1.3e-05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>268.00</td>
<td>684.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,601</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>165.60</td>
<td>310.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>562.70</td>
<td>895.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>385.90</td>
<td>416.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>187.30</td>
<td>413.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105.70</td>
<td>149.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGO Rate</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>32.79</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Integrity Index</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Interest Index</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13: Average Intervention Index by Region

Internationalized Conflict

The first model of humanitarian military intervention selectivity applies the general concept of “internationalized” conflict as a stepping stone toward more detailed analysis of the phenomenon. An intrastate conflict is said to be internationalized if there exists any third-party involvement in the crisis within the year – civilian or military in nature. More specifically, according to the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Database (2015), an internalized internal armed conflict occurs between a state government and one or more internal opposition group(s) with any degree of direct intervention from other states on one or both sides. Descriptive statistics (see Figure 14) already show strong regional patterns of internationalization of conflict – where Western conflicts are disproportionally internationalized relative to non-Western counterparts.

I introduce a combination of logistical models with the “internationalize” dummy as the dependent variable and core theoretical concepts of national interest, human rights, democracy, and region as preliminary independent variables. The results that follow serve as very basic justifications for further exploration of these interacting forces in the phenomenon of intervention.
Table 6 reveals significant predictive relationships between core theoretical variables and the internationalization of internal armed conflicts. In all versions of the model, for example, battle-related deaths, contiguity to powerful state actors, regime durability, conflict intensity, and the narrower definition of Western region are highly statistically significant (at least at the .05 level). The table below displays odds ratios instead of standard coefficients for better interpretation of logistical relationships. As shown, a one unit increase in battle-related deaths, while statistically significant, barely increases the odds ratio of conflict internationalization, holding all other predictors constant. Figure 15 shows this lack of consistent effect alongside regional bias, with battle-deaths measured by the size of the map bubbles (Afghanistan is a large outlier). But one unit increase in regime durability, on the other hand, makes internationalization .94 times less likely, decreasing its odds by six percent. Such a pattern points to the important effects of domestic stability in preventing outside interference, a factor most relevant to liberal theory. Contiguity to the P5 member states also slightly decreases odds of internationalization, which could arise from interest-based dynamics or less tangible regional institutions or ideas.
A rise in conflict intensity – from minor to war – and a move to a Western region, however, increases the odds ratio of internationalization by more than all other predictors combined. A one unit increase in conflict intensity makes internationalization up to 4.6 times more likely to occur (increases odds by 360 percent), while a conflict in the West makes internationalization up to 2.8 more likely (increases odds by 180 percent). Alliances with P5 members are only statistically significant in half of the models and show lowered odds of internationalization of conflict, while the oil-exporting status of a target country increases odds of conflict internationalization in some models. It is interesting to note that the Physical Integrity Index, a proxy for human rights conditions within a country, is not statistically significant in any model and neither is the level of democratization, as measured via Polity.

**Figure 15: Battle-related Deaths and Internationalized Conflict**
### Table 6: Logistical Models of Internationalized Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Internationalize</th>
<th>(2) Internationalize</th>
<th>(3) Internationalize</th>
<th>(4) Internationalize</th>
<th>(5) Internationalize</th>
<th>(6) Internationalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BdHigh</strong></td>
<td>1.000***</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Im_AllianceP5</strong></td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td>0.436**</td>
<td>0.449**</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.181)</td>
<td>(0.336)</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
<td>(0.372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ContiguousP5400</strong></td>
<td>0.345***</td>
<td>0.312***</td>
<td>0.324***</td>
<td>0.167***</td>
<td>0.138***</td>
<td>0.167***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td>(0.104)</td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.074)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OilExport</strong></td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>1.512*</td>
<td>1.744**</td>
<td>2.116**</td>
<td>2.259**</td>
<td>2.126**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.351)</td>
<td>(0.376)</td>
<td>(0.481)</td>
<td>(0.704)</td>
<td>(0.770)</td>
<td>(0.707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FormerColony</strong></td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>1.669*</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>2.026**</td>
<td>1.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.319)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
<td>(0.461)</td>
<td>(0.535)</td>
<td>(0.711)</td>
<td>(0.563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polity2</strong></td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Durable</strong></td>
<td>0.944***</td>
<td>0.946***</td>
<td>0.944***</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Im_PHYSINT</strong></td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>(0.080)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Im_Intensity</strong></td>
<td>4.621***</td>
<td>2.513***</td>
<td>2.513***</td>
<td>(0.956)</td>
<td>(0.731)</td>
<td>(0.731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Im_CumIntensity</strong></td>
<td>2.830**</td>
<td>2.830**</td>
<td>2.830**</td>
<td>(1.466)</td>
<td>(1.466)</td>
<td>(1.466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>(0.556)</td>
<td>(0.556)</td>
<td>(0.556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West2</strong></td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>r2_p</strong></td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.0898</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: the *Im* prefix denotes an imputed variable.

The next set of models for conflict internationalization (Table 7) adds other core variables and combines indicators of national interest into an index form. Moreover, it preserves logistical coefficients in their original logged odds form to focus on relationship nature and direction. As in the first set of models, the narrow definition of Western region remains statistically significant, with a positive relationship to internationalization of conflict, while the broader definition of Western region is not significant. Conflict intensity also consistently shows significant, positive relationships with internationalization, while regime durability, as in previous models, consistently
shows a significant, negative relationship to internationalization. Battle-related deaths reveal little consistency in the models, and mirroring this trend in humanitarian indicators, as the Physical Integrity Index remains statistically insignificant. Yet the Polity index of democratization becomes significant in these models, with a negative relationship to internationalization – implicating that a higher level of democracy decreases the probability of third-party involvement in internal strife. Currently, measures of predominant liberal variables appear more relevant than measures of constructivist/normative or realist forces.

From the new variable additions in the models, Identity War becomes statistically significant, revealing a negative relationship to internationalization, while Ethnic War is overwhelmingly insignificant. Refugee flows, as denoted by the Source variable, alongside affinity scores and the National Interests Index are generally insignificant in the models as well. Yet the CINC index, measuring national power capabilities, becomes highly significant, revealing a negative relationship between high power capabilities of a target state and the likelihood of outside intervention. This finding may relate back to realist notions of power politics, deterrence, and broader dimensions of calculating national interests based on the costs of intervention as well as direct benefits. Therefore, while direct national interests may not increase the likelihood of conflict internationalization, the potential costs of intervention may instead thwart states with some geopolitical interest from involving themselves in an armed internal conflict. The internationalization of armed internal conflict, however, does not reflect the same phenomenon as military intervention in regions of intrastate conflict, otherwise labeled as humanitarian military intervention. Hence, the next statistical models attempt to more closely measure the outcome of military intervention within an internal armed conflict via several indicators, including intervention index, number of military missions, and peacekeeping status.
### Table 7: Expanded Logistical Models of Internationalized Conflict – Indexed Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Internationalize</th>
<th>(2) Internationalize</th>
<th>(3) Internationalize</th>
<th>(4) Internationalize</th>
<th>(5) Internationalize</th>
<th>(6) Internationalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.820*** (0.597)</td>
<td>2.131*** (0.789)</td>
<td>2.625*** (0.800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Intensity</td>
<td>1.763*** (0.377)</td>
<td>1.596*** (0.582)</td>
<td>1.592*** (0.645)</td>
<td>1.515*** (0.390)</td>
<td>1.525*** (0.546)</td>
<td>1.505** (0.619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdBest</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>-1.346*** (0.406)</td>
<td>-1.982*** (0.680)</td>
<td>-2.188*** (0.726)</td>
<td>-1.208*** (0.415)</td>
<td>-1.968*** (0.669)</td>
<td>-2.218*** (0.771)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Affinityscore</td>
<td>1.874 (1.539)</td>
<td>1.278 (1.641)</td>
<td>-0.351 (2.002)</td>
<td>-0.351 (1.228)</td>
<td>-0.351 (1.589)</td>
<td>-0.351 (2.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>-0.022* (0.232)</td>
<td>0.578 (0.409)</td>
<td>0.718 (0.518)</td>
<td>-0.123 (0.229)</td>
<td>0.918** (0.452)</td>
<td>1.088* (0.643)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2</td>
<td>-0.145*** (0.034)</td>
<td>-0.113** (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.116*** (0.056)</td>
<td>-0.154*** (0.042)</td>
<td>-0.112*** (0.055)</td>
<td>-0.120** (0.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>-0.062*** (0.022)</td>
<td>-0.056*** (0.027)</td>
<td>-0.068*** (0.018)</td>
<td>-0.068*** (0.023)</td>
<td>-0.065*** (0.023)</td>
<td>-0.061*** (0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>1.266 (0.970)</td>
<td>-2.486 (1.813)</td>
<td>0.015 (2.197)</td>
<td>-2.018** (0.943)</td>
<td>-3.394* (2.045)</td>
<td>-1.359 (2.103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>0.001 (0.114)</td>
<td>0.141 (0.159)</td>
<td>-0.019 (0.179)</td>
<td>0.032 (0.114)</td>
<td>0.143 (0.149)</td>
<td>0.044 (0.187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatInterestIndex</td>
<td>-0.435** (0.199)</td>
<td>-0.184 (0.303)</td>
<td>0.439 (0.322)</td>
<td>-0.130 (0.240)</td>
<td>0.013 (0.308)</td>
<td>0.513 (0.343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iGDPgrowthln</td>
<td>-0.227 (0.196)</td>
<td>-0.269 (0.197)</td>
<td>-0.179 (0.197)</td>
<td>-0.179 (0.201)</td>
<td>-0.211 (0.199)</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>-572.775*** (204.657)</td>
<td>-547.041** (243.303)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td>0.196 (0.498)</td>
<td>1.103 (0.819)</td>
<td>1.090 (0.932)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.603 (1.357)</td>
<td>-3.143 (1.711)</td>
<td>-2.427 (2.366)</td>
<td>-0.262 (1.243)</td>
<td>-3.533 (1.681)</td>
<td>-2.343 (2.536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2_p</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: the Im prefix denotes an imputed variable.

### Intervention Index

The following models center on the Intervention Index as a primary dependent variable – an ordinal additive scale (0-20) of existing troop activity as well as troop, naval, and air incursions within a unit of intrastate conflict. This variable not only measures the dichotomy of intervention versus non-intervention, but also the intensity of a military intervention. Table 8 includes...
combinations of independent and control variables, both using robust standard errors and clustered standard errors on country units. There appear little discrepancies between these model specifications.

As seen in Table 8, all model specifications denote high statistical significance for Western region, both narrow and wide in definition (West and West2). In fact, proximity to the Western region increases the odds of higher intervention intensity by up to three times, or 200 percent. Conflict perception also becomes significant in these models, with perceptions of an identity war decreasing the odds of intervention and its intensity by up to .6 times, or 40 percent. The National Interests Index, when lagged by one year, yields consistent statistically significant relationships as well – but a one unit increase in the index seems to decrease intervention intensity by around .6 times. It may be that different indicators within the index take on opposing relationships with the dependent variables, hence leading to contradictions in the additive measurement. On the other hand, the Physical Integrity Index, denoting the effects of humanitarian need on the probability of humanitarian military intervention, remains statistically insignificant across all models. But conflict intensity continues to be statistically significant – showing that a unit increase prompts a 2.4 increase (140 percent) in the odds of intervention (illustrated in Figure 16 primarily due to the regional bias it conveys). Additionally, the number of battle-related deaths, when lagged by a year, becomes statistically significant, but not practically significant. Affinity scores, IGO membership rates, and Foreign Direct Investment inflows remain insignificant across models, decreasing the relevance of these primary liberal variables. Alternatively, the Polity Index of democratization and the Durability Index of government stability are statistically significant, showing a negative relationship with intervention intensity and probability. In other words, higher levels of democratization and regime stability within a target country diminish the probability and intensity
of humanitarian military intervention. This is what many liberals expect to see, if such interventions occur primarily to spread democratic values and structures and foment regional stability in otherwise volatile areas (Choi 2013). Lastly, basic economic control variables, such as the logged version of GDP per capita and GDP growth rates, show an inverse relationship between intervention probabilities and national economic growth within a target country – perhaps relating to the realist cost/benefit framework of intervention in countries that may be able to retaliate or otherwise negatively impact the third-party intervener.

**Figure 16: Conflict Intensity vs. Intervention Index**

The models on Table 9 continue the analysis of intervention intensity but include the individual indicators that make up several of the above indexes as well as alternative variable measures of predominantly economic forces. Many relationships from above remain consistent in these alternate models, but new findings also abound. For instance, the inclusion of individual indicators of national interest, humanitarian need, and a greater variety of economic forces has made the variable of Ethnic War statistically significant, with a negative relationship to
intervention probability and intensity. As shown by Figure 17, the vast majority of interventions occur in regions that lack strong perceptions of ethnic war. The West variable becomes more relevant as well, now increasing the odds of intervention by over 10 times in some models. In terms of indicators of geopolitical national interests, alliances with the P5 increase the odds of intervention intensity by two times or 100 percent, while contiguity to the P5 countries decreases odds of intervention and intensity. Such findings hint at dynamics of power politics and spheres of influence, in which intrastate conflicts in close proximity to great powers either become the responsibility of unilateral great power intervention (if an alliance exists and favors governmental forces) or are avoided so as to not infringe upon spheres of influence. Other geopolitical variables, including Former Colony and Oil/Fuel Exporter status of target countries, are statistically insignificant.

**Figure 17: Ethnic War and Intervention Outcomes**

As in the previous section, indicators of humanitarian need and human rights abuses (previously aggregated into the Physical Integrity Index) remain statistically insignificant in the
following models. These measures include: rates of disappearances, killings, tortures, and political prisoners. Such consistent results do not spell strong justifications for the liberal and sometimes constructivist arguments of universal human rights norms as primary catalysts of military interventions. Polity and durability scores, however, continue to reveal consistent negative relationships to intervention intensity – placing the liberal argument more toward the realms of democratic values and institutional stability instead of abstract human rights.

**Number of Missions**

Another measure of intervention probability and intensity is the scope of an intervention, denoted by the separate number of military missions (typically paralleling individual countries or regional organizations) that an intrastate conflict sparks. As seen in Figure 18, the number of missions per intrastate conflict appears to have a regional dimension as well. It shows similar, yet weak correlations with battle-related deaths and national interests of the third-party interveners. The next models use mission number as a dependent variable for humanitarian military intervention outcomes, while predominantly maintaining the same independent variables as above. Table 10 shows the results of ordered logistical regression analysis with clustered standard errors, with a combination of lagged versus unlagged variable versions. In these models, measures of national interest and humanitarian need are aggregated into index form.
Figure 18: Intervention Rates by Region, Interests, and Conflict Fatalities
Table 8: Ordered Logistical Models of Intervention Intensity – Indexed Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(2) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(3) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(4) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(5) Intervention Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.933**</td>
<td>2.553**</td>
<td>2.389**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.582)</td>
<td>(1.004)</td>
<td>(0.996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>0.367***</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>0.552*</td>
<td>0.403**</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.252)</td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
<td>(0.240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NationalInterestlag</td>
<td>0.631***</td>
<td>0.585***</td>
<td>0.729**</td>
<td>0.631***</td>
<td>0.724***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.095)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.655)</td>
<td>(2.578)</td>
<td>(0.417)</td>
<td>(1.068)</td>
<td>(0.879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>5.243*</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>2.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.735)</td>
<td>(5.210)</td>
<td>(2.281)</td>
<td>(0.645)</td>
<td>(1.828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>(0.296)</td>
<td>(0.148)</td>
<td>(0.307)</td>
<td>(0.213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_GDPgrowth</td>
<td>0.951***</td>
<td>0.944***</td>
<td>0.947***</td>
<td>0.953***</td>
<td>0.949***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
<td>(0.083)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_CumulativeIntensity</td>
<td>1.728**</td>
<td>2.362***</td>
<td>1.897**</td>
<td>1.689**</td>
<td>1.779**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.435)</td>
<td>(0.626)</td>
<td>(0.618)</td>
<td>(0.426)</td>
<td>(0.560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_FDIinflows</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>1.017*</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2</td>
<td>0.940***</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.932***</td>
<td>0.935**</td>
<td>0.927**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durablelag</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
<td>0.975***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpop</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milex</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHighlag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lngdpper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.717**</td>
<td>0.633**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.969**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.026**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications</td>
<td>No Cluster</td>
<td>Clustered SE</td>
<td>No Cluster</td>
<td>Clustered SE</td>
<td>No Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2_p</td>
<td>0.0922</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 9: Ordered Logistical Models of Intervention Intensity – Expanded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(2) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(3) Intervention Index</th>
<th>(4) Intervention Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>3.404**</td>
<td>2.780**</td>
<td>10.263***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.752)</td>
<td>(1.412)</td>
<td>(8.035)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.464)</td>
<td>(0.467)</td>
<td>(0.488)</td>
<td>(0.479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceP5</td>
<td>2.055**</td>
<td>2.010**</td>
<td>1.821*</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.725)</td>
<td>(0.714)</td>
<td>(0.624)</td>
<td>(0.309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FormerColony</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.326)</td>
<td>(0.316)</td>
<td>(0.402)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContiguousP5400</td>
<td>0.200***</td>
<td>0.209***</td>
<td>0.272***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td>(0.092)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OilExport</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.471)</td>
<td>(0.480)</td>
<td>(0.517)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.870)</td>
<td>(0.978)</td>
<td>(0.916)</td>
<td>(0.882)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>32.701***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.955)</td>
<td>(1.023)</td>
<td>(0.637)</td>
<td>(41.156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>0.657**</td>
<td>0.666**</td>
<td>0.736*</td>
<td>0.600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_GDPgrowth</td>
<td>0.947***</td>
<td>0.946***</td>
<td>0.946***</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_DISAP</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_KILL</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.240)</td>
<td>(0.237)</td>
<td>(0.326)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_POLPRIS</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_TORT</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.304)</td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.346)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CumulativeIntensity</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.406)</td>
<td>(0.401)</td>
<td>(0.382)</td>
<td>(0.404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_FDIinflows</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHigh</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingdpper</td>
<td>0.736**</td>
<td>0.723**</td>
<td>0.697**</td>
<td>0.596**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2</td>
<td>0.945**</td>
<td>0.950*</td>
<td>0.942**</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durablelag</td>
<td>0.972***</td>
<td>0.972***</td>
<td>0.972***</td>
<td>0.984**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.328**</td>
<td>(0.968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContiguousP5150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.204***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FuelExports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MineralRents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.649**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2 p</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
As in all other previous analyses, the variables for Western region (West and West2) increase the odds of intervention missions by up to 8.5 times or up to 750 percent. In other words, an intrastate conflict within the Western sphere is 8.5 times more likely to experience a greater number of military missions or any mission at all. Moreover, when lagged by one year, the Identity War variable continues to decrease odds of intervention, this time by decreasing the number of military missions.

The National Interest Index and the Physical Integrity Index only become statistically significant in the models of mission number when lagged by a year. But even then, their influence is practically minimal. A higher Physical Integrity Index, for instance, decreases the odds of more missions by over .85 times or 15 percent. Other variables of interest are measures of democracy and stability, via Polity and the Durability Index, which continue to show a negative relationship with intervention scope and number of missions. On the other hand, indicators of refugee flow in a target country, such as internally displaced persons (IDPs), appear statistically significant in some cases, but are practically irrelevant.

Table 11 alters the specifications of the model on mission number by assuming linearity in the dependent variable, instead of a logistical, ordered relationship. The results between the different model specifications, however, are overwhelmingly similar. Furthermore, the following linear models include individual indicators for national interests and humanitarian need, instead of relying on indices. In sum, the primary variables of interest continue to be Western region, conflict perception, in terms of the existence of an identity conflict, and measures of democracy and governmental stability in a target state.
Table 10: Ordered Logistical Models of Mission Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Missions</th>
<th>(2) Missions</th>
<th>(3) Missions</th>
<th>(4) Missions</th>
<th>(5) Missions</th>
<th>(6) Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>4.072***</td>
<td>6.742***</td>
<td>8.535***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.853)</td>
<td>(3.274)</td>
<td>(4.981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWarlag</td>
<td>0.349***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.324***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWarlag</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.393*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.256)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.276)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NationalInterestIndex</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.253)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
<td>(0.279)</td>
<td>(0.242)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.084)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lngdpper</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.689*</td>
<td>0.614**</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.605**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.223)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.133)</td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td>(0.169)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politylag</td>
<td>0.923***</td>
<td>0.913***</td>
<td>0.932***</td>
<td>0.928***</td>
<td>0.919***</td>
<td>0.939***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageGO</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.236*</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.978)</td>
<td>(1.211)</td>
<td>(2.469)</td>
<td>(0.218)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.263)</td>
<td>(1.260)</td>
<td>(0.727)</td>
<td>(2.852)</td>
<td>(1.591)</td>
<td>(0.906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durablelag</td>
<td>0.978***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
<td>0.976***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
<td>0.974***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MineralRents</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_GDPgrowth</td>
<td>0.958***</td>
<td>0.953***</td>
<td>0.950***</td>
<td>0.962**</td>
<td>0.952***</td>
<td>0.948***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_FDIinflows</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHighlag</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpop</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
<td>1.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.441)</td>
<td>(0.318)</td>
<td>(0.502)</td>
<td>(0.369)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>0.553**</td>
<td>0.657*</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>(0.182)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINTlag</td>
<td>0.857**</td>
<td>0.843**</td>
<td>0.857**</td>
<td>0.857**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NationalInterestlag</td>
<td>0.682**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.700**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.106)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.136***</td>
<td>2.558***</td>
<td>3.046***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.050)</td>
<td>(0.828)</td>
<td>(1.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r² p</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.01; Clustered standard errors in parentheses
Table 11: Linear Regression Models of Mission Number – Expanded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) Missions</th>
<th>(2) Missions</th>
<th>(3) Missions</th>
<th>(4) Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.550***</td>
<td>0.428**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.191)</td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWarlag</td>
<td>-0.293**</td>
<td>-0.305***</td>
<td>-0.284**</td>
<td>-0.300***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWarlag</td>
<td>0.102**</td>
<td>0.111***</td>
<td>0.100**</td>
<td>0.107***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDPgrowthln</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHighlag</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lnGDPper</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_DISAP</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_KILL</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_POLPRIS</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_TORT</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.061)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
<td>(0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>-0.484*</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>-0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.239)</td>
<td>(0.266)</td>
<td>(0.244)</td>
<td>(0.267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpop</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milex</td>
<td>-0.000***</td>
<td>-0.000***</td>
<td>-0.000***</td>
<td>-0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politylag</td>
<td>-0.016***</td>
<td>-0.017***</td>
<td>-0.017***</td>
<td>-0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.274*</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
<td>(0.161)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceP5</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td>(0.079)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContiguousP5400</td>
<td>-0.317***</td>
<td>-0.233**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.085)</td>
<td>(0.091)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FormerColony</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.069)</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OilExport</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.093)</td>
<td>(0.094)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
<td>(0.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td>0.226**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.251**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.098)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContiguousP5150</td>
<td>-0.224***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.163**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.281)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1; Robust standard errors in parentheses
More specifically (as seen in Table 11), an intrastate conflict occurring in the West is related to over half a unit increase in mission numbers. An identity war perception of intrastate conflict, alternatively, decreases mission numbers by over one third of a mission. Ethnic war perceptions also show a negative, yet less intense relationship with mission number. The only measures of national interest that show significance relate to target state proximity to the P5 members – leading to a negative relationship between such proximity and mission numbers (also seen in previous models). Alternatively, alliances with P5 members, oil exporting status of the target state, and former colonial relationships are all statistically insignificant in predicting military mission numbers.

Normative arguments find no support in these models of mission number either, given that no measure of humanitarian need or levels of human rights becomes significant. The liberal argument for democratization and regime stability, however, continues to remain relevant as the Polity and Durability Index once again show negative predictive relationships with mission scope. Yet, IGO membership rates – another measure of liberal theoretical premises, remains statistically insignificant.

So far, several core variable relationships reveal themselves across all models and combination of theoretical forces and indicators: 1.) the direct impact of Western versus non-Western region of intrastate conflict on intervention probability; 2.) the inverse relationship between identity conflict perceptions and intervention probability; 3.) the inverse impact of geographic proximity to the P5 on intervention likelihood and intensity; and 4.) the inverse influence of democratic governance and regime stability on intervention likelihood, scope, and intensity. The next section tentatively tests such relationships to peacekeeping and peacebuilding mission selectivity, instead of traditional military interventions. Any variations between military
intervention outcomes and peacekeeping dynamics for intrastate conflict are inherently both theoretically and empirically important to the nature of international humanitarian regimes.

**Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding**

Peacekeeping missions represent another dimension of third-party intervention within intrastate conflict. In addition, these missions are considered humanitarian in nature – yet, they aren’t limited to traditional military involvement. Thus, the usage of peacekeeping mission as a dependent variable serves to broaden the scope of humanitarian intervention and compare and contrast these missions to the solely military-focused categories applied above. The next model uses a variable encompassing all types of peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions, characterized by different intensities and goals, as adapted from Fortna (2008). On an ordinal scale, the variable measures the movement from no peacekeeping or peacebuilding mission, to political missions only, observer/monitoring missions, traditional missions, multidimensional missions, and finally, to enforcement, non-consensual military missions (closely resembling traditional military interventions.)  

The number of observations for such missions, however, is limited to slightly over 100 cases – also limiting the number of independent variables that can be used in the models. Most importantly, any results arising from the following models must be interpreted with caution and hesitation.

Table 12 illustrates the results of linear regression modeling on the selectivity and intensity of all peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions. In this way, I assume that every move in mission category corresponds to an equal change in intensity between categories, marking the variable as a scale measurement. When predicting peacekeeping and peacebuilding mission selectivity, it appears that Western region is less consistently important than in previous models of intervention

---

22 See Chapter 3 for definitions and other methodological details on these mission categories.
given that the variable only shows positive statistical significance in the model with the lowest number of co-variants. Conflict perceptions are also irrelevant in this case, with identity and ethnic wars not showing any explanatory power in patterns of selectivity. New variables, which lacked relevance in previous models of third party intervention, take on statistically significant relationships with peacekeeping and peacebuilding mission patterns. Former colonial status between the P5 and a target state has an indirect relationship with peacekeeping missions, decreasing mission category intensity by almost two levels. Perhaps this relates to the geopolitical sphere of influence that a powerful country continues to have on decisions made regarding a former colony, or perhaps it denotes that these target countries might be more prone to traditional military interventions, instead of peacekeeping missions. Lastly, both the primary indices on national interests and humanitarian need become significant in these models – whereas they remained consistently volatile or irrelevant in previous predictions. Unlike previous models, however, measures of democratization are not statistically significant as predictors of peacekeeping and building missions. Table 13, which models only the outcome of peacekeeping missions and their intensity (both under assumptions of linearity and logistic specifications), confirms these relationships. It also reveals that higher affinity scores with the P5 countries increase peacekeeping mission intensity and probability by over six logged units.

So far, these models depict different interactions within peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions as opposed to the more military-oriented humanitarian interventions of past models. Humanitarian norms and need are relevant in the case of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, while democratization norms are less so. Conflict perceptions also appear unimportant for peacekeeping and building missions, although Western region continues to be highly significant across all models.
Table 12: Linear Regression Models of Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PKPbop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.944**</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.415)</td>
<td>(0.760)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.593)</td>
<td>(0.783)</td>
<td>(0.595)</td>
<td>(0.775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.367)</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.331)</td>
<td>(0.331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OilExport</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.605)</td>
<td>(0.603)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FormerColony</td>
<td>-1.579***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.756***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.424)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.477)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_KILL</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.413)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_POLPRIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_TORT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.546)</td>
<td>(0.557)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.745</td>
<td>-0.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.629)</td>
<td>(0.610)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceP5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.396</td>
<td>-0.386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.763)</td>
<td>(0.766)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>-0.889</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>-1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.929)</td>
<td>(1.456)</td>
<td>(0.844)</td>
<td>(1.363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHigh</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>2.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.413)</td>
<td>(1.791)</td>
<td>(1.374)</td>
<td>(1.765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.805</td>
<td>-2.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.624)</td>
<td>(12.503)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politylag</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_NationalInterestIndex</td>
<td>-0.985***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.936***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.223)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.238)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>-0.218*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.216**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.110)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHighlag</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.626*</td>
<td>-0.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.351)</td>
<td>(0.632)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.364</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.346)</td>
<td>(1.894)</td>
<td>(1.347)</td>
<td>(1.843)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clustered standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Table 13: Linear and Logistical Models of Peacekeeping Missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1) PK</th>
<th>(2) PK</th>
<th>(3) PK</th>
<th>(4) PK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.912**</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.424)</td>
<td>(1.034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>-0.546</td>
<td>-0.499</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.593)</td>
<td>(0.598)</td>
<td>(1.069)</td>
<td>(1.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.696</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.367)</td>
<td>(0.329)</td>
<td>(0.546)</td>
<td>(0.542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FormerColony</td>
<td>-3.000***</td>
<td>-3.142***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.658)</td>
<td>(0.679)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_KILL</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.596)</td>
<td>(0.586)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_POLPRIS</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.380)</td>
<td>(0.384)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_TORT</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.999)</td>
<td>(0.991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_Intensity</td>
<td>-0.973</td>
<td>-0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.174)</td>
<td>(1.117)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceP5</td>
<td>-1.305</td>
<td>-1.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.161)</td>
<td>(1.240)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OilExport</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.738)</td>
<td>(0.735)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>-37.246</td>
<td>-28.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(53.389)</td>
<td>(49.218)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>-0.692</td>
<td>-1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.968)</td>
<td>(0.872)</td>
<td>(2.540)</td>
<td>(2.441)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHigh</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>6.728**</td>
<td>6.947**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.457)</td>
<td>(1.424)</td>
<td>(3.420)</td>
<td>(3.438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politylag</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.064)</td>
<td>(0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalDeaths</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_NationalInterestIndex</td>
<td>-0.994***</td>
<td>-0.949***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.228)</td>
<td>(0.242)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>-0.226**</td>
<td>-0.219**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.112)</td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHighlag</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.354)</td>
<td>(0.916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2_p</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Type</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>Ordered logistic</td>
<td>Ordered logistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clustered standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
The last of the models predicting peacekeeping mission probabilities and intensity is a simple logistical regression model of peacekeeping as a dummy variable – measuring whether any mission occurs at all during an instance of intrastate conflict. Due to limited data points, the models include fewer co-variants than utilized above. As table 14 illustrates, it appears that only aggregated national interests and humanitarian need (level of human rights within a target country) have a predictive relationship with the dummy versions of peacekeeping mission. In other words, when measuring only whether a peacekeeping mission occurs, not levels of intensity, Western region and all other variables become statistically insignificant.

**Table 14: Logistical Models of Peacekeeping Missions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PK Dummy</td>
<td>PK Dummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.431)</td>
<td>(0.295)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdentityWar</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.292)</td>
<td>(0.295)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthnicWar</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.346)</td>
<td>(0.400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_NationalInterestIndex</td>
<td>0.352***</td>
<td>0.369***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.111)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_PHYSINT</td>
<td>0.766**</td>
<td>0.759**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.103)</td>
<td>(0.096)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AverageIGO</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.713)</td>
<td>(1.052)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdHighlag</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Im_AffinityscoreP5</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.098)</td>
<td>(2.303)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politylag</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.237</td>
<td>4.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.049)</td>
<td>(7.175)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2_p</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
4.3. Testing Hypotheses

Prompted by the findings from the various models and variable combinations, this section begins to place the detailed pieces of information within thematic, theoretical categories. First, I revisit the ten null hypotheses of the study, which are founded upon realist theory, and discuss whether the statistical findings support these claims – to varying degrees. Then I return to the original pathway hypotheses of the study, focusing on regional variation and conflict perception, and evaluate their merits as a whole. Ultimately, the section serves to summarize, categorize, and theoretically place the findings detailed above.

The first five null hypotheses of this study relate to the effects of geopolitical national interests on humanitarian military intervention outcomes, tested via several different indicators.

_Hypothesis #1:_ If a state experiencing intrastate conflict has greater oil supplies, they are more likely to be a target of an international intervention and with higher intensity.

- Not Supported

Hypothesis #1 centers on the explanatory power of oil supplies in altering the selectivity of intervention, and it does not gain consistent support across models. In models predicting the internationalization of intrastate conflict, the oil exporting status of a state experiencing internal conflict is positively statistically significant in some of the model specifications. It remains statistically insignificant in models predicting military intervention intensity and number of missions as well, even when alternated with fuel exports and mineral rent indicators. Thus, the hypothesis is not supported by data analysis – moving away from claims that oil resources are primary drivers of “humanitarian” military interventions by resource-hungry great powers (Binder 2009; Fordham 2008). The next hypothesis tests a similar dimension of geopolitical national interests, connected to the access of natural resources (Gilligan and Stedman 2003).
Hypothesis #2: If a state experiencing intrastate conflict has greater levels of export commodities, they are more likely to be a target of an international intervention.
- Not Supported

This second hypothesis also finds no support in the data. In fact, indicators of natural wealth and other primary export commodities were so statistically unimportant that they were removed in most model specifications as to increase sample size and analytical power.

