

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Institute of Political Studies
Department of Security Studies

Master's Thesis

2024

Kateřina Šabatová

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Political Studies
Department of Security Studies

**Legitimising the Launch of Humanitarian
Intervention – A Case Study of U.S. Domestic
Politics Towards the Phenomenon of
Humanitarian Intervention**

Master's thesis

Author: Bc. Kateřina Šabatová

Study programme: Security Studies

Supervisor: Mgr. et Mgr. Tomáš Kučera, Ph.D.

Year of the defence: 2024

Declaration

1. I hereby declare that I have compiled this thesis using the listed literature and resources only.
2. I hereby declare that my thesis has not been used to gain any other academic title.
3. I fully agree to my work being used for study and scientific purposes.

In Prague on
02.01.2024

Kateřina Šabatová

References

ŠABATOVÁ, Kateřina. *Legitimising the Launch of Humanitarian Intervention – A Case Study of U.S. Domestic Politics Towards the Phenomenon of Humanitarian Intervention*. Praha, 2024. 57 pages. Master's thesis (Mgr.). Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Political Studies. Department of Security Studies. Supervisor Prof. Mgr. et Mgr. Tomáš Kučera, Ph.D.

Length of the thesis: 103 968

Abstract

This thesis examines the phenomenon of humanitarian intervention in the context of its process of legitimizing the initiation. Specifically, it focuses on the relationship of U.S. domestic politics to the legitimation of the initiation of humanitarian intervention abroad. Using three case studies of the launch of humanitarian intervention from the Middle East region, it aims to explain and answer the question of how U.S. politics influences American society's perception of the justification for the launch of humanitarian intervention abroad. The case studies analyzed are the 1958 U.S. intervention in Lebanon, the 1991 intervention in Iraq, and the unlike intervention in Syria. The Middle East cases are chosen because of the prevailing threat to civilians in the region, which has the potential to spread to other countries.

Using the three approaches of humanitarianism, realpolitik, and mixed motives, it then with the use of discourse analysis evaluates the arguments and approaches of U.S. policymakers in the case studies and how they influenced the justification of the humanitarian intervention in question. The thesis puts this in context with the nature of American political culture and US foreign policy towards the Middle East.

While the topic of humanitarian intervention has been explored by many authors, this thesis adds to the existing literature by its focus on the arguments and attitudes of domestic U.S. politics towards humanitarian intervention in the Middle East.

Abstrakt

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá fenoménem humanitární intervence v kontextu jeho procesu legitimizace zahájení. Konkrétně se pak zaměřuje na vztah americké domácí politiky vůči ospravedlnění zahájení humanitární intervence v zahraničí. Jejím cílem je pomocí třech případových studií zahájení humanitární intervence z oblasti Blízkého východu, vysvětlit a najít odpověď na otázku, jakými způsoby americká politika ovlivňuje vnímání americké společnosti pro ospravedlnění zahájení humanitární intervence v zahraničí. Analyzované případové studie jsou americká intervence v Libanonu 1958, v Iráku 1991 a neuskutečněná intervence v Sýrii. Případy z Blízkého východu jsou zvoleny kvůli panující hrozbě pro civilisty v této oblasti, která má potenciál se rozšířit i do dalších zemí.

S využitím třech přístupů humanitarismu, realpolitik a smíšených motivů, dále s pomocí diskurzivní analýzy vyhodnocuje argumenty a přístupy amerických politiků

v daných případových studiích a to, jak jimi bylo ovlivněno ospravedlnění dané humanitární intervence. To dává do kontextu s podstatou americké politické kultury a zahraniční politiky USA vůči Blízkému východu.

I když téma humanitární intervence bylo zkoumáno mnoha autory, tato práce doplňuje již existující literaturu svým zaměřením na argumenty a postoje domácí americké politiky vůči humanitární intervencím na Blízkém východě.

Keywords

humanitarian intervention, legitimization, Just War Theory, US politics, real-politik, mixed-motives, humanitarianism, american political culture

Klíčová slova

humanitární intervence, legitimizace, Teorie spravedlivé války, americká politika, real-politika, smíšené motivy, humanitarianismus, americká politická kultura

Title

Legitimising the Launch of Humanitarian Intervention – A Case Study of U.S. Domestic Politics Towards the Phenomenon of Humanitarian Intervention

Název práce

Legitimizace zahájení humanitární intervence - Případová studie americké domácí politiky vůči fenoménu humanitární intervence

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude Mgr. et Mgr. Tomáš Kučera, Ph.D. for his support, willingness and valuable advice during the preparation of my thesis.

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
INTRODUCTION	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	6
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	8
1. HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION AND THE UNITED NATIONS	8
1.1 <i>History of humanitarian intervention under the UN</i>	8
1.2 <i>Humanitarian intervention and the international law</i>	10
1.3 <i>Responsibility to Protect (R2P)</i>	11
2. AMERICAN POLITICS	12
2.1 <i>American political culture</i>	13
3. INFLUENCE OF REALPOLITIK, HUMANITARIANISM AND MIXED MOTIVES	16
3.1 <i>Influence of realpolitik</i>	16
3.2 <i>Influence of humanitarianism</i>	17
3.3 <i>Concept of mixed motives</i>	18
4. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE MIDDLE EAST	20
ANALYTICAL PART	23
5. LEBANESE CRISIS 1958	23
5.1 <i>Description of events</i>	23
5.2 <i>U.S. argumentation</i>	25
5.2.1 <i>Signs of humanitarianism approach</i>	25
5.2.2 <i>Signs of realpolitik approach</i>	26
5.2.3 <i>Signs of mixed motives</i>	28
5.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	29
6. MILITARY INTERVENTION IN IRAQ: OPERATION PROVIDE COMFORT	30
6.1 <i>Description of events</i>	30
6.2 <i>U.S. argumentation</i>	32
6.2.1 <i>Signs of humanitarianism approach</i>	32
6.2.2 <i>Signs of realpolitik approach</i>	33
6.2.3 <i>Signs of mixed motives</i>	35
6.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	35
7. SYRIA CIVIL WAR	36
7.1 <i>Description of events</i>	37
7.2 <i>U.S. argumentation</i>	39
7.2.1 <i>Signs of humanitarianism approach</i>	39

7.2.2	<i>Signs of realpolitik approach</i>	40
7.2.3	<i>Signs of mixed motives</i>	42
7.3.3	<i>Conclusion</i>	42
CONCLUSION		43
SUMMARY		45
LIST OF REFERENCES		46

Introduction

This diploma thesis will address the phenomenon of humanitarian intervention and the process of legitimising its initiation. Specifically, this thesis focuses on the topic of the initiation of humanitarian interventions and its legitimisation process with a focus on the domestic politics of the United States (U.S.). Although in today's political order and world events, the United States is losing its hegemonic status, it is still one of the superpowers with enormous influence whose decisions have repercussions for the whole world. Specifically, their decisions affect, and affected, not only world developments of events, but also the policies of world organisations where the U.S. has a decisive say, and which can legitimise the initiation of humanitarian interventions - especially the United Nations (UN). For this reason, the author decided to examine just the initiation of humanitarian intervention from the perspective of the U.S. In doing so, the author will use a new perspective to examine this phenomenon, the analysis of which will focus on the behaviour of US domestic politics, its argumentation of legitimisation for the launch of humanitarian interventions with a focus on the cases of the Middle Eastern humanitarian interventions initiated by the U.S.

The author would like to answer the main research question of this thesis: *How does U.S. domestic politics influence the legitimisation of the initiation of humanitarian intervention in American society?*

To answer the main research question, the author will analyse the plot of events related to the specific case studies and the reactions of domestic American politics to those developments. The analysis of the collected information will be followed by an evaluation of how the approach of U.S. domestic politics to the identified situation in the Middle East influenced the (non-)initiation of humanitarian intervention.

The author will thus examine the attitudes of the domestic politics of the United States towards three selected cases of humanitarian interventions and its process of legitimisation in three time periods with a focus on post-World War II. era, in which was the boom in humanitarian interventions. The three time periods are the Cold War era, the 1990s and the 21st century, specifically the 2010s. These periods were selected to bring the development of the influence of domestic American politics on American society in the legitimization initiation of humanitarian intervention through time. The cases of humanitarian

interventions from the Middle East were chosen because the region has been and continues to be plagued by unrest and undemocratic regimes that restrict human rights and freedoms. Also, this unrest poses a threat to spreading to other regions with the potential of causing danger to human lives and therefore the stability of the world. Thus, this thesis will focus on this region to analyse the attitudes of domestic American politics towards the Middle East region in initiating humanitarian interventions.

This thesis uses the definition of humanitarian intervention as “*the use of force to stop or oppose massive violations of the most fundamental human rights (especially mass murder and genocide) in a third State*” (Kolb, 2003).

To answer the research question, the author will use the qualitative case study method as the methodological approach, because due to the aim of the thesis, this method is the most suitable with its possibility to examine the phenomenon/s under study in depth and detail, which is necessary for finding the answer to the research question. The author will seek to explain and understand the phenomenon and will therefore use the qualitative case study method.

The gathered data would be analysed with the use of discourse analysis, more specifically, with the use of critical discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis is a research method that is focused on analysing and understanding the role of language in societies and its context within them with the studying of spoken and/or written documents and their interpretations (Given, 2008). This type of analysis is the most suitable for the studying of American domestic politics discourse because of its ability to generate interpretations based on both the details of the material itself and on contextual meaning and knowledge of the examined phenomenon and its society (Luo, 2023).

The author will choose for the analyses the significant and relevant official documents and speeches of the representatives of American domestic politics and their attitudes toward the initiation of humanitarian intervention. Therefore, these selected documents will be examined according to their contents - their statements and meanings - and the impact they have on American society in terms of justifying the initiation of humanitarian intervention and which subsequently have influenced the American discourse in case of the initiation of humanitarian intervention in three selected case studies.

In the selected documents, the author will seek the signs of humanitarianism, realpolitik or mixed motives thinking in American domestic politics according to its attitude to the initiation of humanitarian intervention. This will be added by the description

of the social and historical context and the way it manifested itself in the rhetoric of American domestic politics and its discourse towards humanitarian intervention.

This thesis is divided into two parts - theoretical and analytical. In the theoretical part, there are definitions of the selected concepts that this thesis deals with and that are discussed in this thesis, together with literature review, which lists selected authors and existing works that deal with the main research phenomenon of this thesis. The analytical part will then analyse the three case studies in question from which the answer to the main research question will be evaluated.

Literature review

The authors agree that the current theoretical conditions for launching an armed humanitarian intervention are not sufficient for use in practice. The current understanding of legitimate humanitarian intervention is torn between state sovereignty and the moral demand to save lives and protect human rights. Related to this is the issue of how the initiation of humanitarian intervention is nowadays justified and thus, enshrined in international law, David Mednicoff wrote about this phenomenon in his paper. This academic paper stated the results that the current anchoring of humanitarian intervention is torn between the implementation of a doctrine that legitimizes armed humanitarian intervention with given strict conditions for its launch and the traditional thinking about state sovereignty and according to this split the international law needs to find new moral-building norms (Mednicoff, 2006).

For the initiation of humanitarian intervention to be legitimate, as interpreted by current international law, the following condition must be met - the condition of right intention. Following the moral justification for humanitarian intervention, Michael Walzer follows up by citing the main occasions for initiating humanitarian intervention - rescuing civilians from the dangers of genocide and ethnical cleansing. According to him, humanitarian intervention is clearly justifiable, but it is controversial the unclear how it should be undertaken and its reasons for launching (Walzer, 2004). Regarding the perception of moral principles and ethics in the context of humanitarian intervention, Vítém Kolín described the moral dilemma associated with their launching. Like international law, according to Kolín's work, the moral perception is also torn between two ethical demands - on the one hand demand for the prohibition of the use of armed force against another state and the objective of stopping massive violations of human rights and humanitarian law on the other (Kolín).

