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Abstract

Can mass atrocities pose a threat to global security? Historically, mass atrocities have been treated as humanitarian issues and have been prioritized on the foreign policy agenda as such, especially by the United States. The objective of this paper is to take a deeper analytical dive into this humanitarian issue\(^1\) to find out if there are in fact deeper security repercussions arising from mass atrocities. The paper begins by examining the repercussions of two well-known instances of mass atrocities. The first chapter examines the aftermath of inaction on behalf of the international community to put an end to the devastating 1994 genocide in Rwanda. I choose Rwanda because it is an event in history that continues to resonate with people as one of the most critical foreign policy failures of all time, yet one in which the lessons learned have failed to be identified.\(^2\) In my second chapter, I assess the repercussions of the current mass atrocities in Syria, another case where the path of inaction was chosen. Upon examination of these varying mass atrocity situations, I find a link between refugee spillover and the exacerbation of terrorism in neighboring countries. These findings emphasize a more imminent security threat stemming from mass atrocities than previously assessed. One common mechanism to put an end to mass atrocities involves participation on behalf of the international community to step in and stop the perpetrators. In my final chapter I examine historical cases of intervention in mass atrocities, to better analyze the future of interventions. I compare and

---

\(^1\) According to the Humanitarian Coalition, a humanitarian emergency is defined as “an event or series of events that represents a critical threat to the health, safety, security or wellbeing of a community or other large group of people, usually over a wide area.”

\(^2\) The Rwanda genocide served as an eye opener to the international community and is the gleaming example of the horrific repercussions of inaction. The tragedy sparked constructive foreign policy debates on interventions, as well as mandates aimed at preventing genocides.
contrast instances of UN intervention versus U.S led intervention. I find that due to the change in
the origin of conflict from interstate to intrastate, standard UN intervention mandates are no
longer equipped to intervene in mass atrocities. Due to the link between mass atrocity spillover,
and the exasperation of terrorism in the region, I suggest that it is particularly relevant to U.S
global security interests to take the lead in putting an end to these crimes. Mass atrocities will
continue to destruct countries and regions while exacerbating the spread of terrorism, threatening
global and U.S security. The U.S and the rest of the international community need to begin
identifying mass atrocity situations as national security threats, instead of strictly internal
humanitarian crises.
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I. Introduction

The decision to intervene in mass atrocities has been a controversial foreign policy debate for centuries. It is a topic that has laid bare basic divisions within the international community. Specifically, U.S intervention has been plagued by tragic historical occurrences such as Somalia and Iraq, and some fear intervention can be interpreted as imperialist meddling in the world affairs of other countries. The world agrees that mass atrocities are unacceptable, and yet genocide and mass killings keep occurring. The challenge lies in determining whether or not the threat posed by mass atrocities warrants an international response. The task seems simple on the surface, yet is one of the most persistent policy puzzles of our time. Is the cost of intervention worth it? In an era of fiscal austerity and at a time when countries are exhausted from engaging in far away battles and losing their own men and women, mass atrocities do not seem to make the priority list, the way terrorism does. The way in which the international community should approach mass atrocities is often disputed and intricate, however this is an issue that is relevant and warrants a solution as we continue to witness millions of innocent lives being taken all around the world by heartless dictators, ruthless governments and violent militias. Not only are mass atrocities a devastating reality, their repercussions have proven and continue to prove to be internationally destabilizing, and yet the world continues to sit on the sidelines and allow them to transpire. The humanitarian crisis of systemic human rights abuses and the national security

---

5 Ibid pg. ix
threat of terrorism are seen as separate issues, and are treated as such. I find the linkage between mass atrocities and the threat of refugee spiller exacerbating terrorism in surrounding countries, is under researched and not well understood. This paper acknowledges that there are many reasons terrorism is exacerbated in countries and many reasons why people join terrorist groups aside from mass atrocities and refugee spillover. This paper simply aims to highlights a generally overlooked cause of terrorism as well as bring two separate foreign policy issues, humanitarian vs. national security, into the same arena of thought. Human rights gurus and military specialists cannot seem to have a lateral discussion about the possibility of the two being interconnected, this is a concern.

Of the few global leaders who do recognize mass atrocities as a security issue, their struggle lies in convincing other decision makers of the implications of inaction. Previous U.S Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, argues that it is not only possible but also necessary to create a blueprint for preventing and responding to genocides, still no such framework exists. History proves that despite the amount of casualties occurring and repeated promises to never again let massive amounts of people be systematically killed, the decision to intervene relies more on what strategic interests are at risk. These strategic interests typically include things such as oil reserves, protection of allies and partners, the maintenance of the free flow of commerce, and economic security. All interests which are endangered by terrorism, yet the international community continues to be blinded to this brutal connection and proceeds to view mass atrocities as posing no immediate threat to global security. In this paper I examine the linkage between

---

7 Ibid pg. xvi
mass atrocity refugee spillover and the exacerbation of terrorism. “On 11 September 2001 global terrorism, with its roots in complex conflicts in distant lands, struck US homeland: impregnable lines of continental defense proved an illusion even for the world’s most powerful state.” There is no such thing as irrelevant conflicts occurring in far away places. Everywhere is of strategic importance in today’s geopolitical environment. The threat of refugee spillover exacerbating terrorism warrants the attention of the international community.

Road Map

The paper begins by identifying the unresolved issue of mass atrocities continuing to occur all around the world despite years and years of repeated promises to bring the killings to an end. The paper continues on to highlight why the issue of continuing mass atrocities should be an area of immediate concern to global leaders. Scholars and government officials often categorize mass atrocities as a “soft power,” “humanitarian” issue. The atrocities have never been treated as an imminent priority, or thought of as having any serious security implications, specifically relating to terrorism. I found a lack in literature and research on what exactly happens to the surviving victims and perpetrators once the mass atrocities come to an end. Where do the victims flee too? What happens to them once they leave their native country? If the mass atrocity perpetrators are not penalized, which most are not, where do they go once their killing spree

---


9 Soft power is defined by the Oxford dictionary as a persuasive approach to international relations, typically involving the use of economic or cultural influence. Most cases of mass atrocity interventions are viewed through a soft power/charity lens, and heavily involve the use of aid, such as large economic donations for food, water and shelter. This is in contrast to a hard power approach which involves the use of force, typically military power, used to fight terrorism. Hard power issues are prioritized as more imminent than soft power issues.
comes to an end, if it even does? This paper essentially aims to find out if mass atrocity refugees, both victims and perpetrators, impose a security threat to global security, and if so what can be done to counter this threat.

I begin by examining the 1994 Rwanda genocide. I choose this historical case because it is a clear example of where the world acknowledged mass atrocities taking place and still decided to stand on the sidelines. This decision continues to resonate with people as one of the gravest mistakes in history, mostly due to the moral guilt that still looms over those who turned a blind eye to thousands of innocent lives being taken. At the time, intervention on behalf of the international community to stop the killings, did not seem necessary. Inaction proves that international leaders around the world did not view the genocide as an immediate threat to anyone but the Tutsis being slaughtered inside Rwanda. However, the spillover from the genocide destabilized the entire Great Lakes region and sparked a large cross country bloodbath, particularly, in neighboring Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), known as “Africa’s World War”. This is known to be the largest humanitarian crisis of all time involving five major African countries, including, Rwanda, Uganda, Angola, Zimbabwe, and Sudan. The violence unfolding in the DRC is a direct repercussion of the massive spillover of nearly 2 million Rwandans, nearly a third of Rwanda’s population, including Hutu perpetrators into the DRC. Although it is true the DRC has always been plagued with civil unrest, it wasn't until the immense influx of Rwandan Hutus that one of the most deadly terrorist organization was created.

The group is known as the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR), responsible for the death of more than 5.4 million people.\textsuperscript{13} The core leadership of FDLR is comprised of key members of the Rwanda genocide, plus Hutu members of the former Rwandan army, as well as a mix of displaced Rwandan Hutu’s.\textsuperscript{14} The world, and in particular the West, has long-term strategic interests in Africa due to its critical economic trade links, natural resources, and crucial energy supply, yet the country was considered unimportant during the genocide. Recently, the country has been experiencing growing amounts of terrorist activity and is becoming a larger concern to the international community. Since the spark of increased terrorism, the country has been given a lot more attention.

An unstable Africa is a threat to the entire global community. Having such a large and vicious terrorist organization, such as the FDLR, located in the region is of national concern. The international community has now spent billions of dollars on aid to the Congo in hopes of stabilizing the region. The U.S has provided $306 million in bilateral aid to promote economic reforms and transparency and continues to provide security and counterterrorism assistance and advice to U.S partners in the region.\textsuperscript{15} Although refugee spillover is not a new concern of the international community, and many scholars do recognize a link between refugees and civil wars, I find that few scholars have made the connection between mass atrocity refugees and the spread of terrorism.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} Shah, Au.
\textsuperscript{16} The threat of refugee spillover from mass atrocities has been of urgent concern, especially on the European security agenda, throughout the 1990’s. The bombings in Madrid on March 11, 2004, and in London on July 7, 2005, only reinforced already existing fears regarding links
Following my examination of the Rwanda case, I decided to analyze a more contemporary case of mass atrocities in a different critical region of the world. I choose to examine the present day mass atrocity situation in Syria and its security effect on the Middle East and the rest of the world. Unlike my first chapter where the fleeing perpetrators of the mass atrocities were the main actors in spreading terrorism into neighboring countries, my second chapter takes a different angle on the issue, one in which I identify the effect the fleeing victims had on neighboring countries, specifically Iraq. Following my findings of a link between the fleeing mass atrocity perpetrators and terrorism in Africa, I wanted to explore if there was also a link between the fleeing mass atrocities victims and terrorism. In this case study I examine whether the refugees escaping persecution in Syria had any effect on the empowerment of the terrorist organization known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL), similar to the Rwanda and FDLR connection. I choose this case because it is a present day international security dilemma, and also an instance, again, of non-intervention on behalf of the international community to put an end to mass killings. I find that although ISIL previously existed before the humanitarian crisis in Syria, the Syrian refugees dramatically galvanized it.

In both these case studies the refugee spillover exacerbated previous sectarian tensions within a country igniting terrorism. The case studies demonstrate that intervention means more than just receiving a moral pat on the back and should rather be viewed as a strategic counter terrorism move. Terrorism is one threat that the international community agrees has the ability to disrupt global peace and security and therefore requires global collaboration to combat. Sergei

---

between refugee migration and terrorism. Since the September 11 attacks, the management of migration has become a top national security priority. When massive amounts of people pour into countries with ungoverned spaces, it creates a severe threat.
Ordzhonikidze, previous Director General of the United Nations states, “terrorism is a global threat that can never be justified. A new vision of global security is needed—one that must confront terrorism, respect human rights and draw upon multilateral cooperation.”

In my final chapter I focus on what can be done to solve this issue. I choose to look at historical examples of intervention in mass atrocities, to have a better grasp on future interventions. One of the biggest challenges of mass atrocity intervention is deciding who should be responsible for it. Many scholars attempt to delegate this responsibility to one country, such as the U.S, or one organization, such as the UN. I utilize a comparative case study methodology to analyze historical examples of both U.S led interventions and United Nations interventions. While examining different historical examples of mass atrocity interventions I also make an important observation regarding the change in the origin of conflict, from interstate to intrastate conflict. This new era of threats has drastically complicated mass atrocity intervention and has affected traditional intervention techniques. The majority of historical conflicts are known as interstate conflict, which arises between two separate governments and most of these conflicts declined following the end of the Cold War. The international community is now faced with intrastate conflicts, which occur between the armed forces of the government and an opposing civil organized group, within the same state boarders. This can be troublesome especially for international organizations such as the UN whose peacekeeping mandates are more aimed at

---

handling interstate conflict, and whom rely heavily on the factor of “consent” when considering an intervention.