Hypothesis #3 tests the relationship between colonial legacies to the P5 countries and intervention selectivity (Gilligan and Stedman 2003; Bellamy and Williams 2005; Perkins and Neumayer 2008):

Hypothesis #3: If a state experiencing intrastate conflict has stronger colonial relationships to other states in the international community, they are more likely to be a target of an international humanitarian intervention.
- Not Supported

The colonial relationship between potential intervener and target country appears statistically insignificant in the majority of the models above, including when predicting intervention intensity and mission numbers. But this indicator becomes important when predicting peacekeeping missions and their intensities, displaying a negative relationship. Thus, the opposite claim is supported by the statistical tests on peacekeeping missions – that if a state experiencing intrastate conflict has a colonial relationship to any of the P5, they are less likely to be a target of a peacekeeping mission and one of a higher intensity. This finding may occur due to geopolitical balances of power, in which a great power’s regional and historical influence bars other states or international organizations from becoming involved via multilateral peacekeeping.

The next hypothesis tests the linkage between alliances and intervention patterns:

Hypothesis #4: A state’s alliances have a significant causal effect on the probability of intervention.
- Partially supported
In this case, the analysis provides some support, although somewhat inconsistently across predicted variables. For instance, in models predicting solely conflict internationalization, the existence of an alliance between the target state and a P5 member decreases the probability of third-party involvement. But when focusing only on military intervention intensity, this same alliance relationship seems to increase the probability and intensity of military intervention. Alternatively, alliances have no significant impact on mission numbers. Interestingly, these semi-contradictory results mimic theoretical standings as well. Realists may predict that states often use humanitarian interventions in international crises involving allies to protect vested interests in internal conflict outcomes. But the direction of the alliance relationship will be determined by the nature of the interests and whether they are best served by intervening or not. In other words, powerful states may intervene in the internal conflicts of states with stronger and more numerous alliances due to signaled geopolitical value and inter-governmental ties, but international actors may also be less likely to intervene if powerful allies prevent the international community from acting against the target state’s sovereignty. Both liberalism and constructivism also propose an ambiguous relationship between alliances and military intervention outcomes: alliances denote shared institutions and concepts of collective security (Keohane 1984; Doyle 1997) and even stronger ties of identity between states (Wendt 1999), but their causality to military intervention is dependent on detailed context. In sum, alliances with powerful states are relevant to patterns of humanitarian military interventions, yet the direction of the causality remains disputed.

Geographic proximity to the P5 countries – the last primary measure of geopolitical interests – shows consistent significant relationships with military intervention outcomes. The relationship, however, appears to be indirect, not direct as the original hypothesis states.
Hypothesis #5: Powerful states are more likely to military intervene within an intrastate conflict if the conflict is geographically closer to their own borders.

- **Opposite causality supported**

The analysis reveals that for all measures of third-party intervention, including internationalization of intrastate conflict, military intervention intensity, and mission numbers, contiguity with a P5 country corresponds to decreases in outcome odds. Although the literature generally posits a direct relationship between geographic proximity of powerful states and instances of humanitarian intervention (e.g. Mullenbach and Matthew 2008; Perkins and Neumayer 2008; Gilligan and Stedman 2003), this relationship does not appear to hold solely for P5 nations and countries experiencing intrastate conflict. More in-depth research must be undertaken to understand the directional causality of this geopolitical variable.

Given that the above hypotheses relate to the wider notion of geopolitical national interests, it is important to elucidate upon the general relationship between the aggregated National Interests Index and intervention patterns as well. Inconsistencies abound here as well. While the index is insignificant in predicting the internationalization of internal conflict, it is significant, yet practically irrelevant in its effects when predicting intervention intensity, mission numbers, and peacekeeping mission outcomes. This finding, however, may be due to the difficulties inherent in operationalizing geopolitical national interests in a way that envelops the broad, fluid nature of the concept.

The concept of affinity scores between P5 countries and target states also touches upon notions of national interest. To recall, these scores measure the political affinity and interest alignment between a target state and UN Security Council members. The raw data arises from the UN General Assembly voting records. Affinity scores are statistically insignificant in predicting the internationalization of conflict, intervention outcomes, and mission numbers. They are
inconsistently significant in some models of peacekeeping. Thus, the variable’s positive relationship with third-party interventions is tenuous at best.

Lastly, the CINC Index, a measure of a state’s national power capabilities denotes geopolitical dynamics as well. The pursuit of geopolitical interests through international interventions is said to be affected by the army size and military capacities of a target state – mitigating the full effects of direct geopolitical interests on intervention selectivity (Gilligan and Stedman, 2003, 49 ff.). Indeed, the statistical analysis reveals that a state with higher CINC values (higher capacity to defend itself and strike back) is less likely to be a target of a third-party intervention, further supporting realist notions of cost/benefit policymaking.

The next two null hypotheses relate to the explanatory power of humanitarian norms and human rights abuses in propelling humanitarian military interventions. In this case, the hypotheses expect no significant explanatory power between humanitarian need and intervention selectivity, due to the underlying realist theoretical lens. The statistical evidence appears to overwhelmingly support this claim.

\textit{Hypothesis #6:} Higher levels of human rights abuses will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.

- Partially supported

The primary indicator of human rights within a target country, the Physical Integrity Index, remains statistically insignificant in predicting conflict internationalization and intervention intensity. But the index is negatively related to the number of missions in some model specifications, hinting that higher levels of human rights within a target country lower the number of military missions. The index’s individual components, including the existence of torture, extrajudicial killings, disappearances, and political imprisonments, are irrelevant as well in these models. It may be the case then that the intensity of human rights abuses is less important in
intervention selectivity, as long as the condition of humanitarian crisis/armed intrastate conflict is fulfilled. Nonetheless, arguments founded upon emerging humanitarian norms, as introduced by liberals and constructivists, are not supported by the data analysis. The Physical Integrity Index, however, shows an indirect, significant relationship with peacekeeping mission frequency and intensity. In other words, a better human rights environment appears to decrease both the likelihood and intensity of peacekeeping efforts, and vice versa.

Although the primary proxies for human rights do not reveal consistent relationships with intervention outcomes, several other variables related to humanitarian need do. Battle-related deaths stemming from the intrastate conflict hold a significant, albeit weak, relationship to intervention outcomes (internationalization of conflict and intervention intensity). Conflict intensity – or the movement from a minor conflict to an internal war – is positively related to intervention probabilities across all models. Both the indicator of battle-related deaths and conflict intensity, however, possess tinges of geopolitical interest within their dimensions, not simply reflections of absolute humanitarian need of the general populations. The two measures are inherently political in their natures – not neutral denotations of civilian human rights conditions.

Hypothesis #7 relates to the effects of refugee flows on intervention selectivity, also a measure that intrinsically possesses both humanitarian and geopolitical dimensions – making it difficult to interpret its theoretical importance.

_Hypothesis #7:_ Higher levels of human displacement will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.

- **Supported**

Refugee flows seem to have very little impact on intervention selectivity, according to the data analysis. It stands as statistically insignificant in predicting internationalization of conflict and intervention intensity, while it is practically irrelevant in models of mission numbers.
Overall, measures of humanitarian need and human rights abuses do not provide strong explanatory power of intervention patterns, except for in cases of peacekeeping missions or as related to indicators that hold geopolitical dimensions as well. It is important to recall, however, that every unit analyzed in this study denotes humanitarian need and human right abuses by its very nature. Hence, while the intensity of the abuses may not be statistically significant in the aggregated models of intervention, the existence of a humanitarian crisis is imperative to the study’s premises and cannot be disregarded.

While normative considerations of intrastate crises do not stand as strong explanatory forces of intervention selectivity, this may also be due to the nature of norms – intangible and rarely amenable to solely quantitative analysis. Thus, the next two arguments test more structurally-based, liberal factors of intervention selectivity – economic interdependence, international linkages, and democratization norms.

Hypothesis #8: High economic interdependence with other countries will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.

- **Supported**

Different measures of economic interdependence, including alternative measures of foreign direct investments and trade linkages, do not explain intervention selectivity and number of missions. Basic measures of economic growth (such as GDP and GDP per capita), alternatively, show strong negative relationships to intervention selectivity, intensity, and mission numbers. Hence, a more powerful economy in a target state decreases odds of outside intervention – hinting at correlations between internal stability, national power status, and outside interventions.

Hypothesis #9: Higher numbers of shared IGOs with other countries will not impact the probability of humanitarian military intervention within an intrastate conflict.

- **Supported**
IGO membership also fails to offer any explanatory power in the statistical analysis. It remains statistically insignificant for intervention intensity and mission number. On the other hand, other liberal concepts (initially treated as secondary forces) find consistent relevance in the models. Levels of democracy (Polity) and regime stability (Durability Index) hold strong, negative relationships to all measures of intervention, except for peacekeeping missions. Stronger democracies and more stable regimes are much less likely to experience military interventions and internationalization of conflict – pointing to the relevance of democratization norms in humanitarian military interventions (Doyle 1997; Russett 1994).

The last hypothesis relates to the relationship between intrastate conflict perceptions and intervention outcomes (Campbell 1998; Pehar 2014). For the purposes of this analysis, an internal conflict can be denoted as an identity war, ethnic war, or neither:

\textit{Hypothesis #10}: The type of intrastate conflict has no significant effect on the probability of international humanitarian military intervention.

- Not supported; significant relationships found

This null hypothesis is overwhelmingly rejected by the statistical analysis. Perceiving an internal conflict as identity war consistently explains a high amount of intervention selectivity – including internationalization of conflict, intervention intensity, and mission numbers. Such perceptions decrease the odds and intensity of military interventions. Perceptions of ethnic war, however, are much less significant in the models, and neither one of the conflict perceptions remain relevant in models predicting peacekeeping missions. But ultimately, variables focused on intrastate conflict perceptions are highly relevant in all models of military intervention – demanding great attention in the analysis to follow.
Additionally, this study’s alternative hypotheses place conflict perceptions as central to the pathways of humanitarian military intervention. Given that the statistical analysis greatly supports this assertion, it’s necessary to evaluate the hypothesized causal pathways in full.

**Primary hypothesis 1 (pathways):** There exist three probable pathways to humanitarian military interventions, ranging in mission intensity.

Assuming the existence of a humanitarian crisis, the three proposed pathways of intervention rely on three main forces: 1.) interests; 2.) conflict perceptions; and 3.) region. Thus, the alternative hypotheses below center on the explanatory, interactive power of these three variables.

**Primary hypothesis 2 (vital interests):** Other states are more likely to robustly intervene in intrastate conflicts when vital geopolitical national interests exist, regardless of other confounding factors.

The quantitative models above do not give a clear answer regarding the role of national interests as a whole in the selectivity of humanitarian military interventions. While some indicators of geopolitical interests – such as contiguity to powerful nations and alliance networks – provide significant explanatory power, they are not enough evidence to support this first step to the causal pathway on their own. Consequently, this hypothesis requires more nuanced, in-depth analysis due to the very nature of the concept of “vital national interests” – inherently dependent on context, actors, and specific interactions within a crisis.

**Primary hypothesis 3 (conflict perception):** When only non-vital, secondary interests exist in an internal conflict, states will be less likely to intervene in conflicts perceived as ethnic or identity-based civil wars and more likely to intervene in conflicts perceived as international aggression or systemic killings by one side.

The hypothesis on conflict perceptions, however, gains very strong, consistent support in the quantitative analysis above. Increased perceptions of identity and ethnic wars decrease probabilities of all third-party interventions within an intrastate conflict. Moreover, these variables
stand as some of the most statistically and practically significant within the models of intervention. Unfortunately, the statistical models cannot reveal the causal mechanisms and circumstances surrounding the role of conflict perception on intervention outcomes. Due to data limitations, they also cannot expand upon perceptions of general civil war, international aggression, or systematic killings on intervention selectivity. Therefore, great attention must be paid to conflict perceptions in the upcoming qualitative analysis, to shed light on why, how, and when they become significant drivers of humanitarian intervention and when they may instead inhibit such interventions.

**Primary hypothesis 4 (region):** Holding humanitarian need and non-vital interests constant, an intrastate conflict occurring in or near a Western neighborhood (with robust regional institutions), is more likely to become a target of an intense humanitarian military intervention.

Most importantly to the alternative hypotheses of causal pathways, regional variation is the most significant predictor of all types of intervention outcomes in the quantitative models. An intrastate conflict occurring in the West is much more likely to receive all types of military interventions, with greater intensity. Keohane’s (2003) claims of good Western neighborhood dynamic are supported, but alongside conflict perceptions as well. The following table and corresponding figure reveal that in terms of the internationalization of intrastate conflict, a move from a non-Western to a Western region increases predicted probabilities of internationalization by more five times – moving from 3% to 16%.  

---

23 These findings are based on the Table 5 model of internationalization of intrastate conflict.
Table 15: Predicted Probabilities of Internationalization by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Predicted prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-West</td>
<td>0.0303***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>0.162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0691)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations 953

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

NOTE: All predictors at their mean value

Figure 19: Graph of Predicted Probabilities of Internationalization by Region

Primary hypothesis 5 (conflict perception & region): When no initial national interests exist within an internal conflict, states will primarily militarily intervene in conflicts near or within Western neighborhoods that are perceived as products of one-sided, systemic killings. All other conflicts will most likely to be delegated to peacekeeping missions or ignored.
The final alternative hypothesis #5 combines the interactive forces of regional influence alongside conflict perceptions to explain humanitarian military intervention trends. Such interactions, however, must be explored further in unique cases of intervention, as the quantitative models cannot offer causal mechanisms in their aggregations and generalizations. Moreover, this hypothesis posits a different causal pathway for peacekeeping missions – a notion that has already gained support in the aggregated models of intervention.

4.4. Remaining Puzzles

As it stands, the various quantitative models (predicting the internationalization of internal conflict, military interventions, mission intensities, mission numbers, and even peacekeeping occurrences) can only shed light on the foundational forces that drive the selectivity of the phenomenon of humanitarian military interventions. They have placed certain variables at the forefront of the analysis, while delegating others to the background. In fact, the statistical models have so far shown that traditionally important realist variables, such as geopolitical national interests, are not consistently important in predicting such interventions – and where certain dimensions of national interests become relevant, their causal direction is highly disputed. Furthermore, the “humanitarian” aspect of the interventions stands suspect, according to the statistical results. Greater human rights abuses and refugee flows do not alter probabilities of intervention during intrastate crises. Only battle-related deaths, conflict intensity, and a few other measures, denoting both humanitarian need and geopolitical risks, stand as statistically significant predictors. Thus, the general normative arguments of humanitarianism, stemming from the constructivists, and the human rights promotions, originating from the liberals, are not supported as a whole. Many traditional theoretical variables do not stand as relevant in these models –
creating opportunities and even a necessity to explore other variables and relationships in the aggregated data.

Instead of the expected relationships, the aggregated analysis highlights the importance of Western region, conflict perception (on a very basic spectrum), and democratic regimes as drivers of humanitarian military interventions. Consequently, it appears as though once a threshold of humanitarian need is met via the existence of an internal conflict, the probability of intervention depends primarily on whether the conflict occurs in the West, whether it is denoted as an identity war, and whether the target state is highly democratized and durable in its regime. A Western region coupled with no perceptions of identity or ethnic civil war prompts greater odds of intervention, while higher levels of democratization and regime durability decrease odds of intervention – except in the cases of peacekeeping missions, which reveal their own distinct dynamics. Thus, there exists a linkage between regionally-bounded forces, conflict perceptions, and liberal, democratic norms and regime structures in the data analysis. So far, Keohane’s (2003) theoretical foundation of “good” versus “bad” neighborhoods (paralleling Western versus non-Western spheres and founded on degrees of democratization and liberal institutionalization) and Campbell’s (1998) discussion of civil wars as distorters of international military intervention probabilities stand as strong frameworks on which to place the above results.

Nonetheless, many questions still abound. Certain dimensions of national interest, such as contiguity and alliances, continue to appear as relevant in the aggregated models. Most importantly, the concept of national interest demands greater, more contextually-based analysis, given its operational difficulties. Beyond this, the quantitative models cannot show how national interests interact with regional variations, conflict perceptions, and other important forces. Causal mechanisms can only be hypothesized, not supported in any way via such models. Due to data
limitations, the models also cannot move beyond the overly simplified dichotomy of conflict perceptions as either an ethnic civil war, identity civil war, or none of the two. For now, the models solely posit that an identity and sometimes ethnic-based civil war decreases the odds of humanitarian military intervention. But how would perceptions of systematic killings, genocide or international aggression alter the probabilities of intervention? Why would they alter these odds at all? Moreover, why is the Western region so distinct in its intervention dynamics, even though it experiences the least number of intrastate conflicts? Is it due to Western democratic norms, structures, informational channels, ties of identity, or something unique to the conflict, actors, or intervention?

None of the above questions on variable interactions, expanded definitions, and potential relationships can be handled solely through quantitative analysis. The proposed causal pathways of the study, while greatly supported by the aggregated data analysis, require additional exploration via more nuanced methods – moving away from general patterns and toward individual cases of intrastate conflict and respective intervention outcomes. Consequently, the chapters that follow undertake case study analysis of individual units of humanitarian military intervention and non-intervention so as to further refine relationships between fluid national interests, humanitarian and democratization norms, conflict perceptions, and regional variations. The first of these chapters centers on the NATO humanitarian military intervention in Kosovo, prompted by the “Kosovo Crisis” intrastate conflict, and it relies on newly released NATO archival data, elite dialogues, and other primary sources to build a narrative of the interacting forces that propelled the precedence-setting military intervention.
CHAPTER 5. WESTERN INTERVENTION IN KOSOVO: TRANSFORMED PERCEPTIONS AND INSTITUTIONALIZED NEIGHBORHOODS

“That there could be death camps and a siege and civilians slaughtered by the thousands and thrown into mass graves on European soil fifty years after the end of the Second World War gave the war in Bosnia and the Serb campaign of killing in Kosovo their special, anachronistic interest. But one of the main ways of understanding the war crimes committed in southeastern Europe in the 1990s has been to say that the Balkans, after all, were never really part of Europe.”


The Kosovo Crisis stands as a precedent-setting case of humanitarian military intervention – although many continue to critique its human rights dimensions. NATO’s decision to intervene between ethnic Albanian separatists and the Serbian military and paramilitaries was not a fast or trivial one. It came in the backdrop of years of intrastate violence within Kosovo and after almost a decade of such violence within the Balkans as a whole. Moreover, it came as an explicit rejection of the UN Security Council’s inactivity in the region. The NATO intervention within this Western neighborhood transpired while regions in Africa experienced worsening campaigns of violence and genocide. Most importantly, the Kosovo intervention served as a standard for later instances of intrastate violence confronting the global community, although many of these future conflicts did not receive the same international response. It also permanently altered the European Union’s priorities towards greater integrated security policies. Yet Kosovo’s suffering was not always at the top of Western agendas. What altered the course of the Kosovo Crisis, from a relatively ignored domestic event until 1997 to a systematic atrocity that threatened to destroy the fabric of European identity by 1998? How did the plight of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo become an international concern, warranting severe reactions?

As this chapter will reveal, by 1998, the Kosovo Crisis had fulfilled two key, interacting conditions that made it a prime candidate for Western aid and intervention. First, Kosovo had
proven to Western audiences that it was suffering from a special type of internal conflict – one of ethnic cleansing, not another endless civil war between equally-culpable parties. In other words, the violence in Kosovo had one aggressive, guilty party and one distinct class of innocent, greatly outmatched victims – prompting a wide range of genocide analogies. Once this favorable conflict perception had set in place, it inevitably interlinked with the grandest of Western ideals of liberalism, the norms of the protection of innocents, collective institutional security, and interdependence. Now, the lack of response to the Kosovo Crisis paralleled the failure of Western ideals, community, and institutions as a whole. Since Kosovo unraveled at the very edge of the Western neighborhood, the now one-sided violence (often labeled as impending genocide) activated the missions of several Western institutions and players. Thus, as the aggregated models above highlight, the case study of the Kosovo intervention also confirms that conflict perceptions and Western institutions are the interacting, primary drivers of humanitarian intervention.

The following diagram (Figure 20) illustrates such a proposed pathway of intervention in Kosovo. The internal crisis between ethnic Albanians and the Serbian state in the mid-1990s quickly led to the breach of human rights in the region, and while geopolitical national interests in Kosovo from powerful Western actors appeared vague and secondary at best (as will be detailed below), the shift in perceptions of Kosovo as ethnic cleansing or even potential genocide in the heart of Europe prompted the rise of very particular regional interests, such as protecting innocent civilians, promoting democratic values, and enforcing a liberal standard of human rights. These motivations, however, only manifested because Kosovo was clinging to the edge of a robust Western neighborhood, with institutions that existed solely to ensure collective security and regional stability. This ordering and interaction of forces increased the likelihood of an intensive
humanitarian military intervention in Kosovo, as opposed to one in South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, or other concurrent regions of internal strife.

Several trends dominate within the decision-making processes leading to the Kosovo military intervention, echoing these variables of conflict perception, Western region, and institutional resources. These trends include: 1.) the changing perception of the conflict as systematic killings instead of ethnic civil war; 2.) the existence of a Western-centric alliance to bring Kosovo into the Western neighborhood; and 3.) the potential for democratization and reform within Kosovo, as incorporated in the European identity. As will be detailed below, each of these key factors feed into the next. In other words, had Kosovo not been re-labeled as a conflict, the resources of the Western neighborhood may not have mobilized toward eradicating its violence. Thus, no one trend would have prevailed in isolation from the rest.

**Figure 20: The Kosovo Crisis Intervention Pathway**

In this chapter, I first outline the background leading up to the internationalized Kosovo Crisis. After referencing the limitations of general explanations of the Kosovo intervention, I then apply the study’s theoretical framework to the causal pathways of intervention – focusing on the
role of conflict perceptions, Western neighbors, and institutions. The primary evidence originates from declassified NATO archives, press releases, conferences, telephone calls, and formal speeches, supplemented by U.S. Department of State and Congressional archives.  

NATO as an institution drove the Kosovo military intervention, from start to finish. As the documents below will reveal, the majority of choices made throughout the mission were dependent on maintaining consensus across NATO member states, so as to ensure the flow of funding, military resources, manpower, and most importantly, the Western willingness to invest greater resources into a post-conflict Kosovo, for the sake of Europe. Thus, the NATO dialogue does not merely represent rhetorical choices, abstractions, or ideals – it represents the decision-making timeline and justifications of an institution that had almost absolute influence in the progression of the crisis. The NATO archives on Kosovo reflect elite opinions, negotiations, and updates as they occurred in real-time, as the mission in Kosovo moved from hypothetical policy plan to military reality and then continued to alter course for months to come.

In the next sections, I begin with a historical overview and timeline of the NATO intervention in Kosovo, followed by content analysis of predominantly NATO sources and

---

24 I have selected NATO archives as the study’s primary evidence due to three reasons. First, both preliminary discussions of a Kosovo intervention and intervention trajectories occurred within the context of the Western security alliance. While the UN remained inactive due to lack of member consensus (aside from a few weak, non-binding resolutions), NATO member states initiated and completed the Kosovo military intervention – with both political and military orders coming from NATO, and carefully driven by alliance consensus. Due to the vital role that NATO played in selecting, funding, coordinating, continuing, and finally halting the Kosovo military intervention in 1999, the study centers on NATO’s declassified archives – including daily press briefings by NATO Spokesman Jamie Shea and guests (often including General Wesley Clark and an array of world leaders), conferences, operational updates, speeches by several national leaders as well as NATO generals, conversations, maps, and recordings. These provide the most comprehensive set of documentations from which to gage motives, causes, and shifts in policy agenda. Second, NATO sources allow for the natural inclusion of different state actors, elites, and both global and national dynamics. They also provide a window into consensus-formation between Western national actors. Alternatively, other sources of documentation would only reflect the dynamics of national elites in isolation and vary from country to country. These NATO sources additionally reflect and construct much of the media analysis on the subject, as NATO press releases and dialogues often correct, confirm, or generally discuss daily media reports on the Kosovo mission as they come to pass. Third, NATO archives on the Kosovo mission are now fully declassified. With proper permission, they are accessible via an online portal to the NATO multimedia e-library (NATO Operation Allied Force 1999; NATO Multimedia e-Library 2016).
archives. I center my analysis on dialogues of conflict perception and Western identities and region, placing them within the broader context of military humanitarian interventions, theoretical debates, and the previous aggregated findings. Ultimately, I find that the Kosovo Crisis “earned” a Western military intervention because of shifting, favorable conflict perceptions, which then encouraged and even demanded the involvement of liberal Western institutions. Such institutional missions were activated by the characteristics of the Kosovo conflict as well as its location in the heart of Europe, the continent of “good neighborhoods” (Keohane 2003).

5.1. Background and Timeline on Kosovo

Kosovo serves as a vital geographical piece for both Serbian and Albanian identities. This Balkan province holds 2.2 million people, of whom 88 to 92 percent identify themselves as ethnic Albanians and the rest as Serbs, Roma, Turks, Bosnians and Croats (Statistical Office of Kosovo 2006). It is seen by many Serbians as the cradle of their civilization. It is the site of the legendary battle of Kosovo Polje where, in 1389, the Ottoman Turks defeated a largely Serbian army (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2000). Alternatively, Kosovo permeates Albanian

25 Within the archival dialogues, I search for connections between NATO mission selectivity, Western regional bias, and conflict perceptions. I place rhetoric within three thematic categories: 1.) discussions and transformations of conflict perception; 2.) a West vs. the rest narrative for action, and 3.) traditional national interest and realpolitik justifications. The first thematic grouping includes rhetoric on Kosovo as either “civil war”, “ethnic hatreds,” or “terrorist rebels”, versus “ethnic cleansing,” “innocent civilians,” “Serbian aggression,” or “attempted genocide”. Mentions of previous historical events, such as Srebrenica, the Holocaust, and Rwanda, also find themselves in this grouping, as these comparisons serve the same purpose of conflict perception consolidation. This focus arises out of Campbell’s (1998) findings on international reactions to Bosnia – as predominantly related to a shift in conflict perceptions – from an inevitable civil war to systematic killings and talks of genocide (see also Pehar 2014). It also connects to the influence of historical milieu in re-shaping perceptions of conflicts and their international responses, (Lyon and Dolan 2007). The second thematic grouping includes any discussions that signify different pathways of action depending on region, typically Europe vs. non-Europe. This also incorporates talks of democracies vs. non-democracies, civilized vs. uncivilized nations, and robust security and economic institutions vs. an institutional vacuum in certain regions of the world, making interventions less likely or successful. Such a focus stems from Keohane’s (2003) analysis on good and bad neighborhoods, defined by the existence or lack of value-based institutions that can pool resources and political willpower to solve regional crises.


27 For historical narratives of ancient, medieval, and modern Albanian and Serbian histories, see Vickers (1998).
national identity since ancient times, perceived as theirs before the 6th century Slavic arrival in the Balkans (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2000; Judah 2008, 1-11). After the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans and until 1912, Kosovo belonged to the Albanian-dominated provinces of the Ottoman Empire, but when Albania won independence in 1912, the main European powers split half of the Albanian territories between Greece, Serbia and Montenegro. Kosovo later entered the Yugoslavian Federation and following World War II, gained some autonomy within the Republic of Serbia; yet Serbian institutions treated ethnic Albanians as second-class citizens, a trend which reached its peak during Slobodan Milošević's rise to power (Malcolm 1998; Rogel 2004, 184; Judah 2008, 30-54).

In 1989, Serbia rebuffed Kosovo’s demands for greater autonomy within Serbia and rescinded its autonomous status (Staub 2009, 57). The Albanian deputies in Kosovo’s parliament, making up four fifths of the representation, met in 1989 and declared Kosovo a separate republic of Yugoslavia. They passed a new constitution in 1990 and declared Kosovo independent on September 1991. Until 1995, the Albanian majority followed the path of nonviolent resistance towards independence while the Kosovar government canvassed for recognition from European actors (Staub 2009, 56-57).²⁸

Kosovo’s increased efforts for independence translated into greater oppression for Kosovar Albanians, as it threatened the existing Serbian authority and played into the nationalist rhetoric of President Slobodan Milošević’s regime. Escalating from previous non-violent tactics, in the mid-1990s, ethnic Albanians reacted through the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). The KLA grew into the makeshift militia, often labeled as a dangerous terrorist group by both Serbian and Western sources, which fought the Serbian army during the crisis. The Albanian majority endured firings,

²⁸ For details on the Kosovar Albanians’ peaceful efforts toward statehood since 1991 and the international responses, see Clark (2000, 2008).
school closures, arrests without charge, torture and murder of civilians in the 1990s (Lippman 2008, 36-38; U.S. Department of State 1999a, 1999b; Booth 2001).

Milošević’s ethnic cleansing policies expelled 1.5 million Albanians from Kosovo and killed more than 10,000 civilians (Mandelbaum 1999, 3). In a brief summary of events, since the beginning of the conflict from February until September 1998, Serbian forces attacked 391 of the 1335 villages in Kosovo. They shelled 266 villages, left 217 of them deserted, and ransacked many more. Up until September 1998, 417,483 people had fled their homes to other regions of Kosovo, Montenegro, Albania and Macedonia (U.S. Department of State 1999a, 1999b). Although the intrastate violence in Kosovo was evident years before, the year 1998 made Kosovo and its humanitarian crises impossible to silence or ignore throughout Europe.

By 1998, the intrastate violence between Albanians and Serbians garnered the attention of the West, but Milošević ignored third-party, diplomatic efforts to resolve the crisis. In March of 1999, as a last resort, NATO commenced air strikes over Serbia that lasted seventy-seven days (NATO 1999). Shortly after, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1244, prompting the deployment of international presences under UN auspices (UN Security Council 1999). Negotiations for the status of the territory began in 2000 but stalled when Russia, Serbia’s traditional ally, threatened to veto any UN resolution that allowed future independence. Since the UN-backed solution proved unattainable, Kosovo declared unilateral independence in 2008 (Economist 2009; Lippman 2008). A total of 108 of the United Nations’ (UN) 193 countries, including twenty-three European Union (EU) members, have recognized Kosovo to date.\footnote{The website www.Kosovothanksyou.com has tracked the number of countries that have officially recognized Kosovo as an independent state since the 2008 unilateral declaration of independence. The website shows a chronological list of states and official documents for each case of statehood recognition.}
Kosovo experienced ethnicity-driven violence and repression long before the late 1990s, with the Milosevic-led waves taking place since the late 1980s and intensifying in the early 1990s during the Bosnian and Croatian conflicts (Malcolm 1998). Yet before 1997, the West had actively discouraged peaceful protests against Milosevic’s regime in Kosovo, in an attempt to regulate the region with minimal explicit intervention. The Kosovar Albanian nonviolent struggle in the early 1990s created an opportunity for international organizations to address the conflict and prevent a war – but it was never taken. At that point, Kosovar Albanians envisioned a narrow scope of independence that consisted of a neutral and demilitarized state with open borders; politicians were willing to negotiate for lesser goals as long as Kosovo’s future did not involve subordination to Serbia. In 1993, Kosovo’s “President,” Ibrahim Rugova, proposed that Kosovo should become a UN protectorate, and Adem Demaci, Kosovo’s famous political prisoner, suggested that Kosovo should exist as an equal partner in a federation of Serbia, Montenegro and Kosovo (Clark 2008). In spite of this chance for compromise, the Serbian government and Western diplomats demanded that Kosovar Albanians resign themselves to the “Serbian-imposed reality” (Clark, 2008, p. 14). Diplomats told Rugova, “You have to give up your demands for independence,” to which Rugova and his colleagues replied, “Not before talks even begin” (Clark, 2008, p. 14). Even as late as 1997, such forces convinced Rugova to postpone student demonstrations. When the students retorted that they had a right to protest for education, a delegation of twelve senior diplomats – including US, British and Dutch ambassadors – entered Prishtina in an attempt to stop the demonstrations (Clark 2008).