This means that in the process of launching humanitarian intervention is forbidden to follow any state's interest to achieve its self-interest. In the case of the initiation of humanitarian intervention by the U.S., this condition is highly controversial, and the authors disagree on the motivations that led the U.S. to initiate them. Dolan concluded that U.S.-initiated humanitarian intervention is often blurred with self-interested power pursuits and that strategic concerns are likely to play a role in decision-making (Dolan, 2007). Contrary to this statement, Seung-Whan Choi claimed in his paper that U.S. humanitarian

interventions are utilised for the purpose of preserving liberal norms and moral values rather than for pursuing a national interest and that the U.S. is likely to use force in terms of liberalist thinking (Choi, 2013).

As far as the Middle East region is concerned, according to these authors, the U.S. is pursuing its own interests rather than the interests of protecting human rights and human lives from danger. However, none of these works addressed the issue of how US domestic politics influences the process of launching humanitarian interventions and the subsequent (dis)support for their launching in the Middle East region. Thus, this thesis will attempt to address the question of how decisions made in the field of U.S. domestic politics influence this process and its relationship with the Middle Eastern states.

Theoretical framework

1. Humanitarian intervention and the United Nations

The United Nations is the most important organisation, which is both a representative of the international community and a provider of aid through the humanitarian intervention of its Member States to countries where there is a threat or already exists a danger to the civilian population. When humanitarian intervention is given and approved by the UN and under its auspices, it is given the label of legitimacy. The international relations of the great powers in the UN Security Council also influence the legitimization of the initiation of humanitarian intervention concerning the veto power of each of them. This was most evident during the Cold War, when the scope of the UN was reduced due to the rivalry between the U.S. and the USSR.

The UN rules for initiating humanitarian intervention are binding on all member states. Thus, the development of these rules has influenced the initiation of all humanitarian interventions in the case studies and the U.S. policy approach to initiating them.

1.1 History of humanitarian intervention under the UN

The roots of the concept of humanitarian intervention go back to the 16th century with the roots in customary international law. In the modern era, humanitarian interventions were a frequent occurrence in the 19th century, but they were not based on the consent of the international community or democratic principles, thus humanitarian interventions were condoned by the powers in Europe with ulterior motives of maintaining or extending its power into a given state (Kolb, 2003). The concept of humanitarian intervention, as we know and understand it today, began to take shape after World War II under the auspices of the newly formed international organization, the United Nations which has become the main defender of human rights and freedoms and whose rules and decisions must be followed by the Member States.

In the Cold War era, humanitarian interventions were a controversial topic because, in a bipolar world divided into two major power blocs vying for spheres of influence and power over the rest of the undivided world, any humanitarian intervention that was initiated or supported by one bloc was automatically condemned and branded as illegitimate by the other. Due to this situation, in this Cold War era, there have been no

more than three proper and legitimate cases of launching humanitarian intervention (Kolb, 2003). At this time, the American intervention in Lebanon was launched, which was influenced by the state of the international political order. In particular, the U.S. struggle with the USSR influenced the U.S. decision to intervene.

In the 1990s, after the fall of the Soviet Union, the UN became the main international organisation under whose aegis humanitarian interventions were launched and under whose rules the initiation of humanitarian intervention was to be legitimised. This was due to the end of the bipolar world order and the subsequent willingness of formerly hostile powers to cooperate at the UN and especially in the Security Council, which authorises humanitarian interventions. With the U.S. position as hegemon after the end of the Cold War, the U.S., supported by the American society's perception of its superior status, has committed itself to respond to threats to human life and the principles of democracy. Together with the change of relations in the Security Council, the U.S. could intervene under the auspices of the UN.

Also in 1999, two controversial humanitarian interventions took place that challenged the concept of humanitarian intervention. One of these was NATO's so-called humanitarian intervention in Kosovo, which took place without a UN mandate and peacekeeping mission in East Timor which led to the imposition of UN sanctions on the intervening states. Since 2005, the initiation of humanitarian intervention has also been subject to the Responsibility to Protect, which, following its adoption by the UN, has influenced the legitimisation of the initiation of humanitarian interventions. With what happened on 9/11 and the subsequent launch of the 'war on terror', humanitarian interventions took a back seat for some time and further humanitarian intervention was only launched in 2011 in Libya, which to this day also raises controversy as to the true aims and interests of the intervening powers which were followed by the French intervention in Central African Republic (Heraclides, 2015). The debate about launching humanitarian intervention was then reopened with the civil war in Syria. The outcome of previous humanitarian interventions has also influenced the mood and support of the American public towards their initiation.

1.2 Humanitarian intervention and the international law

In the present day, the launch of humanitarian intervention is legitimate especially if it is approved by the international community, currently represented by the consent of the UN and in particular the Security Council. This approval creates a UN mandate that legitimises the initiation of humanitarian intervention in the third states because the intervention states with the mandate of the UN possess a legal title that gives them permission to intervene.

The concept of humanitarian intervention is still torn between the two main principles. The inviolability of the territorial sovereignty of states represents the main pillar of the current international political order and the related importance of this principle in international law together with the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states (Jayakumar, 2012). The other principles are moral principles and responsibilities to protect and defend the human lives and human rights and freedoms of people at risk or already in danger.

In its Charter, the UN has set out the laws and conditions that govern the legitimisation of humanitarian interventions today and has defined the limits to the lawful and legitimate use of force in humanitarian interventions. Thus, with the creation of the UN Charter, the existing practice in the field of humanitarian interventions has changed, mainly due its Articles 2(4) and 51 which the Member States have undertaken to respect. These two Articles oblige member states to refrain from the use of force and threats of use of force against other states, which is due to this law prohibited in the interest of respecting territorial integrity and political independence of the given state, and that member states have the right of self-defence in the event of an imminent armed attack (Kolb, 2003). This means that this changed the existing practice of humanitarian intervention in international law by outlawing the use of force against the state with a few exceptions (self-defence).

However, Article 2(4) does not allow legal interventions for humanitarian reasons and thus arises a problematic situation where there is no legal norm defining exceptions for the use of force in the case of humanitarian intervention (Jayakumar, 2012). The scarcity of other legal sources and norms that define and shape the concept and practice of humanitarian intervention foreshadows a black hole in present international law. In this regard, contemporary international law needs to adopt a new legal norm for humanitarian

interventions that covers the entire legal framework for its initiation and subsequent realization of the humanitarian intervention.

1.3 Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

The UN has sought to fill this legal black hole, that has so far existed in the field of humanitarian intervention, with the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) document, which came into force in 2005 after the UN World Summit and which was also the international community's response to the violence actions of in the 90s. This official document, and the norm resulting therefrom, binds the international community to prevent from the threats which arise from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing through appropriate and necessary means (Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect). According to the World Summit Outcome Document “*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 Charter, to help to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity*“ (World Summit Outcome, 2005) in cases where the state in question, where this danger threatens or already exists, is unable to ensure the safety of its citizens. The main condition that the motives for initiating humanitarian intervention are altruistic must be met.

R2P Document contains three main pillars that commit states to provide assistance and help. Pillar One relates to the condition that every state has the Responsibility to Protect its populations from four mass atrocity crimes; Pillar Two relates to the responsibility of the international community to encourage and assist individual states in meeting that responsibility; Pillar Three contains that if a state is manifestly failing to protect its population, the international community have to be prepared to take appropriate collective action to prevent the mass atrocities (Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect). In more serious cases, a military intervention is also launched after the humanitarian intervention. In order for a military humanitarian intervention to be initiated, one of two conditions should be met that there exist, or it is likely to occur, the imminent danger for population in the form of “*large scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product either of deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or large scale ‘ethnic cleansing’, actual or*

apprehended, whether carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape.”(International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001).

The legitimisation of humanitarian intervention is furthermore conditioned by other principles that prevent the misuse of its initiation. The misuse of humanitarian military intervention for the self-interest of the intervening state is prevented by the condition of right intention, which means that the main objective and motive for initiating humanitarian intervention should be to prevent the realization or termination of mass atrocities and to protect human lives from the dangers arising from these acts, without any other ulterior motives of the intervening States. The next principle determines that the military humanitarian intervention presents the last resort in terms that all preventive steps and non-military means are used, and the crisis situation is still not calmed down. Then as a last resort, military intervention is used as the last option for preventing mass atrocities. Proportional means ensure that the scale, duration and intensity of the planned military intervention should be the minimum necessary to secure people at risk (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001). The last condition contains that the military humanitarian intervention should be launched, only if there is a chance of success in preventing it from happening or making action of mass atrocities.

R2P was the key document to launch modern humanitarian interventions. But even this approach had some black holes in the conditions for launch. As the application of the R2P doctrine in the case of the intervention in Libya has shown, especially in the case of the omission of right intentions. The main condition in this case was that the aim of the humanitarian intervention should be to protect civilians from danger and ensure their safety. At the same time, however, this does not rule out ulterior motives in the context of mixed motives. By using the right intention, U.S. policy has in some cases hidden its true intentions regarding national interests.

2. American politics

To understand U.S. political decision-making on humanitarian intervention and the subsequent reasoning to justify its initiation, it is important to understand how the U.S. political system works. The United States are federal republic, which consists of 50 states, with a presidential system and the cornerstone of the U.S. political system and the supreme document is the United States Constitution of 1787. The main pillars of American

democracy are based on the separation of governmental power into legislative, executive, and judicial branches. The balance of power between these three branches ensures that these branches are independent of each other, but they are connected with the system of checks and safeguards against abuse of power, and this system prevents the concentration of power in any of the three branches, and to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens (Velvyslanectví USA v České republice).

Legislative power is held by the Congress of the United States, which consists of the House of Representatives, which is composed of representatives from each state and their number is determined by the size of the citizens living in the state, and the Senate, which is composed of two representatives from each state. The executive branch is represented by the office of the president. The president has the ultimate say in the American political system and also orders the deployment of troops abroad. Therefore, the President's position on humanitarian aid is crucial in approving it. Subsequent speeches regarding the justification for intervention are key to increasing support and approval in American society for the initiation of humanitarian intervention. Also, the federal government, which consists of the Vice President and the representatives from 15 ministries, and state governments and other smaller political units from the local areas of the states participate in its exercise of power. The judicial power is represented by the Supreme Court.

America's domestic political environment is dominated by two major political parties - the Republicans and the Democrats. As far as defence policy is concerned, in most matters, the views of these political parties are very similar. They agree primarily on issues related to the fight against terrorism, cyberterrorism and bioterrorism, but diverge more sharply on the issue of military intervention in Iraq (Holík, 2010).

2.1 American political culture

Political culture can be imagined as the political persona of a given nation, in that it displays deeply rooted and settled political patterns that are typical of that society. (Libraries). Political culture thus reflects the values and beliefs that shape the functioning of government according to a society's expectations. Thanks to the well-established political culture, which binds the society, the society can better understand and therefore support decisions and political actions of their government as they reflect the attitudes of society. Thus, the main characteristics of American society also help shape policy

approaches to foreign situations and influence the actions that the U.S. government takes. Political culture encompasses formal rules as well as customs and traditions that are passed down from generation to generation thereby legitimising adherence to political rules and laws (Libraries).