I evaluate the UN because since its inception in 1945, the world has relied, almost solely, on this international organization to put an end to mass atrocities. The UN is known to be the largest international organization responsibility towards maintaining global peace and stability. It has, and continues to try to have, a pivotal role in the protection of civilians in these hostile conflicts. I analyze one case of interstate intervention and one case of intrastate intervention. I examine the United Nations Interim Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIMOG), for the interstate conflict and the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUSCO) for the intrastate conflict. I utilize these different case studies to provide examples of how the UN mandates are structured to be successful in traditional types of conflict, rather than in the new era of conflicts. Following the case studies, I conclude that the UN is not equipped and ready to handle the new type of 21st century threats emanating from these troubled countries, at least not alone.

As the global hegemon, some view the U.S as having an obligation to the international community to put an end to mass atrocities;20 while others disagree arguing that the U.S should not become the “world’s policeman.”21 In this chapter I analyze if it is in the U.S best interest to lead interventions in mass atrocities and if so why. It is vital to note one of the biggest discrepancies of intervention is defining just what “intervention” means. For the purpose of this paper I will be referring to intervention as strictly aimed at putting an end to large-scale human

---

20 Albright, Madeleine Korbel, William S. Cohen, and John C. Danforth pg. xxi
suffering. The protection of civilians first and foremost. Many will point to the disastrous intervention by the U.S in Iraq as an argument against intervention. The security situation in Iraq differs from the type of security dilemmas I will be discussing. The intervention in Iraq right away had different priorities than strictly the protection of civilians. Priorities such as overthrowing Saddam Hussein and making sure WMD’s did not get into the hands of the wrong people. Evident quickly in Iraq was a case of mission creep, which then involved the U.S trying to state building and stabilize the region, not their area of expertise.

One of the first cases of U.S led intervention in mass atrocities took place in Bosnia during the 1992 ethnic cleansing campaign against the Bosnian Muslims by the Bosnian Serb forces. I chose Bosnia because it is considered one of history’s worst case of genocide and one in which the world recognized the danger of the mass killings and collectively decided to try to intervene to put an end to them. Although reluctant at first, even the U.S did decide to intervene. Bosnia was the first time U.S force was matched with diplomacy, breaking the typical Washington policy impasse. This U.S foreign policy decision to intervene would be the basis for the Dayton Peace Accords that saved thousands of lives in Bosnia and stabilized the region.²² However, the U.S could not have succeed without the assistance of allies and 60,000 U.S and NATO forces. Bosnia marks the first time the U.S had demonstrated leadership for a multi-lateral intervention, and it was this dauntless decision that transformed Bosnia into a country at relative peace.²³

I make the argument that while the U.S alone should not be responsible for intervention, after finding a connection between mass atrocities and terrorism, it would be in the U.S best

---

²³ Ibid.
interest to utilize its global status to provide leadership in leading the fight to end mass atrocities. I briefly evaluate the effectiveness of the concept of Responsibility to Protect (RTP), which has become a prominent feature in international debates about responding to mass atrocities. I recommend the U.S utilize the RTP to leverage the protection that RTP provides in the often worrisome debate regarding overriding countries sovereignty. Due to its size and might, the U.S holds a unique position in the geopolitical environment, one in which it has the opportunity to act as an effective mechanism for holding other UN Member states, whom all adopted the doctrine, accountable to uphold the responsibility they agreed upon. In order to lead efficient multilateral interventions the U.S to step up to the plate.

The link between refugee spillover, caused by mass atrocities in the home country, and the exacerbation of terrorism in receiving countries is under-theorized and for the most part has been overlooked by national security decision makers across the globe. Following the findings from my case studies of Rwanda and Syria, I conclude that intervening in mass atrocities goes far beyond moral obligation and is in fact necessary to obtain and ensure global security. Although mass atrocities are not solely the cause of the spread of terrorism, putting an end to mass killings is a great leap towards preventing the spread of terrorism. Mass atrocities are an issue that leaders have promised to end for years and years on end, yet it continues to engulf millions of people a year. The violence being caused by refugee spillovers and the exacerbation of terrorism in surrounding countries, along with the inability of the UN to respond to this threat alone, provides an attractive opportunity for the U.S to lead the global effort to put an end to mass atrocities once and for all. By shining light on the overlooked connection between mass atrocities and terrorism, I aim to make ending mass atrocities look more like opportunity rather than obligation.
Definition Section

There is a definitional challenge of invoking the word *genocide* and *mass atrocities* which has unmatched rhetorical power. The dilemma is how to harness the power of the word to motivate and mobilize while not allowing debates about its definition or application constrain or distract policymakers from addressing the core problems it describes.\(^{24}\) Mass atrocities and mass killings strictly mean large-scale killing and deliberate attacks on civilians. The victims of mass atrocities are targeted because of their identification as a member group. The colloquial description of large scale and deliberate attacks on civilian is buttressed by a framework in international law that has been accepted by the U.S and other governments and that defines serious crimes meriting special international concern.\(^{25}\)

Definitions:

Due to the ambiguity of the terms used throughout this paper, I have listed here the definitions I choose to utilize for this paper.

**Mass Atrocities**: Although a collective definition of what exactly mass atrocities entail does not exist, for the purpose of this paper I will use the definition set out by the Rome Statute of International Criminal Court. The following are excerpts of international legal definitions of mass atrocities:

1) *Genocide*:


\(^{24}\) Albright, Madeleine Korbel, William S. Cohen, and John C. Danforth page xxi.

\(^{25}\) Ibid.
Statute of the International Criminal Court. Article II of the Convention includes the following language:

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: Killing members of the group; Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.26

2) Crimes against Humanity:

Article 7, paragraph 1 of the Rome Statue of the International Criminal Court includes the following language:

For the purpose of this Statue, ‘crimes against humanity’ means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack:

- Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation or forcible transfer of population, imprisonment, torture, rape, sexual slavery, persecution against an identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender as

---

defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court, enforced disappearance of persons, the crime of apartheid, other inhumane activities.

3) War Crimes:

Article 8, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Rome Statue of International Criminal Court includes the following language:

For the purpose of this Statue, ‘war crimes’ means:

- Grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, namely, any of the following acts against persons or property protected under the provisions of the relevant Geneva Convention: Willful killing, torture or inhuman treatment, willfully causing great suffering, extensive destruction and appropriation of property, compelling a prisoner of war or other protected person to serve in the forces of hostile power, willfully depriving a prisoner of war a free trial, unlawful deportation, taking of hostages.

4) Ethnic Cleansing:

The Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect provides the following explanation of the term ethnic cleansing:

The term “ethnic cleansing” has more recently come into general usage and is the least clearly defined of the four categories. It is understood to describe forced removal or displacement of populations, whether by
physical expulsion, or by intimidation through killing, acts of terror, rape and the like: it is essentially one particular class of crimes against humanity.\(^{27}\)

Therefore in this paper any of those crimes listed above will be considered mass atrocities.

**Global Security:** The meaning of global security has certainly expanded since the end of the Cold War, and now includes more issues and actors, increasing the complexity of the meaning. Global security still lacks a comprehensive definition, in turn I chose to utilize a definition set out by the United Nations. The UN describes global security as a term that has evolved out of necessity that nature and many other activities, particularly globalization, have placed on states. These are demands that no national security apparatus has the capacity to handle on its own, as such, calls for the cooperation of states. The global interconnection and interdependence of today's world, makes it necessary for states to cooperate more and work together.\(^{28}\)

**Refugee:** The United Nations 1951 Refugee Convention spells out that a refugee is someone who “owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his or her nationality, and is unable to, or owing such a fear to, is

\(^{27}\) The Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, “R2P FAQ” http://globalr2p.org/about/faq.html#q7 (accessed July 18, 2014).

unwilling to avail her or himself of the protection of that country.”29 The key criteria determining refugee status is persecution, which means the deliberate act of the government against individuals, and thus excludes victims of general insecurity and oppression or systemic economic deprivation, and people who have not crossed national frontiers to seek refuge. 30 It is important to note that in my paper I refer to refugees as those fleeing violence within their country, as opposed to refugees fleeing from a natural disaster. In my paper I discuss two different types of refugees. I categorize the Rwanda genocide perpetrators whom fled to the DRC as refugees as well as the Syrian mass atrocity victims whom fled to Iraq as refugees because both are fleeing fem violence.

United Nations Peacekeeping has proven to be the most effective tool available to the UN to assist during mass atrocities. UN peacekeepers provide security and assist countries to transition from conflict to peace. Peacekeeping is guided by three basic principles: consent of party, impartiality, non-use of force except in self-defense and the defense of the mandate.31

According to Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs, Teresea Whelan, an ungoverned space is a physical or non-physical area where there is an absence of state capacity or political will to exercise control.

A refugee camp is a place where people who have escaped their own country, usually in bad conditions and only expecting to stay for a limited time.

A large portion of the debate over intervention in mass atrocities derives from the term “intervention.” Some would regard any application of pressure to a state as being intervention.32 For some the big issue is ensuring the legality of interventions, process and possible misuse of the precedent.33 Many are concerned with the new concept of human security trumping state sovereignty. It is important to note that my paper will focus strictly on intervention in terms of providing the practical protection for ordinary people at risk of their lives, because their states are unwilling or unable to protect, or in some cases responsible for massacring them.34 I will not be discussing state building post intervention. I also do not make policy recommendations referring to the type of intervention that should be taken. For example, another large debate relating to intervening in mass atrocities is whether or solders must be sent and if armed, military intervention is the only way to tackle today’s mass atrocity situations. This paper does not discuss logical information regarding interventions.

34 Ibid.
II. Rwanda

On August 04, 2011, in a Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities, the President of the United States, Barak Obama, stated, “Preventing mass atrocities is a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States”. Obama is not the first U.S president to recognize the inherent need to put an end to this tragedy. Following the loss of six million lives during the Holocaust, President Jimmy Carter during his presidency in the 1970’s declared “we must forge an unshakeable oath with all civilized people that never again will the world stand silent, never again will the world fail to act in time to prevent this terrible crime”. Five years later in 1984 after the Khmer Rouge claimed millions of innocent lives in Cambodia, President Ronald Reagan too declared that “never again!” would the U.S let the devastation of brutal mass atrocities occur. President George Bush Sr. joined the chorus in 1991 as he left Auschwitz he said he was determined not just to remember but also to act in forever avoiding another Holocaust. Bill Clinton before becoming president preached “if the horrors of the Holocaust taught us anything, it is the high cost of remaining silent and paralyzed in the face of such mass atrocities” Despite repeated promises from American leaders to prevent and halt systematic episodes of massacres, forced displacements, and mass rapes, such atrocities have persisted in our era.

