

War Termination, Identity Conflict, and Genocide: A Road Map

A Monograph

by

MAJ Stephen A. Tribble

United States Army



School of Advanced Military Studies

United States Army Command and General Staff College

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas

AY 2012-001

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved</i> <i>OMB No. 0704-0188</i>		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 22-05-2012		2. REPORT TYPE SAMS Monograph		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) JUN 2011 – MAY 2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE War Termination, Identity Conflict, and Genocide: A Road Map			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Stephen A. Tribble			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) School for Advanced Military Studies 320 Gibson Avenue Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301			8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached abstract					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Identity Conflict, Genocide					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: Unclassified / Releaseable			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT (U)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 67	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	c. THIS PAGE (U)			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)

SCHOOL OF ADVANCED MILITARY STUDIES
MONOGRAPH APPROVAL

MAJ Stephen A. Tribble

Title of Monograph: War Termination, Identity Conflict, and Genocide: A Road Map

Approved by:

Alice A. Butler-Smith, Ph. D. Monograph Director

Michael W. Snow, COL, LG Second Reader

Thomas C. Graves, COL, IN Director,
School of Advanced
Military Studies

Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D. Director,
Graduate Degree
Programs

Disclaimer: Opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed or implied within are solely those of the author, and do not represent the views of the US Army School of Advanced Military Studies, the US Army Command and General Staff College, the United States Army, the Department of Defense, or any other US government agency. Cleared for public release: distribution unlimited.

Abstract

WAR TERMINATION, IDENTITY CONFLICT, AND GENOCIDE: A ROAD MAP by MAJ Stephen A. Tribble, United States Army, 66 pages.

History illustrates that genocide is a reoccurring phenomenon. A variety of indicators suggest that the potential for the US to deploy military forces to prevent or stop genocide or mass atrocity is increasing. Continued involvement in limited warfare, recent events in Libya and Syria, the identification of preventing and stopping mass atrocities as a national interest, the creation of the Atrocities Prevention Board, and the introduction of mass atrocity response operations joint doctrine are but a few. Stopping genocide involves understanding the motives of all the actors involved, invoking R2P, addressing issues of state sovereignty, understanding the legality of actions taken in accordance with UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and much more. Conducting military operations in an environment such as this is challenging. Employing military means to combat genocidal activity only compounds the complexity of the issue. This study identified ambiguous war termination criteria, identity conflict, and the opaque nature of genocide as the critical factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars initiated to stop genocide. The convergence of these three critical factors creates an operating environment that is difficult to understand and navigate. Therefore, it is important for military planners and commanders to understand the complexities of employing military forces to intervene in or stop genocide.

A great deal of academic study has focused on why nations decide to go to war. However, there is a dearth of literature focusing on why nations stop fighting. Although the study of war termination has increased attention in the last few years, war termination as a focus of academically rigorous research is surprisingly lacking. However, war termination is a seminal issue that military, civilian, and especially political leaders must understand and address when contemplating the employment of military force to achieve a national aim. A thorough review of the literature reveals how the ambiguous nature of ending wars makes it difficult to understand and define war termination. Existing US Joint and Army doctrine lack clarity and at times provide confusing and contradictory information related to conflict termination, war termination, and transitions. Additionally, the limited literature related to war termination theory seems applicable to conventional wars between rational state actors but less applicable to the nature of today's wars and the nature of the wars expected in the future. Furthermore, the prevailing literature suggests the following three trends contribute to the difficulty in understanding war termination: the establishment of ambiguous end states, military commanders focusing on combat operations as opposed post-combat operations, and the difficulty of understanding the nature of the conflict.

Genocide is inseparable from the concept of identity. Perpetrators base their justification for genocidal activity on the identity of a particular national, ethnical, racial, or religious group. Geopolitics and social identity theory provide a context for understanding individual behavior in relation to a group and group behavior overall. Additionally, identity conflict theory provides a framework for understanding the interrelationships of parties involved in armed conflict. More specifically, identity conflict theory provides a foundation for understanding the intense, personal nature of genocide that makes it so difficult to understand and prevent or stop.