American political culture is characterized by its beliefs, which have been ingrained in American society since the founding of the country. The most important beliefs, which shape social and political thinking, are individualism and egalitarianism. Egalitarianism is a belief that stresses the equality of people in society, or at least the non-existence of superiority of one group of people over another (Libraries). The principle of individualism emphasizes free action and the ability of individuals to take responsibility to create a more successful and prosperous life for themselves and others in society (Libraries). These two principles are then reflected in the belief that everyone in society has equal rights and chances to make their way in society and achieve a better life, preferably through hard work.

These beliefs are a fundamental building block for creating values in American political culture and these values are known as the American creed. Principles of individualism and egalitarianism are reflected in the belief of American exceptionalism. The unusual development of the U.S. state and its nation, in which equality and liberty have been established in the Declaration of Independence from the beginning, is reflected in American society's sense of its exceptionalism and its unique position in the international political order, and that its political and economic system should serve as a model and inspiration for other states (Libraries). In the context of the initiation and subsequent legitimation of the U.S. humanitarian intervention, this value is crucial. It serves as a trigger, playing on the moral principles of American society, and also as a justification that the main task of the U.S. is to protect democratic principles. Related to this is the spread of patriotism in American society, which refers to the love of the nation and the pride of being an American citizen. Patriotism also promotes the will of citizens to protect the state and its national interests abroad. Thus, during the Cold War, society supported any form of preventing the spread of communism, which was identified by American politicians as a major threat to the United States. The same has been true in the case of eliminating the threat of terrorism since the 1990s.

The next value is political tolerance, which reflects the core value of freedom, which is related to the freedom of speech for everyone, no matter how extremist their speeches and

ideas are. Democratic political values and belief in the rule of law complement the American creed with principles that emphasize a high level of respect from society for the American system of government and the structure of its political institutions (Libraries). On the other hand, the value of limited government is ingrained in American political culture. It lies in the basic value that government is for the people and by the people, and if the government is not carrying out the will of the people, the people have the power to change the government, and at the same time, the government must not in any way restrict the individual rights and freedoms of the people (Study Smarter). Citizen support for government action is important to the American political system. This is because the political system is based on democratic principles, which also form its main characteristics. Thus, the public opinion of the citizens is essential for initiating American humanitarian intervention abroad. The American creed also includes capitalist economic values that reflect the core needs of individualism, which promotes individual success and fair competition in the labour market.

Overall, the American culture is the result of the history of creating of the state and its nation, which influence the deeply rooted values and beliefs related to freedom, equality of opportunity, and a responsive government (Study Smarter). In the context of international relations, this gives American politics a sense that they have a responsibility to teach these ideals to other states, since American democracy, according to American political culture, represents the ideal of where other states should be with their democracies. The U.S. thus takes responsibility for the growth of democratic states according to the blueprint of its state system.

Using these basic characteristics of American political culture, American politicians have appealed to the American people that it is their job to protect democracies and civilians from totalitarian regimes. In doing so, they appealed to the core beliefs and values of American society to also protect its national interests abroad.

3. Influence of realpolitik, humanitarianism and mixed motives

The three main approaches used by U.S. policy to justify the initiation of humanitarian intervention, or conversely not to support it, are humanitarianism, realpolitik and mixed motives frameworks. These three approaches are thus reflected in the reasoning of U.S. politics in humanitarian interventions.

3.1 Influence of realpolitik

According to the Cambridge Dictionary realpolitik is “*practical politics, decided more by the urgent needs of the country, political party, etc., than by morals or principles.*” (Cambridge Dictionary). This means that motives driven by realpolitik are mainly focused on national interests and primarily secure the security of the state and the possibility of gaining more wealth, power, or influence in the field of international relations driven by the motives of the state to become or enhance the great power position. The motives which include the protection of human life are unimportant in these policies. Closely related to this is political realism, which influences both domestic political relations and international relations. The basic idea of political realism is that the main objective of any political action or behaviour is the acquisition or maintenance of political power.

The realpolitik approach primarily entails achieving or protecting U.S. national interests abroad. With the help of influencing the political situation in a crisis in its favour, the U.S. can gain more influence and power in the region. By doing so, it can gain greater control over events in the Middle East region and keep its security interests safe. In particular, maintaining energy security is a major security concern. It can achieve this with the launch of a legitimate humanitarian intervention.

In the domestic arena, political realism argues that politicians seek, or should seek, to enhance their power and self-interest, while in the international arena, nation-states are seen as the main actors that do, or should, enhance their power and nation-interest (Moseley). Thus, states should pursue their own national interests, regardless of the political situation, which mainly concerns the acquisition or maintenance of political influence and power, national security of the state or economic, ideological, territorial, and

sovereign national interest abroad through all available means, the use of which depends on the setting of the moral principles of the given state (Shahi, 2013).

The principles of realpolitik promote patriotism for the sake of defending one's state against an identified danger. This is used by U.S. policy to increase U.S. society's support for initiating humanitarian intervention. At the same time, however, U.S. policy must take into account the domestic mood of society. In the 21st century, and after the failed results of American humanitarian interventions, American society was no longer comfortable with providing its own resources - whether human or material - for military humanitarian interventions in foreign states.

The question of morality and moral principles in the pursuit of national interests is debatable. Political realists are often described as a-moralists, who believe that any means should be used to advance national interests, regardless of human rights or respect for liberal values, both domestically and in international relations (Moseley). Realpolitik is related to the concept of power politics, which means “*politics based primarily on the use of power (such as military and economic strength) as a coercive force rather than on ethical precepts.*” (Merriam-Webster).

The primary U.S. objective thus remains national interests. This is especially so in the context of eliminating threats and maintaining its own security and stability.

3.2 Influence of humanitarianism

According to the Cambridge Dictionary humanitarianism is “*a belief in improving people's lives and reducing suffering.*” (Cambridge Dictionary). In terms of political science, it means that politics recognizes the value of human life and humanity. The main aim of all policies, which are led by humanistic thinking, is to save and protect human lives from suffering and atrocities, not only in the domestic environment but also in the arena of international relations. Motives driven by humanitarianism are mainly focused on the effective response to the threatened people affected by conflict and crises, epidemics and famine, or natural disasters to provide protection, humanitarian aid, peacebuilding, and many more for people affected by a given crisis (International Association of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection). This means that the individual actions of political actors are purely altruistic, humanitarian and disinterested, divorced from other national interests, with the main objective of helping people in need.

For a humanitarian intervention to be legitimate under UN rules, it is crucial that it meets the rules regarding the right intention - the protection of civilians. This means that the most common main reason in the U.S. argumentation is based on the humanitarianism approach. One of the examples of humanitarianism action is anchored in the UN as the principal international organisation representing the international community, mainly in the UN General Assembly resolutions, specifically in resolutions 46/182 and 58/114. Resolution 46/182 stipulates that humanitarian assistance must be carried out within the limits of principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality and at the same time must respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity with the consent of the affected country (United Nations, 1991).

At the same time, the humanitarianism approach combines the characteristics of American society. Especially the sense of duty to protect democratic principles and human lives, which is given by a sense of exceptionalism. According to its society, the U.S. is entitled to the status of a hegemon in the field of international relations. By representing itself as the main protector, the U.S. has come to be perceived as such by the international community.

Humanitarian diplomacy and foreign policy using the principles of humanitarianism is characterized primarily by the fact that in times of crisis, both at home and abroad, the main objective is to help and protect civilians and their fundamental rights and freedoms from danger. This is manifested primarily in the delivery of humanitarian assistance. The humanitarianism argument is also intended to help conceal possible ulterior motives conditioned by national interests to intervene in a foreign state. Humanitarian diplomacy can be defined as convincing key actors and opinion leaders to act in the interests of vulnerable people at all times and in all circumstances and to fully abide by fundamental humanitarian principles (De Lauri, 2021).

3.3 Concept of mixed motives

American politics uses mixed motives reasoning often. Using this approach, all of the basic characteristics of American political culture are used at the same time. In mixed motives, a sense of superiority and exceptionalism is fulfilled relative to the official reason for initiating humanitarian existence - the protection of human life and democratic principles. These motives should be the main objective of any humanitarian intervention that is under the auspices of the United Nations.

In nowadays political system, the initiation of armed humanitarian intervention is justifiable only with the condition of humanitarian intentions - the condition of right intention (Tesón, 2011). This condition is controversial due to the influence of the motives driven by *realpolitik* and the self-interest of the intervening state. The term mixed motives derive from this problem of the condition of the right intention for the legitimization of the initiation of humanitarian intervention. That means that the motives are driven by saving human lives in times of crisis but also there is a motive to secure the interests of the intervening state. Mixed motives are usually defined as a combination of humanitarian motives (morally right and pure) that should be the main objective of a given humanitarian intervention and that is presented to the general public with economic and political motives of national interests (morally bad and dirty) (Jeangène Vilmer, 2007).

In this context, the initiation of humanitarian intervention must have a humanitarian goal as an end and therefore the armed intervention is justifiable as long as the intervening state has a humanitarian intention (Tesón, 2011). However, these two motives are not mutually exclusive, there can always be a good intention to help people from danger along with the existence of a national interest - be it political or economic. They can exist together, and then the motives for initiating humanitarian intervention are referred to as mixed motives.

At the same time, however, there may be ulterior motives for this approach in the form of fulfilling the interests of the state. However, these interests must not override the humanitarian reasons that legitimise humanitarian intervention. That means that there is a possibility that the official humanitarian motives just cover the real motives of the intervening state - the national self-interest. The line between morally justifiable and morally wrong motives is very thin, then it depends on which motive prevails. The so-called hierarchy of motives is used to determine which motive prevails, i.e. the presence of political, economic and egoistic motives would not be detrimental as long as humanitarian considerations remain the "main objective" or "predominant motive" and "morally wrong" motives remain as secondary motives (Jeangène Vilmer, 2007). In other words, the humanitarian motive is required to justify the initiation of humanitarian intervention.

4. American foreign policy and the Middle East

To understand U.S. political positions and arguments toward the Middle East, it is important to first understand the history of U.S. relations with the region. As the importance of oil to energy security has risen, so has the U.S. security interest in maintaining the continuity of oil supplies. At the same time, the threat of terrorism and terrorist attacks to U.S. security has also grown in the Middle East region in the 21st century. These two security concerns - maintaining oil supplies and eliminating the threat of terrorism - have thus become key U.S. political concerns in the decision to launch a humanitarian intervention in the Middle East region in terms of realpolitik approach.

After the Second World War, France and Great Britain, which traditionally represented the positions of the Western powers in the Middle East, were weakened and thus their influence in the region declined considerably. In the new world order of a bipolar world, the U.S. and Soviet Union have seized this opportunity. This situation gave rise to the fact that the U.S. foreign policy interest became more focused on the Middle East region after the end of World War II when its attention was drawn primarily to the political spheres of influence during the Cold War. Fearful of Russia's expanding influence in the Middle East, the U.S. responded by using the Truman Doctrine to suggest that it would take over the UK's commitments to Greece and Turkey and the next step to counter the USSR's influence was also to find allies in the states closest to the USSR in that time (Al Sarhan, 2017).

This situation led to the establishment of the Baghdad Pact Organization, which disbanded in 1979. In 1980, Jimmy Carter created a doctrine that declared that the Middle East were an important U.S. security interest that he was willing to fight for, with or without the cooperation of allies in the Middle East (Al Sarhan, 2017). After the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the USSR, the U.S. became the hegemon in the Middle East. With the end of struggles for influence in Third World countries, foreign policy has become even more focused on securing oil supplies and on the Palestinian-Israeli issue, as the U.S. represents Israel's most important ally in the field of international relations. Thus, in summary, U.S. interests in the Middle East have always been about security concerns, securing oil supplies and the Palestinian question and all these factors are interrelated as they are key to maintaining stability in the Middle East and thus to maintaining oil supplies to the whole world (Al Sarhan, 2017).