After 1996, the KLA replaced the non-violent factions of the Kosovar resistance against Serbian institutions, prompting slowly increased international attention. It was only until 1997 that
the UN, NATO, the EU, the OSCE, and the Contact Group (including France, Germany, Italy, Russia, the UK, and the US) began to mediate between the Serbian government and KLA rebels, with little success. Concurrently, the UN Security Council passed a resolution that imposed an arms embargo on Serbia to pressure the parties to reach a settlement (United Kingdom Ministry of Defence 2000). While the international community was aware of human rights abuses within Kosovo at this time, it had not yet considered the use of force as an option. It was not until over sixty Albanian civilians were murdered in a Serbian operation that the international community increased its pressure on Milošević (Devlen and Özdamar 2009). In September 1998, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1199, expressing alarm at the impending humanitarian catastrophe in Kosovo and demanding a ceasefire, the withdrawal of Serbian forces, and the start of true political dialogue (United Kingdom Department of Defence 2000). The next day, NATO issued an activation warning (ACTWARN), denoting an increased level of military preparedness for both a limited air option and a phased air campaign (United Kingdom Department of Defence 2000, Chap. 2). Therefore, the international community invoked the threat of military force only after the intensification of human rights abuses in Kosovo. Under this threat of air strikes, Milošević finally agreed to a ceasefire on October 1998 and accepted the deployment of an OSCE verification mission within Kosovo (Devlen and Özdamar 2009, 150).

The ceasefire did not hold, however, as Serbian security forces began an indiscriminate offensive against the KLA in December 1998. In January 15, 1999, Serbian security forces killed forty-five Albanians, including women and children, causing great protests in the West. Asserting the potential for air strikes, the Contact Group issued an ultimatum to both parties to negotiate (Devlen and Özdamar 2009). The negotiations started at the Rambouillet conference on February 6, 1999, in Rambouillet, France. On February 23, 1999, the Albanians agreed in principle to the
settlement, but the Serbian party asked for a two-week moratorium and eventually rejected any settlement option. At this moment, the crisis transformed from a primarily internal or perhaps regional conflict to an international crisis between Serbia and NATO, led by the US.

US Envoy Richard Holbrooke, who had succeeded in brokering peace in Bosnia, flew to Belgrade in March 1999 in a final effort to persuade Milošević to yield to diplomacy. The following quote from Milošević’s meeting with Holbrooke in October 1998 provides compelling evidence regarding the Serbian leader’s strategy: he said that if NATO decided to bomb Serbia, “I am sure the bombing will be very polite” (Devlen and Özdamar 2009, 153). Milošević, holding realist views of humanitarian endeavors, underestimated the probability and unity of an international mission within Kosovo and disregarded the intensity of such a mission as well.

According to official NATO archives, elite dialogues, and the diplomatic timeline, NATO acted in accordance with moral demands repeatedly made by the international community to Milošević (NATO 1999). The most important objective was to bring an end to the intrastate conflict and civilian killings in Kosovo. Consequently, the international community has labeled the Kosovo Crisis as a robust case of humanitarian intervention, driven primarily by humanitarian need and perhaps secondarily, by underlying national interests. But such factors are inherently too general to serve as causal mechanisms, as the following analysis of current, standard explanations of the crisis will reveal.

The purpose of the following section is to introduce the standard arguments made in the literature on the Kosovo intervention, ranging from the absolute reign of human rights to the traditional realist arguments on power powers and interests. I seek to showcase the flaws and limitations inherent in such arguments and also reveal how these standard views dismiss the variables of region and conflict perception, even when these forces implicitly make their way into
traditional accounts of the crisis. After having critiqued the standard dimensions of the NATO intervention in Kosovo, I introduce and support my proposed pathway of intervention, relying on a shift in conflict perception followed by the activation of the Western neighborhood, in all its functionalities and institutions.

5.2. Standard Explanations of NATO Intervention: Human Rights vs. Interests

Accounts of initial humanitarian catalysts in Kosovo are dimmed by evidence that US elites were initially unsupportive of intervening in Kosovo, even after persistent updates on mass human rights violations. In March 1998, when General Wesley Clark faxed the Pentagon to warn of potential trouble in Kosovo, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joseph Ralston responded, “Look, Wes, we’ve got a lot on our plates back here…We can’t deal with any more problems (Clark 2001, 109).” At least until May 1998, there was minimal attention devoted to Kosovo’s intrastate violence in Washington’s agenda. Even by the summer of 1998, when Alexander Vershbow, US Ambassador to NATO, wrote a memo pushing for a Dayton-style solution for Kosovo (with US troops as part of an international peacekeeping force), he had no supporters in the White House (Harris 2005, 362). As late as December 1998, US Major General Dennis Reimer, the Army Chief of Staff, responded to a warning from Clark that there may be an impending war situation in Kosovo with, “But we don’t want to fight there” (Clark, 2001, 165). As Republican Senator William Cohen confirmed during a post-intervention interview, the vast majority of US policymakers and congress members were reluctant to send the smallest of peacekeeping forces to Kosovo in 1998 (Cohen 2000). Noting such patterns, most standard explanations of the Kosovo intervention rely on the existence of vital US national interests, yet as will soon be revealed, such a narrative was crafted post-crisis and did not exist during the years of ongoing intrastate conflict in the region.
The US’s “Good Intentions” versus Geopolitical Interests in Kosovo

Since humanitarian catalysts are not readily apparent in the Kosovo Crisis, many assume that the US, acting through NATO, may have merely veiled geopolitical interests through humanitarian rhetoric and multilateral structures. On the first night of Operation Allied Force, President Clinton explicitly justified military force through national interest reminders. Addressing the nation from the Oval Office, he explained that Serbian forces had launched “an attack by tanks and artillery on a largely defenseless people whose leaders already have agreed to peace” (Clinton 1999a, 451). While Clinton argued that “[e]nding this tragedy is a moral imperative,” he also greatly emphasized that it was “also important to America’s national interest” (Clinton 1999a, 451). A “prosperous, secure, undivided, and free” Europe was essential to the US’s own prosperity and security (453). Moreover, the Balkans region was a powder keg that had exploded before, and if a fire were allowed to burn in this area again, “the flames will spread” (452). The former President stated that the conflict could grow, drawing in important allies, and eventually forcing the US to intervene at greater risk and higher cost. NATO’s credibility was also at stake: “Imagine what would happen if we and our allies instead decided just to look the other way, as these people were massacred on NATO’s doorstep. That would discredit NATO, the cornerstone on which our security has rested for 50 years now.” “By acting now,” Clinton explained, “we are upholding our values, protecting our interests, and advancing the cause of peace” (451-452). This rhetoric, uttered the day of the intervention, colors much of the perceived causes of the intervention, while intentionally ignoring the dynamics of years prior.

According to many such standard accounts, redefining NATO’s mission and maintaining its credibility in European affairs was important to American politics in the 1990s. By the time the Kosovo Crisis moved to the top of the agenda in 1998, NATO’s credibility was significantly
invested in Southeast Europe, especially in the maintenance of the Bosnian settlement (Latawski and Smith 2003, 58-59). Having initiated diplomacy and military threats, NATO states could have lost confidence in NATO's capability to guarantee regional security if no successful action was taken against Milošević (Roberts 1999). Senator John McCain was also quoted as saying that "credibility is our most precious asset [in this campaign]. We have purchased our credibility with American blood” (Latawski and Smith 2003, 59). In the Pentagon’s After-Action Report on Kosovo operations, "ensuring NATO’s credibility" was explicitly identified as being one of the "primary interests" of the US (Kosovo/Operation Allied Force After-Action Report 2000, 1). In May 2000, the British House of Commons Select Committee on Foreign Affairs even suggested that the humanitarian imperatives usually cited as the main catalysts for the NATO intervention were partly a cover, to provide legitimacy for operations designed to fortify NATO’s credibility and functionality (UK House of Commons Select Committee on Foreign Affairs 2000, xxviii).

As a founder and leader of the alliance, the US aimed to preserve functionality, credibility, and leadership in NATO as to secure a continued hegemonic position in Europe, influence European security issues, and promote the US economy in Europe. In economic terms, the US could not afford to lose this position. According to the Institute for National Strategic Studies, about 50 percent of the US’s direct investment abroad was in Europe, and over 60 percent of foreign direct investment in the US was from Europe (Gowan 2000). Clinton did not shy away from discussing this non-humanitarian motivating factor in his national speeches prior to the Kosovo aerial campaign. As reported by the Washington Post, in his March 23rd address, amidst humanitarian calls against ethnic cleansing, Clinton explained “that a strong U.S.-European partnership ‘is what this Kosovo thing is all about’” (Babington and Dewar 1999, A1; Gowan 2000, 16). In the same speech, the President also directly discussed the reasons why the
transatlantic alliance required saving: “If we’re going to have a strong economic relationship, that includes our ability to sell around the world, Europe has got to be a key” (Sullivan 1999, 18). The US commitment to multilateralism in NATO, based on its own geopolitical interests, resulted in the transformation of NATO from a regional defense-alliance to a peacemaking mechanism and ensured a leadership role for the US, only available by catering to existing multilateral, humanitarian norms. As Gilles Andréani et al. (2001) concluded:

If the Kosovo crisis found [NATO members] united, it was not because events in the region affected both sides of the Atlantic in the same way, or because of any intrinsic strategic value of Balkan territory, but because the governments elevated the crisis into a test for the credibility of an Alliance which they could not allow to collapse (74).

What is missing is from this discussion, however, is temporal context, as merely a year prior to the Kosovo intervention, the Kosovo conflict was seen as a civil war, especially as one between terrorists and government agents. Then, NATO did not want to come to the aid of terrorists. As will be detailed in following sections, these standard accounts skip over an important step that suddenly put NATO’s credibility on the line in Kosovo and led to post-intervention discussions of vital interests – where there previously were none.

In addition to NATO’s credibility, the standard realist argument is that a predicted refugee spill-over effect motivated Western powers to intervene in Kosovo. A state that descends into civil strife is a cancer on the international body and endangers its region, especially through refugee flows (Freeman 1997, 55). According to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), after the rejection of Kosovo’s autonomous status in 1989, about 350,000 ethnic Albanians left Kosovo for Western Europe. With the beginning of the conflict in 1998, another 100,000 people fled their homes to nearby countries such as Albania, Montenegro, and Macedonia (Del Mundo and Wilkinson 1999, 10-11). Considering that recipient countries were already experiencing deep crises, the US and its allies were concerned that refugee flows could greatly destabilize the whole
European region. But then again, the refugee problem stemming from the Balkans existed years prior to discussions of military intervention. What changed?

Lastly, had the primary motivation behind the Kosovo intervention been humanitarian need, not geopolitical interests, the US and its allies would be expected to protect as many innocent lives as possible through their planned actions. However, in a one-on-one briefing with Secretary of State Albright, General Clark told her the Serbs were certain to attack the civilian population if airstrikes were launched. When asked whether he still thought the administration should go through with the aerial attack, he replied “Yes, we have to. We put NATO’s credibility on the line. We have to follow through…There’s no real alternative now” (Clark 2001, 171). Albright agreed.

In such dialogue, humanitarian context served as the needed catalyst that would ease the pursuits of national interests. As the US leadership had predicted and was well aware of, during the 11 weeks of bombardment until June 10, an estimated 10,000 people died violently in the province of Kosovo (Mandelbaum 1999, 3; Human Rights Watch 2002, 16). Most of them were Albanian civilians murdered by Serbs, but an estimated 488-527 were civilian casualties of the air strikes (Mandelbaum 1999, 5). In comparison, before NATO intervened militarily on March 24, 1999, approximately 2,500 people had died in Kosovo’s civil war between the Serb military and the ethnic Albanian separatists (Allerkamp 2005).

**Inconsistent interests and the influence of humanitarian need**

But despite an initially weak response to the humanitarian crisis, inconsistencies linger within the interests-based narrative. If geopolitical interests were the primary catalysts of the Kosovo intervention, why did US and NATO leaders consistently reference humanitarian arguments? Why did they have to constantly defend their positions to suspicious citizens? Furthermore, it appears that national interests in Kosovo only took foreign policy precedence once
the normative dimensions and demands had become inescapable. Most discussions of national interests in Kosovo took place after the initiation of the intervention or days prior to intervention. Before 1998, the US government did not appear to hold strong policy incentives to act. As neorealist John Mearsheimer even stated, “Most realists are offshore balancers, and most of us do not see any such threat emerging as a result of Kosovo” (quoted in Miller 1999). In the strongest of realist circles, the NATO intervention in Kosovo was seen as a fundamental rejection of state principles and as an example of ruling with imprudence, given lack of security interests, high costs, and exacerbated hostilities with Russia and China (Mandelbaum 1999). Charles Krauthammer denounced the intervention as liberal, amateurish policymaking, “righteous self-delusion,” and “impossibly moralistic and universal” (Krauthammer 1999a). In other words, Krauthammer saw no signs of realism’s calculative, prudent policies in the Kosovo intervention – just the inconsistent, hypocritical application of ethics and morality – recalling the US’s recent inactions in Rwanda and Krajina, Croatia. According to this view, instead of preventing further conflict, the US intervention in Kosovo internationalized a small civil war, without stopping the ethnic violence or refugee flows (Krauthammer 1999b). Hence, the inconsistencies in the interests-based argument give us strong reason to suspect that the Kosovo Crisis resulted from the interplay of different causes and contexts, rather than just pure national interest or moral imperatives, which comprise the standard arguments.

Key to the alleged humanitarian motivation in Kosovo was “the Bosnia syndrome” (Bellamy 2002, 69). The argument is that the US was regretful of what had occurred in Bosnia and had a genuine desire to avoid a repeat of the human rights violations. Coming after Rwanda and Bosnia, Kosovo was an opportunity for the US to show that it was sincere in its goals to prevent humanitarian crises and ethnic cleansing campaigns, wherever they may be (Kosovo Independent
International Commission 2000, 159-160). Clinton recalled in his memoirs that “[t]he killings were all too reminiscent of the early days of Bosnia, which, like Kosovo, bridged the divide between European Muslims and Serb Orthodox Christians…I was determined not to allow Kosovo to become another Bosnia” (Clinton 2003, 849). Albright (2000) claims similar sentiments, “When we saw pictures of massacres, it was like reliving Srebrenica, and the terrible things that had happened in Bosnia.” She continues, “It is not often that you get a second chance” (Albright 2000).

Such justifications hint at a much more complicated picture between human rights protection, Western interest construction, and historical analogies/lessons – which are further entangled in the archival analysis below.

Ultimately, the Kosovo air campaign occurred in the context of great humanitarian rhetoric and demand. Yet it may now be argued that a lack of vital national interests limited the scope of the Kosovo intervention, ruling out ground troops in favor of a gentle, often ineffective air campaign. Albright had a different interpretation of the limited scope of the intervention as 1999 approached. “They’re misunderstanding things,” she said. “We never took the ground option totally off the table…” (Albright 2000). Instead, she claims that had the air campaign not been so successful, the ground troops option may have been implemented. The US National Security Advisor at the time, Samuel Berger, confirms this perspective – the US alongside its NATO alliance was ready to do all that was necessary to win the war in Kosovo by the end of 1998 – a war that initially presented with a lack of vital national interests and very little policy interest by Western elites. Indeed, a large number of political elites confirm in post-crisis interviews that US and UK leaders were quietly planning a ground campaign because losing in Kosovo was no longer an option (Berger 2000; Blair 2000; Daalder 2000). General Wesley Clark (2000) was also certain that had the air campaign not succeeded, group troops would have been the next step. In EU circles,
the importance of the Kosovo mission was about learning from the historical lessons of Bosnia and never again pacifying nationalistic sentiments on the periphery of liberal Europe. By 1999, the Council of Europe had, too, formed a consensus on the vital importance of the Kosovo mission to Western identity, tied to Europe’s “responsibility” to defend human rights (European Parliament 1999). Would the intervention have occurred regardless of the build-up of humanitarian context?

Repeated governmental discussions on the irrelevance of Kosovo before 1998 might argue no.

Many other sources and leaders echoed similar sentiments regarding the Kosovo Crisis. In the spring and early summer of 1999, NATO public statements repeatedly claimed that Operation Allied Force was one of values – not narrow geopolitical interests in the realist sense. These statements dominated rhetoric across NATO member states. For instance, Czech President Václav Havel (1999), in an address to the Canadian Parliament on April 29th, 1999, said that:

This is probably the first war ever fought that is not being fought in the name of interests, but in the name of certain principles and values...Kosovo has no oil fields whose output might perhaps attract somebody’s interest; no member country of the Alliance has any territorial claims there; and, Milošević is not threatening either the territorial integrity, or any other integrity, of any NATO member. Nevertheless, the Alliance is fighting.

Similarly, Javier Solana (1999a), NATO Secretary General, referred to a value-based argument in a speech in Berlin in June 1999, just before the end of the air strikes campaign:

What makes NATO so united in this crisis is the fact that in Kosovo our long term interests and our values converge...The conflict between Belgrade and the rest of the international community is a conflict between two visions of Europe. One vision—Milošević’s vision – is a Europe of ethnically pure states, a Europe of nationalism, authoritarianism and xenophobia. The other vision, upheld by NATO and the European Union and many other countries, is of a Europe of integration, democracy and ethnic pluralism… If this positive vision of Europe is to prevail…we simply cannot tolerate this carnage at its centre.

Even years before the development of the Kosovo Crisis, US leaders were weary of human rights abuses occurring at the hands of the Serbian military and signaled their preparation to protect
the lives of future victims. In his last days in office in late 1992, President Bush instructed Secretary of State Eagleburger to send a classified cable to Belgrade. The US Ambassador was to read it personally to Milošević. It read: “In the event of conflict in Kosovo caused by Serbian action, the US will be prepared to employ military force against Serbians in Kosovo and in Serbia proper” (Daalder and O’Hanlon 2001, 9). This so-called “Christmas ultimatum” was reaffirmed twice in Clinton’s first year in office (Daalder and O’Hanlon 2001, 9; Gellman 1999, A1). Although this statement may also signal latent US interests in Kosovo, it is indicative that the US was concerned about potential human rights abuses in Kosovo years before it decided to intervene. Moreover, the US took clear coercive steps toward Serbia long before it acted militaristically. Samuel Berger, then US National Security Advisor, has claimed that US leadership was awaiting and promoting a unified NATO response to the Kosovo issue at this time – the US did not want to act unilaterally (Berger 2000). If vital national interests had been the only catalysts of the Kosovo intervention, such a long US policy lag would be unlikely to occur, and multiple direct threats to Serbia’s leadership over the decade would serve little purpose. A greater normative context needed to develop before coercive action could be taken.

In this case, the primacy of humanitarian motivations need not be a threshold condition for an international humanitarian intervention (Wheeler 2000, 38). The moral imperative may exist as one of the multiple overlapping and mutually-reinforcing causes that lead to humanitarian intervention. Under broader interpretations, the NATO intervention symbolized an international consensus – partially based on shared values and humanitarian norms – that Serbia had wronged in its governance and lost its right to autonomy (Herbert 2005).

The standard arguments on either national interests or humanitarian intent are not without merit. But each one of these pathways presents with inconsistencies in the timeline of actions, and
both pathways appear to feed into one another. Most importantly, neither one of these standard views can explain why the Kosovo Crisis rose to the top of the Western agenda by 1998, not years before or after. In other words, why did the humanitarian context suddenly become important to Western elites, media, and leaders, when it had been ignored years prior (as above records reveal)? For the realists, why did geopolitical national interests manifest in Kosovo, after repeated discussions of Kosovo as an unimportant periphery? Why is most of this realist argument founded upon post-conflict justifications? Moreover, the isolation of interests from discussions of human rights dimensions becomes incredibly problematic in Kosovo’s timeline of events. After all, NATO’s credibility only became relevant in Kosovo once the internal violence was recognized as ethnic cleansing or genocide. Perhaps most importantly, why did the humanitarian justifications only apply successfully to Kosovo and not to the many other concurrent internal crises across the globe?

Clinton’s (1999a) famous speech in 1999, interpreted through the lens of humanitarianism by some observers and geopolitical interests by others, hints at a deeper storyline of intervention. Phrases like “defenseless people” are used; historical lessons and parallels are made to Bosnia; and every strong promise uttered relates solely to the European continent and the preservation of Western values. What truly connect the humanitarian arguments to the realist ones in Kosovo are the interactions between the understanding of the conflict, founded upon past lessons learned, and the Western ideals and missions that such a conflict perception activated. Kosovo received third-party aid only once it successfully tied its own suffering to the Western narrative. Every new killing of ethnic Albanians shamed the West into action because inaction would have revealed the weaknesses of Western liberal ideals and institutions. It would have marked the failure of the West to protect its very neighbors from potential genocide, again. Such are the interactions that I explore
below – evidenced by recently-released NATO archives, press releases, conferences, and other primary sources on the Kosovo crisis conversation between states, leaders, and organizations.

5.3. Beyond Standard Explanations: Role of Conflict Perceptions & Region

On the surface of the dialogue introduced above, the military intervention in Kosovo held both a security and humanitarian dimension, which made it more likely to occur. Still, neither one of these dimensions explains this particular intervention or others that followed. Kosovo was not a key strategic region for the US at the beginning of the intrastate conflict, nor was Kosovo’s humanitarian plight greater than or even equal in intensity to other past and concurrent internal wars. But within such security and humanitarian justifications, a thematic commonality emerges – one that is lacking in the overwhelmingly ignored internal conflicts within Africa, occurring concurrently with Kosovo’s internationalized “civil war.” A regional approach to the Kosovo Crisis begins with a shift in conflict perceptions, which then opened Kosovo to Western sympathies, principles, attention, and finally – humanitarian intervention. After all, the intrastate conflict within Kosovo had always evolved and intensified next to the Western neighborhood – but it wasn’t until late 1998 that Western actors started to pay attention and began to assign blame. The conflict perception needed to undergo a swift, dramatic transformation before NATO and its partners considered acting in Kosovo and enveloping it in Western protection. As illustrated below, this perception transformation relied on a feedback mechanism between media accounts of Kosovo’s suffering, elite interpretations of ongoing events, analogies to past lessons learned, and the final re-labeling of conflict actors. Eventually, this process re-labeled the conflict as systematic killings, not the typical ethnic civil war, and marked Kosovo as a Western identity conflict.
From Terrorists to Defenseless People – Catering to Western Sympathies and Ideals

While the intrastate violence was unfolding in Bosnia, most Western actors perceived the conflict as another Balkan civil war – three equally culpable sides battling for ancient territorial claims, founded upon ancient group animosities. As Campbell (1998) has examined in great nuance, Western actors hesitated to intervene in Bosnia until the narrative changed from one of ethno-religious civil war into one of systematic killings and ongoing genocide. Until early 1998, the Western and US approach to Milosevic wavered between denouncing his atrocities in the region to perceiving him as the guarantor of peace in the Balkans (given his negotiating role in Bosnia’s Dayton Conference in 1995). In fact, in 1998, Robert Gelbard, then the U.S.’s special envoy to the Balkans, in an attempt to distance Milosevic from blame in Kosovo, publicly declared the KLA as “without any questions, a terrorist group” (Judah 2000, 138). For conflict perceptions to change in favor of military intervention, Milosevic had to be seen as the problem, as the primary aggressor, before third-parties could begin to craft solutions. It is one thing for the West to ignore a war between a government and terrorist factions; but it is another for the West to ignore ethnic cleansing or genocide within its own borders.

From 1990 until 1998, the international community, including European and US counterparts, handled Kosovo’s calls for autonomy and aid with extreme caution, bordering on indifference. Western actors spoke of diplomacy, negotiations, and perhaps slight increases in observer missions in Kosovo, bringing the UN to the forefront of policy-making. This was unfortunate, as the Kosovar Albanian nonviolent struggle in the early 1990s created an opportunity for international organizations to address the conflict and prevent a war – which was greatly ignored. At that point, ethnic Albanians envisioned a narrow scope of independence, as long as Kosovo’s future did not involve full subordination to Serbia (Clark 2008). For a long time, Western
leaders relied on ethnic Albanian passivity to delay the outbreak of war instead of formulating policy to prevent the spread of human rights abuses.

This delay occurred because Kosovo still had to earn its integration as part of the democratic Western community, with its value-based alliances and governance mechanisms. Kosovo had to prove itself innocent of the crimes of aggression, religious extremism, and petty ethnic war-making. Only when these crimes were effectively blamed on the Serbian state, instead of equally assigned to all parties, did the US, NATO, and European nations relay Kosovo’s violence to the top of the international agenda. This shift required a re-interpretation of the KLA, the separatist paramilitary of the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. Up until 1998, the West had labeled the KLA as a terrorist organization, as per Serbian leadership standards – hence perceiving the Kosovo Crisis as another case of ethnic civil war. Such narratives of equally culpable parties in a standard “ethnic” or “religious” civil war were the norm in elite dialogue and press briefings prior to 1999.

Even after the Serbian government had repressed peaceful demonstrations in Kosovo in March of 1998, the North Atlantic Council’s statement affirmed the equally culpable narrative, calling “on all sides to take immediate steps to reduce the tensions” (“Council Statement on the Situation in Kosovo” 1998a). Similar statements followed, condemning “the unacceptable use of force by Serbian police against peaceful demonstrators as well as terrorist actions by the Kosovo Liberation Army or any other group.” In such statements, the term “Kosovar extremists” was widely utilized. Western actors were adamant in “rejecting all use of violence, either by state security forces to suppress political dissent or by terrorist groups to seek political change” (“Statement by the Chairman on the Ambassadors’ Meeting of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council” 1998; “Council Statement on the Situation in Kosovo” 1998b).
As this narrative persisted in the Western media and elite dialogues, the Kosovo humanitarian crisis remained untouched. By June 1998, the only third-party responses amounted to symbolic air exercises in Albania and Macedonia to demonstrate NATO power, the maintenance of observer missions in neighboring countries, and talks of funding UN and OSCE monitoring missions in Serbia, as a way of promoting greater political dialogue. There were absolutely zero talks of moving beyond a diplomatic solution to a violent crisis that had plagued Kosovo for years.

This diplomatic route led to a very short-lived ceasefire in 1998, primarily promoted by several UN Security Council Resolutions discussed above. During the progression of this ceasefire, the civil war narrative continued to dominate Western discussions of the crisis, with NATO and Western state officials holding to the same neutral chains of culpability.

“Since the beginning of November, violent incidents provoked in some cases by Serbian security forces and in others by armed Kosovar elements have increased tension. These incidents show that both the Belgrade authorities and the armed Kosovar elements have failed to comply fully with the requirements set out in UN Security Council Resolutions” (Statement on Kosovo: Meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Foreign Ministers Session” 1998).

The failure of the ceasefire, however, due to Serbian military progression, prompted a NATO air verification mission – but nothing close to talks of direct intervention. As Daalder (2000) explained, the West was at first weary of serving as the KLA’s personal military against an established, sovereign state:

There's a change in dynamic for the international community, particularly the Europeans, but also many in the United States, who believe that the KLA are a bunch of thugs, and these thugs are now winning. All of a sudden, a policy designed to oppose Milosevic creates a situation where the more we oppose Milosevic, the more these thugs will win--at what point are the KLA thugs the problem?...? “We don't want to be the air force of the KLA,” is the standard stock answer of the allies to bombing the Serbs. At that point, the allies decide to stand back, to say, wait a minute, we've got to find a political solution--not because Milosevic might otherwise do bad things--but otherwise, the KLA will win.
Fortunately, due to the Bosnian precedence with its damaging Western delay, perceptions of Kosovo changed more quickly. Within the year, we observe a change from narratives of civil war to ones of ethnic cleansing and then potential genocide in the heart of Europe. Secretary Albright’s spokesperson James Rubin put it simply in 1999, “In order to move towards military action, it has to be clear that the Serbs were responsible” (Rubin 1999). Even President Clinton recognized the benefits of such a shift in conflict perception, in the backdrop of the Bosnian tragedy partially due to Western passivity in the face of “ancient hatreds” and their civil wars.

Now, at the time, a lot of people said, "Well, there's nothing you can do about it, Mr. President. That's the way those people are. They've been fighting for hundreds of years." So I heard all that, and I actually started reading up on the history of that area. And I found out that in fact they had been fighting on and off for hundreds of years, but there was more off than on. And it was an insult to them to say that somehow they were intrinsically made to murder one another. That was the excuse used by countries and leaders for too long—"Well, they're just that way" (Clinton 1999b).

Accordingly, Western elites needed to view the Kosovo intrastate conflict as a campaign of ethnic cleansing at the very least and as an attempted genocide at the most – otherwise, the labeling of civil war would have delayed or muted intervention, as in Bosnia. It was only until summer 1998 that the view of Kosovo as a civil war between two equally-culpable factions began to dissipate, paralleling changes in media attention to Kosovar refugees and a direct elite witness to the civilian massacres. General Wesley Clark (2000) discussed, “People had finally come to terms with the fact that it wasn't just an ordinary reaction to some domestic terrorism that was taking place--they were seeing the first stages of unfolding drama that was likely to culminate in ethnic cleansing.” It was also around this time that NATO commenced an aerial exercise with over 100 aircrafts over Kosovo, Albania, and Macedonia – to show NATO capacity and strength against the Yugoslav government. As the year progressed, NATO repeatedly claimed the justification of ethnic cleansing for its military involvement:
…NATO faced the prospect of either witnessing a deliberately engineered mass expulsion of people in a region bordering NATO and the EU or addressing the Kosovo crisis in full…We decided that these risks were worth taking, for not to have acted would have meant that the Atlantic community legitimized ethnic cleansing in its immediate neighborhood (Solana 1999b).

As Clinton affirmed and expanded upon in 1999, the intrastate conflict in Kosovo wasn’t the typical non-Western petty civil war. It was no longer seen as an ethnic or religious civil war fought by equally guilty parties. By 1998, the violence in Kosovo was slowly being understood as an act of aggression by the Serbian authorities against a “largely defenseless people,” represented by peaceful, cooperating leaders (Clinton 1999a, 451). Repeated meetings with President Milosevic further aided this narrative, as Milosevic’s talks of ethnic cleansing the “bandit” Albanians, blocking international investigators from sites of violence, and breaking diplomatic promises to NATO became the overwhelming norm of such encounters (Wesley Clark 2000). Non-intervention in Kosovo was now starting to become synonymous with complicity in campaigns of systematic killing. Nothing could be more anti-Western, and for Europe and the US, nothing could be so far away from the hard lessons learned.

This view solidified internationally as UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, in his keynote speech to the 54th session of the UN General Assembly in September 1999, tempered his arguments on the need for Security Council-approved use of force in humanitarian endeavors. As the Kosovo Crisis loomed large on the international agenda, he posed the following question: “If, in those dark days and hours leading up to the genocide [in Rwanda], a coalition of states had been prepared to act in defense of the Tutsi population, but did not receive prompt Council authorization, should such a coalition have stood aside and allowed the horror to unfold?” (Annan 1999). This question inherently arises from the belief, from the perception, that the Kosovo conflict was as the Rwandan conflict – an act of systematic killing from one side, and massive civilian deaths on the other side.
In fact, Annan (1999) stated this directly as he encouraged UN members to “forge unity behind the principle that massive and systematic violations of human rights – wherever they may take place – should not be allowed to stand.” Until such a conflict perception of “systematic violations of human rights” had monopolized the Kosovo Crisis narrative, intervention remained unlikely and highly muted in international political circles.

Past events greatly helped in propelling the required narrative of defenseless people, as opposed to equally culpable civil war factions, during the Kosovo intrastate conflict. First, the conflict occurred in the historical backdrop of the Bosnian and Rwandan tragedies. In post-conflict Western perceptions, both of these historical tragedies were founded upon analogies of genocide, unrestrained by the international community. In Bosnia, as Serbian campaigns of ethnic cleansing escalated, the Western media turned to analogies of Nazi Germany to contextualize photos and eyewitness reports of mass crimes (Akrivoulis 2015). Indeed, the West remained passive in Bosnia until such Holocaust imagery and symbolism gained great traction internationally – as journalists reported from “concentration camps” within Bosnia (Akrivoulis 2015). By the mid-1990s, Bosnia was in Western collective identity the first instance of non-prevented genocide on European soil since the Holocaust (Cushman and Mestrovic 1996).

Kosovo, coming after the relative international inactivity of Bosnia and Rwanda, benefitted immensely from the historically-laden analogies of the non-prevented Holocaust (Bates 2009; Steinweis 2005). Especially after the Racak massacre (January 1999) of 45 ethnic Albanians by Serbian soldiers, media reports and elites alike latched on to the Holocaust narrative for good (Kosovo Verification Mission, OSCE 1999; Blair 2000). Ambassador William Walker, also serving as the head of the Kosovo Verification Mission (the international monitoring group meant to track compliance with the ceasefire and human rights situation in Kosovo) personally witnessed
the aftermath of the Racak massacre and subsequently held an impromptu, anger-fueled press conference. Here, he – without a shadow of personal doubt – declared that Serbian security forces had committed crimes against humanity on ethnic Albanian civilians (Walker 2000). He also stated that the government-sponsored stories of KLA set-ups and clashes with armed, uniformed men were outrageous lies. This reaction was so imperative to altering the narrative on Kosovo that Milosevic immediately declared Ambassador Walker *persona non gratta*.