Genocide is a complex, ambiguous, and difficult concept for humans to confront, study, and understand. The opaque nature of genocide is fraught with issues. Simply defining genocide seems to be an impossible task. Furthermore, barriers to understanding genocide include issues concerning legalities, state sovereignty, political will, the psychological effects, and the history of how genocides have ended. However, the US has identified that combating international events of mass atrocity is a national interest. Therefore, it is imperative that leaders understand the characteristics of genocide. More specifically, it is important for US civilian and military leaders to understand the role military intervention plays in stopping genocide.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
War Termination, Identity Conflict, and Genocide: A Road Map	6
The Ambiguity of the Concept of War Termination	6
Identity Conflict as a Social Reasoning for Genocide.....	25
The Opaque Nature of Genocide	32
Understanding the Complex Interrelationships	47
Destination Unknown.....	47
The Way Ahead.....	52
Summary.....	56
BIBLIOGRAPHY	58

Introduction

“Never again!” These are the words inscribed near the entrance to the Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial Site northwest of Munich, Germany and at several other memorial sites. However, history proves that the Holocaust was not the first, nor will it be the last, genocide to occur. During the 20th century, the world witnessed and recorded the horrors of many instances of genocide and formalized the phenomenon as a concept. Now, at the dawn of the 21st century, genocide remains a concern for people, nations, and organizations. More specifically, the United States (US) just recently began considering the protection of the fundamental human rights of the peoples of the world a national interest. As the US military’s participation in limited warfare increases, the possibility of encountering a mass atrocity event increases as well. Therefore, preventing genocide is important and copious amounts of literature related to the topic support this. However, there is a gap in the literature related to how genocides end and, more specifically, how military operations relate to stopping genocide. Therefore, this paper proposes to answer the following question: What are the critical factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars involving genocide? Although there are many potential answers to this question, this paper argues that ambiguous war termination criteria, the centrality of identity to those conflicts, and the opaque nature of genocide are the critical factors that contribute to the complexity in employing military forces to stop genocide.

Most recently, the US made preventing and stopping mass atrocities a national interest.¹ As a champion of the growing international commitment to the concept of “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) Sarah Sewall, from the Harvard Kennedy School, founded the Mass Atrocity Response Operations (MARO) Project in 2007.² In 2010 Sewall, along with two other members

¹ President, “The National Security Strategy,” (May 2010): 48.

² Sarah Sewall, Dwight Raymond, and Sally Chin, *Mass Atrocity Response Operations: A Military Planning Handbook* (Cambridge, MA: The President and Fellow of Harvard College, 2010).

of the MARO project, Dwight Raymond and Sally Chin, published the MARO Handbook. The purpose of the MARO Handbook is to “enable the United States and the international community to stop genocide and mass atrocity as part of a broader integrated strategy by explaining key relevant military concepts and planning considerations.”³ However, Sewall suggested that the US military is ill prepared to respond to acts of mass atrocity.⁴ Additionally, several references in the MARO Handbook suggested that the Department of Defense (DOD) incorporate MARO into doctrine, policy, planning, and training.⁵ Yet, a review of the historical case studies of genocide since 1900 suggested that military intervention played an insignificant role in stopping genocide. According to Genocide Watch, instances of mass murder, genocide, or politicide occurred in over 77 nations between 1900 and 2006.⁶ Alex de Waal, renowned expert, author, and activist on Africa, and Bridget Conley-Zilkic, the Project Director for the Committee on Conscience with the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, analyzed nineteen instances of genocide and/or mass killing in the 20th Century to determine how the killing stopped.⁷ They found that in only three of those

³ Ibid., 5.

⁴ Sarah Sewall, *MARO: Mass Atrocity Response Operations: A Military Planning Handbook* (Cambridge, MA: The President and Fellow of Harvard College, 2010), 8.

⁵ Sewall, inside cover, 13. As the commander of the United National Assistance Mission for Rwanda, Canadian Senator and retired Lieutenant General Roméo A. Dallaire suggested that the MARO handbook moves the military closer to incorporating MAROs into doctrine (inside cover). Additionally, Genocide Prevention Task Force (GPTF) co-chairs Madeleine Albright and William Cohen recommended the US incorporate genocide prevention guidance and response operations into doctrine (13).

⁶ Gregory H. Stanton, “Genocides, Politicides, and Other Mass Murder Since 1945, With Stages in 2006,” Genocide Watch, <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/genocidespoliticides.html> (accessed August 18, 2011).