The dangers to energy security not only for the U.S. but for the whole world, caused by the political crises that plagued the Middle East, which tended to spill over from one state to another, have increased the U.S. interest in maintaining stability in the region, and hence the continuity of oil supplies and secure U.S. security interests. This has been a goal of U.S. foreign policy since the end of World War II, and gradually the effort to maintain stability has intensified as threats emanating from the region have grown. Thus, to ensure security interests, the Americans have not only built military bases in the Middle East to help maintain national security but also to help U.S. foreign policy better control the situation in the Middle East region.

U.S. military bases can be defined as military locations that are used to train, prepare, and store military equipment for U.S. military assistance or operations around the world and have different characteristics depending on the purpose for which they were established (Al Sarhan, 2017). After the start of the Cold War, the number of these U.S. military locations around the world grew rapidly, with the largest increase in military bases in the Middle East region since the 1980s as a reaction to the Iranian Revolution and the USSR invasion of Afghanistan. After the 2001 terrorist attacks, these military bases in the Middle East became the U.S. focal points for counterterrorism and the Global War on Terror. In 1983, then-President Ronald Reagan created the United States Central Command (CENTCOM), whose main task is to ensure the stability, security and prosperity of the region by encouraging cooperation between nations, responding to emerging crises, reducing and preventing aggression and promoting development and reconstruction (Al Sarhan, 2017).

In the context of the initiation of the Global War on Terror, the threat of terrorism and the existence of terrorist movements has become one of the major security concerns of the U.S. It has become a major challenge for the military to ensure that there are no safe havens for terrorists/terrorist organizations, that the region is not dominated by any entities that would threaten the security of the U.S. and thus contribute to energy security (The Policy Circle).

This also involves securing and maintaining good U.S. diplomatic relations with Middle Eastern states. This is done through humanitarian, military or economic assistance, which leads to the maintenance of allies as well as U.S. political influence in the region. Even before the U.S. became a hegemon in the field of international relations, its political culture led it to believe that it was its moral duty to defend human rights and freedoms in

non-democratic states. After the U.S. gained the position of hegemon and, with the recognition of the international community, became the official protector of human rights, this feeling intensified. With this humanitarianism approach, humanitarian interventions were then launched and justified. But this approach has changed, and the U.S. is gradually withdrawing from its role as "world policeman".

This is done through assistance in any form, which leads to the maintenance of allies and also U.S. political influence in the region. This practice of a policy of friendship, which has also led to greater influence in the region, has been used by the U.S. since the end of World War II and continues to this day. Thus, in 2019, the Middle East received more than 50% of all U.S. global military assistance and roughly \$6 billion from the U.S. global foreign military funding (The Policy Circle).

Analytical part

5. Lebanese Crisis 1958

The U.S. humanitarian intervention in Lebanon is an example of the practice of launching humanitarian intervention during the Cold War. Given the bipolar division of the world, with the U.S. and the USSR fighting each other for power and influence in the world, it was almost impossible to reach a consensus in the UN Security Council to launch a humanitarian intervention. This was due to the veto of a given proposal by one or the other of the rival powers. At that time, the greatest danger for the U.S. interests was seen as the spread of the influence of the USSR and communism. It wanted to prevent this by maintain its own influence and power in Third World countries. One of the tools to strengthened the influence of the U.S. in the world was humanitarian interventions with the help of which the U.S. could influence events in political crises. President Eisenhower directly designated the Eisenhower Doctrine for this purpose, which concerned U.S. military assistance abroad.

5.1 Description of events

The current shape of the territory of Lebanon was formed by France in the 1920s when the territory was under its domination. At that time, an area of primarily Muslim population was added to the former autonomous region of Mount Lebanon. This created the current state of Lebanon, whose population is predominantly Maronite Christians and Druze Muslims. For the newly formed Lebanese government to maintain a sense of unity among its citizens, the National Pact was created in 1943 to ensure stability and peace in the state. This pact included that Christians would not seek protection in Western countries and Muslims would not seek to join neighbouring Arab states (Agwani, 1962). Due to external political influences, especially with the onset of the Cold War and the struggle between the U.S. and the USSR over spheres of influence, and with the growing pan-Arabism, the face of which was Egyptian President Gamal Abdul Nasser and that spread through the Middle East region, these points in the National Pact came under threat. As the popularity of the idea of creating an Arab state that would unite all Arab Muslims increased, so did the concern of Christians in Lebanon for their security and privileged position in society, therefore placed their security in the hands of then-Lebanese President Shamun, who was also a Christian.

When, in 1966, Chamoun refused to break diplomatic relations with France and Britain over their attack on Egypt, most Lebanese Muslims took this action as an act of hostility towards Egypt and Arabs in general (Agwani, 1962). Subsequently, Chamoun's foreign policy took on a pro-Western dimension when he adopted the Eisenhower Doctrine. By doing so, Chamoun violated the National Pact, which involved the condition that the direction of Lebanese politics must not take a pro-Western turn, and this has resulted in the polarization of Lebanese society. In June 1957, elections were held in which the incumbent government was supported by the U.S. and UK and the opposition by Syria and Egypt, and in which a new electoral law was implemented that the Muslim population believed disadvantaged the opposition (Juan, 2012). After the ruling party won, riots broke out in the country, which later turned into a civil war after Chamoun expressed interest in amending the constitution, which would allow him to be re-elected for a second term (United Nations). On one side were the Arab nationalists and their radical opposition United National Front to oust the president and on the other the Christians led by Chamoun, who wanted to suppress this threat.

President Chamoun was convinced that external influences especially the influence of the United Arab Republic and its interference in Lebanon's internal affairs, and whom he accused of importing weapons across the Lebanese border, were to blame for the crisis, and this led him to take the case of this crisis to the Arab League and the United Nations (Juan, 2012). In response, the UN established the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL) peacekeeping group to protect Lebanon's borders from outside influences. As the violence and fighting in Lebanon escalated, they began to threaten U.S. national interests. One threat was that if the radicals won, Lebanon would turn away from the West, and this threat was reinforced by the coup in Iraq, which until then had been the only pro-Western Arab country (Libertini).

On 14 July 1958, in response to the regime change in Iraq, President Chamoun asked the United States to intervene to protect the political independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon (United Nations). A day later, the United Nations authorized U.S. military intervention to help ensure political stability in Lebanon. The landing of American soldiers on the beach in Beirut and the subsequent operation are known as Operation Blue Bat. Although U.S. troops encountered resistance from armed radicals, there were no serious clashes during the operation (Libertini). The Americans also took on the role of mediator in the conflict between the rebels and the government side. The peace negotiations resulted

in early presidential elections, won by Fouad Chehab, as a solution to end the Lebanese crisis. When the situation in Lebanon was stabilized, the American troops withdrew from Lebanon on 25 October of the same year.

5.2 U.S. argumentation

5.2.1 Signs of humanitarianism approach

President Chamoun, with the support of his government, officially requested the assistance of the U.S. and the UN, thus facilitating the approval of the resolution concerning the deployment of a UN observer force to Lebanon, which was primarily aimed at guarding Lebanon's borders. Lebanese Foreign Minister Malik stated that the resolution could be more definitive against the United Arab Republic and its interference in Lebanon's internal affairs, but he was aware that a tougher resolution would not be approved in the UNSC by the USSR since the United Arab Republic was more sympathetic to pro-Eastern policies and the USSR (Department of State, 1958).

One of the reasons why President Shamoun decided to accept the Eisenhower Doctrine was to secure U.S. support and protection for his government, which subsequently caused even greater unrest and dissatisfaction in Lebanese society with his government. President Eisenhower, in a record of a conversation between himself and the Secretary of State, said that the U.S. should try by all means to help Lebanon in a volatile situation and thought it would be better to maintain the situation than to restore the damage stability of Lebanon after a possible escalation of the crisis (Eisenhower Library 2 May 1958). Another conversation between U.S. politicians, states that sending troops to Lebanon, which aimed to stabilize the situation with its presence would only be to protect the country's independence and the lives of Lebanese citizens (Eisenhower Library 13 May, 1958).

The main aim of this military intervention in Lebanon was to secure and maintain the independence of Lebanon, which President Chamoun believed was threatened by the interference of the United Arab Republic. According to this argument, the justification for military intervention was precisely to ensure peace and stability not only in Lebanon but in the entire region. This step was intended to protect Lebanon's independence and at the same time prevent any potential danger to the civilian population in the event of a deterioration of the situation. The perceived danger to the civilian population stemmed primarily from possible direct intervention by the United Arab Republic or the USSR. The

U.S. justified its troop deployment by saying that it wanted to prevent this possible situation and avoid a possible threat to civilian lives thereby justifying the intervention humanitarianism reasons. While this justification is seen by the US as a humanitarianism approach, the main motive falls more into the internationalism collective security approach. Because the main objective of the intervention is not to protect civilians, but to protect the independence of the state.

The United States justifies its humanitarian intervention in Lebanon by reference to humanitarianism and supports its beliefs with previous statements and facts. However, even as U.S. policy invoked humanitarian intervention and cited humanitarian objectives as the main reasons for its military presence the case for humanitarian intervention in Lebanon has no hallmarks of humanitarianism. Because the protection and preservation of Lebanon's independence became the main argument for legitimizing military intervention, not the protection of human life. This fact is also due to the overall state of the world bipolar order. The U.S. at that time was competing for world domination with the USSR, which it saw as the main enemy. Its approach in terms of its military presence in Lebanon corresponds to this.

5.2.2 Signs of realpolitik approach

Because of the rhetoric of U.S. policy, which identified the USSR and communism as the main threat to the U.S., this intervention was supported by American society. Eisenhower in this case use of American attitude to determination to protect the principles of democracy and the sense of U.S. superiority for justifying intervention. At the same time, it tapped into the patriotism of an American society that was determined to defend its homeland against a given enemy - in this case, the USSR.

One of the main arguments that U.S. politics adopted in its process of legitimizing humanitarian intervention in Lebanon in 1958 was the application of the Eisenhower Doctrine, which the Lebanese president chose to acknowledge and respect. The Eisenhower Doctrine was created during the administration of U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower in 1957 and came into effect the same year, when Congress passed it. In creating the Eisenhower Doctrine, the U.S. was responding to the situation in the Middle East, where, after the Suez Crisis of 1956, Western countries - particularly France and Great Britain - had lost the affection of Arab countries and damaged their reputations

following the military intervention against Egypt (Office of the Historian, a). Thus, this doctrine represented an effort by the U.S. to fill the resulting power vacuum and thus an effort to prevent the spread of USSR power, by declaring that once the European powers withdrew from the region, the US must take over their position and protect the Middle East from the spread of USSR influence and power. In doing so, Eisenhower was responding to threats to U.S. security interests located in the Middle East.

These threats were primarily posed by the growing hostility of the Arabs towards the West and the growing influence of the USSR in Egypt and Syria, and to prevent the spread of the influence of radical nationalism (in this case, pan-Arabism) and communism, Eisenhower was willing, through the Eisenhower Doctrine, to send American forces into the threatened state to prevent this situation (Office of the Historian, a).