Before this massacre, US and NATO elites had relied on empty threats of force, failing to enforce them time and time again against Milosevic. Instead, they had strong hopes that continued negotiations and implemented ceasefires with Milosevic would be enough to broker a fragile peace in Kosovo. In fact, until the day of the Racak massacre, Western actors discussed and negotiated on Kosovo with the unified assumption that the actual use of force would not be needed, nor would it be warranted – given the nature of the conflict. The West did not want to act as the de-facto military of the KLA, a group of thugs perceived to be equally as violent as their Serbian counterparts. Daalder (2000) explains:

> Just as the principals meet on January 15 in the White House, Serb forces are engaged in yet another massacre of 45 people in Racak. That's on the front page of the newspaper. The next day, the OSCE monitors are there on the scene, and report what happened. The head of the OSCE monitors says this is a crime against humanity. We again have pictures of bodies, of heads torn off, of torsos. Within four days, there is an immediate agreement in the White House that the very option that Madeleine Albright put on the table four days earlier, which was not acceptable, now becomes acceptable. We have to have decisive action. Muddling through is no longer possible. We can't postpone the moment of deciding what to do. On January 19, the decision is to have decisive action, start threatening force, and to do that to get an agreement.

Ambassador Walker’s account of the one-sided nature of the violence in Racak also altered perceptions of the KLA in Kosovo. The West was no longer dealing with two equally culpable warring factions, but with one main state aggressor and a group of fighters defending themselves
against systematic state oppression. As Ambassador Walker’s (2000) narrative reveals below, the West was beginning to distinguish between the scope and nature of the offenses committed by the warring parties within Kosovo.

Even though they've committed some acts that were to be condemned--kidnappings, killings, assassinations--I found that the KLA tried to keep promises they made to me...as opposed to Milosevic, who made all sorts of promises and so help me God, lived up to none of them. I also found when the KLA committed one of these offenses, it was usually limited in scale. One, two, or three people might be targeted, usually policemen, or military--there was some reason they could point to as to why they had done it. On the other side, the Milosevic forces would go in and destroy a whole village and its people to chase one KLA terrorist. There was not a moral equivalency between what they were doing.

A shift in conflict perception soon enveloped all talks of Kosovo within NATO, the US, UK, and the NATO alliance. Official press briefings would now repeat how “the grave humanitarian crisis was brought on by the actions of President Milosevic’s forces in Kosovo,” without mention of Kosovo separatists or terrorist non-state actors (“Statement of the North Atlantic Council following the meeting between Representatives of the NATO Member States, the EU Member States, the OSCE CIO, the UNHCR, the Council of Europe and the Western European Union” 1999). Such a narrative slowly allowed NATO to join in humanitarian relief efforts in Kosovo, coordinating with the OSCE, UNHCR, and the Council of Europe. By the end of January 1999, this shift in perceptions would prompt threats of air strikes in FRY if political negotiations did not yield a lasting peace between the state and its ethnic Albanian population. As the months passed without the cessation of violence, the narrative against Serbia only strengthened with more details from on-the-ground reports. By April 1999, this same narrative led to firm consensus between Western countries and institutions on the urgency of air strikes against FRY:

The unrestrained assault by Yugoslav military, police and paramilitary forces, under the direction of President Milosevic, on Kosovar civilians has created a massive humanitarian catastrophe which also threatens to destabilise the surrounding region. Hundreds of thousands of people have been expelled ruthlessly from Kosovo by the FRY authorities.
We condemn these appalling violations of human rights and the indiscriminate use of force by the Yugoslav government. These extreme and criminally irresponsible policies, which cannot be defended on any grounds, have made necessary and justify the military action by NATO.

Those who are responsible for the systematic campaign of violence and destruction against innocent Kosovar civilians and for the forced deportation of hundreds of thousands of refugees will be held accountable for their actions (“The Situation in and around Kosovo” 1999).

Consequently, before the military mission had begun, the rhetoric had swung fully into the direction of stopping campaigns of systematic violence against innocent ethnic Albanian civilians – with talks of terrorist KLA members virtually, suddenly forgotten. The official NATO tagline, paralleling all elite talks and press briefings for the next several months was “ethnic cleansing.”

It is the culmination of a deliberate policy of oppression, ethnic cleansing and violence pursued by the Belgrade regime under the direction of President Milosevic. We will not allow this campaign of terror to succeed (“Statement on Kosovo” 1999).

In sum, the historical perceptions of the Kosovo conflict itself changed within the year before military intervention – turning terrorists, separatists, and extremists into innocent Kosovar civilians fighting against a terrorist state. This perception came out of greater learning on the part of the media, population, and political elites – regarding both the origins of the Kosovo Crisis as well as the on-the-ground reporting of Serbian military actions and counter-actions. NATO Spokesperson Dr. Jamie Shea (1999) summarized this process of learning and interpretation of behavior and history in his April 29th Press Conference:

…they [ethnic Albanians] only embraced independence once it became clear that they would not be allowed to have their autonomy under Milosevic but for many years all they asked for in the passive resistance organised by Ibrahim Rugova and others was simply for their human rights, their ethnic identity, their autonomy, to be respected. If people have left Yugoslavia since 1991, it's not because of any desire first and foremost to have so much
their own state, it's because the policy of rabid nationalism in Belgrade gave them the impression that if they stayed within the Yugoslav Federation, they would not be able to survive or have their rights protected.

The Kosovar Albanians were now justified in the eyes of the Western elites in their rebellions against the Serbian government, hence deserving intervention. Past Western doubts about ethnic Albanian protests, requests for autonomy, and complaints of human rights abuses seemed to have faded a few months before military intervention, and they evaporated fully during the months of military intervention. Key to such shifts was the changing linguistic arsenals that political elites used in context with one another, the media, and international organizations. They moved away from discussions of civil war, ethnic hatreds, separatists, and terrorists to discussions of mass graves, systematic executions, civilian exodus, and mentions of concentration camps, prison camp, helpless refugees, and scorched villages. NATO briefings consistently mentioned the displacement of ethnic Albanian families, the revocation of passports and identities by Serbian authorities, the selling of property in exchange for “train tickets to nowhere”, and the use of human shields in battles. Accusation of war crimes against the Serbian state abounded, as the narrative shifted from terrorist ethnic Albanians to hotels full of abused ethnic Albanian women, disappearing military-age ethnic Albanian men, and massacred children in front of their parents.

By March of 1999, NATO Spokesman Jamie Shea (1999b) was quoting statistics on refugees and civilian killings to the press on a tri-daily basis. For example,

800,000 Kosovar Albanians have fled Kosovo since March 1998, 650,000 are internally displaced, at least 100,000 men of military age are missing, at least 4,000 victims of summary executions are reported since the beginning of the year, nearly 1.5 million Kosovar Albanians - or 90 per cent of the population - have been expelled from their homes. We have reports of mass executions in 65 towns and villages and mass graves in at least seven locations.
Typically, after announcing the raw numbers, Dr. Shea as well as several Generals at such press briefings and conferences would reiterate the justifications behind a military intervention in Kosovo. “…what we can do is to stop what clearly is a systematic, planned, organized government-directed strategy and not some kind of automatic spontaneous outpouring of violence” (Shea 1999b). Often, such statements would defend the KLA as well – an organization labeled as terrorist just months prior. NATO Spokesperson Shea and SHAPE Spokesperson Major General Walter Jertz attempt to justify this dynamic below:

No, we are not, we are the Air Force of the Kosovar Albanian people, Freddie, and there is a very big distinction there. And the fighting is not simply fighting against the UCK. Ask the 9,800 refugees who were pushed into Albania yesterday if the only violence is against the UCK. Clearly it is not, those refugees showed clearly that the violence is still being directed against the civilian population at large (Shea and Jertz 1999a).

The goals of the Kosovo mission and subsequent bombings were clear, which further aided the mission trajectory and alliance cohesion: 1.) Control internally displaced persons; 2.) Ensure the safe return of refugees to their homes; and 3.) Complete withdrawal of the Serbian military from Kosovo, to be replaced by an international security force. Due to the humanitarian narrative now painted within all elite circles, the mission in Kosovo would be halted only once Serbia had accepted all NATO terms in negotiation – not one minute earlier, no matter the cost.

Reports from refugee camps in nearby countries predicted a spread of the recent Bosnian terror, which by now, Western audiences equated with Nazi Germany campaigns of genocide. Pacifism and delayed reactions meant tragedy. Madeleine Albright (2000) explained her views of the military intervention, “We all knew that he best understood the use of force. He didn't see the light in Bosnia until the NATO bombing…it's difficult to deal with someone who only understands force.” Milosevic only knew aggression and violence, thus, the West needed to react accordingly so as to not repeat the worst of history. Albright remarked of Kosovo in 1999, “My mindset is
“Munich” – hinting at the legacy of European appeasement of ruthless, genocidal leaders over 50 years ago (Dobbs 1999, 34). The Holocaust imagery also frequently found its way into Clinton’s (1999b) speeches on the Kosovo conflict, founded upon the main lessons learned in Bosnia, as this example in March of 1999:

What if someone had listened to Winston Churchill and stood up to Adolph Hitler earlier? How many people’s lives might have been saved? And how many American lives might have been saved?...When President Milosevic started the war in Bosnia 7 years ago, the world did not act quickly enough to stop him. Let's don't forget what happened: Innocent people were herded into concentration camps. Children were gunned down by snipers on their way to school. Soccer fields and parks were turned into cemeteries. A quarter of a million people—in a country with only 6 million population—were killed, and a couple of million refugees were created— not because of anything they had done but because of who they were and because of the thirst of Mr. Milosevic and his allies to dominate, indeed, to crush people who were of different ethnic and religious affiliations. Now, this was a genocide in the heart of Europe. It did not happen in 1945; it was going on in 1995.

The outcome of the Rambouillet Conference in March of 1999 solidified this dynamic – with the ethnic Albanians factions signing on to a peace deal, with several great concessions, while Serbian factions refused to discuss key terms of the agreements. This portrayed ethnic Albanians as the peace-seekers, while Serbia continued to mobilize its military around Kosovo. So the Holocaust imagery continued for Kosovo:

…they've now started rolling from village to village, predominantly in north central Kosovo, shelling civilians, torching their homes so they can't come back. In a number of villages, Serbian police have dragged the male members of Kosovar families from their homes, lined up fathers with sons, and shot them in cold blood (Clinton 1999b).

NATO dialogue and press releases continuously referred to the Holocaust when contextualizing Kosovo as well. Jamie Shea (1999c) even went as far as to quote a famous survivor of the Holocaust to explain the West’s commitment to Kosovo and worries about being a bystander to horrors once more:
Eli Weisel, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1986, once said: ‘What hurts the victims most is not the cruelty of the oppressor, but the silence of the bystander.’ Well NATO is not going to be a silent bystander, we are going to be a vocal actor and we are going to ensure, as soon as we can, that all of these suffering people are allowed to go back to their homes.

Indeed, all NATO operational updates in 1999 explicitly mentioned “targeting Serbs responsible for ethnic cleansing” (NATO Operation Allied Force 1999). During the NATO campaign itself, the Holocaust analogies intensified. Prisons where Kosovar Albanians were kept were transformed into “virtually a concentration camp… and the inmates have not been sentenced for any crime unless their ethnic identity is a sentence of death” (Shea 1999d). The image of freed prisoners lingered in the eyes of Western media, elites, and leaders – strengthening analogies to past genocides:

…the terrible spectre of about 1,000 young men, old men, men apparently of military age, but not showing signs of having done any military service, certainly not in the Kosovo Liberation Army, being released from a prison near Mitrovica. People I’ve called the living dead and certainly these are the kind of images which we have become used to seeing on our movie screens recollecting former days of European history, but certainly not live on our TV screens, reflecting the reality of the present (Shea and Jertz 1999b).

Kosovo – with its human shields, protecting the Serbian military against NATO air strikes, its systematic rapes, with innocents “herded” from their homes and into forced labor camps, and endless mass graves – was not merely reminiscent of Bosnia, but also of all previous campaigns of systematic killing and genocide. Kosovo was denounced as the worst in decades. Stafan de Mistoura, a senior official of the UN who worked in 17 conflict zones, stated that Kosovo was “the most cynical, calculated, glacially coldy planned humanitarian tragedy that I have seen in 29 years working for the United Nations” (quoted in Shea 1999 and Jertz 1999c). Most importantly, NATO was in full agreement with Ambassador Kuka, of Albania, that “Milosevic is the chief architect of
the genocide and the ethnic cleaning campaign in Kosovo…” – removing any blame from the Albanian counterparts (Shea and Kuka 1999).

US Ambassador David Scheffer’s statement below showcases this dynamic clearly, also acting to justify the selection of Kosovo for humanitarian intervention, while muting other international calls for help.

With the exception of Rwanda in 1994 and Cambodia in 1975, you would be hard pressed to find a crime scene anywhere in the world since World War II where a defenceless civilian population have been assaulted with such ferocity and criminal intent and suffered so many multiple violations of international humanitarian law in such a short period of time as in Kosovo since mid-March 1999.

There are hideous crime scenes elsewhere recently - Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sudan come to mind – but Kosovo represents a government-planned campaign to eliminate either through forced deportation or killing, most of an ethnic population from its home…The list of war crimes and crimes and again humanity being committed in Kosovo is diverse, covering such a wide range of criminal behaviour that it represents almost a text-book example of how not to wage warfare (Ambassador David Scheffer in Shea and Scheffer 1999).

The analogies to past genocide campaigns helped place all the blame of the Kosovo conflict solely under Milosevic’s regime – revoking any gradations of victimhood from the Serbian nation, its narratives, and its demands. As Air Commodore David Wilby stated for NATO in April 1999, “[Milosevic] has not been able to convince public opinion that Serbia is the victim. All too clearly we have seen who is the victim and who is the victimizer, and he remains the person who bears the full responsibility for the human tragedy that we have witnessed in Kosovo” (Shea and Wilby 1999a). The victimizer, in this case, was guilty of the worst of the worst in liberal, Western minds – a pre-conceived plan to eradicate an ethnic identity, a pending genocide. The systematic nature of Serbia’s violence against its ethnic Albanians was truly what allied the West behind the side of the rebels, not the state.
…these actions of the Serb forces have been following a pre-arranged pattern. This type of humanitarian disaster is not improvised. It represents a master plan that was conceived and well on its way to being executed before the first NATO bomb was dropped against a military target (Shea and Wilby 1999b).


Former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair was one of the staunchest supporters of an intense military intervention in Kosovo because of these very perceptions of the conflict. “I felt that this was the closest thing to racial genocide that I’ve seen in Europe since the Second World War,” he claimed in post-intervention interviews (Blair 2000). Perceptions and then outcomes of ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Serbian government were imperative in continuing the NATO bombing until Milosevic agreed to Western demands.
The US State Department also went out of its way to publicize and denounce the war crimes committed by the Serbian military during the NATO bombing, ensuring the international community that these crimes would be prosecuted by the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. Press briefings, longer reports, and photographic evidence of the violations of human rights in Kosovo were regularly verified by the US and then publicized widely (see for example, US Department of State 1999a, 1999b for full documents; see Mark Smith 2009 for an analysis of Western public diplomacy in Kosovo).

In turn, public opinion became more and more favorable as the Kosovo Crisis evolved in the media and NATO began to publicize plans of involvement. Since the breakdown of the Rambouillet peace negotiations in February 1999 – which depicted Serbian elites as unyielding to diplomacy and ethnic Albanian elites as highly cooperative – American public support for a military intervention in Kosovo steadily grew, alongside knowledge of the political context in Kosovo. Before March of 1999, only 70 percent of Americans had “seen, heard, or read” about Kosovo, but by April, that number grew to 96 percent (The Kosovo Conflict in the Polls 1999). Before Rambouillet, only 43 percent of Americans supported US participation in a NATO mission, but by April 1999, public support had risen to over 61 percent (Gillespie 1999). As the NATO mission progressed and the media released more images and background stories of Kosovar refugees, the American public even began supporting the idea of ground troops in Kosovo. More than half of respondents supported the option of ground troops if the air mission failed, while over 67 percent of Americans favored the use of ground troops to fulfill a moral obligation to help Kosovar refugees (Gillespie 1999). This progression echoed patterns on public perceptions of national interests in Kosovo. In early March of 1999, only 27 percent of respondents agreed that vital national interests were at stake in Kosovo, but by April, the rate stood at almost 50 percent.
The prevention of a larger war, the need for the US to “protect the world against such events” and worries over a refugee spillover were cited as the most significant interests. Nevertheless, in all polls, the moral imperative for Kosovo greatly outweighed the national interests arguments for the sample of respondents (The Kosovo Conflict in the Polls 1999).\(^\text{30}\)

Across the Western sphere, public support for the Kosovo mission had risen by April 1999, primarily due to the shifting humanitarian context and the placing of blame. In Canada, 65 percent of respondents strongly agreed that there was a moral obligation to help the victims (with 28 percent being somewhat in agreement). In Denmark, 59 percent agreed that one should be prepared to use military force when human rights are endangered, as in the case of Kosovo. In German and Spanish polls, over 50 percent of respondents agreed that a NATO war in Kosovo was justified. In the UK, over 65 percent of those surveyed agreed that Kosovo constituted a “humanitarian outrage” that should not be tolerated by the outside world, and almost 90 percent of people agreed that the UK had a moral duty to prevent further killings and human rights abuses in Kosovo. In the US, over 70 percent of respondents believed that the US had a moral obligation to establish peace in Kosovo, and over 80 percent agreed that the US had a responsibility to provide humanitarian assistance to refugees (The Kosovo Conflict in the Polls 1999). The numbers were consistently higher when applying the argument of suspected genocide in Kosovo. The graph below compares approval and opposition rates (averages from March-April 1999) of a NATO intervention in Kosovo across different Western and select non-Western countries – distinguished by their status as a NATO member or non-member.

\(^\text{30}\) On average, 68% of respondents said that moral imperative was a more important reason than national interests in the potential Kosovo mission. See ICR Survey Research Group for National Public Radio/ Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government.
As in the case of Kosovo’s rise in the international agenda, the transformed perception of the Kosovo conflict, partially due to the publicized suffering of innocent families, was also a crucial factor behind the rise in public support for the intervention. For instance, in France, by early April, over 77 percent of respondents said that President Milosevic was fully to blame for the conflict in Kosovo, and thus, was also responsible for the air bombings. German and Slovakian citizens believed, by 68 percent, that Serbia was to blame for the extension of the Kosovo Crisis, while Spanish citizens held Milosevic responsible at 64 percent. Similar polls reflected the trend that the air strikes against Serbia were fully justified.

Even Russian public opinion, which stood as an exception to the larger European pattern, can be explained by conflict perceptions on Kosovo. In March of 1999, Russian respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the causes of the “Yugoslavian conflict” were aggressive US/NATO policies and Albanian provocation – not Milosevic’s cruel regime. Due to such perceptions, these
respondents believed that the Kosovo conflict was merely “Yugoslavia’s business”, not a concern for the world community. Yet these numbers dropped significantly, from over 60 percent to 26 percent from 1998 to 1999 – with the increase of media accounts and elite narratives on the plight of the blameless Kosovar Albanians in comparison to the Serbian aggressors (Russia’s Center of Public Opinion 1999).

The shift in narratives that declared Kosovo as a case of ethnic cleansing or even genocide, starting with elite opinions and ending with public opinion consensus, opened the way for a robust regional reaction to the crisis. Now, the West had to fend against acts of potential genocide on its doorstep, not simply tolerate another Balkan ethnic war. Inaction in this case amounted to the non-enforcement of basic liberal, western values and the futility of Western institutions.

**Defending Western Identities and Institutions through Humanitarianism**

Kosovo was now about the solidification of Western identity, the hope of Western institutional change, and the expansion of the Western neighborhood. The now one-sided atrocities occurring within Kosovo challenged the most fundamental of Western values and mechanism of collective security. To repeat Solana’s (1999a) rhetoric from above, the Kosovo intervention was a conflict between “two visions of Europe.” One vision maintains a divided European neighborhood, with regions like the Balkans symbolizing a Europe of ethnic purity, authoritarianism, and nationalistic obsessions; and European Union members symbolizing democratic, pluralism, and cosmopolitan values. The Kosovo intervention was to integrate the whole continent within the latter vision. Indeed, Kosovo was right on “NATO’s doorstep,” the pillar of Western collective security (Clinton 1999a, 451-52). It may first appear as a mere rhetorical embellishment, but Clinton’s and NATO’s repeated references to crafting an “undivided Europe” boosted Kosovo to the international agenda – but only after the violence became
understood as ethnic cleansing, not civil war (Clinton 1999a, 451). The European-US partnership, as consistently reaffirmed during the Kosovo Crisis by all Western elites, further extended the normative power and functionality of the evolving neighborhood. As Ivo Daalder (2000), then serving as director for European Affairs at the National Security Council, summarized, “On the one hand lies integration in the rest of Europe at one fork of the road; at the other, is utter darkness.” The Western reaction to Serbia’s aggression demarcated the borders of the Western civilization, and this was enforced by NATO, both physically and normatively.

Even the “Christmas ultimatum” of 1992 discussed as a signaler of latent humanitarian intent, which threatened the use of US force against Serbian aggression in Kosovo, was revoked by the late 1990s due to the need for a unified Western response. Daalder (2000) stated that it was imperative that the “threat of force had to be a NATO threat.” In other words, had Kosovo not existed in close proximity to Western institutions, easily adaptable within the European identity, the intervention may have never materialized. General Wesley Clark affirmed that the usage of NATO was the key to the beginning and ultimate continuation of the Kosovo intervention until Milosevic’s capitulation. It was “‘do or die” for NATO, he said. “That was one of Milosevic's other great miscalculations--that somehow because NATO was far away and Serbia was close, that he would maintain the interest and the commitment to Kosovo, and NATO would lose interest. He failed to understand NATO” (Wesley Clark 2000). The ultimate concern was that ethnic cleansing campaigns simply could not be tolerated within Europe – each time this phrase was mentioned, it always ended with “in Europe”, implying that similar campaigns of violence elsewhere may be more easily tolerated by the international community.

The dialogue introduced in this section highlights that, beyond geopolitical national interests or humanitarian need, the Kosovo mission was about bringing the Balkans back under
the “European mainstream,” with the help of all Western institutions and resources. There was a humanitarian emergency, not just another periphery ethnic war, within the heart of the West. “NATO prevailing is the best long-term recipe for the stability and economic lift-off of the area in which everybody has an interest…”, said NATO Spokesperson Jamie Shea, reminding the audience of elites that “…an impressive array of countries are willing to put their long term interests in a secure and democratic Balkans, ahead of their short term economic gain (Shea and Marani 1999a). Paradoxically, Kosovo was in the long-term interests of Western actors, but it was also not about their short-term national gains. Beyond such contradictions, Kosovo was not “mobilization for strategic purposes, not for sort of classical interests but for humanitarian purposes” (Shea and Marani 1999b). “This is perhaps one of the very few genuine humanitarian conflicts in modern times…” concluded Spokesman Shea and Brigadier General Marani (1999) – thereby effectively dismissing the many other bloody (and often bloodier) intrastate conflicts occurring before and alongside Kosovo in non-Western regions of the world.

Once the Kosovo Crisis came to be synonymous with ethnic cleansing, attempted genocide, and the deaths of innocents, the mission became about the enforcement of nonnegotiable liberal expectations and values in Europe. The hard-won peace within the walls of the EU was not sufficient if it occurred simultaneously with violence just outside of its borders or within “the heart of Europe,” claimed several key elites along the way, including UK Prime Minister Blair (Shea, Jertz, and Maltinti 1999). But the institutions of the Western neighborhood were the real catalysts that made the choice to intervene in the Kosovo Crisis less burdensome and less risky for individual countries and leaders. Western partners pooled resources for refugee monitoring and management, including provision of financial aid to outsider countries willing to host refugees (which convinced the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia). This resource pooling applied broadly to
humanitarian aid, the construction of refugee camps, water sanitation, all levels of civil and
compute engineering, and security monitoring. The enforcement of visa restrictions, economic and
trade sanctions against Yugoslavia were also facilitated by pooling the will and resources of
partner countries and regional institutions (Shea and Jertz 1999e). In addition, NATO, the EU, and
the OESC provided security assurances to non-member countries willing to help in the crisis. Thus,
even intelligence sharing, media strategies, and the prospects for post-conflict rebuilding were
deemed easier in the case of Kosovo, made normatively easier as well by the rhetorical support of
the UN via its many resolutions against Milosevic’s regime (NATO Operational Allied Force
1999).

Due to a broad normative consensus to act in Kosovo, NATO countries could afford to
offer economic aid to any and all countries willing to join the efforts, such as “with balance of
payments; with debt rescheduling; for instance with grants to help them to offset the lost trade
resulting from this crisis; and finally we are helping with institutional links” (Shea, Jertz, and
Maltinti 1999). Pooled Western resources went to work beyond the borders of Serbia and Kosovo.
These resources and coordinated units were responsible for drastic improvements to Albania’s
infrastructure as well – intended to aid transportation into Kosovo by NATO troops. Therefore,
NATO troops were heavily involved in repairing Albania’s roads, airfield capabilities, expanding
and setting up new refugee camps, and much more. In such friendly countries, NATO was allowed
carte blanche to operate, and in exchange, such countries benefitted from NATO shared resources.
This trajectory further enforced the continued importance of the Kosovo intervention and speaks
loudly to its intensity levels. Western organizations were very aware of such a sharing dynamic,
encouraging it so as to ensure a military intervention in the Balkans:

But this is not something that we intend to try and handle alone. NATO is only one
international organisation. The European Union, obviously is going to have a crucial role
to play in economic stabilisation and economic reconstruction as well as humanitarian aid and its playing that role already...we are going to have to look to the special skills of the humanitarian relief organisations that we ourselves do not have. The OSCE clearly is going to come back into the picture before too long with its work on human rights and elections and the rest, so I think that NATO is going to play its role, like in Bosnia in the long term stabilisation and reconstruction of this region which we want to address as soon as the Kosovo crisis has been ended but we will only be one of the actors on the stage (Shea and Wilby 1999c).

In other words, before the Kosovo mission began, Western countries were almost certain that they would not be in it alone. Instead, they would have the material and immaterial backing of several specialized Western institutions – indeed, all of them. While the mission required a “NATO Core” to ensure trust between third parties and ethnic Albanians, maintain credibility for participating member states, and strengthen the military effects of the mission (noting past historical lessons in Bosnia), the Kosovo mission was more than just NATO (Shea and Jertz 1999g). NATO was only to provide military and security resources, while the OSCE focused on democratization, election monitoring, and civilian rebuilding. Then, individual countries volunteered troops, finances, and specialized expertise, as the UN indirectly condoned the mission through its rhetoric, statements, and inaction against regional institutions.

In fact, NATO Spokesman Jamie Shea was adamant in revoking labels of Kosovo as a “NATO protectorate,” instead offering the term “international protectorate,” adding that the mission would involve “all the resources of the international community” and that NATO merely helped coordinate the flow of aid in the humanitarian efforts (Shea and Wilby 1999c). NATO’s ultimate goal was to be replaced by a number of civil organizations and specialized units, such as UNHCR teams. Financial assistance from international governmental organizations (IGOs) was also readily expected, as Secretary-General of NATO discussed in official statements and interviews. “This is just the beginning of the international community's investment in the longer
term stability of the region,” Solana (1999c) stated in relation to IGO funding and aid, “and this stability will extend to include a democratic Yugoslavia.”

The NATO and Western dialogue fully depicts the propensities of a “good neighborhood,” as per Keohane (2003). Sovereignty is shared and often surrendered by members for the shared interests of the neighborhood. The neighborhood’s institutions then get to work on solving regional issues, instead of relying on individual states with isolated resources. In a good neighborhood, the likelihood of successful third-party missions also increases dramatically, given the knowledge that institutions will continue to contribute to post-conflict rebuilding and institutionalization of the conflict zone. This was surely the case in NATO discussions, which occurred months in advance of the Kosovo Crisis.

I will be obviously reporting to you on the contribution that NATO intends to make towards the long-term reconstruction of the south-east European area, particularly in the field of security... As I always emphasise, NATO is not simply interested in fighting the conflict. We are even more interested in building the peace that will follow (Shea 1999e).

Post-conflict rebuilding in Kosovo was predicted and pooled in nature due to one of the underlying themes of the mission: the fostering of democracy. NATO envisioned itself as a group of strong democratic countries with a unifying democratic ethos driving them to action. Naturally, a violence-free Kosovo would be on its way to a democratic Kosovo, finally bringing the Balkans in line with the rest of democratic, “civilized,” “rational” Europe. Such were the exact words repeated over and over in most comparisons between NATO, the EU, and the US versus its Yugoslavian nemesis. For 50 years, NATO defended the “values of any civilized democratic community of nations, and every leader of this Alliance shares this conviction” (Shea and Freytag 1999a). The countries of such a community are so civilized that they are expected to cooperate “fully with international law because [they] are the people who promote and defend international
law,” in comparison to the barbaric others who break this international law (Shea and Jertz 1999e). As Shea and Air Commodore Wilby (1999d) discussed, “it’s very difficult for rational people in Western democracies to anticipate what irrational people are going to do.” General Wesley Clark (SACEUR) reaffirmed, “…liberal democracies have a hard time truly appreciating what's happening right now in Kosovo….perpetrated largely against defenceless civilians by the last vestige of a hard-core communist dictatorship in Europe.” In the same conference, NATO Secretary-General Solana even used the term “barbarous age in Europe” to refer to the nature of non-EU countries (Clark and Solana 1999). When Bulgaria allowed NATO to use its airspace against Yugoslavia, the terminology was that NATO now had a “ring of steel around Yugoslavia…a circle of democratic solidarity” against the brutal, non-European leader, Milosevic (Shea and Jertz 1999h).

Western public opinion echoed such sentiments on Yugoslavia as well. In the Netherlands, respondents overwhelmingly viewed Milosevic as power hungry, untrustworthy, and highly aggressive (with rates at over 80 percent in 1999). US citizens had a very unfavorable view of Yugoslavia, with 45 percent of respondents having mostly unfavorable views and 27 percent having very unfavorable views. Similarly, US citizens considered the Serbian attacks against ethnic Albanians to be a form of barbaric genocide. These numbers stood at 60 percent in early 1999 and increased to 67 percent right before the aerial campaign in the spring. At the same time, public opinion of Milosevic as a war criminal stood at almost 70 percent agreement (The Kosovo Conflict in the Polls 1999).

Thankfully, there was hope for the uncivilized Balkans, as Western elites consistently searched for hints of democratic counter-forces and the revitalization of democracy within dictatorial Yugoslavia. Press briefings and internal dialogues were rife with both personal and
official stories of Yugoslavian and Serbian politicians, citizens, and officials “breaking rank” from Milosevic and joining Western forces. This was “a democratic Serbia lurking in the underground” – something that fortified the goals of the Kosovo mission before its occurrence and long after the last bomb had dropped (Shea and Jertz 1999f).

We are offering the Yugoslav people an alternative to the counter-productive policies of the government, an alternative of democratisation, of reform, of integration into the European mainstream, of security based on co-operation not confrontation, that the door is open to the rest of Europe (Shea and Marani 1999c).

The West couldn’t wait to “welcome a democratic Yugoslavia back into the European family, as part of a stable Balkan region” (Solana 1999d). Indeed, the West simply needed to “exercise once and for all the demon of ethnic nationalism in that part of Europe… ‘the bleeding would of Europe,,’” for the sake of the West as a whole (Shea and Freytag 1999b). Public opinion was also rather optimistic about the prospects of a democratic peace in the Balkans after a NATO intervention. In the US in particular, 50 percent of respondents in March 1999 believed that military involvement would bring peace to the region, and these numbers grew by April (The Kosovo Conflict in the Polls 1999).

Perhaps the most telling sign that Kosovo was truly a regional reaction and phenomenon – all about European identity and Western institutional tools – is NATO Secretary-General Solana’s response to a key question during an interview: Is the Kosovo mission a warning to all dictators throughout the world? In other words, do dictators elsewhere have to worry that their domestic atrocities would be met with the same NATO response as in Kosovo? Solana’s answer was a concise, unabashed no – unless the region was just right.

Let me say first of all that NATO is not a global organisation. When you say whatever it is, it is too broad a concept, but in the region of our responsibilities I think that what has happened in the last months is more important than whatever I could say now. Look at the
facts and that is the behaviour of an Alliance of democratic countries that is able to act in a coherent matter to stop something that never could have happened, or should have happened, in Europe (Solana 1999e).

In less ambiguous terms, Solana was admitting that had Kosovo not been situated in Europe – with all that this neighborhood provided – it would NOT have experienced a NATO-led military intervention. The world would not have reacted with a military mandate. Solana (1999c) was justifying and predicting NATO’s and general international inactivity within future intrastate conflicts outside the Western neighborhood. US public opinion echoed this regional argument quite strongly. When asked “Should US be willing to intervene in Africa and Asia as much as in Bosnia and Kosovo”, only 41 percent of respondents agreed that the US should intervene equally across regions, while 45 said that the US should intervene less in Africa and Asia (The Kosovo Conflict in the Polls 1999).

