FRACTURED STATES AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

IRAQ, ETHIOPA, AND BOSNIA IN THE 1990S

EVELYN FARKAS

Fractured States and U.S. Foreign Policy

This page intentionally left blank

Fractured States and U.S. Foreign Policy: Iraq, Ethiopia, and Bosnia in the 1990s

Evelyn Farkas

palgrave
macmillan

FRACTURED STATES AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY
© Evelyn N. Farkas, 2003.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

First published 2003 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS.
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN 1–4039–6373–8 hardback

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Farkas, Evelyn N.
Fractured states and U.S. foreign policy : Iraq, Ethiopia, and Bosnia in the 1990s / Evelyn Farkas.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 1–4039–6373–8
1. United States—Foreign relations—1989– 2. United States—Foreign relations—Iraq. 3. United States—Foreign relations—Ethiopia. 4. United States—Foreign relations—Bosnia and Hercegovina. 5. Iraq—Foreign relations—United States. 6. Ethiopia—Foreign relations—United States. 7. Bosnia and Hercegovina—Foreign relations—United States. I. Title: Fractured states and US foreign policy. II. Title.

E881.F365 2003
327.73'009'049—dc21 2003049872

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Design by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India.

First edition: November, 2003
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

To Edit and Charles Farkas

This page intentionally left blank

Those who are gifted with the moral power of love and vision of spiritual unity, who have the least feeling of enmity against aliens, and the sympathetic insight to place themselves in the position of others, will be the fittest to take their permanent place in the age that is lying before us, and those who are constantly developing their instinct for fight and intolerance of aliens will be eliminated.

Rabindranath Tagore, *Nationalism**

* Rabindranath Tagore, *Nationalism* (Calcutta, India: Rupa & Co, 1992), 79–80.

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Preface xi

Maps on pages (xiv–xvi)

Introduction 1

Chapter 1 Managing Ethnic Conflict 5

Chapter 2 Iraq 17

Chapter 3 Ethiopia 47

Chapter 4 Bosnia-Hercegovina 71

Chapter 5 Conclusions 109

Notes 127

Bibliography 147

Index 165

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

The journey to this book began in 1996, as I made my way along a winding rock-strewn road perched among the jagged Bosnian hills between Sarajevo and the small town of Gorazde. I spent the next five months working in this town, a so-called safe area during the Bosnian war, which had managed to fend of Serb attacks and remain in the control of its majority Muslim inhabitants. The price for this success was geographic isolation from the rest of the Muslim–Croat federation within Bosnia; the town was surrounded by the Serb-controlled territory of the Serbian republic. Gorazde was caught in the middle of the de facto partition of Bosnia between the Muslim–Croat and Serb political and territorial entities. And I was to become fascinated with the tragedy, past and present, which enveloped the state of Bosnia and its people. As a Human Rights Officer for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), I found myself arguing with a drunken judge in Serb-controlled Rogatica over the fate of three Muslims from Gorazde who had been arrested along that winding road between Gorazde and Sarajevo. I popped a pickup truck tire on a Hungarian-built pontoon bridge while French soldiers watched and ultimately rescued me and one of the two ethnic Serb leaders in Gorazde, who sat, somewhat amused, in the backseat. Our foiled mission was to visit an elderly ethnic Croat returnee. What I heard from ethnic Muslims, Serbs, and Croats during my time there spurred me to embark upon a study of the process that leads to partition, de facto, and de jure.

I returned to Bosnia in 1997, and again in 2000, when I also had the opportunity to visit Kosovo and Macedonia, thanks to a grant from the Air Force Institute for National Security Studies. I saw how the forces that led to partition or de facto partition in places as disparate as Iraq, Ethiopia, and Bosnia, were operating among the ethnic Albanian population in Macedonia. In a restaurant located in a castle set high above the city of Skopje I was asked about the languages I spoke. When I uttered the few words of Albanian that I knew, the ethnic Albanian waiter exclaimed,

"Albanian! It's the language of the future!" As the Slav manager angrily hushed him and the other two waiters who had joined him for this exchange, I was struck by this manifestation of the impact of the war in Kosovo, and more generally by the durability of the challenge of ethnic politics.

This book is essentially an edited doctoral dissertation, and therefore owes much to the individuals and institutions who supported me during the research and writing of the dissertation. If this book constitutes even a modest contribution to the field of international relations, it is a shared achievement. I owe a tremendous debt to my family, friends, colleagues, and curious individuals who encouraged, assisted, and inspired me. Primary thanks goes to my principal advisor at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Professor Robert Pfaltzgraff, and my two readers, Professors Richard Shultz and Eileen Babbitt. There were others at the Fletcher School who assisted me. General John Galvin, the Dean, gave generously of his time, allowing me to interview him more than once and sharing his own writing with me. Thanks are also due to Professors Arpad von Lazar and Hurst Hannum, as well as Roberta Breen, Frieda Kilgallen, Polly Jordan, Bernadette Kelley-Lecesse, Karen McMaster, Carol Murphy, and Miriam Seltzer.

At the Marine Corps Command and Staff College, where I worked during most of the time that I was writing, I benefited from the enthusiastic and thoughtful support of my supervisors, Col. Kevin Conry, Col. Richard Goodale, and Col. Darrell Browning, as well as valuable assistance based on their own research from colleagues including Professors Gordon Rudd, Norm Cigar and Janeen Klinger. Others provided welcome encouragement, including Col. Sue Hoeft, Professors Jack Matthews, Doug McKenna, Chris Harmon, Mark Jacobsen, Kamal Beyoghlow, Rich DiNardo, and my teaching partners Colonels Jack Rees and Bill Kellner.

Several individuals that I interviewed for this project were especially generous with their time, including Ambassadors Bob Beecroft and Hank Cohen, Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, Dr. Andy Semmel, and Gil Kapen. My editor at Palgrave, Toby Wahl, was patient, responsive, and absolutely essential to this project; he offered me encouragement and gave the book, life. Thanks go also to Heather Van Dusen and Ian Steinberg at Palgrave, and V. S. Mukesh at Newgen Imaging Systems. Dr. Bob Filippone, Dr. James Anderson, Dr. Peter and Monica de Janosi, Barbara and Charlie Vamossy, and Jennifer Whitaker served as unofficial mentors. Also, the following friends provided unfailing support throughout this project: Karen Pape Johnson, Sarah Allen Huq, Luisa Boverini, Desiree Filippone, Dr. Rhoda Margesson, Gabriella Rigg, Camelia Mazard, and Anita and Doug Weisburger. I also owe much to the inspiration given to me by the people

and my friends in Bosnia; this book is, in part, a tribute to their suffering and endurance. Penultimately, I thank my siblings—Mik, Elizabeth, and Maria. Maria served as my trusted editor and advisor during the tedious two-year process of repeated revisions.

Finally, this book is dedicated to my parents. They raised me to believe that limits were only self-induced, and encouraged healthy ambition. Their searing experiences during the war and revolution in Hungary, and as immigrants in New York, left an indelible legacy etched on the consciousness of their children. They taught us to take nothing for granted and to seek understanding of other cultures, including those found around us everyday. They are the broader inspiration for this study. I hope that any redeeming qualities found in this book reflect brightly upon them. Let the shadow of the errors, omissions, and slights of hand, fall only upon the author.

Map No. 3729 Rev. 3 UNITED NATIONS
February 2003

Department of Public Information
Cartographic Section



Map No. 4188 UNITED NATIONS
April 2003

Department of Public Information
Cartographic Section

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

Map No. 3835 Rev. 3 UNITED NATIONS
December 2002

Department of Public Information
Cartographic Section

Introduction

In spring 2003, the world was transfixed by the war being waged in Iraq and its simultaneous, uninterrupted broadcast. It was the continuation of a conflict that was over a decade old between the United States and its allies, and Saddam Hussein. As such it presented Washington with some of the same choices that the first Bush administration faced in 1991. One of the most critical choices was whether the Iraqi state would remain intact, that is, whether the Kurds in northern Iraq would obtain their own state.

The war in Iraq came just a year after a global war on terrorism was inaugurated and prosecuted in the mountain outcrops of Afghanistan, and to a lesser extent in the banking networks running through places like Riyadh and Switzerland. Old alliances and friendships—between the United States and the United Kingdom, the United States and Pakistan—are being reinforced and revived. New relationships—between the United States and Russia—are being tentatively forged. Meanwhile, a strategic partnership between the United States and Uzbekistan has been established. The new dynamic that is emerging from the international war against Al Qaeda, and the more controversial fight against Saddam Hussein, presents great possibilities for shifts in alliances and allegiances. The world order that emerges from the new war on terrorism, and the war in Iraq, may be substantially different from the one that existed on September 10, 2001. Just as the end of the Cold War—the discrediting of communism as an ideology and a political organizing principle for states—spawned new competition for control of state governments and territories, the conclusion of this war is likely to bring new challengers to the authority of existing states. If history is any guide in periods when the existing international system is undergoing change, many of the challengers to its fundamental units—states—will be subnational or supranational ethnic groups.

When or if the war on terrorism ultimately succeeds in defeating and discrediting radical Islam as an organizing principle for states in Southwest,

Southeast, South and Central Asia, we will witness a shift in the terms of the struggle for political and territorial power. Groups will fight with decreasing frequency over fundamentalism and secularism. They will frame their arguments in terms of ascribed ethnic differences, which may include religion, ancestry, language, or culture. Religious fundamentalism will be discredited, but nationalism will be there to take its place. Despite what President Bush has stated, the war that was declared on September 11, 2001 is only directed against certain terrorists. It is not a war against all who utilize terrorism, but rather a war against religious fundamentalists who employ terrorist means to obtain their goals. The Western powers just about have the wherewithal to take on the Al Qaeda network, but not all of the separatist terrorists, such as the Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA) in Spain, the Irish Republican Army (IRA) in Ireland, the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka, and countless others all over the globe. Separatist groups per se are not in any immediate danger.

The United States may experience success cobbling together a loose coalition government to rule Afghanistan, but this is no Serbia. In Serbia, the U.S.-supported opposition movement, which ultimately comprised the government that replaced Slobodan Milosevic through the September 2000 elections, was ideologically divided. In Afghanistan, the competing groups are not only divided by ideology, but also by ethnicity (the broadest definition of which is an identity based on common religion, ancestry, language, or culture.) In Central, Southwest, Southeast, and South Asia, layered under, or coexisting with, fundamentalism are enduring nationalist tensions. The ethnic conflict continues unabated in Kashmir, with some of the groups supporting the fighters identified as "terrorists." Such ethnic tensions or conflicts will provide the United States with serious challenges at the conclusion of the counterterrorist war. Once again, reminiscent of the early 1990s, Washington will be forced to side with the central government or with secessionist groups determined to remove their people and territory from the authority of the states governing them. Diplomats and politicians will search for principles to guide or explain U.S. policy. We can expect that the ad hoc diplomacy of the post–Cold War years will be mined for consistencies and lessons.

Underlying the search for precedent in the U.S. response to secessionist movements are questions about the U.S. stance toward partition—the division of a state into two or more states—a potential solution to separatist struggles. When does the United States support partition? Why has the United States supported partition in the 1990s for some secessionists, or irredentists, but not for others?[1] Is partition a policy of last resort, to be avoided until all other political measures have failed, or are there certain

variables that are strong determinants of U.S. policy regarding partition right from the start?

The following chapters detail U.S. policy toward secessionist movements in three countries during the first decade after the Cold War ended. The focus of this analysis is on how U.S. policymakers regarded partition in the case of Iraq and Ethiopia in 1991 and Bosnia from 1992 to 1995. As such it offers some insights into the factors affecting U.S. decisionmaking. The detailed comparative examination of U.S. policy toward these ethnic or secessionist disputes assesses the relative impact of four factors on U.S. decisionmaking. The factors include: (1) the position of U.S. allies or the regional power in a given case; (2) the fear of "spillover," that conflict would spread to neighboring states because of, or in the absence of, a particular U.S. policy; (3) the "demonstration effect," a perception that a negative international precedent would be established, and finally; (4) the impact of domestic pressure exercised by ethnic lobbies through Congress. The cases involve two administrations—the single term of George Herbert Walker Bush during 1991–92 and the first term of William (Bill) Jefferson Clinton from 1992–95. Though their political pedigrees were starkly divergent, both leaders and their subordinates struggled with a proper response to demands for partition in an emerging post–Cold War international environment.

The Bush and Clinton administrations approached the crises in Iraq, Ethiopia, and Bosnia on a case-by-case basis. There is no evidence that decisions were made based on one set of firm principles or with an interest in maintaining rigid consistency. Indeed, the outcome in all three situations varied—Iraq and Bosnia were de facto partitioned, while Ethiopia was partitioned to create, or recreate, Eritrea. The U.S government did not support partition of Iraq in order to create a Kurdish state, and established a de facto partition instead. The de facto partition here served to create an exclusion zone, or safe haven, from which Iraqi military forces were prohibited from entering by air or land. Likewise, in Bosnia, the United States did not support the irredentist movements of the Bosnian Serbs and Croats. Ultimately Washington threw the weight of national and presidential prestige, as well as military resources, into maintaining the legal sanctity of the state of Bosnia-Hercegovina. Given the military and demographic results achieved by the Serbs in particular, and the continued hostility, the only way the state could be preserved was for all sides to concede to a de facto partition. Nonetheless, the irredentists' goals were denied. In the case of Ethiopia, the United States switched its initial policy from no support for partition to acceptance of the partitioning of the state to create Eritrea.

In the Bosnian case, the United States not only failed to support partition, but was also opposed to it. In Iraq, the United States refused to support the

Kurds, but was not adamantly opposed to partition, as it was in Bosnia. Finally, in Ethiopia, Washington did not so much support partition, as it decided not to oppose it. There is still no definitive account for why the decisions fell as they did. The following pages offer a tentative look at some of the key factors that influenced policymakers as reflected in the official statements of the time, and in subsequent discussions with some of the members of the Bush and Clinton administrations.

CHAPTER 1

Managing Ethnic Conflict

The Dilemma Posed by Secession

Issues of separatism or secession go to the core of the international system. The decision to allow, facilitate, support, or obstruct efforts by ethnic or communal groups to carve their own states out of existing ones can be the most difficult and controversial decision a powerful state has to make. At the end of the twentieth century the tensions between international integration and national or local disintegration have perhaps never been stronger. The challenge for the preeminent global power, the United States, is immense, and as the controversy over the 1999 NATO operations in Kosovo demonstrated, miscalculations threaten to shatter alliances, bring Great Powers to blows, and render international organizations (chief among them the UN) irrelevant.

The notion of sovereignty has been eroded by the framework of international agreements regarding human rights, from the Helsinki Accords to the 1992 Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. Ethnic and communal groups that have historically been denied their own state are emboldened by the diminished currency of nonintervention, and are seeking to exploit the current faltering consensus regarding the sanctity of the borders established in the wake of the two world wars. Despite these trends, disintegration and separatism are still regarded in most international fora as negative phenomena signaling a breakdown in modernization and nation building. Secession, or partition, has hardly attained universal legitimacy as an alternative conflict-management option.

When communal groups violently push their demands to the forefront of the international agenda, the powerful states responsible for maintaining the

balance of power or international order must decide whether they support the secessionist aims. This is particularly true when an ethnic conflict breaks out in an area where one or more international powers have strategic interests, and if the conflict is perceived to have regional, if not international, implications. Powerful states will decide whether they think communal groups should obtain partition—the creation of one or more new states from an existing one—or whether a political solution must be forged within the sovereign boundaries of the existing state. Partition or independence is one option, but others range from assimilation (usually unlikely to be advocated if the communal group has adopted violence) to power-sharing, autonomy, or de facto partition.

In his seminal work on ethnic conflict theory, Donald Horowitz writes that the issue of "secession lies squarely at the juncture of internal and international politics."[1] Whether, how, and when a secessionist movement develops is a matter of domestic dynamics, but whether it succeeds is a matter of international politics. Horowitz, writing in 1985, points out that only one country owes its existence to a successful war of secession—Bangladesh. Since then, over a dozen secessionists have obtained their independence, peacefully creating the successor states of the Soviet Union and Slovakia, and through war, from Yugoslavia, Eritrea, and Indonesia. Other secessionist groups have had to settle for separatist solutions short of partition, including de facto partition; in this case, autonomy goes so far as to practically render the entities within the state sovereign in capacity, but not in title. As Horowitz explains, the international community (the major powers) rarely accepts partition. The status quo powers are not likely to endorse the creation of new states, but they are usually in the best position to offer decisive assistance to secessionists. In most cases, secessionist movements fail because of inadequate external assistance, dissention within the ranks of independence movements, and support from outside powers to the central government. Horowitz maintains that it is these factors, not the legitimacy of boundaries and effectiveness of reconciliation efforts that frustrate secessionist movements. In essence, large states or the international community, fail to recognize new states either because one or more states are assisting the central government and assuring its relative superiority in strength, or because no states are supporting the secessionists. The dynamic is similar in the case of irredentist separatism, a "movement to retrieve ethnic kinsmen and their territory across borders."[2] (One key element here is a neighboring state that is interested in reclaiming its co-ethnics and the territory they inhabit.)

External players who opt to refrain from supporting secessionists, or to oppose them, have a number of other solutions they can advocate. These range

from assimilation to power-sharing arrangements (where key executive, legislative, and judicial posts are allocated among ethnic groups, sometimes according to ratios or other formulae). They can include autonomy—cultural, economic, and/or political—and even de facto partition, where the central government has no monopoly over force, commerce, or even international affairs.

Alternatively, states may advocate partition for secessionists. Partition is the outcome of a separatist or secessionist movement, when a new state is created. If secession is defined as an outcome of separatist movements, it is treated as a term synonymous with partition, particularly if the international community plays a major role in determining the boundaries of the new state or states. Nonetheless it is worth noting that separatist movements can have limited objectives such as power-sharing and autonomy, which fall short of actual withdrawal or secession; the actions and policies of central governments often lead separatist movements that are not initially secessionist to eventually pursue independence.

Partition

Alexis Heraclides, in his more recent study of developing country secessionist movements peaking in the 1960s and 1970s, also regards partition as a closely related successor to secession.[3] He defines partition as a method of state formation: "the formation of two or more states by mutual consent."[4] It is to be distinguished from secession on the basis of the consent granted by the state from which an ethnic group is seeking independence. Thus, secession is the movement to gain independence or unite with a co-ethnic state, and partition is the successful result of the former—an independent state or states, or rearranged borders between or among existing states. This conceptualization treats secession as a movement, a dynamic process, and partition as the successful end-state.

The term partition has also been used as a term analogous with "divide" but distinct from secession, when it describes the result of postcolonial or postwar mapmaking. In such cases theorists refer to the delineation of boundaries by large, powerful states (the "Great Powers") with little concern for, much less consultation with, the peoples and leadership involved (although often influenced by the lobbying of favored ethnic groups). The lines were drawn based on criteria selected by the outside power, not as the result of communal war or negotiations. Outside powers did not generally draw lines to reflect cease-fires obtained by the domestic groups in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century; regional balance-of-power

considerations were most relevant. During the Cold War cease-fires did become partitions, but these were based on ideology and divided one nation, or people, such as the Germans, Koreans, and Vietnamese. Since 1990, partition has been increasingly advocated as a solution to ethnic conflict; nonetheless, the international community and the governments of the major powers have been averse to allowing secessionists to obtain independence.

For the discussion that follows, partition is defined as the division of one sovereign state into two or more sovereign states, and as such represents the successful culmination of one or more secessionist movements. Partition is the division of a state by an internationally recognized sovereign border. Secession is to withdraw; when a new state results, partition has been achieved. When secessionists fail to fully achieve their goals, and a *non-sovereign* boundary divides a state ethnically, geographically, and politically, partition exists de facto.[5]

Most theorists and policymakers are negatively disposed to partition, labeling it as "radical surgery," and only suitable if it is "the least bad of the alternatives."[6] Typical of this thinking is the comment, "with rare exceptions, it ought to be not the policy of choice but of desperation."[7] The academic and policy consensus has favored domestic political engineering over granting independence or promoting regional integration. Only when all other measures have failed, or seem likely to fail, and it appears that separate homogeneous states can be created, does partition become widely accepted among elites.

However, secessionist movements rarely involve groups that are homogeneously concentrated on one piece of territory, so partition leaves new majority–minority relations in its wake. As William Maynes points out, "The difficulty with partition is that the line cannot be drawn with any exactitude. Significant minorities will be left behind."[8] Ethnic identity is not static, and subgroup cleavages will often achieve greater salience post-partition. During and after partition other ethnic groups will become emboldened to seize advantages for themselves. One modern example of this phenomenon exists in Slovakia, where the breakup of Czechoslovakia suddenly made 250,000 ethnic Hungarian Slovaks a more prominent and vocal minority group within the new ethnic Slovak majority state. Finally, partition is also likely to displace erstwhile domestic conflicts to the international level. This is especially true where violence has accompanied the partition; the creation of Pakistan in 1947 is the most cited example of this dynamic.

Writing before 1991, political scientists like Heraclides conclude that without a paradigm-shift at the state level, secessionists are unlikely to succeed in obtaining independence. Even following violent conflict between the central government and secessionists—which is the strongest direct

impetus for a decision by outside governments to intervene or abstain—third party states are unlikely to intervene in a sufficiently decisive and durable political–military nature to affect partition as the solution. Yet, for any third party intervention to bring independence to the secessionists, they must obtain military victory, and make an especially compelling case to the court of international public opinion. Military victory must be followed by international recognition of the new state. As a result, third parties will only intervene to the fullest extent if they perceive that the rebels have a definite military advantage over the central government, and if the ramifications of their support pose manageable risks to national interests.

Post–Cold War U.S. Policy

The first post–Cold War official U.S. statement on issues regarding secession came in the wake of the March 1990 declarations of independence by Lithuania and Estonia from the Soviet Union. In response to the Lithuanian declaration, the State Department spokesperson explained that the U.S. government would not offer recognition because, "U.S. practice has been to establish formal relations with the lawful government of a state once that government is in effective control of its territory and capable of entering into and fulfilling international obligations."[9] The U.S. government also responded extremely cautiously to the subsequent declarations, which emanated from the republics of the former Soviet Union during and after the August 1991 coup attempt. On September 4, 1991, Secretary of State James Baker issued a series of principles that would guide U.S. policy toward Soviet secessionist republics. The principles urged the Soviet leadership and the heads of the republics to uphold internationally accepted principles, including democratic values and practices and the principles of the Helsinki Final Act; to respect existing internal and external borders, allowing for change only by peaceful means; to support the rule of law and democratic processes; to safeguard human rights, including minority rights; and to respect international law and obligations, especially the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and the Charter of Paris.[10] In a later statement, Baker also called upon the republics to adhere to responsible security policies, free trade and free market economics, and democratic political practices.

Nonetheless, throughout the period of uncertainty from 1990 to 1991, the United States appeared more concerned with the means that were employed to change borders, not the partitions in and of themselves. The United States was most interested in its relationship with the Soviet Union and in keeping Gorbachev in power. Washington recognized the new states after Moscow had signaled that it would not oppose the dissolution of the

Soviet empire. (Only in the case of Ukraine—a special case, because of its nuclear weapons, size, and historic relationship with Russia—did the United States move to recognize Kiev before Moscow made its intentions clear, but even this recognition was preceded by a cautious initial response.)

With regard to Yugoslavia, the United States remained opposed to the breakup of the state until it was finally pressured by its European allies to follow their lead and recognize the successor states. Washington withheld its recognition in the expectation that the fragmentation of Yugoslavia would be bloody, and feared that it would encourage the Soviet republics to split off without consent from Moscow. The U.S. administration stated that as long as war raged between Croatia and Serbia, there would be no recognition of separate republics. Until January 1992, when it became apparent that the EC was going to recognize the new states and that Russia had accepted the dissolution of the Soviet empire, the United States insisted that some sort of Yugoslav confederal arrangement be established. Washington declared that it would accept any negotiated outcome that was chosen peacefully and democratically. The United States would not accept changes in internal or external borders through the use of force, or intimidation, and insisted that the republics negotiate and commit themselves to the protection of the human rights of all ethnic groups. On April 7, 1992, months after the EC members recognized the breakaway republics, the United States recognized Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Hercegovina; Macedonia was recognized later under the name Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) in deference to Greek sensitivities.

Historically, the United States has favored safeguarding individual rights over securing group rights via political arrangements, or partition. Though the United States has certain legal frameworks for protecting particular disadvantaged minorities (affirmative action and other antidiscrimination legislation), ethnic groups are expected to find redress or solace within the pluralistic civil society, as individuals (sometimes organized as groups to lobby and to raise funds within the given political system). Any ethnic nationalism existing within the "mosaic" of U.S. society should be subordinate to civic nationalism, which is based on common citizenship and individual rights. These American predilections or values shape international priorities. Ultimately, "U.S. policymakers have been more concerned with stability of the state system, more concerned about creating viable economic structures, more concerned about not opening the Pandora's box of ethnically based demands for new nation-states, than they have been concerned to support self-determination everywhere as a principle."[11]

Factors Influencing U.S. Policy

The extremely limited recent academic treatment of U.S. policy regarding secession and partition indicates that a minimum of four factors influence U.S. decisionmaking: the influence of allies or the dominant regional power; the fear of spread of conflict; the fear of a demonstration effect (success encouraging others to follow suit); and the influence of ethnic lobby groups. Perhaps most decisive, is the role of other states. A paper derived from a roundtable discussion of senior Department of State officials concluded, "any U.S. response to a self-determination or secessionist movement will inevitably be colored by the relationship of the United States with the government involved."[12] As Ted Robert Gurr and Barbara Harff note, "The status of the challengers [to regimes or the state] depends on their status in comparison with that of the regime with which they are in conflict. For example, the international status of, and support for, the Kurds increased relative to the declining international stature of Iraq in the aftermath of the Gulf War."[13] Beyond the state(s) directly involved, the United States is always keenly aware of the positions of its allies and the most powerful state(s) in a particular region; one can expect that it would influence any U.S. decision pertaining to sovereignty.

Fear of Continued Conflict or Spillover

The desire to contain conflict is cited by policymakers as a rationale both for, and against, partition, motivated by humanitarian or practical concerns, or by a combination of the two. Political leaders may express concern in purely humanitarian terms or on the basis of interest—that is, related to balance-of-power and regional stability. Governments may support or prevent partition because of a fear that conflict will spill over borders to other states in the region and create greater suffering and injustice, and/or that refugee flows will politically and economically destabilize neighboring states. However, concern about regional stability is more likely to prompt international action than concerns about justice and human rights within a given state. Indeed, the perpetuation of armed conflict especially if it does not appear likely to spill over, is often dismissed by politicians as a humanitarian tragedy in order to avoid calling for any action for or against partition. Meanwhile, the threat of that same secessionist conflict spilling over into contiguous territories or states is likely to spur action by outside actors to force some sort of resolution on the warring parties.

Those who argue most vociferously against partition do so based on arguments having to do with justice and human rights. They assert that

partitions obtained by violence, especially mass killing and displacement (ethnic cleansing), legitimize genocide by allowing aggressors to retain territory that was taken through unlawful, inhumane means. They maintain that such solutions fly in the face of the international laws of war, anchored on the Geneva Conventions. Moreover, these opponents of partition argue that if powerful states allow such violent partitions to occur, they encourage other would-be aggressors to use brutal force to achieve similar objectives. Viewed from this critical perspective, key Western leaders who regard secessionist conflicts as violent in the extreme and therefore, go to great lengths to avoid initiating military operations to hold a state together are wrong. The perception of Western governments that violent ethnic conflict cannot be managed may lead them to grant partition. However, according to these critics of partition, with the creation of new states under genocidal circumstances, criminals are appeased and their strategies are rewarded. Suffering is prolonged and deaths continue to mount as populations resettle according to the new borders.

At the same time, supporters of a given partition will argue that separating one of more warring ethnic groups will increase regional and international stability, because the cause of the conflict will be eliminated, or because international mechanisms become available to resolve the now interstate dispute. Those academics or policymakers who generally favor partition maintain that ethnic conflict is due to irrational primordial forces that cannot be managed by normal political processes, especially after a civil war has been fought. As a result, partition is the only means of enabling peace. Some authors even maintain that partition is inevitable, so that attempting to prevent it will only result in unnecessary casualties. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Van Evera were among the first academics to make this argument—based on humanitarian concerns—with respect to Bosnia.[14] One author agrees, opining "the inevitable tragedy of this partition has been made worse by the refusal of the international community to accept that it would happen."[15] Another professor has applied this thinking beyond the Balkans, advocating partition in most continents "to save lives threatened by genocide," insisting, "Those considering humanitarian intervention to end ethnic civil wars should set as their goal lasting safety, rather than perfect peace."[16] Only permanent separation, according to this author, can guarantee permanent peace. Other measures fail to address group insecurities and tensions among groups.

Fear of continued conflict or spillover may also lead states to formulate a policy advocating de facto partition, the intermediate solution between partition and preserving a unified state. Here the sovereignty of the state exists,

in that the external legally recognized borders remain. However, internal non-sovereign boundaries are drawn to divide opposing groups from one another. De facto partition can serve to create immediate stability, addressing the humanitarian symptoms of a secessionist situation, while postponing more destabilizing solutions (including partition, power-sharing, or assimilation) that deal with root political causes. Often humanitarian intervention, as in the case of Iraq or Kosovo, aims to protect the human rights of an aggrieved party or to address a man-made or natural disaster, while denying the beneficiaries any assistance in exiting from the state (or even negotiating for increased human rights via domestic political institutions or mechanisms).

The Demonstration Effect

Another major factor influencing the decision of states to give or to deny support to groups seeking the partition of an existing state is the fear of a demonstration effect. Successful secessions are generally a source of encouragement to separatist groups. Indeed, even de facto partitions can raise expectations among other groups or ethnicities in other states—especially those living in the same region. The Macedonian Albanians undoubtedly received a psychological (and military) boost from the limited success of their ethnic kin in Serbia in 1999.

Status quo states regard the demonstration effect as a negative phenomenon. From their perspective, the collapse of regional authority and failure of Great Powers and the international community to prevent changes in borders via war and/or genocide threatens to encourage minority groups and undermine regional and international stability.[17] Some authors even maintain, "the emergence of new states, even if they ultimately lead to more stable political communities, is disruptive and destabilizing."[18] When successful secessions produce demonstration effects, more groups clamor for secession. The result of such increased secessionist activity is an increase in regional and global instability.

Other academics and observers discount demonstration effects, sometimes referred to as "contagion," asserting that those political leaders who seek to initiate a change in borders or demographics using force will not be encouraged or deterred based on whether outside powers intervened to bring success or failure elsewhere. Their argument rests on the observation that each case has its own dynamic, a different set of interests for the outside powers, and therefore involves a unique calculus for them as to whether to support or to deny support for partition.

Ethnic Lobby Groups

U.S. policy is also clearly affected by domestic ethnic interest groups, sometimes acting in concert with foreign national lobbying. In the late 1970s the Greek–American lobby persuaded Congress to embargo military assistance to Turkey in protest of the 1974 invasion and de facto partition of Cyprus; this occurred despite the opposition of the White House, and the State and Defense Departments. "With their variable capacities, opportunities and propensities to exert influence on behalf of their domestic or external interests, diaspora communities can be regarded as interest groups and as political actors."[19] This is particularly true in the United States, given the open political system; ethnic groups can exert a great deal of influence via campaign contributions and their votes. Not surprisingly, domestic ethnic groups generally have greater influence than foreign-based ones. As one practitioner puts it, "although a good deal of attention and publicity are periodically attracted by the activities of foreign lobbyists or agents, a close examination of their activities shows that those lacking strong indigenous support acquire only limited or transient influence on American foreign policy."[20]

Yet even strong domestic ethnic lobby groups, such as the Jewish lobby, "usually have little chance of directly influencing public policy-making. They tend to be too small and lack the political resources required to independently influence government. Building coalitions with sympathetic government officials and other non-governmental organizations then becomes an important vehicle for broadening the power base of the group and increasing its potential influence over policy."[21] Ethnic interest groups can impact the formulation of U.S. policy provided they are: large enough or regionally concentrated in key states; are organized and have media outlets in their languages; and if they have the right degree of assimilation (they are a strong force if they maintain their identity but are educated and socialized as Americans).[22] "Finally, the ultimate guarantee that an ethnic lobby will succeed is dependent on the extent that its interests coincide with broader national ones."[23] So, any case to convince the U.S. government to oppose or support partition would have to incorporate nonethnic ideological or economic arguments.

The cases examined in the following chapters involve roughly the same period of time, but occur in different continents, within divergent historical and cultural contexts; nonetheless the relative significance of geostrategic variables should be similar. This is not to imply that U.S. policy is consistent with regard to the various geographic regions. However, U.S. assessment of interests should be similar for each area, focusing on issues of alliances/

balance-of-power (the position of the dominant regional power and its allies, and demonstration and contagion effects). The ensuing pages reveal why the United States refused to support the partition of Bosnia, and Iraq—opting in both cases for a de facto partition—and contrast this with the case of Eritrea, where Washington suddenly supported partition, despite an established policy favoring a unified Ethiopia.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 2

Iraq

Background

Since the inception of the Iraqi state in 1932, when the British mandate ended, its Kurds have lived in tension, and often in conflict, with the central government. The Kurdish struggle in Iraq is just one of the various manifestations of the Kurdish drive for self-determination in the Middle East. Yet, one of the best modern opportunities the Kurds ever had for independence slipped away from them in 1991–92. The Gulf War and the resultant potential for geopolitical restructuring, together with the military defeat of Saddam Hussein, provided the Kurds with an opportunity to press for independence. They took it, and Saddam's aggressive repression of their uprising and the ensuing humanitarian crisis appeared to strengthen the Kurdish hand. Yet the Kurds ultimately attained only de facto partition. Over a decade later, full independence remains elusive.

The Kurdish homeland consists of about 200,000 square miles of territory, along the mountains where Turkey, Iran, and Iraq meet, on the northern boundaries between the Middle East and Central Asia. Since the treaties marking the end of World War I, Kurdistan—this territory where Kurds are in the majority—has been divided among five sovereign states with 43 percent in Turkey, 31 percent in Iran, 18 percent in Iraq, 6 percent in Syria, and 2 percent in Central Asia.[1] The Kurds constitute the highest percentage of the total population in Iraq and Turkey, with 23 percent; 13 million Kurds live in Turkey, and 4.2 million in Iraq. Iran has 5.7 million Kurds (about 10 percent of the population), Syria is home to about 1 million (8 percent of the population), roughly 500,000 Kurds live in Central Asia, and over 700,000 Kurds live elsewhere.

The Kurds are divided into several religions; Sunni Islam is predominant, but Shi'ism is found in northwest Anatolian Kurdistan, where the Kurds practicing that faith are called Alevis. Some Kurds also belong to Ahl al Haqq or Yazidism, two derivations of Islam. Their Indo-European languages, related to Persian, include two major dialects—Kurmanji, spoken north of Mosul in Central Asia, and Sorani (or Kurdi), which is the official Kurdish language in Iraq—and several subdialects. Kurds identify themselves with their tribes—sometimes synonymous with the inhabitants of their villages. Yet, despite the differences among them, Kurds share a distinct culture, separate from those peoples living around them, and have maintained it for at least 2,000 years.

The Kurds comprise the largest territorially concentrated ethnic group in the world—22–27 million strong—without its own state. It is in Iraq, however, that Kurdish national aspirations have been alternately most encouraged and most frustrated. Iraq, with its population of about 17 million divided between different ethnic, cultural, religious, and tribal groups—and ruled since 1958 by a minority Sunni Islam sect—lacks a strong national identity. Tension among the various groups has remained constant over the last 70 years, but has erupted into violence with each shift of power in Baghdad; any sign of weakness from the central government results in attempts by the northern Kurdish region and Shiite south to claim political autonomy.

From World War I to the Rise of the Ba'ath Party in the 1960s

The Kurds came close to realizing their aspirations for a separate state following World War I. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson specifically advocated self-determination and an independent state for the Kurds living within the territories of the former German, Austrian, Ottoman, and Russian empires. The 1920 Treaty of Sevres, which dealt with the territory of the former Ottoman empire, provided for the creation of a Kurdish state. However, the Treaty was signed by the Ottoman sultanate and the new Turkish Republic established by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk never enacted it. The subsequent Treaty of Lausanne, signed on June 24, 1923, turned over northern and western Kurdistan to Turkey. Britain incorporated central Kurdistan, the province of Mosul, which included the oil-producing district of Kirkuk, into its mandate of Iraq. Not for the last time, Turkey, assisted by Britain, would frustrate Kurdish aspirations. The notion of Kurdish independence nonetheless, remained a vibrant force in Iraq from the early 1920s onward.

A Kurdish kingdom was created under the British mandate and was placed under the leadership of Shaykh Mahmud Barzinji, a religious leader operating from Suleymania in southern Iraqi Kurdistan. He immediately turned against the British, and fought them until he was defeated in 1931.

Meanwhile, one of Barzinji's rivals, Mulla Mustafa Barzani, was establishing himself as the leader of the Barzani tribe, based in northern Iraqi Kurdistan. In 1945, Barzani joined forces with the Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP), and participated in the establishment of the Mahabad Republic, an autonomous quasi-state carved out of Iran. The republic endured for a year, during 1946, under the auspices of the Soviet Union, which had maintained its postwar occupation of northern Iran even after the British left the south. Ultimately, under pressure from a Truman administration with a nuclear monopoly, the Soviets withdrew from Iran and the Kurdish republic disintegrated. Barzani went into exile in the Soviet Union.

Iraqi Kurdistan remained relatively stable politically during a brief period following the 1958 Iraqi revolution, which deposed the Hasemite monarchy and resulted in the establishment of the Iraqi republic under the control of a military junta. Barzani returned to Iraq and began to assert control over the KDP and the Kurdish national movement in Iraq. As his popularity grew throughout the 1960s, he recruited young Kurds to his *pesh merga* irregular troops and conducted guerrilla campaigns against the government in Baghdad.[2]

The Ba'ath Party and Saddam Hussein

In 1963, the leaders of the Ba'ath Party wrested control from the military junta. These new leaders recognized the drain on the central power that the struggle with the Kurds produced and sought to arrive at a political agreement with Barzani. In March 1970, Saddam Hussein, who was vice president at the time, met with Barzani and presented the Kurdish people with a Manifesto of 15 rights with respect to language, education, culture, local self-government, and national representation. The Kurds were recognized within the context of the agreement as a second state-constituting nation, together with the Arabs, and Kurdish was to be a second national language. Furthermore, an autonomous Kurdish region was to be established four years after the signing of the treaty. The agreement was never implemented. There was insufficient trust between both sides and neither party was fully satisfied with the provisions. But when, in 1974, the Ba'ath government proposed the unilateral implementation of the 1970 agreement and limited political autonomy for the Kurds, Barzani rejected it. He called his fighters back into action and began to ally the KDP closer with the Shah of Iran. The Kurdish cause obtained the support of Iran (and the financial backing of the CIA), but this came to a swift end in 1975. Kurdish military defeat and Iraqi offers of territory to Iran spurred the Shah to make a deal with Baghdad. Barzani was forced into exile in the United States, where he died in 1979.

Through the late 1970s and early 1980s the Iraqi government poured significant funding into the development of Kurdistan in a bid to co-opt Kurdish citizens, and reduce the influence of the Kurdish parties. Simultaneously, Baghdad attempted to engineer population shifts, encouraging Arabs to move to Kurdish areas. During the Iran–Iraq war, the KDP led by Barzani openly supported Iran (where it had its headquarters), vainly hoping that they would obtain territory in return. The Iraqi government suffering military losses, tried to forge an agreement with the KDP. When that failed, in 1984, the Iraqi government came to an agreement with the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK), a splinter faction of the KDP led by Jalal Talabani on an Autonomous Region that was larger and more generous than the 1970 agreement. This agreement, however, was never implemented because of Turkey's objections to Kurdish autonomy just on the other side of its border and its Kurdish population.

Fighting between the Kurds and Iraqi forces continued from 1985 to 1988. Baghdad used Kurdish mercenaries, or *fursan*, to contain the *pesh mergas*, and at the same time the Iraqi military began to employ chemical weapons to subdue Kurdish forces and citizens. In 1988, the largest chemical weapons attack on a civilian population since World War I was directed at the village of Halabja. Approximately 5,000 people died. The Iraqi government continued its campaign, aiming it at villages in the strategic area north of Mosul where the Iraqi–Turkish oil pipeline, rail line, and highway to Europe run. Thousands more died and approximately 60,000 Kurds fled to Turkey.[3]

The Gulf War Uprising

The Gulf War provided another opportunity for Kurds accustomed to utilizing Baghdad's periods of weakness to press for autonomy. In August 1990, Talabani traveled to Washington. KDP and PUK leaders traveled to France in September. The following month, Saddam offered to come to an agreement with the Kurds, but the Kurdish Front (an umbrella group established in 1988, composed of the KDP, PUK, Kurdistan Socialist Party, Kurdish People's Democratic Party, the small socialist PASOK party, and the Kurdish branch of the Iraqi Communist Party) refused to respond to his advances. The Kurdish leadership had the support of the state-recruited mercenaries and almost 3,000 *pesh mergas*. Given the uncertainty regarding Saddam's future, the Front was not prepared to make a deal. They asserted that they would remain neutral. Saddam would not rest easy and, as a result, eight Iraqi divisions and thousands of mercenaries were tied up in northern Iraq during the war.

On March 4, 1991, less than a week after the conclusion of the Gulf War, the Kurds sparked a series of uprisings, which spread throughout Iraqi

Kurdistan. Town after town fell to the rebels, thousands of Iraqi troops surrendered, and the KDP and PUK seized political leadership. By March 19 almost all of Kurdistan was under Kurdish control, including the oil-town of Kirkuk, but this victory scarcely lasted ten days. The Kurdish leadership was unable to adequately coordinate military and political strategy and successfully defend their gains. On March 28, the Iraqi government forces responded with a powerful counteroffensive.

Using helicopter gunships, tanks, multiple rocket launchers, and heavy artillery, the Republican Guards took back the Kurdish villages. Within 72 hours a massive exodus of Kurdish residents was underway. Spurred on by memories of Saddam Hussein's gas attacks in 1988, the Kurds moved in panicked droves into the mountains and toward the Turkish and Iranian borders. Nearly half of Iraq's Kurds took flight. They fled only with what they could carry, some in cars and trucks and others by foot, and as they choked up the snow-covered mountain passes, vehicles were abandoned for lack of fuel or passable roads. The Kurds struggled to reach the Turkish border freezing, increasingly weakened by disease and dehydration. Elderly Kurds collapsed and had to be buried at the side of the road and those who struggled onward faced the cold and landmines. Nearly 1.2 million Kurds crossed into Iran, but those Kurds heading for Turkey hit a closed border.[4]

At the end of April about 500,000 Kurds had made it to the Turkish border, but the Turkish government, which closed its border after two days, had only allowed in 200,000.[5] The remaining Kurds were left on the mountainside starving, freezing, and harassed by Iraqi and Turkish troops. The nearby media crews swiftly publicized the Kurdish plight. The international community was roused to action, in part because of the publicity, but also because of the Turkish government's calls for help. In addition, coalition activities associated with the Gulf War, such as radio broadcasts urging the Iraqis to overthrow Saddam Hussein, appeared to place some responsibility for an international response in the hands of the coalition leaders, particular the United States.

On April 5, 1991, President Bush announced a plan to airdrop relief supplies to the Kurds in the mountains along the Turkish border. On that same day, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 688 condemning, "the repression of the Iraqi civilian population . . . in Kurdish populated areas, the consequences of which threaten international peace and security in the region." The resolution demanded "that Iraq . . . immediately end this repression," and allow immediate access by international organizations to all those requiring assistance.[6] The Gulf War coalition responded with Operation Provide Comfort, a U.S.-led military intervention, which evolved from April to June 1991, from an ad hoc scramble to assist the dying Kurds with

airdrops to a coordinated, civil–military effort to return the local population of Iraqi Kurdistan to their villages.

The coalition forces did not want permanent refugee camps on the Turkish border; they wanted the Kurds to go home. However, to convince the Kurds to return, their safety had to be guaranteed. On April 7, during a television appearance, Turkish President Ozal suggested creating a safe haven for Kurds under UN auspices. British Prime Minister John Major launched a safe haven plan at an EC summit, and after some foot-dragging Washington lent its support. The result was the creation of a military exclusion zone north of the 36th parallel and the de facto partition of Iraq.

The decision to intervene in Iraq on behalf of the Kurds was directly linked to the 1990–91 Gulf War, which the multinational U.S.-led coalition successfully waged against Saddam Hussein. The consequences of Saddam's defeat included the outbreak of the rebellions in Iraqi Kurdistan and the southern Shiite region. The sudden and surprising torrent of refugees threatened to destabilize Turkey, which was struggling to repress Kurdish nationalism and contain the socioeconomic effects of shutting off a main oil pipeline out of Iraq (originating in Kirkuk) at a cost of about $9 billion in revenues.[7] Turkey did not however fear the direct economic burden, but the destabilizing presence of hundreds of thousands of ethnic Kurds—potential recruits to the Turkish Kurdish insurgent organization, the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK). Turkey's concerns, together with the heavy coalition presence and the failure to prevent the Iraqi government's subsequent use of force, and finally, the prominent television coverage, compelled the United States and its allies to act.

Meanwhile, in late spring 1991, Saddam and the Kurdish leaders entered negotiations regarding the political status of Iraqi Kurdistan. Jalal Talabani declared, "We are closer than ever to autonomy, this is the best chance that we've had this century."[8] The Iraqi government offered a proposal for confederation, and the Front demanded autonomy within a democratic federal Iraq. Baghdad would allow the Kurds to designate Kirkuk as the administrative capital of the autonomous region, in exchange for control over the oil and Kurdish guarantees that they would cut off all foreign contacts. This last stipulation was most problematic, because the Kurds no longer wanted to be at Baghdad's mercy, and needed to work out some agreement with Turkey in order for this autonomous region to be viable, economically and politically. Over time disagreements regarding Kirkuk, and the borders and powers of the autonomous zone emerged. By mid-June, the Kurdish leadership recognized that Saddam was insincere; he was merely stalling until the coalition withdrew. As of July 3 there were still 3,641 coalition soldiers in Iraq,

including 1,455 Americans, maintaining security in coordination with Kurdish forces in the 80-kilometer (50-mile) deep zone. On July 15 coalition ground forces pulled out of Iraq to Silopi, Turkey. Air forces remained in Incirlik and Batman, Turkey, along with a putative rapid response force.[9] These 2,500 to 3,000 troops would ensure that the Kurds were not attacked. Yet, just after U.S. forces withdrew, on August 4–15 Turkish forces conducted their first air attacks over Iraq in an attempt to hit PKK insurgents. Two further air assaults were conducted in October, and by 1991 Turkish air raids over northern Iraq were commonplace.