In the last century, tens of millions of people lost their lives in episodes of mass killings. There is no doubt that mass atrocities exact a horrific human toll. They constitute a direct assault

37 Ibid.
38 Power, Samantha. "Raising the Cost of Genocide by Samantha Powers."
on universal human values, including, fundamentally, the right to life. Still, the international community continues to struggle with deciding if intervention is a viable solution to stop the mass atrocities. Unless leaders around the world start recognizing mass atrocities as posing a direct threat to strategic interests and global security, it is an issue that will undoubtedly remain on the back burner. By analyzing and highlighting the often overlooked connection between mass atrocity refugee spillover and the spread of terrorism, this paper aims to persuade the international community that intervening in genocides is more than just a humanitarian aspiration. It is a national and global imperative, and an issue that cannot be conquered alone.

In this paper I examine the 1994 Rwanda genocide and specifically analyze the sequence of events following the inaction on behalf of the international community. I aim to further explore what happens following the genocide in order to identify any overlooked security repercussions caused by the genocide. Although this event is one that continues to morally haunt foreign policy makers of the Clinton administration, as well as leaders around the world, my aim is to explore more concrete reasons why the decision of inaction is considered a critical failure and reasons that would warrant intervention the best option if another “Rwanda” occurs. I choose this as a historical case because it is a clear example of where the world acknowledged mass atrocities taking place and still choose to not intervene. It is one of the more well-known globally recognized cases of mass atrocities and one in which the sequence of events following the tragedy have often been ignored due to the surprising economic and social progress of Rwanda. I will begin by examining overall competing literature on the concept of intervention in mass atrocities.

**Literature Review:**

---

39 Ibid.
The decision to intervene in mass atrocities is complex and opinions are heavily divided. To identify the large scope of theories regarding intervention, I will begin by comparing and contrasting scholar’s view of the advantages and disadvantages of intervention.

Thomas G. Weiss and Cindy Collins highlight the advantages of mass atrocity intervention in their book *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention*. Weiss and Collins conclude that it is within the international community’s best interest to intervene in mass atrocities for several reasons. The authors begin by highlighting the advantages that intervention can have for international collaboration. They mention that intervening in humanitarian crises can strengthen NATO unity and depending on geography, intervention can mean protecting vital oil reserves in turn protecting global economic lifelines. Weiss and Collins also emphasize the opportunity intervention has to enhance global stability. The authors cite the efforts in Kosovo, as an example of intervention preserving European stability. Former U.S Secretary of State, Madeleine K. Albright and former U.S Secretary of Defense, William S. Cohen, whom are both co-chairs on the Genocide Prevention Task Force, agree with Weiss and Collins that mass atrocity intervention can further global security, specifically U.S national interests. Albright and Cohen note “genocide fuels instability, usually in weak, undemocratic, and corrupt states. It is in these same type of states that we find terrorist recruitment and training, human trafficking, and civil strife, all of which have damaging spillover effects for the entire world.”

---

41 Co-convened by the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, The American Academy of Diplomacy, and the US Institute of Peace in 2007. Funded by private foundations in order to reach beyond individual capabilities and build a practical framework that could help the U.S government respond to mass atrocities, as well as spotlight genocide prevention as a national priority and develop practice policy recommendations.
42 Albright, Madeleine Korbel, William S. Cohen, and John C. Danforth page xx.
also highlight the long-lasting consequences far beyond the states in which they occur such as; the spread of refugees, the increase in the need for humanitarian assistance often exceeding capacities and resources of a generous world. The international community, including the U.S, is called to absorb and assist displaced people, provide relief efforts, and bear high economic costs. Although Albright and Cohen believe putting an end to genocide should be a multilateral effort, they emphasize the need for the U.S to be a leader in preventing and responding to mass atrocities. They note “America has an interest in promoting strong global norms against mass atrocities so that sovereignty cannot be used as a shield. We must also make international and regional institutions more effective vehicles for preventing mass atrocities.”

Samantha Power, whom is now the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, has a firm stance on ending mass atrocities. Power’s is most notably known for her Pulitzer-Prize winning book, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*, where she poses an uncomfortable question about Americas repeated reluctance to confront genocide during the 20th century. Power’s is a strong advocate of intervention, in her article; “Raising the Cost of Genocide” she highlights reasons why the United States and its European allies should step up to put an end to mass atrocities. Her first obvious reason is morality. Power argues, “When innocent life is being taken on such a scale and the United States and its allies have the power to stop the killing at reasonable risk, they have a duty to act.” However she notes that although American troops stand as a last resort, genocide is indeed a critical issue that warrants making U.S

---

43 Ibid.page xviii.
sacrifices to abolish, “given the affront genocide represents to Americas most cherished values and to its interests, the U.S must also be prepared to risk the lives of its soldiers in the service of stopping this monstrous crime.”\textsuperscript{46} However she notes that American troops stand as a last resort. Former U.N Secretary General Kofi Annan agrees, “Armed intervention must always remain the option of last resort, but in the face of mass murder, it is an option that cannot be relinquished.”\textsuperscript{47} Military scholar, Caitlin Conley, points out that the United States holds a unique position, as the lone superpower with an unrivaled military, which entails upholding the moral responsibility to prevent mass slaughter of innocent lives.\textsuperscript{48} Power’s continues to reason that tolerating mass atrocities weakens regional and international stability. She argues that allowing genocides and mass atrocities to occur, creates armed refugees, and indicates to dictators that hate and murder are acceptable tools of governance. She notes that top Western policy makers hardly take appropriate political action in response to these dangers because they are not often seen as immediate dangers and therefore not a priority.\textsuperscript{49} Powers also points out that “American security and security for Americans abroad is contingent on international stability, and there is perhaps no greater source of havoc than a group of well-armed people on ethnic, national, or religious grounds.”\textsuperscript{50} Cadet Anne Hsieh is in agreement with Powers and highlights an important advantage of intervention. Hsieh notes “Humanitarian crises take a significant toll in unjustified

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
deaths, produce both financial and ideological support for terrorist groups, keeps countries mired in economic misery, and causes massive refugee movements. Such damaging consequences not only create moral challenges to the common Western argument that democracies protect and promote human rights, but threatens international security as well.”

Barbra Conry, a policy analyst at the Cato Institute, opposes intervention. Conry contends that a policy that would view global stability as essential to international security would force the world leaders to expend enormous resources in pursuit of an unattainable object. Conry also argues that intervention in cases not involving an immediate interest, mass atrocities as she suggests, leads to hypocritical policies. Conry reasons that because the international community cannot intervene in every instance in which human rights are being abused, that it’s not fair to give priority to one case over another, concluding that the best decision is to just stay out of it.

Mark Evans, a human rights scholar, rebuts Conry’s argument by proposing, “The fact that we cannot intervene to prevent every violation of human rights, or even to prevent every case of mass atrocities, is . . . no reason why we should not intervene where we can, even if the choice of when to do so is determined by pragmatic considerations or by the accidents of geography.”

Jide Nzelibe, professor of law at Northwestern University, believes that no matter how bloody and awful the situation abroad is, the unintended negative effects of humanitarian intervention are worse. Nzelibe argues that humanitarian interventions increase the chance that rebel leaders are going to achieve their political objectives. He believes that rebel leaders could
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end up becoming more motivated and harmful.\textsuperscript{54} In Conry’s policy analysis regarding U.S intervention, she argues that U.S involvement often aggravates the situation, and creates a number of problems for the U.S including a rise in anti-American sentiment and diminished American credibility if the mission fails.\textsuperscript{55} Nzelibe also continues to argue that unlike the Holocaust, contemporary cases of genocides take place in the context of civil wars or rebellions making intervention extremely unstable and dangerous. \textsuperscript{56} Nzelibe suggests that humanitarian intervention often attempts to reconstruct the domestic political environment by forcing or encouraging the combatants to share political power, which does not resolve the root causes of the civil conflict. Conry argues a similar standpoint and believes that regional conflicts are caused by such firmly embedded issue that no outside party has the ability resolve the conflict.\textsuperscript{57} Weiss and Collins although agree intervention has many advantages they point out that international governments, have an interest in maintaining the integrity of the international system of states, which hinges upon respect for state sovereignty and the principle of noninterference as codified in the U.N Charter.\textsuperscript{58} Although the concept of the Responsibility to Protect, unanimously adopted by heads of state and governments at the World Summit in 2005, attempted to eliminate fear of interfering on state sovereignty, some UN members continue to be very skeptical of the RTP concept and refuse to implement the concept. However when no action is taken the conflict often feeds and fuels other threats in weak and corrupt states, creating more

\textsuperscript{55} Conry, Barbara.
\textsuperscript{56} Nzelibe 2013.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} Nzelibe 2013 pg.42
in-depth regional crises. Nzelibe and Conry represent views that many would agree with. Yes, intervention involving reconstructing the political environment on the ground or attempting to build up the state, have historically gone terribly. However, most of these interventions such as Somalia or Iraq, have both experienced “mission creep,”\(^{59}\) with a wider spectrum of objectives than the short term objective of strictly saving lives.

Although many scholars have written in great length about what happens during the genocide, and the thought process involved in the decision leading up to inaction, I find that once decisions are made, leaders typically stand by their decision or swallow their guilt and move forward without ever taking the time to appropriately analyze the lessons learned in order to prevent future mistakes. Countries that neglect to respond to mass atrocities tend to pour money into the country following the conflict in attempts to make amends for the tragedy. They do not fully investigate the repercussions following the genocide. Deadly conflict is rarely over when it’s over. The global community has failed to fully recognize the consequences of their inaction and so continues to underestimate the extreme threat emanating from mass atrocities in a country.

**Case Study:**

In 1994 an estimated 800,000 women, children and men mostly of Tutsi identity, but also moderate Hutus, were massacred during the Rwanda genocide.\(^{60}\) Kofi Annan’s first stop as the
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\(^{59}\) Webster dictionary defines mission creep as the gradual broadening of objectives of a mission or organization. Mission creep was evident in many instances where intervention was considered a failure.

UN Secretary General was to Rwanda, as he felt the Rwandans more than anyone deserved a sincere apology for the critical failure of the international community to lend a hand to the bleeding country during its most critical hour. He fully addressed the failure of the UN and the international community to the Rwanda parliament. He notes “We must and we do acknowledge that the world failed Rwanda at that time of evil. The international community as the United Nations could not muster the political will to confront it. The worst must deeply repent this failure.”  

He ended by reiterating that the genocide in Rwanda was a tragedy for everyone who allowed it to occur. David Scheffer whom served as a senior advisor to Madeleine K. Albright, held a unique insider seat as events propelled policymakers into decisions that would have lasting impact on world affairs, especially in Africa. Scheffer remarks, “For those of us in the policy rooms, the sickening memory of our timidity and detachment from the horror will never be extinguished, we owe the victims and their families our souls every day.”  

Previous U.S President Bill Clinton refers to inaction in Rwanda as one of his greatest foreign policy regrets.

Rwanda was engulfed in violence and unrest for many years, yet today the country is making positive strides in health care, social development and accountable governance. The Rwandan government set out a framework, known as Vision 2020, which is aimed at helping the country overcome poverty and division. As Rwanda begins to rebuild itself with high hopes of a peaceful lifestyle, its neighboring country the DRC is coming apart. Although Rwanda is
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beginning to get back on its feet, the aftermath of the genocide is still heavily felt in the African arena.