From the European perspective, Kosovo was unique as well, due to its ability to showcase the grave need for European collective security. Kosovo framed discussions on the future of the region. As Joschka Fischer, the German Foreign Minister and Vice-Chancellor, said at the European Council meeting during the German presidency, “Unlike 1991/92, the EU pursued a common line in the Balkans this time, which can be explained by the fact that the European States had at last recognised that it was not just about moral duty or the future of a region on the periphery of Europe, but about their own security, indeed our collective security” (Fischer 1999). He continued the discussion on security, while adding in elements of Western identity and regional neighborhoods, just like his US counterparts had done:

In Europe, there is just one single, indivisible kind of security; that is, the logical conclusion we can draw from our experience of the tragedy in Kosovo. If we had stood idly by in the face of bloodthirsty, aggressive nationalism on our continent, then ultimately the fate of European integration itself, the greatest achievement in recent
European history, would have been placed in jeopardy. We could not and would not allow this to happen.

The Kosovo conflict has propagated two important ideas in the EU. Firstly, *South-Eastern Europe is now widely and unreservedly accepted as being part of Europe.*

This discussion overtook almost the full session of the European Parliament meeting in 1999, centering on the need for greater economic cooperation between Western Europe and its new Eastern neighbors, increased free trade agreements, and most importantly, the priority of democratization in Serbia and the extension of Western rule of law throughout the Balkans. All participants agreed that, “the key to the lasting stabilisation of the region will be the democratisation of Serbia…” (European Parliament 1999). In statements to follow, Fischer (1999) joined together dimensions of Western identity and region to explain the Kosovo Crisis and even drew parallels to post-WWII Western Europe as a fragile but reconstructed neighborhood of stability and democracy:

…for the first time in its history, South-Eastern Europe now has a real opportunity to break with nationalism and violence forever and draw closer to an integrated Europe. Reconciliation was able to take place in Western Europe after 1945 and so it can in the Balkans today, provided that it is possible to root out the hatred and violence of nationalism there too. For this to be achieved, it is important that the European Union should make the securing of peace in South-Eastern Europe a priority in peacetime too.

His colleagues concurred, especially regarding the importance of preserving Western civilization and the role of Western institutions and values in creating the ideal expanded neighborhood. Hans-Gert Pottering (1999), a German conservative politician and later President of the European Parliament declared that, “Our message on the threshold of the year 2000 must be: never again are people in Europe to be driven from their homes, from their homeland. Human rights, human dignity, the right to a homeland are the foundation of our European civilisation.” Next, Bas Belder
(1999) from the Netherlands expanded upon the importance of Western institutions and the aspiration to behaving as good Western neighbors:

If we are to consolidate the fragile peace on the legendary killing fields of Kosovo Polje, there must be optimum co-operation between the international organisations concerned; the UN for the return of the refugees, the OSCE in terms of constructing democracy, and the EU for economic and social construction. If international co-ordination is lacking or falls short then the price paid for this will be institutional chaos. For its part, the EU would do well to guard against this critical danger.

…we are certainly in favour of being on good neighbourly terms. Indeed, that is in every sense our Christian duty.

In sum, Keohane’s (2003) “good neighborhood” characteristics stand at the forefront of the NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999. The struggle towards a unified Western identity, security infrastructure, and institutional resources all propelled Kosovo above the rest in 1999, leading to a military intervention against Serbia, in protecting of innocent Albanian civilians (or so was the perception). First, the crisis needed to undergo a transformation in perceptions so as to fall under Western norms of protection of innocents, but ultimately, such a framework is regional in application. The interaction is twofold: 1.) a favorable shift in conflict perceptions was required to access Western resources; 2.) but favorable perceptions may not have helped had Kosovo existed far outside of the Western neighborhood and its pooled institutions.

5.4. Conclusions

The interaction between states, elites, and various organizations solidified a favorable conflict perception for the Kosovo Crisis. The perception shift was sudden, mainly because media and leadership interest in Kosovo was sudden as well, relying on the reports of acute massacres to spark humanitarian and security interests. But once the massacres in Kosovo entered the Western consciousness, it wasn’t long before analogies to Bosnia, the Holocaust, and past Western mistakes came to the rescue – increasing the probability of third-party military intervention in Kosovo. But
such a pattern was strengthened in its influence due to Kosovo’s location within the “heart of Europe” and its role as a test of NATO’s regional benefits. Had Kosovo been located outside the sphere of Western influence, without the institutional benefits provided by NATO, the EU, OESC, and other regional actors, favorable conflict perceptions may not have altered the pathway of intervention. But then again, had the Kosovo Crisis remained well within the narrative of a civil war, it may have taken the West many more years to intervene with military force, as in the case of Bosnia. Even within the Western neighborhood, an intervention is not guaranteed against humanitarian abuses, especially when past historical lessons cannot be applied to the narrative.

In Kosovo’s case, however, the lessons to be learned were plentiful. Especially from the eyes of the European Union, the Kosovo Crisis signified a turning point – a watershed moment – that precipitated a common security and foreign policy. This lesson learned propelled the EU into multiple shared missions in the future. As Joschka Fischer (1999) summarized by the end of the Kosovo Crisis:

[The EU]...turned the crisis to good account as an incentive to achieve further integration. The reason for this is that the war in Kosovo served to highlight again that the essence of European integration is to establish a lasting framework for peace on our continent. This insight resulted in an awareness of the degree to which the national interests of individual Member States are interconnected, and in a readiness throughout Europe to take a decisive step forward in the historic task of bringing European integration to fruition.

But the militarization of the neighborhood, in simple realist terms, was not the ultimate goal here – it was about developing the correct institutions to preserve the liberal Western ethos in the region. The lesson learned was that it was a European duty to further integrate periphery neighbors and to ensure security, peace, and democracy for the continent as a whole – even by resorting to military force.

…this is not about militarisation of the European Union at all, but about developing it into an effective force for peace which has the ability to act, and which is able, as in Kosovo,
to uphold the power of justice and the renunciation of violence, thus ensuring that war as a political instrument in Europe is forever a thing of the past…This requires our determination to oppose those who seek to carry out nationalist policies through violence, murder, terror and expulsion, and when all other means fail, to resort to military means if necessary (Fischer 1999).

Thus, we can most closely place the Kosovo Crisis intervention within the 2nd pathway to intervention, first introduced in Chapter 1 and revised at the beginning of this chapter (see Figure 13). Kosovo initially presented with humanitarian abuses but low traditional security interests to the great powers, a pathway that predicts low probabilities of third-party intervention. But in the background of Western involvement in the Balkans alongside NATO’s need to restore its security image, Kosovo picked up secondary interests for Western elites – such as solidifying a shared security protocol, reaffirming Western values, and spreading democracy as a mechanism for regional stability. Furthermore, the reframing of the Kosovo Crisis as systematic killing, no longer as ethnic war, mobilized Western resources toward intervention. The prospects of immense resource-pooling would not have existed outside of the Western neighborhood. Ultimately, a change in conflict perceptions led to the value-based usage of regional institutions, according to both the statistical modeling and case study narrative. Such an interaction between perception and region appears to have driven the dramatic decision to militaristically intervene in Kosovo in 1999, preceded by years of almost absolute international indifference to the same violence.
CHAPTER 6. INTERVENTION IN LIBYA: NATIONAL INTEREST AND REGIONAL DEMANDS

What's important in Libya is, first of all, it has a good deal of oil. A lot of the country is unexplored; there may be a lot more. And it's very high-quality oil, so very valuable.

Noam Chomsky, 2011

The Libya intervention in March 2011 marked the first time since the Kosovo Crisis that the international community had sanctioned military action under UN Security Council Chapter VII. In other words, it was the first time that a group of states legalized the use of force to prevent abuses by another state against its own people, without the target state’s consent. This adds Libya to the short list of “humanitarian military interventions” in the post-9/11 international sphere – signifying to some the triumph of humanitarian norms since the 1990s (Alkopher 2016). As the predictive models in chapter 5 would infer, the intervention in Libya was quite probable, given Libya’s proximity to the Western neighborhood, perceptions of mass killings, and even strategic national interests in the region. In fact, not only did UN Resolution 1973 on Libya authorize no-fly zones, it also allowed military action to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas from Colonel Gadhafi’s forces. It was this UN resolution that gave NATO the legitimacy to defend cities and regions in Libya even if governmental armed forces there were not hurting civilians directly (Alkopher 2016). Yet beyond the fast military response, the international community refused to provide resources for post-conflict security and rebuilding in Libya, altering the trajectory of this conflict.

It is true that both the cases of Kosovo and Libya present with key characteristics that increase the odds of internalization of conflict and military intervention, according to the previous aggregated models. Both crises were proximate to the Western neighborhood and elicited perceptions of systematic governmental violence. At a glance, Libya appears to be an extension
and even intensification of the patterns that drove NATO to militarily intervene in Kosovo, yet as this chapter will reveal, the Libya military intervention pathway presents with distinct dimensions, especially as related to regional interests and institutions.

In the case of Libya, there seems to be a division between international and regional obligations. In UN Resolutions 1970 and 1973, Dunne and Gifkins (2011) find a disturbing lack of reference to the international community’s responsibility to act against civilian deaths in Libya. Instead, the documentation only invoke the R2P principle to highlight “the responsibility of the Libyan authorities to protect the Libyan population” (Dunne and Gifkins 2011, 521). Therefore, these documents focus more on the duties of Libya as a sovereign state to protect its citizens than on any global norm to collectively intervene in times of crisis. Serving as the tip of the iceberg, these initial documents hint that while NATO did intervene in Libya, it offered very different narratives from the ones introduced in Kosovo.

The campaign against the Libyan state began as an ad hoc “coalition of the willing” led by US Africa Command (AFRICOM). But when the US was reluctant to lead indefinitely, other options emerged, such as a British- and French-led campaign (Michaels 2011). NATO ultimately chose to involve itself at this stage, gathering support from new NATO members, such as the Czech Republic and Romania, and relaxing regional oppositions to the mission (e.g. France and Turkey) (Watt et al. 2011). Such regionalization of intervention was a pre-condition to intervention in Libya, as it was in Kosovo, only this time it occurred much earlier in the discussion and much more explicitly.

In contrast to Kosovo, NATO demanded that legal protocol and regional institutions already be active in a target state – instead of crafting such coordination or mandates on its own. In Libya, NATO considered an intervention against Colonel Gadhafi’s security forces only once
regional support was guaranteed and paralleling UN mandates. Regionalization of the response also provided a strong foundation of legitimacy for third-party actors within Libya. As NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen (2011a) confirmed, “We protected the people of Libya with political support from the region, and with operational support from many of our partners in the region.” This regionalization of intervention, which strengthened mission legitimacy, also opened the way for the pursuit of geopolitical interests. After all, Libya presented with greater security interests than did Kosovo for international actors. In fact, Rasmussen (2011) claimed that the Libya intervention occurred to protect civilians and preserve their right to freedom, but more so, it occurred “to prevent Libya from becoming a failed state” (Rasmussen cited in Wagnsson 2011, 593). Unlike in the case of Kosovo, NATO leaders did not attempt to label the Libya intervention as a fully humanitarian endeavor. Instead, they were quite blunt in their discussion of strategic interests in Libya.

Given such considerations, Libya’s pathway of intervention relies on the interaction between humanitarian conflict perceptions and the pursuit of geopolitical interests. Key Western actors held security interests in Libya, related to oil resources, risks of terrorism, failed statehood, and the international impact of Gadhafi’s regime. But they didn’t explicitly act upon these interest until a sudden, irrefutable humanitarian crisis in Libya activated the narrative of a benign, transatlantic intervention via favorable conflict perceptions, humanitarian intent, and the assurance of regional support and institutional legitimacy. Libya was near a Western neighborhood, and this regional dimension coupled with perceptions of a violence that breached liberal norms led to the internationalization of the conflict. But since Western strategic interests were short-term in nature, so was the Libyan intervention, with minimal post-conflict considerations, unlike the more “heart of Europe” counterpart in Kosovo.
Before delving into the empirical analysis behind such claims, the figure below illustrates such a pathway to Libya’s intervention using the primary variables of the study. The existence of humanitarian abuses, understood as systemic governmental killings against a largely defenseless civilian target, provided cover for third-party pursuits of geopolitical interests within Libya. The legitimacy and the pooled resources that international organizations provided served to facilitate state goals. But since Libya is not within a Western neighborhood or directly bordering it, this institutional mechanism required support outside of the Western sphere. In sum, the immediate conflict perception of Libya as a site of systematic killings prompted a favorable context for the pursuit of Western interests and as a baseline enforcement of the R2P principle. The UN and NATO then served to increase legitimacy and security and economic resource-sharing.

In the following section, I introduce the historical background to the Libyan Crisis before analyzing the standard explanations of intervention, including strategic national interests and humanitarian need in isolation. Most of the chapter then offers evidence for the proposed pathway of intervention within Libya. In such a pathway, conflict perceptions of Libya as an urgent example of systemic killings interacted with vital geopolitical interests to allow for a very swift NATO-led military intervention, but little post-conflict investment from Western actors.  

---

31 The analysis of the Libyan intervention presents with more limitations than the previous Kosovo case. The Libya Crisis is more recent than the 1990s Kosovo intervention, leading to less declassified archival sources, less consistency in information, and doubts on information validity. Also, Libya’s instability makes it difficult to complete fieldwork on the ground.
6.1. Background and Timeline on the Libyan Crisis

By mid-January 2011, small, scattered protests began to emerge in Libya, partially prompted by the earlier civil uprisings in Tunisia and the beginnings of the “Arab Spring”. At this time, protesters demanded more freedom and less corruption from their current regime. But by February 2011, civilian protesters sought the end of Colonel Muammar Gadhafi’s 41-year reign in Libya (Johnson and Mesure 2011; Meo 2011). These demonstrations began in the capital of Tripoli, but within weeks, they spread rapidly across the country. Benghazi soon became the opposition’s stronghold and was thus subjected to brutal attacks by Gadhafi’s national army.

Libya’s leader promised Benghazi residents that his forces would show no mercy to rebels (“Gadhafi vows no mercy as UN eyes action” 2011). In other words, Gadhafi announced his intentions to commit mass human rights violations within domestic borders. In his speech on February 22, 2011, Gadhafi encouraged his followers to attack opposition “cockroaches,” “rats” and “mercenaries.” The Libyan leader then urged his loyal citizens to “cleanse Libya house by house” until protesting “traitors” surrendered (“Libya protests: Defiant Gadhafi refuses to quit”). Due to Gadhafi’s public, self-professed methods, the international community could not simply
categorize Libya as another identity war with equally culpable sides. Instead, Libya was immediately perceived as an example of systematic governmental killing of civilians.

As soon as the government began its indiscriminate crackdown on protesters, civil society groups from around the world pressured international bodies to uphold the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) clause in Libya. These groups first called on the Libyan government to stop the violence against civilians, but as it became clear that this would not occur, they demanded action from regional bodies, states, and the UN. The narrative of abuse in Libya escalated quickly with each passing day. By February 20, 2011, over the course of four days, Human Rights Watch (2011) confirmed that the civilian death toll stood at over 233. “A potential human rights catastrophe is unfolding in Libya as protesters brave live gunfire and death for a third day running,” said Sarah Leah Whitson, Middle East and North Africa director at Human Rights Watch, confirming the massacre of unarmed civilians in Libya, despite a government-imposed information blackout.

Reacting quicker than ever before to domestic conflict, the Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect issued a press release two days later. They urged the Libyan government to immediately end the violence against its own civilian population (UN Secretary-General’s Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect on the Situation in Libya” 2011). Three days later, the Human Rights Council (HRC) adopted Resolution S-15/2, making three key demands: 1.) that the Libyan government cease all human rights violations; 2.) the establishment of an international commission of inquiry; and 3.) the suspension of Libya from the General Assembly Council (HRC 2011). By early March, the General Assembly had unanimously suspended Libya’s membership to the Council (“Libya suspended from rights body” 2011).
Individual state actors, from the West to East, were also quick to condemn Colonel Gadhafi’s bloody crackdowns. From February 23 to 25, French President Nicolas Sarkozy called for EU sanctions against Libya, including the freezing of Gadhafi family assets, while the US closed its embassy in Tripoli and imposed economic sanctions on Libya. At the same time, Canada began Operation MOBILE, in which it sent armed forces to facilitate the evacuation of foreign nationals from Libya (Libya: Chronology of Events 2011).

As evidenced, the Libyan Crisis was almost unanimously publicized as an act of systematic killing by governmental forces. Unlike the Kosovo Crisis, the violence in Libya did not have to undergo a favorable conflict transformation to gain Western attention. It was immediately portrayed as such by regional organizations, UN channels, national leaders, and civilian NGOs.

Within the week of the attacks, broader concerns from the African Union (AU), Human Rights Council, Arab League (AL), and Organization of the Islamic Conference prompted the Security Council (2011) to unanimously adopt Resolution 1970 on February 26, 2011. The passage of Resolution 1970 marked the first time since a 2006 resolution on Darfur that the Council had officially referred to the R2P principle. The resolution imposed a travel ban on the Gadhafi family and key government members, it instituted an arms embargo, and referred the Libyan regime to the International Criminal Court (ICC) for investigation of crimes against humanity (Security Council 2011). Following this international consensus, Italy ended its friendship treaty with Libya, also voiding their nonaggression clause. In early March, US President Barack Obama issued his first public warning against Gadhafi, urging the Libyan leader to step down or face military sanctions. By March 10th, the EU had imposed an arms embargo, sanctions, and a travel ban on Gadhafi and his family, simultaneously freezing Libya’s sovereign wealth fund and central bank assets (Libya: Chronology of Events 2011).
While Western actors applied strong pressure against Gadhafi’s regime, including options of third-party intervention and regime change, regional actors such as the African Union (AU) consistently sought a peaceful solution. In fact, the AU explicitly rejected all proposals calling for third-party military responses. Instead of military retaliation, the AU adopted a Roadmap for Peace by the end of March, demanding an immediate ceasefire and the implementation of political reforms. This regional body was one of the few international actors to persistently push such a political solution, despite greater powers inching their way toward military airstrikes (Apuuli Kasaija 2013).

Western powers argued that the peaceful measures of Resolution 1970 failed to stop Gadhafi’s reign of terror against his own citizens, and on March 17th, the UN Security Council (2011b) adopted Resolution 1973, sanctioning a non-fly zone to protect civilians. It also allowed member states to take “all necessary measures (…) to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat” (UN Security Council 2011). While the resolution passed with strong support, key member states, including China, Russia, India, Brazil and Germany abstained from the vote – believing that diplomatic routes had not been exhausted within such a short period of time.

Several days after the passage of the resolution, Colonel Gadhafi issued an official condemnation of UNSC efforts, while Libyan government troops fired artillery and mortars into the city. This prompted the enforcement of the UN no-fly zone on March 19th, with the UK, US, France, and Canada launching operations against government forces in Tripoli, Misrata, and Benghazi. In quick succession, Operation Unified Protector (2012), now under NATO leadership, included 15 NATO members as well as Sweden, Jordan, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates (NATO Operation Unified Protector 2012). This coalition provided much needed support to the Libyan rebels in their fight against Gadhafi and his loyalist strongholds.
The Libya operation had both air and naval components, with Qatar only aiding the aerial component and all other members contributing to both naval and air support. During the operation, the US flew the largest number of sorties, followed by the UK and France, and then Italy and Canada. Qatar’s combat deployment, however, was of great regional significance as it was the first by an Arab or Muslim-majority country. Qatar was also the only country to commit ground troops to the mission, sending hundreds of Special Forces to fight alongside the Libyan opposition (NATO Operation Unified Protector 2012).

The Libyan conflict remained internationalized via the enforcement of the no-fly zone for eight months. It came to an end with the death of Gadhafi and his son Mutassim in late October 2011 (NATO Operation Unified Protector 2012). Unfortunately, this NATO mission in Libya did not prevent future civil wars, as seen by the renewal and persistence of internal violence years after the intervention.

Unlike the progression of the Kosovo Crisis, the Libyan military intervention occurred swiftly and unanimously via the UNSC – moving from policy discussion to airstrikes over the course of weeks, not years. Although the Libyan mission was UN-sanctioned, unlike its Kosovo counterpart, it did not include a post-conflict component. As soon as the military offensive ended with the overthrow of Colonel Gadhafi, international actors quickly dispersed without any plans for post-conflict rebuilding, institutionalization, or robust observation. Thus, while both Kosovo and Libya experienced technical humanitarian military interventions during periods of intrastate conflict, they ultimately endured drastically different types of internalization of conflict.

The swiftness in which the Libyan intervention occurred, with little time devoted to diplomatic measures or non-military routes, increases suspicions about the existence of key national interests on the part of the intervening coalitions. This becomes especially important when
noting how rarely such international actors had applied the R2P principle in unison in the past. Were Libya’s humanitarian atrocities truly so unlike any others in past that they received such a rapid third-party military response?

The primacy of humanitarian intent weakens when recalling the range of potential national interests in Libya. Italy, for instance, had grave economic concerns regarding the breakdown of the Libyan state, as Italy received 28% of its oil and 10% of its natural gas from Libya (Anderson 2011). Consequently, the two countries were highly interdependent on one another. France, also influenced by Libyan oil supply, intervened in Libya in the backdrop of a series of failed pro-regime stances in several other Arab Spring uprisings, such as in Egypt and Tunisia. Hence, it may have reacted differently in Libya so as to maintain its political influence or regain its regional reputation. Many European states worried heavily about the influx of refugees from nearby Libya, while non-European actors, such as Qatar, saw Libya as an opportunity to expand regional influence. The most potent critique against the humanitarian dimensions of the Libya intervention, however, has centered on NATO’s goals of regime change. NATO not only attempted to protect civilians in Libya, it went out of its way to aid rebels and effect regime change.

Below, I introduce the standard debate on the Libyan intervention – that between the primacy of humanitarian intent versus the reign of national interests across third-party interveners. I analyze the strengths and limitations of these perspectives through archival dialogues before moving towards the analysis of regional dynamics, including the role of the Western neighborhood, conflict perceptions, and institutional links. I conclude that perceptions of Libya as a case of systematic killings, coupled with readily available regional resources and multilateral mandates, made the pursuit of strategic geopolitical interests more favorable for third-party actors. Therefore, the Libyan intervention signifies the dominance of interests over humanitarian intent,
although both dimensions were evident during the crisis. Such a hierarchy of variables also reveals itself in the lack of post-conflict rebuilding within Libya. Lastly, I offer a preliminary comparison between the Kosovo Crisis of 1999 and the Libyan intervention of 2011.

6.2. Standard Explanations of NATO Intervention: Human Rights vs. Interests

It only took the UN Security Council one week to respond to the violent suppression of civil protests within Libya. On February 15th, 2011, the UNSC issued a press statement urging the Libyan government to fulfill its obligation to protect its citizens. Although the subsequent intervention in Libya was controversial, the idea that the international community needed to play a role in protecting Libyan citizens against their functioning domestic government seemed quite undisputed by February 2011 (Brockmeier et al. 2016). Soon after, the HRC recommended Libya’s suspension from the General Assembly Council, which was unanimously enforced by early March (HRC 2011, “Libya suspended from rights body” 2011, UN General Assembly 2011). Such rapid reactions reveal that, in the weeks before military intervention, the international community – consisting of Western states, most Arab League members, the African Union, and a significant number of Latin American and Asian countries – was unified behind some degree of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle in Libya. While such levels of unification on conflict perception and immediate international moral reactions were absent during the Kosovo Crisis, they were strong in the context of Libya.

Responsibility to Protect in Action?

A humanitarian argument for the Libyan intervention relies on this unified, swift international outrage, coupled with the evidence of human rights abuses on the ground. After all, by March 19th, as the NATO operations began, the death toll in Libya had spiked to more than 1,000 (Hamid 2016). These empirical reports from the ground further supported the narratives of
Colonel Gadhafi as a ruthless killer of his people, bent on his own political survival at any human cost. In turn, national leaders repeatedly expressed their concerns about the threat to life within Libya, without any lingering doubts about which side was to blame. French President Sarkozy was clear to delineate aggressor and victim in his call of action: “In Libya, the civilian population, which is demanding nothing more than the right to choose their own destiny, is in mortal danger…it is our duty to respond to their anguished appeal” (“Libya: US, UK and France Attack Gadhafi Forces” 2011). US President Obama issued a similarly structured call, “We cannot stand idly when a tyrant tells his people there will be no mercy” (“Libya: US, UK and France Attack Gadhafi Forces” 2011). Thus, many within the international community perceived a sense of moral duty regarding Gadhafi’s uninhibited aggression against his civilian protestors.

The following UN resolutions on Libya used the same language of humanitarian intention, clearly delineating victim from perpetrator in the domestic crisis. These documents even immediately labeled Gadhafi’s violent crackdowns as crimes against humanity.

“Deploring the gross and systematic violation of human rights, including the repression of peaceful demonstrators, expressing deep concern at the deaths of civilians, and rejecting unequivocally the incitement to hostility and violence against the civilian population made from the highest level of the Libyan Government…. Considering that the widespread and systematic attacks currently taking place in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya against the civilian population may amount to crimes against humanity…” (UN Security Council 2011a).

In Resolution 1973, these “crimes against humanity” become more explicit and detailed. They include the “arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, torture and summary executions” (UN Security Council 2011b). But the document focuses primarily on the “responsibility of the Libyan authorities to protect the Libyan population” – a stark contrast to the otherwise cosmopolitan-laden narrative.
In a short time, these humanitarian narratives began to take on more nuanced policy agendas, especially once NATO took full control of the mission. At the London conference on Libya, participants not only agreed to send “a clear message to Qadhafi that he cannot attack civilians with impunity” but they concurred on regime change, albeit one centered on the demands of the Libyan people – one without Gadhafi at the helm.

“We agreed that it is not for any of the participants here today to choose the government of Libya: only the Libyan people can do that. Participants agreed that Qadhafi and his regime have completely lost legitimacy and will be held accountable for their actions. The Libyan people must be free to determine their own future” (Hague 2011a).

The theme of regime change repeated itself during the Libya Contact Group meeting in Doha. The chairman, Foreign Secretary William Hague, summarized that all players “were united in believing that Qadhafi’s continued presence would threaten any resolution of the crisis.” Thus, “they called on all Libyans who wanted to see a process of political transition to urge Qadhafi to step down.” “Gadhafi must leave power,” Hague (2011) reasserted.

In a remarkable joint-statement, the leaders of the US, UK, and France framed this political aspect of the intervention in terms of humanitarian need and international law. “The people of Libya are suffering terrible horrors at Gadhafi’s hands… His rockets and his shells rained down on defenceless civilians in Ajdabiya. The city of Misrata is enduring a medieval siege as Gadhafi tried to strangle its population into submission. The evidence of disappearances and abuses grows daily,” write Obama, Cameron, and Sarkozy (2011) in the New York Times. Effectively, these leaders justified aiding rebel factions in Libya with the language of humanitarian intent, steering clear from outright regime change rhetoric. They do highlight, however, that “so long as Qaddafi is in power, NATO must maintain its operations so that civilians remain protected and the pressure on the regime builds” (Obama, Cameron, and Sarkozy 2011).
As NATO extended its mandate within Libya, it also went out of its way to justify the implicit goal of regime change as a humanitarian necessity. NATO authorities appear to defend their mission extension via an “us versus them” narrative of culpability. While still in the realm of humanitarian intent, these justifications occur in the backdrop of a very political reality of regime change. In a press conference, NATO Spokesperson Oana Lungescu begins this trend:

“I think what is clear is that what started the international community in its efforts to support the people of Libya were the systematic attacks by Colonel Gadhafi on his own people. The fact that you've seen the shelling of city centres with heavy artillery, the outrageous violence that we've seen from the authorities against unarmed protesters, that is how this all started, and we have to remember that” (Bouchard and Lungescu 2011).

Colonel Roland Lavoie, the military Spokesperson for Operation Unified Protector, adds a secondary component to these humanitarian justifications – that of a solid UN mandate. He states, “As long as there are attacks, threats of attacks and incitement of violence against civilians NATO will act to protect them. This is not a matter of religion, ethnicity or culture, but a commitment derived from a United Nations Security Council Resolution in order to protect innocent victims” (Romero and Lavoie 2011).

Thus, the humanitarian narrative was set as follows: 1.) Gadhafi was fully to blame for the situation in Libya; 2.) Gadhafi’s attacks against civilians activated the R2P principle, now enforced by NATO; and 3.) Due to Gadhafi’s horrifying humanitarian abuses, the only way to fully enforce the R2P principle and the UN mandate was via continued military attack aimed at regime change. In this case, NATO portrayed itself as a humanitarian vessel, steered toward more political goals by factors outside of its control. NATO Spokesperson Lungescu encouraged this pattern below, in response to a critiquing question on NATO’s continued mandate and obvious regime goals.

Let's not lose sight of the fact that it is the Qadhafi regime which started this crisis. Not NATO, not the international community. It is the Qadhafi regime who's deliberately and indiscriminately attacking civilians. It is the Qadhafi regime who has been deliberately and indiscriminately using tanks, guns and artillery against cities, like Misrata and Zintan. It is
the Qadhafi regime that has been deliberately and indiscriminately firing rockets from mosques and citing bunkers next to children's playgrounds (Lungescu and Bracken 2011).

**Libya: Security before Saving Lives**

These trends of regime change alongside humanitarian rhetoric, however, diminish the strength of a purely humanitarian cause for the swift Libyan intervention. In fact, several alternate accounts dictate that the Libyan intervention did very little to ameliorate the humanitarian circumstances of civilians – instead, sacrificing their wellbeing for political gains. On April 14th, Alan Kuperman questioned whether President Obama had used humanitarian rhetoric as false pretense for the intervention in Libya. Calculation of lives saved versus lives lost did not favor humanitarian intent. For example, after two months of fighting in Misrata, a city inhabited by 400,000 people, 257 people had been killed, combatants included. Of the 949 who had been wounded, less than three percent were women. According to Kuperman’s interpretation, such statistics did not support the widespread accusations that Gadhafi’s forces were indiscriminately attacking cities and civilians. Moreover, compared to the humanitarian crises in Rwanda, Darfur, Congo, and Bosnia, Libya’s targeting of rebel positions (before the no-fly zone) appeared relatively insignificant in systematic harm (Bachman 2016).

Beyond the threshold of humanitarian harm, Bachman (2016) argues that had NATO truly sought humanitarian relief above interests-based opportunities, it would have focused on the creation of humanitarian corridors and ceasefires, allowing civilians a chance to flee and seek further aid. But instead, NATO repeatedly rejected viable ceasefires, proposed by both the Libyan regime itself as well as regional organizations such as the AU. China was one of the most vocal critics of such NATO policymaking, calling the organization both hypocritical in their international standards and antithetical to humanitarian protection for Libyan civilians. An editorial in the *Global Times*, a popular nationalist tabloid in China read, “Although Libya had
announced a ceasefire and was willing to talk to the opposition forces, western countries still carried on the air raids, after making the UN pass their smartly designed no-fly zone resolution ... Although it is under the name of ‘protecting human rights and civilians,’ it is for their own economic and political interest.” *The People's Daily*, the official Communist party newspaper, added another scathing commentary: "The air raids clearly go against the original goal of protecting civilians in Libya. There has been a long history of western countries having double standards” (“Libya conflict: Reactions around the world 2011).

While little systematic data exists on state-level public opinion toward the Libyan intervention, the preliminary trends show large differences between Western and non-Western audiences. First, as Figure 22 shows, the intervention in Libya was less than popular, even in the eyes of Western audiences. Over 50 percent of individuals polled in Italy opposed the intervention, while levels of support remained below 50 percent for the majority of Western audiences – with France presenting as a large outlier. Even with such low polling numbers in the West, the discrepancy between these audiences and non-Western audiences is clear. Middle Eastern and African states presented with much lower levels of support for the Libya intervention. But ultimately, these public opinion numbers did not impact the decision-making of international elites, as state governments dove into the Libyan intervention before they knew what regional audiences preferred or expected. In other words, the third-party military intervention within Libya was not brought about by domestic pressure to enforce the R2P norm, but by fast-forming elite consensus across national borders and within international institutions. The question then remains, did the humanitarian context in Libya truly propel such fast consensus on international policymaking, or were other considerations at the forefront of the international agenda?
Consequently, geopolitical national interests can easily compete with the humanitarian narrative of the Libyan intervention. In this sub-section, I summarize the interests-based argument and then proceed to showcase its relative strengths to the humanitarian counterparts. Nevertheless, the national interest standard argument requires greater nuance, which may be gained by re-assessing the role of regional ties, institutions, and perceptions within the selectivity of intervention.