U.S. Objectives

The United States never publicly and specifically advocated a Kurdish rebellion during the Gulf War or since. Any support for greater rights for Kurds—and U.S. support in 1991 never went further than verbal encouragement of discussions with Baghdad regarding autonomy—has come within the context of efforts to support a broad democratic opposition in Iraq. Thus, to explain why Bush called on the Iraqis to rebel, but failed to respond quickly enough to limit Iraqi airpower and safeguard the Kurdish and Shiite uprisings, one observer states, "What the president really meant, it emerged, was that the United States would like to see a compliant military regime in power in Baghdad. Kurds and Shia need not apply."[10] The United States had been targeting a different opposition—the Sunni elite.

Though the Bush administration was criticized for allowing Saddam to remain in power, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time, General Colin Powell, maintained, "The objectives that the President, our friends in the region, and the United Nations agreed on was to get the Iraqi army out of Kuwait and restore the legitimate government in Kuwait and provide for regional security . . . It was never one of our objectives to change the form of government of the Iraqi people."[11] Had the United States and coalition forces marched into Baghdad, Powell maintained, they would have been unable to find any sort of democratic successor to Saddam Hussein, and might have found themselves bogged down there, serving as a security force. When asked about the U.S.-led operation in northern Iraq, Powell continued to make the link with the Gulf War objectives: "The war aims had nothing to do with rearranging Iraq and they had nothing to do with establishing a Kurdish regime."[12]

While the United States was not going to directly engineer Saddam's fall from office or physical demise, the Bush administration did verbally support a change in government. The Kurdish cause was not espoused by Washington, but it was probably deemed useful to the extent that it might

weaken Saddam's control of the government. Washington may have been following the old Nixonian strategy of using the Kurds to keep Baghdad distracted and weakened, and the power of the Ba'ath Party challenged, eroded, but not destroyed. The administration believed that internal unrest, together with the crushing military defeat and oppressive international sanctions would encourage the opposition within the ruling party to step forward and seize control.

The radio broadcasts represented the only serious public attempt during the war to topple the Iraqi government. Removing Saddam from office was an unstated U.S. objective of the Gulf War. It remained unstated, and therefore poorly operationalized, because U.S. allies were ambivalent or at least unassertive on this issue. And the United States needed the coalition to win the war and to forge peace.

At the conclusion of the war, the U.S. leaders were eager to move American troops out of Iraq as soon as possible. Once they deemed that the limited, UN-sanctioned objectives of the resolutions passed by the Security Council between August 2, 1990 and March 1991 had been met, the goal was to start redeploying forces back to the United States. President Bush was anxious to prove that the U.S. government could function as an honest broker, keeping its pledge not to become an occupying force. He had an eye on subsequent negotiations in the Middle East, hoping to leverage the situation to obtain breakthroughs between Israel and Lebanon, Israel and Syria, as well as to obtain basing privileges in the Gulf. Bush was characteristically cautious, unwilling to step outside the bounds of international consensus to potentially destroy the Iraqi state by taking tanks to Baghdad and beheading the government. The president also refused to squander diplomatic and domestic political capital (with an election approaching in 1992) by appearing ruthless vis-à-vis the pathetic, surrendering Iraqi army. Seven weeks after hostilities had ceased, U.S. forces were redeploying almost as fast as they had come.

The Position of Allies or Dominant Regional States

According to the contemporaneous statements of policymakers, the U.S. decision not to support the partition of Iraq was decisively influenced by the position of the U.S. allies —the key coalition leaders Britain, France, and Turkey (the dominant regional state in this case) and to a lesser extent Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and others. U.S. policy regarding the Kurdish secessionist movement was governed according to the dictates of the general coalition strategy vis-à-vis Baghdad. As one administration official emphasized, "our mandate—as voted by the UN Security Council and supported by the

Congress—was to seek Kuwait's liberation, not remake Iraq. Our coalition would not have survived the more ambitious undertaking."[13] Furthermore, once the war was won, the United States still needed its allies to enforce peace. Any attempt to enforce the UN resolutions aimed at modifying Iraqi policy and behavior (and perhaps provoking Saddam's overthrow) hinged on the cooperation of U.S. allies, particularly Turkey. Going one step further and assisting the Kurds to achieve autonomy or independence was not actively advocated by any of the U.S. allies.

Turkey

The Turkish government was nervous about Kurdish self-determination, but it was also divided on this issue. The Turkish foreign policy establishment was adamantly opposed to any concessions to the Iraqi Kurds in the form of autonomy, independence, or even federation, because they feared that this would cause Turkish Kurds to become more rebellious and threatening to the stability of the Turkish state. However, President Ozal represented a more liberal perspective on the Kurds. This manifested itself in 1991 when he orchestrated the repeal of the legislation banning the use of the Kurdish language, and became more evident during 1992–93. At that time "what he wanted to do was to have the establishment of an autonomous northern Iraq, whose guarantor would be Turkey. It was a brilliant move on his part. It would have sent a message to his Kurds- don't rebel."[14] In fact, he may have even tolerated an independent Iraqi Kurdistan, as long as it operated, "under Turkish suzerainty."[15] A former advisor to Ozal contends that the Turkish president's 1991 statement that Turkey, Syria, and Iran "were in agreement that no Kurdish entity should be allowed to emerge from the Gulf crisis" did not truly reflect his thinking.[16] It did, however, represent the conservative Turkish political–military establishment's position. Ultimately, the conservative thinkers prevailed, but during 1991 the United States would have heard more than one voice speaking on the issue from Ankara. The question is to which voice did Washington heed. According to a senior State Department analyst, if the United States were speaking with Ozal, then only the claim that Turkish opposition was an obstacle to a more aggressive policy (aimed at removing Saddam and/or helping the Kurds) could have been an excuse for inaction. Ozal himself would have been accommodating.[17]. According to Paul Wolfowitz, who served as undersecretary of Defense for Policy at the time, Ozal, "viewed Saddam as a major danger, he viewed Northern Iraq as an opportunity for Turkey, which most Turks didn't and he viewed the Kurdish problem as something that needed to be resolved politically by Turkey and not militarily

and therefore he was less afraid of dealing with Kurds; all of those things kind of converged."[18]

During the war, Secretary Baker characterizes President Ozal as "... stalwart in his support for the United States."[19] There is no indication this changed in a few short months. So, the United States either did not act because it was not the administration's policy preference, or because others in Turkey had the decisive word. Ozal was speaking to President Bush, while all the other Turkish political and military figures interfacing with the State Department via the ambassador and with the Defense Department through military channels, would have been urged to withhold any assistance to the Kurds. It is quite possible that administration officials "listened to whoever supported what they believed in the first place."[20] Perhaps Turkey, and many of the other Middle Eastern allies feared the possibility of Iraqi fragmentation and/or Kurdish independence or autonomy more than Saddam and his weapons of mass destruction. At any rate, helping the Kurds achieve autonomy or independence would not necessarily have led directly to the removal of Saddam Hussein from office. It would, however, have led to internal and regional instability—a condition the United States and its allies hoped to avoid.

According to most accounts, the coalition allies, Arabs and Europeans, were petrified that Iraq would be dissembled into three pieces. The neighboring states feared the consequences of a break-up for two reasons—because of the power vacuum and instability that might result, and because of the heartening effect an independent Kurdish and/or Shi'a state might have on their domestic secessionist groups. The U.S. ambassador in Turkey at the time recalls, "I think most of that discussion about should we keep Iraq intact was during the Gulf War and the next couple months when the Kurds came out and I think that ... [we] basically settled on the notion that [granting autonomy or independence to the Kurds] would be unacceptable to the Arabs."[21] The Gulf states were concerned that Turkey and Iran would intervene in Iraq if the Iraqi government was no longer able to control its borders. Turkey might reassert its claim on the oil town of Mosul, which it had conceded under the League of Nations arbitration, and Iran might assert historic and religious interests, the latter based upon the fact that a majority of the population was Shiite. One potential negative outcome would be the emergence of a fundamentalist Shiite bloc with a controlling share of oil production (and the corresponding ability to control oil prices).

Turkey clearly feared the impact that greater political freedom in Iraq would have on its own Kurds. At the same time, it was pressure from Turkey that led to the intervention in northern Iraq in 1991. During the Gulf War, the Ozal government had reluctantly, and despite protests from its military

leadership, allowed the United States to conduct Operation Proven Force, a combined effort of 55,000 sorties into Iraq. The economic cost of the war to Turkey was well publicized—April 1991 was payback time. The governor of eastern Turkey declared, "Turkey should not be left alone with this problem . . . all the world is responsible."[22] Turkey expected to be rescued from the refugee crisis by her North American and European allies. Indeed, if the Western allies failed to act, President Ozal informed President Bush that Turkey would be forced to invade Iraq.[23] This posed clear problems for President Bush's Near East policy team, which was turning to the next challenge—invigorating the Arab–Israeli peace process. Wolfowitz comments, " . . . there was a somewhat Arabist attitude that we can't afford to be associated with a Turkish intervention in an Arab country like that . . . and it isn't clear that if Ozal had gone in that he would ever have left."[24]

Just as U.S. forces were leaving in summer 1991 the Turkish government switched to hard-line tactics in dealing with its own Kurds for the first time since the 1970s, using extreme right-wing vigilantes to mete out punishment to suspected or actual PKK sympathizers. The Ozal government, under political pressure due to the stationing of foreign troops on Turkish territory, launched offensives against the PKK bases in Iraq, and established a 10-mile-wide buffer zone (patrolled by Turkish troops) inside Iraq. In early August 1991 a statement by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs stipulated that the humanitarian effort should be limited to 30 days, and to northern Iraq, just over the Turkish–Iraqi border, "with the objective of ensuring the United Nations relief agencies assume this task in close cooperation and coordination with the Turkish authorities."[25]

By summer 1992 Turkey no longer regarded the de facto partition of Iraq as a necessary solution to the direct and acute threat of a sudden influx of Iraqi Kurdish refugees. Instead, the safe haven was considered undesirable and potentially dangerous from a political and military perspective. Northern Iraq provided a precedent for Turkey's Kurds to look to in their quest for greater rights; the Turkish government feared that their Kurds would demand autonomy as well. Turkey was decidedly displeased with the prospect of Kurdish elections in spring 1992. The Turkish air force bombed Barzani's campaign office just days before the elections, and Ankara claimed that elections would lead to a power vacuum and more violence in northern Iraq.

The territory between Turkey and Iraq also posed problems for Turkey's military, because the lack of control by Baghdad had resulted in increased PKK activity; they were fighting insurgents who now had a large sanctuary enforced by an international no-fly zone. The Turkish government determined that the de facto partition was militarily unacceptable unless they

could consider northern Iraq to be a buffer zone and accordingly initiate cross-border raids against the PKK. Ankara began to fill the military vacuum left by the coalition. The Turks were attempting to assert military control of the area; they already had economic control because all international aid was channeled through Turkey. Neither the Bush nor the Clinton administrations protested or did anything to obstruct, much less discourage, Turkish operations. Instead, in November 1992 responding to reports that the PKK was blocking humanitarian relief transports the U.S. administration declared, "we applaud the efforts of the Government of Turkey and Iraqi Kurdish groups to protect this truck traffic and Turkish efforts to restore security and block PKK blackmail."[26]

The Europeans

Turkey and its key European allies pressured the United States into leading the humanitarian operation that would lead to the de facto partition of Iraq. Britain advocated the creation of a safe haven in northern Iraq as the only feasible means to bring down refugees from the unforgiving mountains and back to their villages. One commentator observed, " . . . Remember during the Gulf crisis, Bush was a leader. Now he's following Prime Minister Major and President Mitterrand, they're leading the way on this."[27] Another regarded the British effort to establish a safe haven as so aggressive that "the British seem to be maneuvering toward establishing an independent Kurdish entity in northern Iraq—a way, they apparently believe, of removing the Kurds from the grip of their enemies, the Ba'athists."[28] He speculated that London might have cut a deal with Talabani for oil concessions in Kirkuk.[29] General John Galvin, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe at the time, recalls, "I didn't sense it as the British pushing us . . . the French were also leaning in the direction of support, other nations came on board very quickly . . . but I would say of them all the British were right up front. They were willing to commit force early on."[30]

On April 13 President Bush was still holding back, insinuating that the operation in Iraq might involve the United States in a civil war. "We'd already declared victory and we were heading home and nobody wanted to take on new tasks . . . 'bring the boys home' is a perennial cry with great political appeal and particularly once you've said you finished the job the last thing anyone wants to do is admit that they haven't."[31] Three days later, the U.S. commander-in-chief dispatched troops to Turkey and Iraq.

"President Bush still said he wanted all American troops home as soon as possible; the whole affair was a classic example of Washington double-speak in which Bush and his aides finally bowed to allied pressure as they realized that

their own public was swinging round to the European point of view."[32] Yet, the United States eventually had its own reasons to share the European perspective, and aside from contributing forces, Wolfowitz recalls, "the British didn't have a whole lot of influence," and neither the British nor the French "...claimed to be the ones that persuaded the President."[33] Their pressuring was undoubtedly helpful to their cause, and hurried things along, but was probably not decisive.

On March 28, under increasing pressure from the allies, the U.S. government opened a dialogue with the Kurdish front. This was the end of a policy of no-contact with the Kurdish leadership adopted in 1988, when a visit to the State Department by Jalal Talabani provoked serious outcry from Ankara and Baghdad. During the Gulf War, Kurdish representatives had attempted to meet with American officials, but were rebuffed. "The public snub of Kurdish and other Iraqi opposition leaders was read as a clear indication that the United States did not want the popular rebellion to succeed. This was confirmed by background statements from Administration officials that they were looking for a military, not a popular, alternative to Saddam Hussein."[34]

But this new willingness to work with the Kurdish leaders did not stem from a radical shift in U.S. policy toward their nationalist aspirations. There would be no new Kurdish or Shiite state carved out of Iraq. Washington had not decided to get ahead of its allies, and Ankara's position was that removing the threat to Turkish internal stability that the Kurdish refugees posed could not come at the cost of the creation of yet another threat to Turkey—a Kurdish state in Iraq. Once the refugee crisis had been contained and eliminated, Turkey adopted a nervous, ambivalent attitude toward the safe haven. The Turkish government knew that not all of the coalition partners shared their concern about Kurdish separatism. London was more sympathetic to the Kurdish perspective. Indeed, according to Mort Abramowitz, the U.S. ambassador to Turkey in 1991, "The Turks always thought the British were the most sort of perfidious, so to speak—they were trying to seek Kurdish self-rule, independence, etc. They knew the British had a long history of encouraging Kurdish insurrection and supporting anti-Turkey Kurds."[35]

Ultimately, the United States responded to pressure to withdraw from the safe haven, and did so despite British misgivings. The United States proved sensitive to Turkish unease and eager, for its own reasons, to pull out of Iraq as soon as possible. After all, the "security zone was less a way to ease the suffering of the Kurds than an effort to assist Turkey—a NATO member and an important partner in the international sanctions effort against Saddam."[36] In addition, the United States had domestic reasons to push for a rapid exit.

"In Washington the aim had always been to do the job and get out as soon as possible. The administration was convinced that the main wish of the American people was 'to get the boys back home' and that for all the public pressure earlier on, there was no longer much interest in the affair."[37] The United States was eager to turn the operation over to the UN. However, Washington faced resistance from the Kurds, and from their British allies. As Colin Powell explained, "there was a difference in agreement as to when we should back out. After my visit in June, I thought we could come out in a few weeks." The British were nervous about leaving, concerned that the Kurds might return to the mountains. In this case, the United States gave in only a little. "We gave the Brits a week or two more," says Powell.[38]

Withdrawal: Ankara and United States Reluctance Prevail

The Kurdish leadership was desperate for the coalition forces to remain. They were in the midst of negotiations with Saddam Hussein and recognized that the presence of foreign troops in northern Iraq gave them some leverage. Indeed, after General Powell announced that the coalition would withdraw from Iraq, Kurdish leaders maintained that Iraqi negotiators started losing interest. Talabani complained about the lack of U.S. support, maintaining, "There is no American pressure. Perhaps we are blaming them because they are not playing a part. They are still able to use their influence . . . for a just solution and agreement acceptable to both sides."[39] The Kurdish leaders appealed to the coalition commanders to extract political and security guarantees for the Kurds from Saddam in exchange for the withdrawal of allied troops. The U.S. military commanders adamantly made the distinction between their humanitarian mission and the political issue of Kurdish autonomy. At the time, General Shalikashvili explained to the Kurdish leaders, "You know that from the beginning we did not come here with the expectation that we as strangers could land here and solve the Kurdish problem, that is a long standing problem. I think that you would all agree with me that this is a problem that must be solved between you and the Iraqi government . . . We came here to solve the refugee problem, just that piece, not even attempting to solve the whole refugee problem . . . As a matter of fact, we set out initially to just drop some supplies into the camps in the hope that we could solve the problem . . . I understand what you are saying but when I say we have finished the job—it is what we came to do and what you would want us to do."[40]

The coalition withdrew and the United States avoided involvement in the Kurdish–Iraqi negotiations. The allies left only the Military Coordination

Committee (MCC) behind, a presence that did more to guarantee protection for the humanitarian operation than for the Kurds. In 1992 the MCC constituted seven officers and four enlisted men from Britain, France, and Turkey with an American commander, a presence that was aimed at deterring about 85,000 Republican Guards below the 36th parallel. Four years later, the first MCC commander characterized it as "the only assurance the Kurds had/have regarding security guarantees is the continued presence of the MCC."[41] One of his successors credited it with serving as the most visible symbol of coalition concern on the ground.[42] Meanwhile, its detractors asserted, that it "had a limited mandate, everything was done in concert with the Turks. Everything was done to deny any support for the PKK. It was a horrible policy throughout; it strung people along."[43] Nonetheless, in 1996 even the MCC was withdrawn and Operation Provide Comfort was succeeded by Operation Northern Watch, a purely air operation. This operation was now executed by a coalition reduced to the United States, Turkey, and Britain.

Turkey exercised enormous leverage on U.S. policy. Ankara might have revoked authorization of Provide Comfort, which was carried out from its air bases. This may have resulted in a subsequent U.S. retreat from Iraq, an implicit or explicit disavowal of the Kurds, and severe damage to U.S. credibility. Certainly, Saddam Hussein would have perceived the abandonment of the no-fly zone as a victory, and would have swiftly reasserted full control over the territory. Ironically, the United States entered Iraq in response to a request from the Turkish government, but only a few years later U.S. officials were expressing gratitude to Ankara for allowing them to carry out the deterrent and humanitarian operation! The United States encouraged each extension of the operation in northern Iraq, with such characteristic language: "Operation Provide Comfort was recently renewed by the Turkish parliament. We welcome Turkey's action, which was taken by a large majority and which demonstrates Turkey's ongoing support for the coalition."[44]

The American sense of indebtedness was addressed in a concrete fashion. In 1994 alone the United States provided $5.3 billion in military aid to Turkey, which placed it at the very top of the list of weapons importers for that year.[45] This hardly demonstrated any inclination to support the Kurds in their attempt to gain autonomy or partition. In fact, while United States forces were patrolling the no-fly zone of northern Iraq in order to deter Iraq from harming the Kurds, this same action facilitated Turkish air and ground assaults on the PKK and their Iraqi Kurd sympathizers.

The U.S. decision not to support Kurdish efforts to obtain partition bolstered the Turkish policy of opposition to partition. Yet, Ankara's position

was not the sole determinant of U.S. policy. The Bush administration did not want to become militarily involved in a civil war in Iraq; the leadership was suffering from what Wolfowitz coined, "a declare victory syndrome."[46] In addition, the Bush officials did not want to split the state, because of their allies' and their own concern about spillover effects. The result was a situation where, as Wolfowitz explains, "we never really tried to push the limits of what the Turks would let us do in northern Iraq because we weren't interested in taking advantage of the situation ourselves."[47]

On the separate question of removing Saddam, the United States did not wish to become directly involved politically or militarily. While Turkey and Iraq's other neighbors probably would have preferred Saddam's removal they recognized that this was impossible without United States assistance. As a result, they kept their preferences private. At any rate, the prevailing conservative establishment in Turkey and Saudi Arabia most definitely did not regard the Kurdish or Shiite uprisings as acceptable vehicles for removing Saddam, and were clearly opposed to autonomy for these groups. As for the Western allies, primarily the U.K. and France, once the humanitarian operation was in place, they were marginalized; Turkey exercised the most leverage from early April to the present. But again, it could do so because Washington did not initially resist, and this pattern was never broken. Working with Ankara to fashion a common policy has always presented challenges to U.S. officials, however, in this instance, "it certainly wasn't the case that we had a clear direction we wanted to go in and we just couldn't get there 'cause the Turks vetoed it. Some large part of us was just as happy to be vetoed by the Turks . . ."[48]

Fear of Spillover

U.S. policy vis-à-vis the Kurds was fundamentally motivated by the probability that granting partition to the Iraqi Kurds would provoke conflict in Turkey between the government and its Kurds, and the possibility that conflict would break out among Turkey, Iran and Syria and the Kurds. The Bush and Clinton administrations recognized that fighting among these states could provoke another regional war. At a minimum, any conflict could derail Middle East peace initiatives, and would lead to certain tragedy for the Kurds. The concern that conflict would follow the creation of a Kurdish state was primarily a realist one. The U.S. government concluded that a divided Iraq would be a weak Iraq—prey to its neighboring states. Following a longstanding policy of "dual containment," which aimed to maintain a balance-of-power between Iran and Iraq—the two major regional powers, the United

States was wary of allowing Iraq to become vulnerable to outside regional intervention. A weakened government was acceptable, but a weakened state, territorially speaking, was not. Indeed, while Saddam himself was considered dangerous to regional stability, allowing Iraq to be torn apart would have produced a commensurate, or worse, threat.

This assessment—that if the Kurds achieved partition, it would create great regional instability—manifested itself in U.S. policy from 1991 onward. During the Kurdish uprising the U.S. government warned Saddam not to use chemical weapons (again) on his citizens. Yet, the United States did nothing to assist the rebellion. Indeed, by failing to prevent the Iraqi army from using its rotary planes prior to the uprising and during it, the United States can be regarded as somewhat complicit in its defeat. Once the Kurds rebelled it was due to an U.S. oversight that they were so rapidly and forcefully defeated. At the March 3, 1991 Safwan armistice talks General Schwartzkopf gave permission to the Iraqis to fly armed helicopters (but not fixed-wing airplanes) over areas where there was no U.S. presence. It was understood that the purpose of these flights would be for planning reconstruction of rail and road infrastructure. The day after these talks, on March 4, the helicopters conveyed Iraqi troops to southern Iraq to suppress the Shiite rebellion, which had erupted as Iraqi troops were surrendering to the coalition. With this rebellion crushed, Saddam sent the helicopters up north. There was no political outcry from the U.S. government, no deterrent or defensive military action.

Keeping Iraq Intact

Washington categorically opposed the destruction of the state of Iraq. Saddam's removal was a U.S. policy objective—so long as the process of achieving it did not destroy Iraq. The preferred scenario required the defeat of the rebels prior to the overthrow of Saddam.[49] In fact, the U.S. government deemed the rebellions detrimental to its policy. According to Baker, "while we had been careful not to embrace it as a war aim or political aim, our administration had made it publicly clear for some time that we would shed no tears if Saddam were overthrown. There was reason to hope that an emotionally battered armed forces leadership would rise up against the man responsible for the Kuwaiti debacle. In fact precisely the reverse occurred. The rebellions provided a convenient excuse for the military to forget their humiliating performance in Desert Storm."[50] The administration had hoped that the Sunni leadership would "liberate" Iraq from Saddam Hussein.

The United States was clearly influenced in the pivotal 1991–92 period by the assessment that the partition of Iraq would create internal and

regional conflict. As Secretary Baker explains, "the administration's policy in the weeks immediately following the cessation of hostilities was grounded in a complex mix of calculations, designed with one overriding strategic concern clearly in mind: to avoid what we often referred to as the Lebanonization of Iraq, which we believed would create a geopolitical nightmare."[51] Fragmentation, Baker explained, would have provided Shiite extremists with an opportunity in southern Iraq.[52] "Just as fears of Iranian expansionism helped shape U.S. prewar policy toward Iraq, this same phobia was a significant factor in our postwar decisionmaking."[53] The southern and northern Iraqi rebellions were therefore clearly linked from the perspective of the Administration. Indeed, Baker lumps them together expounding on the U.S. response to the 1991 uprisings. "We did not assist the insurrections militarily, primarily out of fear of hastening the fragmentation of Iraq and plunging the region into a new cycle of instability. The Shia were quite naturally perceived as being aligned with Iran, and the Kurds, who had demanded an independent state of Kurdistan for decades, were very fragmented in their leadership and were a constant source of concern to Turkey. For these geopolitical reasons, we were wary of supporting either group. We believed it was essential that Iraq remain intact, with or without a more reasonable new leadership."[54]

Limiting the Mission

When the United States finally did intervene with Operation Provide Comfort, the administration went to great pains to emphasize that its involvement was humanitarian. It was not assisting the Kurds in their secessionist campaigns, nor was it attempting to strike at Baghdad by dismantling Iraq. The U.S. government accepted the erosion of Iraqi sovereignty as a temporary measure, an extension of the rights it possessed as victors working in the classic American tradition to save the oppressed citizens of the enemy state. As the initial phase of Operation Provide Comfort—airdrops—began, President Bush declared, "at stake are not only the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women, and children, but the peace and security of the Gulf," and then, "I want to emphasize that this effort is prompted only by humanitarian concerns."[55]

On expanding the relief effort on April 16 from simple airdrops to placing U.S. military personnel on the ground, creating a safe area, and moving the Kurds down, Bush was adamant: "I want to stress that this new effort, despite its scale and scope, is not intended as a permanent solution to the plight of the Iraqi Kurds. To the contrary, it is an interim measure designed to meet an immediate, penetrating humanitarian need. Our long-term

objective remains the same—for Iraqi Kurds and, indeed, for all Iraqi refugees, wherever they are, to return home and to live in peace, free from repression, free to live their lives."[56] In similar words, Bush wrote to congressional leaders a month later: "This effort is not intended as a permanent solution to the plight of the Iraqi Kurds. It is a humanitarian measure designed to save lives, consistent with Resolution 688. It is also not an attempt to intervene militarily into the internal affairs of Iraq or to impair its territorial integrity. We intend to turn over the administration and security for these temporary sites as soon as possible to the United Nations (a process that has already begun), and to complete our total withdrawal from Iraq. Our long-term objective remains the same: for Iraqi Kurds, and indeed for all Iraqi refugees and displaced persons to return home and to live in peace, free from repression."[57]

The operation was thoroughly humanitarian, because political issues were kept at arms-length and the stated impetus for U.S. engagement was humanitarian, and even this involvement was reluctant. As late as April 4, almost a week after the Iraqi military reprisal, the only U.S. official response was to condemn the repression of the Kurds and encourage the efforts of the relief agencies. Airdrops were authorized only two days later, but the administration was still reluctant to send U.S. troops, fearing an open-ended engagement, the potential disruption of the regional balance-of-power via the empowerment of the Kurds, and the implications of violating Iraq's sovereignty.[58]

Nonetheless, the magnitude of the crisis, and Turkish, British, and Western media pressure provided the impetus for U.S. intervention. President Bush explained, "We simply could not allow 500,000 to a million people to die up there in the mountains."[59] More to the point, the president was personally compelled to act. "I don't think Bush had a choice, given his own rhetoric urging the Iraqis to rise up against Saddam. He was hoisted on his own rhetoric."[60] Finally, the global television audience was watching. The residual Gulf War media presence in the region was significant, and the pictures they transmitted, especially the live CNN images, stirred up public opinion.

At the same time, the U.S. military was ready to act; General Galvin, US, Commander in Chief of the European Command and NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe, had already anticipated the crisis and coalition response. Days before President Bush's April 4 announcement to commence the operation, Galvin had initiated logistical preparations, and had managed to convince General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the United States risked involvement in an unmanageable disaster situation

(where camps would collapse) if action came too late.[61] Galvin commented in his journal, "tell the national military chiefs to send their best people to Operation Provide Comfort. This is one of the great paradigms of the future. This is a watershed experience, the first grand-scale example of military forces in crisis management—and the crisis is both humanitarian and military. Humanitarian help in the middle of conflict."[62]

The Bush administration and the leaders of the U.S. military units sent with the coalition forces overwhelmingly characterized Operation Provide Comfort as a "humanitarian" mission. As one U.S. official explained, "Our relief program in northern Iraq is based on a humanitarian policy, not a political one. It exists within the context of our overall Iraq policy, including our support for the territorial integrity of Iraq. The relief program has averted a humanitarian crisis."[63] The implication was that there was a clinical separation between humanitarian and political actions and that this operation was not the latter, and therefore, strictly speaking, not even a peace operation. According to one journalist's assessment, "officials addressed themselves to the narrow dimensions of the tragedy, intending to avoid any role in solving the underlying ethnic or civil strife that contributed to the humanitarian crisis in the first place."[64] This was simply a matter of cleaning up the postwar mess in Iraq. While the president and his military advisors had been eager to bring all the troops back to the United States after the Gulf War, and certainly were reluctant to place new ones in the mountains and villages of Iraqi Kurdistan, human decency required action that only the U.S. military could take.

Stability Over Self-Determination

Once the humanitarian crisis had been managed, it became even clearer that the United States was more concerned with stability than with human rights, or democratization in Iraq. The United States took a hands-off approach to the elections and establishment of a Kurdish government, and refused to fund any programs that had clear political ramifications. Reconstruction and long-term development projects were rejected, because they might involve U.S. troops for a longer duration, than if they simply maintained security. The result was "... the coalition strategy of investing only in relief efforts and not in infrastructure and projects which will permit recipients to be self-sustaining for fear that such actions would be seen as enabling the creation of a separate Kurdish state."[65] As one U.S. after-action report noted, "At a time when the major objective was getting people [U.S. troops] home, actions that could have accelerated the repatriation and reintegration process, such as economic incentives, assistance with harvest, etc., were often restricted from Washington."[66]

The United States abstained from political involvement because it feared the regional consequences of partitioning Iraq. Indeed, Washington remained so skittish about the status of the safe zone that it did nothing to prevent the Kurds from being punished under international sanctions aimed at Saddam and the internal sanctions imposed by Baghdad on the region. In 1993, the administration still refused to consider reexamining the sanctions policy vis-à-vis Iraq so that it would no longer harm the Kurds . . . . "UN economic sanctions on Iraq apply to the entire country. An important tenet of our policy on Iraq is to support the continued unity and territorial integrity of the country. Our concern with creating a special exception to UN sanctions for one part of Iraq is that it could contribute to the breakup of the sanctions regime and possibly the country."[67] Ultimately, however, after UN approval of limited Iraqi oil sales for humanitarian goods, the Kurds leveraged control over the northern border and associated trade-flows to their substantial benefit.

The Demonstration effect

The written and oral record provide little evidence that the U.S. government was concerned that granting partition to the Kurds, or opposing their efforts, might encourage non-Kurdish secessionists and lead to undesired independence movements in the Middle East or elsewhere. Paul Wolfowitz maintains, in that respect, "the demonstration effect is somewhat overstated."[68] The U.S. government was, however, concerned about the potential reaction from Kurds in the neighboring states. Washington recognized that if Kurdish groups in Turkey, Iran, and Syria became emboldened, and provoked reactions from their governments and those of neighboring states, this would threaten domestic and regional stability. Neither the Bush nor the Clinton administrations wanted to see additional grievances and tensions added to the existing web of disputes in the Middle East. In particular, the United States was concerned that its NATO ally, Turkey, should assume a constructive, balancing role vis-à-vis Russia in Central Asia and the Balkans. In order for Turkey to adopt a greater regional role, however, Ankara had to get its political and economic house in order. Clearly, any additional tension between Turkish Kurds and the central government (especially the army) would be counterproductive.

The United States did not want to become involved in "a quagmire," another Vietnam. In the words of Secretary of State James Baker, "we are not prepared to go down the slippery slope of being sucked into a civil war. We cannot police what goes on inside Iraq, and we cannot be the arbiters of who

shall govern Iraq. As the President has made repeatedly clear, "... our objective was the liberation of Kuwait. It never extended to the re-making of Iraq. We repeatedly said that could only be done by the Iraqi people."[69] U.S. troops were being placed on the ground again, but the U.S. administration recognized that the context was entirely different from the one that had led them to deploy troops in August 1990. It was the same state, the same despotic ruler that was causing trouble, but this time his military aggression was not aimed at his neighbors but at his subjects—vulnerable minority groups in northern and southern Iraq. And so it was that Bush found it necessary to assert, "I am not going to involve any American troops in a civil war in Iraq."[70] Though the Gulf War was reputed to have exorcised the ghost of Vietnam—a notion trumpeted by President Bush himself—the commander in chief insisted "all along, I have said that the United States is not going to intervene militarily in Iraq's internal affairs and risk being drawn into a Vietnam-style quagmire."[71] Intervening in a civil conflict, particularly an ethnically motivated one, was not to be confused with the conventional war so recently completed. Indeed, Bush and his principal advisors, particularly the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, believed that the United States must avoid military intervention in civil wars, because they do not affect vital U.S. national interests. This conviction, however, was never expressed in relation to a possible demonstration effect.

Nothing in the official record indicates that the United States denied partition to the Kurds based on a feared demonstration effect. Nonetheless, this has not prevented some observers from concluding, in connection with the Kurds, "... just as China was afraid of the idea of a UN-protected enclave in a sovereign state because of its own situation in Tibet, and the Soviet Union was concerned about the Baltic states, so the U.S. may have had in mind the situation in the Israeli-occupied territories."[72] The United States was careful to limit its involvement to humanitarian matters, and to pull its troops out as quickly as possible. This author maintains that the United States may have feared that the Palestinians, who had long desired UN observers and troops in the West Bank and Gaza to protect them, might have regarded the Kurdish plan as a trial run for assistance aimed at their people.

The international response to the Kurdish attempt to gain autonomy and possibly independence was not considered precedent-setting by the U.S. government at the time that they initiated Operation Provide Comfort. It was hailed as such only later by academics and officials in subsequent administrations charged with issues of human rights, humanitarian missions, and peace operations. When President Bush authorized the operation to create the safe haven, he regarded this action as an extension of the Gulf War.

Its purpose was to manage a humanitarian crisis that had resulted from Saddam's defeat at the hands of the coalition. The unprecedented intrusiveness of the operation was the victor's prerogative.

UN Security Council Resolution 688, which called for humanitarian assistance for the Kurds, and the international response "was taking the side of the Iraqi Kurds and the allies against Iraq."[73] The operation was not impartial—indeed humanitarian needs superseded the violation of Iraq's territorial sovereignty and intervention in the state's domestic affairs. Though the UN resolutions and declarations all gave a nod to state sovereignty embodied in Article 2 of the UN Charter, the number of refugees constituted a threat substantial enough to impact peace and stability and therefore a potential justification for intervention. The international community had sanctioned the violation of another state's territorial sanctity and the execution of a de facto partition. Nonetheless, the Kurds were denied partition, and the U.S. decision not to support their secessionist movement was only indirectly affected by fears of a demonstration effect. To the extent that Turkey feared that granting partition to the Iraqi Kurds would encourage Kurds in Turkey, it became a factor for the United States.

Ethnic Interest Group Lobbying

Neither Kurdish Americans, nor Turkish Americans had strong ethnic lobby organizations operating in Washington, DC—to say nothing of Iraqi Americans. Moreover, to the extent that the Kurdish groups in particular are influential today, it is due to the events of 1991. Saddam's suppression of rebellion in the north and the refugee crisis it caused raised awareness and sympathy for the Kurdish cause. One State Department official even maintained during the end of the Clinton administration, "today it would be very difficult for the same cast of characters [in the George H.W. Bush administration] to make the same decision [not to help the Kurds achieve autonomy]. Today the world has changed, the events of those days have made the picture of the Kurds indelible and hard to ignore."[74]

Kurdish Interest Groups

The main Iraqi Kurdish political parties—the PUK and KDP—maintained offices in Washington during 1991–92. The party representatives served as liaisons between the State Department and the Kurdish leadership in Iraq. For Kurdish Americans, however one former State Department official notes, "there is no one ethnic lobby group . . . they [the Kurds] have their supporters in Congress, but usually no money, no votes . . . they are living off

the situation created by Saddam Hussein and Turkey."[75] In 1991, there were only approximately 10,000 Kurds in the United States.[76] The most active Kurdish American organization was the Kurdish National Congress of North America (KNC), an umbrella organization formed in 1988. The organization claimed 500 members and served political, cultural, and charity purposes. The main objective—the political mission—was to help the Kurds obtain their self-determination in the form of autonomy or even independence. The KNC was closely linked to the Washington Kurdish Institute, which functioned as a clearing house for information on the Kurds and lobbied the United States European governments, and international organizations for their human and political rights.

The human rights lobby groups represented Kurdish interests but only in the broadest sense, and they tended to focus on the situation of the Kurds in Turkey. The Greek American and Armenian American lobbies also gave some support to the advocates for the Kurds, but their more anti-Turkish, rather than pro-Kurdish, motivations limited their contributions and participation. The head of the KNC states, "the Armenians and Greeks support us when we have an issue, especially when it's related to the Kurds of Turkey."[77] In 1991 they attended KNC meetings and expressed their support verbally, but the impact of such support was minimal. Mike van Dusen, the Chief of Staff for the House Committee on Foreign Relations during 1991–92, comments, "Did the Greeks, who had an ax to grind with Turkey, or the Israelis, who had an ax to grind with Saddam, get involved with the Kurds? I never saw it overtly . . . I think that the Israelis came pretty quickly to the judgement that their relationship with Turkey was too important to get messy with Turkish politics . . . "[78] In any event, Van Dusen explains, if other ethnic groups had a position or wanted to weigh in, the Kurdish issue would not have been the top priority on their list of concerns, and "they rarely get to the fourth or fifth item" when meeting with congressional leaders.[79]

The Anti-Partition Camp

On the other side—the side more likely to lobby the U.S. government not to grant partition to the Kurds—were the Turkish American organizations. Here again, there was no single powerful Turkish lobby group. The closest thing was the Assembly of Turkish American Associations, which focused on fostering U.S.–Turkish business ties, particularly in the defense industry. Indeed, with only approximately 500,000 Turkish Americans, "the Turks don't have a huge lobby here, but what they've had is the Pentagon, White House and State Department doing their bidding because Turkey is

such an important country . . . they don't in effect need a lobby."[80] Iraqi American organizations, such as the Iraqi American Committee and the Iraq Foundation, also lobbied against Saddam Hussein, but they were interested in preserving Iraq's territorial integrity.

The Effect on U.S. Policy

In 1991 the KNC urged the U.S. administration to intervene in northern Iraq "with any means, whether it's military, economic or political."[81] Their leadership stressed, "the solution for the Kurdish problem is a political solution and as long as these people are driven out of their homeland, the problem will remain."[82] In early April Kurdish representatives argued for military intervention to save the Kurds, declaring, "it's the moral obligation of President Bush to stop this massacre."[83] A Kurdish Human Rights Watch representative declared, "I would like to ask the United States to take the same position as France and England and now Germany and Austria in asking the United Nations to interfere. We're asking for a protection zone for the Kurds who are fleeing from Iraq . . . "[84]

The KNC supported the establishment of the safe area, and urged the United States to secure political rights for the Iraqi Kurds. They were pushing for a final political resolution of the Kurdish situation in Iraq. Partition was, for them, the desirable scenario. The KNC attempted to appeal to a fundamental U.S. concern, arguing, "No stability will ever be established in the area if the Kurdish problem is not going to be addressed."[85] They urged senior State Department officials to meet with the Kurdish leadership, but were met with stiff opposition. The KNC had limited access to the State Department. During the Gulf War they met periodically with Richard Schifter, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, and his subordinates. The head of the KNC speculates that the Bush administration refused to meet with the KDP and PUK leaders because, " . . . they didn't want to make the Kurds prominent."[86] The Kurdish Americans were finally able to set up such meetings after Operation Provide Comfort was well under way.

In the aftermath of the defeat of the uprising, the KNC submitted a list of demands to the State Department. They asked the United States to offer "massive assistance to the Kurds" in the form of protection, an emissary to Kurdistan who would signal U.S. support for the Kurds, humanitarian aid, a request to the government of Turkey to open the border, the acceptance of 20,000 Kurdish refugees "as a symbol of goodwill," and a meeting with the Iraqi Kurdish leadership. The U.S. government ultimately met most of the

demands; Secretary Baker visited a humanitarian aid camp, Operation Provide Comfort was initiated, and approximately a month later U.S. officials met with the Iraqi Kurdish leadership. It is not clear that this was a result of the KNC's lobbying. Other sources of pressure and geostrategic calculations, such as allied and public opinion (media), were compelling the administration to become involved.

Following the uprising, the Kurdish Americans provided the State Department with information concerning the situation in Iraq and the KNC (benefiting from media pressure) was able to finally push the door open in May 1991 to face-to-face meetings between the Iraqi Kurdish leaders and U.S. State Department officials. Regular meetings were held between State Department officials and Kurdish representatives, including the Kurdish American KNC, and Washington-based representatives of the PUK and KDP. Unlike the PUK and KDP representatives who maintained that their aspirations were limited to self-determination in the form of autonomy, the KNC leadership spoke out in favor of partition—severing Iraqi Kurdistan from Iraq to create a Kurdish state.[87] The administration officials tired of the less accommodating Kurdish American representatives and edged the KNC out of their meetings. The PUK and KDP representatives were "more restrained" in representing their objectives, "cowed by the view [of the administration] that these are 'separatists' and the administration wanted to push that line that we [the U.S.] are supporting the territorial integrity of Iraq . . . gradually they wanted to see and hear less from people like us [the KNC] than the KDP and PUK, the established people who always went along with the main U.S. policy."[88] In the final analysis, the KNC never obtained a hearing by any senior administration officials. The secretary of state, president, and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were clearly opposed to any expansive political intervention.

While the State Department was wary about meeting with Kurdish representatives, congressional leaders were willing to meet with them, and pushed the State Department to do so as well. According to the senior congressional aide for the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "the anti-Saddam, anti-Halabja, anti-chemical weapons use groups weighed in hard on the Kurdish side."[89] Congressman Lee Hamilton, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, met at the end of the Gulf War with an Iraqi opposition delegation that included two Kurdish representatives and a Shiite cleric. The State Department was initially unwilling to meet with them, but Hamilton called and urged them to reverse their position. Eventually, an assistant secretary met with the representatives. Yet, "in doing that he [Congressman Hamilton] was not taking the banner of the Kurds or the

opposition or of anybody, but here were some Iraqis that were fed up with Saddam and Lee [Hamilton] thought that the United States ought to be meeting with them."[90]

Congress, on the whole, was very receptive to the Kurdish Americans in the wake of the humanitarian disaster. According to Dr. Najmaldin Karim, head of the KNC, " we contacted a bunch of Congressmen and Senators and they sponsored resolutions to support the Kurds, provide humanitarian aid, and they allocated a lot of money and all that."[91] He adds that the congressional response was "very swift because there was no opposition."[92] Indeed, the KNC had the high-profile support of Senate Majority Leader Robert Mitchell and Minority Leader Robert Dole.[93] The Kurds also garnered the backing of Senators Nancy Kassebaum, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and Edward Kennedy, joining Senator Claiborne Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a Kurdish supporter since the late 1980s.[94] On the House side, Representatives Dante Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and Lee Hamilton, his successor, rallied to the Kurdish cause, along with Tom Lantos, another member of the committee, Mitch McConnell, John Porter, and Brian Bilbray. The support was bipartisan, but particularly strong on the part of the Democrats, because, Karim explains, "they wanted to stick it to Bush." In the meantime, Bush supporters, like Mitch McConnell, were urging the KNC leader to praise Bush during his repeated press appearances, maintaining that it would help the Kurdish cause. Thus, in some cases, the lobbyists were being lobbied back by their target audiences.

The combined effect of both the pro-Kurdish (or anti-Turkish) and anti-Kurdish ethnic lobby groups was insignificant. For the most part, they had little direct access to the key decisionmakers, and even those who would hear their argument within the administration or Congress were not aggressive about promoting the agenda of one ethnic group or another. Administration officials appreciated the information the Kurds would share with them, but generally found that "they weren't able to turn Congress loose on you, so it was a pretty weak lobby actually."[95] Congresspeople were more apt to be swayed by nonethnic interest groups that could affect the situation in their district more directly (business lobbies), or by personal platforms that they had consistently held regarding human rights. As a result, "US policy towards Kurds was a policy largely concentrated in executive branch . . . Congress was circling the issue, not deeply immersed, more commenting, facilitating."[96] The ethnic lobby groups did not effectively create a new constituency for support, or lack of support, for the partition of Iraq.

Conclusion

The U.S. government decided not to support the Kurds' attempt to carve their own state out of northern Iraq because of the opposition of the Turkish government, and due to fears of regional spillover. Aside from the compulsion to rapidly address—or redress—a humanitarian disaster, U.S. objectives were simply an extension of those of the Gulf War. Iraq would remain intact as a state, albeit with diluted sovereignty, and Saddam Hussein had to be indirectly forced from power. Since overall stability and balance-of-power in the Middle East was the primary U.S. regional objective, an opposition within Iraq could be encouraged to stage a coup, but only political change was desirable; territorial change was out of the question. Moreover, the United States was eager to limit its involvement in Iraq, turn the humanitarian operation over to the UN, and place the responsibility for enforcing the framework of the UN Security Council resolutions with the secretary general.

The Bush administration was not interested in unilaterally assisting the Kurds in their effort to break free of Saddam's rule. Initially, the emphasis was on returning U.S. troops to the United States, and avoiding further engagement and missions that would spoil the good relations between the United States and her Middle Eastern allies. After the uprisings had been suppressed, managing the urgent humanitarian crisis was paramount, and an accompanying political policy favoring the Kurds might have jeopardized the more crucial relief effort. While the United States had its domestic reasons to avoid offering support to the Kurds in the civil war against Baghdad, presumably a prolonged military adventure, the written and oral evidence collected for this study indicate that U.S. officials gave substantial consideration to Ankara's position. Turkey played a particularly powerful role not only as a U.S. ally, but also as a dominant regional power. The positions of European allies, particularly the United Kingdom and France, were also considered, but were less decisive.