Following the overthrow of Rwanda’s genocidal Hutu regime, more than two million Hutus, including members of the ousted Hutu government, fled into Democratic Republic of Congo fearing reprisals against them by new, Tutsi-dominated government. This is known as the fastest ever refugee movement in human history. The fleeing perpetrators set up refugee camps that soon became militarized, and started to be used as terrorist safe havens, ultimately resulting in the creation of The Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR). The FDLR is primarily responsible for much of the violence in Eastern Congo. The group is comprised of almost entirely ethnic Hutus who have been incriminated in the Rwandan genocide. Once the perpetrators arrived in the DRC, they quickly allied itself with Mobutu’s government, exploiting the already weak country with their hatred, and began attacking the Congo’s sizeable population of ethnic Tutsis, who had lived peacefully in the country for generations. This catastrophe is often known as “Africa’s World War,” which has been recognized as the largest humanitarian disasters of all time.

Although the Congolese have a long history of conflict involving fights over basic resources such as water, access and control over rich minerals as well as various political agendas, the arrival of the Hutu extremists from Rwanda ignited an even larger, deadlier regional genocide in which ethnicity citizenship are pitted against one another. More than 5.4 million people have died as a result of mass murder, famine and disease from the chaos of the Congo
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conflict.\textsuperscript{67} The scale of death and suffering in the DRC is so high that it is difficult to fathom. To put the death toll into perspective, here is statistic: more than sixty of the world’s countries have populations \textit{less} than 3.3 million. The violence in the Congo would have completely wiped some countries off the map. Sexual violence is also a pandemic in Eastern Congo. Between 2006 and 2007, more than 400,000 women were reported raped, and that number continues to rise. The DRC is known as the most dangerous place in the world for women. Rape and sexual violence are routinely employed as weapons to subjugate villages and terrorize entire communities. The terrorist cell continues to recruit child soldiers forcing them to radicalize and commit murder. To further emphasize the relative scale of the conflict, the following graph compares the death toll

\begin{center}
\end{center}
of the conflict in the DRC to more well-known mass atrocities.

Some scholars argue that the international community ignored Rwanda because no immediate strategic interests were at risk; however as we see today, those scholars were simply
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68 Due to the ambiguity of historical U.S decision-making involving intervention in genocides, many believe that intervention is not based on consistent principles but on capricious politics. For example, President Barak Obama has recently issued military intervention in Iraq, partly motivated by the urgent need to stop genocide of Yazidi, and others are beginning to wonder
incorrect. Africa is a critical region in today’s geopolitical environment. The importance of the region’s economic trade links, supply of natural resources, and crucial energy source, makes an unstable Africa a threat to the entire global community. In an early mission statement, the United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) notes:

> The West’s long-term strategic interests in Africa are clear: we must thwart the growth of terrorism and transnational crime; we must prevent destabilizing mass migrations; and we must maintain secure trade links. In order to realize these strategic objectives, as well as to act of out of simple human compassion to alleviate suffering on a colossal scale, the world must fix the current situation in Africa. From a more selfish perspective, a strong and vigorous Africa will open its markets to the rest of the world and at the same time liberate an entire continent’s energy, intelligence, and creativity.69

In the 21st century, Africa plays the same worldwide economic role that it has for the previous 4 centuries—providing natural resources from its plentiful supplies, and markets for manufactured goods.70 Stability in the African region largely depends upon stability in the D.R.C due to the country’s size and location of nine bordering nations.71 Although citizens of the DRC are among the poorest in the world, having the second lowest GDP per capita globally, the
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country is widely considered to be the richest country in the world regarding natural resources, with untapped deposits of raw minerals estimated to be worth in excess of US $24 trillion dollars.\textsuperscript{72} The DRC is teeming with copper, diamonds and gold, vast farmlands of spectacular fertility and enough hydropower to light up the continent.

The violence in the DRC allows for illegal mining and trade, which is ultimately inimical to the integration of the black market into the formal economy.\textsuperscript{73} The FDLR plays a pivotal role in the continuation of the conflict and violence, and their elimination is key to restoring the country. In April 2013, the US government offered $5 million for information leading to the arrest, transfer and conviction of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda (FDLR) supreme commander, General Sylvestre Mudacumura.\textsuperscript{74} The U.S has spent more than 125 million dollars in relief to those involved in the Congo War and continues to be the largest donor to the United Nations stabilization mission in the D.R.C.

Today, Hutu rebels threaten to re-enter Rwanda, creating a fear among many Tutsi’s living in the country.\textsuperscript{75} Within the walls of the Rwandan government buildings, those who once liberated the country believe that at any time the FDLR will move in from across the DRC and use the same violent methods of execution in order to establish a political and social agenda for a

\begin{footnotesize}
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‘Tutsi-free Rwanda’. The FDLR continues to be engulfed by human rights violations and the illicit exploitation of natural resources. Terrorism remains active in territories of Masisi, Walikale, Southern Lubero and Rutshuru. The FDLR has proved its violent resiliency keeping the African region living in fear.

Although various factors were involved in igniting Africa’s World War, the Rwanda genocide was without a doubt a necessary factor. It is hard to believe how one of Africa’s smallest and poorest countries, Rwanda, could have sent a large country like the DRC into a never-ending tailspin that continues to destabilize the region.

Conclusion

In 2004 Secretary-General Kofi Annan set up the United Nations High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, that states there is collective international responsibility, “excisable by the Security Council authorizing military intervention as a last resort, in the event of genocide and other large-scale killing, ethnic cleansing and serious violations of humanitarian law which sovereign governments have proved powerless or unwilling to prevent.” In Kofi Annan’s address to the General Assembly in September 2003 he notes that due to the interconnection and globalization of today’s world, a threat to one is a threat to all. On
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February 2nd 2010, the Director of National Intelligence Dennis C. Blair raised the specter of an unfamiliar threat, far from the issues of nuclear proliferation and cyber attacks that the rest of his discussion focused on. Blair says “looking ahead over the next five years, a number of countries in Africa and Asia are at significant risk for a new outbreak of mass killings, among these countries a new mass genocide is likely to occur in Southern Sudan. The mass genocide he predicted in South Sudan has claimed more than 400,000 lives and continues to claim five thousand lives each month. Blair brings to life the big picture threat stemming from mass killings. Putting an end to mass atrocities is not a moral issue, it is a national security priority.

The moral devastation of the Rwanda genocide is undeniable and widely recognized by the international community. However, the larger threat of the spread of terrorism caused by the mass atrocities, is not being taken into consideration at foreign policy decision tables. The issue of mass atrocities is not seen through a national security lens, but rather a non urgent humanitarian lens. The FDLR is a concrete example of how global security is affected when the international community sits back and allows massive amounts of innocent civilians to be forced from their homes and pushed into surrounding countries. The paper makes the counterfactual that if the U.S, along with the international community had acted more assertively during the Rwandan mass atrocities of 1994, there is a possibility that terrorism, corruption and poor governance could have been replaced by progress and development and the FDLR would not

82 Ibid.
exist. The causal mechanism between the Rwanda spillover and the creation of the FDLR terrorist organization, is not something that should be overlooked or considered a one-time scenario. We understand much better now than we did a decade ago that mass atrocities are much more cyclical than linear- the best single indicator we have of the probability of future conflict is past conflict.83

Although sometimes countries small countries such as Rwanda can seem unimportant and irrelevant on the global scale, the instability caused by mass killings no matter where they take place, effect security on a larger scale. Africa is now engulfed with terrorism, as we see in Nigeria, Mali and Somalia. Africa is not the only war torn country where mass atrocities were ignored and terrorism spread. The international community needs to start prioritizing the ending of mass atrocities.

III. Syria

Introduction:

Mass atrocities and other human rights violations are frequently seen as matters of “domestic politics,” however violence often extends across national boundaries as conflicts involving mass atrocities unfold. Cross-border violence suggests that refugee flows may provoke tensions between states, and at the extreme, such migration has the potential to spark militarized disputes between host and home countries. Mass atrocities are a leading source of refugees, and in turn is one of the most destabilizing humanitarian disasters to occur. There is a shared fear in the global community that instability in one country will spread to surrounding countries through refugee flows in turn creating more conflict.

The threat emanating from refugee spillover is not a new concern. One of the major motivations behind the northern Iraq no-fly zone, established in 1991 was to relieve the burden of an estimated million-plus Kurds seeking shelter in Turkey by creating a secure zone for them within Iraq. Ankara was particularly worried about the influx of refugees exacerbating tensions among its own Kurds in the southeast, creating a kind of “Kurdish Gaza Strip” that could become a lawless zone of instability. In Bosnia and Kosovo, similar spillovers of refugees and the threat they posed to regional stability provided the catalyst for greater involvement and eventual military intervention. As then U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright put it, “Spreading conflict … could flood the region with refugees and create a haven for international terrorists, drug traffickers, and criminals.”
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respond to mass atrocities, despite the known consequences that refugee spillover can have on a region?

On April 4, 2014 the United Nations warned the world that if the international community did not tackle the Syrian refugee crisis, there would be major instability in the Middle East. Jordan, one of Washington’s most consistent allies in the Middle East and an important partner in U.S policy toward Iraq, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority, is now home to approximately 600,000 Syrian refugees, the equivalent of almost 10 percent of Jordan’s population. By the end of the year, the refugee population is expected to rise to 800,000, just in Jordan. The U.S has contributed immense resources and support to Jordan in order to combat the threat of terrorist spillover from Syria. This is another example of the typical Western way of handling mass atrocities issues, which is always ‘after the fact’. Many argue about the cost of intervention, however few seem to acknowledge how much money is spent on “clean up”, once the country has taken a turn for the worst. This post atrocity notion is only making the US expend more resources on its own.

Dating from Bashar al-Assad’s first suppression of mass demonstrations in April 2011, the war in Syria is now more than four years old, has killed more than 130,000 Syrians, displaced nine million Syrians, two million as refugees into neighboring countries, destabilizing the entire region. Senior Military Fellow Colonel Richard Outzen at the National Defense University
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(NDU) notes, “Foreign intervention has increasingly shaped the course of fighting and will continue to have substantial regional consequences.” The longer the conflict in Syria drags on, the more deeply entrenched ethnic and sectarian divisions could become, creating a longer, more intense conflict. The most dangerous repercussion stemming from the Syrian atrocities is the empowerment of the al Qaeda-linked terrorist organization, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). As in the Rwanda/DRC case, sectarian violence existed in Iraq prior to the conflict in Syria, however the unrest in Syria provided the group with space to metastasize and galvanize their influence. ISIL has swept eastward across Syria, seizing the moment of weakness in the country that the international community watched unfold, capturing lucrative oil fields and even selling electricity from power plants under its control to the Syrian government. ISIL has roughly $2 billion in assets with which to finance its recrudescence in Iraq and its operations in Syria and continues to gain momentum every day.

The Syrian civil war has gone from bad to worse, with casualties mounting and horrors multiplying. Mass atrocities, such as the ones in Syria, are obvious tragedies for the countries they consume, but they also create catastrophes for their neighbors. This recent situation in Syria, accompanied by the lessons learned in the Rwanda, exemplify the magnitude mass atrocities can have on a country and ultimately on global security. The international community should consider intervention in mass atrocities more than just a humanitarian act of kindness, but one of refugee turmoil prevention and counter terrorism. The paper will begin by reviewing

---

literature on the overall threat of refugee spillover, followed by scholarly opinions specifically regarding intervention in Syria. I will then examine the mass atrocities in Syria and the effect of the refugee spillover to the region.