Through the Eisenhower Doctrine, the U.S. offered states that recognized its validity the option of requesting the U.S. to provide economic assistance and/or aid consisting of the intervention of U.S. military forces if it was in danger arising from armed aggression by another state which threatens the stability and security of that state (Office of the Historian, a). The Eisenhower Doctrine also defines and emphasizes the threat from communist states or states sympathetic to the Eastern Bloc. In his speech legitimizing the creation of the Eisenhower Doctrine, Eisenhower argued to American society that the sole and most important U.S. ambition in the region was to ensure that each state retained its independence, and that peace was maintained in the area, both at the level of domestic affairs and in the field of regional international relations (Wallenfeldt, 2023). Since there was no direct intervention by a foreign state in Lebanon, the Eisenhower Doctrine could not be fully utilized.

However, to a certain extent, the American military intervention in Lebanon was associated with it, because part of it, the so-called Mansfield Amendment, was used to legitimize the military intervention, stating that the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East was vital to national interests and world peace, or American security interests and that there is no intention other than to help a friendly government maintain its sovereignty and independence, that this move does not create a threat to other nations in the region (Eisenhower Library 13 May 1958).

U.S. military aid was primarily intended to curb the growing power and influence of Chamoun's political enemies, some of whom were sympathetic to communism and had ties to Syria or Egypt, but in this case, there was no direct threat in the form of armed

aggression or direct intervention by the USSR (Office of the Historian, a). The importance of the decision to send troops was then underlined by the discovery that the United Arab States was illegally transporting military materials into Lebanese territory, thereby supporting the opposition in Lebanon, which meant that it was interfering in Lebanon's internal affairs (National Archives and Records Administration, 1958). Thus, the primary objective of the U.S. was to send a message to the USSR through its military intervention in Lebanon that the U.S. was prepared to secure and maintain its position in the Middle East and thereby secure its security interests, which consisted primarily of securing oil supplies, for the provision of which it was necessary to maintain stability and peace in the region. Congress was willing to take appropriate steps to ensure U.S. security interests in Lebanon.

The US wanted the position of superpower for itself to maintain its influence and power in the region, which it would then use to ensure the stability of energy security along with ensuring the continuity of oil supplies to the whole world. Directly to legitimize military interventions in states that ask for help before invading another state or before the threat, which arises from international communism, the U.S. government created the Eisenhower Doctrine, which justified possible military interventions in the form of military assistance to the imagined country. In this way, it would protect its security interests.

This is what the U.S. has used the situation in Lebanon and President Chamoun's request for help to do. In doing so, it has stabilised and empowered its position in the Middle East. It also prevented the spread of USSR influence in the region. Thus, launching humanitarian intervention in Lebanon was in the interest of the U.S. in gaining a better status in the field of international relations.

5.2.3 Signs of mixed motives

On the one hand, American policy argued that it wanted to help and protect the independence of a friendly Lebanon, which, although it was not under direct military intervention coming from a foreign state, there existed a threat of foreign interference in Lebanon's internal affairs; on the other hand, it also pursued its national interests of preventing the USSR from gaining more influence in the Middle East. Its alleged humanitarian intentions thus masked its real intentions in the struggle for power in a bipolar world.

In this case, the realpolitik approach has clearly prevailed in American politics, both over humanitarianism and mixed motives. Although U.S. politicians labelled the intervention as humanitarian, it was intended as a tool to intimidate the USSR. The Eisenhower Doctrine was essentially created to give the U.S. the ability to protect its interests abroad from the threat of the USSR. With the launching of humanitarian intervention, U.S. also gained more power and influence in the Middle East. Not only did this act prevent a potential USSR intervention in Lebanon, but it also protected their security interests in the region. These security interests consist in particular of maintaining the continuity of oil supplies.

5.3 Conclusion

As a result of the U.S. rivalry with the USSR for power over the world, it used U.S. humanitarian intervention for its national interest. This is also true in the case of the 1958 intervention in Lebanon. The Eisenhower Doctrine itself serves as a justification for sending U.S. military intervention to states that request assistance. With the main goal of defending democracy from communism, and at the same time preventing the spread of USSR influence. In their arguments, then, U.S. policy appeals to this U.S. duty to protect the principles of democracy.

It also used the argument of the possibility of an attack on Lebanon by the United Arab Republic or the USSR directly to justify intervention, which could then lean towards a pro-Eastern power bloc. U.S. politics established the USSR as the main enemy of the U.S., and any action that would lead to the weakening of the USSR was supported by U.S. society. The U.S. officially stated that the intervention aimed to maintain Lebanon's independence and protect its people, so it was necessary to intervene. However, the protection of the independence of the state does not fall under the humanitarianism approach. Also, it was in the U.S. national interest to intervene and secure a strong position in the Middle East. Primarily to maintain continuity of oil and gas supplies, and also to maintain stability in the Middle East, which was crucial for oil exports.

Realpolitik interests of the U.S. outweighed all others. It was important for U.S. national and especially security interests to intervene and prevent the USSR from acquiring a power vacuum. They succeeded in doing so through this intervention, and the U.S. retained Lebanon as its ally in the Middle East.

6. Military intervention in Iraq: Operation Provide Comfort

After the end of the Cold War, new U.S. security interests emerged in the new international order. George H.W. Bush was the first American president to be in power after the end of the bipolar world order in which, after the loss of power of the USSR and its subsequent disintegration, the U.S., as the sole superpower, had the opportunity to assume the privileged position of hegemon in the field of international relations. Thus, the main concern of American policy at this time was to maintain its position as a hegemon in the field of international politics. In this case, this also meant active American interference in other countries. This was primarily through the use of humanitarian interventions, which could have served as a tool for securing a superpower in the region or promoting a sense of American superiority by protecting civilians and their human rights from authoritarian regimes.

6.1 Description of events

The Kurds are a nation without a state of their own who inhabit the Middle East. Under Turkish and Persian rule, the Kurds enjoyed a degree of autonomy within that empire. This changed with the advent of the 19th century the control of borders and the centralization of power. This act began to make the Kurds a persecuted minority in the region, which led to the rise of Kurdish nationalism and the quests for their nation-state caused, and continues to cause to this day, outbreaks of protest and unrest in what is now Turkey, Syria and Iraq (Kramlinger, 2001). In the 1980s, the situation of the Kurdish minority in what is now Iraq, especially in its north, began to deteriorate as a result of the Kurds' efforts to create the nation-state of Kurdistan and their assistance to Iran in the Iran-Iraq war. For these reasons, Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein cracked down on the Kurdish population in his territory. After the defeat of the Saddam regime in the Gulf War in 1991 and the subsequent weakening of the state, the Kurds took the opportunity to again seek the creation of Kurdistan.

Thus, in March 1991, the Kurds, who were also backed by U.S. President George Bush's calls for the Iraqi people to overthrow Saddam, began fighting against the Iraqi army and succeeded in bringing under their control 75 per cent of the Kurdish population that was on Iraqi territory (Tubbs, 1997). However, the Kurds did not expect the violent

reaction of Saddam, who launched widespread attacks against Kurdish civilians. With Saddam's violent response and with the brutal acts towards Kurdish civilians the Iraqi army crushed the Kurdish uprising. Because of the danger posed to the Kurdish population by Saddam's regime, many fled to neighbouring states to seek safe haven. This subsequent migration of Kurds fleeing danger has created a humanitarian catastrophe, with hundreds of thousands more Kurds stranded on the borders of Iraq and Turkey in appalling living conditions, which caused thousands to die for lack of food, water, clothing, blankets, shelter and medical supplies (Ball).

The situation of the Kurds on the Turkish-Iraqi border was becoming unmanageable for the Turkish government. In response to the humanitarian crisis, in April 1991, Turkish President Ozal asked the UN not only for humanitarian aid but also for help to end the Saddam regime's repression of the Kurdish population (Tubbs, 1997). A few days later, the UN adopted Resolution 688 to provide aid and support to the Kurdish population, denouncing the violent actions of Saddam's regime. Legitimizing UN humanitarian aid meant that the U.S. launched operation Provide Comfort, whose main goal was to provide humanitarian supplies to the Kurdish population. Unfortunately, the amount of humanitarian aid handed over was not sufficient to alleviate the suffering of the Kurds in the refugee camps and the only solution to the humanitarian crisis that remained was to ensure the safe return of the Kurds to their homes in Iraq.

However, the form of assistance was originally to be carried out without the use of military means, as the situation developed, it became clear that the use of military force would be necessary to stop the practice of repression. In response, the Americans expanded the mission and built additional refugee camps, supported by military ground troops and air units, which were also to serve to protect them from the dangers caused by Saddam's regime creating a safe zone for the Kurds to return to northern Iraq (Ball). Gradually, the operation began to focus on airspace, relying on military aviation to protect Kurdish civilians from Iraqi intervention by its deterrence. This created a no-fly zone for the Iraqi Air Force that prevented the movement of any Iraqi aircraft into the territory of northern Iraq, which was patrolled by air units from Operation Provide Comfort. With the presence of air forces, the Kurds gradually began to return to Northern Iraq. In 1997, Operation Provide Comfort was renamed Northern Watch, as its main objective was no longer to provide humanitarian aid to Kurdish refugees, but to secure airspace thereby complementing the no-fly zone in southern Iraq known as Southern Watch, and was active

until 2003, when it was terminated a month after the start of the U.S. invasion of Iraq (Ball).

6.2 U.S. argumentation

6.2.1 Signs of humanitarianism approach

Even before the Turkish government asked for help to cope with the situation of Kurdish refugees on its borders, this humanitarian crisis attracted media attention. With the help of the media, information about the suffering of the Kurds both on the border and in their persecution under Saddam's rule spread throughout the world and thus began to push governments and the UN to respond. The media also played an important role in bringing news directly from the ongoing humanitarian intervention and helping to shape attitudes and increase support in American society for U.S. military intervention. The positive image of Provide Comfort created by the media also helped ensure greater support for the Bush administration and the Pentagon in carrying out operations against Saddam (Rudd, 2004). In this way, the media helped to build the image of the U.S. as the main protector of human rights through its portrayal of the U.S. and its intervention. Thus, ensuring greater popularity for the U.S. across the world.

The image building of the human rights defender was also enhanced by the attitude and speeches of the Bush administration towards the situation of the Kurds. In April 1991, the international community, under the auspices of the United Nations, through Resolution 688, condemned Iraq's repression of its own population and determined that Saddam's regime was a threat to international peace, thereby providing justification for international response and intervention in the form of humanitarian aid (Rudd, 2004). By doing so, the UN provided the US with sufficient justification and cover to carry out a humanitarian intervention called Operation Provide Comfort approved by President Bush in a meeting with top U.S. policymakers. President Bush has stated that the main objective of the operation is for "*Iraqi Kurds, and indeed, for all Iraqi refugees, wherever they are, to return home and to live in peace, free from oppression, free to live their lives.*"(Rudd, 2004). Thus, the president uses the idea of humanitarianism in his speeches when emphasizes providing assistance and security to civilians and their human rights who are at risk. Together with the UN umbrella that legitimised this operation, the main objective of

this operation is the protection of human life, which is the duty of the international community.

When humanitarian aid alone proved insufficient to improve the situation of the Kurds, the Bush administration opted for direct military humanitarian intervention. This was to primarily consist of a U.S. military presence in Iraq to provide protection and assistance to the refugee camps. President Bush justified the military intervention on the grounds that it was primarily a humanitarian intervention, not a step towards a long-term occupation of Iraq or interference in its internal affairs, and not an effort to create Kurdish autonomy from the refugee camps in the north of the country (Kramlinger, 2001).

According to these speeches, the military operation is thus without ulterior motives to disturb internal political events or the political situation in the region. The military intervention is purely altruistic with the aim of improving the situation of the Kurds who are suffering under Saddam's rule. In the U.S. Senate report on the situation of the Kurds, information is given on the number of victims who have been affected by Saddam's regime, as well as listing the successes of the military humanitarian intervention. It further states that the U.S. should continue to provide a military presence whose primary goal is to ensure the safety of refugees and their safe return to their homelands, and even increase U.S. efforts to assist Kurdish refugees (The Senate of the United States, 1991). Under the auspices of the UN and with the main argument of protecting human lives from demonstrable danger, the process of legitimizing this humanitarian intervention is characterized by the use of a humanitarianism approach.