The fear of spillover was a factor in the U.S. decision not to support partition for the Iraqi Kurds, but predominantly in a secondary fashion. The United States was concerned about the potential for a broader conflict in the region that could potentially involve Turkey, Iran, and Syria. However, much of that fear may have been based on the assumption that there would be a power vacuum, and on Turkish analysis. The United States and Turkey assumed that the United States would not maintain an extended presence in the area to protect any new Kurdish state from its stronger neighbors. Given that assumption, Ankara maintained that Turkey must intervene in northern

Iraq to ensure that Iran and Syria did not obtain control over the weak state and thereby threaten Turkish security.

Traditional realist concerns about balance-of-power and regional stability far outweighed any desire to establish an international precedent by assisting suppressed ethnic groups or to ease suffering in the long term through economic development projects. Moreover, the foreign policy establishment was not significantly affected by the particularistic concerns of constituents who identified themselves ethnically with the Kurds or with the central governments, such as Turkey or Iraq, which had a stake in the development of U.S. policy. The U.S. government demonstrated adherence to classic principles of geopolitics.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 3

Ethiopia

Background

Eritreans have been demanding the right to self-determination in the form of statehood since 1941 when Italian colonial rule ended, and have pursued this goal by means of armed conflict and diplomacy since 1961. After 30 years of war with the Ethiopian government, Eritreans finally negotiated and voted their way to independence in 1991–93. It was not only through military victory that the Eritrean leadership succeeded, but also because of its successful alliance with the other key Ethiopian opposition movements to the dictatorship of President Mengistu Haile Mariam. In addition, international acceptance of their achievement was facilitated by U.S. involvement in the negotiations. In the period 1991–93, U.S. policy underwent a transformation from Cold War opposition to the Eritrean secessionist movement, to offering crucial diplomatic and political support to the Eritrean leadership. The result constituted the first successful postcolonial secession in Africa.

Ethiopia, located in northeast Africa on the Horn of Africa, was established during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as a Christian imperial state via territorial consolidation of smaller feudal holdings.[1] It was the only African political entity that escaped European colonization, and was only briefly occupied by Italy from 1936 to 1941. Meanwhile, the adjacent territory of Eritrea was established as an Italian colony in 1889, and remained so until 1941. From 1941, the British government administered both Ethiopia and Eritrea until the UN established a federation between them in 1952.

By mid-1989 the Ethiopian population was almost 50 million, and included 76 ethnic groups who spoke 286 languages.[2] Ethnic identity in the

state of Ethiopia (including the territory of Eritrea) was based primarily on a common language, but contained cultural and religious aspects as well. The largest ethnolinguistic group was the Oromo, followed by the Amhara, the Tigrinya speakers, the Somalis, Afars, Gurages, and Tigreans. The most commonly spoken languages included Amharic, the official language, and Orominya, Tigrinya, Tigre, Afar, and Somali. Forty percent of the Ethiopian population was Christian, adhering mainly to the Ethiopian Orthodox faith (some Oromo were Protestants), and 45 percent was Muslim; by the early 1990s the growth rate of the latter population was increasing, while that of the Christians remained static.[3]

The Eritrean region in 1989 comprised 9 percent of the territory of Ethiopia, with 8–10 percent of Ethiopia's population—about three to four million people.[4] The largest ethnic groups in Eritrea, the Tigrinya and Tigreans speakers, coexisted with seven small minorities. The Eritrean population was estimated to be evenly split between Christians and Muslims, with the Christian Tigrinya-speaking Eritreans generally living in the highlands and the mostly Muslim Tigre residing in the lowlands and along the Red Sea coastline. Of the Muslims, approximately one-third were Tigre speaking. The main Eritrean languages were Arabic and Tigrinya.

The 1880s to the 1950s

Eritrean national identity is not an exclusive one, based on ethnicity, religion, or other immutable characteristics, but instead is based on a shared territory and history. Eritrean national consciousness evolved as a combined result of the separate political and economic existence established by the Italians in 1889; the political integration achieved under British administration; and the common experience of repression under the authoritarian regime of Haile Selassie. The European powers laid the foundation by establishing and maintaining an Eritrea independent of Ethiopian rule. Indeed, under British rule Eritrea enjoyed a pluralistic society, and relative to Ethiopia, economic success, particularly among the Christians. But, it was the hot iron of despotism that forged the fiery, strong will to secede from Ethiopia. As one expert states, "it was above all Selassie's rule which was instrumental in tying together the two distinct strands of Eritrean society, Christian and Muslim, and kindling Eritrean nationalism to the point of a mass movement for secession."[5] During the 1940s and 1950s interest in independence was exhibited only among the Muslims—led by the Beni Amer people—of Eritrea. A decade later Christian Tigrinya-speakers were joining the movement, and two decades later the majority of the Eritrean population favored a future outside the confines of the Ethiopian state.

Ethiopian opposition to Eritrean self-determination has always been predicated upon a different, longer historical perspective, which has been accepted at various times by Europeans and by the United States. Ethiopian leaders have asserted that Eritrea belonged to kingdoms that date back 3,000–4,000 years, which were precursors of the modern Ethiopian state. Critics of the Ethiopian argument point out that these Abbyssian ancestors of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries raided the lowlands, but they did not remain or govern. In addition, their kingdom did not include the entire territory of modern Eritrea. In fact, scholars contend that Eritrea was always on the periphery of various empires attempting to control the Red Sea coast and hinterland, but it was never under continuous control of one political authority. From the fifteenth century to the Italian occupation, different areas of Eritrea enjoyed local autonomy at various times, while tribute was granted to successive empires—Ottoman, Ethiopian, Funj, and Egyptian.

In late 1935 Mussolini's army invaded and occupied Ethiopia. Six years later British and Commonwealth forces ousted the Italians from the Horn. The British swiftly reinstalled the Emperor, Haile Selassie—and over the next 11 years, from 1941 to 1952, consolidated the modern Ethiopian state. Selassie established relations with the United States, signing a lend-lease agreement in 1942, and a technical cooperation agreement in 1951. Meanwhile, the UN Security Council members had accepted the Ethiopian argument that Eritrea belonged within the Ethiopian state. On November 20, 1950 the UN General Assembly voted overwhelmingly for (the U.S. formulated) UN Resolution 390 (V), The Federal Act, establishing the basis for the federation between Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Verbal consideration was given to Eritrean will, but no attempt was made to act on such principles. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared, "from the point of view of justice, the opinions of the Eritrean people must receive consideration. Nevertheless, the strategic interest of the United States in a Red Sea basin, and considerations of security and world peace, make it necessary that the country has to be linked with our ally, Ethiopia."[6] The U.S. government considered the establishment of an American military and radio facility in Eritrea an important security interest, one that the Ethiopian government was prepared to grant. Washington would not compromise security imperatives for self-determination, a notion that, according to the prevailing wisdom, only presented opportunities for Communist troublemakers allied with the Soviet Union. Indeed, the United States provided Ethiopia with counterinsurgency assistance in fighting the Eritrean rebels, and even sent a special counterinsurgency team in 1964.[7] On the British side, the military administrator in Asmara argued for the partition of Eritrea between

Ethiopia and Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, arguing that the Tigreans in Eritrea belonged to the Abyssinian political system, which was composed of Tigreans and Amhara who share the Coptic faith and identical or related languages.[8]

The Ethiopian–Eritrean federation endured for a decade until Selassie annexed Eritrea and abolished what had become its nominal political autonomy. Selassie immediately clamped down on the more democratic elements of Eritrean society, banning political parties and newspapers. He decreed Amharic the official language of Eritrea, despite the fact that the Amhara constitute a small minority within the region, suspended the Eritrean constitution, abolished the flag, and manipulated the Eritrean parliament via blackmail and subversion of the electoral process. The Eritreans responded by organizing the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF), which initiated its guerrilla struggle in September 1961. On November 13, 1962, the Eritrean assembly—by then essentially acting as a rubber stamp for Selassie—announced the end of the federation. From that point on, the emperor began to lose control of his polity, although not exclusively because of his treatment of the Eritreans. In 1963 Ethiopia went to war with Somalia in the Ogaden. Corruption, unemployment, and inflation rose, adding fuel to peasant and other rebellions. The government responded to the internal violence by imposing a state of emergency in 1970, and when famine struck Ethiopia during 1972–74. Meanwhile, satellite technology had made the radio station obsolete, the U.S. navy had shifted its focus to the Indian Ocean, and in 1966 Diego Garcia became the U.S. forward base in the region.

Mengistu's Dictatorship

In January 1974 general strikes led to the resignation of the government, and by September the Provisional Military Administrative Council, or Derg, had engineered a coup. On December 20, 1974, Ethiopia was declared a socialist state. For the next three years, Lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam consolidated his control over the government and instituted a campaign of socialization and Sovietization. The domestic reaction manifested itself in continued fighting between Mengistu's ethnic Amharic regime and five separate revolutionary or secessionist movements, including a coalition of the Marxist-Leninist Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), the Tigrean Peoples' Liberation Front (TPLF), the Muslim-led Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF), and the dominant Eritrean guerrilla group, the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF).

In 1988 the rebel groups launched a massive military offensive against the Ethiopian troops in Eritrea and Tigray, and in May 1989 the military attempted a coup. By this time the Soviet Union had disengaged from the

Horn, leaving Mengistu weak and isolated. The insurgent military activity culminated in a joint offensive launched in February 1991 by the opposition groups to oust Mengistu and the Derg from power.

By 1989 in the wake of the internationally publicized famine that struck Ethiopia between 1983 and 1986, the United States had become involved in efforts to negotiate an end to the civil war. Former President Carter worked fruitlessly with the EPLF, the TPLF, and Mengistu in 1989–90 to develop a solution to the separatist conflicts. In 1991, as the government increasingly lost control of its territory, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Herman Cohen made a final attempt to negotiate a peace agreement. Just four days before the commencement of a peace conference in London, Mengistu slipped out of Ethiopia and into exile in Zimbabwe. After a day of negotiations between the government and the rebel groups, Mengistu's successor informed the United States that he could no longer control the capital, and issued a unilateral cease-fire. On May 27, the EPRDF, under Meles Zenawi entered Addis Ababa, and the EPLF, under Isaias Afewerki, entered Eritrea. The 30-year civil war against the military dictatorship was over.

The rebel leaders, the Mengistu-appointed prime minister, and the U.S. government established a provisional government of Ethiopia and agreed that a referendum on Eritean independence would be held in 1993. The parties also agreed that a conference would be convened in July 1991 to decide on the composition of the interim government, which would rule until elections could be held within a year. Meanwhile, riots were raging in Addis Ababa, with protesters angrily denouncing the U.S.-brokered agreement as "Cohen's coup."[9] The Amhara, who had constituted the elite group under Mengistu (and throughout Ethiopian history), were infuriated at the U.S. government for facilitating the EPRDF takeover. The new provisional government was dominated by Tigreans from the north, whom the Amhara living in the capital regarded as inferior and threatening to their privileged positions. They viewed the London negotiations with utter distrust, and considered the decision to allow Eritrea's secession traitorous.

The Transition to Partition

On July 4, 1991, the conference of Ethiopian ethno-political factions agreed on the structure of the Transitional Government of Ethiopia, and a set of principles affirming the right to self-determination within a federal state. Any group could theoretically call for a referendum. For the Eritreans, specifically, the right to secession was guaranteed, and in exchange the EPLF agreed to make the port of Assab available to Addis Ababa. The Ethiopians and Eritreans reaffirmed that the referendum on the final status of Eritrea would be held in

1993, and accepted in principle the desirability of a mutual defense pact and joint committees to foster cooperation on security, and economic and social issues, as well as the freedom of movement for people, goods, and services.

While the Eritreans agreed during the negotiations in May to postpone a vote on their independence, immediately after the July 5 London Conference the EPLF asserted that they would administer the province as a provisional government until the referendum could be held on its final status. The EPLF refused to participate in the Ethiopian provisional government, established border posts, refused entry to diplomats and journalists, and began deporting non-Eritreans. On April 23 and April 25, 1993, 99.8 percent of the one million Eritreans who participated in the referendum voted for independence.[10]

In 1991 the United States suddenly decided to support the Eritrean secessionists, thereby sanctioning the partition of Ethiopia. The U.S. decision to support the partition of Ethiopia was based upon a mix of humanitarian and interest-based concerns, focusing on one key variable—the fear of continued conflict. The Eritreans were able to obtain a sovereign state, because Washington recognized that withholding support from the secessionists would lead to continued conflict. This in turn would thwart ongoing efforts to eliminate famine and rescue Ethiopian Jews threatened by famine and displacement. U.S. concern about allies' and domestic ethnic group opinions, and fear of spillover, continued conflict, or demonstration effects were either insignificant or just enough to modify implementation of the policy, but not the decisions that were made.

The Position of Allies or Dominant Regional States

According to Ambassador Cohen—the broker of the agreement that paved the way to Eritrean secession—there were no U.S. allies attempting to influence the decision to support or not support Eritrea's push for partition.[11] Nonetheless, Israel and The Organization of African Unity (OAU) were interested parties, and U.S. policymaking took these players into consideration. There was an attempt to develop a U.S. strategy that would not provoke disagreement with the OAU, and would garner Israeli and the European support to the extent that it was necessary. At minimum, U.S. officials were constrained by the need to inform the dominant regional organization and their Middle Eastern ally.

During the 1980s Europe's role in the Horn was circumscribed and their 1991 decisions to support Eritrean secession were noncontroversial. The Europeans simply did not have much at stake. In 1984, the European Parliament had already adopted a resolution urging Ethiopia to find a solution to the conflict with the Eritreans that would be compatible with the 1950 UN resolution establishing the federation, and with OAU principles.

By 1989–91, the European and U.S. policies were identical, supporting federation or confederation until mid-1991 when, in the aftermath of the military campaign and ouster of Mengistu, the United States and the Europeans acceded to partition. According to an American official, the Europeans "would not have thrown themselves on the tracks over this issue."[12]

The United States took over the negotiations in the Horn in the late 1980s largely at the request of Soviet President Gorbachev. Washington did not require much persuading since congressional and White House interest was already high because of humanitarian issues. In short, "domestic concerns about Ethiopian Jewry and hunger in the Horn of Africa complemented Bush's overarching policy of collaborating with the Soviets to solve regional problems."[13] Once the U.S. administration was committed to negotiating an end to the civil war, the minor interlocutors who had not been achieving much success dropped out of the picture.

Italy had been involved in the earlier fruitless negotiations between Mengistu and the TPLF, but was no longer a player at the time of the London Conference. Even the Soviets were excluded from the negotiations and the final decision by the United States to support the partition of Ethiopia. As for the Africans, they rarely raised the topic of Ethiopia's partition in discussions with their American counterparts. Indeed, "in 'facilitating' the London talks the US acted virtually alone—that is, without any noticeable participation by other powers or even by its allies."[14]

The Organization for African Unity

A key OAU principle—established by a resolution at its inaugural conference in 1964—is the notion that postcolonial borders are inviolable and unalterable. The fear that partitioning Ethiopia would lead to increased fragmentation of existing states was made acute by the political–military competition with the Soviets. The United States maintained that the ideal resolution of the conflict would be a return to the federal arrangement of 1952. Washington made repeated statements regarding the desirability of retaining a unified Ethiopia. Thus, until 1991 the OAU was opposed to the creation of an Eritrean state, and until the London conference, the United States rejected the idea of partitioning Ethiopia. The U.S. government was careful from 1989 on to formulate a position that would not appear to contradict this principle. According to Ambassador Cohen, "up until the London conference we supported the territorial unity of Ethiopia and the reason is that we were supporting the OAU."[15] The United States assumed the role of mediator a year prior to the London meeting in 1991, with the assumption

that the ideal solution to the Eritrean–Ethiopian conflict would be the reestablishment of the 1952 confederal arrangement that had been forcibly abolished by Mengistu. As the rebels made progressive advances, the administration amended its assessment somewhat; an August 14 meeting of senior Africa policy officials determined that while U.S. policy supported a unified Ethiopia with significant autonomy for Eritrea, "as we view the prospect of de facto independence for Eritrea, as the result of military victory by the EPLF, we should keep our policy options open and avoid staking out legal positions unnecessarily. The possibility of U.S. recognition of an independent Eritrea should be used to leverage both the EPLF and the successor Ethiopian regime."[16]

By summer 1991 it was clear that the Eritreans would accept nothing but a referendum on independence. The State Department lawyers determined that "the Eritrean situation was not a strictly colonial one as described by the OAU."[17] OAU doctrine applied to those territories that had passed from colonial states to postcolonial ones, but in Eritrea's case, according to the State Department, there was no proper transition to the postcolonial state. When the British simultaneously liberated Ethiopia and Eritrea, the former reacquired its independent status (it had never been a colony, nor had it ruled over Eritrea), but the latter became a UN protectorate until the UN confederated Ethiopia and Eritrea (so Eritrea, a former colony, had never acquired independence). This was not a new argument. In retrospect, the 1952 UN arrangement appeared flawed, because a referendum had not been held. The U.S. government found that the OAU doctrine "was not legally applicable . . . Self-determination for Eritreans would not be illegal under OAU doctrine because, they never had it."[18] Nonetheless, for over six months after this determination was made, the United States continued to press for keeping Ethiopia intact, simply because "the preservation of existing boundaries was so important to the OAU."[19]

The U.S. government attempted to reassure the African states and avoid the perception of a radical shift in policy by consistently emphasizing Washington's hope that the Eritreans would choose to remain in Ethiopia. Ambassador Robert Houdek, the U.S. Charge d'Affaires in Addis Ababa at the time, comments, "for the longest time we supported the OAU principle of inherited colonial borders . . . [but by this time] (1) Eritrea had won and (2) the new government *agreed* to the secession. So if the two parties agree, who are we to oppose it?"[20] Ambassador Cohen maintains, "the OAU saved us by endorsing the agreement," but, like the United States, it had little choice since the Ethiopian government itself had approved it.

Israel

Israel and the United States cooperated to a certain extent on policy regarding Ethiopia, but in 1991 the intersection of their immediate interests was less geostrategic, and more humanitarian. Washington and Israel were concerned with evacuating the more than 14,000 Ethiopian Jews, who had left their homes in the Gonder province during the 1984 famine and had been gradually emigrating to Israel via Sudan.

Historically, Israel's concern for the Horn had been strategic—ensuring freedom of navigation through the Red Sea. During the Cold War, Israel regarded Eritrean separatism—originally spearheaded by the Muslim-led ELF—as a potential threat to its strategic interests in the Horn. Tel Aviv provided assistance to Addis Ababa in its military campaign against the Eritreans in order to prevent the Red Sea from becoming an Islamic lake. The Eritrean insurgency was perceived as part of a broader Islamic movement that threatened Israeli, and therefore, U.S. security. By early 1991, the United States and Israel agreed that a united Ethiopian confederation would be the desirable outcome of any negotiations. There was no need for either side to convince the other. The extent to which Israel tried to influence U.S. policy "shouldn't be exaggerated. AIPAC and the Israeli embassy whispered words here and there that good relations with Ethiopia was a priority for them . . . the Israeli view and U.S. view at that particular moment . . . were both flawed and reinforced each other."[21] As the situation on the ground evolved, the Israeli and U.S. governments had to adjust to the same degree.

The Fear of Spillover or Continued Conflict

The primary motive for U.S. diplomatic intervention, according to most observers and the chief implementors of the policy, was the desire to bring an end to conflict on the Horn, to stop the war between the Ethiopians and Eritreans, and among the Ethiopians themselves. This concern was partly humanitarian, in that the United States was eager to see the man-made cause of the horrendous Ethiopian famines eliminated, but Washington was also eager to prevent Ethiopia from becoming an anarchic failed state. There was some contradictory concern that supporting Eritrean independence could be disruptive, but supporting self-determination for Eritreans—finessing the issue by recognizing reality in a way that was acceptable to all—was deemed a constructive means to bring all negotiating parties to the table.

Famine and Instability

By 1991 the U.S. government was willing to become involved in the Ethiopian civil war under the circumstances that included Soviet acquiescence, active participation of the parties, and the likelihood that diplomacy alone would bring peace. The United States was willing to act in the specific case of Ethiopia, which had obtained wide media coverage in the mid-1980s during the politically and militarily induced famines. President Bush's desire for a New World Order, where the United States would bring peace unilaterally, with the Soviet Union, or multilaterally through the UN, was coupled with "the desire to promote the human side of American policy, and this was where conditions in Ethiopia were germane to the Bush vision . . . the United States began to alter the geopolitics of the Horn and to emphasize human rights, political reforms and economic development as new responsibilities."[22]

As one analyst explains, "The continuing humanitarian tragedy in Ethiopia, as famine and conflict in one part of the county were followed by devastation in another, increased the sense among both Ethiopians and foreign observers that 'someone' must do 'something' . . . U.S. officials, however, were convinced that unless the various conflicts in Ethiopia could be resolved, food aid would not bring relief to the suffering people."[23] As the State Department's spokesman put it, "The United States is committed to the welfare and economic development of the Ethiopian people and considers a peaceful transition to democratic government essential to development and human well-being."[24] There was also a connection to the plight of the Jews; the end of civil war would speed up the emigration of the remaining 20,000 Ethiopian Jews.

Washington wanted to minimize instability, so that Africans could be fed and further conflict could be prevented. Indeed, instability was regarded as more inimical to U.S. interests than famine, and therefore worthy of prevention in its own right. Washington was alarmed by the breakdown in law and order following the overthrow of the governments in Liberia and Somalia (in 1990 and January 1991, respectively). According to one analyst, " . . . the recent disasters following regime collapse in Liberia and Somalia revealed the consequences of U.S. reluctance to become involved in regional political crises. Rather than stand by and watch Ethiopia disintegrate into violence, Washington hoped that by using diplomacy and dangling a few carrots of future cooperation, it could bring about a peaceful transition."[25] In 1991 as the U.S. government encouraged the EPLF to enter Addis Ababa, the United States was deliberately acting to prevent increased conflict. Inaction would have allowed Ethiopia to become another African failed state, where toppling one dictatorial regime led to a power vacuum, lawlessness, and desperation.

It was clear that the decision to allow the EPRDF to take control of Ethiopia was motivated entirely by a desire to end the fighting. "Mr. Cohen's encouragement of the EPRDF's entry into Addis Ababa was not intended to transfer power to it but simply to ensure that somebody was in charge while the country settled down and got ready to vote for a democratic government."[26] Cohen himself said that the immediate goal was to prevent the capital from descending into chaos. He explained, "our goal was to replace war with peace and find a path forward to a more broadly based and democratic political system. We sought a transitional mechanism that could produce an interim government made up of all Ethiopian parties."[27]

Stability and Partition

The desire for peace and stability determined U.S. policy regarding the Eritreans. According to one analyst, "the Bush Administration quickly recognized that the primary U.S. interest in Eritrea was geopolitical. The dominant perception in Washington was that Eritrean stability was indispensable to the stability of Ethiopia itself."[28] In the aftermath of the London Conference, Ambassador Cohen summarized the U.S. perspective on the EPLF stating, "they've said the first priority is stability for Ethiopia—we don't want to do anything to unhinge the cease-fire and the peace that can be established there, so we're going to put off the Eritrea question for a couple of years."[29] As long as the Eritreans professed a commitment to peace and stability—the number one U.S. objective—the United States was willing to give them the opportunity to secede. Indeed, some U.S. officials indicated that almost any arrangement would be acceptable, so long as the fighting ceased. The former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs, describes the U.S. attitude as, "whatever they work out, God bless them . . . They drew up their own blueprint. We were more concerned about the stability of Ethiopia. Whereas in Eritrea you had not exactly a monolithic party, in Ethiopia you still had a festering problem of a small disliked group opposed by two larger ones, one of which thinks it has the right to rule and the other the right to autonomy."[30]

Cohen told the U.S. Congress that the Eritreans were " . . . doing their best to avoid conflict, and hope to deal with this issue with a democratically elected Ethiopian government, which would come within a two-year period. So the best we can hope for now is that the Eritreans will run their own country for a while on a provisional basis and the political problem of Eritrean self-determination will be postponed to a later date."[31] The United States urged the Eritreans to maintain economic links with Ethiopia—which depended on Eritrean ports for most of its shipping and trade—and to allow Ethiopia to

represent it overseas. Meanwhile, Washington was pressuring the EPRDF to establish a broadly representative, democratic transitional government.

The U.S. government recognized that the fighting would not simply end with the removal of Mengistu. In fact, without some sort of internationally accepted Ethiopian–Eritrean agreement there would be no real peace. By the London Conference the EPLF controlled all of Eritrea; to reverse this would have required military action. The Mengistu government had failed, and the EPRDF was willing to forfeit that well-neigh impossible option. As one author explains, "the Eritreans insisted upon the full application of the principle of self-determination to the territory, under strict international supervision. The military prowess of the EPLF had bolstered the territory's diplomatic status, and it was no longer likely that Eritrea would accede to Soviet-American demands."[32]

Ultimately, the U.S. decision to support partition was a pragmatic one. As Ambassador Cohen explains, "The Ethiopian government was making concessions; towards the end everything was on the table. At the London conference we saw the rebels winning . . . we changed our strategy to end the conflict, to get a soft landing, which meant no fighting in Addis. We agreed to self-determination for Eritrea. We publicly said that just to give us consistency and influence with the Eritreans."[33] The U.S. government made it clear that it would withhold recognition of the new Ethiopian government and of Eritrea if they concluded an immediate partition. All parties to the talks agreed on the referendum, and the Eritreans agreed to wait three years to hold it. On the international level, "the absence of opposition to a referendum on independence on the part of the new government of Ethiopia was a key factor in the international community's acceptance of the principle of Eritrean independence."[34]

Thus, the decision to allow partition was made to advance the prospects for stability and security on the Horn. The means by which it was implemented demonstrates most clearly the U.S. concern about stability. Recognition of Eritrea's independence was only possible to the extent that it would contribute to stability in Ethiopia and would be achieved in a constructive—as opposed to destabilizing—fashion. The true diplomatic victory for the Americans, Ethiopians, and Eritreans was the fact that these objectives were achieved. And the prudence of the Eritreans—which led them to postpone achieving their national goal for two years—contributed the final determinant of success.

Ambassador Cohen explained to the U.S. Congress, " . . . most important, in this fragile transitional stage in Ethiopia, the judicial issue of Eritrea's future did not really arise among the parties in London. A provisional

administration is installed in Asmara . . . But there is a general, if tacit, agreement that the long-sought referendum and the final determination of Eritrea's status can await a more stable situation emerging in Addis . . . "[35] Indeed, the referendum was a key part of Eritrean strategy. It was a way of getting back at the UN—which had remained mute as Selassie abrogated the agreement on the federation—ensuring international acceptance, and given the expected result, recognition. Moreover given the unpopularity of the decision in Ethiopia, especially among the more numerous and vocal Amhara, it was a safe means of securing their victory. "Retaining the referendum proposal was viewed as crucial to international legitimacy. In the event of a recrudescence of Greater Ethiopianism in the future, the legitimacy shoe would be on Eritrea's foot."[36]

The U.S. government, therefore, determined that institutionalizing the situation on the ground would be the most effective means to halt the warfare on the Horn. The real U.S. contribution was getting the EPLF to agree to refrain from declaring independence immediately, and to delay the referendum by two years. Ambassador Cohen was able to ignore other considerations that might have influenced him to oppose Eritrean aims, and to make the decision to support the partition of Eritrea, because independence for Eritrea—he ascertained—would lead to peace. The Americans trusted the Eritrean and Ethiopian leadership and believed that the close working relationship between Presidents Meles of Ethiopia and Isaias of Eritrea, the fact that they were both Tigrean, and assurances that Eritrea and Ethiopia would continue to cooperate closely on the economic front, would prevent any conflict from erupting. There was no fear that conflict would be taken to the international level, in the likely event that Eritreans voted for independence, because U.S. officials did not anticipate the conflict, which did, in fact, occur in 1993 when a serious border dispute erupted.

In 1991, U.S. policy in Africa was chiefly motivated by a desire to eliminate famine and instability. Cooperating with the Soviets to quell regional conflicts was a broader U.S. objective that became a means to achieving stability on the Horn. The decision to support the partition of Ethiopia was an extension of this policy—partly based on humanitarian concerns but primarily by a desire to put an end to conflict on the Horn. There is no documentary and oral evidence that U.S. policymakers feared that supporting partition would lead to increased or more widespread conflict. If anything, there was an implicit recognition that not accepting the fait accompli would lead to more fighting. If the United States had decided not to support partition, this might have encouraged outsiders to intervene and assist non-EPRDF forces to fight the EPLF, while also reigniting the civil war in

Ethiopia proper. Alternatively, an intervener or interveners might have convinced the EPRDF to turn on their allies and fight to regain Eritrea. In the best-case scenario, a U.S. decision not to support partition would have left Eritrea in limbo, without much hope for international recognition, but also in danger of being invaded at some future point by those who would exploit its murky international legal status. Though there were no direct expressions of fear that conflict would continue if the United States did not support the Eritrean cause, comments made by administration members and key negotiators clearly indicate that the U.S. defense of the territorial sanctity of Ethiopia was only abandoned when it became an obstacle to continued negotiations and peace. In short, the United States decided to support Ethiopia's partition because it became necessary in order to achieve peace and stability. Clearly, concern about conflict continuing and spreading—was the paramount U.S. policy consideration.

The Demonstration Effect

On the Horn of Africa, "For more than a quarter-century, the U.S. government had ignored or dismissed the struggle of Eritrean rebels for an independent state . . . Washington, along with Western Europe, accepted the conventional diplomatic wisdom that while Africa's borders may be absurd, changing any one of them could open up a Pandora's box of ethnic conflict."[37] During the Cold War and "throughout the conflict, the EPLF's dream of sovereignty was stymied by international fears that Eritrea's secession would lead to 'balkanization.' Major powers, including Britain, supported Ethiopian regimes against Eritrea."[38] At the time, Cohen's decision to support the partition of Ethiopia and his subsequent public statements caused considerable consternation among his superiors in Washington. Secretary of State James Baker was concerned about the possible demonstration effect with regard to Yugoslavia. His concern lay, however, not with the signal that U.S. policy in Ethiopia would send to the Yugoslav secessionists or irredentists or to the Yugoslav government; he was worried that allies and the media would treat the decision to recognize Eritrea as an independent state as a precedent and pressure the United States to approach the Croat and Slovene secessions in a "consistent" fashion. Baker called Cohen the morning after the London Conference agreements had been announced and expressed anxiety over statements that Cohen had made in favor of Eritrean self-determination. Cohen recalls that Baker told him, " 'this could cause me a lot of problems, because we are under heavy pressure by the German government now to recognize Slovenia and Croatia. We don't want to do that.

We want to maintain the unity of Yugoslavia and when you say we want to support self-determination you know now the Washington press will sandbag us with that . . . it points out inconsistency.' "[39]

The U.S. Congress also expressed some concern—after the fact—about a possible demonstration effect and a more significant shift in U.S. policy vis-à-vis secessionist movements. Cohen responded: . . . "I do not expect a generalized movement in Africa at cession in every tribal or ethnic group trying to establish their own country. I think there are some special cases however. The Eritrean People's Liberation Front conquered the country away from Mengistu and they have reached a very pragmatic solution with the new Transitional Government of Ethiopia . . . There is an intellectual understanding of what these people strive [*sic*]. That does not mean we support cession. I am just saying we understand there are special reasons in some cases . . . So far we have agreed with self-determination for Eritrea and nothing more."[40]

Ambassador Cohen did, however, recognize that the perception of a precedent could be a problem, especially when dealing with territorial boundaries. "The territorial integrity of states is not to be taken lightly in any situation," he remarks.[41] In Africa this is a particularly sensitive issue, because of the potential for competing claims by hundreds of ethnic groups or tribes. Thus, despite the determination that Eritrea did not fit the OAU colonial boundary paradigm, the United States waited until the last possible moment to relinquish strict adherence to the existing territorial boundaries of Eritrea.

Yet, once the decision had been made in London, the United States never wavered from support for the partition of Eritrea. Ambassador Cohen asserts, "there was no point at which the U.S. would rethink its strategy."[42] The United States could only finesse the question of partition by stating that Washington would recognize the outcome of a referendum on independence in the name of self-determination, providing its policy some semantic cover.

Other U.S. officials who were responsible for policy regarding the Horn in 1991 dismiss the notion that fear of a demonstration effect impacted upon U.S. decisionmaking in this case. James Woods, the Pentagon's former deputy assistant secretary of state for African Affairs, states matter-of-factly, "These things [secessionist movements and resulting civil wars] are looked at case by case pragmatically and we don't care about principle. In Eritrea and Ethiopia we wanted the parties to agree . . . We were interested in procedure, so that the issue of principle didn't apply."[43] Indeed, a journalist, writing at the time, noted the attention to process, or means, over outcome, reporting that U.S. diplomats, "emphasized that the U.S. favored 'self-determination' for the Eritreans only as the result of a negotiated, internal agreement."[44]

An Africa expert who was a congressional staffer at the time maintains that a "judgement was made that this would not have large echo-effects," because there were "special factors involved."[45] When asked directly about a potential demonstration effect, or pressure to apply principles consistently, this former staffer responds, "The demonstration effect is nonsense."[46] James Woods comments that the demonstration effect had "no impact in this specific case."[47] Indeed, Woods scoffs, "The consistency is ad hoc, case-by-case decisionmaking—principle is a convenient finding if it supports your policy."[48] Woods adds flesh to the bones of a political scientist's observation that because American decisionmakers approach problems as crises, "there has been a continuity of sorts that one finds in the fabric of America's policymaking, but it is continuity that exists in terms of contingency planning for crises."[49]

Nonetheless, while it was not decisive, fear of a demonstration effect had a tempering effect on U.S. policy. It caused U.S. officials to delay relinquishing their public adherence to the territorial integrity of Ethiopia, and affected the means by which the partition was implemented. Until the U.S. government was forced to alter its position by the military reality of EPLF control of Eritrea, it consistently advocated confederation as the ideal political solution. However, there was no earnest attempt to convince the Eritreans to accept this arrangement. U.S. policymakers recognized that Washington would not win this political battle at least six months before it publicly relented. The delay can be explained by wishful thinking, consideration for the OAU, and some fear of demonstration effect in Ethiopia proper. There was less fear that allowing Eritrea to become an independent state would encourage other secessionists or states to take certain proactive or preemptive action, than concern that this was an OAU fear. U.S. policymakers regarded Eritrea as a "special case" and expected that others would too. But just in case groups in Ethiopia would be tempted to make a land-grab, Washington persuaded the Eritreans to hold off until the EPRDF had consolidated its hold on the government and its instruments of power.

The U.S. government was sensitive to the demonstration effect, but not concerned about it. It is possible, however, that if the media had made the link between Eritrea and the former Yugoslavia, as Secretary Baker feared they would, the United States might have backed away from support for Eritrea. The demonstration effect is based entirely upon perception, and had the media treated the situation as a precedent—along with the decision that was ultimately made to cave in to German pressure and recognize the Yugoslav successor states—Washington might have tempered its policy in the Horn. None of this, however, came to pass. In the final analysis, the

United States supported the partition of Ethiopia, and there is nothing in the documentary or oral record to support the proposition that this decision resulted either because of fear of a demonstration effect, or despite it. Fear of the demonstration effect only affected the way the United States managed the announcement and implementation of their policy regarding partition.

Ethnic Interest Group Lobbying

Eritrean- and Ethiopian Americans became involved in discussions regarding the secession of Eritrea. However, their influence was not exerted in groups, but rather on an individual basis. For Ethiopians and Eritreans alike, "there was no unifying group, no umbrella lobby." They made their mark as they do today, "less in terms of lobbying, but as individuals."[50]

The Ethiopians and Eritreans focused their efforts mainly on Congress, in a more diffuse, indirect way on the administration, and made little to no effort to rally public opinion. Congressional interest in Ethiopia was chiefly limited to two issues from the late 1980s to 1990–91—hunger and the Ethiopian Jews, or Falasha. As a senior congressional staffer during that time explains, "to the extent that members were interested in Ethiopia, it was because of the Cold War, famine or because of the Jewish immigrant question."[51] He adds, "the primary focus of any congressional interest was humanitarian."[52] The most obvious manifestation of this was the establishment of the Joint Committee on Hunger, chaired by Representative Tony Hall, which held hearings that addressed the situation on the Horn, partially, if not exclusively. Some of this legislative interest was translated into policy focus. Ambassador Cohen recalls, "hunger in the Horn was another bipartisan burning issue."[53] So much so that "impressed by the level of congressional interest," Deputy Secretary of State Eagleburger instructed Cohen to give the issue high priority and demonstrate this by visiting the Horn on his first trip as assistant secretary for African Affairs.[54] Meanwhile, contrary to what one might have expected, the 26-member Congressional Black Caucus did not become significantly involved in the Ethiopian–U.S. policy debate.

Ethiopian American Interest Groups

Though it was individuals who made the case for the various Ethiopian perspectives, some Ethiopian Americans were nonetheless, organized into interest groups, which were lobbying in Washington in the aftermath of the fall of Mengistu. Ethiopian immigrants had come over in waves—first, after Selassie came to power, second after the Derg took control, and finally in the

1980s and 1990s. The bulk of the Ethiopian Americans were Amhara, especially those who comprised the third wave of immigrants. Oromos were the next numerous group, followed by the Tigreans, who were relatively few in number.[55] In total, about 100,000 Ethiopians (including Eritreans) were living in the United States in 1991.[56]

The organizations representing the Ethiopians included The Private Office of His Royal Highness Ermias Sahle-Selassie, the exiled Amhara descendent of Emperor Haile Selassie, as well as the Oromo American National Foundation (a civic social organization). The Oromo Liberation Front also had an office in Washington, DC, which provided unofficial representation for the main Oromo insurgent group, and an Amhara opposition group, Coalition of Ethiopian Democratic Forces (COEDF), was based in Washington at the time. Moreover, in 1991, Mengistu also attempted to lobby the Bush administration and Congress to his cause, primarily through the public relations firm, Pagonis, but also to some extent via the Israeli embassy and AIPEC. One influential Ethiopian American, Jonas Deressa, a representative of the Ethiopian Democratic Union, who focused on cultivating Republican support, managed to gain the ear of Representative Toby Roth, and testified at a hearing in the early 1990s.[57] Probably influenced by this contact, Roth warned the administration on October 11, 1989, not to negotiate with Mengistu or his Communist rivals. Yet, Ambassador Cohen insists that the administration "had bipartisan support because our objectives were noble: peace in Ethiopia and the emigration of Ethiopia's Jews."[58]

The Ethiopian Americans were eager to see their homeland transformed into a democratic state, and were opposed to any partition of its territory. However, while they were universally opposed to Mengistu, they were divided with respect to who should rule once the dictator was gone. Since most of the exiles were Amhara, and indeed, they were the most vocal of all the ethnic groups, the U.S. government was under some pressure to assuage concerns about the EPRDF majority-Tigrean government. Immediately after the EPRDF took control of Addis Ababa, Ethiopian Americans began lobbying their congresspeople through letters demanding that the United States "pressure the provisional rulers of Ethiopia to hold the planned all-parties conference somewhere outside of Ethiopia under a neutral chairman, preferably a senior U.S. official."[59] These efforts had some effect. For approximately six months there was considerable congressional intervention aimed at reversing U.S. policy regarding the EPRDF. Senators David Boren and Richard Lugar wrote letters to Ambassador Cohen echoing the demand for a neutral conference, questioning U.S. acceptance of the fait accompli. Senator Boren invited Ambassador Cohen to his office so that he could

reiterate his constituents' concerns about the EPRDF. Representatives Toby Roth and William Gray III appealed directly to Secretary of State Baker, sending him letters on June 4, expressing concern that the United States had "decided to favor one side."[60]

Congressional pressure did not bring about a change in U.S. policy. The administration remained committed to the planned conference under EPRDF auspices. Nonetheless, in an effort to assuage legislative concerns, Ambassador Cohen publicly insisted that the transitional government would receive no U.S. aid, if a democratic system was not established. Some of this rhetoric can be explained by the successful lobbying of Ethiopian opponents of the EPRDF. "Stating this requirement was meant in part to assuage these groups. The latter could feel that so long as there is democracy in Ethiopia they could come to power through the ballot box."[61]

Ambassador Houdek, the former charge in Addis Ababa, explains that Ethiopian American ineffectiveness resulted, "because the greater Ethiopian diaspora is ethnically divided, they can't organize. Their resentment is ethnically based."[62] Ethiopian Americans were only capable of agreeing to one goal—removal of Mengistu from power. According to a congressional staffer at the time, "the Ethiopians were very divided . . . fighting each other and confusing the picture."[63] The Ethiopians were characterized as having "lots of clout because they become citizens swiftly and lobby very well."[64] Nonetheless, the Ethiopian Americans were not able to achieve any of their objectives. The transition from the Mengistu regime to the provisional and then transitional government was entirely engineered by the EPRDF, and despite U.S. urging that the government include members of the opposition, most of the real opponents of the EPRDF were left out of the government. Many were also excluded from the negotiations of May and July 1991.

Likewise, on the question of Eritrea, Ethiopian American opinion was brushed aside. Most Ethiopian Americans were opposed to Ethiopia's partition; again these were preponderantly Amhara, as smaller less dominant groups were less emotional on the subject and even indifferent. The objection to Eritrean independence was formulated in historic terms, that is, Eritrea is an integral part of the ancient Ethiopian kingdom and should therefore remain part of the modern state, or the objection was based on fear of an internal demonstration effect. In 1991 leaders of the 3,000-strong community of Ethiopian Americans in Atlanta held a demonstration against U.S. policy. Their spokesman maintained, "If it [the U.S. government] lets Eritrea secede, there is no way the government can deny it to any other group, which is the dismemberment of Ethiopia."[65]

Jewish American and Israeli American Interest Groups

As for Mengistu, he clearly lost on the ground, but he also failed to win any support from Congress. Though he bolstered the Israeli conviction that Eritrean independence would be inimical to Israeli interests—that the Eritrean rebels were pro-Arab Marxists—the leadership on Capitol Hill was not won over by their Israeli or Jewish contacts. The same held true for the administration. Though the Israeli embassy exerted enough influence to secure a meeting for Mengistu in 1990 with Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, this "didn't have any impact. Mengistu was such a known loathed figure, the war was going in the wrong direction."[66] Indeed, Congress and the administration ended up reversing the Israeli stance vis-à-vis Eritrea. In the aftermath of the Eritrean capture of the Massawa, the Ethiopians launched a disproportionately destructive assault on the city, utilizing cluster bombs and needlessly killing Eritrean civilians. This was captured on videotape and broadcast on Nightline; there was a special video viewing on the Hill and pressure was exerted on the Israelis to refrain from providing Mengistu with military assistance.[67] So, while, "AIPAC and the Israeli embassy whispered words here and there that good relations with Ethiopia was a priority . . . the Israeli and U.S. views were not too far off."[68] Once Mengistu had exiled himself to Zimbabwe, Israel and the Jewish lobbies began—just as the United States did—to reorient themselves to the new realities, and to give the opposition groups, including the separatist EPLF, a second look.

The only Ethiopians who saw their objectives met—largely because of excellent ties to Congress and the administration—were the Jewish Ethiopian Americans. The North-American Conference on Ethiopian Jewry and the American Association of Ethiopian Jewry (AAEJ) were able to pressure the U.S. government to make the Falasha cause the number one short-term priority in 1990–91. They had very good access to decisionmakers, which was no doubt facilitated by the fact that there was a natural synergy between this issue and general humanitarian concerns regarding Ethiopia and the interests of the chief U.S. regional ally, Israel. As Ambassador Cohen described it, "the issue of Ethiopian Jewry was quite hot in Congress . . . ,"and "AAEJ Executive Secretary Will Recant, a regular visitor to the Africa Bureau, kept the issue alive and brought us excellent information about events in Ethiopia."[69] Once the Falashas were out, however, the Ethiopian Jews disengaged. They did not involve themselves in the question of Eritrea's political or territorial future. This was also true for their allies in the broader Jewish lobby. "The Jewish groups were so happy the Falashas were gone—they said our work is done."[70]

Eritrean Americans

The Eritrean Americans, though much smaller in number, were not plagued by such divisions. Those individuals who presented arguments to policymakers did not represent groups or perspectives opposed to the EPLF. "The major Eritrean organizations opposing the EPLF had no connections with Washington. At least there was no visible sign of such connections."[71] The audible Eritrean voice was unanimously pro-EPLF. Moreover, it was pervasive and persuasive. Eritrea, one official exclaimed, . . . "is one African country that covered the [Capitol] Hill better than anyone in town with the exception of South Africa."[72] "The contrast of Eritreans to their Tigrean counterparts was that they had a very, very well-developed network among the diaspora."[73] There was "a consultative quality to the diaspora participation."[74] So that in exchange for the remittances the Eritrean Americans sent back to their homeland, they enjoyed close cooperation with the EPLF leadership and an exchange of information. However, the EPRDF ultimately benefited from the EPLF's activism vis-à-vis Capitol Hill. After 1988 the EPLF established an office in Washington. In 1989, Isias Afewerki, who was secretary-general of the EPLF visited Washington as part of a sweeping public relations tour of the major Western capitals. One former staffer recalls, "the EPLF representatives that were here in town that were very well-spoken, very effective . . . they made their presence known on the Hill . . . to the extent that people knew about the TPLF [EPRDF] it was through the EPLF."[75]

The Eritrean Americans who lobbied members of Congress and their staffers during 1989–91 to convince them that Eritrean independence was a cause they should endorse, were not organized into formal groups. They represented the EPLF perspective officially or informally. Key staffers maintain that they "didn't know of any grass roots Eritrean organizations," and that there were no major campaign donors among the Eritrean Americans.[76] Despite the lack of formal organization, Eritrean Americans—working together with the EPLF leadership—effectively created a favorable climate for the partition of Ethiopia, primarily among a small set of legislators and staffers on Capitol Hill.