**Literature Review of Refugee Spillover**

The security implications stemming from refugee migration are far from new revelations. Even before the 9/11 attacks, the United States in particular has been well aware of the threat stemming from massive migrant movements and has been studying the relationship between globalization and security in both the policy world and security studies field. During the Bosnian genocide, the then U.S President Bill Clinton argued that without intervention, “the conflict that already has claimed so many people could spread like poison throughout the entire region.” The danger of refugee spillovers into neighboring countries has a topic that has been vastly investigated. Fiona B. Adamson investigates the relationship between international migration and national security in her publication “Crossing Borders: International Migration and National Security” by surveying how cross border migration flows affect state interests in three core areas of national security concern: state sovereignty, or the overall capacity and autonomy or state actors; the balance of power among states; and the nature of violent conflict in the international system. Adamson’s article emphasizes the need to examine migration and
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security through the lens of terrorism. She notes “this is not just true in the United States but also
in Europe and other states.” 94 Alan Dowty and Gil Loescher suggest that governments can
longer afford to ignore the brutalities of civil and communal conflicts and human rights abuses
that uproot entire communities. 95 These authors argue that following the mass movements of
people in Iraq, Liberia, and Haiti, a precedent has been set for international, regional, and
unilateral intervention into the internal affairs of states. They also reason that intervention in
humanitarian crises to prevent refugee flow is now a viable policy option in the international
community. 96

Large refugee movements across national boundaries entail negative consequences for
neighboring countries. 97 If receiving nations are in fact already weak, they are more likely to fall
victim to internal violence when refugees of another country flow in. Gil Loescher points out that
“most refugees and displaced people move from one Third World country to another and are
found in the poorest parts of the world: Sudanese, Somalis, and Ethiopians in the Horn of Africa,
to give only a few examples.” 98 Given the religious and ethnic diversity within countries,
refugees are frequently viewed as unwanted intruders and therefore become targeted, generating
conflict and more violence. Loescher also highlights that “tensions may also arise from the
consequences of outsiders into traditional social structures. Frequently, refugees are cultural and
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economic minorities who seek safety among closely related groups and many governments are unwilling to admit refugees.  

*Literature review on Syria intervention*

The question of whether or not to intervene in Syria has been contested in foreign policy circles around the world since the onset of the violence. It is evident that the crisis in Syria has spun out of control and is now creating a threat to more than just the anti-government insurgents in Syria, however the debate over intervention to stop the bloodshed continues to intensify. The topic of intervention in Syria continues to be a contentious one, with many different opinions around the table and continues to lack an international consensus.

One of the most evident obstacles regarding intervention is the fear of a repeated Iraq and Afghanistan. Many believe another military intervention would lead to a similar situation as the one in Iraq, ultimately leaving the country worse off. The standard assertion is that Syria’s social complexity and fractured state structure recall Afghanistan, and that Washington has neither the time, the patience, nor the resources to see through a fight under such conditions. However, intervention does not strictly mean Washington has to commit to a massive ground campaign; there are other options other than fully abstaining from action or invading and occupying as the U.S did in Iraq. For example, empowering the non-jihadist opposition through arms and funding or forbidding cross boarder flight between Syria, Turkey and Jordan.
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Some people argue against intervention in Syria by pointing to the regime change in Iraq and Libya as examples of perils of intervention. CNN’s Holly Yan argues that robust support to Assad’s opposition would lead to massive direct intervention and a high bill in American lives and treasure.\(^{101}\) The counter argument to this perspective is that Syrians already are fighting in large numbers to overthrow their dictator, so there is no call for U.S or other international troops to do that work for them.\(^{102}\) Many who are opposed to intervention in Syria, argue that intervention means arming the unknown Syrian rebels whom are thought to be “a bunch of infighting, disorganized, jihadist thugs, whom can’t be trusted,” and arming them could lead to a more massive conflict than the one currently residing.\(^{103}\) U.S General Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said, “Until we’re a lot of clearer about who they are and what they are, I think it would be premature to talk about arming them.”\(^{104}\)

More push back regarding intervention in Syria comes from the lack of support from UN Security Council members. Unlike Libya, the UN Security Council is divided on whether or not to intervene in Syria. As Fareed Zakaria from CNN notes, “this in turn means action could not happen through the UN, leaving only the choice of unilateral or some kind of NATO operation with no international legitimacy, and nobody seems to want to go in alone on this one, at least not yet.”\(^{105}\)
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Analysis

Syria began its decent into a civil war over four years ago and many claim there is little the international community as a whole can do to end the fighting. “However, the fact that outside global forces cannot stop the conflict does not absolve it of responsibility for responding to its effects—above all, to the worsening refugee crisis that is now destabilizing Syria’s neighbors and the region as a whole.”106 Outzen notes “the internal dimension of the Syrian civil war has roots in the 20th century; it is by no means an endemic, perpetual, or irreconcilable conflict.”107 It seems as though the debate about action in Syria has mainly focused on the cost of action while ignoring the costs of continued inaction.

In January 2014, Col Outzen warned “Failure to articulate and implement clear American strategies in Syria can damage the stability of both Turkey and Iraq”108 As current events reveal, his predictions were exactly right. Turkey’s economy and peaceful sectarian and political divisions are both taking hard hits. Turkey shares a 510-mile border with Syria, and is currently housing over 163,000 Syrians in thirteen refugee camps and temporary receiving centers in Turkey, costing Turkey about $40 million per month.109 Since the spillover from Syria into Turkey, one of the most severe repercussions in Turkey is the resurgence of the once outlawed Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK), which is now active and engaging in the most audacious attacks since the 1990’s. The PKK is recognized as a terrorist group by the international community

107 Outzen page 3.
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including the U.S. Turkish experts note that the PKK is infamous for their coordinated attacks on Turkish diplomatic offices in six Western European countries, as well as their attacks on tourist sites on Istanbul and Turkish seaside resorts.\textsuperscript{110} For a country that continues to be a crucial U.S. ally, as well as a responsible partner in transatlantic and European institutions, the international community did not take into account the massive hit the country would endure from the inaction in neighboring Syria.\textsuperscript{111}

Speaking at the UN Security Council, the special envoy to Iraq, Nickolay Mladenov, said the conflict in Syria was "affording terrorist networks the occasion to forge links across the [Iraq-Syria] border and expand their support base," and this is exactly what has transpired.\textsuperscript{112} The conflict in Syria has exacerbated local sectarian politics within Iraq and ISIL is capitalizing on the opportunity to strengthen their terrorist organization and take over the region, thereby threatening the entire international community. Inaction has its price, as ISIL gains momentum and territory in Iraq the international community is slowly starting to realize that the consequences of inaction are outweighing the cost of intervention. As more and more Syrian refugees seek asylum in Iraq, the escalation of Sunni-Shiite antagonism will worsen, further destabilizing the Middle East.


\textsuperscript{111} William Young, David Stebbins, Bryan A. Frederick, Ómar Al-Shahery of the RAND cooperation not that the Turkey-Syria-Kurdish strategic triangle has been a significant source of conflict in the past. For many years, Syria supported the activities of the militant Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK), allowing it to operate from Syrian territory and recruit from Syria’s own sizable Kurdish minority in its campaign against the Turkish state throughout the 1980s and early 1990s.

\textsuperscript{112} "UN Warns of Syria Spillover into Iraq." - \textit{Middle East}. Al Jazeera, 28 Mar. 2014. Web. 18 Aug. 2014.
ISIL now controls much of Syria and Iraq. According to U.S intelligence officials, ISIL obtains the bomb-making skills and foreign fighters needed to strike U.S and other Western interests, making the organization an “extremely high” terror threat. “While trying to rank threats or compare them to previous threat periods is a hazardous endeavor,” said one former U.S. counterterrorism official, “the current threat coming out of ISIL and Syria more broadly -- is extremely high.” While the opposition in Syria and Iraq is diverse, said the official, there are “sub elements” within it that are “especially worrisome because of their commitment to attack the West.” The U.S however is not the only country that needs to be concerned with ISIL. The political strains in neighboring states demonstrate the risk of a widening crisis. Syria is located in the heartland of the more popular MENA (Middle East, North Africa) region, and repercussions of the mass atrocities are felt along the entire Mediterranean, as well as in the Gulf. Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United Arab Emirates, and Iran are all deeply invested in the Syrian conflict.

The ramifications for not only U.S interests, but for the security of Israel and European democracies are profound. British officials say their concern about domestic terrorism from ISIS and other foreign fighters in Syria is higher due to the larger number of British residents who have traveled back and forth to Syria. They estimate 400 to 500 British “foreign fighters,” including Muslim converts, have gone to Syria, and about two thirds have come back to the U.K. According to the U.S Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper’s Annual Worldwide Threat Assessment to Congress on January 29th, 2014, the Syrian war has attracted

---

114 Ibid.
115 Ibid.
over 7,000 foreign fighters from over 50 nations.\textsuperscript{116} Clapper also stated that Syria “is becoming a center of radical extremism and is an extreme threat.”\textsuperscript{117} The International Center for the Study of Radicalization has estimated “that nearly 2,000 Western Europeans had traveled to Syria to fight and that the number was growing fast.”\textsuperscript{118}

The protracted nature of fighting in Syria, and the absence of pressure against Assad from world powers, has helped sustain and sharpen the sectarian dimension of the conflict. “Suddenly, Obama’s understanding of the situation in Iraq (as well as in West Africa and Syria) as ‘local power struggles,’ as he remarked in January, looks naive at best and dangerously misguided at worst.”\textsuperscript{119} A conflict originally thought to be one of little importance and priority on the foreign policy agenda has now taken over a stretch of territory the size of Jordan and is subsequently declaring an Islamic caliphate. Although the 2003 war in Iraq may have led to the formation of the jihadi group, the chaos in Syria provided it with the space to metastasize. Would the international community have intervened in Syria had it known that the occurring crimes against humanity would have led to the current crisis in Iraq involving ISIL?\textsuperscript{120}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[	extsuperscript{118}] Griff Witt.
\item[	extsuperscript{120}] On August 7th 2014, President Barak Obama authorized air operations in Iraq and emphasized that “today, America is coming to help, when we have the unique capabilities to help avert a massacre, then I think the United States of America cannot turn a blind eye.” This further supports my point of U.S eventual involvement in places where they previously chose not to get involved. Is it possible that if the U.S had intervened in Syria it could have prevent future intervention in Iraq?
\end{enumerate}
The humanitarian and regional security crises emanating from Syria now appear to be beyond the power of any single actor, including the United States, to contain or fully address. Large numbers of Syrian refugees, the growth of powerful armed extremist groups in Syria, and the assertive involvement of Iran, Turkey, and Sunni Arab governments in Syria’s civil war are all negatively affecting the regional security environment in the Middle East. Until the international community decides the “humanitarian crisis” in Syria is of global concern, the critical country in the heart of the Middle East remains suspended between death by a thousand cuts and a world apparently incapable or unable to come together to attend to even its most elemental needs.


IV. Change in Origin of Conflict and United Nations Intervention

Introduction

Since the end of WWII, an international effort has been undertaken to protect civilians in armed conflict and prevent mass atrocities. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights defines the rights the UN seeks to protect. Among these is freedom from systematic governmental acts and polices involving torture, slavery, murder, prolonged arbitrary detention, disappearance, and racial discrimination. In 1948 the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the United Nations, and entered into force three years later. However, the efforts to end mass atrocities once again fell short. More than 60 years after the Convention, and more than 20 years after its ramification by the U.S, the international community still lacks the institutions, policies, and strategies to reliably prevent genocides and mass atrocities. One of the main reasons the global community has taken a back seat approach to this severe issue is due to the assumption that ethnic cleansing and mass killings is a UN problem to solve. This may have been the case during the Cold War when majority of conflicts were interstate, however there has been profound changes in international security and the UN can no longer be solely responsible for putting an end to this problem, nor should it be. The UN was not intended to be a war fighting force. The UN was designed to act as a monitor of compliance and self-defense, in other words to stand by and supervise in a way. Majority of instances involving

mass killings are not “peacekeeping zones” but rather intense areas of violence and war fighting, something the UN is simply not prepared to confront.