6.2.2 Signs of realpolitik approach

On the other hand, given the environment and events that preceded the humanitarian military intervention, humanitarian objectives come under question. In 1990, relations between the U.S. and Iraq began to cool down and gradually turned hostile. One of the reasons for the deteriorating relations was that Iraq weakened from the Iran-Iraq war of the previous years, claiming that Israel, along with the U.S., was encouraging the neighbouring state of Kuwait to export excessively more oil, thus depreciating its value. By lowering the oil price with excessive production, Iraq was losing badly needed profits. Although the U.S. demonstrated its support for Kuwait through military exercises in the Persian Gulf while warning Iraq of a possible invasion, the Bush administration pursued a conciliatory policy to improve both economic and diplomatic relations with Iraq, as outlined in

President Bush's letter (Office of the Historian, b). Saddam nevertheless launched a military intervention into Kuwait and fully occupied it. This provoked reactions not only from the U.S. but from the entire international community, which condemned the Iraqi intervention and subsequent annexation of Kuwait. The UN Security Council issued Resolution 660, which called for the withdrawal of Iraqi military forces from Kuwait, and Resolution 678, which authorized the use of allied military force to liberate Kuwait (Office of the Historian, b). Thus, the U.S. launched a military operation to liberate Kuwait. The same year that Operation Provide Comfort was launched, Operation Desert Storm, a military operation in response to Saddam's aggression against Kuwait, which ended by pushing Iraq out of Kuwaiti territory.

Saddam's move threatened the stability and peace of the entire Middle East region. He also posed a danger to the supply of oil and gas from the Persian Gulf. Saddam's move threatened the stability of the entire Middle East region. At the same time, he also posed a threat to the supply of oil and gas from the Persian Gulf, which would have the potential to affect the whole world and its economy. This put U.S. security and national interests in the region at risk. By posing such a danger to U.S. national interests, Saddam's decisions became a major threat to the United States. It was in the best interest of the U.S. not only to help its ally but also to ensure peace in the region and the energy security that comes with ensuring continuity of oil supplies.

Concerning this, in mid-February 1991, at the height of the Gulf War, President George Bush called on the Iraqi people to "*take matters into their own hands and force dictator Saddam Hussein to step down.*" (Kramlinger, 2001). In response to this statement by Bush, combined with the perceived weakening of Saddam's regime, the Kurdish uprising began, leading to a humanitarian crisis on the Turkish border. And despite the Bush administration's refusal to support the Kurds, the humanitarian catastrophe led them to launch a humanitarian military intervention. But the situation also provided an opportunity to further weaken Saddam's regime and eliminate the threat posed by his actions within the Middle East region. It has also given the U.S. greater control over events in the region and greater oversight over the securing of oil supplies. By weakening Iraq they have stabilised their position as a great power in the Middle East.

6.2.3 Signs of mixed motives

As the importance of the Middle East region has grown in U.S. policy attitudes, so has the importance of securing power and influence in the region. Thus, a closer analysis of the Provide Comfort humanitarian intervention reveals that the U.S. interest in keeping civilians safe and protected from the dangers emanating from Saddam's regime is not the only reason for its initiation. The desire to maintain energy security also plays a role. Ensuring the continuity of oil supplies is conditional on the security situation in the region. Thus, it was in the highest interest of the U.S. to help the Kurds not only for purely humanitarian reasons but also for realpolitik reasons. These reasons are largely driven by the desire to secure U.S. national interests in the region. This is preceded by a desire to have more control and influence over the security, and hence political, situation in the Middle East. At the same time, it is to eliminate threats that have the potential to undermine stability and peace in the region. And that threat in the 1990s was Iraq.

The Bush administration's stated main goal was to stop the humanitarian crisis of Kurdish refugees, and it has succeeded to some extent. At the same time, through Operation Provide Comfort followed by a no-fly zone, they were assured a safe return to their homeland, northern Iraq. Thus, the main objective that justifies the initiation of humanitarian intervention - the protection of human lives and their rights and freedoms, from a demonstrable danger emanating from their state - was met.

However, there were ulterior motives of trying to weaken Saddam's regime and exert more control over events in the Middle East. But it was a secondary motive, complementary to the main humanitarian motive, which was the fundamental argument of U.S. politics to justify military aid to the Kurds.

6.3 Conclusion

After the end of the Cold War, the U.S. assumed the position of a hegemon in the field of international relations. At the same time, it has positioned itself as the official protector of human rights and freedoms and democracy. This only reinforced the American public's sense of its exceptionalism.

The resulting humanitarian crisis on the Iraq-Turkey border, which was publicized, prompted American society to support the launch of a humanitarian intervention to help

Kurdish refugees. American politicians have declared that helping the Kurds return home and protect them from Saddam's regime is the main task of their military forces.

However, in the context of the previous Gulf War, it was also advantageous to intervene. This was mainly to take the opportunity to do more to weaken or remove Saddam's regime and the threat it posed to the Middle East. At the same time, Saddam with his acts also threatened oil supplies that would have jeopardized U.S. energy security.

Mixed motives are evident in the justification for this humanitarian intervention. Under public pressure and UN auspices for humanitarian intervention, the U.S. could have used military force to protect the lives of the Kurds and stop their persecution under Saddam's regime. But on the other hand, national interests also played a role in the decision. Primarily in the need to eliminate the already existing or potential threats posed by Iraq along with Saddam's regime.

7. Syria Civil War

In 2005, the UN adopted one of the first official Responsibility to Protect documents, which was supposed to change the existing concept of humanitarian intervention. This was both in theoretical and practical form. Since the adoption of Responsibility to Protect, all humanitarian interventions must follow the rules set out in the document. U.S. policy has also had to conform to this new concept. In 2011, protests, known as the Arab Spring, began to spread in the Middle East. As part of these events, the R2P was used to intervene in Libya, which to this day is controversial as to whether it was launched under the terms of R2P or whether there was also an ulterior motive for the U.S. to defend its security interests in the Middle East. This humanitarian situation had a huge impact on the next launch of humanitarian interventions and their legitimization.

The situation in Syria was beginning to deteriorate at the time when protests broke out against President Assad, which escalated into civil war and the subsequent collapse of the state apparatus. This situation provided an opportunity for Islamic radicals who sought to build the Islamic State. However, the catastrophic humanitarian situation in Syrian territory did not lead to the launch of a humanitarian intervention. According to the Global Appeal 2023, the UN says the Syrian crisis has caused the largest refugee outflow in 12 years and the largest number of internally displaced people in the world (UNHCR, 2023). Although

it met the R2P conditions for intervention by the international community, no humanitarian intervention has ever been officially launched.

7.1 Description of events

In 2010, a series of protests against the governments there began to spread across the Middle East in what has since become known as the Arab Spring. The Arab Spring sparked protests in Syria against President Bashar al-Assad, which later escalated into a civil war that continues to this day. The aim of these protests was primarily to push for a change in the current regime and to gain greater freedom. Assad responded to the protests with the use of military forces. Syrian armed forces have responded harshly to rebel protests by firing on unarmed demonstrators; arresting demonstrators, followed by torture during interrogations or extrajudicial executions (Laub, 2023). The use of military forces led some cities to cut off their citizens from basic needs, and the number of civilian deaths rose rapidly.

With the unsuccessful efforts of the disunited opposition to respond to the atrocities committed by the regime against the population, al-Qaeda fighters from neighbouring Iraq took advantage of the desperate situation of the population. In January 2012, the group Jabhat al-Nusra declared itself a Syrian branch of al-Qaeda, and the following month al-Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri called on Sunnis across the region to join the jihad against the Assad regime (Laub, 2023). This situation has also been fuelled by the failures of opposition forces in the struggle against the regime, with radical groups in turn celebrated successes. Radical groups then occupied the eastern part of Syria together with the western part of Iraq and formed the self-proclaimed Islamic State on this territory.

The territory of Syria was thus divided into three spheres of power - the north was under the rule of the opposition, the east under the Islamic State and the rest under the rule of the Assad regime. In all three areas, however, civilians suffered and died. Mainly because all parties in power had the civilian population in a given territory as the main targets of their attacks. These attacks also involved the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons on civilians, the deployment of which was responsible for the deaths of 1,400 civilians in 2013 and sparked an international response (Laub, 2023). Subsequent UN humanitarian aid in the form of food and medicine has been used by the Assad regime against rebel groups, with this aid was redistributing only in the territory under Assad's rule to reduce the popularity of the opposition.

There were other factors involved in the Syrian civil war that influenced its course. These factors are, in particular, the rise of Islamic radicals to establish an Islamic State, the military operations by Turkish forces against the Syrian Kurds, and the actual fighting between the Assad government and the opposition (Centre for Preventive Action, 2023).

The international community decided to intervene only after the threat of the Islamic State began to spread in the form of terrorist attacks across Europe. The main objective was therefore not to help the civilian population, but primarily to eliminate the threat posed by the radical mindset of the Islamic State. In response to the terrorist acts, in 2015 the U.S., France, the UK and their Arab allies decided to expand their air campaign in Iraq to Syria (Centre for Preventive Action, 2023). U.S. troops operated on Syrian territory against the Islamic State until their withdrawal by Donald Trump and after the defeat of the Islamic State in 2019. However, the civil war in Syria between the opposition and the Assad regime continues to this day. The civil war has turned into a proxy war, with each side relying on the support of external actors. The opposition was supported by the U.S.-led coalition and Assad was supported by Russia and its allies.

Since 2011, the Syrian civilian population has suffered as a result of air and ground attacks, including the use of chemical weapons. Civil war is characterised by mass atrocities, crimes against humanity and war crimes committed by the fighting forces against civilians. The Syrian population faces arbitrary arrests, torture, enforced disappearances, deaths in custody and executions throughout the territory; in areas previously controlled by the opposition, the government arbitrarily restricts freedom of movement dispossesses people of their property and commits mistreatment of prisoners of war (Global Centre for Responsibility to Protect, 2023).

Despite the mass atrocities being committed against the civilian population, not only by the state but also by other actors, the UN Security Council has not launched R2P humanitarian intervention. Even though the situation in Syria meets the conditions for its launch. Since 2013, the UNSC has adopted 29 resolutions on the situation in Syria to improve the situation of civilians, but none of them have been fully implemented and many of them have been directly violated by the Syrian government (Global Centre for Responsibility to Protect, 2023). Russia and China are boycotting any further harsher resolutions condemning the Assad regime and holding it accountable for crimes committed against civilians, including the use of chemical weapons.

7.2 U.S. argumentation

During the course of the Civil War in Syria, there have been three U.S. presidents since 2011 - Barack Obama (2007-2017), Donald J. Trump (2017-2021) and Joe Biden (2021-present). All three presidents have maintained the U.S. position of not intervening militarily in Syria's internal affairs during their terms in office. Respectively, not to get militarily involved in the conflict between Syrian President Assad and the opposition, which demanded Assad's withdrawal. The U.S. military intervention in 2015 was not humanitarian, but a response by the international community to the global threat of terrorism emanating from the Islamic State. Its main objective was not to protect Syrian civilians from danger.