The Eritreans gained some congressional supporters, including the chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative Howard Wolpe, and his successor Mervyn Dymally, as well as the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee, Representative Dan Burton. Representative Frank Wolfe was also positively inclined toward the Eritreans, as was a bipartisan group of congressional staffers who periodically met to discuss policy vis-à-vis Eritrea. "On that issue," one of the erstwhile adherents of the staff group explains, "we found

a meeting of the minds. It's quite remarkable."[77] They maintained steady contact with the Eritreans, meeting with Issais Afewerki, who was then the secretary-general of the EPLF, when he visited Washington, hosting receptions for the Eritreans and giving them a voice, often inserting their statements into the Congressional Record. These legislative staffers and their employers became convinced by the EPLF that the Eritreans deserved to have their claims reconsidered by the UN. A negotiated settlement that might result in independence for Eritrea was not out of the question. Meanwhile, the administration was feeling the impact of grassroots Eritrean American activity. While official policy in 1989 continued to defend the sanctity of the Ethiopian borders, Ambassador Cohen recalls, "it discomfited me personally, however, because wherever I traveled for speaking engagements, Eritrean Americans were there to protest. They were relentless picketers."[78]

The Impact on the U.S. Government

Ethiopian- and Eritrean Americans were an active presence on Capitol Hill, but they were not able to translate their pressure into congressional pressure on the administration. This is mainly because, for Congress on the whole, Africa policy was of little interest. Efforts were limited to letter writing. Senator Lugar wrote to National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft urging the administration to arrange Mengistu's removal from Ethiopia. The reasoning was, "if he's gone, the amount of killing and destruction has a greater probability of being reduced. At the same time, we get the Falasha [Ethiopian Jews] out."[79] There is no evidence that such letters alone were decisive.

The administration remained fixed on the course it had chosen—prepared to allow the Eritreans to select independence. The Ethiopian Americans protesting U.S. policy regarding the EPRDF and Eritrea could not effect change. The State Department merely had to wait six months for congressional pressure to abate. Meanwhile, the Eritreans had managed to convince a handful of key congresspeople to support their cause. There was general acceptance of the notion of an Eritrean state among these legislators and their staffs, and these were the individuals who might have held up funding or publicized their dissatisfaction by holding hearings and publicly upbraiding administration officials. Instead, the treatment Cohen received on the Hill was very favorable. Most praised the administration for preventing the crisis in Ethiopia from engulfing the capital and paralyzing the government, as similar civil conflicts had done in neighboring Somalia and in Liberia.

U.S. policy was made without much regard for how the ethnic groups or Congress might react, because the Ethiopian- and Eritrean Americans did not have tremendous congressional influence in terms of dollars, cents, or votes.

Meanwhile, Congress was more concerned with humanitarian issues than with territorial questions. According to the legislative perspective, if Eritrean independence would eliminate conflict, humanitarian aid would flow more freely, indigenous agriculture and trade would develop, and the overall objectives in Africa would be met. Moreover, among those who participated in the legislative wrangles of that time, there was a strong sentiment that not only was the role of lobby groups and Congress inconsequential, but so was U.S. policy. The Eritreans were going to take their independence anyway. This is probably accurate, but the means by which Ethiopia was partitioned saved lives and maintained stability in the short run. The credit for that lies with the parties to the conflict, as well as the United States and USSR.

Conclusion

Washington supported the creation of the Eritrean state, because it was not regarded as destabilizing. Indeed, it was expected to bring the 30-year civil war between the Eritreans and the Ethiopian army to an end. The Israelis were not opposed, because they made the same assessment about conflict, and if the U.S. administration had deemed partition likely to spur conflict, even Israeli urging on behalf of Eritrea would not have been likely to cause a change in U.S. policy. Stability was simply more important than maintaining alliance cohesion or, in this case, healthy bilateral relations. Fear of a demonstration effect was not officially expressed, though there was some sensitivity. Nonetheless, this was not sufficient to stop the United States from supporting partition. Finally, the ethnic lobby groups were divided, with one only somewhat stronger than the other, but neither was influential enough to cause a shift in congressional opinion from one side or another, and certainly not in the administration's policy. Again, the only factor here that finally forced the United States to give up its long-standing adherence to territorial integrity was the desire to bring stability to the Horn, and the recognition that withholding support to Eritrea would only provoke more armed conflict.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 4

Bosnia-Hercegovina

Background

The history of Yugoslavia holds the roots of the struggle among Bosnia's ethnic groups to partition the territory of Bosnia-Hercegovina, the conflict that raged in Bosnia from 1992 to 1995. The war in Bosnia was triggered by power politics, by elites who manipulated deeply rooted ethnic tensions to benefit their quests for political and economic supremacy. The proximate causes were political, spurred on by economic realities, but they combined with fundamental tensions, of a historical and eventually primordial nature, to explode into the bloody, merciless mayhem of ethnic conflict.

Yet, it was never inevitable that Bosnia would be torn apart and placed under a de facto partition. Fighting among ethnic groups is a recurring event in Bosnia, but it has always been provoked from outside Bosnia, and never has the violence sliced so clearly and deeply along the lines of ethnic affiliation as it did in the 1990s.[1] Save periodic peasant uprisings, the Bosnians were at peace with one another from 1878 to World War I, and after World War II two generations of Yugoslavs were raised in Bosnia. Throughout Bosnian history, animosities existed among the different ethnic groups, but these were largely linked to economic issues (such as the insurrections Christian peasants staged against Muslim landowners). World War II left 1.7 million Yugoslavs dead; about 1 million were casualties of interethnic fighting. However, even then, Muslims fought alongside the Croat fascists and with the Serb Partisans, while Serbs and Croats fought against the paramilitary organizations associated with their ethnic group. Only in the 1990s—with the exception of the defenders of Sarajevo—were all sides in Bosnia recruited almost exclusively from their ethnic group. Ultimately, the ruthless, relentless nature of the

conflict led the international community to impose a political compromise, leaving neither the irredentist groups nor the central government satisfied.

Communist Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia emerged from World War II as the successor state to the kingdom of Serbs and Croats.[2] It was a country of Slavs, but also included Germans, Hungarians, Albanians, Romanians, Turks, Greeks, and Ruthenians. The Yugoslav constitution recognized the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, and Montenegrins, and after a revision in 1974, the Muslims.

The Communist ruler of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, offered an ideology of multicultural Yugoslavism as a rationale for unifying the various southern Slav and other ethnic groups living within the Yugoslav borders, but Tito failed to embark on a campaign to eradicate old ethnic affiliations. Power struggles among the ethnic groups were moderated, but the Communists embark or imposed a strong Yugoslav identity. Tito simply superimposed a multinational veneer of Yugoslavism over the existing ethnic identities. Nonetheless, with one-third of the urban population intermarried by 1991, Tito and his Communist Party had managed to convince the elite that they were multinational and to secularize Yugoslavia, including Bosnia.[3]

The problem was that while Tito was able to maintain the delicate political balance among the main ethnic groups in Yugoslavia, his reform of the federal system, which gave greater responsibilities and latitude to the republics, set the stage for ethnic bickering. In 1974 Tito revised the constitution, devolving power to the republics. He had already designated Kosovo and Vojvodina as "autonomous regions" in recognition of their ethnic composition (Kosovo, the heart of ancient Serbia was 90 percent Albanian, and Vojvodina's population was about 60 percent non-Serb). Four years later he instituted the collective leadership system, whereby the presidency rotated among republics and party posts and executive positions were distributed evenly among the Yugoslav nations. The new federal system only encouraged competitive regionalism; combined with economic distress and the total discrediting of communism, the situation was ripe for exploitation by the amoral politicians who took Yugoslavia crashing to its destruction.

With Tito's death in 1980, the balance-of-power among the republics, which had merely papered-over differences instead of reducing them, began to shift. Slobodan Milosevic, who was head of the Serbian Communist Party at the time, began to consolidate his power, forcing his erstwhile mentor Ivan Stambolic from his post as Serbian president in 1987. Stambolic was accused of being soft on the Kosovan Albanians. In Serbia, as early as 1968

nationalists had begun voicing their concern that Kosovo, home to some of the oldest Orthodox churches and the battlefield where the Serbs were defeated by the Ottomans in 1389, was becoming an Albanian region, with ethnic Albanians comprising about 90 percent of the population. Milosevic's political maneuvering ultimately meant placing the Serbian republic in a position of supremacy relative to the other Yugoslav republics. This was to have a wrenching effect on the tenuous balance among the republics, and within Bosnia itself, tearing the latter apart. Moreover, once communism was discredited there was no competing ideology, save nationalism, to take its place. Democracy didn't have a chance. The elites who favored democracy did not have the power to implement their ideas, and quickly found themselves politically, and ultimately physically, squeezed out of Yugoslavia.

The Independence Movements

With the first democratic elections in 1990, the Yugoslav Federation began to unravel in earnest. The elections brought victory to the nationalist Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) in Croatia, and for a liberal–nationalist coalition in Slovenia. The leaders of both republics, Franjo Tudjman and Milan Kucan, respectively, initially attempted to modify the Yugoslav system from a federal to a confederal one, where the republics would retain real authority and the federal bodies would serve as joint agencies. Milosevic was unwilling to entertain such plans. His aspiration was to bring Yugoslavia under Serbian domination, and later, failing that, to forge a Greater Serbia by annexing portions of Bosnia and Croatia to Serbia-Montenegro ("rump" Yugoslavia). Milosevic professed a commitment to holding Yugoslavia together as a federation, even as he exploited and ultimately destroyed the constitution, which served as its legal foundation.

In summer 1990, Serbs in Croatia began organizing their resistance to the local authorities. The Serb population was radicalized through a disinformation campaign. They were recruited as Serb irregulars staged incidents aimed at instilling insecurity, and finally, the federal army was asked to intervene. By 1990, with Serbia holding the federal presidency firmly in Milosevic's control, asking the army to intervene was simply a method of obtaining reinforcements and heavy weaponry.

In December 1990 Slovenia held a referendum on independence; with a turnout of over 90 percent, 89 percent voted in favor. In May 1991 Serbia refused to rotate the Yugoslav presidency to Stipe Mesic, a Croat; from this point forward the Yugoslav federal system was paralyzed. On May 19 the Croatian referendum on independence garnered a 92 percent vote in favor. Finally, on June 25, 1991, a year after Serbian insurgents had begun rebelling

in Croatia, the Croats and Slovenes declared independence simultaneously. After a ten-day skirmish between the Slovenian territorial defense forces and the Yugoslav National Army (JNA), the Yugoslav army retreated. Slovenia had secured its independence and its borders. In Croatia, full-scale war erupted between ethnic Serbs and paramilitaries from Serbia who worked together to drive ethnic Croats from their homes.

A single ethnic group comprised the clear majority in the federal republics of Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia, and Montenegro. This was not the case in Macedonia and Bosnia. The presidents of Bosnia and Macedonia, Alija Izetbegovic and Kiro Gligorov, respectively, immediately recognized that the implications of the independence movements for their republics were grave. With Slovenia and Croatia seceding from Yugoslavia, Bosnia and Macedonia were threatened with being reduced to the status of provinces in a Greater Serbia. This was unacceptable to the leadership of both republics. In the case of Bosnia, the potential change in the status of the Muslims and Croats within the republic relative to the Serbs was particularly problematic. Already in 1990 Bosnian Serb nationalists, led by Radovan Karadzic, were agitating for autonomy within Bosnia. Their ultimate aims were irredentist—contiguous union of the territories where Serbs lived with Serbia. By September and October of that year the Bosnian Serbs had begun establishing illegal military formations, supplied and trained by the JNA.

In the aftermath of the 1990 elections Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic formed a government of national unity. The Bosnian population at that time was 44 percent Muslim, 31 percent Serb, and 17 percent Croat.[4] Rather swiftly, the Serb nationalists quit the government and the remaining representatives voted to seek Bosnian independence.

On November 12, 1991, President Izetbegovic appealed to the UN to send a preventative peacekeeping force. His request was turned down. The following day, the Bosnian Serbs declared the establishment of the Serb Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina, and on December 22 Izetbegovic made another plea for UN forces to be posted along Bosnia's borders. By this time the JNA had already occupied the communication centers in Bosnia, and the Bosnian Serbs were completing construction of heavy artillery positions around the major towns.

The Bosnian government held a referendum on independence on March 1, 1992. Sixty-four percent of the population voted—the Serb leadership called for a boycott—and the result was an almost unanimous assent to the establishment of a multiethnic independent state. On March 27, the Bosnian Serbs announced the establishment of the Bosnian Serb Republic, and in the same month Milosevic and Tudjman held a meeting where it is

widely believed they outlined plans to divide the territory of Bosnia between their states. On April 6, 1992, the EC recognized Bosnia-Hercegovina as a sovereign state. U.S. recognition followed the next day. The following month Serbian paramilitary troops invaded Bosnia, augmenting the military effort already initiated by Bosnian Serbs and JNA soldiers.

The War

In about two weeks Serb forces had captured the key towns commanding roads linking Bosnia with Serbia and Eastern Croatia. By the end of May 1992, the Serbs controlled 60 percent (this went up to 70 percent later) of Bosnian territory, including western Bosnia (except Bihac and its surroundings) and most of eastern Bosnia. This frontline was to remain essentially unchanged until summer 1995.[5]

The conflict was international, to the extent that the governments of Serbia and Croatia had initiated it and were directing it, but it also resembled a civil war as Bosnians took up arms against one another. Nonetheless, the military resources and politico-military strategy coming from Zagreb and Belgrade determined the shape, direction, and duration of the war. "... Even though some of the soldiers serving in the federal army were Bosnian Serbs, and even though it was coordinated with elements of a Serb insurrection in some areas, this was predominantly an invasion of Bosnia planned and directed from Serbian soil."[6] Of course there were denials from the Serbian and Croatian governments, but their own words and actions belied them.[7]

The International Response

In August 1992 with over 50,000, mostly civilian, dead and more than two million homeless as a result of the war in Bosnia, the EC convened the London Conference. The territorial integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina was reaffirmed and Serbia-Montenegro/rump Yugoslavia was identified as the aggressor. Lord David Owen, as the EC representative and Cyrus Vance representing the UN, were given a mandate to arrive at a negotiated solution to the conflict. However, the internationally recognized Bosnian government, as such, was ignored as they convened negotiations among the three ethnic groups—a tacit acceptance of the nationalists' premise that the three groups could not live together—at a time when the Bosnian cabinet still included six Serbs, five Croats, and nine Muslims.[8]

Vance and Owen unilaterally drafted the Vance–Owen Plan that divided Bosnia into ten cantons. Each of these had a majority ethnic group, but they were arranged in a patchwork to avoid creating three contiguous ethnic territories. Vance–Owen was initially accepted by the Bosnian Croats and

eventually by the Bosnian government, but the Bosnian Serbs rejected it on four separate occasions in 1993—on January 12, 1993 and again in March, April, and May. The first revision of the plan already carried ethnic labels and it motivated the warring parties to forcibly link their cantons. This led directly to the initiation of an all-out Muslim–Croat war in central Bosnia in February 1993. Muslim–Croat cooperation ceased and paved the way for a rapid succession of Serb victories.

The developers of the plan failed to harness the means to obtain the assent of the parties—coercive instruments or incentives. The Europeans viewed the problem as military and humanitarian, not political; the problem for them was the fighting, which was driving refugees into their states. In addition, suffering and starvation on the European continent were challenging their self-image and sense of morality. At this point the Europeans and their North American allies did not perceive that the Bosnian war and their response to it affected their democratic principles, their ability to forge an effective consensus within the transatlantic alliance, or as precedent-setting. They worked assiduously to avoid becoming politically entangled in this Balkan imbroglio, but stopped short of asserting as Secretary of State James Baker characterized U.S. interest, that they "had no dog in this fight." The international community insisted that their responsibility in Bosnia was humanitarian; the political issues were almost intractable and could only be worked out by the parties to the conflict.

Nonetheless, the Western European and North American governments had to provide the appearance of managing the war in Bosnia; the threat of public backlash was too great, especially as the press uncovered Serb atrocities in the form of concentration camps in Omarska and elsewhere. Their response was humanitarian and ad hoc. A UN contingent of about 200 staff officers entered Bosnia in spring 1992, but their initial mission was to establish the headquarters for the UN peace operation in Croatia, mandated at the conclusion of the fighting with Serbia in 1992. The decision to place them in Sarajevo was a consolation prize tossed at Izetbegovic after the UN refused his request to deploy a preventative force into Bosnia.[9] In June 1992, the Security Council authorized a small humanitarian mission, and an arms embargo was placed over the six former republics of Yugoslavia. In October 1992, about 8,000 UN soldiers—the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR)—were deployed in Bosnia to protect the aid convoys and contain the conflict.

In March 1993, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 836 creating "safe areas" around those Muslim towns that were resisting the Serbs but were encircled by them.[10] It was an effort to save lives without assisting ethnic cleansing—a charge that was continually being leveled at the UN as they

evacuated Bosnians (mainly Muslims) from their towns under the guns of their opponents.

On April 17, the UN Security Council approved a resolution to tighten sanctions on Serbia, which up to that point had had minimal effect. Ten days later, President Bill Clinton met with members of the U.S. Congress to discuss the possibility of conducting air strikes against Serb targets. This prompted Karadzic to signal his approval of the Vance–Owen agreement and to submit it to the Bosnian Serb parliament for approval. The West called off discussions of military action and the Bosnian Serb parliament rejected Vance–Owen. A May 15 referendum on the plan obtained a resounding negative response from the Bosnian Serb population.

On June 20, 1993, the European Union (EU), the newly expanded EC, formally gave up on the Vance–Owen plan but asked David Owen to keep negotiating with the help of Thorwald Stoltenberg, a Norwegian diplomat; even in the face of this failure, the EU offered no carrots or sticks to the warring parties. The resulting Owen–Stoltenberg plan of August 1993 allocated 52 percent of the territory to the Serbs, 30 percent to the Muslims, and 18 percent to the Croats; this mirrored the Milosevic–Tudjman plan to divide Bosnia. Nevertheless, it also failed to obtain acceptance by the Bosnian Serbs; Karadzic was more ambitious than Milosevic. Meanwhile, in June NATO finally offered to provide close air support to UN troops.

In early 1994, the United States began effecting reconciliation between the Croats and Muslims. The resulting Washington Agreement called on the parties to merge their armies and to establish a federal framework. In the same year the Contact Group—the United States, Russia, France, Germany, and Britain—was established. The members were divided with regard to their perspectives on the conflict and affinities for various parties. The Russians supported Milosevic, the United States was sympathetic to the Bosnian government, the Germans favored the Croats, and the British and French, accused of harboring pro-Serb sentiments, defended the interests of the UN operation.[11] Nevertheless, the group agreed on two major points: they would not become involved in a ground war and any solution would have to contain some territorial and ethnic de facto partition.

In June 1994, the Contact Group proposed another solution to the Serbs; this plan was similar to its predecessors and granted the Muslim–Croat Federation 51 percent of the territory and the Serbs 49 percent. The UN/EU team threatened the Serbs with lifting the arms embargo from the Federation if they refused to sign, and promised to lift the economic embargo on Serbia–Montenegro if they did sign. The Serbs rejected it and increased sniping and shelling in Sarajevo.

Only in 1995—when force was finally coupled with diplomatic efforts—were the Serbs willing to come to the negotiating table. A confluence of events finally brought a cease-fire to Bosnia. First, the situation on the ground was changing—the Federation forces were getting stronger. The United States had smuggled communications equipment to the Bosnian army, which allowed them to coordinate their offensives, and as more arms entered the Federation, the Muslim advantage in manpower was beginning to offset the Serb advantage in heavy weaponry.[12] Indeed, by October 1995, the United States had to urge Izetbegovic to halt his offensive, which was days from capturing the Serb-held town of Banja Luka; the loss of this town threatened to humiliate the Serbs into abandoning the negotiations and to destabilize the situation in Serbia, the likely destination for an estimated 200,000 newly created refugees.[13] Meanwhile, in a sudden offensive the Croatians had expelled Serb forces and sent 180,000–200,000 Serbs running to Serbia for safety.

The United States initiated talks with Milosevic in May 1995, despite divisions within the U.S. government regarding the wisdom and morality of dealing with him and of negotiating territorial swaps. The proposed agreement maintained the 51 : 49 split between the Federation and the Serb republic, and in exchange for Yugoslav or Serbian recognition of Bosnia, the economic embargo would be at least partially removed. The talks came to a pause with the August 19 accidental deaths of Ambassador Robert Frasure, the head of the U.S. delegation, and two members of his negotiating team, whose armored personnel carrier flipped off a road and into a minefield while enroute to Sarajevo. However, on August 28, a shell landed near the open market in Sarajevo, killing 37 and wounding 88, and when crater analysis demonstrated that it originated from Serb positions, NATO bombs rained down on the Serb besiegers. It was the largest operation in NATO history. Over the course of two weeks 3,400 sorties were made, with 750 attack missions against 57 targets, including ammunition bunkers, SAM missiles, and communication centers.[14] With the tacit approval of the United States, Federation forces swept across over 100 square miles of Serb territory in one week.[15]

The Dayton Peace Agreement

On September 14, the Bosnian Serbs signed an agreement to withdraw their weapons around Sarajevo and begin negotiations for peace; the siege of Sarajevo lasting three years and four months, ended. Milosevic was empowered to represent the Serbs in negotiations and on November 21, after 21 days of negotiations, the General Framework Agreement and its annexes, commonly referred to as The Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA) or Dayton,

was initialed. Bosnia was to remain sovereign in name, with a weak central government and two contiguous territories—one for the Serbs and the other for the Muslims and Croats. The Federation would be strengthened. The Bosnian Serbs with about 31 percent of the population secured 49 percent of the territory of Bosnia and Hercegovina and recognition of the right to live separately. The Muslims, 44 percent of the population, held onto 25 percent of the land, and the Croats, only 17 percent of the population, came away with 25 percent of the territory. After four years of war, tens of thousands of deaths, and about 2 million displaced persons, the three ethnic groups had all signed the same agreement.

The DPA is composed of two components: a separation of militaries and, by implication, communal groups along a geographic and political non-sovereign boundary (established and enforced by military intervention), that is, partition, and political arrangements aimed at achieving a confederation.

The U.S. government is now firmly opposed to the secessionists and irredentists in Bosnia. The Bush and the Clinton administrations, for most of the latter's first term, exhibited an ambivalent attitude toward the Bosnian state. Accordingly, sovereignty was recognized, but Sarajevo was not assisted in its campaigns to defend its territory and citizens. Only in 1994 did the U.S. government begin to take an active role in resolving the conflict, finally bringing it to a close in 1995. The policy was to preserve Bosnia at all costs; the specific price was considerable autonomy for the Bosnian Serbs, and for both the Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats the right to special, quasi-confederal relations with neighboring Serbia and Croatia.

The Position of Allies and/or Dominant Regional States

The U.S. allies agonizing over the fate of Bosnia included Britain, France, Germany, or effectively, the key European NATO members and France. From the moment Bosnia-Hercegovina declared its independence, to the instant the United States government recognized it as a sovereign entity, and to the conclusion of the settlement that currently determines Bosnia's international and domestic political disposition, the United States attached paramount significance to the position of its European allies. The question of how the U.S. government should respond to Serb and then Croat irredentist movements was always addressed with explicit or implicit reference to Europe and the transatlantic relationship. "The war," said the Special Representative of the President and the Secretary of State for the Implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords, "challenged our vision of a united Europe to strengthen American security. That's why we want not just

to stop the war, but to secure peace."[16] The United States was anxious to cooperate with its chief Western European allies—Britain, Germany, and France—and careful to at least coordinate with Russia, the largest continental military power.

The Bush Policy

The U.S. approach to Bosnian sovereignty and the wars that erupted over irredentism was based on the overall U.S. policy regarding the fall of Yugoslavia. The fundamental element of that policy during President George H. W. Bush's administration was that Europe would have primary responsibility for managing the crisis. The Europeans had insisted that this humanitarian problem was theirs and that the "hour of Europe," not of the United States, "had dawned." It was the moment for the EC to prove itself on the foreign policy front. Initially, there was no place for NATO or even the UN. The Europeans were determined to fashion a common policy to stop the Balkan wars without U.S. interference. "Key European allies, already disappointed with Washington's cold reception to the idea of an EC-based common defense policy, would have considered unfriendly any attempt by the United States to frustrate their wish to treat Yugoslavia as a matter of EC common foreign policy."[17]

Meanwhile, Washington was pleased to regard the conflict as European, squarely in the backyard of the European members of the Atlantic Alliance. As a result the Bush administration deferred to European requests to take the lead in negotiating a solution to the crisis, mistakenly agreeing that the effort might strengthen the "European pillar" of NATO and efforts to establish a defense arm of the Western European Union (WEU).[18] The Bush administration already had its hands full with the Gulf War, the fall of the Soviet Union, and the presidential election campaign season. Perhaps the most telling statement from the administration was: "Our domestic problems are myriad and cry out for attention. We want somebody—anybody—to take over the load overseas."[19]

The media outrage and public disgust in the wake of the discovery of the concentration camps in Omarska, Temelin, and other central Bosnian towns prompted some stronger language, but the only action taken was under UN auspices. Secretary of State James Baker asserted that the United States would not use unilateral force and would only consider using force if its European colleagues were prepared to do so under Chapter VII of the UN charter.[20] Finally, under pressure from several Arab states, in December 1992 the lame duck Bush administration attempted to persuade the Europeans to support lifting the international arms embargo on Bosnia. France and the United Kingdom remained opposed, and the United States gave up the effort. Briefly the administration dropped the rhetoric that mirrored that of the

Europeans (blaming all three ethnic groups) and spoke out against Serb atrocities and violations of agreements.[21]

The Clinton Policy

As a presidential candidate, William Jefferson Clinton gave the impression that he would deal more forcefully with the irredentists in Bosnia and provide the Bosnian Muslims the opportunity to defend themselves. His campaign speeches accused the Bush administration of turning its back on Bosnia; Clinton indicated that he favored lifting the arms embargo against the Bosnian government. The early rhetoric from his Secretary of State Warren Christopher also had a determined ring. Christopher declared that the United States "must say no" to the Serbs to protect multiethnic democracy in Bosnia.[22] He explained that President Clinton would take six steps with regard to Bosnia: engage actively in the European-led Vance–Owen negotiations; communicate to all three parties that the only means to reach peace is to negotiate; tighten the enforcement of sanctions and political pressure on Serbia; reduce the suffering in Bosnia via the enforcement of a no-fly zone; support the establishment of a war crimes tribunal; and help implement any agreement that the parties might reach. Yet from his Senate confirmation speech onward, Christopher was emphatic that the United States must work with its allies and the European institutions.[23]

Christopher delivered a strong reminder to NATO allies in February 1993 that U.S. involvement should not allow the Europeans to conclude that they could relax their efforts. Europe, the secretary of state asserted, will play a leading role and the UN, European Community, and NATO will serve as implementers of its policy.[24] At the same time the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Peter Tarnoff maintained that the United States lacked leverage and the inclination to employ military force to manage problems such as Bosnia.[25] The Clinton team, like its predecessor, preferred to avoid unilateral action. Indeed, until the U.S. military was suddenly and shockingly bloodied in Somalia in 1993, "aggressive multilateralism," a term coined by Madeleine Albright while serving as U.S. ambassador to the UN, was the preferred approach to foreign policy challenges.

The Clinton administration feebly attempted to influence European policy regarding Bosnia first, with its lukewarm support of the Vance–Owen negotiations and then, with its proposal to lift the arms embargo on the Muslims and to prosecute air strikes against the Serbs. Vance–Owen collapsed partly because of U.S. efforts but the lift and strike proposals were allowed to founder upon heavy British and French opposition. Critics of the February 1993 Christopher mission assert that he went to Europe ready to

take no for an answer. The United States remained unwilling to demand that the agenda be altered or to take any unilateral action. All effort was focused on developing a consensus among the United States, its West European allies, and Russia. National Security Advisor Lake explained, "washing our hands of the problem by unilaterally lifting the arms embargo and walking away would be a profound mistake. It would blow a hole in our ability to implement sanctions against Iraq and Libya . . . It could provoke the most serious rift in NATO history, and certainly, the most serious since the 1956 Suez crisis."[26] In addition, Lake added, the problem would then really fall to the United States to solve and might provoke the use of U.S. ground troops. So even in the wake of the lift and strike initiatives—when the United States was attempting to lead proactively—Christopher stated, "This is a multilateral problem . . . Furthermore, at heart this is a European problem."[27] Finally, he shifted the blame from "the Serbs" to "ancient hatred and atrocities on all sides," echoing the common European perspective.[28]

In the aftermath of the failed Christopher mission, the United States quickly fell in line with the European proposal to establish safe areas for endangered Muslim towns and Sarajevo, which was manifested in the UN Security Council Resolution 836. The rapid consensus obtained for the safe area proposal largely stemmed from the political desire to unify European and American policies. Christopher ratcheted back his rhetoric; while in February he qualified the crisis in Bosnia as strategic, by June he was calling it humanitarian. Again, this mirrored the perspective of the major European allies. During that same time period, though the United States was able to obtain European (the French and Russians were most stubborn) agreement to NATO air strikes to deter attacks on Sarajevo and the town of Gorazde, the price Washington paid was a compromise in its own declaratory policy. The United States signed the Joint Action Program, a Russian initiative, which would divide Bosnian territory along the 49:51 ratio split. The Clinton administration essentially signed a map, despite the fact that it had consistently emphasized that the preservation of a multiethnic Bosnian state was the objective and that the irredentist aggressors would not achieve victory. "Until then, American policy had not envisaged or condoned partitioning Bosnia. The new initiative, although purporting to keep Bosnia whole, was a long step toward partition."[29] Yet, such a partition was only de facto; the Untied States remained opposed to de jure partition.

Though the Clinton administration had slightly realigned its policy to match that of the Europeans, differences among the allies and within the administration led to increasing tension. Christopher was publicly squabbling with the French, who were urging the Americans to pressure the Bosnian government to sign the Vance–Owen agreement; this was causing

great agitation for the secretary and his colleagues who did not want to appear to force the Muslims to accept an arrangement that some policymakers, and the press corps in general, viewed as unjust.[30]

The Differences among Allies in Understanding the War

The clashes among NATO and Security Council members regarding Bosnia occurred because of differing interpretations concerning the causes of the war (these opinions were often colored by traditional political relationships or cultural affinities, e.g., between the Russians and Serbs, the French and Serbs, and the Germans and Croats) and divergences regarding the relative importance of reestablishing stability versus assuring that justice was served. Generally speaking, the Europeans tended to be more pragmatic; their immediate concerns involved stemming the refugee flow or eventually repatriating those who had sought protection or assistance in their countries. From the start, they were chiefly interested in containing the conflict, which was also a primary goal of the Americans. While the Europeans expressed outrage regarding the atrocities committed in Bosnia, the Americans went further in calling for punishment of the aggressors and emphasizing the need for peace that was not only stable, but just. However, as the war dragged on the Clinton administration itself was polarized between the goals of stability and justice. This would be reflected in the Dayton Agreement, a compromise among the Serbs, Croats, and the Bosnian government, and between peace and justice. Yet, no agreement would have been possible if pragmatic thinking had not prevailed. "The U.S. decision in May 1995 to talk seriously to Milosevic, the traditional villain of the Balkan peace, indicated that in the Clinton administration the wish to end the war was gaining the upper hand over the wish to punish the Serbian aggressors."[31]

The Threat to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Alliance

The British, French, and Russian governments, diplomats, and soldiers maintained that all the three ethnic or communal groups were to blame (sometimes even equally). They propagated the interpretation of the Balkan wars, which stated that ethnic conflict arose from suppressed ancient hatreds released by the fall of communism and totalitarianism; all hands were bloody, and there was no rational way to comprehend what was happening. They spread the impression that the Bosnian conflict was too difficult to understand and therefore impossible to manage. By portraying it as a lost cause, an enigmatic quagmire that threatened to suck the democratic nations of Western Europe and North America under, they could assure themselves that any intervention would be hopeless. (Of course, there were more than a

few prominent Americans who shared this opinion.) This thinking proved convenient to the Serb forces, which were making military gains and were actively frustrating any diplomatic or military intervention.

The U.S. and German governments, on the other hand, regarded the Serb leaders—of Serbia and Bosnia—and Tudjman as aggressors who had harnessed the dark forces of nationalism via political maneuvering and authoritarian exploitation of the media. Milosevic had substituted his repressive nationalistic regime for the oppressive Communist one of Yugoslavia. Greater Serbia was being built by a policy of genocide. The Americans in particular, sympathized with the Muslims, the obvious underdogs, and felt an urge, at a minimum, to level the playing field.

Although motivations often differed, the Russians, French, and British took identical or similar positions, generally contradictory to U.S. and German policy. The French and British, because the bulk of the UNPROFOR forces were composed of their citizens, opposed the use of punitive airpower, justifiably fearing that their troops would be taken hostage. Suggestions of air strikes almost always targeted the Serbs and, for this reason, Russia lined up with the British and French, who were also fairly and extremely pro-Serb, respectively. The Russians were interested in cooperating with Milosevic and Serbia and therefore did not wish to see the men under "Yugoslav" sponsorship suffer what they deemed biased assaults. In August 1993, the United States managed to push the UN to establish procedures for conducting air strikes with NATO forces. The resulting agreement was an operational disaster requiring prior approval of the commander of UN forces in the Balkans (at that time Lieutenant General Jean Cot of France), the secretary general of the UN, and all 16 NATO members. After a series of disagreements, the system was amended with the appointment of Yasushi Akashi in December 1993 to act as the secretary general's representative in the field (Zagreb), empowered to act on airpower requests. Nevertheless, this "dual key" system—where both the UN and NATO were required to approve the use of force—continued to hamper attempts to enforce UN resolutions. In no situation was this more blatant than in the safe areas created in 1993 by Resolution 836. The security of these towns could not be guaranteed if there was no system of enforcement and no means to protect threatened populations.

For three years, the United States followed the European lead with respect to managing the crisis in Bosnia. The general approach and several specific initiatives failed, and each left a wake of bitterness and dissention between the United States and its European allies. Indeed, the NSC Advisor's fears were realized. National security analysts noted in 1995, "disagreements

among Britain, France, and the United States over NATO policy toward Bosnia have brought intra-Alliance relations to their lowest point since France's departure from the integrated military structure (1966) or, perhaps, the Suez Crisis (1956)."[32] Under President Bush, the United States gave the Europeans the lead on managing the Balkan conflicts. The Europeans chose to mediate via the auspices of the EC, a relatively new organization with little diplomatic or operational experience. The EC operated under a UN mandate and as a coequal of the international organization when conducting negotiations. Yet, because it was a weak organization, it found much of its diplomatic initiatives competing with UN resolutions and its goals diverging with those of a Security Council member state, which was not an EC member—Russia. Ultimately, only the United States, using NATO, was capable of enforcing policy consensus among all of the Contact Group states, even Russia. Furthermore, unlike NATO, the EC never had an operational military capability, that is the ability to actually apply the threatened sticks.

The UN and the EC (later as the EU) could not reconcile the two opposing viewpoints among the allies. Without naming the Serbs as aggressors there was no way to mandate action to affect the outcome of the war. Only half measures could be taken: tough diplomatic language regarding air strikes, protection of convoys and safe areas, but no actual enforcement when a bluff was inevitably called. Picking aggressors would have compromised UNPROFOR's impartiality and the thin veneer of consent under which it operated. And as frustrations rose because differing interpretations and policies made coherent strategy impossible, the European and North American governments lost credibility and became even more irritated with one another. NATO, tasked with enforcing UN Security Council Resolutions effectively under UN command (dual key), was being severely tested. In fact, attempts to manage the Bosnian crisis were having such a negative impact on NATO that the status of the alliance became a crisis in and of itself.[33]

Both the Bush and Clinton administrations avoided acting unilaterally and allowed the Europeans to lead at least until 1994, but by 1995 this had changed because of the various political and foreign policy pressures negatively impacting the Clinton administration. As Anthony Lake saw it, "Clinton was being increasingly boxed in—by the United Nations, the NATO allies, his own State and Defense Departments which didn't want to move, and now the Republicans and Senator Dole."[34] The latter was dangerously close to pushing through a Senate resolution to unilaterally lift the arms embargo and authorize airstrikes against violators of the various UN resolutions. The others had brought the administration to the point where U.S. troops would be required to extract UN peacekeepers, if the Bosnia mission

failed. Ultimately, Clinton had to put troops in. The only question was whether they would be inserted into a hostile environment as a rescue team, or into a permissive one as peacekeepers. Would U.S. troops enter a war zone to extract UNPROFOR soldiers or would they be deployed in conjunction with a peace agreement to monitor and enforce compliance? As Secretary of State Warren Christopher expressed it to the Senate in October 1995, "I think we face a fundamental choice now. Will we go forward, seek a peace agreement, and be willing to implement it? If we turn away from that, we will almost certainly be in a situation that will deteriorate. Our NATO allies will want to pull out. That will put us in the position of having to supply ground troops . . . ."[35]

In mid-June 1995, Lake began working on his "Endgame Strategy" for Bosnia, a course of action that would be developed by working backward from the conceptual desired endstate. The objective was to take the U.S. policy out of crisis management mode. The final version of Lake's initiative, approved by the president on August 9, was "a peace settlement based on simpler borders and no enclaves . . . "[36] The Serbs would be threatened into compliance by a bombing campaign and the Bosnian government would be confronted with the possibility that if they refused to negotiate, the United States would lift the arms embargo and leave.[37] The administration declared that Lake would present, not propose, the plan to the Contact Group governments; implying that the U.S. government was going to implement it, with or without the support of its allies or the UN. But the plan was none other than the Contact Group plan, the one the British and French had been pushing for months.

For three years U.S. prestige had been eroded, and with it the credibility of NATO and the future of the alliance. Transatlantic relations grew strained with each debate over air strikes and/or lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian government. The Europeans viewed U.S. proposals for air strikes as irresponsible because they would endanger UNPROFOR troops. The British (and Americans opposed to air strikes) maintained that there was no guarantee that the Serbs would back down as a result of the bombing; instead they were more likely to take revenge on the UN soldiers. The fact that none of the peacekeepers were American made the bad feelings worse. Ironically, by summer 1995, stopping the war in Bosnia became the key to restoring ailing transatlantic relations. Vice President Gore asserted, "The need for us to protect and preserve the alliance is driving our policy."[38] "The Yugoslav war moved from being an important question for European stability and security and a test of the then CSCE's brand new Conflict Prevention Center, to being a test of the future of the EU Common Foreign

and Security Policy; from that it moved to being a test of UN diplomacy and UN peacekeeping; from that it became a test of European, Transatlantic and East–West relations and post-cold War cooperative security; and finally, it became a test of NATO credibility and with that of international and particularly American credibility."[39] And so it was that by 1997 Clinton's second National Security Advisor Samuel Berger declared, "at the time of Dayton, there was a compelling case for American engagement in Bosnia on humanitarian grounds alone . . . But our interest was not just humanitarian. Under these conditions, Bosnia would have remained a source of dangerous instability in Europe. We have learned from hard experience in this bloody century that America's security and Europe's stability are intimately linked . . . Indeed, a larger conflict would have cast doubt on the viability of the alliance itself. Allowing nationalist aggressors to dismember Bosnia, in the middle of Europe, would have undermined the prospects for building a new Europe that is democratic, undivided and at peace, a Europe that can strengthen America's security in the 21st century."[40]

The Allies Compromise

From the beginning of the conflict in Bosnia, the U.S. position regarding the irredentist Serbs and Croats was negative. Washington insisted on the preservation of Bosnia's sovereignty and territorial sanctity. Officially, there was no difference between U.S. policy and that of its allies, although the Europeans were more willing to engineer territorial compromises among the ethnic groups. The United States allowed the Europeans to take the negotiating lead from 1991 until 1994. Washington did not blatantly oppose European policy at any time nor did it seek to unilaterally enforce its own design. At the points when the administration sought to change its approach it insisted on waiting until it could act multilaterally; in effect, the United States tried to convince the Europeans to change their policies too. If London, Paris, and Bonn remained unconvinced, as they did in 1993 regarding lift and strike, the United States gave up and fell in with the European ranks.

More significantly, after opposing the Vance–Owen plan and quietly scuttling the UN–EC negotiations because of the American desire not to reward the aggressors, the United States finally agreed to compromise in 1994–95. Despite their varied attitudes, the United States adopted the Contact Group's 49 : 51 territorial formula as the basis of the Dayton Agreement, despite the fact that Washington had consistently expressed reluctance regarding territorial compromise. In the end, the United States accepted the pragmatic European perspective and acceded to de facto partition. Indeed, the Clinton administration's sense of realpolitik led the United

States to extend military assistance to Croatia, and allow equipment from the United States and other sources to be placed at the disposal of the Muslim–Croat Federation.

From 1991 to 1995, U.S. declaratory policy varied from European declaratory policy. The United States accused the Serbs of aggression and insisted that they would not be rewarded. Administration officials used terms like "justice," and spoke about preserving Bosnia's sovereignty. The United States tacitly supported the Bosnian Muslims and the government in Sarajevo, while the Europeans argued that all sides were equal and effectively favored the Serbs and Croats. At the same time, however, the same players described the conflict in European terms, as one stemming from ancient ethnic hatreds, where all sides were equally culpable. In effect, the declaratory policy covered all bases. More significantly, from 1991 to 1995, U.S. operational policy was carefully coordinated with the Europeans. Only at certain points did the Untied States attempt to operate at cross-purposes with the Europeans—at the very end of the Bush term, when the United States proposed lifting the embargo on Bosnia; in February 1993 when the United States proposed lift and strike; and in encouraging the Bosnian Muslims to hold out for a better deal than Vance–Owen.[41] In the first two instances, the United States backed down when it did not obtain European support.

The United States gladly followed the European lead during the Bush administration but it forced a compromise during the Clinton administration. However, the latter refused to fully accept the de facto partition until events on the ground reflected the Contact Group map, and when it appeared likely that the French and the British would call in the U.S. guarantee to extract their peacekeepers. In the final analysis, Washington was convinced by its allies to take a more decisive role but did not agree to partition Bosnia.

The Fear of Continued Conflict and Spillover

The fear that the conflict in Bosnia would spill over into neighboring states was probably the most consistently articulated reason from 1992 to 1995 for bringing U.S. diplomatic and military power to bear on peace efforts in Bosnia. Both the Bush and Clinton administration officials expressed fear that the conflict would spread from Bosnia to Macedonia, Kosovo, and perhaps even involve Hungary and the two Balkan NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. As one former Bush advisor stated, "the chief American strategic concern during the Bush administration, and later under Clinton, was to keep the Yugoslav conflict from spreading southward, where its flames could leap into the Atlantic alliance."[42] Washington was also wary of the destabilizing effect the economic

embargo was having on the neighboring Balkan states, particularly Romania and Bulgaria, as their governments struggled to reform their political and economic systems. The U.S. government was concerned about containing the conflict inside Bosnia as a "humanitarian problem" primarily through humanitarian means until 1994–95, when it appeared that the perpetuation of conflict within Bosnia's borders alone was affecting U.S. strategic interests.

The Bush Policy

On August 6, 1992, in his first major statement regarding the recently erupted war in Bosnia, President Bush characterized it as "a true humanitarian nightmare," announced that the U.S. would establish full diplomatic relations with the new governments in southeastern Europe, and declared, "we must contain conflict from spilling to neighboring states."[43] He proposed sending civilian monitors to the endangered areas and examining what NATO could do to help. Bush asserted that the U.S. government was doing everything it could to avoid using force, explaining "this crisis so far has afflicted only areas within the former Yugoslavia, but there is no guarantee it will not spread further."[44] He specifically voiced his concern regarding Kosovo, Vojvodina, and Albania. Bush had ruled out the application of limited force to stop the fighting in Bosnia and protect the state's sovereignty, "but our assessment could change if the situation changes. The stakes could grow; the conflict could threaten to spread."[45] The implication was that spillover into these areas might prompt U.S. intervention. Indeed, in 1989, the Bush administration issued explicit warnings to Belgrade that if they took military action in Kosovo to quell ethnic Albanian dissent or to stir up unrest, Washington would respond with force. On December 25, 1992, Bush reiterated this message in his so-called Christmas Declaration. "Washington was so certain that this threat was necessary that it made it despite the misgivings among its UN Security Council partners."[46]

In a statement issued by the North Atlantic Council, NATO ministers asserted: "we are deeply concerned about possible spillover of the conflict, and about the situation in Kosovo."[47] Bush and British Prime Minister John Major elaborated on the policy implications in a joint statement delineating three objectives in the former Yugoslavia: peace and a just settlement, preventing the conflict from spreading to Kosovo and Macedonia, and maintaining humanitarian aid (with over 2,000 British troops). The administration and its allies concluded that if war broke out in Kosovo, Albania would become involved. This would then draw in the Macedonian Albanians, which would lead to Serbian and Greek intervention in Macedonia and a response from Bulgaria and Turkey to prevent Greek influence in that area. "Whereas the Bosnian war could be

contained, conflict in Kosovo most likely could not."[48] In effect, the United States was more concerned about the effects of internal repression in Serbia than irredentist genocidal activities that threatened the survival of the Bosnian state.

The Bush administration was criticized as "aloof and harsh" with respect to the situation in Bosnia. Though Secretary Baker declared, "... the world community is appalled at the atrocities that are taking place in Bosnia-Hercegovina ... None of us should try to find reasons for not taking some sort of action to try and end what truly is a humanitarian nightmare in the heart of Europe," there was no follow-up.[49] Even after the existence of concentration camps had been revealed by the Western media, Baker's successor was arguing that the killing was inevitable, that all sides were equally culpable, and that there was nothing the outside world could do to stop the massacres.

The Clinton Policy/Administration

The Clinton administration's initial statements highlighted the humanitarian situation, much as its predecessors had, and continued to raise concerns regarding spillover and the demonstration effect. In Clinton's inaugural speech, he declared that the United States would be prepared to use force if "the will and conscience of the international community is defied."[50] Warren Christopher asserted that the United States must pay attention to the situation in the former Yugoslavia because, "We cannot ignore the human toll ... Our conscience revolts at the idea of passively accepting such brutality." Beyond humanitarianism, "the continuing destruction of a new UN member state challenges the principle that internationally recognized borders should not be altered by force. In addition, this conflict itself has no natural borders. It threatens to spill over into new regions, such as Kosovo and Macedonia."[51] Again, he noted that Greece, Albania, and Turkey could become involved, and commented that the refugee situation would be highly destabilizing. As the United States began to coordinate implementation of UNSCR 836 on the safe areas, Christopher explained that the initiative was aimed at halting the killing "and contributes to our goal of containing the Balkan conflict."[52]

The June 10, 1993, North Atlantic Council's final communiqué emphasized that the policy of the allies was to prevent spillover. Clinton, under European pressure to demonstrate his conviction, sent 300 ground troops to Macedonia as part of the UN monitoring force, "to try to forestall a wider conflict."[53] In addition, he repeated Bush's warning to the Serbs that military action in Kosovo would trigger unilateral U.S. action. Meanwhile, Clinton did take action to alleviate the humanitarian situation, continuing to provide assistance to international relief efforts and providing a substantial amount of direct U.S. aid.