**Figure 23: Public Opinion on the NATO Libya Intervention**
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*Source: “Libya conflict: Reactions around the world” 2011*

When asked about Turkey’s stance on the Libya Crisis and pending military intervention, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan did not stick to the typical NATO script, showcased above. “I wish they would look at Libya with a conscientious eye instead of an eye for oil,” he said (“Libya conflict: Reactions around the world” 2011). Libya’s abundance of natural resources is a well-known international fact. It is, therefore, not surprising that the standard argument of geopolitical national interests dominates the debate on the Libya intervention. NATO intervening states had
strong national interests to preserve in the region. First, European states were quite reliant on Libya’s oil reserves – with Libya exporting about 85 percent of oil to Italy, France, the UK, and others. More specifically, Italy consumed about 28 percent of Libya’s oil, with France and the UK following next, at 17 and 8 percent, respectively (Anderson 2011). The domestic crisis of 2011 diminished oil productions to less than 20 percent of Libya’s national needs (Anderson 2011). Such a dramatic decline threatened both the security and economic prosperity of key oil-importing European states, especially France, Italy, and the UK. It is important to note that these same states played leading roles in the Libyan intervention by either providing air resources, directly training Libyan rebels, or even supplying weapons to the anti-Gadhafi factions (“Italy, France sending troops to advise Libyan rebels” 2011).

NATO did not hide their concern over Libya’s deduced oil production either. Contact Group meetings devoted much time to discussions on recovering Libya’s oil production and international distribution, even while the civilian crisis within Libya raged on. International pledges of funding were abundant, all in the aims of supporting Libya’s war-torn hydrocarbons infrastructures and industry – now handed over to a new, un-tested rebel regime.

…participants stressed the importance of international support to help the NTC to resume the production and export of crude oil. The Contact Group also welcomed the fulfillment of pledges of 200 million USD from Turkey, 100 million USD from Qatar, 5 million USD from Bahrain and Italy’s contribution of 250 million Euros in cash and 100 million Euros in refined oil products, and looked forward to disbursement of remaining pledges by France and Kuwait. The Group urged others to follow a similar path in support of the Libyan people (Fourth Meeting of the Libya Contact Group 2011).

Oil and economic risks weren’t the only drivers of national interests in Libya. For Western partners, a Gadhafi-led Libya was always a terrorist-sponsoring state (Boucek 2005). In the early 1970s, Colonel Gadhafi established terrorist training camps in Libya and provided a large number of weapons, funding, and safe heavens to an array of terrorist groups. In fact, it wasn’t until 2006,
when Gadhafi had cut off most of these ties, that the US removed Libya from the list of terrorism-sponsoring states (Boucek 2005).

Over the past decades, Colonel Gadhafi’s regime hindered the power aspirations of other NATO members as well. For example, Gadhafi’s meddling in the domestic affairs of Chad threatened France’s sphere of influence. Thus, France militarily supported Chad in its direct exchange against Libyan forces in the 1980s, leading to heavy losses for the French (St John 2011).32 Gadhafi’s provision of guns and explosives to the IRA also made the UK a victim of Libya’s past actions, especially during the attack on the government in the bombing of the Grand Hotel in Brighton in 1984 (St John 2011). Such historical examples of Libya’s aggression toward Western states are endless and further explain the motivations of Western regime change.

But such motivations aren’t limited to past actions and behavior. A contemporary failed Libyan state, close to a Western neighborhood, could exponentially increase terrorism in the region. Therefore, Western states had strong interests in regime change in Libya, hoping to temper down domestic instability while crafting a more favorable regional dynamic for the future. NATO Spokesperson Lungescu did not hesitate to discuss these security threats during her public press briefings:

Obviously a failed state in Libya would be the worst case scenario. Nobody wants a failed state in Libya or breeding ground for extremism, which is why we think it's so important that the whole international community has heard the call from the UN to help stop the violence and to protect the civilians in Libya (Lungescu 2011).

NATO Secretary General Rasmussen (2011a) was even blunter about the motivating security interests driving the Libyan intervention. In the following excerpt, the Secretary General goes

---

32 France conducted the Wadi Doum air raid against Libyan forces in 1986, losing an aircraft and 171 persons on board in the process. See St John (2011).
out of his way to dismiss Libya as a case of humanitarian intervention and instead places it squarely within the camp of “strategic interest for NATO territory.”

…Let me stress that NATO’s core function remains the territorial defense of our populations and our territories. That’s the core function of NATO and it will remain so…However, we have to realize that in today’s world the defense of our borders very often starts beyond our borders. That’s the reason why we decided to take on the responsibility for the Libya operation, because we consider this of strategic interest for NATO territory. Instability in North Africa could also have negative repercussions for NATO Allies…You can call it humanitarian interventions, but I wouldn’t explain it that way. It is about territorial defense, it’s about defense of the interests of our countries and our populations (Rasmussen 2011).

Given such rhetoric, the Libyan intervention had undisputable interests-based origins. But how do we reconcile such a clear interests-based argument with the significant humanitarian elements in previous sections? Faster than ever before, the international community banded together in solidarity against a state’s systematic abuse of civilians, not once doubting this perception of events. It took the solidification of such a humanitarian context to prompt a third-party military intervention in Libya. In other words, despite the existence of strong national interests within Libya for decades, the international community did not proceed with unified, aggressive foreign policy until the occurrence of a humanitarian crisis. The next section further explains this interaction between humanitarian context and the Western pursuit of interests in Libya via military intervention.

6.3. Favorable Conflict Perceptions as Promoters of Western Regional Interests

Western actors have long held security and economic interests in Libya and the surrounding region, as explicitly admitted by elites in the above dialogues. But these same actors have rarely considered third-party military interventions as optimal strategies for pursuing these interests. It wasn’t until the Libyan government lost undeniable legitimacy in the eyes of the liberal international order that military intervention became a viable strategy. This is because
humanitarian context may decrease the risks associated with military interventions, especially through pooled regional resources and the lowered probability of retaliation by the other international actors. Consequently, as I will exemplify in this section, the perceptions of the Libyan government as a systematic killer as well as the existence of willing regional actors prompted the military intervention in 2011. National interests in Libya were surely a driving factor, but they required a specific humanitarian context in which to activate. Even then, Libya’s distance from a Western neighborhood limited its pathway of post-conflict rebuilding.

This pathway of intervention reveals itself directly through NATO’s swiftly transformed and consolidated rhetoric on Libya. As news of the Libyan government’s crackdown on civilian protesters spread globally, NATO initially vehemently denied any vital interests in Libya and denied plans of intervention. The organization merely hinted at several negative regional consequences. On February 24th, the Secretary General gave the following assessment:

“We not consider the situation in Libya a direct threat to NATO or NATO Allies, but, of course, there may be negative repercussions. Such upheaval may have a negative impact on migration, refugees, etc., and that also goes for neighbouring countries. But I would like to stress that NATO as such has no plans to intervene. We have not received any request in that regard and any actions should be based on a UN mandate” (Rasmussen 2011b).

At this stage, NATO was waiting for a legal international mandate to act. Indeed, before the UN approved an international intervention in Libya, Rasmussen was quoted as saying that events in Libya had no bearing on NATO. He emphasized that NATO would only involve itself if clear need and legal conditions were evident. Instead, Rasmussen called for “firm regional support” and a strict UN mandate before NATO would consider acting within Libya (Rasmussen 2011a).

This legitimacy would facilitate a multilateral military intervention within Libya, driven by both member interests as well as humanitarian demand. NATO leadership was also assessing the degree of regional involvement and resource pooling available for such an intervention. In fact,
the very following day, as violent images of Libya flooded the media and international community, NATO activated its rhetoric on “neighborhoods” and the protection of innocent civilians. During an emergency meeting of the Atlantic Council, Rasmussen (2011c) led with a strong regional argument this time: “It’s a crisis in our immediate neighbourhood. It affects the lives and safety of Libyan civilians and those of thousands of citizens from NATO member states.” In this case, NATO did not alter its policy or motivations on Libya within a day; it simply used the amplified, undeniable humanitarian need in Libya to craft the best narrative of intervention.

Germany’s stance serves as a counterfactual to the conflict perceptions pathway. Although in the minority, Germany vehemently opposed military intervention within Libya, partially due to its pacifist national identity but also because it perceived the conflict in Libya as a civil war, with little national interests for Germany. Guido Westerwelle, the German Foreign Minister repeatedly stated that “we don't want to get involved in a civil war in north Africa” (“Libya conflict: Reactions around the world” 2011). Had the perception of a standard African civil war pervaded most of the international community, a military intervention would have been out of the realm of policy possibilities in Libya. But the majority of Western actors grasped tight to a narrative of systematic killing from the first glimpse of protests within Libya.

Figure 24 shows the number of articles and documents from January to October 2011 that portrayed Libya as either a genocide, mass killings, identity civil war, or other measures related to international security, coded using Factiva (see Appendix for details on coding of these narratives). As protests overtook Libya in January, all the narratives related to acute crisis were

---

33 Factiva is an online search tool and database that aggregates content from licensed and free sources – providing access to over 32,000 newspapers, journals, magazines, photographs, newswires, and other informational sources from every country. Access it here: www.global.factiva.com. My search parameters include the dates from January to October 2011, all article sources, regions, and subjects, and searching within the full article – not solely the title or headline. I do, however, limit our search to English-written sources only.
just beginning to arise. But by February, these narratives grew exponentially and the genocide and mass killings perceptions began to outpace the ones of civil war in media coverage and elite discussions. By the beginning of the intervention in March, this narrative fully dominated over the one of civil war and failed statehood, although it never outmatched the narrative of Libya as a case of dangerous terrorism. Interestingly, once the military intervention was under way, the narratives of potential genocide and systematic killings slowly lost out to the more complicated civil war perception. These changes may have been influenced by the mission complexities that marred progress on the ground in Libya. Moreover, this secondary civil war narrative helped mute any international responsibility for post-conflict rebuilding in Libya.

**Figure 24: Public Perceptions of the Libya Crisis**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Genocide</th>
<th>Identity War</th>
<th>Terrorism</th>
<th>Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the initially favorable conflict perceptions, by March, NATO received the legal mandate and regional support it needed to intervene in Libya. With the passing of UN Resolution

---

34 See Appendix for a line graph version of this figure.
1973, NATO was guaranteed a degree of legitimacy for its military mission as well direct pledges of support from both member states and various regional organizations. In fact, according to several sources, it was the promise of regional support that really won NATO over. The declaration of the Arab League in favor of the no-fly zone was the most influential news in the decision-making of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Due to such an impact upon elites, Alex Bellamy called this regional addition a “diplomatic game changer” (Bellamy 2011).

By this point in time, Rasmussen (2011d) eagerly promoted a NATO-led, democratizing intervention within Libya, under the assumption of strong regional support. “There is an urgent need, firm support from the region and a clear UN mandate for necessary international action. Allies stand behind the legitimate aspirations of the Libyan people for freedom, democracy and human rights,” he said. Such rhetoric signaled that the Libyan intervention was now beyond just protecting citizens from physical harm; it transformed into a battle over liberal values, democratization, and regime change.

In early March, the EU explicitly supported regime change as a means of bringing Libya under its influence. In a common communiqué, the EU wrote that “Colonel Kadhafi must relinquish power immediately”, emphasizing that the “regime has lost all legitimacy and is no longer an interlocutor for the EU” (European Council 2011; cited in Brockmeier et al. 2016). Of course, Western leaders were careful to intertwine their regime change rhetoric with the language of protection of innocents, lest national interests pushed their way to the forefront of the narrative.

Less than a month into the intervention, the key leaders of the Western neighborhood, US President Barack Obama, French President Nicolas Sarkozy, and UK Prime Minister David Cameron, reminded the world about the intertwined nature of regime change. They also recalled their hard-earned mandate for this military mission. “Our duty and our mandate under UN Security
Council Resolution 1973 is to protect civilians, and we are doing that. It is not to remove Qaddafi by force. But it is impossible to imagine a future for Libya with Qaddafi in power” (Obama, Cameron, and Sarkozy 2011). In this way, the strategic goals of regime overthrow melded into a fully legitimized humanitarian mission in Libya.

Under this regional narrative of humanitarian intervention, regime change and direct humanitarian assistance vied for dominance. While France and the US ardently warned of “another Srebrenica” or “another Rwanda” within Libya, regional actors worried about the prospects of regime change (Brockmeier et al. 2016). They suspected NATO’s seemingly excessive use of force to protect civilians, shunning what they saw as “the abuse of the humanitarian argument of protecting civilians for the political goal of regime change” (Brockmeier et al. 2016).

Making matters worse, NATO dismissed several efforts by the AU to negotiate a ceasefire between the government and the rebel forces, never once pressuring the National Transitional Council to negotiate with the Gadhafi regime (Bachman 2016). While this pattern may serve to diminish humanitarian accounts, it also arises due to the ineffectiveness of non-Western regional institutions. According to Apuuli Kasaija (2013), the Libyan intervention simply revealed how dysfunctional the AU was in comparison to NATO. The AU was fragmented in its demands, as members disagreed on how to resolve the crisis. Gadhafi even ignored the AU’s calls to end the crisis peacefully. Thus, regional institutions became muted by more effective Western partners and their UN legal mandates.

Apuuli Kasaija (2013) claims that more than anything, the Libya Crisis demonstrated that the AU did not have the ability or resources to handle regional crises on its own. At the most fundamental level, the Libyan Crisis shattered the notion of “African solutions to African problems”. Perhaps this is why journalist David Rieff lamented that in Libya, “…R2P was NATO-
ized” (Rieff 2011). “As a result, everywhere outside Western Europe and North America, R2P is losing what little ethical credibility it ever commanded,” he continued (Rieff 2011). In such a perspective, Rieff (2011) is directly critiquing the regional dimensions of humanitarian interventions – claiming that any universal norm of humanitarianism becomes highly regionalized once it is enforced. This is because the norm, including the R2P principle, is most likely to be enforced within certain regions of the world. Western actors, encouraged by their pooled resources, institutions and liberal mandates against systematic violence, are often able to enforce humanitarian norms within their spheres of influence/interest. But this trend harms the future of norms enforcement in other parts of the world.

**Military intervention only**

Not only did this “NATO-ized” response to humanitarian crisis spell disaster for non-Western victims of abuse, it also meant less post-conflict support for Libya. While NATO intervened to enforce the no-fly zone over Libya, it shied away from a role in post-conflict rebuilding, security, and regime transition. Unlike in the case of Kosovo, NATO and its Western partners went out their way to reject a seat at table of post-conflict Libya. They left this task up to regional organizations and UN institutions – often citing their legal mandate and its limitations as justification.

“We will continue to coordinate with other key organisations, including the United Nations, the European Union, the League of Arab States and the African Union, and to consult with others such as the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, and we encourage these organisations’ efforts in the immediate and longer term post-conflict period” (Defence Ministers 2011).

Lieutenant General Charles Bouchard, Commander of the military operation Unified Protector, added the following, “Throughout we stayed focused on the mandate, to protect the population, to ensure a No-Fly Zone and to conduct the embargo…We did not get involved in anything beyond
what was our legal mandate and we remain well within the mandate assigned to us by the North Atlantic Council” (Lungescu and Bouchard 2011).

NATO Spokesperson Oana Lungescu best summarized this legalistic, human rights-laden argument on NATO’s lack of involvement. She led with a vivid, emotional portrayal of Libya’s humanitarian plight, bordering on implications of genocide – paving the ground for NATO’s initial justification for military intervention. But this humanitarian rhetoric did not apply to post-conflict discussions. Instead, it is replaced by legalistic language on mandates and rule of law.

The mission will continue in full compliance with the United Nations mandate for as long as it's needed, but not a day longer...

In the last week we've seen vivid reminders of where the threats are coming from. We've seen the grim pictures from Tripoli and the allegations of mass graves, executed prisoners and a hospital full of dead patients. We've seen more reports of how the regime has been using mosques, schools and market places as shields for its weapons.

We must make sure that these threats are gone and that they're gone for good. Until civilians and cities in Libya are safe. So that the Libyan people can build a new future based on democracy, reconciliation and the rule of law. Once NATO's job is done it's for others to take over the lead in supporting Libya. We expect the United Nations to take the leading role and we've already seen that it is doing so. NATO could support upon request (Lungescu and Lavoie 2011).

Enforcing this lack of additional investment in Libya, NATO and other international actors never once considered ground troops or further intensification of the mission, regardless of outcomes. As Admiral Giampaolo di Paola affirmed for NATO, “…the answer is not. Is no. The Alliance, the Council and for this matter not even the Military Committee discuss of any hint of the fact or ground forces, because the Alliance has been clear, so far the Resolution is clear, the Alliance has been clear so far” (Lungescu 2011). While the Kosovo Crisis needed to be won at all costs (including a reoccurring option of “boots on the ground”), not even a “hint” of ground troops was allowed in Libya. This is because the Libya intervention was meant as a simple military mission, with very little consideration of post-conflict rebuilding, institutionalization, or stability.
This trend fits well with national interests-driven narratives of intervention, as interacting with favorable humanitarian conflict perceptions.

6.4. Conclusions

Ultimately, the Libya case presents with a much shorter, less complicated pathway of military intervention. After all, Libya’s humanitarian suffering at the hands of the Gaddafi regime made international headlines right away, and within the week, an array of international actors were calling for the enforcement of the R2P principle. Conflict perceptions were already favorable for Libya’s humanitarian plight. Western governments didn’t label anti-government rebels as terrorists in Libya as they readily did during the Kosovo Crisis. But it still took NATO some time to grab the reigns of the mission. As the normative consensus around Libya was building, NATO awaited the activation of regional support and legitimacy. Once this support was guaranteed, especially through several UN mandates, NATO key members committed themselves to a military intervention in Libya. Although the humanitarian context prompted this intervention, NATO was not shy about its pursuit of geopolitical interests in Libya either – with NATO elites often calling Libya a strategic intervention, which also explains the lack of post-conflict mission components.

Thus, the military intervention in Libya presents with a high level of geopolitical national interests, made easier to obtain alongside a humanitarian mission. The humanitarian components of this mission, however, were often criticized by both state actors and academics alike. In fact, the lack of systemic polling evidence on sentiments towards the Libyan Crisis strengthens such criticism. There was little time to check in on public opinion, as international actors quickly used humanitarian conflict perceptions to begin strategic military plans, without allowing time for diplomatic routes or non-military options in Libya.
In the next case study, the interaction between strategic interests and humanitarian intent is much easier to untangle. The Darfur crisis, tragically, did not prompt any third-party military intervention – despite it producing more humanitarian suffering (in strict quantifiable terms) than both the Kosovo and Libya Crises combined. The following chapter explains this non-intervention via the same key variables of conflict perception and regional variation.
CHAPTER 7: NON-INTERVENTION IN DARFUR: CIVIL WARS IN BAD NEIGHBORHOODS

The news media's silence, particularly television news, is reprehensible. If we knew as much about Darfur as we do about Michael Jackson, we might be able to stop these things from continuing.

Nicholas Kristof, 2005

The UN has described the intrastate violent conflict raging within Darfur as "the world's worst humanitarian crisis," while the US government was one of the first to call it "genocide." Within broad international circles, such levels of destruction are usually compared to the 1994 Rwandan genocide (Prunier 2005; Sikainga 2009). Despite the powerful rhetoric and condemnation of violence, the international community has purposefully abstained from directly intervening within the Darfur Crisis. Unfortunately, all the evidence from previous chapters present this reaction as inevitable, given Darfur’s location, its regional institutions, and the fragmented progression of conflict perceptions. Making matters worse, UNAMID, the joint mission between the African Union (AU) and UN that is responsible for peacekeeping in Darfur, is decimated by lack of inter-state coordination, a dramatic dearth in resources, and a narrow mandate that has failed to protect civilians. Therefore, Darfur remains a tragic case of non-intervention, despite a wide international consensus on ongoing human rights abuses on the ground.

Darfur, a fragmented region within western Sudan, has experienced grave and persistent armed conflict since 2003, albeit no military intervention over the past decade. Over these years, the fighting between the Government of Sudan (GoS) (allied with the Arab-based Janjaweed militia) and the Sudanese Liberation Movement (SLM) and Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) rebel groups has killed more than 300,000 people and displaced at least 2.7 million (Sikainga 2009; Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). Although the murder of civilians and the
systematic rape of women and girls in Darfur quickly became daily international news, this intrastate violence garnered minimal third-party responses. Why then has the international community chosen to remain silent in response to the Darfur humanitarian crisis spanning across decades? As this chapter will reveal, the silence is not due to a lack of information on the nature and scale of the atrocities committed on the ground – but due to an explicit unwillingness of powerful actors and institutions to invest resources and activate the narrative of genocide within a non-Western neighborhood, without direct geopolitical payoffs.

In this last empirical chapter, I introduce the Darfur Crisis as an instance of international non-intervention in a region of undeniable, ongoing humanitarian abuses against civilians. Despite documented crimes against humanity and many proclamations of genocide, Darfur has not been a target of any robust peacekeeping mission, let alone a humanitarian military intervention. As Figure 26 illustrates below, the same factors that intersected and drove the Kosovo and the Libya interventions were largely absent in the Darfur Crisis. First, Darfur’s narrative of violence wavered between that of a retractable, multi-actor civil war to that of an undeniable genocide, leading to unclear and unfavorable conflict perceptions of intervention. Making matters worse, Darfur was a long way from a “good neighborhood,” or Western institutional resources. While Western actors individually called on the UN to act in Darfur, they never attempted to craft policy outside of UN platforms. Moreover, regional, non-Western institutions such as the African Union (AU) and Arab League (AL) often ignored the government-affiliated atrocities within Darfur, in favor of short-run national interests, instead of any semblance of shared values. Such organizations even staunchly opposed outside intervention and refuted the label of genocide as related to Darfur. Lastly, unlike the case of Libya, Darfur was also lacking in strong geopolitical interests for many regional and international powers.
I begin with an overview of the progression of the Darfur Crisis, including a timeline of international responses, resolutions, and missions. Next, I use limited archival data to trace how conflict perceptions, regional institutions, and lack of geopolitical interests ensured a weak international response to the worst humanitarian crisis of the 21st century. The Darfur Crisis reveals how damaging even a fragmented perception of civil war becomes for humanitarian action, especially in the context of a bad neighborhood, with little institutional support.

7.1. Background and Timeline on the Darfur Crisis

While the origins of the conflict in Darfur span across decades of state-sponsored economic and political marginalization of non-Arab groups, the spark that ignited the contemporary violent crisis occurred in 2003. As the Second Sudanese Civil War culminated in a peace process in 2002-2005, worries over being left out of comprehensive peace talks heightened the Darfuris’

---

35 It is important to note the difficulty in distinguishing non-Arab populations in Darfur from Arab ones. Both groups practice the Islamic faith and share similar phenotypes in appearance. Moreover, the roots of these social divisions follow trends of economic exploitation, resource-seeking, and elite manipulation, more so than true cultural or religious differences. See Prunier (2004, 2005) for a detailed account of the older, non-ethnic origins of Darfur social divisions.
urgency to challenge governmental oppression. It was around this time that members of the marginalized Fur and Zaghawa tribes organized themselves into armed rebel groups, leading to the creation of the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) in 2001 (Pruner 2004, 2005; International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). While the Khartoum government had been aware of these rebel movements since at least 2002, it had typically underestimated their influence. Despite a threat by Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir to “unleash” the army, the military had little in reserve at the time, making any losses against the rebel groups even more humiliating and dangerous (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017).

By April 2003, a joint SLA and JEM force attacked several government installations, including a key airport, and decimated Sudanese military equipment and personnel (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). This level of damage by rebel movements was unprecedented in the country and thus served as a turning point for governmental retaliation. As the rebel movements grew more powerful, they became greater threats to the government in Khartoum. Every rebel victory revealed more weaknesses of state power. The Khartoum government, however, could not dedicate enough resources toward mounting an effective counter-offensive, as they were overextended in other domestic conflicts in the south. Instead, the national government commenced aerial bombardments and then waged a proxy war against the rebels in Darfur (Pruner 2005). To structure their proxy wars, the government had to manipulate ethnic resentments in the region, arming hostile groups and turning them against the unfavorable rebel groups. The best example of this proxy war tactic was the creation of the Janjaweed, a government-allied paramilitary group, mainly composed of Arabic-speaking individuals (Lindijer 2004). With
the financial and technological aid of the Sudanese army, the Janjaweed committed mass violence against non-Arab communities across Darfur (Sikainga 2009).

Though Chad brokered a ceasefire between the government and rebel groups in September 2003, this agreement fell apart by December 2003. Consequently by 2004, the government’s renewed counter-insurgency campaign intensified, now systematically targeting ethnic groups. These groups experienced civilian massacres, summary executions, the burning of villages, forced depopulations, and systematic rape of women and girls as a weapon of war (Human Rights Watch 2004c). Human Rights Watch reported at least 14 incidents of large scale murders in Dar Masalit alone between September 2003 and February 2004, which left 770 people dead. The government-support militias emptied hundreds of villages, in half of which there were reports of rape and sexual assault. By the spring of 2004, an estimated 30,000 people had been killed, 1.4 million people had become internally displaced and another 100,000 had fled into Chad (Hauck 2004). This high level of systematic mass violence has plagued Darfur for over a decade now, with cycles of relative calm following periods of acute horrors.

*International Responses*

International attention to the Darfur Crisis began with reports by Amnesty International in July 2003, followed closely by incoming information from the International Crisis Group in December 2003 (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). Soon, Human Rights Watch reported that government-affiliated militias were engaging in an ethnically-targeted campaign of mass killings, displacements, rape, and destruction of property (Human Rights Watch 2004b). Widespread media coverage, however, did not materialize until the outgoing United Nations Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator for Sudan, Mukesh Kapila, called Darfur the "world's greatest humanitarian crisis" in March 2004 (“Mass rape atrocity in west Sudan” 2004).
Just before the tenth anniversary of the Rwandan genocide, Kapila warned of the similarities between the situation in Darfur and that of Rwanda. He was shocked at the international community’s inaction, emphasizing that in the case of Darfur, “it is more than just a conflict. It is an organised attempt to do away with a group of people” (“Mass rape atrocity in west Sudan” 2004).

On this same day, Tom Eric Vraalsen, the Secretary-General’s Special Envoy for Humanitarian Affairs in Sudan, called the situation “one of the worst in the world” (“World's worst humanitarian crisis unfolding in Darfur, Sudan: UN official” 2004). Similarly, by early April, UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs Jan Egeland declared that the scorched-earth tactics of the Sudanese government and rebel groups have triggered "one of the world's worst humanitarian crises." Most importantly, he highlighted, “I consider this to be ethnic cleansing” (Africa Renewal 2004; “Darfur Conflict” 2014). By May, Egeland had once again told the UN Security Council that Darfur threatened to become "the biggest humanitarian drama of our time” (Africa Renewal 2004).

In the following month, the US reported to the UN Commission on Human Rights that mass atrocities, such as rape and ethnic cleansing, were taking place in Darfur, while humanitarian aid was being blocked from reaching non-Arab groups within the region (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor 2004). This was followed by a detailed report by Human Rights Watch (2004c), which stated, “there can be no doubt about the Sudanese government’s culpability in crimes against humanity in Darfur,” and demanded that the international community enforce its responsibility to protect civilians within Sudan, noting that the domestic government has revoked this guarantee.
Although civil society groups and some official representations were quick to describe and condemn the human rights situation in Darfur, they could not get the UN’s full attention. This is because the UN was distracted by another regional conflict. As the violence in Darfur escalated in early 2003 until mid-2004, the UN Security Council was focused on negotiations in Naivasha, Kenya to resolve the Sudanese north-south civil war. Although the massacres in Darfur grew harder to ignore, the Security Council still attempted to demote the crisis on its policy agendas, out of fear that a discussion of Darfur would cause the government in Khartoum to pull out of the Naivasha talks. Even when the Security Council passed Resolution 1547 by June 2004, establishing a UN mission in Sudan to monitor the implementation of a final agreement as related to the Sudanese civil war, Darfur was barely mentioned in the writing and following discussions (Clough 2004).

Unfortunately, by the time international attention had turned to Darfur, instead of the many other regional conflicts, the violence in the region had claimed almost two-thirds of its total victims (Bureau of Intelligence and Research 2005). Overall, the conflict claimed 300,000 lives, internally displaced 2.7 million people, and forced another 250,000 to flee across the borders (“Who’s at Risk: Sudan Backgrounder” n.d.). These numbers were available to all relevant international organizations and state actors, and yet, there was no perceived urgency to act. Conflict perceptions were partially response for such silence and international policy paralysis.

**Genocide or Civil War?**

Despite such massive, recognized loss of innocent lives, the label of genocide was not unanimously applied in Darfur. While Western counterparts were quick to narrate the Darfur Crisis as a case of genocide (albeit with little policy change), regional actors were strongly opposed. This is especially relevant given that regional actors had self-proclaimed a heavier burden in stabilizing
the country, while Western institutions generally referred to UN mandates or the need for African responses. As the timeline of events reveals below, the international actors that had no direct responsibility to act in Darfur eagerly applied the genocide narrative, while actors that would have been required to intervene in the crisis refuted this narrative, in favor of a civil war analogy.

Before the US administration publicly declared its position on Darfur, the EU had wavered on how to describe the violence decimating villages in Darfur. Surprisingly, the EU made a statement in response to Congress’s genocide resolution, saying that Darfur did not meet the legal requirements of genocide (“U.S. Senate Leaders Insists ‘Genocide’ Underway in Darfur” 2004). But this did not keep the US Congress from discussing the situation in Darfur as genocide by July 2004 (H.Con.Res.467: Declaring genocide in Darfur, Sudan). This claim resurfaced in September in a report by the US State Department and US Secretary of Defense (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and Bureau of Intelligence and Research 2004). Within the month, the European Parliament had joined into this narrative, labeling the actions of the Government of Sudan as “tantamount to genocide” (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). At the time of these genocide proclamations, the US and the EU had minimal direct ties to political action in Darfur and no binding mechanisms to follow. Despite their passionate condemnations of an ongoing genocide, these actors would ultimately refuse to protect the victims.

In dramatic contrast to such actors’ proclamations, in January 2005, the UN International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur (2005) argued against the usage of the genocide narrative. They claimed that while “no genocidal policy has been pursued and implemented in Darfur by the Government authorities, directly or through the militias under their control,” they did warn that “international offences such as the crimes against humanity and war crimes that have been committed in Darfur may be no less serious and heinous than genocide.” Indeed, had the UN
directly condoned the narrative of genocide in Darfur, it would have had to bolster its missions within the region – but such a political consensus was lacking at the time (especially in the case of Russia and China’s veto within the Security Council and worries over spoiling negotiations of the North-South Sudan peace).

By June 2005, US President George W. Bush had broken from UN rhetoric to echo former Secretary of State Colin L. Powell, who referred to the violence in Darfur as explicit genocide (VandeHei 2005). This rhetoric, however, did not lead to any dramatic policy changes for the suffering citizens of Darfur. In the years to follow, the EU continued to condemn the atrocities occurring within Darfur, but it, too, never undertook any action beyond the scope of a limited UN mandate. For instance, by April 2006, the European Parliament pressured the UN to “act on its responsibility to protect civilians,” and in September, the Parliament claimed that Sudan “has failed in its ‘responsibility to protect’ its own people” and called on the Government of Sudan to allow a UN mission under Resolution 1706 (European Parliament Resolution on Darfur 2006; European Parliament Resolution on the Situation in Darfur 2006). In the following year, Parliament intensified its rhetoric, demanding that the UN “act in line with its Responsibility to Protect doctrine ( . . . ) even in the absence of consent or agreement from the Sudanese Government.” In other words, the EU was promoting a UN-based humanitarian military intervention, in every dimension of the definition. Following this demand, by July of 2007, the EU Parliament called on the UN to act “basing its action on the failure of the Government of Sudan (GoS) to protect its population in Darfur from war crimes and crimes against humanity” (European Parliament Resolution on the Situation in Darfur 2007; European Parliament resolution of 12 July 2007 on the situation in Darfur 2007).
While leaders of powerful Western states used the narrative of genocide to describe the violence within Darfur, international and regional organizations were hostile to the rhetoric. The AU refused to use the language of genocide by 2004, instead claiming that “there is mass suffering, but it is not genocide” (“Position and Response of the African Union on the Darfur Crisis as being Genocide” 2004). The AU withheld this narrative since “the Government of Sudan has facilitated assistance (through such channels as the granting of visas and in some cases protection) to various members of civil society organization...hardly reflects the actions of a country practising genocide” (“Position and Response of the African Union on the Darfur Crisis as being Genocide” 2004). In a similar trend, the League of Arab States announced that it could not find “any proof of allegations that ethnic cleansing or the eradication of communities had been perpetrated” (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017).