The end of the 20th century marked a change in the nature of armed conflict, once the primary actors in the post Westphalian world, states no longer have the stage to themselves. Large inter-state wars were replaced by violent internal conflicts, where the vast majority of casualties are now civilians. Throngs of non-state entities clamor for a share of the limelight and the strategic global environment has dramatically changed since the end of the Cold War. The end of the bipolar era brought a new wave of dangerous and unfamiliar threats and conflicts, including resource scarcity, economic inequality and ethnic tensions, all which demand immediate attention of the international community. The international arena is now facing interstate conflicts.

Since its inception in 1945, the United Nations has played a pivotal role in the protection of civilians involved in these hostile conflicts. UN peacekeeping is a unique global partnership that draws together the legal and authority of the Security Council, the personnel and financial contributions of Member States, the support of host countries and the accumulated experience of the Secretariat in managing operations in the field, which gives the organization certain legitimacy.

126 Intrastate conflict occurs between the armed forces of the government and an opposing civil organized group, within the state borders.
conflict. The UN has undertaken international responsibility for maintaining peace and security and has proved to be an essential element of mass atrocity response. However, the UN is at a crossroad as the origin of conflict and the nature of war has changed, so has the ways in which to respond to such conflicts. This section of the paper explores whether or not the institution dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security on the basis of protecting the territorial integrity is prepared to handle today's era of atrocities.

During the Cold War, UN peacekeeping was primarily refined to maintaining ceasefires and stabilizing situations on the ground and providing crucial support for political efforts to resolve conflict by peaceful means, however the 1990’s brought some brutal challenges for the United Nations, and unfortunately some of its most crucial failures. In 1991 the Somalia government was overthrown by opposing clans, resulting in the loss of thousands of innocent lives. Bosnia experienced three years of a brutal civil war beginning in 1992, which ultimately resulted a large UN failure. In 1994, an estimated 800,000 people died in Rwanda while the international community stood by and watched. These situations challenged the UN to move beyond its traditional notions of neutrality and to make judgments between good from evil, and aggressor from victim. Although these events left permanent stains on the UN reputation, they also provided the UN with an irrefutable wakeup call; the origin of conflict has changed and in order to be an effective peacekeeping force it too must change.

With over 116,000 deployed personnel across 15 missions, the scale of UN peacekeeping today is unprecedented. Personnel, logistics, finance, and administration systems are struggling to support operations in some of the world’s most inhospitable terrain. As the necessity for UN peacekeeping missions rise, the UN’s resources and capabilities are diminishing. The UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support emphasize that “the scale and complexity of peacekeeping today are mismatched with existing capabilities, and divisions within the international community impact the ability of some missions to act effectively on the ground and Member States’ attention at times spreads thin among competing peace and security priorities.” UN Peacekeeping mandates today are not matched with realistic capabilities of the peacekeeping forces. The mandates are often unrealistic and overreaching. For example, in 2006 a peace agreement was signed in Darfur. After more than three years of conflict, the UN had high hopes that the agreement would mean the parties would lay down their weapons. This however was unrealistic. Only one rebel group signed the document and following the signing, there was an escalation between those who supported the agreement and those that did not. Another example is the UN Mandate for the peacekeeping mission in the DRC, which continues to expand every couple years. Currently the mandate objectives include: the protection of civilians, neutralizing armed groups through the Intervention brigade, monitoring the implementation of the arms embargo and the provision of support to
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national and international judicial processes. The UN simply does not have the capabilities or tools to fulfill these mandates.

The most vital precedent implemented following the aftermath of the Rwandan genocide was the Responsibility to Protect (RTP). RTP has become a prominent feature in international debates about preventing genocide and mass atrocities. It was adopted unanimously by heads of state and government at the 2005 UN World Summit and has been reaffirmed twice since by the UN Security Council. The principle of RTP rests on three equally weighted and mutually exclusive pillars: (1) the primary responsibility of states to protect their own populations from the four crimes of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, as well as from their incitement; (2) the international community’s responsibility to assist a state to fulfill its RTP; and (3) the international community’s responsibility to take timely and decisive action, in accordance with the UN Charter, in cases where the state has manifestly failed to protect its population from one or more of the four crimes. RTP helped establish a global understanding that state sovereignty is a responsibility not a right. If a state fails to protect and provide peace for its population, than the international community has a responsibility to intervene within the states domestic matters.

(MONUSCO). This provided MONUSCO with an unprecedented UN peacekeeping mandate for offensive operations to neutralize armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). While the mandate was both innovative and controversial—for political, operational, and legal reasons—the Intervention Brigade has been seen by many as a success and a future model. The Security Council renewed the Intervention Brigade’s mandate in Resolution 2147 in March 2014 without any significant modifications.
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notes, “A United Nations for the twenty first century would have to create new partnerships, respond to the needs of individuals, and stand for the principle that national sovereignty could never be used as a shield for genocide.”

Due to the change in the origin of conflict the United Nations had to completely re-evaluate their approach to peacekeeping efforts, and although they have evolved to try and meet the new demands of the modern geo-political landscape and have implemented the RTP, the UN has yet to formulate an effective mandate for dealing with non-traditional threats stemming from intra-state conflicts. The UN administrative peacekeeping practices and financial management systems are designed for a stable civil service secretariat, now are expected to manage massive, complex field operations in some of the most difficult and remote environments in the world. The UN is simply not designed to conquer mass atrocities on its own.

**Road Map**

The paper begins by examining literature written on the challenges currently facing UN peacekeeping operations, the complications with implementing the RTP in modern day conflicts, and, the importance of UN peacekeeping missions in today’s human security sphere. I utilize a comparative case study methodology to scrutinize two different UN peacekeeping missions, one in which the UN engaged in a peacekeeping mission involving the traditional inter-state conflict and one involving the newly prevalent intra-state conflict. These case studies are chosen to emphasize the significant role the UN continues to play in mass atrocity prevention and response, however case studies outline how much more effective the UN was in handling past
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with interstate conflicts. I examine the United Nations Interim Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIMOG), for the interstate conflict and the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUSCO) for the intrastate conflict. Following the case studies, I argue the international community has yet to formulate a new effective mandate when dealing with state actors who prove unwilling to respect their obligation to protect their population and to consent to UN peacekeeping missions. As the 21st century realm of conflict and violence escalates, UN peacekeeping is more important now than ever when it comes to the protection of innocent civilians. If the international community continues to ignore the RTP, it could lead to severe global instability.

**Literature Review on UN intervention**

William Durch describes the objectives set out in the original UN Charter and compares them with the new needs involved in twenty-first century peace operations in his book *The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping*.141 Durch points out that during the Cold War the UN was tasked with more modest objectives such as: the mediation of isolated and idiosyncratic conflicts, the monitoring of cease-fire arrangements, and the separation of hostile armed forces.142 Durch then acknowledges that following the collapse of the Soviet Union the UN has undertaken missions of varying scope, mostly dealing with issues that can be traced back to the colonial empire. These issues involve responding to decolonization, which often unleashes ethnic and nationalist forces that challenge state authority.143 Durch specifically investigates UN Peacekeeping missions of
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the Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group and the Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo. He provides detailed information about each peacekeeping mission including the initiatives toward UN involvement, the political support, the UN mandates, planning and implementation, an assessment and a conclusion. The Annual Review of Global Peace Operations published by the center on international cooperation also highlights the changing face of UN peace operations from interstate to intrastate conflicts. The review stresses how the UN faces an evolving-and deteriorating-threat environment in many new and existing missions. The security challenges and political pressures facing UN and non-UN peace operations and political missions place major demand on national and international policy makers.144

William Zartman and Lewis Rasmussen have also written at great length about peacemaking in the twenty-first century involving new rules, new roles and new actors while also highlighting the importance of peacekeeping. In their book, Peacemaking in International Conflict, they explain why the variety and methods of which the UN can respond to conflicts has become increasingly more complicated, “while wars in the past were largely the province of august heads of state and foreign ministers representing powerful nations and grand alliance, conflict in the twentieth century evolved to bring destruction and death to mass publics and threaten stability on a global scale.”145 The authors also make an intriguing point in their book regarding the future of international conflict, they believe that until restive populations and ambitious actors have learned the new rules of the international and national communities, and until new and effective systems of world and domestic order are recognized, conflict over values
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worth fighting for, such as sovereignty, liberty, self-determination, identity, and power, will continue to take place.\textsuperscript{146}

The UN peacekeeping handbook explains the procedures involving multidimensional peacekeeping operations to respond to conflict worldwide and also provides an executive summary of the UN Charter. According to the handbook, the Security Council holds primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security, and even though it is not specifically enshrined in the Charter, the legal basis for peacekeeping can be found between the traditional methods for settlements under Chapter VI, and the more forceful action mandated under Chapter VII.\textsuperscript{147} This is particularly important because it highlights the core principles of UN peacekeeping, number one being consent. The handbook states “peacekeeping can only take place with the consent of the parties to the conflict”.\textsuperscript{148} This is the problem regarding states experiencing intrastate mass atrocities, what happens when the host government refuses to protect its people or in some cases is the cause behind the mass atrocities and will not consent to UN involvement? In the absence of consent, a peacekeeping operation risks becoming a party to the conflict, and being drawn towards enforcement action, and away from its fundamental role of keeping the peace.\textsuperscript{149}

Author Rachel Gerber, from the Stanley Foundation, published an article on Peacekeeping and the RTP. Gerber tackles this issue of needing consent from the actors involved in mass atrocities in order for the UN to intervene. Gerber writes,
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Contemporary peacekeeping mandates, objectives, strategy and doctrine operate explicitly on the principles of consent, impartiality and non-use of force (except in self-defense or defense of a mission’s mandate). Experiences in Somalia, Bosnia and Rwanda remind us that ambitiously under-resourced UN missions are ill suited to bullying unwilling belligerents into a ceasefire.\textsuperscript{150}

She continues on to use current examples such as the atrocities in Libya and Syria to exemplify the fact that not all atrocities begin with armed conflict and not all perpetrators are willing to engage with the international community, much less consent to UN presence on the ground.\textsuperscript{151}

Another large issue aside from states not willing to consent to UN peacekeeping missions, is the lack of an effective mandate to make sure RTP members are accountable for intervening when crimes against humanity are taking place.\textsuperscript{152}

Pillar three of the RTP, which addresses oppressive regimes unwillingness to protect their citizens, or even engage their military and police forces in atrocity crimes, is the most important because this is the criteria that is required for RTP to engage. Mark Notaras and Vesselin Popovski, from the United Nations University, published an article focusing directly on the RTP. The authors address the three pillars of RTP and apply them to appropriate situations. For
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\textsuperscript{152} When members signed the RTP, they unanimously affirmed, “Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity”. They agreed, as well, that the international community should assist States in exercising that responsibility and in building their protection capacities. When a State nevertheless was “manifestly failing” to protect its population from the four specified crimes and violations, they confirmed that the international community was prepared to take collective action in a “timely and decisive manner” through the Security Council and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.
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example, they note that oppressive regimes, such as the Libyan government of Gaddafi, are unwilling to protect their citizens and therefore the UN Security Council needs to invoke RTP in order to intervene in situations like these. Paragraph 139 of RTP states that “The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the [UN] Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.”