In March 1993, Christopher asserted: "we believe it is of critical importance that this conflict be settled on terms which will preserve the independence and territorial integrity of Bosnia. Such a solution would be in keeping with our values as a nation and the goal of preventing a wider Balkan war."[54] In May, as the secretary of state reported on his mission to convince the Europeans to accept lift and strike, he stated, "there are, of course, issues of conscience and humanitarian concerns at stake in this situation. But fundamentally our actions are also based upon the strategic interests of the United States. All of us seek to limit the risk of a widening instability that could lead to a greater Balkan war."[55] One of his subordinates explained, "Our policy has been to try to stop the killing through a negotiated settlement and prevent the conflict from spreading, while making a major contribution to humanitarian efforts to ease the suffering."[56]

Containment and De Facto Partition

The primary policy objective regarding Bosnia up until 1995 was to deter spillover. "U.S. policy on Bosnia by late 1992 was driven not by a resolve to defeat aggression but by a desire to bring humanitarian relief to aggression's victims."[57] American efforts focused on containing the war and alleviating the humanitarian disaster provoked by the participants. Clinton's only mention of Bosnia in his 1994 State of the Union address was in praise of the U.S. troops conducting the humanitarian airlift.[58] Ultimately, however, without singling out aggressors, there could be no unified policy to punish or prevent aggression and thereby put an end to the humanitarian disaster. The policy of negotiating with all sides to find any common denominator played directly into the attritionist, maximalist strategy of the irredentists (especially the Serbs). By 1995, however, the U.S. administration recognized that war in Bosnia itself threatened the NATO alliance. To achieve a more durable containment the United States and its allies need to take additional measures. The National Security Advisor in 1997 explained, "At the time of Dayton, there was a compelling case for American engagement in Bosnia on humanitarian grounds alone . . . But our interest was not just humanitarian. Under these conditions, Bosnia would have remained a source of dangerous instability in Europe. We have learned from hard experience in this bloody century that America's security and Europe's stability are intimately linked."[59] Spillover was still cited as a rationale for engagement. National Security Advisor Lake voiced ". . . concerns about a new Balkan war with spillover that could draw in the Greeks and the Turks; and what could be more uncivilized than—I hate the euphemism 'ethnic cleansing.' "[60]

The United States recognized that there were no firewalls against ethnic conflict spreading throughout the Balkans. Yet, whether spillover was more or less imminent no longer mattered.

Fear of the conflict continuing or spreading was not sufficient to cause a shift in U.S. policy toward the Contact Group model. Concern for the transatlantic alliance and U.S. credibility, and the desire to insert troops into a benign environment (not as extractor of peacekeepers, but to enforce an agreement) were also required to spur the United States to take action in 1994–95. The fear that conflict would spill over was high, though the only threat that was levied directly to prevent this concerned Kosovo, and not Bosnia. All U.S. policy from 1991 to 1994 was designed to prevent spillover (stationing troops in Macedonia) and to contain the humanitarian disaster in Bosnia. Operationally the focus was on airlifts and supporting UNPROFOR. Meanwhile, the administration struggled with its concerns regarding justice for the Bosnian Muslims and attempted to convince their allies to level the playing field. Humanitarian concerns were consistently voiced, but even concentration camps and genocide did not move the United States to take a bolder position in defense of the Bosnian state and against the irredentists. From 1994 to the signing of the Dayton Agreement, when the United States adopted the European territorial compromise, Washington's motivation was concern about potential regional spillover. By 1994–95, however, the United States had determined that continued conflict in Bosnia and potential spillover threatened the viability of NATO. According to a State Department official, "The fundamental concern was spillover, but the more ostensible cause was humanitarian—to 'do something' . . . We were afraid that spillover could destroy what we had spent fifty years building."[61] If the conflict did not end and/or if it spread, it might lead to war among NATO members, if Greece and Turkey became involved, or, at a minimum, a diplomatic standoff and the political failure of NATO.

The fear of widening conflict derived its impact from geostrategic considerations. The fear of spillover was considerable but operated in conjunction with other factors to affect the resulting political outcome. Its significance was increased in large part by the linkage with something the administration valued—NATO, its only operational defensive alliance and the cornerstone of U.S. national security policy in the transatlantic area. Once the situation in the Balkans was regarded as a threat to the transatlantic alliance, the United States was compelled to act to minimize the likelihood that conflict would spread. This meant ending the conflict in the most expeditious fashion.

The Demonstration Effect

U.S. officials frequently vented concern regarding the possible demonstration effects that might follow in the wake of the war and the Western response. The Bush and Clinton administrations were anxious to avoid an outcome that might encourage other secessionists or irredentists in the area, or anywhere in the world, to follow the Bosnian Serb and Bosnian Croat examples. Policymakers wanted to assert U.S. interests and values, to make a clear statement regarding issues of self-determination and sovereignty. From the very beginning as Yugoslavia began to fall apart, officials declared, "the United States will not encourage or reward secession . . . We firmly believe that Yugoslavia's external or internal borders should not be changed unless by peaceful consensual means."[62] The Bush administration insisted that peace would come through coexistence and not through separation.

Throughout the war the State Department, in particular, justified its opposition to the Vance–Owen agreement and any other plans to divide Bosnia and reward the irredentists based on concerns about the precedent such settlements might establish. The principle of sovereignty was evoked, as were human rights. Early in the conflict, before the war had widened to include Croatia and the Bosnian Croats, Acting Secretary Eagleburger assured the Bosnian foreign minister that the "'cantonization' of Bosnia-Hercegovina contradicts CSCE principles, sets a bad precedent for future conflicts, and could well lead to partition of Bosnia-Hercegovina—thus rewarding the use of force."[63] He added that respect for territorial integrity must be assured and that the United States would support efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution. Eagleburger recognized the risk that humanitarian assistance might allow aggressors to consolidate their landgrabs, thereby leading to the political cantonization that the United States opposed on principle. He explained that refugee returns would help ensure that political gains would not be recognized via bloodshed and human rights abuses.[64]

Eagleburger's successor, Warren Christopher, stated it more clearly and forcefully: "There is a broader imperative here. The world's response to the violence in the former Yugoslavia is an early and crucial test of how it will address the concerns of religious minorities in the post–Cold War world . . . Bold tyrants and fearful minorities are watching to see whether 'ethnic cleansing' is a policy that the world will tolerate. If we hope to promote the spread of freedom or if we hope to encourage the emergence of peaceful multi-ethnic democracies, our answer must be a resounding no."[65] President Clinton revealed how committed the United States was to preventing a bad precedent, how important the demonstration effect really was when it came

to tough decisions, when he declared, " 'The US should always seek an opportunity to stand up against—at least speak out against—inhumanity.' "[66] As two BBC journalists pithily noted, "The West was intent on preserving a unified Bosnia even if only on paper."[67] Ultimately, the United States was forced to accept the European solution—a de facto partition—with only the de jure sovereignty of Bosnia and the civil and political provisions of Dayton to provide them with the scant political cover they needed to declare that the United States had not compromised its principles and those of international law.

The Vance–Owen Plan

The roots of the de facto partition that is formalized by the Dayton Agreement lie in the reality of the failure to stop Serb advances and the Croats from starting their own offensive, as well as the precedents set by previous negotiations, particularly those of Vance and Owen. The UN–EC negotiators began by inviting the Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats, together with the Bosnian government. It did not initiate negotiations among three states—Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia—but among three different domestic groups. "Before the Bosnian government declared independence a set of rules and criteria were established as the basis on which Bosnia-Hercegovina would receive international recognition as an independent state. It met these criteria. Then the international community then abandoned this policy by treating the government of Bosnia-Hercegovina—at this point, still multinational—as if it were merely one of several contending factions."[68]

In refusing to offer direct military assistance to the Bosnian government in the form of weapons and military ground intervention and then holding international negotiations with parties to a domestic dispute, the sponsors of Vance–Owen were not siding with the state according to an international precedent. Instead they were signaling to the Serbs and Croats that the gains they made in assaulting Bosnia's territorial sovereignty would be tolerated. Military force would pay—the borders were not sacrosanct. "The Vance-Owen Plan in fact made a dramatic break with past diplomatic practice and in one swoop annulled a key principle of international law that had been agreed upon in the interest of fostering stability in political transitions."[69] The principle of *uti possidetis, ita possidetis* (you may keep what you had before), established during the decolonization of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, held that when colonial possessions became independent or existing states broke up, internal administrative borders

would be treated as legitimate.[70] Of course, this assumed that the new governments did not require military assistance to control their borders.

The failure of the Vance–Owen plan in spring 1993 as well as the demonstrated lack of resolve regarding the implementation and protection of the safe areas, brought on a turning point in the Bosnian war. Until then it had been primarily a war of the Serbs against the Croats and Muslims, but on June 16 Tudjman and Milosevic met and hostilities ceased between the Serbs and Muslims. The Croats initiated an offensive against the Muslims in a bid to consolidate their territorial gains—to bring the situation on the ground into consonance with the map that they wanted to serve as the basis for negotiations; since military advances were not being reversed by the international community's diplomats, the best policy was to put off a final agreement as long as military gains could be expected. For the Serbs, in particular, this became a race against time. While they possessed the distinct advantage in weapons and materiel, they were completely reliant upon Milosevic for additional troops; the Muslims significantly outnumbered the Bosnian Serb forces and were gradually acquiring new weapons and training. In time, the Bosnian government reversed the military advances of the Serbs, just as Milosevic was applying political pressure on them to negotiate. The result was the empowerment of Milosevic to initiate the negotiations leading to Dayton.

The Dayton Agreement

The parameters of the Dayton Agreement were established by the 1995 national security strategy, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*. According to this document, the United States had five policy objectives in the former Yugoslavia. First, a political settlement that preserves the territorial integrity of Bosnia. Second, preventing the war from spreading and endangering U.S. allies and the stability of the new democracies of Eastern and Central Europe. A third goal was stemming the refugee flow, and a fourth entailed halting the slaughter of innocents. Finally, the United States would ensure NATO's central role in Europe and maintain its role in shaping the evolving European security architecture.

Christopher explained, "…the preservation of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina as a unified entity, as a federal or confederal system, is fundamental" to the Dayton Accords.[71] He assured the U.S. Congress "the peace agreement, ultimately, will reinforce the territorial integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina."[72] Two years later, implicitly drawing a distinction between the de facto partition in Bosnia and the de jure partition advocated by some Western pundits, the National Security Advisor asserted: "I believe the

partitionists are wrong, because accepting partition means ratifying the worst ethnic cleansing in Europe in more than half a century. We should not give up on justice and reward aggression . . . Partition also would be wrong because it would send the message to ethnic fanatics everywhere that the international community will allow the redrawing of borders by force."[73] The creation of ethnically pure states would leave governments with grievances and inclined to expansionism—a recipe for more war.

The United States and its allies could not allow Bosnia to disappear from the map; had they done so they would have been accused of aiding and abetting genocide. They would also have been nullifying their own recognition of Bosnia and Hercegovina as a sovereign state in 1992. Although the EU and U.S. decision to grant sovereignty to Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, and Bosnia came in direct contravention to the 1975 Helsinki Accords, which stated that the borders of the European states could not be altered unilaterally and by force, the 1992 recognition was the latest precedent in international law regarding those territories and governments.

The problem was that Bosnia never possessed the traditional characteristics of a state. The government in Sarajevo did not have a monopoly on force. It did not control all of the armed forces or police within the state borders nor did it actually have firm control over its own military or paramilitary units, as was revealed after the war. It did not control the borders of Bosnia—goods, people, weapons, and materiel moved in and out of the country, subject only to the "customs" control of local warlords—and there was never a common currency. The arms embargo, and more significantly, the fact that Bosnia was landlocked and dependent on Croatian ports and Croatian or Serbian rail lines, meant that the new, inexperienced Bosnian government would find it terribly difficult—if not impossible—to exercise its authority and consolidate its territory.

The purpose of Dayton was to stop the fighting. This, in turn, would take care of the other objectives: restoring U.S. prestige and NATO unity, removing the threat to Clinton's campaign, and eliminating the need to send U.S. troops into a war zone. As for the territorial disposition of Bosnia, the issues of sovereignty and self-determination—or self-appropriation in the cases where territory was ethnically cleansed by force and especially in those towns, cities, and villages where the appropriator was not the majority ethnic/communal group—could not be decisively settled if the U.S. negotiator, Richard Holbrooke, was to obtain the agreement of all the Bosnian parties as well as the factions within the U.S. administration. The result was a compromise agreement. Bosnia remained a sovereign state but the Serbs got their "entity," a territorial unit with the right to form a special agreement

or relationship with Serbia. The Croats remained in the Federation with the Muslims, but they also obtained the right to forge special political ties to Croatia.

In short, the demonstration effect was a significant factor in the U.S. decision to deny de jure partition of Bosnia, and it also motivated much of the opposition to the European territorial initiatives. There was a fear that Vance–Owen and its successors would be the precursor to partition. Again, partition was anathema to the administration because it would set a poor precedent. By rewarding aggression and denying justice to the victims, it might encourage other would-be aggressors. Intertwined with this concern was the fear that once the United States had declared that the Serbs would not retain territory they had seized, backing away from this principle might damage U.S. credibility. In the final analysis, however, the United States conceded this point. The Bosnian Serbs, 31 percent of the prewar population, came away with 51 percent of the territory, almost where the cease-fire line fell in 1995. The sovereignty of the Bosnian state was severely compromised, and by 1999 it was obvious that other secessionists or irredentists in the region—the Kosovan and Macedonian Albanians—recognized the utility of force. The United States has never decided to support or not support partition based only on principle. Context has always been critical, especially the means employed by the secessionists and geopolitical considerations. In this case, the fear of a demonstration effect had little impact on the final decision to force a territorial compromise. However, preserving Bosnia's sovereignty was the first stated goal of the U.S. National Security Strategy, and the one principle that U.S. negotiators would never concede.

The Ethnic Interest Group Lobbying

American lobbying organizations linked to the Bosnian political organizations of each of the three ethnic groups emerged with the onset of war. Their efforts were aimed at shaping policymakers' perceptions within Congress and the administration. Each group worked to establish the definition of the conflict—what it was about and who the victims and aggressors were—and what the United States should or should not do about it. As an indirect means of achieving their objectives, they also targeted public opinion, mainly through the media. Both the Bosnian Muslim and Croat organizations painted the Serbs as the primary aggressors responsible for tearing Bosnia apart, and for adopting a political–military strategy that employed genocide. Meanwhile, the Serb interest groups insisted that all sides were equally culpable. Moreover, they maintained that they could not be blamed for

destroying Bosnia because there had never been a real multiethnic Bosnia. Much of the policy debate, especially on Capitol Hill, centered around the arms embargo on Bosnia and the possibility of conducting punitive, tactical, or strategic air strikes on the Bosnian Serbs. Lobbying efforts targeting the executive branch members also addressed the effectiveness and justness of the various peace agreements, and diplomatic and humanitarian interventions.

The Bosnian Muslim and Croat American Groups

The Bosnian and Croat lobby groups were almost indistinguishable, particularly with regard to their aims. In 1992 the Bosnian Americans aligned with the Croat Americans who were more numerous and concentrated (hence their potential political impact was greater). After fighting broke out between the Muslims and Croats in Bosnia in 1993, if Bosnian Americans wished to divorce themselves from the Croat American efforts, they joined the lobbying efforts conducted on their behalf by nonethnic American lobbies; all along these groups of influential Americans provided the best possibility for the Bosnian government case to be heard. The organizations supporting Bosnian Muslims and the central government argued that the territorial integrity of Bosnia and Hercegovina had been violated with the 1992 invasion of the JNA and the subsequent genocide against the Muslim population. The Bosnian Muslim lobbies maintained that the embargo imposed by the UN on September 25, 1991, constituted a violation of the UN Charter, which grants all states the right to self-defense. They urged the international community to lift the arms embargo so that the sovereign government and primary victims of the war could obtain the badly needed weapons to defend themselves. In addition, they were strong advocates of air strikes against the Serbs to punish violations of the various UN resolutions and to deter them from continued persecution of civilians and additional military gains.

The Croat American lobby groups shared the Bosnian Muslim lobbies' perspective regarding Serbian actions in Bosnia, while they also highlighted Serb attacks on Croatian citizens and cultural monuments, and Bosnian Croats' human and political rights. Like the Bosnian Muslim supporters, they wanted the arms embargo to be lifted so that Muslims and Croats could correct the military imbalance frozen in place and defend themselves. They called for the international community to "lift the arms embargo against Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina and provide the necessary air support to level the playing field."[74] The Croat American interest groups explained that the fighting between Muslims and Croats in Bosnia occurred when "the international community refused to protect the integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina and proposed plans for the partition of Bosnia-Hercegovina along ethnic lines.

Extremists of both the Croat and Muslim communities seized on this 'every person for him/herself' philosophy and began to fight each other."[75]

The main Croat American lobby groups claiming to represent 2.5 million Croats were the National Federation of Croatian Americans and the Croatian American Association. The National Federation of Croat Americans was an umbrella organization for two dozen Croat American organizations. It mobilized Croat Americans, lobbied members of Congress, and disseminated information on the Balkans in order to help produce independent, democratic, and free market Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina. The Federation maintained that it represented the "progressive mainstream of the Croatian-American community," and worked with other groups supportive of Bosnia.[76]

The Croatian and Bosnian governments hired the public relations firm, Ruder Finn, to work on their behalf from May to December 1992. In August of that year three major Jewish organizations (B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, and the American Jewish Congress) came out in support of the Bosnian Muslims and against the Serbs, an achievement credited by industry observers to Ruder Finn. Both the Serb and Croat/Bosnian lobbyists had been attempting to recruit Jewish groups to their cause based on allegations of World War II anti-Semitism, but had met resistance. However, when the media broke the story of the internment camps in Bosnia, the Jewish organizations reacted with an advertisement in the *New York Times* and a rally in front of the UN headquarters recalling the Holocaust and decrying Serb war crimes.

The Bosnian Muslims and the government in Sarajevo also enjoyed the allegiance of Muslim American groups in the United States such as the American Muslim Foundation.[77] However, they obtained the greatest and most effective support from nonethnic American interest groups, such as the Action Council for Peace in the Balkans, the American Committee to Save Bosnia (ACSB), and in 1995 the related think tank, The Balkan Institute. The Action Council, and its grassroots organization, ACSB, were founded in 1994 by State Department officials who resigned protesting U.S. policy regarding Bosnia. The funding and impetus came from financier George Soros, who hired the public relations (PR) firms the Sawyer Miller Group and The Wexler Group. The PR firms, in turn, worked with the former State Department officials and several influential individuals who had served in both Democratic and Republican administrations to establish the two organizations. The objective of both groups was to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia. They worked to accomplish this via lobbying Congress and administration officials, and drumming up grassroots awareness and support through various media outlets.

Serb American Groups

The Serb lobby groups stated that the Serbs had historically been victimized within Yugoslavia and Bosnia, and denied the fact that a genocide of the Bosnian Muslims was occurring. They repudiated the idea of a multiethnic Bosnia, and maintained that the war in Bosnia was a classic civil war, where all sides are guilty of aggression. The Serb lobbyists called for the termination of the sanctions imposed on Serbia and Montenegro, full recognition of the Bosnian Serb Republic, and evenhanded treatment of all the parties—which meant a continuation of the arms embargo on the former Yugoslav republics, including the weapons-poor Sarajevo government. They opposed any Western military intervention, and therefore strove to preserve the status quo with regard to U.S. policy, which emphasized diplomacy and neutrality, from 1992 onward. The Serb American lobby groups maintained a political agenda from 1990 to 1995 that was an unwavering extension of policy established by the Bosnian Serb leadership headquartered in Pale, Bosnia.

The Serbs established three major interest groups during 1990 and 1991. The first of these, the Serbian American National Information Network (SerbNet), was established by Congresswoman Helen Denich Bentley, one of the most vocal Serb Americans. SerbNet functioned as a PR organization, preparing and disseminating information in support of the Bosnian Serb regime's political mission. The organization also sponsored speeches by prominent individuals friendly to the Serb cause, most notably Major General Lewis Mackenzie, the first UNPROFOR commander. Mackenzie described a civil war, where not only were all sides culpable, but the Muslim government in Sarajevo was capable of cynically attacking their own citizens to galvanize Western military intervention.[78] Testifying before the U.S. Congress in May 1993, Mackenzie justified the use of force in order to obtain partition, by implying that it was the natural order of things. He blamed the Bosnian government for the continuation of the war, and encouraged the United States to pressure the Muslims to accept a partition settlement.

Serb Americans also established the Serbian American Voters Alliance PAC, and the Serbian Unity Congress (SUC). The latter, based in Napa, California and Washington, DC, functioned as a nationwide membership organization lobbying for Belgrade and Pale; indeed during the war the SUC financed the official representative of the Bosnian Serb regime in Washington. Like SerbNet, the SUC sponsored information campaigns targeted at Congress, the media, universities, and research centers. In its own words, "since the beginning of the conflict in Bosnia, Serbian Unity Congress has supported the Bosnian Serbs in their determination to retain

the land of their forefathers. We initiated an educational campaign on the true nature of the conflict to the American people and government officials, we collected humanitarian aid, we maintained liaison with the Bosnian Serb leadership, we participated in the Brcko corridor arbitration, and we developed an economic recovery plan for the Republic of Srpska."[79]

The Serb American community engaged the services of four PR firms during the course of the war.[80] SerbNet hired David Keene and Associates and McDermott/O'Neill & Associates. These two PR firms helped organize General Mackenzie's U.S. tour.[81] The SUC secured Manatos and Manatos, and Craig Shirley and Associates also managed a Serbian account. Manatos and Manatos worked to ensure that the viewpoint of the Pale leadership would be represented during congressional committee hearings, and provided financial support for Serbophilic speakers and journalists.[82] In addition, the firm's partners funneled campaign donations to friendly congresspeople and by 1994 they had formed an alliance with the well-established Greek American lobby, which could command greater resources and attention of politicians.

Of all the legislators, "the most popular recipient of Serb-American and Greek American contributions was the former chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee."[83] From 1993 to 1995, Federal Election Commission reports demonstrate that Representative Lee Hamilton received 47,141 in itemized contributions from leaders of the Serbian American and Greek American communities, many of whom were Manatos's clients.[84] On April 25, 1994, Hamilton received $9,525 in multiple contributions by Greek/Serbian Americans, who were Manatos's clients.[85] On that same day, Andrew Manatos testified before the Appropriations and Foreign Operations Committee in opposition to recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and against renewal of U.S. aid to Turkey. Three weeks later, on May 11, 1994, the former SUC President Michael Djordjevich testified before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.[86] But he was joined by his Croatian American counterpart, and two Americans representing the Bosnian Muslim perspective.

The Serb American community also made contributions to Senator Spencer Abraham, Senator Phil Gramm (for his presidential campaign), Representatives Dan Burton, Bill Baker, Richard Chrysler, and Joe Knollenberg.[87] From 1991 to fall 1995 the Serb American lobby had contributed at least $63,353 to congressional campaigns.[88] To some extent their efforts paid off, because they managed to get a hearing from prominent lawmakers, and helped shape the "talking points" for those who were opposed to taking action that would hurt the Serb cause. Yet, the fact that the SUC

obtained entré to so many congressional offices can be attributed to a desire for fairness and thorough fact-finding. According to one author, "it would be fair to say that the SUC's success depended less on its lobbying power and more on the predisposition and willingness of influential actors to tolerate seemingly 'balanced' and nonviolent solutions to the conflict in Bosnia."[89] The demonstrated legislative results of the Serb lobby's efforts were mixed. Senator Abraham and Representative Chrysler voted to lift the arms embargo, while Representatives Baker and Knollenberg voted against lifting it; a spokesman for the latter asserted that his vote had nothing to do with the Serb American contribution he had received.[90]

As for Hamilton, he did not take up vocal opposition to lifting the arms embargo until 1994. During the 103rd Congress, he sponsored "an amendment to urge the President to take the necessary steps to secure a UN Security Council agreement for the suspension of, or a limitation on, the arms embargo against Bosnia."[91] This served to emphasize his opposition to a *unilateral* lift. His position hardened when Clinton's did, and he was one of the key outspoken defenders of the administration's post-1993 opposition to lift and strike.[92] He was also opposed to the use of force—specifically airpower—to manage the crisis. Prior to the House vote of 319 to 99 in favor of lifting the arms embargo and Senators Robert Dole and Joseph Lieberman's efforts to achieve a similar victory in the Senate, Hamilton conducted a media campaign against lifting the embargo, arguing along with the administration, for a diplomatic solution to the conflict. Indeed, Hamilton's position concerning most major legislation was to support the Clinton administration's objectives and intent.[93] His opposition to lift and strike may have helped the pro-partition Serbs, who assisted him somewhat financially, but there is no evidence that Hamilton was convinced that dismembering Bosnia was a desirable solution.

The Impact

It is unclear whether congresspeople took positions or cast votes because they had obtained support from the ethnic lobbies, or whether certain lobbies supported them because of their demonstrated beliefs. Substantively, congressional lobbying differed from influencing public opinion or key administration officials regarding the question of partition, because of the emphasis on the lift and strike debate. This debate was not the same as the broader question of whether to keep Bosnia intact, however, its outcome was perceived to have implications for those that favored secession or maintaining the state. Since the initial military imbalance overwhelmingly favored the Serbs, lifting the embargo and conducting air strikes was expected to

improve the Bosnian Muslim military situation in the long run. For this reason, most Serb Americans argued against lift and strike, and generally against American military involvement.

However, several members of Congress strongly felt that the Bosnian government should have the right to defend itself, regardless of the immediate military and humanitarian consequences. The government of Bosnia-Hercegovina was calling for the embargo to be raised and international law supported it. Legislators became more vocal about the issue after the February 4, 1994 Sarajevo marketplace massacre, which received tremendous television coverage and provided a graphic testament to the humanitarian plight of the Bosnian Muslims. As public interest was stoked by the media, congressional debates grew more frequent. While there was one resolution in 1992 calling for termination of the arms embargo on Bosnia-Hercegovina and Croatia (and this was still focused multilaterally, under the auspices of the UN Security Council), by the summer recess of 1995 the Senate had voted seven times on bills and amendments calling for unilateral lifting of the embargo.[94] In 1994 both Houses of Congress went on record supporting a multilateral lift of the embargo, voted for a unilateral lift at various times in 1994, although not on the same piece of legislation, and in summer 1995 voted to terminate the embargo. "But Congress did not make policy. The Secretary of State, Warren Christopher; the head of the JCS [Joint Chiefs of Staff], John M. Shalikashvili; and Clinton's national security Advisor, Anthony Lake, made policy. Their priority was holding NATO together—and the British and French were clearly hostile to Sarajevo."[95] The president vetoed the bill to terminate the embargo on August 11, 1995. By then, Dayton was becoming a distinct probability.

The Bosnian and Croat lobbies did manage to garner public support and they sensed that after the Serb-run concentration camps were revealed, the Bush administration was more receptive to their arguments. Yet even the public outrage at the genocide in Bosnia did not work to persuade either the Bush or Clinton administration, or the 102nd, 103rd, or 104th Congresses to lift the arms embargo, to employ air strikes against the Serbs, or to actively force an end to war between 1992 and 1994. Bosnian sovereignty was ultimately salvaged, but one of the Action Council steering committee members stated, " 'I'd love to tell you about our great success, but it was events on the ground that changed much of the equation.' "[96]

As for the efforts of the Serb interest groups, "it seems as though there were few converts, although their claims may have contributed to confusion about the Balkan situation in the minds of the American public."[97] In short, while U.S. public opinion generally remained unfavorable toward the Serb cause, and the Serbs were generally identified as more culpable than others,

there was a sense that the other parties were not entirely blameless. The Serb American assertion that all sides were guilty in a conflict that was an irrational civil war did obtain a solid body of adherents. Even President Clinton accepted this interpretation, as popularized in Robert Kaplan's *Balkan Ghosts*. Indeed, there was dissention within both the Bush and Clinton administrations regarding the underlying causes of the war.[98] Naturally, this affected positions regarding the proper conflict management strategy, and whether justice was on one side or was irrelevant.

Yet the fact that the Serb arguments found their way into the text of major speeches delivered by politicians or sound bites uttered by pundits did not necessarily indicate a bias toward the Serbs. More often than not, the Serb portrayal of the war as a civil war and evocation of their fierce partisan fighting legacy served the agendas of those who were opposed to U.S. intervention for separate reasons. The chief reason was the desire to avoid committing American military might, particularly U.S. ground troops, to any role in the Balkan wars. The most influential representative of this perspective was General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under Bush, and for several months, under Clinton. Powell's career had been fired in the blazing furnace of Vietnam, and he was determined to prevent the United States and its military from ever being placed in the position of fighting a war with limited objectives and means against an opponent fighting an unlimited war for unlimited objectives. He asserted, "the harsh reality is that the Serbs, Muslims, and Croatians [*sic*] are committed to fight to death for what they believe to be their vital interests. They have matched their military actions to their political objectives, just as the North Vietnamese did years earlier."[99]

"Powell, in his final months as chairman of the joint chiefs, exerted a powerful influence against military intervention."[100] He challenged UN Ambassador Madeleine Albright, who reportedly favored punitive military action against the Bosnian Serbs, arguing that the political goals must be defined before troops are deployed. Powell insisted that none of the Contact Group states favored using troops to end the war or help its victims, and that air strikes were not guaranteed to affect Serb behavior in the desired fashion (in fact, they would probably take UN hostages). Moreover, air strikes were unreliable because of visibility constraints due to weather and terrain. With respect to Bosnia, Powell had already made his views clear in 1991. "When ancient ethnic hatred re-ignited in the former Yugoslavia in 1991 and well-meaning Americans thought we should 'do something' in Bosnia, the shattered bodies of Marines at the Beirut airport were never far from my mind in arguing for caution."[101] He laid out his opinion forcefully and publicly in

The New York Times and the journal *Foreign Affairs*.[102] "The prospect of becoming entangled in a second Vietnam, whether justified or not, haunted all the NATO militaries.... Notably in the United States and Britain, such fears had succeeded in convincing the national governments that intervention was not a good idea."[103]

The opinion of the Bosnian or Balkan ethnic group lobbies did not cause a radical shift in U.S. policy regarding Bosnia. "...American Serbs, Croats and Balkan Muslims are few in number and split by the same religious and ethnic differences that divide the combatants in splintered remains of Yugoslavia."[104] Therefore, they did not comprise a strong electoral force. Indeed, with the 1996 presidential election looming, the administration and its congressional supporters were more concerned that the public would agree with House Speaker Newt Gingrich who asserted, "Bosnia is the worst humiliation for the Western democracies since the 1930s."[105] Clinton was being increasingly and more effectively challenged by the Republican presidential candidate, Senator Dole, who was using the failures of the Bosnia policy to confront Clinton on his general management of foreign affairs; he had forced Clinton to use the veto against the bill to lift and strike. According to one State Department official, "Bob Dole made a difference based on his moral outrage."[106] He was joined by other legislators who had visited Bosnia and had "the individual temperament and agenda" to keep the spotlight on Bosnia.

Perhaps the Serb American lobbies were effective in that the arms embargo was never lifted, and they were able to hold onto most of their conquests. Yet the United States did play a decisive role in the air strikes against the Serbs, and ultimately ensured that they were denied their irredentist aims. In the end, neither side was able to mobilize their ethnic groups to have a profound influence on the U.S. decision to support or not to support partition. The arguments presented by the interest groups either caused greater frustration and confusion or were employed to justify positions that had been adopted for reasons that had nothing to do with support for any ethnic group. Certainly, *realpolitik* and other considerations—including the three other variables tested by this study—outweighed moral outrage or affinity for one ethnic group over the others. Ethnic group lobbies were not able to have a direct impact on the policy-making process. Their role was peripheral or contextual. As one State Department official expressed it, ethnic lobby group pressure was "more important than the demonstration effect, but hard to measure."[107] Its effect was felt in the public domain, where arguments were vented via the media and the associated congressional process. Though certain members of Congress were swayed by one group or another, Congress never played a pivotal role. It did not even have a positive agenda (advocating specific policies, rather than arguing

against the administration strategy) at least not until 1994. Even then the administration rendered its actions ineffective, via the presidential veto, and by dint of the fact that the executive branch possessed the initiative in managing such a complex foreign policy challenge, upon which the future of the transatlantic alliance rested.

Conclusion

Both the Bush and Clinton administrations refused to support the partition of Bosnia, while the European allies were ambivalent on this issue. Once the United States had followed the European lead and recognized Bosnia as a sovereign state, at no time did Washington seriously and publicly entertain the notion of dismembering the state to satisfy the Serbs and Croats. The Europeans also never publicly advocated revoking Bosnian sovereignty or dividing the state, although Paris, London, and Bonn were in favor of diluting Sarajevo's sovereignty, and probably would have acceded to partition. In the final analysis, the United States forced a compromise upon the Europeans and the parties to the war. Dayton balanced pragmatic security imperatives and international principles of human rights and justice. In 1994–95, the transatlantic position solidified—neither the United States nor its allies supported the partition of Bosnia.

The U.S. government consistently verbalized a desire to prevent the conflict from spreading regionally. It demonstrated its concern by stationing troops in Macedonia and warning Belgrade against military operations in Kosovo. Yet, the United States took little action to prevent the escalation of the conflict within Bosnia proper. The puny NATO air strikes of 1994 were barely effective, and when the longer-lasting bombardment of the Serbs occurred in 1995, this was aimed at bringing the Serbs to the negotiating table, not at settling the conflict on the battlefield. Members of the U.S. government did express distaste for Vance–Owen, because it was fueling further warfare, as the ethnic groups forced the situation on the ground to resemble the maps being drawn by the diplomats or to bring about a fait accompli and send the cartographers back to work. Still, the United States never officially disavowed Vance–Owen, and Dayton is a derivation of this and subsequent plans. U.S. concerns about continuation or escalation of the conflict and existing or potential humanitarian conditions were not sufficient until 1994 to elicit a robust U.S. policy in favor of de facto partition. The United States only began demonstrating active, as opposed to rhetorical, concern about any escalation or continuation of the war, when the NATO alliance and U.S. credibility were threatened, and U.S. military involvement appeared

unavoidable. Though it took three years, it was this concern about the conflict continuing and perhaps spreading that ultimately propelled the United States to set a clear policy advocating de facto partition and to forge a consensus with its allies centered on this policy.

U.S. policy was, however, not exclusively based on the desire for a rapid end to the conflict. If it had been, U.S. policymakers might have expressed support for partition especially during 1992–93 when, arguably, the quickest end to the war would have been allowing the Serbs and Croats to consolidate their military victories, and effectively dividing the territory into two or three parts (if the Bosnian Muslims lived to defend themselves or did not become refugees). There were loud advocates for this strategy outside the administration and overseas, but it was roundly rejected by the U.S. government based on a combination of concerns about justice, human rights, and a demonstration effect.

While the United States did not support partition, Washington also did not take direct action, with the exception of the stationing of troops in Macedonia, to address a potential demonstration effect at any time. Washington did not go to great lengths to explain to other inspiring secessionists or the world audience, why Bosnia must be preserved based on the theory that partitioning Bosnia would encourage other partitions. U.S. policymakers had some concern that ethnic leaders in the Soviet Union, and then Russia, might become emboldened if Bosnia were dismembered, but this didn't drive their policy toward Bosnia. Finally, ethnic lobby groups contributed to confusion and dissension regarding the issues, and reinforced the U.S. desire to allow the Europeans to take the lead. They may have contributed to the inertia of 1991–94, but no one group or combination of groups exerted enough influence over the Clinton administration to force the government to espouse their platform.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions

Introduction

The examples discussed in the preceding pages demonstrate that the primary concern of U.S. decisionmakers in the 1990s who were faced with separatism was regional stability. Relationships with allied countries, which effectively bolstered the primary objective, came next, and fear of demonstration effects and lobbying by ethnic groups had marginal to no impact. Whether the decision is to support a secessionist group, to withhold support, or even to oppose it, in the first order U.S. policymakers will scrutinize the potential impact on geostrategic interests. Since allied states and expanding conflict have the most immediate potential negative or positive impact on U.S. interests, these factors are most significant. The ramifications of a potential demonstration effect or pressures exerted by lobby groups, are of less immediate or direct concern and are not generally decisive.

The decision to support or not support partition, is not usually adopted to copy the policy of an ally and/or the dominant regional power. The United States will not make such decisions based on this one factor alone, and such a policy is not simply reflexive. Instead, an administration factors this into its decisionmaking process, but if it comes to a conclusion that is somewhat different from its allies—either more negative or more positive—it engages them in a process aimed at synchronizing policies. The three examples studied here, however, do not provide evidence concerning what the United States would do if an ally were firmly opposed to its initial or definitive position.

In the case of Iraq, the Turkish government clearly opposed the establishment of an independent state for the Kurds on their southeastern border.

Though President Ozal was broadminded and had enough foresight to recognize that independence for Iraqi Kurds could be managed to Turkey's advantage, at the time there was little he could do to convince the Turkish general staff and the political–military establishment of this. The climate was not right, and Ozal's liberalization measures were hardly sufficient to turn the momentum toward accommodation of Kurds, domestically or internationally.

Turkey clearly opposed the partition of Iraq, and this position would not have been easy to alter. The Bush administration would have had to conduct considerable lobbying to convince the Turks that the Kurdish and Shi'a uprisings should be supported, because they would lead to the removal of Saddam Hussein. Only a U.S. guarantee of military intervention—or acquiescence to Turkish intervention—to secure victory for Saddam's opponents and to manage events so that Ankara's interests were protected, could have potentially forced a change in Turkish policy. The United States was not prepared to do so. The Bush officials were eager to bring the troops back home as rapidly as they could and to avoid additional costly and troubling engagements. The administration recognized that the clear-cut Gulf War victory could not be replicated here. Involvement in an Iraqi civil war would have had unforeseen consequences and was contrary to the idealized American conception of war, which is characterized by brief campaigns and decisive or overwhelming victories.[1] Not insignificantly, General Powell, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had publicly endorsed pursuing *only* such wars in his "Powell Doctrine," which linked vital national security interests with popular support and use of overwhelming force.

Allowing the Turkish army to assume a semipermanent presence in northern Iraq was equally unacceptable to the U.S. government. In the post–Gulf War period during 1991, the Bush administration was actively engaged in reinvigorating the dormant Arab–Israeli peace process. At the same time, Washington was securing basing rights in Saudi Arabia. Condoning, and even encouraging, a Turkish invasion of an Arab country might have jeopardized these diplomatic and security initiatives.

In Bosnia, the U.S. government opposed partition, but the European allies were ambivalent. There were serious differences among the European states regarding Bosnia policy and never any Europe-wide agreement that partition should be opposed. The Europeans were not adamantly opposed to partition nor were they clearly in favor of it. More to the point, many of the U.S. policymakers did not perceive the Europeans to be opposed to partition. An official who was posted in the U.S. Embassy in Bonn and at NATO headquarters during the early 1990s, and then served as Chief of Mission in Sarajevo in 1996, maintained that the Europeans would have been just as happy to partition Bosnia, as they were to keep it unified.[2]

Nonetheless, the United States made a concerted effort for three years to coordinate policy and prevent divergences in opinion over Bosnia from spoiling transatlantic cooperation. The position of the allies did matter to the United States, because neither the Bush nor the Clinton administrations wanted to act unilaterally. Indeed, even in refraining, they wanted their allies beside them. Ultimately, the relationship with the allies and the desire to protect European stability and security forced the United States to act, and to find a compromise not only among the Bosnians but also between themselves and their European allies. The position of the Europeans was always significant, because if U.S. policy deviated too strongly from that of its allies, NATO—the only operational strategic alliance—might fail. This danger became greater over time, as the media and the public pressed indignantly for action to stop the killing, questioning the relevance of a military alliance that would not address the gravest immediate security challenge of the day.

While the European positions were clearly important, they did not affect the substance of U.S. policy. If the Europeans had openly favored partition, the United States would not have done so. Given the strong feelings within the cabinet regarding the Muslim genocide and the impact of U.S. policy on relations with the Islamic world, it is most likely that the United States would have worked with the allies to devise a compromise or win them over to the U.S. position. The main point is that U.S. and European policy had to be synchronized in order to develop an executable multilateral response. The Clinton administration determined that this was necessary in order to stop the conflict and prevent it from spreading. The ambivalent position of the Europeans made it possible for the Americans to effectively exert pressure and devise an agreement that was acceptable to the allies. Both sides had to concede something, either in the name of stability or of justice. Dayton was probably the most blatant compromise over sovereignty of the late twentieth century. The U.S. position differed from the European one, but because it was not in definitive opposition, the Americans were able to forge a compromise with their allies.

In the case of Ethiopia, the U.S. policy was to support partition and the creation of Eritrea, while its European allies were indifferent to, and the Israelis were not opposed to, partition. In truth, the Europeans were irrelevant because they didn't enter the discussion in any significant fashion. The July conference resulted in a coordination of policy among the EPRDF, EPLF, and the U.S. government. Though the British facilitated the meeting in London, they maintained only an observer status. Meanwhile, the Israelis allowed the United States to take the lead on policy toward the Horn, especially once they knew the remaining Ethiopian Jews would be allowed to emigrate to Israel. If anything, the Israelis leaned toward withholding

partition from the Eritreans for traditional geostrategic reasons, and because they expected cooperation from the Mengistu regime. The United States took a unilateral stance but faced no objection from the Israelis. Indeed, Washington and events on the ground managed to convince them that this was the only practical outcome.

The position of allies is a somewhat significant factor in the U.S. decision to support or not support partition. However, the three cases discussed here provide no evidence that an ally's position results in the United States accepting the same position. Indeed, in the Bosnian case, the United States refused to accede to partition. The United States refrained from any decisive action during the Bush and early Clinton administrations until it appeared that European security and stability would be threatened. Once the decision was made to dedicate U.S. prestige and power to maintaining the sovereignty of Bosnia, Washington worked assiduously with London, Bonn, and Paris to ensure that the European efforts would not operate at cross-purposes with U.S. policy. The United States made the necessary compromises to ensure that the parties to the conflict and those Europeans who were sympathetic to the Croats and Serbs were sufficiently satisfied, but insisted on preserving the state of Bosnia and Hercegovina.

The Fear of Spillover or Continued Conflict

Of the four considerations affecting U.S. policy discussed in this volume, the fear of spillover or continued conflict had the strongest qualitative impact. The outcomes in each instance substantiate assertions that as a status quo power the United States regards civil conflicts as threatening to stability, and therefore negatively impacting national interest. This is particularly true in Europe and the Middle East, areas of long-standing U.S. strategic interest. However, in the first half of the 1990s, Washington and its allies adopted a more global interest in fostering stability as they perceived a potential for multilateral efforts through a newly invigorated post–Cold War international (almost synonymous with the UN) system.

No longer driven by the fear that the Soviet Union would exploit civil or regional conflicts, the U.S. government appeared to fear general instability as states broke into smaller sovereign entities. In the absence of any formal, internationally accepted mechanism to govern the disintegration of states, the United States has been quick to discourage secession. Washington was loathe to fully exploit secessionist movements (like the Kurdish one) for its own interests, fearful that the process might spin out of control.

It is usually difficult to isolate the motivation to protect stability from the humanitarian impulse. However, the United States rarely acts out of purely humanitarian motives. Thus, the fear of renewed and continued conflict usually stems from the desire to avoid spillover and regional destabilization. Concerns about human plight are less urgent, but nevertheless are often incorporated into exhortations for action. If the United States perceives that a conflict can be contained, as in the case of Bosnia during the initial years of the conflict, it appears less likely that the United States will formulate either a positive or negative policy regarding partition. Only when containment is failing is Washington compelled to act. Fear of regional or even global instability is stronger than the fear that more innocent people will die; moral and ideological interests do not often get addressed before tangible security interests. The implication of this analysis is that policy is only formulated once it has reached crisis proportions. Thus, a strategy to manage the conflict is only hammered out when the administration is forced to do so—another example of the U.S. propensity to run foreign policy as a series of responses to crises.[3]

In the case of Iraq, the Bush administration feared that the break up of the state would not be peaceful. Based on consultations with the Turkish government, U.S. officials expected Turkey to take military action to secure stability and/or fill a power vacuum, in the event that Ankara deemed it necessary. In order to maintain an economically and a politically viable state, the Kurds would require assistance from the Turkish government. Yet, it was not clear whether all the Kurdish factions would cooperate with Ankara. Moreover, it was highly probable that Iran and Syria would attempt to exploit the instability resulting from a de jure partition to secure natural resources (such as oil and water), and make a bid for regional hegemony. The breakup of Iraq would have imperiled the balance-of-power in the region, especially if the United States did not offer some type of security guarantee to a new Kurdish state.

The prime motivation in the Iraq case had to do with the fear that conflict would flare up between the Iraqi army and the Kurds, or between one or more Kurdish factions and the Turkish army, or among the states bordering Iraq. Humanitarian motivations were sufficient to provoke a U.S. military response to contain the instability in northern Iraq and prevent spillover of the conflict into Turkey. However, concern about the well-being of the Kurds did not extend beyond the immediate desire to assist the refugees. Once the Kurds were no longer refugees or displaced persons, and no longer threatened Turkish domestic stability, the United States was content to leave them in the state of Iraq. Washington recognized that de facto partition was

required in order for the coalition troops to be able to bring the refugees home. The Iraqi army had to be removed from the area; they could not be permitted to threaten the coalition, and only their absence would convince civilians that their villages were safe. De facto partition was a means to insure stability. De jure partition, on the other hand, would only breed conflict and more humanitarian disasters. De facto partition was easier for the U.S. government to accept and to justify based on military expediency, especially since it did not involve any permanent political or strategic changes. International borders remained unaltered, and Iraqi sovereignty over the territory was operationally impeded, but not eliminated.