By 2008, the ICC’s chief prosecutor took the controversial step of charging Sudanese President Bashir with masterminding genocide in Darfur, accusing him of killing 35,000 people and persecuting hundreds of thousands more with his policies. More specifically, Prosecutor Luis Moreno-Ocampo also said 2.5 million people were subjected to a campaign of "rape, hunger and fear" in refugee camps (“Darfur Conflict” 2014). Yet even by 2010, after judges at the International Criminal Court (ICC) had issued a second arrest warrant for Sudanese President al-Bashir on three counts of genocide committed in Darfur (representing the first time the ICC had issued a warrant for the crime of genocide), the Arab League and the African Union denounced the narrative (“Arab leaders back ‘wanted’ Bashir” 2009; International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). In fact, during its 16th annual summit, the AU Assembly called for the UN Security Council to defer proceedings against President al-Bashir. While the UN Security Council has not acted on this request, it has repeatedly failed to enforce the warrant when President al-Bashir has been
allowed entry across a wide range of national borders, including within Chad, Egypt, Kenya, and non-signatory states such as China and Saudi Arabia (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017).

It is important to repeat that the organizations and states most opposed to the narrative of genocide within Darfur are the same actors who have claimed the largest responsibility in maintaining peace and influence within Africa and the Middle East. The AU, for instance, has staunchly opposed Western aid and general international intervention as related to Darfur, under the premise of promoting “African responsibility” (VandeHei 2005). Thus, it appears that these organizations have distanced themselves from the narrative of genocide to evade their claimed regional responsibilities. These connects merit further scrutiny and will be expanded upon in following sections.

**Timeline of Inaction**

Unfortunately, even a strong narrative of genocide on the part of Western states did not lead to action within Darfur, partially because regional and international institutions were unwilling to utter the word that would legally require a robust mandate. The scale of the violence in Darfur was impossible to ignore, yet Western governments, including those of the US and EU, were unwilling to intervene. They were also unable to craft a unified, long-term policy towards the Government of Sudan. At the international level, the UN proclaimed a series of threats and passed several resolutions, but without the compliance of the Sudanese government, these mechanisms were hollow and ineffective.

In particular, the Security Council attempted to alter the dynamics of the conflict by imposing an arms embargo (via Resolution 1556) on all non-governmental entities and individuals,
including the Janjaweed, within Darfur in July 2004 (Security Council Report 2004). In other words, the resolution only targeted the rebels and the Janjaweed militias, but not the government that organized, financed, ordered, and supplied the Janjaweed. By September 2004, after nearly two more months of worsening humanitarian conditions in Darfur, the Security Council passed Resolution 1564. Here, they declared their “grave concern” that the government of Sudan had not met its obligations to protect its citizens. Thus, the Security Council called for Sudanese leadership “to end the climate of impunity in Darfur” by identifying and bringing to justice those responsible for the widespread human rights abuses (Clough 2004). Furthermore, it called for an expansion of the AU monitoring mission in Darfur and established a commission of inquiry to investigate violations of international humanitarian law and to determine whether acts of genocide had occurred. Finally, the Security Council threatened additional measures, including actions that would hinder Sudan’s petroleum sector or individual members of the Government of Sudan (GoS) (Clough 2004). In summary, five months after receiving irrefutable evidence of government-sponsored mass violence against civilians in Darfur, the Security Council still primarily relied on investigations, mild threats, and the promotion of an AU force as policy against genocide.

By 2005, the passage of Resolution 1590 authorized a mission (UNMIS) to support the peace agreement that ended the Second Sudanese Civil War (UN Security Council 2005). Resolution 1591 more specifically targeted the Darfur conflict by strengthening sanctions and imposing a travel ban and an asset freeze on two rebel leaders, a former Sudanese air force chief and the leader of a pro-government militia (“The UN and Darfur” 2007). By 2006, the Security Council’s Resolution 1706 sought to expand the UNMIS mandate, but it faced intense opposition from the GoS (UN Security Council 2006). Nowhere in these resolutions, however, were direct governmental bodies or actors targeted for sanctions.
After persistent pressure from the UN, the AU, and regional actors, the Sudanese government and rebel groups attended a series of peace talks in Nigeria, leading to the signing of the Darfur Peace Agreement of 2006 (Darfur Peace Agreement 2006). This deal created a power-sharing, wealth-sharing mandate alongside mechanisms of compensation for victims. Unfortunately, this agreement was rejected by several rebel groups and failed in the long-run (“The UN and Darfur” 2007; Sikainga 2009).

Even the deployment of a very narrow peacekeeping mission in Darfur was met with contention. The Sudanese government objected to the presence of any European troops on its soil and maintained that it would only allow AU peacekeepers – and the international community eagerly complied. Until 2007, only a 7,000-strong AU peacekeeping force was active in Darfur, and given its overextension, it was unable to prevent the violence or protect civilians (“Darfur Conflict” 2014). Noting such challenges, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1769 in July 2007 that offered a compromise – the creation of a “hybrid force” consisting of 18,000 UN and AU troops. This resolution authorized the establishment of UNAMID under Chapter VII, a mission focused on monitoring the implementation of agreements, the protection of civilians and humanitarian assistance, and the promotion of rule of law (UN Security Council 2014). These peacekeepers, however, faced government restrictions on movement and access, including limited access to camps for displaced communities. The troops were also gravely underfunded, lacking equipment, including helicopters and basic weaponry (“Darfur Conflict” 2014; UN Security Council 2014).

While levels of violence in the region fell after 2005, they spiked again by 2013 (“Darfur Conflict” 2014). Such changing trends led to the extension of UNAMID’s mandate in 2010 and once again in 2013 and 2017. But the mission’s strength remains set at 26,167 personnel by UN
Resolution 2063 in 2012 (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017). Although the Sudanese government has agreed to these mandates in technicality, their foot-dragging and the lack of international funds have consistently hindered the mission’s ability to protect civilians in any meaningful way (UN Security Council 2014; “The UN and Darfur” 2007). Moreover, a downsizing of UNAMID troop and police numbers is now part of the 2017 renewal mandate, to be gradually accomplished over the next two years (UNAMID 2017).

Alongside a trail of failed peace agreements and proposed power-sharing mechanisms, recent years have brought about an increased fragmentation within rebel groups. Since 2010, government-sponsored militias began to act independently in response to declining financial support from GoS as well as faltering oil revenues due to internal strikes. Consequently, rebel forces began fighting among themselves over commercial interests, including the gold mines in North Darfur. Most distinct in this new phase of violence is that attacks also occur within Arab communities, not simply following earlier narratives of an Arab versus non-Arab conflict. The UN reported that 400,000 people were displaced in 2013 alone, ending a positive trend that had seen 100,000 people return home from refugee camps in 2012 (Gettleman 2012). In March 2014, the World Food Programme reported that 20,000 people had been displaced by renewed intrastate fighting (“20,000 believed displaced after unrest in Sudan's Darfur” 2014). Around the same time, US Ambassador Samantha Power reported that 120,000 people had been displaced in Darfur since January 2014 (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect 2017).

Since the beginnings of the Darfur Crisis, the international community has done almost nothing to curb the internal violence that has been taking the lives of innocent civilians for over 14 consecutive years. Despite staggering numbers and narratives of horrifying violence over the decade, the international community has muted its condemnation of the conflict in Darfur. Too
often, this silence has been strategic – to ensure successful negotiations on the many other conflicts raging within Sudan, to create cooperation with the US War on Terror, and to ensure a peaceful secession of South Sudan in 2011 (Lynch 2012). In the following sections, I briefly delve into some of these interests-based causes of international inaction before exploring the effects of regional variation and conflict perceptions as applied to non-intervention in Darfur.

7.2. Standard Explanations of Non-Intervention: Interest in the Status-quo

As in the previous cases of military intervention, one of the strongest, standard explanations of non-intervention in Darfur is that of geopolitical interest. For Darfur, the argument is that international inaction (instead of military intervention) promoted the national interests of powerful states and institutions, including most Western actors, regional organizations, as well as China. As Prunier (2005, 2008) also observed, the world's most powerful countries limited themselves to merely expressing concern for Darfur and demanding vague UN action. Meanwhile, the UN, lacking the funding and military support of these powerful, rich countries, relied heavily on the AU to deploy a token force without a real mandate to protect civilians.

Prunier (2005) wasn’t the only one to notice the international community’s willful passivity towards mass civilian killings and impending genocide. After all, none of these international players could hide behind justifications of ignorance – knowledge of the mass atrocities in Darfur had become daily common knowledge. By October 2004, the UN Secretary-General announced the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry to determine whether acts of genocide had occurred in Darfur. Although the Commission’s final report decided against the label of genocide, it still strongly asserted that GoS forces and allied militia had “conducted indiscriminate attacks, including killing of civilians, torture, enforced disappearances, destruction of villages, rape and other forms of sexual violence, pillaging and forced displacement.” The panel concluded that
“international offences such as the crimes against humanity and war crimes that have been committed in Darfur may be no less serious and heinous than genocide.” It urged the Security Council to “act not only against the perpetrators but also on behalf of the victim” (“The UN and Darfur” 2007). But this humanitarian urgency and consensus did not produce any new policy initiatives regarding Darfur.

By October 2006, the Minority Rights Group (MRG) published a report detailing how easily the UN and the great powers could have prevented the Darfur Crisis. The report also heavily critiqued these actors for learning so little from the Rwandan genocide. MRG's executive director, Mark Lattimer, went on to say that "this level of crisis, the killings, rape and displacement could have been foreseen and avoided... Darfur would just not be in this situation had the UN systems got its act together after Rwanda: their action was too little too late” (“UN could have averted Darfur crisis – MRG” 2006).

In the context of this explicit dismissal of mass atrocities, geopolitical national interests surface as key motivators of international inactivity. The US, for instance, had their sights set on other policy battles within Africa, such as ending the Sudanese civil war. As briefly discussed above, when the rebel attacks and government counter-offensive started in Darfur, the Bush administration was unwilling to criticize Khartoum, fearing that doing so might destroy the North-South peace initiative that the administration had prioritized since 2001. But by April 2004, a bipartisan group of Congress members had called for sanctions, pressuring President Bush to finally condemn the “atrocities” in Darfur (Clough 2004). By midsummer, Secretary of State Colin Powell traveled to Darfur, and in the next months, he told Congress that that the Sudanese government and the Janjaweed had committed genocide (as per State Department conclusions). But despite this official stance, US policy toward Darfur was characterized by tragic inconsistency,
as seen in the administration’s reversion in November 2004 to using carrots to induce GoS to sign the Naivasha accords. This inconsistency and shift in US foreign policy was also largely to blame for the Security Council’s failure to even discuss the need to take stronger action against human rights abuses within Darfur (Clough 2004).

Instead of contributing to a solution, the US alongside its Western allies encouraged “African solutions to African problems,” while at the same time criticizing regional efforts in Darfur. It was seemingly in the US national interest to take a normative stance on the violence in Darfur but offload actual responsibilities to others. In other words, the Bush administration was torn between competing policy priorities in Sudan. On the one hand, the US government preferred that others manage the Darfur crisis, but on the other, it faced strident demands by activists and Congress to “do more” (Obama and Brownback 2005). This policy ambivalence explains why the US was quick to call Darfur “genocide,” but at the same time rule out even the potential of a NATO mission. Making matters worse, the US kept urging the AU to lead in Darfur while simultaneously attacking the quality of African initiatives (Verhoeven et al. 2016). In this way, the US could maintain some semblance of its normative image, as related to the protection of innocents, without contributing to a mission that appeared both difficult and unsupported by other robust Western institutions. At the same time, the US could maintain a status-quo in Africa that was more conducive to its international outcomes, especially regarding the war on terror, Sudanese civil war, and dealings with China and Russia.

Western actors weren’t the only ones complicit in such interests-driven, passive policymaking. The African Union (AU), too, has been accused of ulterior motives in its Darfur mission trajectories. Beyond its well-known deficits in mission funding, organization, and resources, the AU is blamed for failing to step aside and allow others to solve Darfur’s violence.
The AU’s presence in Darfur, no matter how minimal or flawed, made it difficult for non-African states and institutions to debate the merits of more extensive humanitarian intervention. As Black and Williams (2010) reaffirm, “the AU presence became, in effect, a stumbling block to move robust external interventions—a fact that the GoS [Government of Sudan] used adroitly” (cited in Verhoeven et al. 2016). The AU’s blockage of an external military intervention may have been intentional, not solely a consequence of organizational dysfunctions. After all, as the AU itself admitted, “Countries within the North African Region such as Egypt and Libya have a direct interest in developments in the Sudan. These collective interests are expanded upon within the forum that the African Union provides” (“Position and Response of the African Union on the Darfur Crisis as being Genocide” 2004). Such interests may explain why AU members refused to confront the GoS on its campaigns of mass violence, making sure to dismiss any discussions of genocide. Instead, the AU focused on “compliance with multilateral objectives” and justified their narrow mandates by reminding the international community of Sudan’s record of accepting and inviting international organizations during the time of crisis. “The fact that Sudan has recently approached the African Union to send additional Peacekeepers to Darfur reflects the credibility and objectivity of the institution as well as the trust African countries have in their own institutions,” AU representatives would often claim (“Position and Response of the African Union on the Darfur Crisis as being Genocide” 2004).

This legacy of regional hesitation followed the hybrid UNAMID mission to the extreme detriment of Darfur’s civilians. “It is fair to say that UNAMID peacekeepers largely failed to protect Darfur civilians, and their presence didn’t deter either the government or the rebels from attacking the civilians,” Aicha Elbasri, the mission’s former spokeswoman, wrote in 2013, after resigning in protest. “They sometimes helplessly witnessed the attacks and harassment of civilians,
some of which took place near UNAMID team sites” (Lynch 2014). These UNAMID peacekeepers endured bullying by governmental security forces, while fully aware of the West’s critical indifference. Lacking the necessary weapons, numbers, and mandate to properly fight against both government and rebel forces, UNAMID peacekeepers have been killed in greater numbers than in any others in UN mission history (Lynch 2014). Some of this failure to protect civilians (and peacekeepers themselves) can be attributed to resource deficiencies. Internal UNAMID documents say that troop-contributing countries supplied their blue helmets with broken vehicles and low-quality weaponry. Meanwhile, powerful foreign states declined several UN appeals to give UNAMID peacekeepers attack helicopters, which would reinforce the mostly AU infantry battalions. Moreover, UN headquarters in New York repeatedly rejected UNAMID commanders’ requests to replace underperforming or misbehaving peacekeeping troops (Lynch 2014).

While there is strong consensus on how a scarcity of resources hindered UNAMID goals, there are also factions that perceive the UNAMID as voluntarily hesitant in Sudan. For instance, from the very beginning, UNAMID was reluctant to denounce the Sudanese government without firsthand proof collected by its own personnel – even though the GoS is the only actor in Darfur with airpower. As a result, UNAMID public reporting has withheld strong circumstantial evidence of Sudanese violations in communications with the Security Council (Lynch 2014). Although Elbasri first discussed UNAMID’s bureaucratic and funds-based dilemmas, she did not shy away from these heavier accusations. While working for UNAMID, she also raised concerns about the mission’s refusal to acknowledge the atrocities committed by the GoS. One of the peacekeepers’ local commanders, Maj. Gen. Wynjones Matthew Kisamba, even told Elbasri, that UNAMID
forces had to sometimes reframe the truth. “You know, sometimes we have to behave like diplomats,” he told her. “We can’t say all what we see in Darfur” (Lynch 2014).

But the UNAMID did witness crimes against humanity committed by GoS forces and their rebel allies – they simply hid the evidence to placate an already hostile government. Throughout the conflict in Darfur, UNAMID collected large stacks of evidence linking Sudanese authorities to serious human rights violations, particularly in using air power and Arab proxies to attack pro-rebel communities (Lynch 2014). Yet as will be expanded upon in the following section, much of that evidence never made it to public records and rarely became amplified in the international community. The UNAMID’s refusal to verify the connection between civilian attacks and the Sudanese government remained a source of frustration for US policymakers, even by the end of the Obama administration. In their attempt to placate the Sudanese government and ensure their own regional interests and overall stability, AU country members shut their eyes to the genocide unfolding in their own neighborhood.

China followed a similar strategy in Darfur – allowing some degree of human suffering in exchange for relative stability in a region of interest. In such a case, the preservation of Sudan’s sovereignty suited both China and the AU more so than the prospects of third-party military involvement, particularly Western humanitarian intervention. After all, the main impediment to stronger UN mandates in Darfur was always the Chinese Security Council veto. China owns a 40 percent share of Sudan’s main oil producing field. To secure these resources, it joined with Russia (the main arms supplier to GoS) to pressure other Security Council members to downgrade Resolution 1574 at the special November 2004 session in Nairobi (Clough 2004). But it was China that took much of the credit for ultimately persuading Sudan to accept the hybrid UNAMID peacekeepers. As a major buyer of Sudanese oil and supplier of arms, China remained highly
influential in Sudan and came under international pressure to do more to stop the violence (“Darfur Conflict” 2014). In response, China still managed to safeguard its geopolitical interests by promoting UNAMID as the solution to the violence, muting more robust, less hesitant Western alternatives.

With such a trail of evidence, the national interest argument quickly wins over the humanitarian intent. Seemingly, neither the US, EU, AU, nor China stood to benefit from robust intervention in Darfur, despite undeniable mass atrocities occurring there over the many long years. As such, the UN was also frozen by its members’ interests in a Sudanese status-quo. But as convincing as the status-quo arguments are, something is still missing in this analysis. Then again, none of these states stood to lose extensively from a third-party military intervention in Darfur. In the case of Kosovo, we saw that despite low national interests, Western institutions and actors overrode UN mandate and intervened anyway. In other words, humanitarian context mattered for foreign policymaking in Kosovo. Why wasn’t it half as influential in Darfur, all the while the civilian suffering in Darfur continued for decades? As I will argue in the following section, the narrative of conflict perceptions also strongly favored non-intervention in Darfur, and in the context of a bad neighborhood with little institutional success, these perceptions became fatal to any Western humanitarian initiative.

7.3. Ambiguous Conflict Perceptions in Bad Neighborhoods

Early in the trajectory of the Darfur Crisis, Western actors were quick to label the mass violence as genocide, albeit with little policy consequences. But as the crisis worsened without end in sight, these same actors opted to cooperate with the GoS, thus approving it as a legitimate state actor. Meanwhile, regional actors and powerful non-Western states solidified a narrative of Darfur as an ethnic/religious civil war, with equally culpable sides. As discussed below, this wide
rift in crisis perceptions greatly diminished the odds of military intervention in the Darfur Crisis, especially given the distance from the Western neighborhood and its institutional benefits.

*Early Warnings of Genocide*

As the first waves of mass violence decimated Darfur, the international community reacted with a figurative shrug – it was yet another African conflict, after all. While diplomats worried about the Darfur Crisis derailing peace negotiations to end the Sudanese civil war, few actors rang the alarm on human rights abuses right away. Thus, Darfur remained on the backburner as a typical African civil war until several political elites seized on the commemorations of the 10th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide as a call to action. Also discussed above, in March 2004, Mukesh Kapila, UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator in Sudan, denounced the GoS counter-insurgency as a scorched earth policy comparable to the 1994 Rwandan genocide (Verhoeven et al. 2016). Kapila was one of the first to directly condemn the silence of the Security Council. He used a lessons-learned narrative to shame and threaten international actors into action: “I was present in Rwanda at the time of the genocide, and I've seen many other situations around the world and I am totally shocked at what is going on in Darfur … This is ethnic cleansing, this is the world's greatest humanitarian crisis, and I don't know why the world isn't doing more about it” (“Mass rapeatrocity in west Sudan” 2004). Consequently, within UN circles, Darfur as a case of systematic ethnic cleansing began to replace the passivity that defined the narrative of another African civil war. Samantha Power’s (2004) op-ed “Remember Rwanda, But Take Action in Sudan” provided the same framing for elites in Washington. Like the Kosovo Crisis, analogies to historical genocides and international shame over historical inactivity altered conflict perceptions in Darfur. Such a transformation, of course, relied heavily on circulating images of slaughtered unarmed civilians (Slim 2004; Welsh 2009).
The lessons of Rwanda also haunted UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who had been the head of peacekeeping operations at the time of the 1994 genocide and was blamed for the UN’s grave failure to act. On the 10th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide, Annan brought the matter of Darfur before the UN Human Rights Commission, endorsing a broader policy of civilian protection and possible interventionist measures against genocide (Verhoeven et al. 2016).

Whatever terms it uses to describe the situation, the international community cannot stand idle. At the invitation of the Sudanese Government, I propose to send a high-level team to Darfur to gain a fuller understanding of the extent and nature of this crisis, and to seek improved access to those in need of assistance and protection … If that is denied, the international community must be prepared to take swift and appropriate action. By “action” in such situations I mean a continuum of steps, which may include military action… But let us not wait until the worst has happened, or is already happening…Let us not wait until the only alternatives to military action are futile hand-wringing or callous indifference (Annan 2004).

Although Annan stopped short of labeling Darfur as ethnic cleansing or genocide, he did remove it from the narrative of the typical African civil war, as previously perceived by key Western actors. The parallels to Rwanda convinced even India, otherwise highly critical of Western interventionism, to demand international action on behalf of Darfur’s civilians. The Economic Times editorial team wrote that “Darfur is another Rwanda in the making. And not just in terms of the human atrocities but the apathetic reaction of the international community” (“A Rwanda in the Making” 2004).

Thus, by appealing to analogies of former genocides and historical lessons, Darfur swiftly left the realm of “another African conflict” and entered the favorable narratives of “ethnic cleansing” and a type of violence that merited international reaction. But this favorable conflict perception did not guarantee international intervention and indeed, it did not last long. On one end of the spectrum, the actors who were quick to condemn Darfur as genocide were the same ones who shied away from any commitment to act. On the other end, various states actively fought...
against the genocide narrative, in favor of a highly complex civil war narrative, so as to quell demands for military intervention. This ensuing confusion over the nature of the conflict doomed Darfur to a path of non-intervention.

*Genocide, but No Protection Needed*

The US, for instance, used the genocide label to quell domestic protests on the violence in Darfur. Its rhetoric didn’t come close to matching its foreign policy, whether debated or actualized. The Bush administration did not believe that identifying Darfur as “genocide” also demanded a US commitment to stopping such genocide. A US-led intervention to protect civilians in Darfur was out of the question, regardless of conflict perceptions (Strauss 2005; Verhoeven et al. 2016). In the backdrop of worsening conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, US leadership settled for a policy with the “rhetoric of genocide … as a substitute for more forceful action” (Heinze 2007, 362). In other words, instead of interpreting the violation of the 1948 Genocide Convention by the GoS as an obligation to intervene itself, the US interpreted as an obligation to support regional intervention, as part of the theme of “African solutions to African problems,” with a few US sanctions thrown in.

This policy choice was an easy one to make for most Western actors, given the strong normative support by regional actors. In this way, the US and the EU didn’t have to forsake their values of human rights, democracy, and prevention of genocide outright. In fact, after the tainted US legacy of “humanitarian intervention” in Iraq, many argued that Western actors were finally listening to the democratic demands of African leaders, citizens, and governments in the case of Darfur. Since the war in Iraq significantly undermined the credibility of US-led humanitarian military interventions and general foreign policy in the region, the choice of non-intervention in Darfur may have led to greater moral credibility for the US (Heinze 2007). This is especially true
given that Sudanese leadership had effectively stoked suspicions that the US would only involve itself in Darfur for oil resources, not humanitarian aid (Strauss 2005). Given such an international context, Western actors simply had to transfer the responsibility for Darfur’s safety onto regional organizations, instead of their own organizations or states, to maintain their normative images.

Regional actors were particularly glad of the Western restraint. South African President Thabo Mbeki went on to say that it was their preference. “It's critically important that the African continent should deal with these conflict situations on the continent. And that includes Darfur…indeed, you will notice that we have not asked for anybody outside of the African continent to deploy troops in Darfur. It's an African responsibility, and we can do it” (cited in VandeHei 2005). But although the West stepped aside while the AU lead efforts for a military solution, Western elites continued to critique AU measures as too weak to prevent the killing of innocent civilians. The Western counter-response invoked the promise of NATO organizational advice and organizational logistics, but never direct military support. President Bush, for instance, would casually mention NATO to deflect critiques of US inaction in Darfur. "We are working with NATO to make sure that we are able to help the AU put combat troops there," Bush said. "And, as a part of that, I believe a transport plane of ours, for example, will be a part of this mission” (VanderHei 2005). Bush was willing to offer Darfur a NATO transport place, but very little else. In fact, Bush – who was one of the first to call Darfur a genocide – even opposed UK British Prime Minister Tony Blair's plans to persuade the world's wealthiest nations to double their aid to Africa, saying simply that "it doesn't fit our budgetary process" (VandeHei 2005). In sum, Western actors remained on the right side of the narrative debate, but practically irrelevant in Darfur.
Another Civil War

Meanwhile, non-Western actors were busy reinforcing their own narrative of the conflict. In particular, China, the Arab League (AL), and Russia seriously contested the nature of the Darfur Crisis. They had no sympathies for the “simple” genocide narrative; instead, they argued that the violence was more complex than the narrative of Sudanese regime/Arab militias as perpetrators and non-Arab rebel groups as innocent victims of mass crimes. They preferred the characterization of “civil war,” blurring the distinctions between perpetrator and victim and equalizing culpabilities (Liu and Zhang 2014; Campbell 1998). This Darfur civil war then, naturally, required a peace process or even the provision of developmental aid involving the Sudanese government – not a humanitarian military intervention. In a view largely shared by Brazilian and Indian state actors, the best way to protect civilians in Darfur was through a peace settlement between the GoS and the rebel groups. This would eventually lead to increased security, thus ending the killings in the long-run (Verhoeven et al. 2016).

Even those who perceived the state as the main culprit of the Darfur violence were not ready to use the term genocide, since many didn’t perceive humanitarian intervention or coercion of the GoS as effective solutions. To these parties, the GoS was a flawed, albeit legitimate and necessary international actor. Consequently, non-Western countries like China and Arab states sought peace deals with the moderates within the Bashir regime in Sudan, hoping that this peace would prove beneficial to AU diplomatic and peacekeeping efforts (De Waal 2007, 2008). In Beijing's perspective in particular, the Sudanese government should not be ignored as an illegitimate actor, nor pressured as a culpable party. Instead, the Sudanese government merely required help by international actors to assert control over its own population. Only then would the GoS be able to fulfill its obligation to protect its citizens (Verhoeven et al. 2016).
Leading Western academic Alex de Waal also promoted such a narrative on Darfur, leading to extremely different policy options from the narrative of genocide. “Darfur is a war - a horrible war, but first and foremost, it is a war,” he said. He then reminded his audience of how the conflict had transformed in the past five years: “Ninety per cent of the deaths occurred four to five years ago and the government and its militia proxies were the main culprits…Today many fewer are being killed and it is hard to make a moral distinction between the sides.” With this admitted ambiguity in culpability, de Waal presented one of the most standard effects of the “civil war” conflict perceptions – dramatically decreased odds of humanitarian military intervention. After all, the option of third-party intervention barely exists with such perceptions. As de Waal added, “In big and complicated wars - like Darfur - successful armed intervention is so unlikely that it is foolish even to make the threat…What Darfur needs is old-fashioned peace and peacekeeping and state-of-the-art humanitarian technology. RIP R2P” (de Waal 2008).

Related to the framings of the previous literature on conflict perceptions, de Waal and many non-Western actors understood Darfur as the inevitable result of ancient and intractable ethnic hatreds between black Africans and Arabs (Campbell 1998). Not only does such a narrative limit policy response, it also simplifies politics to be compatible with stereotypes about Africa. But as Campbell (1998) was quick to capture in the case of Bosnia, these narratives neglect elite manipulation in Darfur and more structural, economic causes of conflict – let alone ignore Sudan’s complicity in arming the Janjaweed throughout the counter-insurgency campaign.

Despite the flaws latent in such “ancient hatreds” narratives, the civil war perceptions of Darfur produced an interactive feedback effect (Kushi 2016). It encouraged the reporting of violence in Darfur as a neutral exercise, devoid of assigning culpabilities, especially upon governmental actors. The longer the crisis remained in the realm of domestic politics, the more the
civil war narrative took a toll on information gathering, information sharing, and the odds of greater investigation or interventions in Darfur. The most egregious example of such a trend is within the UN itself. Since 2009, UN human rights agencies essentially stopped issuing public reports on abuses in Darfur, according to human rights advocates and a leaked UN report (Lynch 2012). This report confirmed the tendency of the UN and AU to magnify the successes, and mute the failures, of the peace process that they pushed in lieu of robust intervention. Making matters worse, the GoS never stopped intimidating UN officials and aid workers into remaining silent on government atrocities, threatening to expulse these actors or directly harassing them on the ground. These trends intensified by March 2009, when the Sudanese government expelled 13 relief organizations, increasing fears that openly critiquing the regime could trigger a crackdown on UN agencies as well (Lynch 2012). Consequently, from January 2009 until 2012, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights did not issue a single report on abuses in Darfur.

By 2012, a group of three former UN experts confirmed that this silence was intentional and systemic – the UNAMID mission had actively minimized reporting of governmental abuses in Darfur, including incidents of ethnic cleansing against the Zaghawa tribe (Lynch 2012). Jehanne Henry, the Darfur researcher for Human Rights Watch, confirmed these leaked reports: “Still we do receive reports from sources inside Darfur indicating the war architecture and tools of repression are very much intact,” she said. She added that the Sudanese government had "effectively muzzled the AU/UN mission into silence…Humanitarian aid agencies, traditionally a reliable source of informally reporting on rights abuses, also do not speak out [for] fear of being kicked out of Darfur altogether” (quoted in Lynch 2012).

Even Susan Rice, then US ambassador to the UN, was worried about this lack of reporting and raised grave concerns in a private meeting with Ibrahim Gambari, UNAMID’s representative
in 2012. In the following months, in a closed-door Security Council meeting, the US and EU powers demanded that the UN chief peacekeeper increase the reporting on governmental abuses in Darfur. Ultimately, an expert panel of former UN officials convened to address this discrepancy. They argued that UNAMID’s sparse reporting on Darfur was evidence of its bias, in which regional actors ignored government abuses while highlighting the violence carried out by the rebels (Lynch 2012). According to these panel members, the institutional bias "risks exacerbating existing perceptions of UNAMID as insufficiently neutral: perceptions which may pose a threat both to UNAMID’s own security and to the eastern Darfur area’s peace and security" (quoted in Lynch 2012).

But this neutrality in reporting merely echoed the neutrality of the Darfur conflict narrative, as perceived by regional actors on the ground. As long as Darfur remained a civil war, with equally culpable violent parties, its abuses would be reported along the same lines. Thus, the original ambiguity in perceptions affected information-sharing on Darfur, which further enhanced the civil war narrative. This feedback mechanism not only extinguished any prospects of robust intervention in Darfur, it erased Darfur from the long list of global crises altogether, since a standard African civil war could not effectively compete for the world’s attention.

**Bad neighborhoods and NATO**

Making matters worse, Darfur’s location within a “bad neighborhood” meant that it did not benefit from the resources and value-based will of robust multilateral organizations (Keohane 2003). In this bad neighborhood, any transformative missions or attempts at democratization were already dismissed as futile policy options by powerful Western players. The assumption was that any humanitarian military interventions in Darfur would be tainted by the legacy of long-run instability and even failed statehood. Even if Western actors were to intervene to stop the genocide
in Darfur, they wouldn’t remain in the region long enough to guarantee a better outcome relative to the current status-quo. Therefore, as to avoid such messy involvement, the West allowed regional actors to maintain dominance in Darfur – to define its atrocities as an African problem, not a global horror. Such a narrative ensured the delegation of moral responsibility beyond the state, while at the same time implying that geography should alter whose responsibility it is to protect civilians from systematic violence and government massacres.

Thus, in Darfur, the Western community championed the safeguarding of state sovereignty over the protection of human rights, precisely because of the characteristics found within a “bad neighborhood” (Keohane 2003). In a bad neighborhood, the sharing or diminishing of sovereignty for the sake of the neighborhood is unheard of. Instead, sovereignty remains the only way to preserve order within the dynamics of inter-state animosity, little shared resources, and weak inter-state institutions. Without the possibility of bundling sovereignty or activating shared institutions, the West could not pursue any long-term goals in Darfur – no hopes of democratization, no rhetoric on economic development, and zero transformative goals. Instead, the West spoke only of returning refugees to their homes and relative stabilization in Darfur. Days after the signing of the Darfur Peace Agreement, U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice (2006) portrayed such small milestones, always delegating their enforcement to the UN:

Most importantly, the agreement sets out a path that can return the people of Darfur to their homes… It is now more important than ever to have a strong United Nations effort to ensure that the agreement's detailed timelines are monitored and enforced. The accord clearly states that neutral peacekeepers have an essential role to play in this process.