Although the authors support the need for invoking the RTP within countries experience mass killings, they also recognize the conflicting view in their article. They state “despite the increasing acceptance of RTP within the international system, the concept is still very much a developing norm and that acceptance of it varies according to the needs of each organization.

In addition, although R2P was initially born in the minds of policy makers and academics from conflict-affected countries in the global South (in Africa, in particular), some still regard RTP as a cover for neo-imperialist humanitarian intervention by powerful Western states.”

RTP can also raise some controversy regarding respect for states sovereignty. Some feel that RTP is not a universally accepted concept and can be used as an excuse to intervene in order to further selfish interests. However, the concept of RTP was developed to establish a standard to identify when the international community should become involved in an internal crisis, so
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although some remain skeptical of this intimidating, that should not diminish the concept itself.\textsuperscript{155}

\textit{Case Selection}

The UN is the largest multilateral contributor to post-conflict stabilization worldwide, only the U.S deploys more military personnel to the field than the UN.\textsuperscript{156} UN peacekeeping is a vital, robust, effective mechanism for international conflict response and conflict prevention. The background note of UN peacekeeping published by the UN itself remarks that “as of 30 November 2012, there were more than 117,000 personnel serving on 16 peace operations led by the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) on four continents directly impacting the lives of hundreds of millions of people. This represents a nine fold increase in UN peacekeepers since 1999.”\textsuperscript{157} Since the end of the Cold War, emphasis on the militaristic peacekeeping operations has changed and now they frequently contain civilian aspects. As demonstrated in the Congo, these are messy affairs in which success is hard to achieve and more than military skills are required.\textsuperscript{158} The end of the Cold War era gave smaller states freedom to fight without great power interference.\textsuperscript{159} As conflicts continue to increase as does the need for an effective UN peacekeeping framework. From 2003 to 2008 overall conflicts increased by

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid.
some 25 percent.\textsuperscript{160} Below is a chart that emphasizes the dramatic increase in intrastate conflicts vs. interstate conflicts from 1946-2008.\textsuperscript{161}

![Trends in Armed Conflicts by Type, 1946-2008](image)

UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, in his speech to UN members, notes that “human protection is a defining purpose of the UN in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century, the global community can no longer afford hesitation or inaction, let us work together to make the RTP a living reality for the peoples of the world.”

For my case study selection I have chosen to analyze two different UN Peacekeeping missions involving the two different types of conflict, interstate conflict vs. intrastate conflict. The Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group is a traditional-type UN peacekeeping mission involving

overseeing peace negotiations and the UN mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo exemplifies an intrastate conflict, one in which the UN peacekeeping force needed to be armed due to hostility of the crisis.

**Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group**

My first case study of UN peacekeeping is the August 1988 to February 1991 United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) mission. I choose this case study because it represents a traditional UN peacekeeping mission, one involving two hostile states engaged in almost eight years of war. UNIIMOG was established to verify, confirm and supervise the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of all forces to the internally recognized boundaries pending a comprehensive settlement. Dealing with the Iran-Iraq conflict was indeed difficult, but the UN, however, knew exactly whom it was dealing with, the Ayatollah Komeini of Iran and Saddam Hussein of Iraq. Having a firm grasp on who you are negotiating with was a pleasure that most UN members took for granted. This is the opposite of today’s conflict environment, where identifying the leaders involved in committing the atrocities can be difficult, making negotiations nearly impossible.

When the Secretary General of the UN proposed a resolution, Iraq welcomed it with open arms and informed the Secretary General of its readiness to cooperate with him and the Security Council in its implementation, while Iran was more hesitant and criticized fundamental defects

---


163 For example, when the debate about intervention in Syria was unfolding, many argued that you could not arm the rebels of the Assad regime due to the ambiguity involved in identifying perpetrators and rebels.
and incongruities in it.164 Following the proposal came a period of intense diplomatic activity from the Secretary General between Tehran, Baghdad and UN Headquarters in New York. Between July 26 and August 7th, the Secretary General met with the Foreign Minister of Iran nine times and with the Representative of Iraq six times in talked aimed at bringing about implementation of a solution.165 On August 8, 1988, both governments agreed that direct talks between their foreign ministers should be held under the Secretary General’s watch. It is important to note that a major component of obtaining a ceasefire agreement involved UN personnel initiating discussions with the political and military authorities in both capitals about the method of operation of Resolution 598.166 However, an intrastate conflict lacks this distinction of leadership and, making organizing any sort of peace talks extremely challenging. Also, in majority of intrastate conflicts the conflicting sides are usually not willing to negotiate as easily as two separate states due to the lack of consent of each actor.

**Democratic Republic of Congo**

The U.N peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) represents an example of the challenges involved in modern day U.N peacekeeping missions. The war in the DRC has been Africa’s deadliest conflict, contributing to the deaths of more than three million people since its start in August 1998.167 The crisis in the DRC embroiled as many as nine African countries at once and involves local, national and regional dimensions, which causes the
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conflict to resist conventional conflict resolution mechanisms. The UN first became involved in the DRC following the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement in July 1999 between the DRC and five regional states, at this time the Security Council established the United Nations Organization Mission in the DRC (MONUC) by its resolution 1279. The resolution initially planned to oversee the ceasefire and disengagement of forces and maintain liaison with all parties to the Ceasefire Agreement, a strategy the UN has widely utilized. However, it would not be as simple as just an oversight. The Security Council then tasked the UN peacekeeping forces with implementing multiple political, military, rule of law and capacity building, including trying to resolve ongoing conflicts in multiple DRC provinces. MONUC was eventually authorized at a strength of 22,016 uniformed military and police personnel. Finally the diffidence of the Secretariat and the Security Council was matched by the Congolese government’s refusal to let UN forces deploy beyond the Capital. It quickly became apparent that the current and traditional UN mandate for the DRC mission, could only function as an “observer” of the conflict. Its ambitious ceasefire accord, only warranted an aggressive response. Despite multiple attempts to intensify the UN mandates involved in the DRC peacekeeping mission, the mass atrocities continue to occur. William Durch notes; “the operation in the DRC best exemplifies what can go wrong with peace implementation when there is serious deficiency in local leaders’ willingness to support the peace, marginal international political will to take risks for peace, and equally little
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willingness to expand the necessary resources to create it.”\textsuperscript{172} Although this may prove to be true, even after the DRC agreed to the RTP, the killings continue to occur every day.

In 2005 the DRC agreed to the R2P, in which the state accepted to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The government of the DRC, with international assistance, must take comprehensive measures to protect its population and prevent further atrocities.\textsuperscript{173} The government has indeed taken steps to put an end to the mass killings, including a plan for stabilization, however these measures have once again proved to be ineffective. A large issue is that the armed forces of the DRC, known as FARDC, are known human rights abusers who have yet to be held accountable for their crimes, leaving a large trust issue when it comes to who is actually doing the protecting on behalf of the Congolese government. UN member states must uphold their responsibility to take action to prevent and halt crimes in the DRC.\textsuperscript{174} According to a policy brief produced by the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, UN member states do this by contributing to the largest UN peacekeeping force in the world as well as other measures that include investigation by the international Criminal Court and the implementation of targeted sanctions against individuals believed to be responsible for abuses in the DRC.\textsuperscript{175}

\textit{Analysis}

\textsuperscript{172} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid.
Unlike the Iran-Iraq conflict, the crisis occurring in the Democratic Republic of the Congo exemplifies the more common type of conflict occurring today, one that stems from within a state, involving two or more groups fighting one another within the same boundaries. This particular type of conflict setting has added new dimensions and twists to UN peacekeeping. The UN is no longer solely involved in separating hostile forces and observing ceasefire, and without cooperation from the armed states and or groups involved in the conflict, UN peacekeeping is almost irrelevant. However, according to pillar three of the RTP, the countries made a commitment to intervene when mass atrocities are occurring, which in turn should strengthen UN peacekeeping missions immensely by the addition of manpower and strength from other powers. Although, as seen in the example of the DRC, even RTP has not put an end to genocides. The UN along with the rest of the international community, needs to establish an effective framework that addresses situations in which mass atrocities are occurring in an environment where the government and or other established groups inside the state refuse to consent, and or negotiate a peace arrangement at all.

Intrastate conflicts produce the dilemma of having to take sides involving the conflict, which then abuses the UN protocol of impartiality. However, if the UN can identify the perpetrator within the country, then they are obligated to do whatever it takes to stop them from massacring innocent civilians. Genocides are not inevitable, Susan Rice points out in her address to the United Nations in 2010 “if people are afraid of the punishment of atrocities, it is more likely they will not commit them.”176 If an effective strategy involving keeping the international

community accountable for RTP, allowing RTP to override consent of parties, as well as enforcing consequences to address the perpetrators, mass atrocities are less likely to occur.

**Conclusion**

The answer to the proposed question of whether or not the change in origin of conflict has affected UN peacekeeping operations in relation to the RTP, is yes it has. UN peacekeeping has been affected by this new emerging origin of intrastate conflicts and as a result the international institution is failing to succeed in peacekeeping missions. Intrastate conflicts continue to challenge peace and stabilization experts. Genocides will continue to occur until the international community can formulate a strategy to put an end to this horrific reoccurring crisis. Many were hopeful that the RTP agreement would be the final step in assuring that truly “never again” would the international community allow mass atrocities to occur. The UN is an essential component of peacekeeping and conflict response. It provides invaluable support to both states and the international community and has the sole authority and obligation to hold the RTP states accountable for their commitment towards protecting innocent lives all around the world. UN peacekeeping and RTP both frame mandates and equip missions that operate in contexts of ambiguity, where consent is fickle, power diffuse, and violence often ongoing. RTP will continue to be ineffective unless the issue of requiring consent from the countries experiencing mass atrocities is eliminated. The success or failure of one country is ultimately connected to the success or failure of the entire international community.¹⁷⁷ Our own success depends on security
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in every country. With the number of international conflicts constantly increasing; the world cannot afford to have a UN that is not evolving with the rest of the security environment. The role assigned to the UN in intrastate conflict management begs more than the explanations offered so far, it suggests that the UN’s evolving approach to conflict involves a number of normative changes in addition to several empirical changes.  

VI. United States Led Intervention

*Introduction:*

“As the Cold War came to an end, many foreign policy analysts predicted that the U.S would return to isolationism without the need to counter the Soviet Union, this prediction would not be more false. Throughout the 1990’s, the U.S continued to play the leading role in global affairs, maintaining military bases around the world and regularly intervening with military force.”¹⁷⁹ As America considers its role in the years to come, it needs to carefully evaluate the threat mass atrocities can pose to American national security and interests. It has been widely recognized that mass atrocities do threaten American values, however it is often disputed whether or not mass atrocities threaten security interests. Although RTP is indeed an international responsibility, the concept lacks leadership and support. U.S global leadership suffers when the global democratic power is not seen taking an active role in trying to prevent atrocities; the eyes of the victims, and indeed the world, often look to the United States for leadership in helping to prevent and redress these crimes.¹⁸⁰ The historical American willingness to act decisively in support of values as well as narrow security interests has built and preserves the moral authority required to build and lead coalitions.¹⁸¹ Col Outzen notes, “The United States of America is the global hegemon and leading power of the international order, and we justify that leadership based on value arguments as well as hard interest.”¹⁸² Circumstances will
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continue to develop in which the lives of large numbers of civilians are placed at risk, while those who perpetrate mass atrocities and those responsible for stopping them deny that such crimes are happening. This chapter investigates why it is particularly relevant to the United States to be the backbone enforcing the RTP.