In Bosnia, the fear of continued conflict or spillover was a—if not the—primary factor driving the decision not to support the partition of the state. Granting the Croats and Serbs the right or ability to achieve their irredentist aims would have had destabilizing effects in neighboring Balkan states, such as Macedonia, and Serbia, and in eastern Europe in general. Here, the demonstration effect acted to support the fear of spillover. The Clinton administration by 1995 clearly anticipated the possibility that partitioning Bosnia would encourage other groups in ethnically polarized states to attempt a partition of their respective states. Thus, it was feared that the Albanians in Kosovo or Macedonia would be emboldened to press for independence or union with Albania. The struggle over this territory was expected to involve the Greeks, Bulgarians, and Turks, who have historical claims on Macedonian territory. Any military confrontation between the Greeks and Turks would fuel the already tense standoff between the two states and spell the end of a viable NATO southern flank. It was clearly not in the U.S. interest to allow two NATO allies to come to blows and thereby potentially undermine the alliance itself.

The fear of continued conflict in this case derived its impact from the desire to preserve stability and security on the European continent. Humanitarian concerns were expressed verbally from 1992 to 1995, but they were never sufficient to bring the United States to take a definitive stand on partition. There was a definite policy slant in favor of the Bosnian Muslims and the government in Sarajevo, and this was largely fueled by disgust at the tactics first utilized by the Serbs—ethnic cleansing and genocide. Elements of the U.S. government opposed Vance–Owen on the grounds that it would reward the aggressors, and there was an attempt by the United States to distance itself from the evenhanded (but morally neutral) European approach. However, until the United States brokered the Federation and began to support the arming and training of the Croat and Muslim armed forces, no action was taken either in support of or in opposition to partition.

Once strategic interests were threatened, the United States acted firmly in favor of the underdog—with whom it had sympathized anyway. The determination that dividing the state would create more conflict that would spread to neighboring states was decisive. The fact that the decision looked more just and morally defensible than granting the Serbs and Croats their irredentist aims undoubtedly made adopting the policy easier. The negative U.S. policy vis-à-vis secession also made an easier sell with the American press and those who viewed the old multiethnic Bosnian state as somehow like the poly-cultural United States. (Nonetheless, the press and pundits still criticized the de facto partition for giving the Serbs and Croats too much autonomy.)

In the case of Ethiopia, the U.S. administration determined that partition would actually put an end to the civil war and prevent any further conflict. Partition was supported in order to end conflict. Indeed, this objective exerted the strongest, decisive influence. Other factors received attention and were considered, but the decision to partition was made in order to eliminate conflict. The United States did not act out of principle. International law was barely relevant to the policymakers—it was utilized to justify a decision that was made based on pure pragmatism. Likewise, humanitarian concerns were evident (although more prevalent in the legislature than in the cabinet) but war, famine, and drought were not new to the Horn. It was the opportunity to end a conflict that enticed the United States to act, along with the negative example of Somalia and Liberia; the latter demonstrated that without a rapid negotiated settlement and acceptance of a military fait accompli, the entire system of governance could be imperiled. The complex ethnic composition of Ethiopia and its authoritarian legacy, were regarded by the United States as an invitation for continuing civil war. In this instance, accepting continued conflict was regarded as tantamount to acquiescence in the collapse of the Ethiopian state.

The Bush administration was clearly interested in reaping the rewards of the demise of the Cold War system, in part by improving conditions on the African continent. Though not all cabinet members agreed that the United States should become involved in political–military transitions in Africa, President Bush's concept of a "New World Order" implied that this would occur. Indeed, he authorized a U.S.-led military operation in Somalia, predicated entirely upon humanitarianism. With regard to Ethiopia, the United States had demonstrated humanitarian concern since the famine of the 1980s, and U.S.-based NGOs were active in the Horn. Yet, it was not until the Soviet and Ethiopian governments appealed to Washington that the administration recognized the opportunity to act constructively and not

until chaos hit Monrovia and Mogadishu that the potential consequences of inaction became evident. At little cost, the United States was able to implement a policy that fostered peace. The fact that the same policy supported partition was almost beside the point. There was no particular affinity within the administration for the Eritreans or their cause, although they clearly benefited from comparison with the hated "communist" Mengistu regime. Washington's recognition of the EPRDF as the successor regime was the real policy decision. Since the EPRDF and EPLF had already agreed on partition, the United States accepted it almost by recognizing the new government. The United States was able to influence the modalities of the partition process, but the decision to support partition was no more than the acceptance of partition. The United States accepted the fait accompli because to oppose it would have meant certain unrest. Only accepting partition would bring peace.

The Demonstration Effect

Fear of the demonstration effect was not found in the Iraq case, was briefly expressed in the Ethiopia case, and played a supporting role in the Bosnia case. Overall, the effect of this variable was very weak, strengthening the observation that Washington makes such policy decisions on a case-by-case basis. Where concerns about consistency are raised, they are done so with an eye to the potential restrictions that *the appearance of a precedent* might have on other current or future policies. The cases, happily, demonstrated no tendency to embrace consistency for consistency's sake. The context mattered in each case, and consistency was never treated as a principle in itself. The demonstration effect was not a factor in determining the policy to be adopted, unless it was linked to a stronger concern—the fear of renewed or continued conflict.

There was a fear within the Bush and Clinton administrations that sanctioning the partition of Bosnia would have led other ethnic groups in the Yugoslav successor states, as well as other parts of eastern Europe, to attempt to forcibly win their sovereign states. This perception that a demonstration effect was likely, however, derived its true strength from the fear of continued conflict and spillover. The notion that other groups in the region might be emboldened by a partition of Bosnia produced the spectre of expanded fighting and refugee flows that would destabilize Europe.

During the Bush administration there was also a strong fear that the breakup of Yugoslavia would cause the territorial collapse of the

Soviet Union. Such a potential development was accepted as negative, given the Soviet nuclear capability and general perception that state dissolution spelled chaos. In time, however, once the breakup of the USSR had proven relatively peaceful, the U.S. government became less concerned about the demonstration effect. By 1994, the U.S. fears were, for the most part, restricted to the Balkan region. The Russian government—part of the Contact Group—remained worried about possible domestic demonstration effects, but the United States did not embrace such concerns about the Russian federation. The demonstration effect, in this case, was entirely regional; it was restricted to the Balkans. There is no evidence that the U.S. administration worried that a partition in Bosnia would encourage would-be secessionists or central governments on other continents or other regions in Europe, to adopt strategies that might harm U.S. interests.

However, the fear of a demonstration effect did play a role in the U.S. decision not to support the partition of Bosnia. It derived some influence from its connection with the fear of spillover. The outcome of the expected demonstration effect was likely to be continued and expanded regional conflict—something that was unacceptable to the U.S. government. In short, it was feared that the demonstration effect would bring immediate conflict to adjoining states in the Balkans, such as Macedonia and Serbia. In addition, there were other contextual elements in the Bosnia case that contributed to the significance of this variable. First, the Bosnian conflict received a tremendous amount of media coverage, which made it more possible that other groups would be making comparisons between themselves and the Serbs and Croats. The international coverage increased the possibility that governments and groups in countries quite distant from the Balkans would derive lessons from the U.S. response and adjust their strategies in ways that might fuel instability. Second, the Bosnian conflict spanned the course of three years, so there was plenty of time for groups to study the dynamic between the conflict and U.S. policy. Moreover, the media coverage did not drop off over time—it increased as the humanitarian costs mounted. Finally, by 1993 there was an awareness in the U.S. policymaking community that formulating U.S. responses to separatism was a critical challenge that promised to keep the U.S. government occupied for the remainder of the decade and beyond. The Clinton administration appreciated the nature of the problem and the potential pitfalls of flawed policy. Though there is no evidence that the government attempted to fashion a consistent policy regarding partition, it would have felt the pressure by the press and lobby groups to do so. Thus, the administration could have expected any decision in the Bosnia case to be treated as precedent.

In the case of Ethiopia, Secretary Baker feared that the press might point out inconsistencies and add to the pressure the German government was placing on him to accept the partition of Yugoslavia. Though there was apprehension that conflict would continue in the Balkans, the Bush administration opposed that partition mainly based on the fear that the Soviet Union might be similarly dissolved, with civil war erupting in a nuclear state. Yet even Baker's concerns were swept aside. They did not become grounds for a reversal of U.S. policy. No connection was ever publicly made between U.S. policy in Ethiopia, Bosnia, Iraq, or elsewhere beyond the African continent. And at the time there was no evidence that Ambassador Cohen and his superiors worried about an African demonstration effect. From their perspective, Ethiopia was a special case and a positive test for the New World Order, for proactive U.S. policy aimed at achieving regional and global stability. Congress did raise the issue retroactively, but there was little indication that this was done in order to force a shift in U.S. policy. Moreover, the congressional role in setting policy vis-à-vis Eritrean independence was nil. Congress could do no more than pressure the administration to reverse its policy after the London Conference, and due to evident policy success this was unlikely and indeed did not occur. In any event, the conditions the Eritrean rebels enjoyed are rare, and it would be extremely difficult for any secessionist movement to replicate their success. The key ingredient was their effective alliance with the successor government, the EPRDF leadership. This guaranteed a peaceful partition and, coupled with Eritrea's unique history, convinced the powerful United States, other African states, and the international community to accept the creation of Eritrea.

In Iraq, the question of a demonstration effect never arose. This was largely due to the fact that at the time, U.S. policymakers did not anticipate the dilemma of state dissolution that they would be facing in the Balkans only months later. They clearly assessed the situation based entirely upon the circumstances in Iraq. There was very little fear that U.S. policy would be precedent-setting. The U.S. government did not consider that partitioning Iraq would lead to a regional or global demonstration effect, so the decision not to support partition was not related and could not have been motivated by it.

The Ethnic Interest Group Lobbying

The role of ethnic lobby groups was insignificant in shaping U.S. policy toward partition in Iraq, Ethiopia, and Bosnia. The ethnic lobby groups with an interest in the political and territorial fate of Iraq were very weak and therefore exercised very little influence on the administration or on Congress.

Yet even if there had been more Kurdish, Turkish, and/or Iraqi Americans with key supporters on Capitol Hill, it is unlikely that they would have influenced the fundamental course of U.S. policy. The Kurdish question touched upon geostrategic interests in a region of tremendous importance to the United States, and the Bush administration, operating on a realist philosophy, generally took a tougher stance on secessionist movements.

The Bush administration's predilection against partition also formulated the backdrop to the decision in the case of Ethiopia. However, even in this case, where the outcome was favorable to the secessionists, the influence of ethnic lobby groups was extremely weak. The Ethiopian- and Eritrean Americans were not particularly well organized and they did not enjoy the benefit of strong support from key legislators. There was very little profile for the issue of Eritrean independence. What little attention the area received, had to do with the resettlement of the Ethiopian Jews, not with the question of the relative merits of Eritrean secession. No ethnic lobby group was demonstrably strong or stronger than the other. The potential influence of Ethiopian Americans and Eritrean Americans canceled themselves out. Neither group appeared stronger than the other, and it was regardless of their respective positions that U.S. policy came out in favor of partition.

In 1991, the role of ethnic lobby groups on national security issues was weak, with the exception of the Jewish, Greek, and Cuban interest groups. From that year forward, however, this began to change and was particularly evident in the case of the Eastern European American lobbies, attempt to influence U.S. policy regarding the expansion of NATO. As part of this trend and an outgrowth of the longer duration of the Bosnia conflict, ethnic lobby groups tied to the Bosnia case were more organized and active than in the other cases. However, they were also unable to exert any significant influence on U.S. policy. There too, the Serb and Croat lobby groups were almost equally weak. (The Croats were somewhat stronger but their priorities had to do with the Serb–Croat conflict rather than the situation in Bosnia.) Neither the Croats nor Serbs had the money, votes, or allies, to be able to decisively influence a U.S. policy outcome. If anything, their shrill, impassioned rhetoric hurt their cases.

In addition, while the Bosnian Muslims had the support of key congresspeople, such as Senator Bob Dole, there was effectively no ethnic Bosnian Muslim lobby group. The Bosnian Muslim perspective gained more political adherents in Washington than the other parties to the conflict, without the benefit of an ethnic lobby group. It was the human rights lobby and the efforts of influential U.S. citizens who were concerned about the genocide of Bosnian Muslims, which won the support of key legislators. They worked

with the press to reinforce public opinion against the Serbs (the chief aggressors) and the partition of the state of Bosnia and Hercegovina. The nonethnic lobby groups made a difference, and Congress stepped into the void while the Clinton administration dithered. Senate Republican opposition to administration policy and the strong advocacy of lift and strike were a source of pressure on the Clinton cabinet. Congressional initiatives combined with the other concerns examined here, forced the United States to act more decisively—to plot "the end-game." Yet again, this was unrelated to ethnic lobby group influence. The Bosnian lobby was based on humanitarian concern, not ethnic affiliation or geostrategic calculations. Thus, ethnic lobby groups were not a serious political force even concerning Bosnia, where they had more time and opportunity to exploit the media and the access to Congress, to their advantage.

Conclusion

The preceding pages provide further evidence that U.S. policy regarding partition is driven mainly by geostrategic concerns and that Washington will oppose partition if policymakers determine that it will lead to more conflict. In addition, if the senior members of the U.S. government perceive partition as a threat to stability and a precursor to humanitarian disaster, it is highly probable that U.S. allies and/or the dominant regional power share this perception. In the early to mid-1990s, U.S. policy tended to preserve the status quo, most notably in the form of existing sovereign boundaries. However, the desire for stability could not be entirely separated from humanitarian concerns, since conflict breeds suffering, and U.S. policymakers often utilized both realist and humanitarian arguments to justify action or inaction. In addition, U.S. policy was particularly resistant toward U.S.-led military intervention to secure partition. The United States was more likely to employ troops to prevent de jure partition, and was willing to compromise much of the substance of sovereignty in exchange for acceptance of de facto partition. Nonetheless, if partition appeared to be the means toward achieving peace, Washington was prepared to work for it diplomatically or just to accept it.

Of the four factors influencing U.S. policy toward partition that have been discussed here, only two demonstrated strong relevance. A third is only slightly significant, and a fourth factor was not significant at all. In all three cases there was a demonstrated relationship between the fear of spillover or continued conflict and U.S. policy. Written and oral evidence points to this variable as the key motivation for policy one way or another. In the case of Bosnia and Iraq it worked to deny secessionists their goals—U.S. policy did

not support the partition of the states. In Ethiopia the fear of continued conflict operated to support the development of a policy that was positively oriented toward partition. In this case the relationship between the desire to end conflict and the partition policy was particularly strong. Not only did the United States not expect partition to lead to conflict, but Washington's assessment was that accepting the partition would quell existing conflict and bring peace.

The second most influential factor was the position of allies and/or the dominant regional state. In Iraq the influence of the allies was strong, but closely linked to the fear of continued conflict. Turkey feared conflict in the event of partition, and based its opposition on this potential scenario. The Turkish position was a key factor in determining Washington's negative orientation toward partition.

In Ethiopia the position of allies was slightly significant. The only ally with a real interest in the Horn was Israel, and its position essentially mirrored that of the United States. Yet, Israel was not decidedly in favor of the partition of Ethiopia. Tel Aviv, like Washington, held out hope for a federal solution and only shifted its position at the urging of the U.S. government. Therefore, the position of Israel was too closely aligned and influenced by the United States to operate as a truly independent variable. With regard to Bosnia, the allies had an ambivalent position toward partition, with the U.S. opposed to granting the Croat and Serb irredentists, their objectives. Eventually, a territorial and political compromise was found without partitioning the state. In the final analysis, however, a true test of the impact of the position of allies would involve an ally that was strongly opposed to U.S. policy.

The marginal impact of a feared demonstration effect on U.S. policy appears to indicate that the U.S. government is not concerned with precedent, and regards one region in isolation from another. International law is utilized, as in the Ethiopian case, to justify a course of action that has already been selected based on pragmatic geopolitical considerations. There was no evidence in any of these cases of any attempt to apply Wilsonian principles of self-determination. In fact, the interests of the states involved were at the heart of each decision regarding partition. Even in Ethiopia, the decision to support Eritrean independence was taken in part based on the assumption that this outcome would be best in the short- and long run for the Ethiopian state.

Finally, the irrelevance of the ethnic interest groups indicate that domestic ethnic pressure groups—even when they are a part of international networks—are not a significant factor in the process of making foreign policy. They might shape the dialogue, successfully confusing the policy debate by asserting moral equivalence between the parties to the conflict. Yet, even

if they win over powerful legislators, that is, those who set the legislative agendas, their indirect impact is limited. Congressional advocates of one side or another are also restricted in their ability to pressure the administration on foreign policy issues, particularly those that involve clear geostrategic interests. Nonetheless, none of the relevant ethnic interest groups were truly powerful. Studies involving the Jewish or Israeli and Greek lobbies could provide more information on the significance of ethnic lobby groups.

Ethnic conflict theory does not account for other factors that are specific to the United States, but have some explanatory value in all three cases. One of these is the role of media alone.[4] The press does not set policy nor does it usually have a direct impact, but like ethnic lobby groups it could potentially help fashion a climate that is friendly or unfriendly toward partition. In the case of Bosnia, Western journalists had a definite bias in favor of the Bosnian Muslims and preservation of the multiethnic sovereign state of Bosnia and Hercegovina. For the most part, reporters lived in Sarajevo with the war's most frequent victims, the weakest parties to the war. Their articles and broadcasts influenced public opinion and fed the moral exasperation among academics, legislators, and senior policymakers. From their perspective, Bosnia could not be ignored, and justice required at least the minimum compromise that Dayton represented.

In the case of Iraq, the media provided much of the pressure forcing Bush to take lifesaving action, however belatedly from the Kurdish perspective. It gave the issue salience and the question of Kurdish self-determination has become more public since the tragic flight into the mountains. Nonetheless, media pressure was never sufficient to overcome other obstacles to a pro-partition U.S. policy. In the case of Ethiopia the media was not a factor. Media coverage was in general positively inclined toward U.S. policy, but did not exert any pressure prior to the U.S. decision simply because the U.S. policy shift was unanticipated. Nonetheless, any examination of U.S. decisionmaking should include analysis of the impact of the media, even if it only plays a marginal role much like ethnic lobby groups and the Congress.

Another element that is peculiar to the American experience is the legacy of Vietnam–Beirut, and after 1993, Mogadishu. These perceived political–military disasters, all resulted because policy was based on assumptions fed by a fundamental misunderstanding of the civil conflict. Having recognized the complexity of such conflict situations, many U.S. policymakers—especially military officers of the Vietnam era—are loathe to commit new errors and afraid of wasting America's youth on fruitless causes. The Powell Doctrine successfully inhibited involvement in military operations where objectives were not clearly defined and the means were limited.

Until Kosovo, the United States was unwilling in the post–Cold War era to intervene to assist one side in a secessionist struggle. Yet, even in Kosovo, the state was only partitioned de facto, and it is unlikely that such an operation will take place again in the near future. Intervention to help the Albanians was based on both geopolitical and humanitarian considerations. To a considerable extent, the United States and its allies took action out of a desire to make amends for three years of disingenuous foot-dragging while thousands of civilians died in Bosnia. Yet, the geostrategic reality was that the U.S. government had determined that any military action by the Serbian military in Kosovo would bring refugee flows and instability to Albania, Macedonia, and perhaps beyond. Once the conflict began, the human exodus surpassed any intelligence forecast and only reinforced the perspective that intervention was required to prevent spillover. In addition, the demonstration effect was felt in this instance because the Bosnian Serbs and Croats and Albanians in Macedonia were watching closely to see whether the Albanians would achieve an independent Kosovar state. The Serbs and Croats in Bosnia were prepared to use the Kosovo case as a precedent to justify further obstruction and possibly the violent dismantling of Dayton.

In all three examples discussed here, none of the U.S. policies necessitated the use of U.S. military force to fight in a civil war. This was no coincidence. Even if a partition had been deemed likely to quell conflict, the United States would not have endorsed it if obtaining it would have required sending troops into a hostile situation. The operations in Bosnia and Iraq were conducted in permissive or semi-permissive environments where the opponents were severely overpowered by allied forces. In Iraq, U.S. troops were also rapidly withdrawn, and the NATO operation in Bosnia was also only initially accepted by the U.S. Congress partly based on the assurance that the operation would not last longer than a year. And in Ethiopia, partition was the easy policy to endorse. The two parties had already negotiated their divorce (or the annulment of their illegitimate covenant) and appeared capable of enforcing it peacefully and without U.S. military assistance.

The 1999 operation in Kosovo only slightly eroded the culture of resistance to placing U.S. ground troops into theaters of operation characterized by civil war. Indeed, at the onset of the NATO bombing campaign, President Clinton actually ruled out ground operations. Only later when the bombing operation was past the first few weeks—thereby lasting exponentially longer than NATO allies expected—and not achieving Milosevic's rapid surrender, was the potential need for a ground invasion publicly discussed. This was however, more a tactic to increase pressure on Milosevic than

a reflection of strong allied determination to bring NATO infantry into Kosovo to go head-to-head with the Yugoslav army.

The allied political leadership continually stressed that no ground invasion was intended, and sought to fight what was a limited political campaign with limited military means. On the other hand, the NATO commander of the Kosovo operation, General Wesley Clark, argued that the military means employed should not be limited. He utilized the Powell Doctrine to argue against restrictions in resources and rules of engagement, but did not question the limited political objective. Nonetheless, public resistance among the policymaking community or the political elites, to intervening in a civil war and fighting openly on one side was minimal. This tacit support for a war driven by strategic and humanitarian objectives, but publicly characterized more by the latter concern, was clearly a departure from contemporary U.S. political–military experience. As such, it was facilitated by the guilt some policymakers felt for not having acted sooner in Bosnia.

The debate over the proper role for the U.S. military as part of overall policies to deal with failed states, foster democracy and most significantly—post–September 11, 2001—defeat the Al Qaeda terrorist network, has not abated. The current Bush administration's National Security Strategy of preemption could not be more aggressive, in the sense that it is offensively oriented and proactive, rather than reactive. Yet, much of the controversy over use of force in Iraq, Afghanistan, Philippines, and Colombia, to name the most salient examples, still occurs in the shadow of the experience of Vietnam and the perceived failures of the Clinton administration in Mogadishu, Haiti, and Rwanda. In all of these cases military intervention failed to satisfactorily address domestic ethnic (or "clan-based") tensions. These recent experiences as well as ongoing instability in Afghanistan and Iraq, where there are substantial American commitments, ensure unabated debate over U.S. policy toward secessionist movements and partition, to create new states for long-suffering and/or disgruntled ethnic groups.

Though the Bush administration appears more willing to intervene in certain states to dismantle weapons of mass destruction programs, destroy terrorist networks, and to foster democracy, its agenda appears to follow the traditional conservative approach that Washington has always had toward partition and state formation. New states or irredentism is discouraged. Thus, in preparation for war in Iraq, while the Bush administration was quick to secure the assistance of Kurdish groups in northern Iraq, officials also discouraged any Kurdish political agenda beyond political autonomy. Moreover, it appears that U.S. officials, foremost among them, Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz, are granting Turkey greater military

presence and control in northern Iraq. This would have been the price—according to Wolfowitz speaking in 1999—for Turkish acquiescence to the toppling of Saddam Hussein in 1991.

U.S. policy has come full circle in Iraq, but this time de facto partition is likely to disappear, to be replaced—if Washington prevails—with some type of federal solution or another means toward preserving some of the autonomy the Kurds have enjoyed for the last 12 years. On the Horn of Africa, Ethiopia and Eritrea have now entered the tenth year of on-again, off-again fighting over their common border. It would appear that partition has not brought total peace. Yet, the alternative would have been far worse and might have energized other ethnic groups like the Oromo to fight for a stronger political voice. Indeed, the fact that the current dispute occurs between two states has facilitated active UN involvement in efforts to stop the fighting and find a solution.

Finally, in Bosnia, progress toward unitary government has been painstakingly slow. Yet optimists note the Bosnian push to enter institutions—such as the EU, and more importantly NATO—will necessitate the consolidation of military, monetary, and other powers within the federal government. The effect would be a further softening of the de facto partition, perhaps ultimately erasing it, thereby rendering the Bosnian central government fully sovereign and ultimately achieving the undiluted U.S. policy objective in Bosnia—preserving a multiethnic state including territory where Serbs and Croats comprise the majority.

If there is any underlying trend to be discerned by following developments related to the three cases studied here, as well as the situation in Kosovo, it may be encapsulated by Shakespeare thus:

> So we grew together,
> Like to a double cherry, seeming parted,
> But yet a union in partition,
> Two lovely berries moulded on one stem.[5]

The American policy preference is to preserve the existing state system and to withhold support from or prevent partition. It is only when faced with the strong likelihood of increased or sustained conflict that partition may be supported by Washington as the "least worst" solution. But even then, if possible, Washington will choose de facto partition over full partition. U.S. policymakers appear to prefer postponing a final resolution of the problem and providing some chance for future union of two or more seemingly separate "berries molded on one stem."

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

Introduction

1. Secessionists desire the establishment of an independent state, while irredentists aim for union with a neighboring co-ethnic state. Not all separatists are secessionists (they may simply seek autonomy), but secessionists are separatists.

1 Managing Ethnic Conflict

1. Donald L. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups and Conflict* (Charlotte, NC: Duke University Press, 1985), 232.
2. Ibid., 281.
3. Heraclides writes, "In practice the borderline between secession, which is unacceptable, and partition, which is acceptable, can often be blurred." Alexis Heraclides, *The Self-Determination of Minorities in International Relations* (London: Frank Cass and Company, 1991), 24.
4. Ibid.
5. While de facto partition often serves as a preliminary measure to prepare for partition, it can also become a permanent situation, sitting on a spectrum between integration or centralization, and independence. This distinction and its implications have not been explored in the ethnic conflict management literature.
6. Horowitz, 591.
7. Ibid., 592.
8. Charles William Maynes, "Containing Ethnic Conflict," *Foreign Policy*, no. 90 (Spring 1993): 12.
9. Morton H. Halperin, David J. Scheffer, and Patricia L. Small, *Self-Determination in the New World Order* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1992), 28.
10. Ibid.
11. Henry Bienen, "Ethnic Nationalisms and Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy," in *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*, ed. Charles A. Kupchan (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 159–60.

12. Patricia Carley, *U.S. Responses to Self-Determination Movements: Strategies for Nonviolent Outcomes and Alternatives to Secession, Report from a Roundtable Held in Conjunction with the Policy Planning Staff of the U.S. Department of State* (Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace, July 1997), vii.
13. Ted Robert Gurr and Barbara Harff, *Ethnic Conflict in World Politics* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), 120.
14. John Mearsheimer and Stephen Van Evera, "When Peace Means War," *The New Republic* (December 18, 1995), 16.
15. Robert M. Hayden, "The Partition of Bosnia and Hercegovina, 1990–1993," *RFE/RL Research Report*, 2, no. 22 (May 1993): 131.
16. Chaim Kaufmann, "Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars," *International Security*, 20, no. 4 (Spring 1996): 137, 151.
17. Power vacuums result in internal and regional security dilemmas, as described in Barry Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," *Survival* (Spring 1993), 27.
18. Charles A. Kupchan, "Conclusion," chap. in *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 191.
19. Milton Esman, "Diasporas and International Relations," in *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*, ed. Gabriel Sheffer (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 4.
20. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., "Ethnic Groups and Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* (Summer 1981): 978. Nicholas O. Berry, "The Management of Foreign Penetration," *Orbis* (Summer 1973): 598–619, also downplays the role of foreign "penetration" of contemporary politics. He finds that penetration is being effectively managed by states.
21. David Howard Goldberg, *Foreign Policy and Ethnic Interest Groups* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 9–10.
22. Janeen Klinger, "Immigrants, Ethnic Lobbies, and American Foreign Policy," *Commonwealth: A Journal of Political Science*, 7 (1994–95): 11–12.
23. Ibid., 13.

2 Iraq

1. Mehrdad R. Izady, *The Kurds: A Concise Handbook* (Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis, 1992), 3.
2. The literal translation of *pesh merga* is "those who face death."
3. Izady, *The Kurds*, 68–70. For more on the Ba'ath Party's campaign of genocide against the Kurds see U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Kurdistan in the Time of Saddam Hussein* (Washington, DC: GPO, November 1991) and U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *Saddam's Documents: A Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate*, report prepared by Peter Galbraith (Washington, DC: GPO, 1992.)
4. Ibid., 70.

5. Ibid., 70.
6. See U.S. Department of State, "UN Security Council Resolution 688 on Repression of Iraqi Civilians," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 8, 1991), 233–34. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 10 to 3 (Cuba, Yemen, Zimbabwe) with two abstentions—China and India.
7. Daniel P. Bolger, *Savage Peace: Americans at War in the 1990s* (Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1995), 233.
8. "In Iran, Politics Thwarts Efforts to Help Refugees," *The St. Petersburg Times*, May 9, 1991, 3A.
9. At the height of Operation Provide Comfort 30 nations, including a core of 13 allies from the Gulf War, deployed over 21,000 troops and contributed supplies. During 1991, coalition forces provided 27,000 tons of relief supplies and aid to approximately 850,000 Kurds.
10. John Bulloch and Harvey Morris, *No Friends but the Mountains: The Tragic History of the Kurds* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1992), 12.
11. David Roth, *Sacred Honor: Colin Powell, the Inside Account of His Life and Triumphs* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House and San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco, 1993), 207.
12. General Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, interview by Lt. Col. Gordon W. Rudd, 1992, Washington, DC. This interview and others by Dr. Rudd cited within this dissertation were conducted for the U.S. Army's official history of Operation Provide Comfort.
13. U.S. Department of State, " 'One Year after the Gulf War: Prospects for Peace,' Richard N. Haass, Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Near East and South Asian Affairs of the National Security Council, Address before the Faculty Club, University of Miami, Coral Gables Florida, April 2, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 13, 1992), 297.
14. Henri Barkey, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State, interview by author, May 12, 1999, Washington, DC.
15. Cengiz Candar, journalist, *Sabah*, and former advisor to President Ozal, interview by author, May 26, 1999, Washington, DC.
16. McDowell, *A Modern History of The Kurds*, 370–71.
17. Barkey, interview.
18. Paul Wolfowitz, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Political Affairs, U.S. Department of Defense, interview by author, July 8, 1999, Washington, DC.
19. James A. Baker III, with Thomas M. DeFrank, *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War and Peace 1989–1992* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1995), 285.
20. Wolfowitz, interview.
21. Morton Abramowitz, interview by author, July 8, 1998, Washington, DC.
22. Blaine Harden, "Turkey to Move Iraqi Refugees; Effort Would Ease Harsh Living Conditions," *The Washington Post* (April 15, 1991), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

23. Wolfowitz, interview.
24. Ibid.
25. Gordon Rudd, "Operation Provide Comfort: Humanitarian Intervention in Northern Iraq" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1993), 115–16.
26. U.S. Department of State, "PKK Impeding Truck Traffic into Iraq: Statement by Department Spokesman Richard Boucher, Washington, DC, October 26, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (November 2, 1992), 807.
27. Fred Barnes of *The New Republic* quoted in *MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*, transcript # 4010 (April 1, 1991), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
28. Stephen Pelletiere, *The Kurds and Their 'Agas'—The Situation in Northern Iraq* (Washington, DC: U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency, VP-2200-691-91, November 1991), 21. This document, circulated within the military and defense agencies, was highly critical of the Kurdish leadership and the foreign interests who would help them.
29. Ibid. Pelletiere speculates that while Barzani was negotiating with Saddam in November 1991, Talabani made a deal with the British regarding Kirkuk (in 1972 the Iraqi government nationalized oil concessions once held by the British, Dutch, French, and Italians). If Kirkuk—one of Iraq's richest oil fields—had been included in the safe zone, the coalition and the Kurds would have had considerable leverage over Saddam.
30. General John Galvin, former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, interview by author, June 26, 1998, Medford, MA.
31. Wolfowitz, interview.
32. Bulloch and Morris, *No Friends but the Mountains*, 39.
33. Wolfowitz, interview.
34. Bulloch and Morris, *No Friends but the Mountains*, 24–25.
35. Abramowitz, interview.
36. Katherine A. Wilkens, "How We Lost the Kurdish Game." *The Washington Post*, September 15, 1998, C1, <http://www.kurdistan.org/Washington/lostkurd.html> April 23, 1999.
37. Robin Wright, "America's Iraq Policy: How did it Come to this?" *The Washington Quarterly* (Summer 1998): 44.
38. Powell, interview.
39. Hugh Pope, "Kurdish Leader Asks U.S. Pressure on Iraq; He Also Appeals for Allied Troops to Remain Until Agreement is Reached on Autonomy," *The Times*, June 11, 1991, 8, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
40. Lt. General Shalikasvili and Kurdish leaders, tape recording by Lt. Col. Gordon W. Rudd, June 19, 1992, Zahko, Iraq.
41. Colonel Richard Naab, written correspondence with author, June 5, 1996.
42. Col. Larry M. Forster, "Operation Provide Comfort: A Shield for Humanitarian Intervention in Iraqi Kurdistan," Harvard Center for International Affairs Research Paper, April 20, 1996, 30. Forster served as MCC Commander during March–August 1995.

43. Mike Amitay, Executive Director, Washington Kurdish Institute, interview by author, May 21, 1999, Washington, DC.
44. U.S. Department of State, " U.S. Policy on Recent Developments and Other Issues in the Middle East: Edward P. Djerejian, Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs, Statement before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC, July 27, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (August 9, 1993,) 571.
45. Jon Stewart, "American Hammers, Kurdish Nails," *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 11, 1996, available in Lexis-Nexis News library. The United States was the dominant supplier of the Turkish military, providing 75–80 percent of its military equipment.
46. Wolfowitz, interview.
47. Ibid. Wolfowitz recalls a conversation in 1992 with a senior Turkish foreign ministry official in late 1992, where the official indicated that the establishment of a provisional government of free Iraq—not Iraqi Kurdistan—in northern Iraq might be acceptable to Turkey if it was under the protection of an international force, in which Turkey would play a major role.
48. Ibid.
49. McDowell, *A Modern History of the Kurds*, 370. He cites unattributable briefings cited by *The Wall Street Journal* on March 15, 1991 and *The Financial Times* on April 3, 1991, maintaining that the United States wanted the rebels defeated before Saddam was overthrown.
50. Baker with DeFrank, *The Politics of Democracy*, 438.
51. Ibid., 435.
52. Baker points to Iranian President Hashemi Rafsanjani's calls to the Iraqi citizens to oust Saddam and to the repeated Iranian appeals specifically to the Shia to take action to remove Saddam. Whether the United States was correct or not in lumping the Iraqi Shiias with the fundamentalists of Iran—something scholars of the region subsequently have criticized—the administration clearly regarded the Shiite drive for self-determination in Iraq as part of a monolithic fundamentalist movement.
53. Ibid., 437–38.
54. Ibid., 439.
55. U.S. Department of State, "U.S. Humanitarian Assistance to Iraqi Refugees: President Bush, Newport Beach, California, April 5, 1991," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 8, 1991), 233.
56. U.S. Department of State, "US Expands Kurdish Relief Efforts: President Bush, Opening Statement at White House News Conference, Washington, DC, April 16, 1991," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 22, 1991), 273.
57. George Bush, "Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Situation in the Persian Gulf," May 17, 1991, <http://www.csdl.tamu.ed/bhushlib/aepers/1991/91051704.html> May 13, 1998.

58. Chris Seiple, "Square-Dancing into the Future: The U.S. Military/NGO Relationship and the CMOC in Times of Humanitarian Intervention" (M.A. Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 1995), 33.
59. Michael M. Gunter, *The Kurds of Iraq: Tragedy and Hope* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 57.
60. Lawrence Korb, a senior Pentagon official in the Reagan administration, as quoted in Richard C. Gross, "Do Havens Mean Partition of Iraq?" *The Washington Times*, April 19, 1991, A1.
61. Galvin, interview.
62. Galvin, "Chapter 16: The Kurds," 30.
63. U.S. Department of State, "Overview of U.S. Policy Toward Iraq: Ronald Neumann, Director, Office of Northern Gulf Affairs, address at the Meridian International Center, Washington, DC, January 27, 1994," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (February 7, 1994), 66.
64. Warren P. Strobel, *Late-Breaking Foreign Policy* (Washington, DC: U.S. Institute for Peace Press, 1997), 216.
65. Forster, 28.
66. U.S. Department of State, *Kurdish Relief and Repatriation: DOD/AID-OFDA Partnership, The Kurdish Response After-Action Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance/Bureau for Humanitarian Response, December 1991), 3.
67. Edward P. Djerejian, Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs, U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., March 9, 1993, 62.
68. Wolfowitz, interview.
69. U.S. Department of State, "Remarks by Secretary Baker upon arrival at Esenboga International Airport, Ankara, Turkey, April 8, 1991," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 15, 1991), 271.
70. George Bush, "Exchange With Reporters on Aid to Iraqi Refugees," April 11, 1991, <http:///www.csdl.tamu.edu/bushlib/papers/1991/91041102.html> May 13, 1998.
71. U.S. Department of State, "US Expands Kurdish Relief Efforts," 273.
72. Bulloch and Morris, *No Friends but the Mountains*, 37.
73. Gunter, *The Kurds of America*, 85.
74. Barkey, interview.
75. Ibid.
76. Amitay, interview. Harvard University's Mehrdad Izady estimates that there are 10,000–12,000 Kurds in the United States, but that they are difficult to count because they have arrived in the United States as Iranian, Iraqi, Syrian, and Soviet citizens. Marvine Howe, "After the War; Kurds in U.S. Call for More Backing," *The New York Times*, April 7, 1991, 15, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

77. Najmaldin Karim, President, Kurdish National Congress and President, Washington Kurdish Institute, interview by author, July 1, 1999, Washington, DC.
78. Mike van Dusen, former Chief of Staff, Committee on Foreign Relations, House International Affairs Committee, interview by author, May 26, 1999, Washington, DC. Van Dusen went on to say that he could not state definitively that this was the decision the Israelis made, but that it stood to reason.
79. Ibid.
80. Barkey, interview.
81. Najmaldin Karim, Kurdish National Congress, "Kurdish Refugees in Desperate Situation," *Nightline, ABC News*, American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., April 8, 1991, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
82. Ibid.
83. Mustafa Al-Karadaghi, "National Press Club Morning Newsmaker with Dr. Mustafa Al-Karadaghi, Director, Kurdish Human Rights Watch, Dr. Ahmed Uthman, Member, Kurdish National Congress, Dr. Asaad Khailani, Member, Kurdish National Congress" at the National Press Club, Washington, DC, April 8, 1991, Federal News Service, available in Lexis-Nexis Universe library.
84. Dr. Pary, Kurdish Human Rights Watch, Ibid.
85. Assad Khailani, Ibid.
86. As Saddam was putting down the Kurdish rebellion, members of the media were pressuring White House Spokesperson Margaret Tutweiler, asking whether the administration had met with Iraqi Kurdish representatives. Tutweiler stated no—the Kurds had not asked for a meeting. According to Najmaldin Karim the KNC had pressed repeatedly for meetings; they repeated their request at this juncture and finally achieved this objective in May 1991. Karim, interview.
87. Ideally, according to Karim, there could be an independent Kurdistan made up of all of the territory where Kurds are the majority, however the greatest chance for a sovereign state exists in Iraq, where there is already de facto independence.
88. Karim, interview.
89. Van Dusen, interview.
90. Ibid.
91. Karim, interview.
92. Ibid.
93. Karim states that he and the Senator Mitchell held a press conference together.
94. Karim expressed admiration for Senator Kassebaum's "courageous" position in favor of sanctions, given the fact that she was a Republican representing Kansas, a farm state. Senator Bilbray, according to Karim, wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Kurds. In the aftermath of the gassing of the Iraqi Kurds in Halabja and other villages in 1988 Senator Pell was one of those who publicly questioned the U.S. government's support for Saddam Hussein and demanded that the Iraqi government be sanctioned for such human rights violations. Senator Pell's chief staffer for this issue was Peter Galbraith, who secured the files on the gassing of the Kurds in 1991, and later became ambassador to Croatia.

95. Wolfowitz, interview.
96. Andrew Semmel, Legislative Assistant to Senator Richard Lugar and former staff member, Foreign Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, interview by author, July 1, 1999, Washington, DC.

3 Ethiopia

1. Prior to Italian colonization, a number of loosely organized empires succeeded one another including Sudanic Funj Kingdom, Ottoman empire, Egypt, and several Ethiopian imperial dynasties. David Pool, *Eritrea: Towards Unity in Diversity* (London: Minority Rights Group, 1997), 4.
2. *Ethiopia, Somalia, Djibouti: Country Profile 1990–91* (The Economist Intelligence Unit, September 1990),3.
3. Ibid., 3.
4. Heraclides, 179.
5. Ibid., 179.
6. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles as quoted in Amare Tekle, ed., *Eritrea and Ethiopia: From Conflict to Cooperation* (Lawrenceville, NJ: The Red Sea Press, 1994), 172.
7. Ibid., 172.
8. Tekeste Negash and Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, *Eritrea and Ethiopia: The Federal Experience* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, Rutgers—The State University, 1997), 19–22.
9. Tom Post with Todd Shields, Daniel Pedersen, Jane Whitmore, and Ann McDaniel, " 'Cohen's Coup' in Ethiopia," *Newsweek*, June 10, 1991, 33.
10. Report of the Referendum Commissioner of Eritrea (RCE); " 'Referendum' 93 Tzebtzab Commissioner, Nehase 1992" as cited in Ruth Iyob, "The Eritrean Experiment: A Cautious Pragmatism?" *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 35, no. 4 (December 1997): 648.
11. Herman J. Cohen, interview by author, June 15, 1999, Arlington, VA.
12. Steve Morrison, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State, Former Staff Member, Subcommittee on Africa, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, interview by author, July 12, 1999, Washington, DC.
13. Herman J. Cohen, "3: Ethiopia—Ending a Thirty-Year War with a Soft Landing," unpublished manuscript, 22.
14. Testfatsion Mehdhane, *Eritrea & Neighbors in the 'New World Order': Geopolitics, Democracy and 'Islamic Fundamentalism'* (Bremen, Germany: Informationszentrum Afrika (IZA), no year given), 42. According to Morrison there was also considerable goodwill toward the Eritreans in Europe, primarily in Norway and in Britain within the Labor Party, with the faith-based Left and NGOs, which had stronger influence with parliaments than U.S. NGOs had on Capitol Hill.

15. Cohen, interview.
16. Cohen, unpublished manuscript, 12.
17. Cohen, interview.
18. Ibid.
19. Cohen, manuscript, 22.
20. Robert Houdek, National Intelligence Officer for Africa, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs and Ambassador to Ethiopia, phone interview by author, May 13, 1999, Washington, DC.
21. Gil Kapen, Staff Member, Subcommittee on African Affairs, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, interview by author, June 25, 1999, Washington, DC.
22. Baffour Agyeman-Duah, *The United States and Ethiopia: Military Assistance and the Quest for Security, 1953–1993* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1994), 183.
23. Terrence Lyons, "Post-Cold War U.S. Policy Towards Africa: Hints from the Horn," *Brookings Review* (January 1992), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
24. U.S. Department of State, "Elections in Ethiopia: Statement by Department Spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, Washington, DC, 30 March 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 6, 1992)," 271.
25. Lyons, "Post-Cold War U.S. Policy", 271.
26. "Ethiopia Boils," *The Washington Times*, June 3, 1991, D2.
27. Kinfe Abraham, *Ethiopia: From Bullets to the Ballot Box; The Bumpy Road to Democracy and the Political Economy of Transition* (Lawrenceville, NJ: The Red Sea Press, 1994), 15.
28. Okbazhi Yohannes, *Eritrea: A Pawn in World Politics* (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1991), 191.
29. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, *Aid to Africa: Hearing of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee*, June 4, 1991, Federal News Service.
30. James L. Woods, former Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, U.S. Department of Defense, interview by author, June 15, 1999, Arlington, VA. The opposition groups Woods refers to are the Amhara and Oromo, respectively.
31. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, *Aid to Africa*.
32. Yohannes, *Eritrea*, 188.
33. Cohen, interview.
34. David Pool, "Eritrean Independence: The Legacy of the Derg and the Politics of Reconstruction," *African Affairs* 92 (1993): 391.
35. Cohen, manuscript, 457.
36. Pool, "Eritrean Independence," 393.
37. Blaine Harden, "Yugoslav Crisis Raises Questions About Nature of National Unity," *The Washington Post*, June 30, 1991, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

38. Julie Wheelwright, "Eritrea's New Dawn," *New Statesman and Society* (April 23, 1993): 11.
39. Cohen, interview.
40. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa and Subcommittee on International Operations, *An Assessment of Recent Developments in the Horn of Africa, Joint Hearing before the Subcommittees on Africa and International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives*, 102nd Cong., 2nd Sess., April 8, 1992, 24–25.
41. Cohen, manuscript, 21.
42. Cohen, interview.
43. Woods, interview.
44. Howard Witt, "Rebellions Factions Threaten Ethiopia's Future," *Chicago Tribune*, June 2, 1991, 1.
45. Morrison, interview.
46. Ibid.
47. Woods, interview.
48. Ibid.
49. Roger S. Whitcomb, *The American Approach to Foreign Affairs* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998), 70.
50. James Knight, Ethiopia Desk Officer, U.S. Department of State, phone interview, June 23, 1999, Washington, DC.
51. Kapen, interview.
52. Ibid.
53. Cohen, manuscript, 2.
54. Ibid.
55. This summary of the origins and composition of the Ethiopian Americans is based upon James Knight, interview.
56. Cohen, manuscript, 21.
57. Kapen, interview.
58. Cohen, manuscript, 21.
59. Ibid., 36.
60. Harden, "Yugoslav Crisis Raises Questions."
61. Medhanie, *Eritrea & Neighbors*, 52.
62. Houdek, interview.
63. Morrison, interview.
64. Knight, interview.
65. Deborah Scroggins, "Ethiopia's Civil War; Long-Distance Loyalties Stir Expatriates; Passionate Politics are Order of the Day in Local Community," *The Atlanta Journal*—Constitution, August 3, 1991, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
66. Morrison, 3, interview.
67. Kapen, interview.
68. Ibid.

69. Cohen, manuscript, 1, 27. Cohen credits this lobby with pushing through, in 1991, an amendment to the Defense Department appropriations bill that allocated up to $15 million for the Falasha airlift.
70. Cohen, interview.
71. Medhanie, *Eritrea & Neighbors*, 52.
72. Houdek, interview.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
75. Kapen, interview.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
78. Cohen, manuscript, 5.
79. Andrew Semmel, Legislative Assistant to Senator Richard Lugar and former Staff Member, Foreign Relations Committee, interview by author, July 8, 1999, Washington, DC.