7.2.1 Signs of humanitarianism approach

Indications of U.S. efforts at humanitarian intervention to help civilians in Syria were most pronounced during the Obama administration. At the beginning of the conflict in 2011, Obama expressed support for the Syrian population and for their efforts to establish a democratic regime, at the same time he condemned all violent attacks by the state. He expressed respect for the desire of foreign powers not to interfere in Syria, but called on Assad to step down and said the U.S. would continue to press Assad on this issue (Phillips, 2011). The change in stance on the use of U.S. military force in Syria came with Assad's order to use chemical weapons against the civilian population. Obama had already stated before their use that any use against civilians would trigger a response in the U.S. in the form of a decision to intervene militarily (Ballotpedia). The humanitarianism desire of the U.S. to prevent further danger to the civilian population that came from the threat of using unconventional weapons led to the consideration of sending U.S. troops to Syria. U.S. troops would be sent to weaken the Assad regime and, more importantly, to prevent another chemical weapons attack. It was the moment when the U.S. came closest to launching a humanitarian intervention in Syria.

Obama also said in his speech that the international community must respond to the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons to clearly define the line across, which they must not be used and to send a warning and deterrent signal for their possible future use (Ballotpedia). It would also protect the entire Middle East region from chemical weapons. Obama thus emphasised the need to intervene in the case of the use of chemical weapons to limit the dangers arising from them. However, he did not take into account the complex

situation of civilians in Syria. In his statements, he used the deployment of U.S. armed forces only in the context of the continued use of chemical weapons.

At the same time, however, he took issue with the persistent notion, ingrained in American political culture, that the U.S. has an obligation as a democratic model to rescue other non-democratic states. At the same time, he pushed back against the persistent notion ingrained in American political culture that the U.S. has to hold the status of defender of democracy and human rights by stating that "*America is not the world's policeman*" (Ballotpedia). On the other hand, however, he stressed that the U.S. has a duty to prevent the use of chemical weapons against civilians under any circumstances. He thus appealed to the sense of superiority that gave the U.S. the feeling that it could influence the internal affairs of foreign states in the name of protecting human lives.

However, the implementation of the humanitarian intervention in Syria remained only in verbal form. The humanitarian intervention never took place. Even as the situation of the civilian population in Syria assumed catastrophic proportions and the conditions for initiating humanitarian intervention under R2P were met, other factors - realpolitik factors - prevailed in U.S. policy, leading to the judgment that it was not beneficial for the U.S. to intervene in Syria's internal affairs. The Obama administration launched a policy that espoused the belief that the primary U.S. objective should be to seek a diplomatic solution rather than military intervention. This policy was then followed by incoming presidents who decided not to intervene militarily in Syria.

7.2.2 Signs of realpolitik approach

Several circumstances in the U.S. political environment ultimately decided not to launch a humanitarian intervention. The Obama administration decided that America's interests were better served by not supporting the launch of a military humanitarian intervention. Obama and his administration have also approached the crises in the Middle East as historic conflicts with entrenched religious radicalism and political fragmentation while viewing previous U.S. interventions as factors that have only exacerbated the crisis (Itani, 2016). Obama's positions were also fundamentally opposed to the use of military force to achieve political results. One of those circumstances was Obama's speeches and positions on U.S. military engagement abroad. In his speeches in the past, he committed to reducing and ending the U.S. military presence in foreign wars (Tisdall, 2018). The fact that he would again bring American military forces into another crisis in a Middle Eastern

country was against his speeches and could negatively affect the perception of American society.

The Obama administration was also reassured that it was not in America's interest to intervene in Syria by the results of a poll in which the American public said it opposed military intervention (Tisdall, 2018). American society at this time no longer supported politicians in launching humanitarian interventions. One of the reasons for the American population's reluctance to initiate U.S. interventions was the previous military operations in the Middle East, particularly Afghanistan, Iraq and the NATO military intervention in Libya in 2011, whose true motives are controversial. Moreover, while NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya ended up ending the Gaddafi regime, it did not turn the political situation in Libya towards democracy and the result of the intervention did not meet the expected outcome.

As a result, politicians were losing the support of the community, which, given the importance of citizens to government in American political culture, the government could not afford to do. Not only the American society, but also the American government was exhausted by the failures of American interventions in the Middle East, and so in this case it opted for a more diplomatic way of resolving the conflict.

Another reason why the U.S. has decided to refrain from military action is the situation in Syria itself. The U.S.-backed opposition was split into several groups with different views on how the war should end. However, none of these groups correlated their approaches with the U.S.'s ideas about the end of the conflict. U.S. intervention would ideally result in a negotiated political regime change, but it was quite possible that Assad would never agree to any ceasefire in which he lost and would keep fighting, which could have required more robust military engagement that would have entailed additional costs and complications (Itani, 2016). The uncertain outcome of a possible humanitarian intervention also discouraged the U.S. from launching it. Another complication was the support of Assad by Russia and Iran. This fact made it more difficult to conduct U.S. operations on Syrian territory on the side of the opposition. Without the active support of Russia and Iran, the outcome of launching the fight against Assad would not have been clear.

The decision not to intervene was also made as a result of disagreements in the UN Security Council. Russia has vetoed all decisions that would condemn or otherwise damage its ally, Assad. Without the UN's backing and support for humanitarian

intervention, the U.S. had another legitimate reason not to intervene. Although in some cases in the past it has ignored this fact.

The shift in U.S. policy away from the U.S. position as the "policeman" of the world order, which has caused several U.S.-led humanitarian interventions, has caused a reduction in the U.S. military presence and help abroad. Subsequent U.S. President Trump and President Biden have continued this stance against military intervention in Syria. Their conduct of U.S. policy has the hallmarks of isolationism, leading the U.S. to withdraw from political conflicts in the Middle East region.

7.2.3 Signs of mixed motives

In this case, there were no signs of mixed motives in not initiating humanitarian intervention. Even though, at the beginning of the civil war in Syria, the U.S. was prepared to prevent the use of chemical weapons through humanitarian intervention. Any humanitarian intervention would have the objective of protecting civilian lives from the dangers of the Assad regime, which was committing atrocities against its own population. However, complications have arisen here in the form of the situation in Syria itself. At the same time, American society had been reluctant to support humanitarian intervention, and the Obama administration itself has rejected U.S. military involvement in crises abroad.

National interests in Syria were not central to U.S. security. The U.S. has thus decided that the best thing for its national and security interests is not to intervene. National interests thus outweighed humanitarian thinking, which aims to protect human lives and human rights and freedoms from potential or pre-existing dangers.

The 2015 U.S. military operations in Syria and Iraq were in response to the growing threat from the Islamic State. As terrorist attacks by Islamic State militants spread around the world, the U.S. had to intervene for its own security. However, this intervention was only against the Islamic State. It served to weaken it and its subsequent fall, not to protect the civilian population of Syria or to bring political stability to Syria.

7.3.3 Conclusion

In the event of non-implementation to intervene in Syria, national interests trumped in the U.S. argument. U.S. society no longer supported humanitarian intervention in Middle Eastern countries after the failed operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. At the same time, Obama, who held the presidency at the time of the start of the civil war in Syria, favoured

U.S. diplomatic policy over the use of military force to resolve international conflicts. Subsequent U.S. Presidents Trump and Biden have maintained this line of U.S. policy in the context of the intervention in Syria.

The situation at the UN Security Council also contributed to the U.S. decision not to intervene. The UN Security Council could not agree on what position to take on the issue of intervention in Syria. The situation was complicated by Russia's alliance with the Assad regime. The U.S. military intervention in 2015 cannot be described as a humanitarian intervention, as its aim was not to protect civilians, but to prevent the spread of the threat of terrorism and to cause the collapse of the Islamic State.

Thus, the only signs of a humanitarianism approach in U.S. policy have been in Obama's condemning the Assad regime and its actions against civilians, especially in the context of the use of chemical weapons. Mixed motives characteristics are not evident in the case of the decision to intervene, as all other motives were overridden by the national interests of realpolitik.

Even though civilians were dying all over Syria, no matter what part of Syria they were in, the U.S. chose not to intervene. The process of deciding whether to intervene was guided by U.S. national interests. This decided that it was not advantageous for the U.S. to intervene in Syria.

Conclusion

The main focus of this thesis was how U.S. politics influences the legitimization of the initiation of humanitarian intervention in American society. Or rather, what arguments it uses to justify them. What is significant for the American political system is the support of American society for the actions of politicians. American society thus plays an important role in legitimising the launch of humanitarian intervention.

American society is founded on the principles of democracy and the related principles of respect for human rights and freedoms. From this, the approaches of humanitarianism in American politics are reflected. In the case of humanitarian intervention in Lebanon and Iraq, U.S. policy has used arguments appealing to an entrenched principle of American society is to protect human lives. At the same time, it also exploited a sense of exceptionalism.

At the same time, the humanitarian intervention in Lebanon was influenced by the bipolar world order, with the US competing with the USSR for influence and power. The

U.S. thus took advantage of the situation in Lebanon to secure a stronger position in the Middle East region. This not only expanded its influence but also prevented the USSR from gaining more power in the Middle East region, which had the potential to threaten not only the U.S. position but also its energy security. While the U.S. argued humanitarian intentions in this case, it is clear that this was not a humanitarian intervention. It was an intervention designed to protect the independence of Lebanon. This is neither a case of mixed motives or humanitarianism, but a pure *realpolitik* approach.

In the context of the end of the Cold War, when the U.S. became the hegemon and, more importantly, the "world's policeman", that fostered a sense of exceptionalism, American society felt it was their duty to protect civilians from danger. This was also applied in the case of the Kurdish civilians in Iraq who suffered under Saddam's rule. On the other hand, this situation was also advantageous to American security interests, who perceived the presence of Saddam's regime as a threat. The humanitarian intervention under the auspices of the UN provided them with an opportunity to weaken his regime and at the same time his position in the region which threatened oil supplies. Thus, in this case, it is a mixed-motives approach, where there are strong humanitarian motives that serve as the main argument for legitimation. At the same time, however, America had strong national and security interests to intervene in Iraq.

In both cases, the humanitarian arguments of American politics were influenced by *realpolitik* motives derived from the protection of national interests, which rely on the value of patriotism in American society and the willingness of American society to fight for the interests and protection of their country. In particular, the protection of the security interests that the U.S. must defend in the Middle East - maintaining the continuity of oil supplies. This is related to the U.S. efforts to maintain stability and peace in the region to ensure the continuity of oil exports to the U.S.

In the case of the decision to launch a humanitarian intervention in Syria, humanitarian considerations were the main trigger for these debates. However, the protection of the Syrian people from harm did not convince the American public to support its launch. One reason for this is the failure of previous U.S. humanitarian interventions in the Middle East. Another reason is also President Obama's policy of opposing the U.S. military presence abroad. At the same time, the political situation in Syria offered no advantageous alliances that would benefit the U.S. and give it stronger influence in the region. And while the R2P doctrine could be used in this case, its approval by the UN Security Council has

complicated Russia's alliance with the Assad regime. This situation only supported U.S. politics in their decision not to intervene.

Thus, in this case, the realpolitik motives, since it was neither important nor advantageous to the interests of the U.S., that decided not to carry out the humanitarian intervention in Syria clearly prevailed.

The three case studies thus suggest that even when US policy appeals to humanitarian motives, the reality of what humanitarian intervention will mean for U.S. interests is significant. In legitimizing humanitarian intervention, the most common use of entrenched values in American society - exceptionalism and patriotism - is to garner support for initiating humanitarian intervention.