Just as UN peacekeepers play a central role in helping to implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between North and South, we now need a UN peacekeeping force to help implement the Darfur peace agreement.
It is a rare moment, indeed, whenever US leadership demands “a strong United Nations.” In the case of Kosovo, the West went out of its way to dismiss UN mandates and pursue separate missions in a region of humanitarian crisis. In Libya, the West used the UN’s normative credibility to activate the NATO mission for regime change and potential democratization. Yet when it came to protecting human rights in Darfur, the West insisted on an all-powerful UN framing as the solution of choice. The Western community, including the US and EU actors, scrapped the idea of intervention in Darfur with the alternative of propping the only stable government actor in the crisis, the Government of Sudan, and leaving the rest to UN structures. As Susan Rice (2007) summarized, “In effect what we’ve done […] – we, the international community – is to allow the perpetrators of genocide, the government of Sudan, to dictate the terms of the international community’s response to that genocide.” As absurd as this may sound in terms of humanitarian effect, this variation in policy response parallels variations in region and institutional resources, which alter the costs associated with revocations of Sudan’s sovereignty.

The West ardently supported GoS’s sovereignty due to the risks arising from a bad neighborhood. This is also why powerful states implicitly made the UN the sole institution with a mandate to act. Without strategic interests or transformative liberal missions at stake in Darfur, the West could not use up its own resources and credibility within a region that it saw as an eternal quagmire of violence. In other words, the R2P principle no longer applied to Darfur because a humanitarian intervention in the crisis wouldn’t lead to an outcome conducive to Western liberal goals. Even at the height of the humanitarian suffering in July 2004, US Defense Department officials admitted that they had no plans to deploy US forces to Darfur, not even to aid in the delivery of humanitarian relief (Fessenden 2004). After all, as Senators Brownback and Corzine had publicly asserted, the purpose of any US resolution in this matter was not meant to oblige the
US to intervene in Darfur, but to “add moral weight to efforts to pass a United Nations resolution” (Barker 2004).

This choice was made much easier by the fact that regional players didn’t want any Western support or aid. To repeat South African President Mbeki, “you will notice that we have not asked for anybody outside of the African continent to deploy troops in Darfur. It's an African responsibility, and we can do it” (cited in VandeHei 2005). But as discussed above, without any semblance of Western support, the regional organizations of the AU and AL lacked both the resources and political will to stage a strong intervention on behalf of civilians in Darfur. The West, however, didn’t care that nothing was being done – they only cared about the image of responsibility, coupled with credibility.

Unlike in the case of Kosovo, where the choice of non-intervention would have weakened Western institutions and values, the non-intervention in Darfur aided Western credibility and normative images. This relates to accusations of colonial exploitation and imperialist wars, especially in the aftermath of the US interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, which grew louder once the UN Commission of Inquiry released its report on Darfur – refusing to label the violence as genocide (Heinze 2007). The isolated US declaration of genocide was thus perceived as another Western ploy to imperialize Africa and the global south. Media outlets even accused the US of “hyping” genocide in Darfur (“U.S. ‘Hyping’ Darfur Genocide Fear” 2004). In a similar vein, former Assistant Secretary-General of the UN, Ramesh Thakur (2004), attacked Western “humanitarians clamoring for another war,” adding that “Western intervention in Darfur would be exploited as yet another assault on Arabs and Muslims.” This, of course, evolved from the “humanitarian” origins of the war in Iraq, in that “most actors in international and world society believed that humanitarian justifications were used to mask the exercise of hegemonic power”
(Williams and Bellamy 2005, 36-37). Thakur (2004) continued on this imperialist critique against Western involvement in Darfur:

A Western intervention, far from offering a solution, may add to the problems. Especially after Iraq, we have to work through regional governments and the United Nations. There seems little interest in contemplating the possibility that developing countries might have some justice on their side in resisting assaults on sovereignty. The most important clue to understanding their concerns is the history of Europe's encounter with Arabs, Africans and Asians…

But given the history of past interventions by Westerners, the wiser course is for the African Union or the UN – which has been trying for over a year to alert everyone to the urgency and gravity of the Darfur crisis - to accept the lead responsibility. If London and Washington lead the charge to eliminate the veto power in the Security Council, then - but only then - can they claim legitimacy for military intervention outside the UN framework if UN authorisation is vetoed.

Thus, the sovereignty argument against intervention in Darfur is heavily tangled within a regional perspective of both norms and interests. It relates back to the limitations of Western values and institutions. The “normative foundations” of these institutions become moot once outside of the Western neighborhood, both in terms of regional functionalities and in terms of public expectations and international demands. In fact, in the case of Darfur, Western non-intervention offered the West more moral high ground and credibility than the alternative would have. The alternative of Western intervention in Darfur would have reeked of colonial pasts and imperialist patronyms – and so the West eagerly blurred its unwillingness to intervene within legalistic rhetoric tied to UN mandates. In this way, the West was happy with non-intervention, but so were regional and UN actors. As Thakur (2004) questioned, “Do developing countries not have the right to use force to put down armed challenge to their authority? Who decides the answers to these questions other than regional countries and the UN?” In other words, by not challenging Sudan’s sovereignty, Western actors were upholding their moral credibility to the international community and steering
clear from risky, non-transformative missions in bad neighborhoods. It was now only up to the UN to do something about Darfur.

But after the US attempt to justify intervention in Iraq under humanitarian grounds, the UN principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) suffered a credibility blow as well. Some developing countries compared the R2P to a “Trojan horse” for realpolitik amongst powerful Western actors, while smaller countries were terrified of becoming future targets for intervention (Bellamy 2005; Williams and Bellamy 2005, 36-40). Thankfully for Western actors, this skepticism of intervention let them off the hook in Darfur, a region of low geopolitical interests. In fact, many US and EU administration officials were relieved when the UN Commission announced that there was not enough evidence to suggest that genocide was unfolding in Darfur (Heinze 2007). The West was able to use its lack of humanitarian credibility abroad to provide normative cover for non-intervention in a self-declared genocide in Darfur (Heinze, 2007). In this way, the West could talk a big humanitarian game, but contribute very little to prevention of human suffering – something it couldn’t have so easily accomplished in Kosovo or other crises near Western neighborhoods.

In this normative backdrop, NATO was not inclined to use force to halt massive human rights atrocities in Darfur either. In Kosovo, NATO was willing to rebuke the UN and several powerful state actors to intervene. Yet five years later, NATO stood firm that it required a UN mandate before it could legitimately act as a UN proxy against acts of ethnic cleansing or genocide. In fact, despite increasing trends towards regionalized military responsibility, NATO demanded expansive UN authorization to even consider this option in Darfur.

Many of Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer’s speeches touched upon this NATO reluctance to use military force in Darfur without a clear UN mandate. On top of this, Scheffer distanced NATO even further by exclusively promoting the regionalization of international
responsibility via the AU and the principle of “African ownership.” An excerpt from a speech given in October of 2008, at the Kofi Anan International Peacekeeping Training Center in Ghana, openly explains NATO’s lack of enthusiasm for involvement in Darfur. Indeed, Scheffer (2008) presents a virtually opposite view from the one NATO took on Kosovo in 1999. The speech begins with a glimpse of the past, mentioning Bosnia as a case of necessary NATO intervention with a UN mandate. “In Bosnia, however, the UN blue-helmets found themselves in the middle of an ongoing war. The result was a series of humiliations for UN forces…we needed more than a classic UN peacekeeping force. We needed a military alliance. Provided with a mandate by the UN, it was NATO that took on the challenge” (Scheffer 2008). At this point, the only conflict dimensions differentiating Darfur from Bosnia are region and the lack of a UN mandate for NATO action.

But then Scheffer (2008) brings forth Kosovo as an instance of necessary NATO military action without a UN mandate: “…Kosovo was on the brink of a humanitarian disaster. This time, Russia and China made it clear that they would not provide a UN mandate for an intervention by NATO…NATO Allies decided to act without that direct UN mandate” (Scheffer 2008). Scheffer (2008) justified this breach of UN law by reminding us of Kofi Annan’s normative appeals at the time: “The UN Charter, he said in April 1999, ‘should never [be] the source of comfort or justification’ for ‘those guilty of gross and shocking violations of human rights.’” The overarching argument was that no national government could misuse sovereignty for the purposes of committing human rights abuses against their own civilians.

So, what then distinguished the Kosovo Crisis from the Darfur Crisis? In both cases, human rights abuses by government actors were rampant. The UN had normatively condemned both crises and called the international community to action. Lastly, the UN had withheld a formal mandate
for NATO in both Kosovo and Darfur – albeit more forcefully in the case of Kosovo. Thus, if we are to compare Scheffer’s rhetoric on NATO’s Kosovo intervention with NATO’s Darfur non-intervention, we are left with region as the only varying explanatory force. In Kosovo, the Western neighborhood could not tolerate ethnic cleansing and was pushed into action, but in Darfur, the Western neighborhood gained credibility and avoided labels of imperialism by not intervening. The following longer except from the speech implicitly admits this regional variation as a source of policy divergence:

In 1999…the NATO Allies decided to act without that direct U.N. mandate. It was a controversial decision, and it was a particular challenge for the Secretary General of the United Nations…in the summer of 2005, when I received calls from the Presidency of the African Union and from U.N. officials. Their question was straightforward: Would NATO support the African Union in its attempt to resolve the crisis in Darfur? As you all know, the answer of NATO’s 26 member countries was “yes” …Could NATO do even more? Should it do more? This is a question that is first of all for the African Union to answer. Our approach is clear: we respond to requests put forward by the African Union. We do not see ourselves as a global policeman…We are not seeking to impose ourselves, nor do we pretend that we have the answers to all of Africa’s security problems. This is why we strongly support the principle of African ownership. And why we will always coordinate closely with other international organisations – especially the United Nations. We need African solutions for African problems (Scheffer 2008).

In less diplomatic wording, NATO intervened in Kosovo without a UN mandate because it services Western neighborhoods, not outside realms of violence. Non-Western regions should then rely on their own regional institutional and resources for the preservation of human rights. After all, NATO wasn’t going to impose itself as a global policeman on Africa’s many civil wars and standard “security problems.” It saw these problems as Africa’s business, not the global business of genocide prevention. Along this line of expectations, NATO’s role in Darfur was self-limited to the provision of logistical advice, training, and sometimes airlift support to AMIS troops in Sudan.
But NATO had warned the world of its regional selectivity before, back in 1999 after the end of the Kosovo mission. NATO elites made it clear that unless a region was amenable to Western transformation or democratization goals, it would not be a target of NATO rescue:

Let me say first of all that NATO is not a global organisation. When you say whatever it is, it is too broad a concept, but in the region of our responsibilities…Look at the facts and that is the behaviour of an Alliance of democratic countries that is able to act in a coherent matter to stop something that never could have happened, or should have happened, in Europe (Solana 1999e).

With NATO decisively on the sidelines, the UN dealing in rhetoric that it couldn’t enforce, and with regional organizations interested in a civil war narrative, Darfur did not stand a chance. Over the decade of violence in Darfur, Western condemnations of genocide were not enough to override neither the ambiguity of conflict perceptions and its reporting bias nor the many regional deficits. These interactions muted a robust international response in favor of traditional diplomacy and mild peacekeeping in Darfur.

7.4. Conclusions

It is unsurprising, then, that Darfur stands with Rwanda as a tragic, yet preventable case of state-sponsored genocide. In the literature of historical humanitarian military intervention, this was surely the opposite of a “lessons learned” trajectory. What’s more, the Darfur Crisis raged on for over a decade, as the international community placated the R2P principle with a flawed regional mission and moral outrage.

Not even high levels of public support across international actors were enough to save Darfur. According to two public opinion surveys in several African countries and within the United States, a majority of people supported a UN military intervention in Darfur (see Figure 25 below).36

36 n=10,809 for GlobeScan survey of Angola, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania and Zimbabwe; n=812 for PIPA/Knowledge Networks survey of 812 US respondents
Sixty-five percent of Africans interviewed (a majority in seven countries and a plurality in one) said the UN “should have the right to authorize the use of military force to prevent severe human rights violations such as genocide.” Among these countries, Ghana and Kenya stood at the strongest supporters of intervention, at eighty and seventy-five percent, respectively. In contrast, South Africa offered the least support at forty-seven percent. For the supportive respondents, the UN was the most preferred and well-trusted of all third-party mediators in Darfur, with the AU falling in second place. But even so, over half of the African respondents believed that countries should be able to intervene against human rights without explicit UN approval (PIPA 2005).

The survey of US citizens revealed similar, bi-partisan patterns, with sixty-one percent of Americans agreeing that the best solution for the crisis was for the UN to “step in with military force to stop the violence in Darfur.” While favoring a multilateral UN approach, a smaller majority of the Americans also supported the deployment of US and NATO forces in Darfur (Program on International Policy Attitudes 2005). Support was even higher for the provision of equipment and logistical aid for the AU peacekeeping force – with seventy-one percent of US respondents saying that NATO should provide help, and only twenty-one percent saying that it should not.

But conflict perceptions still mattered deeply here. In a study done by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations in 2004, participants were asked if they would favor sending US troops in Darfur “to stop a government from committing genocide.” Seventy-five percent of respondents agreed with such a policy, but once “genocide” was removed in reference to the mass violence, support for sending US troops decreased by six points, and public support for a general UN intervention dropped by thirteen points (ReliefWeb 2005). Ultimately, the Darfur Crisis received very little of this proclaimed support, as elite policymaking did not match public sentiments,
largely due to ambiguous conflict perceptions, interests in maintaining the status-quo, and regional dynamics.

**Figure 25: Public Opinion on UN Military Intervention in Darfur**
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Some, however, have a more optimistic take on the Darfur non-intervention. In their interviews with regional elites, Verhoeven et al (2016) found cause for optimism as related to the expansion of humanitarian interventions, albeit under a different name. For instance, El-Ghassim Wane, the director of the AU's Peace and Security Department, did not view Darfur as an example of reluctance or failure of African states to multilaterally intervene in domestic affairs; instead, Darfur was an opportunity for African states to learn optimal resource-pooling and specializations as per different comparative advantages for future crisis management.

As Verhoeven et al (2016) noted, since the Darfur Crisis, the AU has intervened militarily in Burundi, the Central African Republic, and Somalia. It has also wielded sanctions and suspensions to manage unconstitutional takeovers of power in Burkina Faso, Comoros, Egypt,
Mauritania, Madagascar and Togo. They go on to say that while “the AU may not use verbatim R2P language because of its connotations with Western imperialism,” especially after the Western Libya intervention in 2011, “the practice of intervention as a legitimate instrument in Africa's international relations to arrest bloody conflicts or prevent violence from escalating further is here to stay.” Therefore, Darfur may serve as an example of how non-Western actors can begin to institutionalize their neighborhoods for more effective, collective humanitarian outcomes – that is, if we can somehow sideline the decades-long atrocities continuing to occur in Darfur.

While there is literature that posits Darfur as a catalyst for a growing movement to institutionalize AU principles of humanitarian intervention, in this study, Darfur more readily represents persistent non-intervention in a region experiencing systemic humanitarian abuses. The main distinguishers of this policy outcome from the interventions in Kosovo and Libya are unfavorable conflict perceptions (laden in dynamics of national interest) and regional variations.

In the last chapter of this journey, I synthesize such pathways of intervention and non-intervention as portrayed via the Kosovo, Libya, and Darfur case studies. I return to the interacting variables of conflict perception, regional variation, and geopolitical interests to explain patterns of selectivity in humanitarian military interventions. I consolidate these findings within a four-by-four typology of intervention, followed by a short section on contributions and implications for international security policy and ethics in international relations. Lastly, I suggest several steps for future research on a phenomenon that has the potential to save millions, but often inflicts damage, suspicion, and unspoken regional bias on the worthiness of human life instead.

---

37 Verhoeven et al. (2016) refer to the AU’s movement toward regional humanitarian intervention as the principle of non-indifference, to distinguish it from Western imperialism.
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND THE FUTURE OF HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS

“Because you can't intervene everywhere, you don't conclude you can't intervene anywhere.”

Zbigniew Brzeziński

Now equipped with our statistical generalizations and three detailed cases of intrastate crisis, we can ask the question that underpinned the trajectory of this study – are humanitarian military interventions really humanitarian? In other words, are these missions primarily activated by the need to prevent human suffering or the strategic pursuit of interests? The answer to such a question is a hesitant yes. Yes, humanitarian military interventions certainly require a threshold of human suffering to become probable policymaking. But this human rights dimension is a necessary, yet not sufficient condition for the activation of such missions. Given our model findings on minimal impact of both traditional state interests and norms of human rights on the selectivity gap of humanitarian military interventions, the nature of the question changes. We must instead ask: under what conditions does human suffering prompt third-party responses, including the phenomenon of humanitarian military intervention? Using both predictive modeling and case study analysis, I have shown that the probability of intervention depends on how powerful international actors perceive the violence within the conflict – whether as another civil war, systematic killings, or impending genocide. Yet even if the conflict receives favorable perceptions as something beyond a civil war, it must still be near a good neighborhood, synonymous with the Western sphere and institutions so as to receive third-party resources, and perhaps a military rescue.

38 Try as I might, I could not find the original document that produced this quote. But more than 30 separate online sources attributed the exact phrase to the same author.
Most importantly, however, what do these patterns say about the current state of international norms on the protection of innocents? After all, if the regional bias within the HMI phenomenon is so rampant, then how can we speak of an international normative evolution or consensus on human rights? Thus, in this last chapter, beyond summaries of empirical arguments, I begin the discussion on the nature of ethical sentiments and behavior across states. I focus on the regional bias that pervades humanitarian expectations within contemporary international security, exploring ways to diminish the selectivity gap that has characterized every finding in this study.

8.1. Key Drivers of Intervention

Understanding the dynamics behind contemporary military interventions within regions of intrastate conflict is not only an exercise in isolating important theoretical variables but can also alter behaviors toward future calls for such interventions. If the propelling force of intervention is humanitarian need, including perceptions of grave human rights abuses, then the international community should not discourage these defensible endeavors, but instead focus on improving outcomes. Most importantly, such a finding would, to some degree, warrant the conferral of the label “humanitarian military intervention” upon the missions. Alternatively, if the reasons behind the interventions are strictly tied to national interests, the international community must consider stricter barriers so as to limit abuse of the R2P norm and international law. If the answer stands in the middle of this spectrum – such as involving political identities, interests, and norms in certain interactions – the academic community must work harder to define relationships so as to determine the efficacy and role of these missions. The primary catalysts of these interventions can influence the outcome of the missions, either placing humanitarian goals before or after national interests.

So, what stand as the key causes of humanitarian military interventions in this study? The good news is that national interests do not dominate this answer, but the bad news is that neither
do human rights or norms. Instead, the effects of both interests and human rights norms depend on variations in conflict perceptions and regional institutionalization. Keohane’s (2003) theoretical framework on good versus bad neighborhoods begins to explain the regional variation in intervention outcomes, while Campbell’s (1998) nuanced analysis of conflict perceptions in Bosnia explains the conditions under which regional resources become activated. For instance, in the Kosovo Crisis, it took years for NATO to consider the suffering of ethnic Albanians as worthy of elite attention, let alone military intervention. But as soon as the perception of the Kosovo Crisis moved away from ethnic/religious civil war and into the realm of systematic killing, the Western neighborhood activated its institutions. This transformation in conflict perceptions occurred swiftly after US Ambassador Walker personally witnessed the civilian massacres in 1999, in the backdrop of years of third-party inactivity within the Kosovo Crisis. For Kosovo, this change in conflict perceptions was a mandatory condition before Western actors would consider intervention, and once it was fulfilled, Western institutions created secondary interests based on their own functionalities. The Kosovo intervention ultimately became a test of NATO’s regional values, credibility, and effectiveness as well as the West’s enforcement of its own normative image.

In Libya, conflict perceptions were immediately favorable to Western attention because of existing traditional interests in regime change. As soon as Gadhafi began his offensive against protesters, the Western media alongside elites immediately reported the crisis as a case of systematic violence, with the Libyan government as the fully culpable actor and the protestors as the consistently outmatched, innocent victims. But because Libya was not within a Western neighborhood, NATO required strong proof that both the UN and regional institutions such as the AU and AL would contribute to the mission, so as to prop mission legitimacy and support NATO’s
Western values. Ultimately, however, the West was only interested in regime change in Libya, which was made easier to pursue in the midst of favorable conflict perceptions. Thus, NATO did not care to invest in post-conflict rebuilding in the region.

In comparing the two missions, we see that NATO took longer to intervene within the human suffering in Kosovo, but it was ready to send in boots on the ground once the mission was under way. In the long run, it also invested more in Kosovo’s future stability. In contrast, NATO intervened swiftly through aerial strikes to stop human suffering in Libya, but as soon as the Gadhafi regime fell, NATO and Western partners abandoned Libya to its failing state conditions. In both cases, conflict perceptions and regional institutions were key factors of intervention, albeit within a dramatically different timeline. Once the suffering in Kosovo earned the right to be called “ethnic cleansing” or “potential genocide,” Western elites were ready to expand the good neighborhood so as to incorporate Kosovo within European identity, hence investing heavily in its future. As narratives show, transatlantic actors were sure of the Balkan’s path of democratization and assimilation into “civilized” Europe (Campbell 1998). But this expansion of the neighborhood was not an option in Libya. The intervention in Libya in 2011 never had transformative goals beyond a quick regime overthrow – in fact, Western leaders never uttered words of democratic solidarity for Libya. They simply could not envision Libya within the good Western neighborhood, and thus, Libya today remains in violent conflict and on the brink of failure. Conflict perceptions may have propelled a military intervention in Libya, but they were not enough to mobilize the resources of the good neighborhood toward long-term transformations.

8.2. Key Drivers of Non-intervention

But perceptions and regional variations are a double-edged sword. The variables that drove the Kosovo and Libya interventions are also the ones that continue to mute international responses
to the decades-long atrocities in Darfur. Far from the borders of a good neighborhood, Darfur holds minimal national interests for powerful states and institutions. Making matters worse, the fragmented conflict perceptions of the conflict allow for passive reactions. Regional actors such as the AU and AL have gone out of their way to dismiss narratives of genocide or systematic killings in Darfur, preferring to discuss the Government of Sudan (GoS) as an equally culpable actor within a complicated identity civil war. They have also monopolized the third-party missions in Darfur, which has proven to be one of the most ineffective missions in the history of peacekeeping. Western actors have sometimes protested against the civil war narrative by proclaiming the violence in Darfur as ongoing genocide, but without the activation of their regional institutions, Western accusations of genocide in Darfur enter the void of UN stalemates. In the backdrop of accusations of imperialism, the West was able to gain credibility and normative power via non-intervention in Darfur, instead allowing regional institutions to take the reins. It was also able to sidestep a mission within a non-institutionalized bad neighborhood, choosing the preservation of a deadly sovereign rule over the risks of more disorder in Africa.

Indeed, almost twenty years later, the people of Darfur continue to suffer from government-sponsored violence all because effective institutions are too far away from their homes. NATO refuses to use its resources beyond its own good neighborhood, especially when there are no interests to pursue. It refuses to act in regions that don’t serve as arenas for the pursuit of transatlantic values. In other words, NATO and other Western actors have effectively regionalized their responsibility to protect and any norm of human rights that follow.

As the figure below confirms using an expanded set of cases from the aggregated dataset in chapter four, all crises bordering the Western neighborhood had much higher rates of intervention than the crises outside this neighborhood, regardless of national interests involved.
Figure 27: Crisis Intervention by Region and Interests

The effects of this regionalization of responsibility and normative evolution extend beyond Darfur. All violent conflicts outside of the Western neighborhood suffer from fragmentations in conflict perceptions and muted international reactions. For instance, the current atrocities committed by the Myanmar military against the Rohingya minority population remain at the periphery of Western institutions and elite attention. While the UN has condemned the violence as ethnic cleansing, it has not been able to rally support for third-party intervention. As the violence rages on, the international community limits itself to reading periodic updates from NGOs and UN agencies on how much worse the Myanmar crisis is becoming by the minute. As long as Bangladesh takes on the refugee spillover and the Myanmar government denies the existence of mass graves, the international community will simply dismiss the degree of undeniable human terror, so as not to activate any legal mandates to act.

The typology of intervention below, based on aggregated data and case study narratives, confirms such tragic consequences. If a violent internal crisis is outside of the Western neighborhood and within the realm of a civil war narrative, the probability of rescue is in the negatives, even if national interests are moderate across third-party actors. If the internal crisis
happens near a Western neighborhood and also picks up the perceptions of systematic killings, then intervention is increasingly probable and more intense. As the figure reveals, there are degrees of intervention within this Western realm as well. While Bosnia and Kosovo had minimal national interests at play, these crises received more intense interventions than Libya, as they were within the Western neighborhood, not simply proximate to it. The limited intervention in Libya, on the other hand, was primarily driven by great power interests and favorable perceptions.

**Figure 28. Typology of Humanitarian Military Intervention**

Simply put, current norms and expectations for the protection of innocents vary by region of the world. Scholars, policymakers, and institutions such as the UN may wax poetic about the importance of human rights across the globe, but in times of crisis, the human rights of very specific populations become deserving of protection, while the rights and safety of others barely elicit any responsibility to care, let alone act. This regional discrimination, unfortunately,
originates from the shared values of Western institutions, not from the expected, cold indifference of national interests. These benign origins are what make the selectivity gap so much harder to address and ultimately fix. Put another way, we like what NATO and the EU can do for the Western sphere in times of crisis, and most audiences support the values that underpin the activated institutions. So, how can we preserve the benefits of such regional norms and institutions while at the same time diminishing the inequalities and exploitations that they may implicitly perpetuate across the world? The first step may lie in bolstering regional institutions beyond the West.

8.3. Policy-making against Regional Selectivity

Since Western institutions, such as NATO, drive military interventions during times of neighborhood crises, then perhaps strengthening regional institutions throughout other neighborhoods could narrow the selectivity gap. The AU and AL stand as strong examples of existing institutions outside of the West that can expand their mandates and shared resources. Unfortunately, the member states within these institutions are often adamant about protecting their own sovereignty and therefore contribute very little funding to institutional growth and missions (Prunier 2004; 2005). As it stands, both the AU and AL suffer from internal dysfunctions brought about by self-interested national agendas, lack of funding, and a complete lack of explicit shared values (Lynch 2012; 2014). But outside support could alter these trends in the long-run. If transatlantic actors were to invest in training and resources for these non-Western regional organizations, founded upon the experiences of stable institutions like NATO, then they could one day divest themselves from the burdens of human rights protection outside of the Western neighborhood, without risking normative images and accusations of hypocrisy and indifference.

But despite some functionalist improvements, such a solution would only further solidify the regionalization of human rights norms into the future. A better solution would relate to shaming
well-funded, functioning Western institutions into responding to global calls for aid. Their own Western constituents, INGOs, and transnational advocacy networks (TANS) could mobilize such a call to action. In other words, civil society actors should put the same effort into shaming these regional institutions as they do pressuring the UN into paying attention to endless instances of global suffering. Equal media reporting on distant crises, better informed citizenry, and reworked expectations of human rights beyond UN mandates would be key to such a campaign. In such a distant scenario, robust institutions would be able to stem the violence within a crisis before it ever required a full-blown military intervention. In fact, the UN should be encouraged to reconsider the nature of its partnerships with regional institutions – to accept its own political limitations and create channels of resource-sharing with NATO, the EU, and even the AU and AL that don’t require the full consent of the Security Council. But these alternatives are in the distant future. For the time being, it is important to be aware of the regional bias that pervades our “universal” notions of human rights and not simply accept it as the only way.

8.4. The Future of Humanitarian Military Intervention

This research has revealed the heavily regionalized selectivity gap of humanitarian intervention, driven by the interactions between conflict perceptions and institutional resources. Along this empirical journey, the findings have opened a space for larger discussions on what is deemed acceptable in the realm of international relations. Does contemporary international relations have room for ethical and moral discussions? If so, is it ethical to allow current patterns of humanitarian military interventions to go unchallenged?

It is my hope that future research will delve deeper into the patterns of humanitarian military interventions, and with every new empirical finding, it will offer new insight into the relationship between power, ethics, and norms. The current humanitarian crises, including in Syria,
Libya, Yemen, Myanmar, and Darfur, require much more of our attention as scholars and policymakers, as international security is more than counter-terrorism, the management of failed states, or the control of inter-state hostilities. The way that we respond to these internal armed crisis, ranging from levels of media attention to degrees of Western policymaking, will shape the nature of the international relations discipline as a whole.

Expanded research on other cases of internal violence is necessary to further untangle the relationships between perceptions, interests, and norms. More in-depth examinations are needed to understand, for example, why Russia has invested much time and resources into their normative justifications for the Crimean and Ukrainian interventions, even though traditional realist interests appear dominant. Also, why has the international community, including the West, chosen to remain relatively inactive, outside of economic sanctions (Becker et al. 2016)? Perhaps the answer lies in Russia’s greater power status, a weaker humanitarian context, or more risky pursuit of interests. But are the normative justifications thrown on both sides only frail mirrors for realist pursuits or do they serve a more significant purpose in today’s international arena? Are there differences in how Western versus non-Western actors use norms and practice humanitarian missions? For now, it appears as though Russia’s 2014 intervention in Ukraine exhibits noteworthy interactions between norms and interests. A more multidimensional theoretical perspective is required to explain Russia’s diverse arsenal of interventionist tools, including normative appeals, economic incentives, indirect coercion, and of course, pure militaristic strategies (Becker et al. 2016). Russia has justified military intervention in Ukraine through the authority of international bodies, norms of protecting innocents, and through the denial of military force.\(^\text{39}\) In contemporary

\(^{39}\) For more details, see US Department of State: Office of the Spokesperson (2014) and RT (2014).
politics, the illegitimate use of force is arguably more strictly limited than before, thus, normative context may play a much larger role in allowing interventions (Pinker 2012; Goldstein 2012). Indeed, in recent cases of intervention, Russian officials persistently rejected the term “military intervention.” (Allison 2009). In contrast, during the bipolar Cold War international atmosphere, Russia did not bother to legitimize its military interventions by appealing to humanitarian norms. But today, Russia’s strategic use of norms (humanitarian justifications for intervention; responsibility to protect arguments; and ethnic ties) allows it to pursue regional power and ethnic politics without costly Western interference. Therefore, the recent Russian military intervention offers insights into the interaction between the power structure of the international system, security interests, and the contemporary norms that may alter those interests.

While this study has delved into all cases of internal armed conflicts and corresponding international responses, the study’s sample is dominated by Western actors as key third-party intervenors. Future research should consider splitting up the sample of crises between Western and non-Western intervenors and perhaps more specifically, between Russian, Arab, or Chinese third-party intervenors. These refinement of sample characteristics could provide more nuanced insight into the selectivity gap in intervention across different geopolitical spheres of influence and begin to examine non-Western institutional effects as well.

Lastly, future studies should extend measurements of conflict perceptions beyond dichotomous generalizations and individual case studies. This can be done via a systematic analysis of language used across media, elites, and the general public during specific crises. The Factiva database would be a strong starting point for the construction of such a dataset, once the range of perception narratives is solidified via an expanded literature review process. If we better understand the power of conflict perceptions and narratives of crisis, we can learn to use
information campaigns, media accounts, and wording choices to equalize the distribution of human rights protection across the world. What must be prevented is the darker alternative from these narratives – the abuse of information and language towards dismissing human suffering or perceiving a subset of our global community as undeserving of human rights protection.

Implicitly underlying this study are questions of responsibility to the distant other. Yet the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle becomes a mere international pacifier – the justification of the status-quo of regionalized indifference. Under its assumptions, there already exists a duty on behalf of international actors to protect innocent civilians from massacres, where the sovereign state refuses to do so. But despite the universal consensus that “something must be done,” our international security policies consistently showcase a highly biased enforcement of the R2P norm. In most parts of our world, states and elites continue to commit genocide against their own citizens, as the rest of us stand as sympathetic, knowledgeable, but paralyzed actors. But by revealing the extreme variations in such international responses, including the key causes, we can begin to explicitly discuss and decide upon the nature of our political expectations, ethical standards, and trade-offs between sovereignty and suffering.
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APPENDIX

Table 1: Factiva Conflict Perceptions Coding during the Libya Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NARRATIVE</th>
<th>FACTIVA SEARCH TERMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genocide/Mass Killings</td>
<td>Libya and (crisis or conflict or war or intervention) and (genocide or ethnic cleansing or massacres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity War</td>
<td>Libya and (crisis or conflict or war or intervention) and (ethnic or religious or civil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>Libya and (crisis or conflict or war or intervention) and (terrorism or terrorist or terrorists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed State</td>
<td>Libya and (crisis or conflict or war or intervention) and (failed state or failing state)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Conflict Perceptions via Article Count during the Libya Crisis