4 Bosnia-Hercegovina

1. Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History* (New York: New York University Press, 1994), xxi. See also Robert J. Donia and John V. A. Fine, Jr., *Bosnia and Hercegovina: A Tradition Betrayed* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1984); and Barbara Jelavich, *History of the Balkans: Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
2. The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slavs was established on December 1, 1918, and was renamed Yugoslavia in 1929.
3. In 1981, 15.8% of all Bosnian children were the products of mixed marriages, and in Sarajevo 45% of families were mixed. Yahya M. Sadowski, "Bosnia's Muslims: A Fundamentalist Threat?" *The Brookings Review* 13 (Winter 1995): 13.
4. Sabrina Petra Ramet, *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to Ethnic War* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 244. The figures are taken from the April 1991 census.
5. During 1992, the Serbs consolidated their gains via ethnic cleansing. By the end of the year there were two million refugees, mostly Muslims. As late as April 1992, Izetbegovic still indicated that he considered the Serb paramilitaries, rather than Belgrade, responsible by requesting JNA assistance to protect the town of Bijelina. The JNA immediately occupied the town, turning it into a stronghold for the Bosnian Serbs.
6. Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 238.
7. See Major General Lewis Mackenzie, *Peacekeeper* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1993), 304.

8. This was the ethnic composition of the Bosnian cabinet as late as February 12, 1993.
9. Major General Lewis Mackenzie, 1992–93 Commander of UN forces in Bosnia, interview with author, February 11, 1998, Triangle, VA.
10. The safe-area idea was first proposed in October 1992, but in December Cyrus Vance spoke out against it. This occurred right after the Bosnian government had launched successful offensives, and the idea was shelved until March 1993 when the suffering in Srebrenica made the headlines.
11. It is difficult to ascertain whether the UNPROFOR leaders and their political masters in London and Paris were in fact pro-Serb, as most of the American literature suggests. However their insistence that the UN maintain its neutrality and focus on humanitarian work—in effect, do nothing to change the strategic situation on the ground in Bosnia—directly benefited the Serbs. The short-lived Clinton administration attempt to lift the arms embargo so that the Muslims could match Serb heavy weaponry, and most attempts to launch air strikes or to offer close air support by NATO were defeated by British and French objections. UN, British, and French willingness to cut deals with the Bosnian Serbs and to exert pressure on the Muslims to accept any agreement, however unjust, revealed a greater desire "to be done with it," than to punish the aggressors.
12. David Rohde, *Endgame: The Betrayal and Fall of Srebrenica, Europe's Worst Massacre Since World War II* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997), 333.
13. Laura Silber and Allan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (London: Penguin Books and BBC Books, 1996), 340. On September 15, with the territorial balance exceeding 51-49, Holbrooke pressured the Bosnian government to halt their offensive.
14. Rohde, *Endgame*, 340. The UN Commander in Sarajevo, Rupert Smith, had the pretext to launch air strikes because the London Declaration's promise to defend Gorazde had been extended to the other safe areas, including Sarajevo. To neutralize the hostage threat, peacekeepers had been leaving Gorazde. On August 30 the bombing of Serb positions around Sarajevo began and continued for three days until Mladic agreed to pull his heavy weapons back. When he failed to comply, bombing resumed on September 5.
15. Silber and Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia*, 340.
16. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Bosnia: The U.S. Role: Testimony of Robert Gelbard, Special Representative of the President and the Secretary of State for Implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords, Hearing Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, November 17, 1997, <http://www.lexis/thomas.loc.gov> February 9, 1999.
17. David C. Gompert, "The United States and Yugoslavia's Wars," in Richard Ullman, ed., *The World and Yugoslavia's Wars* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1996), 128.

18. In the end, of course, NATO was weakened, the WEU revealed as meaningless, and the EC Eurocrat's dream of a common foreign and security policy remained just that.
19. U.S. Department of State, "U.N. Peacekeeping Efforts to Promote Security and Stability: John R. Bolton, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Excerpts from a Statement Before the Subcommittees on International Operations and on Human Rights and International Organizations of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, March 25, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (March 30, 1992), 246.
20. Ibid., 246.
21. U.S. Department of State, "The Need to Respond to War Crimes in the Former Yugoslavia: Secretary Eagleburger, Statement at the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, Geneva, Switzerland, December 16, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (December 28, 1992), 923–25.
22. U.S. Department of State, "New Steps Toward Conflict Resolution in the Former Yugoslavia: Secretary Christopher, Opening Statement at a News Conference, February 10, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (February 15, 1993), 81.
23. And at this point he stated that their efforts would be aimed at stopping the Serbs and preserving Bosnia as a state. See U.S. Department of State, "Statement at Senate Confirmation Hearing, Secretary-Designate Christopher, Statement Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC, January 13, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (January 25, 1993), 48.
24. U.S. Department of State, "NATO and US Foreign Policy: Secretary Christopher, Excerpts from the Intervention at the Special Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium, February 26, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (March 1, 1993), 121.
25. In May 1993, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, Peter Tarnoff, stated that the inaction of the United States in Bosnia was a calculated policy to withdraw from overseas commitments, because of limited resources and will. Thomas H. Henriksen, *Clinton's Foreign Policy in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti and North Korea* (Stanford: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, 1996), 20–21.
26. U.S. Department of State, "Anthony Lake, The Need for Engagement: Address to the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, Trenton, New Jersey, November 30, 1994," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (December 5, 1994), 806.
27. U.S. Department of State, "Foreign Assistance Priorities After the Cold War: Secretary Christopher, Statement before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC, May 18, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (May 31, 1993), 395.
28. Ibid. A notable exception to this interpretation was Margaret Thatcher. See Margaret Thatcher, "Stop the Excuses. Help Bosnia Now," *The New York Times*, August 6, 1992, A23.

29. Joshua Muravchik, *The Imperative of American Leadership: A Challenge to Neo-Isolationism* (Washington, DC: The American Enterprise Institute Press, 1996), 108.
30. Elizabeth Drew, *On The Edge: The Clinton Presidency* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 148 and Elaine Sciolino, "Who Can Make Peace in Bosnia?: The U.S. Says France. No, Only the Bosnians, Says the U.S.," *The New York Times*, January 28, 1994, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
31. Jan Wilem Honig and Norbert Both, *Srebrenica: Record of a War Crime* (New York: Penguin Books, 1996), 167–68.
32. Stephen J. Blank, William T. Johnsen, and Earl H. Tilford, Jr., *U.S. Policy in the Balkans: A Hobson's Choice* (Carlyle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1995), 12. Margaret Thatcher makes the same assertion in Margaret Thatcher, *Path to Power* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995).
33. NATO was already in a difficult situation before the war in Bosnia broke out because of the perception by many that it no longer had a mission in a world where the Warsaw Pact and USSR did not exist. Those who argued for continued support to NATO did so stating that its mission could evolve to include crisis management operations "out-of-area," and indeed some others such as Senator Richard Lugar declared that NATO should go "out of area or out of business." Yet as the atrocities mounted and NATO allies argued about the correct policy in Bosnia, with the U.S. moving toward NATO military action, and its allies hesitating because of their troops on the ground, NATO appeared increasingly paralyzed and riven by dissent.
34. Bob Woodward, *The Choice* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 256.
35. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, *The Peace Process in the Former Yugoslavia, Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations*, 104th Cong., 1st sess., October 17 and December 1, 1995, 19.
36. Rohde, *Endgame*, 333.
37. The "lift and leave" scenario would have meant certain devastation for the Bosnian government, which would need time after an embargo was lifted to receive shipments of weapons and materiel and to train their troops. Its opponents would not be constrained in this fashion—they could rapidly reinforce—and would almost immediately overwhelm Bosnian forces. Only a combination of lifting the embargo, air strikes, and probably the insertion of already trained and equipped armed forces would be certain to prevent such a scenario.
38. He made this remark at a June 14, 1995 meeting according to Bob Woodward, 255.
39. James Gow, *Triumph of the Lack of Will* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 87.
40. U.S. Department of Defense, "Dayton Accords Must Succeed to Prevent Wider War: Remarks by Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor, Georgetown University, September 23, 1997," *Defense Issues* 12, no. 48, <http://www.defenselink.mil/pub/di97/di1248.html> November 3, 1997.

41. Under the Bush and Clinton administrations covert arms shipments were being sent to the Bosnian Muslims with the tacit acceptance of the U.S. government. However, the U.S. government did not play any role in supplying the covert assistance. See Richard Holbrooke, *To End a War* (New York: Random House, 1998), 51.
42. Gompert, "The United States and Yugoslavia's Wars," 136.
43. U.S. Department of State, "Containing the Crisis in Bosnia and the Former Yugoslavia: President Bush, Opening Remarks from News Conference, Colorado Springs, August 6, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (August 10, 1992), 617.
44. Ibid., 617.
45. U.S. Department of State, "America's Role in the World: President Bush, Address at West Point Military Academy, January 5, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (January 11, 1993), 13.
46. Gompert, "The United States and Yugoslavia's Wars," 137.
47. U.S. Department of State, "Statement on the Former Yugoslavia: North Atlantic Council Ministerial Meeting, Brussels, December 17, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (December 28, 1992), 929.
48. Gompert, "The United States and Yugoslavia's Wars," 137.
49. U.S. Department of State, "Helping the New Independent States, Sanctions on Serbia/Montenegro: Excerpts of Secretary Baker's Remarks at Concluding News Conference of the Lisbon Conference on Assistance to the New Independent States, May 24, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (June 1, 1992), 429.
50. Mark Danner, "Clinton, the UN, and the Bosnian Disaster," *The New York Review of Books* (December 18, 1997): 72.
51. U.S. Department of State, "New Steps Toward Conflict Resolution in the Former Yugoslavia: Secretary Christopher, Opening Statement at a News Conference, February 10, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (February 15, 1993), 81.
52. U.S. Department of State, "America's Partnership With the European Community: Secretary Christopher, Statement at the Conclusion of the EC Ministerial, Plateau du Kirchberg, Luxembourg, June 9, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (June 21, 1993), 447.
53. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Statement of the Hon. Stephen A. Oxman, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Canadian Affairs, Department of State, *Developments in Europe and the Former Yugoslavia: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., September 15, 1993, 2.
54. Department of State, "Bosnia-Hercegovina: Statement by Secretary Christopher, March 25, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (April 5,1993), 200.
55. U.S. Department of State, "US Consultations with Allies on Bosnia-Herzegovina: Secretary Christopher, May 1, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (May 10, 1993), 321.

56. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Developments in Europe and the Former Yugoslavia: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., September 15, 1993, 2.
57. Gompert, "The United States and Yugoslav's Wars," 135.
58. Elaine Sciolino, "Who Can Make Peace in Bosnia?" The author describes U.S. strategy as an attempt "to portray Bosnia as a human tragedy about which Washington can do little."
59. U.S. Department of Defense, " 'Dayton Accords Must Succeed to Prevent Wider War' Remarks by Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor, Georgetown University, September 23, 1997," *Defense Issues* 12, no. 48, <http://www.defenselink.mil/pub/di97/di1248.html> November 3, 1997.
60. Drew, *On the Edge*, 144.
61. Robert Mason Beecroft, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, U.S. Department of State, interview by author, March 8, 1999, Washington, DC.
62. U.S. Department of State, "U.S. Policy Towards Yugoslavia; Statement Released by Department Spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, May 24, 1991" *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (June 3, 1991), 395.
63. U.S. Department of State, "US Meeting with Bosnian Foreign Minister: Statement released by the Office of the Assistant Secretary/Spokesman, August 19, 1992," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (August 24, 1992), 671.
64. U.S. Department of State, "Intervention at the London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, Acting Secretary Eagleburger, Intervention on August 26, during the Conference held, August 26–28, London, United Kingdom," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (August 31, 1992), 675. Contrary to most of his statements on the cause of the war, he stated that the fighting was not inevitable, but was willed by men seeking to perpetuate the last Communist regime.
65. U.S. Department of State, "New Steps Toward Conflict Resolution in the Former Yugoslavia: Secretary Christopher, Opening Statement at a News Conference, February 10, 1993," *U.S. Department of State Dispatch* (February 15, 1993), 81.
66. Clinton made this remark in April 1993. Mark Danner, "Clinton, the UN, and the Bosnian Disaster," 78.
67. Silber and Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia*, 377.
68. "Separating History from Myth: An Interview with Ivo Banac," in *Why Bosnia?: Writings on the Bosnian War*, ed. Rabia Ali and Lawrence Lifschultz (Stony Creek, CT: The Pamphleteer's Press, Inc., 1993), 149.
69. Ramet, *Balkan Babel*, 249.
70. Ibid., 249–50. Her main source is Rein Mullerson, "New Developments in the Former USSR and Yugoslavia," *Virginia Journal of International Law* 33, no. 2 (Winter 1993): 313. For an interesting examination of this issue, from the perspective of a large multiethnic, status quo state, see Raju G. C. Thomas "Self-Determination and International Recognition Policy: An Alternative

Interpretation of why Yugoslavia Disintegrated," *World Affairs* 160, no. 1 (Summer 1997): 17–33.

71. U.S. Congress, Senate, *The Peace Process in the Former Yugoslavia: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations*, 104th Cong., 1st sess., October 17, and December 1, 1995, 32.
72. Ibid., 32.
73. U.S. Department of Defense, " 'Dayton Accords Must Succeed …' ".
74. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, *US Policy Toward Bosnia and the Balkans, Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., May 11, 1994, 38.
75. Ibid., 42.
76. Ibid., 49.
77. During the 1996 presidential campaign season, the foundation posted an evaluation of both candidates listing their positions and action regarding Bosnia first. "Muslim Pros and Cons for President Bill Clinton and Senator Bob Dole."
78. Mackenzie insinuated that the Bosnian government may have staged the May 1992 bread line massacre in Sarajevo, launching a mortar round at its own citizens.
79. "Why Should You Become a Member of the Serbian Unity Congress?" Membership Form, at <http://www.suc.org/membership.html> January 25, 1999.
80. Before sanctions were imposed by the UN embargo on Serbia, Wise Communications in Washington, DC represented Serbia's interests through a contract with Jugopetrol, the state-owned oil company, Stanfield.
81. Ray Gutman, A Witness to Genocide: The 1993 Pulitzer Prize—Winning Dispatches on the Ethnic Cleansing of Bosnia (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1993), 171.
82. According to the SUC's IRS returns they funded journalists including Peter Brock, who wrote a pro-Serb January 1994 *Foreign Policy* article.
83. Brad Blitz, "Serbia's War Lobby," in *This Time We Knew: Western Response to Genocide in Bosnia*, ed. Thomas Cushman and Stjepan G. Mestrovic (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 214.
84. Blitz maintains this is significant because the largest bundle of cash given to a House member was 61,300 in 1992. The Serbian/Greek contributions during a 20-month period even challenged the thousands collected from Emily's List in 1992. Until 1991 the main interest groups making substantial donations to Hamilton were pro-Israel groups. From 1992 fewer PACS supported Hamilton, and as the Israeli lobby contributions went down, the Serbian/Greek support was more evident—up to 40% of individual contributions.
85. Blitz, "Serbia's War Lobby," 217.
86. At a time when the Serbs controlled of about 70% of Bosnian territory, Djordjevich called for a cease-fire and an arbitration panel. He equated Serb efforts to realize their self-determination with the U.S. civil war, and compared the right to do so with Germany's right to unify. See U.S. Congress, House

of Representatives, *US Policy Toward Bosnia and the Balkans, Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., May 11, 1994, 33–36.

87. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchenson and Representative Sam Gejdenson also received $1000 apiece, but returned the contributions shortly thereafter.
88. Deborah Lutterbeck, "The War Lobby," *Common Cause* (Fall 1995), available in Lexis-Nexis News library. Gramm's presidential campaign received $1000 from Djordevich and since 1991 Representative Baker received $8000 from him as well as $250 from the Vice President of the SUC. The former SUC Treasurer Peter Chelovich and his wife contributed $4000 to Senator Abraham as well as $3000 to Representative Chrysler and $5500 to Representative Knollenberg. Hamilton received at least $5000 from Serbian American sources.
89. Blitz, "Serbia's War Lobby," 223.
90. Lutterbeck, "The War Lobby."
91. H.AMDT.612, "Bill Summary & Status for the 103rd Congress," <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery>.
92. Elizabeth Drew describes Clinton's change in attitude regarding lift and strike as occurring just as Secretary Christopher was pitching the strategy to the Europeans. She attributes the shift in his thinking to Robert Kaplan's *Balkan Ghosts*, which described the inexorable, inevitable force of "ancient hatreds" upon the Yugoslav nations.
93. The author worked (as a Rosenthal Fellow) for Hamilton in his capacity as Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee from May to August 1993.
94. During the 102nd Congress, on September 16, 1992, Senator Slade Gorton called on the president to call an emergency UN Security Council meeting to terminate the arms embargo on Bosnia-Hercegovina and Croatia. In the 103rd Cong., Senator Dole sponsored ten bills to terminate the U.S. arms embargo on the Bosnian government.
95. James J. Sadkovich, *The U.S. Media and Yugoslavia, 1991–1995* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 202.
96. Dick Kirschten, "Sarajevo's Saviors," *National Journal* (March 19, 1994), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
97. Blitz, "The Serbia's War Lobby," 228.
98. The old Yugoslav hand, Lawrence Eagleburger, made numerous comments insinuating that the conflict reflected primordial tensions and that all sides were culpable. Toward the end of his tenure with the administration, he nonetheless pointed his finger at the Serbs as the chief aggressors. In the Clinton administration, Madeline Albright agreed with the assessment of the last ambassador to Yugoslavia that the Yugoslav leaders, primarily Milosevic, were to blame. She was an advocate for assisting the Bosnian government. Meanwhile, her superior, Warren Christopher, was convinced that the United States should maintain a hands-off approach to Bosnia; there was no winning policy.
99. Colin L. Powell, *My American Journey* (New York: Random House, 1995), 577. Powell and Caspar Weinburger, secretary of defense under President Bush had developed a list of criteria for authorizing use of U.S. military force. If met, the

Powell or Weinburger Doctrine principles insured that military force would only be applied when vital interests were threatened, the objective was clear, and the support of the U.S. public had been obtained, and that force would be overwhelming and decisive. Powell regarded the war in Bosnia as one where vital objectives were not involved.

100. Thomas Omestad, "Foreign Policy and Campaign 1996," *Foreign Policy* (Winter 1996–97), 42.
101. Powell, *My American Journey*, 291.
102. Powell's October 8, 1992 *The New York Times* article was written in response to an editorial asserting that after investing $280 billion in defense, we should take action in Bosnia.
103. Honig and Both, *Srebrenica*, 122.
104. Dick Kirschten, "Ethnics Resurging," *National Journal* (February 25, 1995), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.
105. Rohde, *Endgame*, 300.
106. Beecroft, interview.
107. Ibid.

5 Conclusions

1. This prototype stands in contrast to wars of attrition, such as our involvement in the Vietnamese civil war, and provides the philosophical basis for the Weinburger–Powell Doctrine, which argues for war as a last resort fought with unlimited means. As a sometimes idealized version of history, it ignores successes such as George Washington's Revolutionary War strategy, which employed attrition. See Russell Weigley, *The American Way of War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973).
2. Robert Mason Beecroft, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, U.S. Department of State, interview by author, March 8, 1999, Washington, DC.
3. For more on the American "strategic style" based on "the confrontation and resolution of crises," see Roger S. Whitcomb, *The American Approach to Foreign Affairs: An Uncertain Tradition* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998), 69–71. In the words of one author, the Bush and Clinton administrations conducted foreign policy in "a muddle-through mode." Karl von Vorys, *American Foreign Policy: Consensus at Home, Leadership Abroad* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1997), 312.
4. See Warren Strobel, *Late-Breaking Foreign Policy: The News Media's Influence on Peace Operations* (Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace, 1997) for an assessment of the impact of media pressure on U.S. participation in recent peace operations, including those conducted in Bosnia and Iraq.
5. William Shakespeare, "A Midsummer-Night's Dream," III, ii, in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare, Volume I, Comedies* (Roslyn, NY: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1965), 208.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

"About ATAA." <http://www.ataa.org/ataa/about/about.html> April 23, 1999.

"About AKIN." <http://www.kurdistan.org/aboutakin.html> April 23, 1999.

Abraham, Kinfe. *Ethiopia: From Bullets to the Ballot Box; The Bumpy Road to Democracy and the Political Economy of Transition*. Lawrenceville, New Jersey: The Red Sea Press, 1994.

Abramowitz, Morton, former Ambassador to Turkey. Interview by author, July 8, 1998, Washington, DC.

Achen, Christopher H. and Duncan Snidal. "Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies." *World Politics* (January 1989): 143–69.

Agyeman-Duah, Baffour. *The United States and Ethiopia: Military Assistance and the Quest for Security, 1953–1993*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1994.

Ajami, Fouad. "History Repeats Itself in the Gulf." *The New Republic*. February 23, 1998, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Ali, Rabia and Lawrence Lifschultz, eds. *Why Bosnia?: Writings on the Bosnian War*. Stony Creek, CT: The Pamphleteer's Press, Inc., 1993.

Allegrone, Kathleen, Deputy Director, Office of Northern Gulf Affairs, Department of State. Phone interview by author, May 18, 1999, Washington, DC.

Amitay, Mike, Executive Director, Washington Kurdish Institute. Interview by author, May 21, 1999, Washington, DC.

Atkinson, Rick. *Crusade*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1993.

Baker, James A. III with Thomas M. DeFrank. *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War and Peace 1989–1992*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1995.

Banac, Ivo. *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Barkey, Henri, Staff Member, Policy Planning, Department of State. Interview by author, May 12, 1999, Washington, DC.

Barnes, Fred of *The New Republic*. Quoted in *MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour*, April 1, 1991, transcript #4010, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Beecroft, Robert Mason, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State. Interview by author, March 8, 1999, Washington, DC.

Bengio, Ofra. "The Challenge to the Territorial Integrity of Iraq." *Survival* 37, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 74–94.

Berry, Nicholas O. "The Management of Foreign Penetration." *Orbis* (Summer 1973): 598–619.

Beyer, Lisa. "Ethiopia: Rebels Take Charge." *Time* (June 10, 1991), available in Lexis-News library.

Bienen, Henry. "Ethnic Nationalisms and Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy." In *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*, 159–60. Edited by Charles A. Kupchan. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Biles, Peter. "Birth of a Nation." *Africa Report* (July/August 1993): 13–19.

"Bill Summary & Status for the 103rd Congress." <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgibin/bdquery> January 28, 1999.

"Bill Summary & Status for the 104th Congress." <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgibin/bdquery> January 28, 1999.

Blank, Stephen J., William T. Johnsen, and Earl H. Tilford, Jr. *U.S. Policy in the Balkans: A Hobson's Choice*. Carlyle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1995.

Blitz, Brad. "Serbia's War Lobby." In *This Time We Knew: Western Response to Genocide in Bosnia*, 214–29. Edited by, Thomas Cushman and Stjepan G. Mestrovic. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Bolger, Daniel P. *Savage Peace: Americans at War in the 1990s*. Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1995.

Boniface, Pascal. "The Proliferation of States." *The Washington Quarterly* 21, no.3 (Summer 1998): 111–27.

"Briefing: The Eritrean-Ethiopian Border Dispute." *African Affairs* (October 1998) <http://web3.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/ses…/272/595/13407933w5/140!xrn_47_0_A53356369> April 25, 1999.

Brown, J. F. *Nationalism, Democracy, and Security in the Balkans*. Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1992.

Brown, Michael, ed. *Ethnic Conflict and International Security*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

——. *The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995.

——. *The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1996.

Buchanan, Allen. *Secession: The Morality of Political Divorce from Fort Sumter to Lithuania and Quebec*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991.

Bulloch, John and Harvey Morris. *No Friends but the Mountains: The Tragic History of the Kurds*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bureau for Humanitarian Response. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. *Annual Report: FY 1994*. Washington, DC.

Bureau for Humanitarian Response. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. Agency for International Development. "Northern Iraq—Displaced Persons." *Situation Report #1–5* (November 7, 1995).

——. "Northern Iraq—Displaced Persons." *Situation Report #2 FY 1996* (February 5, 1996).

Bush, George H., President. "Exchange with Reporters on Aid to Iraqi Refugees." April 11, 1991 <http:///www.csdl.tamu.edu/bushlib/papers/1991/91041102.html> May 13, 1998.

——. "Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Situation in the Persian Gulf." 17 May, 1991 <http://www.csdl.tamu.edu/bushlib/papers/1991/91051704.html> May 13, 1998.

——. "Remarks on Assistance for Iraqi Refugees and a News Conference." April 16, 1991 <http://www.csdl.tamu.edu/bushlib/papers/1991/91041608.html> May 13, 1998.

——. "Exchange with Reporters on Aid to Iraqi Refugees." April 11, 1991 <http:///www.csdl.tamu.edu/bushlib/papers/1991/91041102.html> May 13, 1998.

Callahan, David. *Unwinnable Wars: American Power and Ethnic Conflict*. New York: Hill & Wang Publishers, 1998.

Candar, Cengiz, journalist, *Sabah*, and former advisor to President Ozal. Interview by author, May 26, 1999, Washington, DC.

Carley, Patricia. *Self-Determination: Sovereignty, Territorial Integrity, and the Right to Secession*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace (March 1996).

——. *U.S. Responses to Self-Determination Movements: Strategies for Nonviolent Outcomes and Alternatives to Secession*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace (July 1997).

Chaliand, Gerard. *A People Without a Country: The Kurds and Kurdistan*. New York: Olive Branch Press, 1993.

"Charter 91." <http://www.iraqfoundation.org/forum/Projects/charter91.html> April 23, 1999.

Chazan, Naomi, ed. *Irredentism and International Politics*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner Publishers, Inc., 1991.

Cigar, Norman. *Genocide in Bosnia: The Policy of "Ethnic Cleansing."* College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995.

Cohen, Herman J. "3: Ethiopia—Ending a Thirty-Year War with a Soft Landing." Unpublished manuscript.

——. Interview by author, June 15, 1999, Arlington, VA.

Connell, Dan. "Letter from Eritrea." *The Nation* (March 29, 1999), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Connor, Walker. *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Crawford, James. *The Creation of States in International Law*. Oxford, England: Oxford Press, 1979.

Dagne, Theodros S. *Ethiopia: The Struggle for Unity and Democracy*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, June 20, 1992.

Danchev, Alex and Thomas Halverson, eds. *International Perspectives on the Yugoslav Conflict*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Danner, Mark. "The U.S. and the Yugoslav Catastrophe." *The New York Review of Books* (November 20, 1997): 56–64.

Danner, Mark. "America and the Bosnia Genocide." *The New York Review of Books* (December 4, 1997): 55–66.

——. "Clinton, the UN, and the Bosnian Disaster." *The New York Review of Books* (December 18, 1997): 65–81.

——. "Bosnia: The Turning Point." *The New York Review of Books* (February 5, 1998): 34–41.

——. "Bosnia: The Great Betrayal." *The New York Review of Books* (March 26, 1998): 40–50.

——. "The Killing Fields of Bosnia." *The New York Review of Books* (September 24, 1998): 69–77.

Denitch, Bogdan. *Ethnic Nationalism: The Tragic Death of Yugoslavia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Donia, Robert J. and John, V.A. Fine Jr. *Bosnia and Hercegovina: A Tradition Betrayed*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Dougherty, James and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff Jr. *Contending Theories of International Relations*. 3rd ed. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 1990.

Drew, Elizabeth. *On The Edge: The Clinton Presidency*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Dusen, Mike van, former Chief of Staff, Committee on Foreign Relations, House International Affairs Committee. Interview by author, May 26, 1999, Washington, DC.

Eagleton, William Jr. *The Kurdish Republic of 1946*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

"Eritrea's Hard Road to Independence." *Africa Confidential* 33, no. 6 (March 30, 1992): 7–2.

"Ethiopia: From Rebels to Rulers." *Africa Confidential* 32, no. 11 (May 31, 1991): 1–3.

"Ethiopia: Holding the Centre." *Africa Confidential* (June 14, 1991): 3–4.

"Ethiopia: Majorities and Minorities." *Africa Confidential* 32, no. 14 (July 12, 1991): 1–2.

"Ethiopia: Mengistu's Last Throw." *Africa Confidential* 32, no. 9 (May 3, 1991): 2–4.

"Ethiopia, Somalia, Djibouti: County Profile 1990–91." *The Economist Intelligence Unit*, September 1990, 3.

Facts on File World News Digest. Facts on File, Inc., 1984.

Fein, Bruce. "Kurdish Enclaves more Curio than Paradigm." *New Jersey Law Journal* (May 23, 1991), available in Lexis-Nexis Law Review library.

Filippone, Robert. "The Humanitarian Moment: Humanitarian Intervention and United States Decision-Making in the 1990s." Ph.D. dissertation, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, 1995.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service. Near East and South Asia. March 29, 1991, FBIS, 12.

Forster, Col. Larry M. Interview by author, April 30, 1996, Cambridge, MA.

——. "Operation Provide Comfort: A Shield for Humanitarian Intervention in Iraqi Kurdistan," a Harvard Center for International Affairs Research Paper, April 20, 1996.

Freij, Hanna Yousif. "Alliance Patterns of a Secessionist Movement: The Kurdish Nationalist Movement in Iraq." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 18, no. 1 (April 1998): 19–37.

Fuller, Graham E. "The Fate of the Kurds." *Foreign Affairs* 74 (Spring 1993): 108–21.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsiderations, Provocations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

——. *Saddam's Documents: A Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate*. Washington, DC: U.S. G.P.O, 1992.

Galbraith, Peter. Interview by author, August 25, 1999, Washington, DC.

Galucci, Robert. Interview by author, July 12, 1999, Washington, DC.

Galvin, John. Former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe. Interview by author, May 7, 1996, Medford, MA.

——. Interview by author, June 26, 1998, Medford, MA.

Galvin, John. "Chapter 16: The Kurds." Unpublished manuscript.

Gauch, Sarah. "Getting All the Help they Can." *Africa Report* (July/August 1993): 18–19.

Gelbard, Ambassador Robert, Special Representative of the President and Secretary of State for Implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords. Interview by author, May 7, 1999, Washington, DC.

Gellner, Ernest. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Rivals*. New York: The Penguin Press, 1994.

George, Alexander L. and Timothy J. McKeown. "Case Studies and Theories of Organizational Decision Making." *Advances in Information Processing In Organizations* 2 (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1985): 21–58.

George, Alexander L. and Richard Smoke. "Deterrence and Foreign Policy." *World Politics* (January 1989): 170–82.

Glenny, Misha. *The Fall of Yugoslavia*. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.

——. "The Age of the Parastate." *The New Yorker*, May 8, 1995, 45–53.

Godina, Vesna V. "The Outbreak of Nationalism on Former Yugoslav Territory: A Historical Perspective on the Problem of a Supranational Identity." *Nations and Nationalism* 4, no. 3 (1998): 409–22.

Goldberg, David Howard. *Foreign Policy and Ethnic Interest Groups*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Gordon, Michael R. and General Bernard E. Trainor. *The Generals War*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1995.

Gow, James. *Triumph of the Lack of Will*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Greenstein, Fred I. and Nelson W. Polsby, eds. *Handbook of Political Science. Vol. 6, Foreign Policy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975.

Gunter, Michael M. *The Kurds of Iraq: Tragedy and Hope*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Gurr, Ted Robert and Barbara Harff. *Ethnic Conflict in World Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994.

Gutman, Roy. *A Witness to Genocide: The 1993 Pulitzer Prize-winning Dispatches on the Ethnic Cleansing of Bosnia*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1993.

Halperin, Morton H., David J. Scheffer, and Patricia L. Small. *Self-Determination in the New World Order*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1992.

Haltzell, Michael, Staff Member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Phone interview by author, June 29, 1999, Washington, DC.

Hamel, Jacque, Stephanie Dufour, and Dominic Fortin. *Case Study Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1993.

Hannum, Hurst. *Autonomy, Sovereignty, and Self-Determination: The Accommodation of Conflicting Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.

Hayden, Robert M. "The Partition of Bosnia and Hercegovina, 1990–1993." *RFE/RL Research Report* 2, no. 22 (May 1993): 131.

Henderson, Gregory, Richard Ned Lebow, and John Stoessinger. *Divided Nations in a Divided World*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1974.

Henriksen, Thomas H. *Clinton's Foreign Policy in Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti and North Korea*. Stanford: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, 1996.

Henze, Paul. *Ethiopia in 1991—Peace through Struggle*. RAND Paper, P-7743, Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1991.

——. *The Defeat of the Derg and the Establishment of New Governments in Ethiopia and Eritrea*. RAND Paper, P-7766, Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1992.

Heraclides, Alexis. *The Self-Determination of Minorities in International Relations*. London: Frank Cass and Company Ltd., 1991.

——. "The International Dimension of Secessionist Movements." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kent, 1985.

Hillway, Tyrus. *Handbook of Educational Research; A Guide to Methods and Materials*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, (1969).

Holbrooke, Richard. *To End a War*. New York: Random House, 1998.

Holsti, Kalevi J. *Change in the International System: Essays on the Theory and Practice of International Relations*. Hants, England: Edward Elgar Publishing Company, 1991.

——. *Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order 1648–1989*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Honig, Jan Wilem and Norbert Both. *Srebrenica: Record of a War Crime*. New York: Penguin Books, 1996.

Horowitz, Donald. *Ethnic Groups and Conflict*. Charlotte, NC: Duke University Press, 1985.

——. "Ethnic Conflict Management for Policymakers." *In Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies*, 115–30. Edited by Joseph V. Montville. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1990.

Houdek, Robert, National Intelligence Officer for Africa, and former Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs and Ambassador to Ethiopia. Phone interview by author, May 13, 1999, Washington, DC.

"How Many States for the Afar?" *Africa Confidential* 32, no. 14 (July 12, 1991): 2.

Hussien, Seifudein. "The Conflict in Eritrea Reconsidered." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 18, no. 1 (1988): 159–68.

Ibrahim, Ibrahim, ed. *The Gulf Crisis: Background and Consequences*. Washington, DC: Center for Contemporary Arab Studies, Georgetown University, 1992.

Iraq Report. November 13, 1998–March 12, 1999, <http://www.rferl.org/iraq-report> March 16, 1999.

Ismael, Tareq and Jacqueline Ismael. *Politics and Government in the Middle East and North Africa*. Miami, FL: Florida International University Press, 1990.

Iyob, Ruth. "The Eritrean Experiment: A Cautious Pragmatism?" *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 35, no. 4 (December 1997): 647–73.

Izady, Mehrdad R. *The Kurds: A Concise Handbook*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis, 1992.

Jelavich, Barbara. *History of the Balkans: Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Jentleson, W. *With Friends Like These: Reagan, Bush, and Saddam, 1982–1990*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1994.

Kapen, Gil, Staff Member, Subcommittee on African Affairs, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives. Interview by author, June 25, 1999, Washington, DC.

Karim, Najmaldin, President, Kurdish National Congress. Interview by author, July 1, 1999, Washington, DC.

Kaufmann, Chaim. "Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars," *International Security* 20, no. 4 (Spring 1996): 136–75.

Keller, Edmond J. "The United States, Ethiopia and Eritrean Independence." In *Eritrea and Ethiopia: From Conflict to Cooperation*, 169–85. Edited by Amare Tekle. Lawrenceville, New Jersey: The Red Sea Press, 1994.

Kelly, Michael. "Back to the Hills." *The New Republic*, June 3, 1991, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Kent, Sarah. "Review Essay, Writing the Yugoslav Wars: English-Language Books on Bosnia (1992–1996) and the Challenges of Analyzing Contemporary History." *American Historical Review* (October 1997): 1085–14.

Kirschten, Dick. "Sarajevo's Saviors." *National Journal* (March 19, 1994), available in Lexis-News News library.

Kirschten, Dick. "Ethnics Resurging." *National Journal* (February 25, 1995), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Kissinger, Henry. *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.

Klinger, Janeen. "Immigrants, Ethnic Lobbies, and American Foreign Policy." *Commonwealth: A Journal of Political Science* 7 (1994–95): 1–18.

Knight, James, Ethiopia Desk Officer, Department of State. Phone interview by author, June 23, 1999, Washington, DC.

Kupchan, Charles A. *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.

"Kurdish Politics in Washington." <http://www.kurdistan.org/Washington> April 23, 1999.

"Kurdish Refugees in Desperate Situation." *Nightline*. ABC News, American Broadcasting Companies, Inc., April 8, 1991.

Kymlicka, Wym. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Laizer, Sheri. *Martyrs, Traitors and Patriots: Kurdistan after the Gulf War*. London and New Jersey: Zen Books, Ltd., 1996.

Lapidoth, Ruth. "Sovereignty in Transition." *Journal of International Affairs* 45, no. 2 (Winter 1992): 325–46.

——. *Autonomy: Flexible Solutions to Ethnic Conflict*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace Press (1996).

Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Lefebvre, Jeffrey A. "The Geopolitics of the Horn of Africa." *Middle East Policy* 1, no. 3 (1992): 7–22.

"Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Situation in the Persian Gulf." May 17, 1991, <http://www.csdl.tamu.ed/bhushlib/aepers/1991/ 91051704.html> May 13, 1998.

Lewis, Herbert. "Beginning Again." *Africa Report* (September–October 1991): 59–62.

Lijphart, Arend. "Comparative Politics and Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65, no. 3 (September 1971): 682–93.

——. "The Comparable-Cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 8, no. 2 (July 1975): 171.

Lutterbeck, Deborah. "The War Lobby." *Common Cause* (Fall 1995), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Lyons, Terrence. "The Transition in Ethiopia." *CSIS Africa Notes* no. 127 (August 27, 1991).

——. "Post-Cold War U.S. Policy towards Africa: Hints from the Horn." *Brookings Review* (January 1992), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

——. "Closing the Transition: The May 1995 Elections in Ethiopia." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 31, no. 1 (1996): 121–42.

Mackenzie, Major General Lewis. *Peacekeeper*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1993.

——. 1992–93 Commander of UN forces in Bosnia. Interview by author, February 11, 1998, Triangle, VA.

Mackinlay, John and Jarat Chopra. "Second Generation Multinational Operations." *The Washington Quarterly* (Summer 1992), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Malcolm, Noel. *Bosnia: A Short History*. New York: New York University Press, 1994.

Mansfield, Peter. *A History of the Middle East*. Viking Penguin: New York: 1991.

Marr, Phebe. *The Modern History of Iraq*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1985.

Mater, Nadire. "Northern Iraq: Kurdish Peace Remains as Distant as Dublin." *Inter Press Service*, August 31, 1995.

Mathias, Charles McC. Jr. "Ethnic Groups and Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* (Summer 1981): 978.

Maynes, Charles William. "Containing Ethnic Conflict." *Foreign Policy* 90 (Spring 1993): 12.

McDowall, David. *The Kurds: A Nation Denied*. London: Minority Rights Publications, 1992.

——. *A Modern History of the Kurds*. London: I. B. Tauris, 1996.

McGarry, John and Brendan O'Leary. *The Politics of Ethnic Conflict Regulation*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Mearsheimer, John J. "Shrink Bosnia to Save it." *New York Times*, March 31, 1993, A23.

Mearsheimer, John and Stephen Van Evera. "When Peace Means War." *The New Republic* (December 18, 1995): 16–18.

Medhanie, Tesfatsion. *Eritrea & Neighbors in the "New World Order": Geopolitics, Democracy and "Islamic Fundamentalism*." Bremen, Germany: Informationszentrum Afrika (IZA), no date printed.

Meldrum, Andrew. "Mengistu's Golden Parachute." *Africa Report* (July–August 1991): 42–44.

Morris, Dick. *Winning the Presidency in the Nineties*. New York: Random House, 1997.

Morrison, Steve, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State, Former Staff Member, Subcommittee on Africa, House Foreign Affairs Committee. Interview by author, July 12, 1999, Washington, DC.

Mullerson, Rein. "New Developments in the Former USSR and Yugoslavia." *Virginia Journal of International Law* 33, no. 2 (Winter 1993): 313.

Muravchik, Joshua. *The Imperative of American Leadership: A Challenge to Neo-Isolationism*. Washington, DC: The American Enterprise Institute Press, 1996.

Murray, Douglas J. and Paul R. Viotti, eds. *The Defense Policies of Nations: A Comparative Study*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Mutua, Makau wa. "Ethiopia: An Oppressed Opposition." *Africa Report* (November/December 1993): 50–52.

——. "The New Oligarchy." *Africa Report* (September/October 1993): 27–31.

Naab, Colonel Richard. Written correspondence with author, June 5, 1996.

Nacht, Alexander. "U.S. Foreign Policy Strategies." *The Washington Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (Summer 1995): 195–210.

Nash, Major General William. Interview by author, June 26, 1998, Cambridge, MA.

"National Press Club Morning Newsmaker with Dr. Mustafa Al-Karadaghi, Director, Kurdish Human Rights Watch, Dr. Ahmed Uthman, Member, Kurdish National Congress, Dr. Asaad Khailani, Member, Kurdish National Congress." National Press Club, Washington, DC: *Federal News Service*, April 8, 1991, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Navaratna-Bandara, Abeysinghe M. *The Management of Ethnic Secessionist Conflict: The Big Neighbor Syndrome*. Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1995.

Negash, Tekeste and Nordiska Afrikainstitutet. *Eritrea and Ethiopia: The Federal Experience*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, Rutgers—The State University, 1997.

Omestad, Thomas. "Foreign Policy and Campaign 1996." *Foreign Policy* 105 (Winter 1996–97): 37–54.

Owen, David. *Balkan Odyssey*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1995.

Paige, Glenn D. "The Korean Decision." In *International Politics and Foreign Policy: A Reader in Research and Theory*, 461–72. Edited by James Rosenau. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Pelletiere, Stephen C. *The Kurds: An Unstable Element in the Gulf*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984.

——. *The Kurds and their "Agas"—The Situation in Northern Iraq*. Washington, DC: Defense Intelligence Agency, VP-2200-691-91, November 1991.

Peters, Joel. *Israel and Africa*. London: The British Academic Press, 1992.

Pfaltzgraff Jr., Robert L., and Richard H. Shultz Jr., *Ethnic Conflict and Regional Instability: Implications for U.S. Policy and Army Roles and Missions.*, Carlyle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1994.

Pool, David. *Eritrea—Africa's Longest War*. London: Anti-Slavery Society, 1979 and 1982.

——. "Eritrean Independence: The Legacy of the Derg and the Politics of Reconstruction." *African Affairs* 92 (1993): 389–402.

——. *Eritrea: Towards Unity in Diversity*. London: Minority Rights Group, 1997.

Posen, Barry. "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict." *Survival* (Spring 1993): 27–47.

Posen, Barry. "Military Responses to Refugee Disasters." Draft manuscript, September 13, 1995, 1–54.

Post, Tom, Todd Shields, Daniel Pedersen, Jane Whitmore, and Ann McDaniel. " 'Cohen's Coup' in Ethiopia." *Newsweek*, June 10, 1991, 33.

Powell, Gen. Colin, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Interview by Lt. Col. Gordon W. Rudd (Pentagon, Washington, DC, 1992). U.S. Army's Official History of Operation Provide Comfort.

Powell, Colin L. *My American Journey*. New York: Random House, 1995.

Ramet, Sabrina Petra. *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia: 1962–1991*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

——. *Balkan Babel: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia from the Death of Tito to Ethnic War*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.

RFE/RL Iraq Report. January 15, 1999 <http://www.rferl.org/iraq-report/1999/01/2-150199.html> April 23, 1999.

——. February 5, 1999 <http://www.rferl.org/iraq-report/1999/02/5-050299.html> April 23, 1999.

Roberts, Brad, ed. *Order and Disorder after the Cold War*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1995.

Rohde, David. *Endgame: The Betrayal and Fall of Srebrenica, Europe's Worst Massacre Since World War II*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1997.

Roth, David. *Sacred Honor: Colin Powell, the Inside Account of his Life and Triumphs*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House and San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco, 1993.

Rothschild, Joseph. *Ethnopolitics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Rudd, Gordon. "Operation Provide Comfort: Humanitarian Intervention in Northern Iraq." Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1993.

——. Interviews of commanding officers, Operation Provide Comfort, U.S. Army Center of Military History, 1991.

Rudd, Lt. Col. Gordon. Tape—recorded discussion between Lt. General Shalikashvili and Kurdish leaders, Zahko, Iraq, June 19, 1992.

Ryan, Christopher M. "Sovereignty, Intervention, and the Law: A Tenuous Relationship of Competing Principles." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 26, no.1 (1997): 77–100.

Sadkovich, James J. *The U.S. Media and Yugoslavia, 1991–1995*. Westport, CN: Praeger, 1998.

Sadowski, Yahya M. "Bosnia's Muslims: A Fundamentalist Threat?" *The Brookings Review* 13 (Winter 1995): 13.

Said, A. and Simmons, C. R. *Ethnicity in an International Context*. New Jersey: Transaction, 1976.

Schraeder, Peter J. *United States Foreign Policy toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis and Change*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Schwarzkopf, Gen. H. Norman with Peter Petre. *It Doesn't Take a Hero*. New York: Bantam, 1992.

Seiple, Chris, "Square-Dancing into the Future: The U.S. Military/NGO Relationship and the CMOC in Times of Humanitarian Intervention." M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 1995.

——. *The U.S. Military/NGO Relationship in Humanitarian Interventions*. Peacekeeping Institute, Center for Strategic Leadership, U.S. Army War College, 1996.

Seligman, Adam B. *The Idea of Civil Society*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Semmel, Andrew, Legislative Assistant to Senator Richard Lugar and former Senate Foreign Relations Committee Staff Member. Interview by author, July 8, 1999, Washington, DC.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare, Volume I, Comedies*. Roslyn, New York: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1965.

Sheffer, Gabriel. *Modern Diasporas in International Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.

Shehadi, Kamal S. *Ethnic Self-determination and the Break-up of States*. Adelphi Paper 283. England: The International Institute for Strategic Studies/Brassey's (U.K.) Ltd. (December 1993).

Silber, Laura and Allan Little. *The Death of Yugoslavia*. London: Penguin Books and BBC Books, 1996.

Smith, Gayle, "Birth Pains of a New Ethiopia." *The Nation* (July 1, 1991), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Smith, Admiral Leighton, Commander Implementation Force, and commander AFSOUTH, NATO, 1995–1996. Interview by author, March 23, 1998, Alexandria, VA.