Summary

By analysing the results of three case studies, the thesis evaluated the answer to the question of how U.S. politics influences the legitimization of the initiation of humanitarian intervention in American society. U.S. politics uses the humanitarianism approach mainly to justify and generate support for launching humanitarian intervention in American society. In doing so, it uses the American political culture to its advantage, as the sense of exceptionalism and the need to protect human rights and the principles of democracy are strongly rooted in American society. These purposes, however, primarily conceal the national interests of the realpolitik approach. In all three of selected case studies, U.S. politics had ulterior motives, or outright national security and national interests as the main motives for (not) intervention in the first place. To justify these national interests, patriotism used to elicit support from American society by citing the need to protect one's state from a given danger.

List of References

Al Sarhan. 2017. „United States Foreign Policy and the Middle East.“ *Open Journal of Political Science*, Vol.7, No. 4.

<https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=78991>

Agwani, M.S. 1962. „The Lebanese Crisis of 1958 in Retrospect.“ *International Studies*, Vol. 4, Iss, 4: 329-422.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1177/002088176200400401>

Ball, Gregory. „1991 – Operation Provide Comfort and Norther Watch.“ Air Force Historical Support Division. [https://www.afhistory.af.mil/FAQs/Fact-](https://www.afhistory.af.mil/FAQs/Fact-Sheets/Article/458953/1991-operation-provide-comfort-and-northern-watch/)

[Sheets/Article/458953/1991-operation-provide-comfort-and-northern-watch/](https://www.afhistory.af.mil/FAQs/Fact-Sheets/Article/458953/1991-operation-provide-comfort-and-northern-watch/)

Ballotpedia. „The Obama administration on Syria 2009-2017.“ Ballotpedia.

https://ballotpedia.org/The_Obama_administration_on_Syria_2009-2017#cite_note-red-11

Cambridge Dictionary. “Humanitarianism.” Cambridge Dictionary.

<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/humanitarianism>

Cambridge Dictionary. “Realpolitik.” Cambridge Dictionary.

<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/realpolitik?q=Realpolitik>

Centre for Preventive Action. 2023. „Conflict in Syria.“ Global Conflict Tracker.

<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/conflict-syria>

De Lauri, Antonio. 2021. „Humanitarianism: An Overview.“ Chr. Michelsen Institute.

<https://www.cmi.no/publications/7782-humanitarianism-an-overview>

Department of State, Conference Files: Lot 63 D 123, CF 1022. 1958. „65.

Memorandum of a Conversation, White House, Washington, June 9, 1958.“ Department of State, United States of America. [https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-](https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d65)

[60v11/d65](https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d65)

Dolan, Chris J.; Lyon, Alynna J. 2007. „American Humanitarian Intervention: Toward a Theory of Coevolution.“ *Foreign Policy Analysis*, vol.3, No.1.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/24907220?saml_data=eyJzYW1sVG9rZW4iOiI3MzBiNzAyNi02M

[TI2LTQ4N2QtYTU5Yi1jN2M1YzdkNDE1ZTYiLCJlbWFpbCI6InNhYmF0b3Zha2F0ZXJpbm](https://www.jstor.org/stable/24907220?saml_data=eyJzYW1sVG9rZW4iOiI3MzBiNzAyNi02M)

[FAZ21haWwuY29tIiwiaW5zdGl0dXRpb25JZHMlOlsiN2FjZjI2MzUtNzhhMi00NDg0L](https://www.jstor.org/stable/24907220?saml_data=eyJzYW1sVG9rZW4iOiI3MzBiNzAyNi02M)

WJkY

mEtZTU2NGMwMTIxMjU5IiwiYWExNTk3NGUtMTIkOS00MDcyLTk1OTMtZGQ0NTE2MzhkNTg3II19

Eisenhower Library, Dulles Papers, Meetings with the President. 1958. „Memorandum of a Conversation Between the President and the Secretary of State, Washington, May 2, 1958.“ Department of State, United States of America.

<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d17>

Eisenhower Library, Dulles Papers, Meetings with the President. 1958. „Memorandum of a Conversation, White House, Washington, May 13, 1958.“ Department of State, United States of America. <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d30>

Given, Lisa M. 2008. “The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods.” Los Angeles: Sage Publications, p.145.

Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. „What is R2P?“ Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. <https://www.globalr2p.org/what-is-r2p/>

Global Centre for Responsibility to Protect. 2023. “Syria.” Global Centre for Responsibility to Protect. <https://www.globalr2p.org/countries/syria/>

Heraclides, Alexis. 2015. „Humanitarian Intervention Yesterday and Today: A History“ *European Review of International Studies*, Vol.2, No.1: 15-37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26593355?saml_data=eyJzYW1sVG9rZW4iOiIxYzc0ZjliZC0xMDgzLTQxNDQtYWJkMy01ZTQ2NmZhNTQ2ZTYiLCJlbWFpbCI6InNhYmF0b3Zha2F0ZXJpbmFAZ21haWwuY29tIiwiaW5zdG10dXRpb25JZHMlOlsiN2FjZjI2MzUtNzhhMi00NDg0LWJkYmEtZTU2NGMwMTIxMjU5IiwiYWExNTk3NGUtMTIkOS00MDcyLTk1OTMtZGQ0NTE2MzhkNTg3II19

Holík, Josef. 2010. „Republikáni a demokraté v USA.“ E-Polis. <https://www.e-polis.cz/clanek/republikani-a-demokrate-v-usa.html>

Choi, Seung-Whan. 2013. „What determines US humanitarian intervention?“ *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 30., No. 2. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26275315>

International Association of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance.
“Humanitarianism.” International Association of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance. <https://phap.org/PHAP/PHAP/Themes/Humanitarianism.aspx>

- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. 2001. „The Responsibility to Protect.“ International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. https://walterdorn.net/pdf/Responsibility-to-Protect_ICISS-Report_Dec2001.pdf
- Itani, Faysal. 2016. „The Origins and Consequences of Nonintervention in Syria.“ *Current History*, Vol.15, No. 785. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48614207?seq=1>
- Jayakumar, Kirthi. 2012. „Humanitarian Intervention: A Legal Analysis.“ *E-International Relations* <https://www.e-ir.info/2012/02/06/humanitarian-intervention-a-legal-analysis/>
- Jeangène Vilmer, Jean-Baptiste. 2007. “Humanitarian Intervention and Disinterestedness.” *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*: 207-216. <http://www.jbjv.com/Humanitarian-Intervention-and.html>
- Juan, Romero. 2012. „Discourse and Mediation in the Lebanese Crisis of 1958.“ *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.48, No. 4: 567-587. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41721153?seq=3>
- Kramlinger, George D. 2001. „Operation Provide Comfort.“ Air University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/resrep13948.9.pdf>
- Kolb, Robert. 2003. „Note on Humanitarian Intervention.“ *International Review of the Red Cross*. https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/assets/files/other/irrc_849_kolb.pdf
- Laub, Zachary. 2023. „Syria’s Civil War: The Descent Into Horror.“ *Council on Foreign Relations*. <https://www.cfr.org/article/syrias-civil-war>
- Libraries. „Political Culture.“ *Libraries*. <https://open.lib.umn.edu/american-government/chapter/6-1-political-culture/>
- Libertini, Colonel Christopher G. „July: Crisis Response in the Levant.“ *U.S. European Command*. <https://www.eucom.mil/moments-in-eucoms-history-a-countdown-to-the-70th-anniversary/july-crisis-response-in-the-levant>
- Luo, Amy. 2023. “Critical Discourse Analysis | Definition, Guide & Examples.” *Scribbr*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/discourse-analysis/>
- Mednicoff, David M. 2006. „Humane wars? International law, Just War theory and contemporary armed humanitarian intervention.“ *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, Vol.2., Iss.3. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.1177/1743872106069823>
- Merriam-Webster. „Power Politics.“ *Merriam-Webster*. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/power%20politics>

Moseley, Alexander. „Political Realism.“ Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
<https://iep.utm.edu/polreal/>

National Archives and Records Administration, RG 218, JCS Files. 1958.
„Memorandum for the Record of the State–Joint Chiefs of Staff Meeting, Pentagon,
Washington, May 16, 1958.“ Department of State, United States of America.
<https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d39>

Office of the Historian. (Office of the Historian,a). „The Eisenhower Doctrine.“
Department of State, United States of America. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/eisenhower-doctrine>

Office of the Historian.(Office of the Historian,b). „The Gulf War, 1991.“ Department
of State, United States of America. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1989-1992/gulf-war>

Phillips, Macon. 2011. „President Obama: "The future of Syria must be determined by
its people, but President Bashar al-Assad is standing in their way." The White House.
President Barack Obama.
<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2011/08/18/president-obama-future-syria-must-be-determined-its-people-president-bashar-al-assad>

Rudd, Gordon W. 2004. „Humanitarian Intervention: Assisting the Iraqi Kurds in
Operation Provide Comfort 1991.“ Department of the Army Washington, D.C.
https://history.army.mil/html/books/humanitarian_intervention/CMH_70-78.pdf

Shahi, Amreeta. 2013. „Is Humanitarianism in conflict with Realpolitik?“ Research
Gate. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Amreeta-Shahi/publication/271967372_The_Conflict_of_Humanitarianism_with_Realpolitik_Unpublished/links/54d856710cf24647581a0051/The-Conflict-of-Humanitarianism-with-Realpolitik-Unpublished.pdf

Study Smarter. „American Political Culture.“ Study Smarter.
<https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/explanations/politics/political-participation/american-political-culture/>

The Policy Circle. „Foreign Policy: The Middle East.“ The Policy Circle.
<https://www.thepolicycircle.org/brief/foreign-policy-brief-the-middle-east/>

The Senate of the Unnited States. 1991. „Commending the humanitarian relief efforts
for Iraqi refugees.“ Congress. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/102nd-congress/senate-resolution/132/text?s=1&r=92&q=%7B%22search%22%3A%22R.%22%7D>

Tisdall, Simon. 2018. „The epic failure of our age: how west let down Syria.“ The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/feb/10/epic-failure-of-our-age-how-west-failed-syria>

Tesón, Fernando R. 2011. “Humanitarian Intervention: Loose Ends.” *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol.10, Iss.3.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15027570.2011.608494?scroll=top&needAccess=true&role=tab>

Tubbs, James O. 1997. „Military Intervention in Iraq: Provide Comfort.“ *Beyond Gunboat Diplomacy: Forceful Application of Airpower in Peace Enforcement Operations*, pp-15-29. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep13793.9?seq=1>

UNHCR. 2023. „The Global Appeal 2023.“ The UN Refugee Agency.
<https://reporting.unhcr.org/global-appeal-2023>

United Nations.1991. „General Assembly – Forty-sixth Session.“ The United Nations.
<https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/582/70/IMG/NR058270.pdf?OpenElement>

United Nations. „Lebanon – UNOGIL.“ United Nations.
<https://peacekeeping.un.org/mission/past/unogilbackgr.html>

Velvyslanectví USA v České republice. “Vládní system.” Velvyslanectví USA v České republice. <https://cz.usembassy.gov/cs/our-relationship-cs/politika-historie/vladni-system/>

Wallenfeldt, Jeff. 2023. „Eisenhower Doctrine.“ Britannica.
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Eisenhower-Doctrine>

Walzer, Michael. 2004. “The Argument about Humanitarian Intervention.” *Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention*: 21-37.
https://books.google.cz/books?hl=cs&lr=&id=FU2678Df-TEC&oi=fnd&pg=PA21&dq=michael+walzer+and+humanitarian+intervention&ots=eb_c6xAATEF&sig=LkBB-F6oCfCSxgfScEH4Nh7tG9w&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=michael%20walzer%20and%20humanitarian%20intervention&f=false

World Summit Outcome. 2005. „Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 16 September 2005.“ 2005 World Summit Outcome. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/487/60/PDF/N0548760.pdf?OpenElement>