I do agree that the U.S has a moral obligation as the world’s superpower to put an end to mass atrocities, however morality falls short of legitimizing intervention, and foreign policy decisions are not always based on “doing the right thing.” However, Rwanda and Syria both exemplify why putting an end to mass atrocities goes far beyond a moral obligation. Both places have shown that distant problems, if unaddressed, prove costly to our country. Mass atrocities have long-lasting consequences far beyond the states in which they occur. Mass atrocities spill across national borders, creating security imbalances, and generating grievances that terrorists and demagogues can exploit. The mass atrocities in Rwanda, as well as the mass atrocities in Syria, both had a connection with the spread of terrorism in each region. No matter how one calculates U.S interests, the reality of our world today is that national boarders provide little sanctuary from international problems and if left unchecked, mass atrocities will undermine American security. As Kofi Annan once noted “today’s real boarders are not between nations but between powerful and powerless, free and fettered, privileged and humiliated.”

With reference to the earlier case studies in Africa and the Middle East, both arenas are quickly becoming engulfed with terrorism. In Africa, the Al-Qaeda linked group known as Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, which has amassed an estimated 90$ million over the past decade
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from drug smuggling and kidnapping for ransom, and is linked to the Benghazi consulate attack in Libya that killed Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other Americans, continues to pose a threat.¹⁸⁵ U.S forces are stationed in Djibouti and have used drones to counter another Al-Qaeda affiliated group in the region. The U.S is also supporting the African Union in its fight against yet another Al-Qaeda affiliate known as Al-Shaabab in Somalia. In the Middle East the exit of U.S troops from Iraq and Washington’s continued absence in Syria, seems to be working in favor of the enemy. The RAND Corporation reports that since 2010 the number of jihadist groups in the region has increased by 58 percent, the number of extremist fighters has doubled, and the number of attacks by al Qaeda affiliates has tripled.¹⁸⁶ As ISIL makes its way to Baghdad, the threat is becoming seen as more and more imminent.

Of course, the cost of intervention is not small. While recognizing the limitations of time and resources as well as other constraints on policymakers, inevitably intervention faces challenges of bureaucracies and budgets, polices and political will. During a time of fiscal austerity, the economic costs involved in humanitarian intervention is one of the strongest arguments against intervention. In Somalia, a country of about 8.5 million people, the final bill for the U.S intervention totaled more than $7 billion.¹⁸⁷ There are limits to American power, which must be factored into policy choices. But a predisposition to passivity has costs -- to American interests, to nervous friends and allies, and to the victims of ongoing atrocities. And

these should be factored in as well. However, Michael Abramowitz, from *Foreign Policy* makes a strong point, “When prevention fails, the United States invariably foots much of the bill for post-atrocity relief and peacekeeping operations -- to the tune of billions of dollars”. The longer the U.S waits to act, the more exorbitant price tag. If the U.S were to successfully intervene right when mass atrocities begin to take place, it could avoid post-relief costs. For example, in Bosnia, the U.S has nearly invested $15 billion to support peacekeeping forces in the years before America decided to belatedly intervene to stop the mass atrocities.

When assessing the gravest dangers to American national security, one of the first threats that comes to mind post 9/11, is terrorism. Since the attacks the United States of America has tailored its national security strategy almost directly towards preventing another September 11th massacre. The paper does acknowledge that not all terrorism in Africa and the Middle East stems from mass atrocities, however the U.S is heavily involved in many different counter-terrorism efforts in both regions and continues to have strategic interests in both parts of the world. The 9/11 terrorist attacks emphasize the perception that in today’s global environment weak states, like Afghanistan, Iraq, and the DRC, can pose a direct, great danger to U.S national security. Several threats emanate when a state is considered weak, fragile, and vulnerable or in crisis. Mass atrocities not only endanger the promotion of democracy and global stability abroad, it


breeds terrorism, which is viewed globally as a threat to not only the U.S but also the entire global community. Terrorism most notably trumps humanitarian crises in terms of the U.S foreign policy agenda. After examining the onset of the FDLR and ISIL, I find that both terrorist organizations have benefited immensely from mass atrocities, which should be an eye opener for U.S policy makers when considering consequences in allowing mass killings to occur. The paper will now examine one famous historical case of a U.S led intervention in mass atrocities.

**Bosnia:**

The paper utilizes a case study methodology to review an instance of U.S intervention in mass atrocities in order to examine what advantages intervention has had for the U.S in historical instances of mass atrocities. I examine the intervention in Bosnia because it was an event in history where the international community, including the U.S, recognized the mass atrocities taking place and decided to multilaterally intervene to end the crisis. I also choose this event because it showcases the importance of U.S leadership in an intervention. Prior to U.S involvement in Bosnia, the U.N, NATO and other international organizations, although involved, were not successful in ending the violence. It was not until the U.S decided to step up, that peace negotiations were made.

The 1990’s experienced numerous amounts of ethnic conflicts in which actors utilized mass atrocities as a means to an end. The Bosnian War took place from April 1992-1995, and approximately 150,000 people were murdered as a part of an attempt by Serbia to preserve its rule over Bosnia via ethnic cleansing.\(^{192}\) I chose this historical event because it is a clear example

of how U.S intervention in genocides can further U.S national security interests. The Bosnian genocide began when ethnic tensions broke out between the Serbs and Bosnians, and people who had lived peacefully together for years turned against each other with arms.\textsuperscript{193} Serbia set out to “ethnically cleanse” Bosnian territory by systematically removing all Bosnian Muslims.\textsuperscript{194}

The U.S began delivering humanitarian aid to the region in 1993 when Srebrenica was seized, and continued till 1995. Aid was not enough to stop the genocide. During the 1995 United Nations tribunal on human rights violations, twenty-one Bosnian commanders were charged with genocide and crimes against humanity, marking the first time a Western political body openly charged Serbs with genocide.\textsuperscript{195} In December 1995 the U.S led peace negotiations in Dayton, Ohio known as the Dayton Peace Accords. The tireless diplomatic leadership of the U.S, supported by 60,000 NATO soldiers employed to preserve the cease-fire, is the sole reason the carnage in Bosnia came to an end. The Supreme Allied Commander in Europe at the time, General George Joulwan says “In Europe it brought back all kinds of concern and fear, it was an issue of credibility for the Alliance and since the United States is the lead member of that alliance, it was very important for the U.S to lead, not just militarily, but politically as well.”\textsuperscript{196}

Today Bosnia and Herzegovina are transitional economies pursuing membership in the European Union and World Trade Organization. More than 40 U.S and U.S-affiliated companies

\textsuperscript{193} "Genocide in Bosnia." Genocide in Bosnia. Accessed March 27, 2013. doi:Holocaust Museum
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid.
have established a full-time presence in the country. The country’s progress toward Euro-
Atlantic structures and the democratic, economic, and security commitments that this entails, are
essential to the broader stability of the western Balkans. Bosnia and the U.S belong to a number
of the same international organizations including the United Nations, Euro-Atlantic Partnership
Council, and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, International Monetary Fund
and the World Bank. Due to U.S intervention during the genocide in Bosnia, the U.S gained
an international partner and ally. As the U.S aims to strengthen relations with Europe in order to
combat 21st century global issues and Bosnia remains a critical component in U.S-European
relations. Vice President Joe Biden continues to visit Sarajevo to emphasize the importance of
Bosnian stability, security and ultimately its integration into NATO. Investment in strengthening
the rule of law in Bosnia can prevent the creation of an environment in which terrorism can
flourish, which in recent years has been revealed as the largest threat to U.S security. The
stability of southeastern Europe depends on the ability of the Bosnians, working with the
international community, to create a self-sustaining, peaceful, democratic system in their
country.

The continuing importance of a strong U.S-Bosnia relationship demonstrates how U.S
intervention in genocides, though brutal and economically costly, furthers U.S national security

197 "U.S. Relations With Bosnia and Herzegovina." U.S. Department of State. September 20,
198 Ibid.
199 Lammer, Hannah. "Renewed US Interest in Bosnia and Herzegovina Must Be on Par with EU
Goals, by Hannah Lammer." Association Alumni of the Centre for Interdisiplinary Postgraduate
200 "SAIS Review, Bosnia: Why the United States Should Finish the Job." Project MUSE -
interests. Having a strong presence and favored view of America in Bosnia enables the U.S to continue to play a key leadership role involving European security affairs. Without stability in Bosnia, southeastern Europe will struggle with creating an effective democratic system in their country. The Bosnia example also portrays how although U.S intervention is costly, it can not only stop the carnage, but can also transform a beaten and broken country into a viable and peaceful state.201 As a permanent member of the UN Security Council and a funder of 27 percent of the UN peacekeeping budget, the U.S has an enormous, yet under-leveraged, influence on peacekeeping operations.202

V. Conclusion

After repeated broken promises from leaders around the world to end the crisis of mass atrocities, “The time has come to reassert our common humanity. Any time someone says it’s not in the “national interest” to stop mass atrocities, ask about the billions we’ll spend for relief of refugees, the hundreds of thousands who will flee beyond boarders and spreading terrorism and instability, and more importantly the shame we should feel as human beings to see mass murder before our eyes, but walk by on the other side.”

Previous United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan warned, “No war leaves the neighboring countries untouched…What often begins as an internal dispute over power and resources can quickly engulf an entire region.” Henry Kissinger also reminds us that “the study of history offers no manual of instruction that can be applied automatically; history teaches by analogy, shedding light on the likely consequences of comparable situations.” We continually see mass atrocities creating instability all over the globe. Mass atrocities can no longer be viewed as simply a domestic issue. This paper aims to emphasize the severity of the risk being taken when the international community chooses to ignore mass atrocities. The case studies of Rwanda and Syria are aimed at opening policy maker’s eyes to some seemingly ignored lessons of instability spillover. It is vital that the world learn from the lessons of the past, so that it can better prepare for future mass atrocity crises, as they will inevitably occur. After analyzing the inability of the UN to effectively respond to today’s era of mass atrocities, it would

be in the international community's best interest to begin stepping up to put an end to this vicious crisis. With the U.S leading the global war on terrorism, this paper aims to encourage the U.S to consider the consequences of the spread of terrorism from mass atrocities when deciding whether or not to intervene in the next “Rwanda” or “Syria” like crisis. The U.S has the capability and the opportunity to provide global leadership towards putting an end to mass atrocities. The U.S can advance the collective capacity and will of the international community to further its obligations under RTP. In the famous words of Madeleine Albright to Colin Powell regarding U.S forces, “what is the point in having a superb military that you’re always talking about if we can’t use it?” Mass atrocities needs to be seen as more than just systematic human rights violations occurring internally in far away countries. This paper aims to be a step forward in mending a gap between global and American principles and practices and put an end to a tireless tragedy. Just as the nineteenth century was the century of the movement to abolish slavery, let us make the twenty-first the century when we abolish mass killings.
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