Sorenson, John. *Imagining Ethiopia: Struggles for History and Identity in the Horn of Africa*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1993.

Spanier, John and Uslaner, Eric., eds. "Foreign Policy in a Democracy." In *American Foreign Policy Making and the Democratic Dilemmas*, 1293–1320. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1989.

Stanfield, Rochelle L. "Balkan Wars on K Street." *The National Journal* (August 15, 1992), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Stewart, Jon. "American Hammers, Kurdish Nails." *San Francisco Chronicle* February 11, 1996, available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Stokes, Gale, John Lampe, Denison Rustow, and Julie Mostov. "Instant History: Understanding the Wars of the Yugoslav Succession." *Slavic Review* (Spring 1996): 136–60.

Strobel, Warren P. *Late-Breaking Foreign Policy: The News Media's Influence on Peace Operations*. Washington, DC: United States Institute for Peace Press, 1997.

Tamir, Yael. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Tekle, Amare, ed. *Eritrea and Ethiopia: From Conflict to Cooperation*. Lawrenceville, New Jersey: The Red Sea Press, 1994.

Thatcher, Margaret. "Stop the Excuses. Help Bosnia Now." *New York Times*, August 6, 1992, A23.

——. *Path to Power*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1995.

Thomas, Raju G. C. "Self-Determination and International Recognition Policy: An Alternative Interpretation of Why Yugoslavia Disintegrated." *World Affairs* 160, no. 1 (Summer 1997): 17–33.

Ullman, Richard, ed. *The World and Yugoslavia's Wars*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1996.

Unfinished Peace: Report of the International Commission on The Balkans. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1996.

United Nations. International Court of Justice. *Northern Cameroons (Cameroon v. United Kingdom.)* ICJ Reports, 1963.

United Nations Security Council. Provisional Verbatim Record of the Two Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty Second Meeting. S/PV 2982. April 5, 1991.

"USAII: Who's Who Among the Africanists." *Africa Confidential* 32, no. 1 (January 11, 1991): 5–7.

"U.S. Announces Coalition Pullout from Iraq." *Agence France Presse*, July 12, 1991.

U.S. Congress House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Africa. *Looking Back and Reaching Forward: Prospects for Democracy in Ethiopia: Hearing*

Before the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 102nd Cong., 2nd sess., September 17, 1992.

——. *U.S. Policy and South Africa: Hearing of the Africa Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee*. July 31, 1999.

——. Subcommittee on Africa and International Operations. *An Assessment of Recent Developments in the Horn of Africa: Hearing before the Subcommittees on Africa and International Operations*. 102nd Cong., 2nd sess., April 8, 1992.

——. Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. *Developments in Europe and the Former Yugoslavia: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East*. 103rd Cong., 1st sess., September 15, 1993.

——. *Developments in the Middle East: Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee on Foreign Affairs*. 103rd Cong., 1st sess., March 9, 1993.

——. *U.S. Policy Towards Iraq 3 Years after the Gulf War: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee on Foreign Affairs*. 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., February 23, 1994.

——. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Human Rights and Organization and Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. *U.S. Role in Iraq: Joint Hearing of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, and the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee*. April 1, 1992, available at Lexis-Nexis News library.

——. *U.S. Policy Toward Bosnia and the Balkans: Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*. 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., May 11, 1994.

——. *Bosnia: The U.S. Role: Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs*. November 17, 1997, <http://www.lexis-nexis/thomas.loc.gov> March 17, 1999.

U.S. Congress Senate Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. *Aid to Africa: Hearing of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee*. June 4, 1991, Federal News Service.

——. *Civil War in Iraq: A Staff Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations*. Washington, DC: U.S. GPO, May 1991.

——. *Kurdistan in the Time of Saddam Hussein: Staff Report*. November 1991.

U.S. Congress Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on European Affairs. *American Policy in Bosnia: Hearing before the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations*. 103rd Cong., 1st sess., February 18, 1993.

——. *The Peace Process in the Former Yugoslavia: Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations*. 104th Cong., 1st sess., October 17, and December 1, 1995.

U.S. Congress Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on near Eastern and South Asia Affairs. *U.S. Policy Towards Iraq: Hearing of the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee*. Federal Information Systems Corporation, Federal News Service, March 9, 1999, <http://www.inc.org> March 16, 1999.

U.S. Department of Defense. *Summary-CTF Provide Comfort: Joint Universal Lessons Learned System (JULLS)Long Report*. HQ USEUCOM. July 15, 1991.

U.S. Department of Defense. Office of Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict. *Kurdish Relief and Repatriation: DOD/AID-OFDA Partnership, The Kurdish Response After-Action Report*. Washington, DC, December 1991.

——. "Dayton Accords must Succeed to Prevent Wider War: Remarks by Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor, Georgetown University, September 23, 1997." *Defense Issues* 12, no. 48 <http://www.defenselink.mil/pub/di97/di1248.html> November 3, 1997.

U.S. Department of State. "Human Rights Yugoslavia: Richard Schifter, Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, February 21, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. March 4, 1991, 152–53.

——. "Iraqi Refugees: The Need for International Assistance: Remarks by Secretary Baker upon Arrival at Esenboga International Airport, Ankara, Turkey, April 7, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 8, 1991, 271.

——. "UN Security Council Resolution 688 on Repression of Iraqi Civilians." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 8, 1991, 233–34.

——. "U.S. Humanitarian Assistance to Iraqi Refugees: President Bush, Newport Beach, California, April 5, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 8, 1991, 233.

——. "Remarks by Secretary Baker upon Arrival at Esenboga International Airport, Ankara, Turkey, April 8, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*, April 15, 1991, 233.

——. "U.S. Expands Kurdish Relief Efforts: President Bush, Opening Statement at White House News Conference, Washington, DC, April 16, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 22, 1991, 273.

——. "U.S. Policy towards Yugoslavia: Statement released by Department Spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, May 24, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. June 3, 1991, 395–96.

——. "Recent Developments in Ethiopia: Statement by Department Spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, May 29, 1991." *Department of State Dispatch*. June 3, 1991, 397.

——. "Political Crisis in Ethiopia: Herman J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, Statement before the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC, June 18, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. June 24, 1991, 457–58.

——. "Humanitarian Situation in Iraq: Jackie Wolcott, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Social and Humanitarian Affairs, Statement before the International Task Force of the House Select Committee on Hunger, November 13, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. November 18, 1991, 851–53.

——. "U.N. Peacekeeping Efforts to Promote Security and Stability, John R. Bolton, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, Excerpts from a Statement before the Subcommittees on International Operations and on Human Rights and International Organizations of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, March 25, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. March 30, 1992, 244–46.

——. "Elections in Ethiopia: Statement by Department Spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, Washington, DC, March 30, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 6, 1992, 271.

——. "One Year after the Gulf War, Prospects for Peace: Richard N. Haass, Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Near East and South Asian Affairs of the National Security Council, Address before the Faculty Club, University of Miami, Coral Gables Florida, April 2, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 13, 1992, 296–97.

——. "Northern Iraq Elections: Statement by Department Spokesman Margaret Tutwiler, Washington, DC, May 15, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. May 18, 1992, 385.

——. "Helping the New Independent States, Sanctions on Serbia/Montenegro: Excerpts of Secretary Baker's Remarks at a Concluding News Conference of the Lisbon Conference on Assistance to the New Independent States, Lisbon, Portugal, May 24, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. June 1, 1992, 429–30.

——. "Containing the Crisis in Bosnia and the Former Yugoslavia: President Bush, Opening Remarks from News Conference, Colorado Springs, August 6, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. August 10, 1992, 617.

——. "U.S. Appalled by Continuing Situation in Bosnia-Hercegovina: Edward J. Perkins, U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Address before the UN Security Council, New York City, August 13, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. August 17, 1992, 651.

——. "U.S. Position and Proposed Actions Concerning the Yugoslav Crisis: Thomas M.T. Niles, Assistant Secretary for European and Canadian Affairs, Statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee, August 11, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. August 17, 1992, 653–55.

——. "U.S. Meeting with Bosnian Foreign Minister: Statement Released by the Office of the Assistant Secretary/Spokesman, August 19, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. August 24, 1992, 671.

——. "Intervention at the London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, Acting Secretary Eagleburger, Intervention on August 26, during the Conference Held August 26–28, London, United Kingdom." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. August 31, 1992, 673–75.

——. "Update on Situation in Ethiopia: Herman J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, Statement before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC, September 17, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. September 21, 1992, 715–16.

——. "PKK Impeding Truck Traffic into Iraq: Statement by Department Spokesman Richard Boucher, Washington, DC, October 26, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. November 2, 1992, 807.

——. "The Need to Respond to War Crimes in the Former Yugoslavia: Secretary Eagleburger, Statement at the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, Geneva, Switzerland, December 16, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. December 28, 1992, 923–25.

U.S. Department of State. "U.S.-U.K. Policy on the Former Yugoslavia: President Bush, Prime Minister Major, Text of a Joint Statement, December 20, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. December 28, 1992, 936.

——. "America's Role in the World: President Bush, Address at West Point Military Academy, West Point, New York, January 5, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. January 11, 1993, 13–15.

——. "Charting the Course: U.S. Foreign Policy in a Time of Transition: Secretary Eagleburger, Address before the Council on Foreign Relations, Washington, DC, January 7, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. January 11, 1993, 16–19.

——. "Statement at Senate Confirmation Hearing, Secretary-Designate Christopher, Statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, DC January 13, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. January 25, 1993, 45–49.

——. "New Steps toward Conflict Resolution in the Former Yugoslavia: Secretary Christopher, Opening Statement at a News Conference, February 10, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. February 15, 1993, 81–82.

——. "NATO and U.S. Foreign Policy: Secretary Christopher, Excerpts from the intervention at the Special Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium, February 26, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. March 1, 1993, 119–21.

——. "UN Security Council Adopts Resolution 808 on War Crimes Tribunal, Statement by US Ambassador Albright." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. March 22, 1993, 166.

——. "Bosnia-Hercegovina: Secretary Christopher, Department Statement, UN Security Council Resolution, Ambassador Walker, Washington, DC, March 25, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. April 5, 1993, 200–02.

——. "U.S. Consultations with Allies on Bosnia-Herzegovina: Secretary Christopher, Opening Statement at a News Conference, Washington, DC, May 1, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. May 10, 1993, 321.

——. "America's Partnership with the European Community: Secretary Christopher, Statement at the Conclusion of the EC Ministerial, Plateau du Kirchberg, Luxembourg, June 9, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. June 21, 1993, 447–48.

——. "U.S. Policy on Recent Developments and other Issues in the Middle East: Edward P. Djerejian, Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs, Statement before the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC, July 27, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. August 9, 1993, 233.

——. "Overview of U.S. Policy toward Iraq: Ronald Neumann, Director, Office of Northern Gulf Affairs, Address at the Meridian International Center, Washington, DC, January 27, 1994." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. February 7, 1994, 66–68.

——. "Anthony Lake, The Need for Engagement: Address to The Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, Trenton, New Jersey, November 30, 1994." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. December 5, 1994, 804–07.

——. Office of Public Communications, Bureau of Public Affairs. *The Dayton Peace Accords: General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Hercegovina*. Washington, DC, 1995.

——. "Democratization in Africa: Herman J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, Address Before the Voice of American Symposium, Washington, DC, September 17, 1991." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. October 28, 1991, 795–96.

——. "Foreign Assistance Priorities after the Cold War: Secretary Christopher, Statement before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC, May 18, 1993." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. May 31, 1993, 393–95.

——. "Statement on the Former Yugoslavia, North Atlantic Council Ministerial Meeting, Brussels, Belgium, December 17, 1992." *U.S. Department of State Dispatch*. December 28, 1992, 929.

"U.S. Official Suggests U.N. Aid to Help Kurds Return Home." *Reuters* April 15, 1991.

"U.S. Policy towards Iraq, Hearing of the Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee." March 9, 1999. Federal Information Systems Corporation Federal News Service <http://www.inc.com> April 23, 1999.

Van Evera, Stephen. *Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science*. Cambridge, MA: Defense and Arms Control Studies Program, MIT, no date printed.

Vorys, Karl von. *American Foreign Policy: Consensus at Home, Leadership Abroad*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1997.

Waterman, Stanley. "Partition and Modern Nationalism." In *Community, Conflict, Partition and Nationalism*, 117–32. Edited by Eleonore Kofman and Colin H. Williams. London: Routledge, 1989.

Weigley, Russell. *The American Way of War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

Wheelwright, Julie. "Eritrea's New Dawn." *New Statesman and Society* (April 23, 1993), available in Lexis-Nexis News library.

Whitcomb, Roger S. *The American Approach to Foreign Affairs: An Uncertain Tradition*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998.

"Why Should you become a Member of the Serbian Unity Congress?" Membership Form <http://www.suc.org/membership.html> January 25, 1999.

Wilkens, Katherine A. "How We Lost the Kurdish Game." *The Washington Post* September 15, 1998, C1 <http://www.kurdistan.org/Washington/lostkurd.html> April 23, 1999.

"Will Congress Force America out of Bosnia?" *The Economist*, October 25–31, 1997.

Woerhrel, Steven. *Bosnia-Hercegovina: Summary of the Debate On a Unilateral Lifting of the Arms Embargo*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, CRS Report for Congress 95-477, April 12, 1995.

Wolfowitz, Paul, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Political Affairs. Interview by author, July 8, 1999, Washington, DC.

Woods, James L. Former Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, Department of Defense. Interview by author, June 15, 1999, Arlington, VA.

Woodward, Bob. *The Choice*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Woodward, Susan. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after The Cold War*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1995.

Wright, Robin. "America's Iraq Policy: How did it come to this?" *The Washington Quarterly* (Summer 1998): 44–53.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1994.

——. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989.

Yohannes, Okbazhi. *Eritrea: A Pawn in World Politics*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1991.

——. *The United States and the Horn of Africa: An Analytical Study of Pattern and Process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997.

Zimmermann, Warren. *Origins of a Catastrophe: Yugoslavia and Its Destroyers—America's Last Ambassador Tells What Happened and Why*. New York: Times Books, 1996.

——. "The Demons of Kosovo." *The National Interest* (Summer 1998): 9.

Index

AAEJ
  see American Association of Ethiopian Jewry
Abraham, Spencer, 101, 102, 144n.88
Abramowitz, Mort, 29
ACSB
  see American Committee to Save Bosnia
Action Council for Peace in the Balkans, 99
Afars (ethnolinguistic group), 48
Afghanistan
  ideological and ethnic divisions in, 2
  ongoing instability in, 124
  U.S. invasion of, 1
Africa
  failed states in, 56
  postcolonial secession in, first successful, 47
  U.S. policy in, 59, 60
  see also Horn of Africa; *specific states*
aggressive multilateralism, 81
Ahl al Haqq (Yazidism), 18
Akashi, Yasushi, 84
Albania
  Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 89, 90, 114
  Kosovo crisis and, 123
Albright, Madeleine
  on aggressive multilateralism, 81
  on Bosnian crisis, 104, 144n.98
Alevis (ethnolinguistic group), 18
Al-Karadaghi, Mustafa, 133n.83
allies, influence on U.S. policy, 3, 11, 109, 112, 121
  on Bosnia, 79–88, 110–11, 121
  on Ethiopia, 52–55, 111–12, 121
  on Iraq, 24–30, 31, 44, 109–10
Al Qaeda, war against, 2
  policy choices presented by, 1
American Association of Ethiopian Jewry (AAEJ), 66, 137n.69
American Committee to Save Bosnia (ACSB), 99
American Jewish Committee, 99
American Jewish Congress, 99
American Muslim Foundation, 99, 143n.77
Amhara, 48
  EPRDF takeover in Ethiopia and, 51
  immigrants in U.S., 64
  Selassie's rule and, 50
Amitay, Mike, 131n.43
Arab-Israeli peace process
  Kurdish self-determination efforts and, 38
  and U.S. policy on Iraq, 110
Armenian American lobby, and Kurdish interests, 40
Assembly of Turkish American Associations, 40
assimilation, 6, 7
Atatürk (Mustafa Kemal), 18
autonomy, 6, 7

Ba'ath Party (Iraq), 19
Baker, Bill, 101, 102, 144n.88
Baker, James
on Bosnian crisis, U.S. position on, 76, 80, 90
on Eritrean secessionism, concerns about, 60, 118
on Ozal's policies, 26
on Saddam's removal, 33, 131n.52
on Soviet secessionist republics, 9
on U.S. policy on Iraq, 33, 34, 37–38
visit to Kurdish refugee camp, 42
Balkan Ghosts (Kaplan), 104, 144n.92
The Balkan Institute, 99
Balkans
demonstration effect of Bosnian crisis and, 88, 89, 90, 114, 117
see also specific countries
Bangladesh, creation of, 6
Barkey, Henri, 129n.14
Barzani, Mulla Mustafa, 19, 20, 130n.29
Barzani tribe, 19
Barzinji, Shaykh Mahmud, 18
Beecroft, Robert Mason, 142n.61
Beni Amer people, 48
Bentley, Helen Denich, 100
Berger, Samuel, 87
Bilbray, Brian, 43, 133n.94
Black Caucus, 63
Blitz, Brad, 143n.84
B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, 99
Boren, David, 64
Bosnia-Hercegovina
arms embargo on, 80, 81; attempts to lift, 98, 99, 102, 103, 138n.11, 144n.94
break-up of Yugoslavia and, 74
concentration camps revealed in, 80, 90, 99, 103
Dayton Peace Agreement and, 78–79, 83, 87, 95–7, 106, 111
de facto partition of, 3, 79, 82, 94, 107, 115
ethnic divisions in, 71
international recognition of, 75
mixed marriages in, 137n.3
Owen-Stoltenberg Plan for, 77
partition of: Serbo-Croatian plan for, 74–75, 95; U.S. opposition to, 107, 110, 117
population of, 74
progress toward unitary government in, 125
referendum on independence of, 74
Serb nationalists in, 74
U.S. policy on, 77, 79, 110–11; ethnic interest group lobbying and, 97–106, 119–20; fear of demonstration effect and, 93–94, 97, 116–17; fear of spillover and, 88–92, 114–15; "lift and leave" scenario, 82, 86, 140n.37, 144n.92; "lift and strike" proposals, 81, 82, 87, 88, 91, 102, 105; media pressure and, 122; position of allies and, 79–88, 121; support for Bosnian Muslims, 78
U.S. recognition of, 10, 96
Vance-Owen Plan for, 75–6, 94–95; Bosnian Serb response to, 77; U.S. position on, 81, 82–83, 87, 93, 106, 114
war in, 75; causes of, differing interpretations of, 83; containment of, 91–92, 113; international response to, 75–78; NATO air strikes, 86, 105, 106; safe areas during, 82, 84, 138n.10
Bosnian Americans, lobbying by, 98, 103
Britain
and Ethiopian regimes, support for, 60
and Kurdish aspirations after World War I, 18
mandate in Ethiopia and Eritrea, 47, 54
policy on Bosnia, 77, 83, 103, 138n.11

policy on Eritrea, 49–50, 111, 134n.14
policy on Iraqi Kurds, 28, 29, 30
Brock, Peter, 143n.82
Bulgaria, Bosnian conflict and, 89, 114
Burton, Dan, 67, 101
Bush, George H. W.
on civil wars, U.S. involvement in, 38
concept of "New World Order," 115
and humanitarian operation in Iraq, 28, 34–35
policy on Bosnia, 80–81, 89–90
policy on Ethiopia, 53, 56, 57
policy on Iraqi Kurds, 21, 23, 110
policy on Saddam Hussein, 23, 24
response to secessionist demands, 3
Turkish pressure on, 27
Bush, George W.
preemptive strategy of, 124
and war on terrorism, 2

Candar, Cengiz, 129n.15
Carter, Jimmy, 51
Central Asia, Kurds in, 17
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and Kurdish cause, 19
Chelovich, Peter, 144n.88
chemical weapons, use against Iraqi Kurds, 20
Christopher, Warren
on Bosnian crisis, 81–82, 86, 90, 91, 93, 144n.92, 144n.98
on Dayton Agreement, 95–96
and U.S. policy on Bosnia, 103
Chrysler, Richard, 101, 102, 144n.88
civic nationalism, vs. ethnic nationalism, 10
Clark, Wesley, 124
Clinton, Bill
and Kosovo campaign, 123
policy on Bosnia, 77, 81–83, 85–86, 90–91, 93–94, 103, 104, 120, 144n.92
response to secessionist demands, 3
Coalition of Ethiopian Democratic Forces (COEDF), 64
Cohen, Herman, 51
on congressional interest in Horn of Africa, 63
congressional pressure on, 64, 65
on demonstration effect of Ethiopia's partition, 61, 118
on Eritrean American lobbying, 68
and Eritrean secession, 52
on Ethiopian Jewry, 66
on Ethiopian unity, support for, 53
on Organization of African Unity, 54
on partition of Ethiopia, U.S. decision to support, 58–60, 61
support for EPRDF, 57
on U.S. objectives in Ethiopia, 64
Cold War
Ethiopia during, 53, 55
partitions during, 8
Cold War, end of
counterterrorist war compared with, 2
NATO's weakness following, 140n.33
political challenges following, 1
U.S. policy following, 9–10, 112
concentration camps, in Bosnia, 80, 90, 99, 103
contagion, *see* demonstration effect
Cot, Jean, 84
Craig Shirley and Associates, 101
Croat Americans, lobbying by, 98–99, 103, 119
Croatia
independence movement in, 73, 74
plan for division of Bosnia, 74–75
Serbian insurgency in, 73, 74
U.S. recognition of, 10, 60
and war in Bosnia, 75
Croatian American Association, 99
Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ), 73
Cyprus, de facto partition of, 14
Czechoslovakia, break-up of, 8

David Keene and Associates, 101
Dayton Peace Agreement, 78–79, 83, 87, 95–97, 106, 111
de facto partition, 6, 7, 12–13, 127n.5
  of Bosnia, 3, 79, 82, 94, 107, 115
  demonstration effect of, 13
  of Iraq, 3, 17, 22, 113–14
  U.S. policy regarding, 125
demonstration effect, fear of
  Bosnian conflict and, 93–94, 97, 114
  Eritrean secessionism and, 60–63, 69, 118
  influence on U.S. policy, 3, 11, 13, 109, 116–18, 121
  Iraqi Kurdish secessionism and, 37–39, 118
  Kosovo crisis and, 123
Deressa, Jonas, 64
diaspora communities
  see ethnic interest group lobbying; *specific ethnic groups*
Djerejian, Edward P., 132n.67
Djordjevich, Michael, 101, 143n.86, 144n.88
Dole, Robert
  Bosnian crisis and, 85, 102, 105, 144n.94
  Bosnian Muslims and, 119
  Iraqi Kurds and, 43
Drew, Elizabeth, 144n.92
Dulles, John Foster, 49
Dymally, Mervyn, 67

Eagleburger, Lawrence
  Bosnian crisis and, 93, 142n.64, 144n.98
  Eritrean secession and, 63, 66
Eastern European American lobbies, 119
ELF
  see Eritrean Liberation Front
EPLF
  see Eritrean People's Liberation Front
EPRDF
  see Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front
Eritrea
  annexation by Ethiopia, 50
  continuing instability in, 125
  Ethiopian claims on, 49
  ethnic groups in, 48
  federation with Ethiopia, 47, 49, 50
  history of, 47, 134n.1
  independence of: Ethiopian American objections to, 65; international recognition of, 118; referendum on, 52, 58, 59; transition to, 51–52
  national identity of, factors responsible for, 48
  peace negotiations with Ethiopia, 51
  Selassie's authoritarian rule in, 48, 50
  struggle for self-determination, history of, 47, 48, 50
  U.S. policy on secession of, 3, 47, 52, 69; ethnic interest group lobbying and, 63–69, 119; fear of demonstration effect and, 60–63; fear of spillover and, 55–60; media pressure and, 122; position of allies and, 52–55
Eritrean Americans, lobbying by, 67–68
Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF), 50
Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF), 50
  Eritrean American support for, 67
  takeover in Eritrea, 51, 56, 58
Estonia, declaration of independence by, 9
Ethiopia
  annexation of Eritrea by, 50
  during Cold War, 53, 55
  continuing instability in, 125
  emigration to U.S. from, 63–64
  ethnic divisions in, 47–48, 65
  famines in, 50, 51, 55, 56
  federation with Eritrea, 47, 49, 50

historical claims on Eritrea, 49
Jews of, concerns about, 52, 53, 55, 56
languages in, 48
under Mengistu, 47, 50–51
modern state of, establishment of, 47
neutral conference on, demand for, 64
peace negotiations with Eritrea, 51
religion in, 48
under Selassie, 49
Soviet policy on, 50–51, 53, 59
transition to partition, 51–52
unified, U.S. support for, 53–54, 62
U.S. policy on partition of, 3, 47, 52, 69, 111–12, 115–16; ethnic interest group lobbying and, 63–69, 119; fear of demonstration effect and, 60–63, 118; fear of spillover and, 55–60; media pressure and, 122; position of allies and, 52–55, 111–12, 121
U.S. relations with, 49
Ethiopian Americans, lobbying by, 63–65
Ethiopian Democratic Union, 64
Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), 50
Eritrean American lobbying and, 67
Ethiopian American lobbying and, 64, 65
takeover in Ethiopia, 51
Tigreans in government of, 51, 64
U.S. relations with, 57, 58, 116
ethnic identity, partition and, 8
ethnic interest group lobbying, influence on U.S. policy, 3, 11, 14, 109, 118–20, 121–22
on Bosnia, 97–106, 119–20
on Eritrea, 63–69, 119
on Iraqi Kurds, 39–43, 118–19
ethnic nationalism, vs. civic nationalism, 10
ethnicity, definition of, 2
Europe
U.S. strategic interest in, 112
see also Western Europe; *specific countries*

Falasha, *see* Jews, Ethiopian
Fascell, Dante, 43
Forster, Larry M., 130n.42
France
policy on Bosnia, 77, 82, 83, 103, 138n.11
policy on Iraq, 28
Frasure, Robert, 78
fursan (Kurdish mercenaries), 20

Galbraith, Peter, 133n.94
Galvin, John, 28, 35–36
Gejdenson, Sam, 144n.87
Germany, Bosnian war and, 77, 84
Gingrich, Newt, 105
Gligorov, Kiro, 74
Gorbachev, Mikhail, 9, 53
Gore, Al, 86
Gorton, Slade, 144n.94
Gramm, Phil, 101, 144n.88
Gray, William, III, 65
Greece, Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 88, 89, 90, 114
Greek American lobby, 14
Bosnian war and, 101, 143n.84
and Kurdish interests, 40
group rights, vs. individual rights, in U.S. policy, 10
Gulf War
economic cost to Turkey, 27
Iraqi Kurds' uprising during, 20–21, 33
and opportunities for Iraqi Kurds, 17
U.S. objectives in, 23–25
Gurages (ethnolinguistic group), 48
Gurr, Ted Robert, 11

Haass, Richard N., 129n.13
Haiti, legacy for U.S. policy, 124

Hall, Tony, 63
Hamilton, Lee
  Iraqi opposition and, 42, 43
  Serbian Americans and, 101, 102, 143n.84, 144n.88
Harff, Barbara, 11
HDZ, *see* Croatian Democratic Union
Helsinki Accords (1975), 96
Heraclides, Alexis, 7
Holbrooke, Richard, 96, 138n.13
Horn of Africa
  congressional interest in, 63
  instability in: continuing, 125; fear of, 56–57
  Israeli interests in, 55, 121
  modern history of, 47
  Soviet policy on, 59
  see also Eritrea; Ethiopia
Horowitz, Donald, 6
Houdek, Robert, 54, 65, 135n.20
humanitarian concerns
  in Bosnia, 90, 91
  in Iraq, 21–22, 31, 34–36
  separating from political considerations, 36
  vs. stability, in U.S. policy, 113–14, 115
human rights
  and arguments for and against partition, 11–12
  de facto partition and, 13
  international agreements on, and erosion of sovereignty, 5
human rights lobby groups, and Kurdish interests, 40
Hungary, Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 88
Hussein, Saddam
  Bush administration policy regarding, 23, 24
  lobbying against, 41
  negotiations with Kurds, 19, 20, 22, 30
  removal of: Iranian calls for, 131n.52; U.S. policy regarding, 32, 33, 110
  suppression of Kurdish uprising, 17
  war against, policy choices presented by, 1
Hutchenson, Kay Bailey, 144n.87

individual rights, vs. group rights, in U.S. policy, 10
Iran
  Iraqi Kurdish refugees and, 21
  and Kurdish cause, 19, 20
  Kurds in, 17
  and Saddam's removal, calls for, 131n.52
  war with Iraq, 20
  after World War I, 19
Iraq
  Ba'ath Party in, 19
  de facto partition of, 3, 17, 22, 113–14
  ethnic, religious, and tribal groups in, 18
  instability in: continuing, 124; fear of, 26, 32–34, 113
  no-fly zone over, 31
  Operation Northern Watch in, 31
  Operation Proven Force in, 26–27
  Operation Provide Comfort in, 21–22, 31, 34–36, 38–39, 129n.9
  partition of, ethnic lobbying for, 41–42
  revolution in (1958), 19
  Shiite in, U.S. policy regarding, 33, 34, 131n.52
  Turkish air raids over, 23, 27, 28
  Turkish pressure and 1991 intervention in, 26–27
  U.S. invasion of (2003), 1, 124
  U.S. policy regarding, 23–24, 44–45; choices in, 1; ethnic group lobbying and, 39–43, 118–19; fear of demonstration effect and, 37–39; fear of spillover and, 32–37, 44; media pressure and, 122; position of allies and,

24–30, 31, 44, 109–10; stability vs. self-determination in, 36–37
U.S. withdrawal from (1991), 29–30
war with Iran, 20
see also Kurds, Iraqi
Iraq Foundation, 41
Iraqi American Committee, 41
Iraqi Americans, lobbying by, 41
irredentist separatism, 6, 127n.1
Isaias Afewerki, 51, 59
visits to U.S., 67, 68
Islam
and Eritrean separatism, 55
among Kurds, 18
radical, discrediting, 1–2
see also under Muslim
Israel
Arab–Israeli peace process, and U.S. policy on Iraq, 110
Eritrean secession and, 52, 55, 69, 111–12, 121
Iraqi Kurds and, 38, 40
Israeli American interest groups, Eritrean secessionism and, 64, 66
Italy
Eritrean colony of, 47
Eritrean secession and, 53
occupation of Ethiopia by, 47, 49
Izady, Mehrdad, 132n.76
Izetbegovic, Alija
and government of national unity, 74
pleas for UN support, 74
relations with Belgrade, 137n.5
U.S. relations with, 78

Jewish Americans, lobbying by, 14
Bosnian conflict and, 99
Eritrean secessionism and, 66
Jews, Ethiopian, concerns about, 52, 53, 55, 56
Joint Action Program, 82
Joint Committee on Hunger, 63
Jugopetrol, 143n.80

Kapen, Gil, 135n.21
Kaplan, Robert, 104, 144n.92
Karadzic, Radovan, 74, 77
Karim, Najmaldin, 43, 133n.77, 133n.86
on Kurdish independence, 133n.87
Kashmir, ethnic conflict in, 2
Kassebaum, Nancy, 43, 133n.94
KDP
see Kurdish Democratic Party
Kemal, Mustafa (Atatürk), 18
Kennedy, Edward, 43
Khailani, Asaad, 133n.83
Kirkuk (Iraq), 18
Gulf War uprising and, 21, 22
status of, negotiations regarding, 130n.29
KNC, *see* Kurdish National Congress of North America
Knight, James, 136n.50
Knollenberg, Joe, 101, 102, 144n.88
Kosovo
Albanian separatism in, demonstration effect of, 13
autonomy under Tito, 72
Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 88, 89–90, 114
NATO operations in, controversy over, 5
U.S. intervention in, 123–24
Kucan, Milan, 73
Kurdi language, 18
Kurdish Americans, lobbying by, 39–40, 41–43
Kurdish Democratic Party (KDP), 19
and Gulf War uprising, 21
during Iran–Iraq war, 20
lobbying by, 39, 42
Kurdish Front, 20
Kurdish National Congress of North America (KNC), 40
lobbying by, 41–43

Kurdish Workers Party (PKK), 22
Turkish offensive against, 23, 27, 28, 31
Kurdistan
territory of, 17
after World War I, 18
Kurds
homeland of, 17
Iran–Iraq war and, 20
languages of, 18
religions of, 18
struggle for self-determination, 17, 18–23
in Turkey, 17, 27
in U.S., 132n.76
Kurds, Iraqi, 17, 18
autonomous zone for, 22–23
chemical weapons attack on, 20
de facto partition of Iraq and, 3, 17, 22, 113–14
European policy regarding, 28–30, 44
Gulf War uprising of, 20–21, 33
interest group lobbying by, 39–40, 41–43
leadership of, U.S. relations with, 29, 30, 42, 133n.86
negotiations with Saddam Hussein, 19, 20, 22, 30
Operation Provide Comfort for, 21–22, 31, 34–36, 38–39, 129n.9
refugee crisis, 20, 21–22, 35
struggle for independence, 17, 18–19
Turkish policy regarding, 20, 25–28, 29, 131n.47
UN sanctions and, 37
U.S. invasion of Iraq (2003) and, 124
U.S. policy regarding, 23–24, 44–45; choices in, 1; ethnic group lobbying and, 39–43, 118–19; fear of demonstration effect and, 37–39; fear of spillover and, 32–37, 44; media pressure and, 122; position of allies and, 24–30, 31, 44, 109–10
Kurmanji language, 18

Lake, Anthony
on Bosnian crisis, 82, 91
"Endgame Strategy" for Bosnia, 86
and U.S. policy on Bosnia, 103
Lantos, Tom, 43
Lausanne, Treaty of (1923), 18
Lebanon, legacy for U.S. policy, 122
Liberia, legacy for U.S. policy, 56, 115
Lieberman, Joseph, 102
Lithuania, declaration of independence by, 9
lobbying, *see* ethnic interest group lobbying
London Conference (August 1992), 75
London Conference (July 1991), 51, 52, 53, 58, 111
Cohn's statements at, concerns about, 60
Lugar, Richard
Eritrean secession and, 64, 68
on NATO, 140n.33

Macedonia
Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 88, 89, 114
break-up of Yugoslavia and, 74
ethnic Albanians in, 13
Kosovo crisis and, 123
U.S. recognition of, 10
U.S. troops in, 90, 92, 106, 107
Mackenzie, Lewis, 100, 101, 138n.9, 143n.78
Mahabad Republic, 19
Major, John
Bosnian crisis and, 89
Iraqi Kurdish refugees and, 22
Manatos, Andrew, 101
Manatos and Manatos, 101
MCC, *see* Military Coordination Committee
McConnell, Mitch, 43
McDermott/O'Neill & Associates, 101
Mearsheimer, John, 12

media coverage
of Bosnian conflict, 103, 117
of Ethiopian famines, 56
impact on U.S. policy, 122
of Kurdish refugees, 21, 22, 35
Meles Zenawi, 51, 59
Mengistu Haile Mariam, 47, 50–51
lobbying of U.S. government by, 64, 66
removal of, U.S. support for, 68
Mesic, Stipe, 73
Middle East
U.S. strategic interest in, 112
see also specific countries
military, U.S.
debate about proper role of, 124
resistance to use of ground troops, 123
Military Coordination Committee (MCC), in Iraq, 30–31
Milosevic, Slobodan
Kosovo campaign and, 123–24
peace talks involving, 83, 95
rise to power, 72
and Serbian domination, 73, 84
and Tudjman, plan for division of Bosnia, 74–75, 95
Mitchell, Robert, 43, 133n.93
Morrison, Steve, 134n.12
Mosul (Iraq), 18
Turkish claim on, 26
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, 43
multilateralism, aggressive, 81
Muslim Americans, support for Bosnian Muslims, 99
Muslims, Bosnian
lobbying on behalf of, 98–99
U.S. support for, 78, 84, 88, 114, 119–20, 141n.41
Mussolini, Benito, 49

National Federation of Croatian Americans, 99
nationalism
Eritrean, factors responsible for, 48
ethnic vs. civic, U.S. policy regarding, 10
resurgence of, 2
Serbian, rise of, 72–73
A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement (1995), 95
North-American Conference on Ethiopian Jewry, 66
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)
Bosnian crisis and, 77, 78, 81, 82; air strikes against Serbs, 86, 105, 106, 123, 138n.14; concerns about spillover of, 89; threats to viability of, 83–87, 91, 92
expansion of, Eastern European American lobbies and, 119
Kosovo operation of, 5, 124
post-Cold War weakness of, 140n.33
Norway, support for Eritreans, 134n.14

OAU
see Organization of African Unity
Operation Northern Watch (Iraq), 31
Operation Proven Force (Iraq), 26–27
Operation Provide Comfort (Iraq), 21–22, 31, 129n.9
limiting, 34–36
precedent-setting nature of, 38–39
Organization of African Unity (OAU)
colonial boundary doctrine of, 53, 54
Eritrean secession and, 52, 53–54
Oromo, 48, 125
Oromo American National Federation, 64
Oromo Liberation Front, 64
Owen, Lord David, 75, 77
see also Vance-Owen Plan
Owen-Stoltenberg Plan, 77
Ozal, Turgut
policy on Iraqi Kurds, 22, 25–26, 110
threat to invade Iraq, 27

Pagonis (public relations firm), 64
Pakistan, creation of, 8
Palestinians, Kurdish self-determination efforts and, 38
partition, 7–9
  alternatives to, 6, 7
  arguments against, 11–12
  arguments for, 12
  definitions of, 7, 8
  demonstration effect of, 13
  and ethnic identity, 8
  in historical context, 7–8
  international community's position on, 6
  negative reactions to, 8
  secession compared with, 7, 127n.3
  third parties and, 8
  U.S. policy regarding, 2–4, 97, 120, 125
  see also de facto partition; secession
Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK), 20
  and Gulf War uprising, 21
  lobbying by, 39, 42
Pell, Clairborne, 43, 133n.94
Pelletiere, Stephen, 130n.28
pesh merga (Kurdish irregular troops), 19, 20, 128n.2
PKK
  see Kurdish Workers Party
Porter, John, 43
Powell, Colin
  on Bosnian crisis, 104–05, 145n.99
  on civil wars, U.S. involvement in, 38
  interview of, 129n.12
  on Iraq policy, 23, 30, 35
Powell Doctrine, 110, 122, 124, 144n.99, 145n.1
power-sharing arrangements, 7
precedent, *see* demonstration effect
preemption, U.S. policy of, 124
The Private Office of His Royal Highness Ermias Sahle-Selassie, 64
PUK
  see Patriotic Union of Kurdistan

Rafsanjani, Hashemi, 131n.52
Recant, Will, 66
refugees
  Bosnian conflict and, 137n.5
  Iraqi Kurd, 20, 21–22, 35
  Kosovo Albanian, 123
religions
  in Ethiopia, 48
  among Kurds, 18
  see also Islam; Shi'ism
religious fundamentalism, discrediting, 1–2
Romania, Bosnian crisis and, 89
Roth, Toby, 64, 65
Rudd, Gordon W., 129n.12
Ruder Finn (public relations firm), 99
Russia
  Bosnian war and, 77, 82, 83, 107, 117
  see also Soviet Union
Rwanda, legacy for U.S. policy, 124

Saddam, *see* Hussein, Saddam
Safwan armistice talks (1991), 33
Sarajevo (Bosnia)
  marketplace massacre in, 78, 103, 143n.78
  safe area of, 138n.14
  siege of, 78
Saudi Arabia, on Saddam's removal, 32
Sawyer Miller Group, 99
Schifter, Richard, 41
Schwartzkopf, Norman, 33
Scowcroft, Brent, 68
secession, 5–7
  definitions of, 7, 127n.1
  demonstration effect of, 13
  failure of, factors responsible for, 6

international community's response to, 5–6
partition compared with, 7, 127n.3
possible outcomes of, 6–7
post-Cold War, 1, 3
U.S. policy on, post-Cold War, 9–10
U.S. response to, search for precedent in, 2
war on terrorism and, 2
see also partition
Selassie, Haile, 49
authoritarian rule in Eritrea, 48, 50
exiled descendant of, 64
self-determination principles
vs. stability: in U.S. policy on Eritrea, 49; in U.S. policy on Iraq, 36–37
U.S. position on, 10, 121
see also secession
Semmel, Andrew, 134n.96, 137n.79
separatism, 6, 127n.1
see also secession
Serb Americans, lobbying by, 100–02, 103–04, 105, 143n.84
Serbia
Afghanistan compared with, 2
plan for division of Bosnia, 74–75
rise of nationalism in, 72–73
UN embargo on, 143n.80
and war in Bosnia, 75, 137n.5
Serbian American National Information Network (SerbNet), 100
Serbian American Voters Alliance, 100
Serbian Unity Congress (SUC), 100–02, 143n.79, 143n.82
Sevres, Treaty of (1920), 18
Shakespeare, William, 125
Shalikashvili, John M., 30, 103
Shi'ism, Kurds and, 18
Shiite, Iraqi, U.S. policy regarding, 33, 34, 131n.52
Slovakia, Hungarian minority in, 8
Slovenia
independence movement in, 73, 74
U.S. recognition of, 10, 60
Smith, Rupert, 138n.14
Somalia
legacy for U.S. policy, 56, 81, 115, 122, 124
war with Ethiopia, 50
Somalis, 48
Sorani (Kurdi) language, 18
Soros, George, 99
sovereignty, erosion of, 1, 5
Soviet Union
break-up of, U.S. response to, 9–10
break-up of Yugoslavia and, 116–17
and Ethiopia, 50–51, 53, 59
and Kurdish struggle for independence, 19
occupation of Iran, post-World War I, 19
see also Russia
spillover, fear of, influence on U.S. policy, 3, 11–13, 109, 112–16, 120–21
on Bosnia, 88–92, 114–15
on Ethiopia, 55–60
on Iraq, 32–37, 44
stability
civil conflicts as threat to, 112
demonstration effect as challenge to, 13
desire for: influence on U.S. policy, 109, 120; post-Cold War, 112; and U.S. policy on Ethiopia, 57–60, 69
vs. humanitarian concerns, in U.S. policy, 113–14, 115
vs. justice, in U.S. policy on Bosnia, 83
vs. self-determination: in U.S. policy on Eritrea, 49; in U.S. policy on Iraq, 36–37, 45
Stambolic, Ivan, 72
Stoltenberg, Thorwald, 77

SUC
see Serbian Unity Congress
Sunni Islam, Kurds and, 18

Talabani, Jalal, 20, 22, 29, 30, 130n.29
Tarnoff, Peter, 81, 139n.25
terrorism, war on, 1
targets of, 2
Thatcher, Margaret, 139n.28, 140n.32
Tigrean Peoples' Liberation Front (TPLF), 50
Tigre/Tigreans, 48
in EPRDF government, 51, 64
Tigrinya speakers, 48
Tito, Josip Broz, 72
TPLF
see Tigrean Peoples' Liberation Front
Tudjman, Franjo
Croatian independence movement and, 73
and Milosevic, plan for division of Bosnia, 74–75, 95
Turkey
air raids over Iraq, 23, 27, 28, 31
Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 88, 89, 90, 114
de facto partition of Iraq and, 27–28
economic cost of Gulf War to, 27
greater regional role for, U.S. interest in, 37
influence on U.S. policy, 31, 32, 44, 109–10
and intervention in northern Iraq (1991), 26–27
Iraqi Kurdish refugees and, 20, 21, 22
Kurds in, 17, 27
policy on Iraqi Kurds, 20, 25–28, 29, 131n.47
on Saddam's removal, 32
threat to invade Iraq, 27
U.S. invasion of Iraq (2003) and, 124–25
U.S. military aid to, 31, 131n.45
after World War I, 18
Turkish Americans, lobbying by, 40
Tutweiler, Margaret, 133n.86

Ukraine, U.S. recognition of, 10
United Nations (UN)
Bosnian crisis and, 75, 76–77, 84, 85
Bosnia's pleas to, 74
and federation of Ethiopia and Eritrea, 47, 49, 54
Iraqi Kurdish refugees and, 21
sanctions against Iraq, 37
Security Council Resolution 688, 21, 39, 129n.6
Security Council Resolution 836, 76, 90
weakness of, 59
UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR), 76, 84, 85
first commander of, 100
pro-Serb position of, 138n.11
U.S. proposals for air strikes and, 86
Uthman, Ahmed, 133n.83
uti possidetis, ita possidetis, 94–95

Vance, Cyrus, 75, 138n.10
Vance-Owen Plan, 75–76, 94–95
Bosnian Serb response to, 77
U.S. position on, 81, 82–83, 87, 93, 106, 114
Van Dusen, Mike, 40
Van Evera, Stephen, 12
Vietnam
Bosnia compared with, 104–05
Iraq compared with, 37, 38
legacy for U.S. policy, 122, 124
violence, secession accompanied by, 8
international response to, 12
outcomes of, 6

Vojvodina (Yugoslavia)
autonomy under Tito, 72
Bosnian conflict and concerns about, 89

Washington Agreement (1994), 77
Washington Kurdish Institute, 40
Weinburger, Caspar, 144n.99
Western Europe
Bosnian crisis and, 75–76, 77, 79–88, 106, 110–11, 138n.11
Eritrean secession and, 52–53, 111, 134n.14
Iraqi Kurdish secessionism and, 28–30, 44
see also North Atlantic Treaty Organization; *specific countries*
The Wexler Group, 99
Wilson, Woodrow, 18
Wise Communications, 143n.80
Wolfe, Frank, 67
Wolfowitz, Paul
on demonstration effect, 37
on European policy on Iraq, 29
on Turkish policy on Iraq, 25–26, 27, 131n.47
and U.S. invasion of Iraq (2003), 124–25
on U.S. policy on Iraq, 32
Wolpe, Howard, 67
Woods, James, 135n.30
on demonstration effect of Ethiopia's partition, 61, 62
on U.S. policy on Ethiopia, 57
World War I
Iran after, 19
Kurds after, 18

Yazidism (Ahl al Haqq), 18
Yugoslavia
break-up of: fear of demonstration effect of, 116–17; U.S. policy regarding, 10, 80
communist, 72–73
demonstration effect with regard to, Eritrean secessionism and, 60–61, 62, 118
former, U.S. policy objectives in, 95
independence movements in, 73–75
Milosevic's subversion of federal system in, 73
see also Bosnia-Hercegovina; Croatia; Kosovo; Macedonia; Slovenia