⁷ Alex de Waal and Bridget Conley-Zilkic, “Reflections on How Genocidal Killings are Brought to an End,” How Genocides End, http://howgenocidesend.ssrc.org/de_Waal/ (accessed August 18, 2011). Waal is a renowned expert, author, and activist on Africa. He serves as the HIV/AIDS and Social Transformation program director with the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). He is also the Horn of Africa Regional Advisor to SSRC’s Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum. He holds a doctorate degree in social anthropology from Oxford University. Conley-Zilkic currently serves as the Project Director for the Committee on Conscience with the US Holocaust Memorial Museum. She is a recognized and established author on the subject of mass atrocity and holds a doctorate degree in comparative literature from Binghamton University.

cases did military intervention influence genocidal activity. In the majority of the cases, the killing stopped because the perpetrators achieved their goal and chose to stop.⁸

Gregory H. Stanton, a professor of Human Rights at The University of Mary Washington, provided a model of genocide that suggested it's progression through eight stages: classification, symbolization, dehumanization, organization, polarization, preparation, extermination, and denial.⁹ Additionally, Stanton is the president of Genocide Watch, an organization formed to raise awareness of genocide and influence public policy to predict, prevent, stop, and punish acts of genocide.¹⁰ According to the Genocide Watch website, there are currently 12 countries with instances of mass atrocities in the extermination stage.¹¹ An additional eight countries are in the preparation stage and six countries in the polarization stage. That is a total of 26 at risk countries. Many of these countries are located in the Middle East and Africa. Both the US National Security Strategy (NSS) and the US National Military Strategy (NMS) discuss these two regions repeatedly as important to US national interests.¹²

The US continues to participate in small, limited wars in areas that have the potential for genocidal activity. The likelihood of the US military encountering genocide is seemingly increasing. Additionally, with R2P, the likelihood of the US conducting a military intervention to stop genocide appears more possible. The preponderance of literature on genocide focuses on

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Gregory H. Stanton, "The 8 Stages of Genocide" (paper presented as the first Working Paper (GS 01) of the Yale Program in Genocide Studies, New Haven, CT, January, 1998), <http://www.genocidewatch.org/images/8StagesBriefingpaper.pdf> (accessed January 25, 2012). Stanton also serves as the President of Genocide Watch, the Chairman of The International Campaign to End Genocide, the Director of The Cambodian Genocide Project, and the Vice President of the International Association of Genocide Scholars.

¹⁰ Genocide Watch, "About Genocide Watch," <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus.html> (accessed January 25, 2012).

¹¹ Genocide Watch, "Current Countries at Risk," <http://www.genocidewatch.org/alerts/countriesatrisk2011.html> (accessed January 25, 2012).

¹² President, "National Security Strategy," (May 2010). U. S. Department of Defense, *National Military Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: 2011).

prevention by means other than military intervention. There is a glaring absence of literature addressing how to terminate military operations related to stopping genocide once they start.

Furthermore, stopping genocide is a complex undertaking. Stopping genocide involves understanding the motives of all the actors involved, invoking R2P, addressing issues of state sovereignty, understanding the legality of actions taken in accordance with United Nations (UN) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and much more. Employing military means to combat genocidal activity only compounds the complexity of the issue.

The convergence of military operations with the complexity involved in stopping genocide makes this what many in the US Army consider an ill-structured problem. US doctrine provides a methodology to help planners better understand how to address ill-structured problems, namely design. “Design is a methodology for applying critical and creative thinking to understand, visualize, and describe complex, ill-structured problems and develop approaches to solve them.”¹³ The first step in design is to understand the nature of the problem. Without an understanding of the problem, military commanders and planner cannot effectively establish the context associated with the situation or develop viable approaches or options to effect change.¹⁴

Therefore, this paper provides a contextual basis for understanding the critical factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars involving genocide. First, understanding what the end of any war looks like and how to achieving war termination is difficult. The concept of conflict termination has been around for centuries, but what happens when the fighting stops? Is the war over? The unconditional surrender of Germany to end World War II (WWII) is a historical anomaly. The US fought the majority of Operation Iraqi Freedom

¹³ United States Army, *Field Manual 5-0, The Operations Process* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 2010): 3-1.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 3-2.

after President George W. Bush declared the end of major combat operations on May 1, 2003. Only recently has academic literature begun to address the concept of war termination. Still today, US doctrine does not delineate the concept of war termination clearly. Furthermore, military end states for US armed conflicts are typically nebulous in nature. Considering these issues, it is understandable that determining how to terminate any kind of war is difficult.

Second, some scholars argue that identity conflict serves as a social reasoning for genocide. As a social phenomenon, understanding the dynamics of identity conflict is complex. Understanding identity conflict requires insight into social identity theory, geopolitics, group behavior, reconciliation, and even forgiveness. Third, genocide itself is a complex phenomenon. Genocide as a concept has only been around for about 60 years. As an academic discipline, genocide is even less developed. This makes understanding and studying genocide difficult. Even the simple task of defining genocide is complex. Furthermore, the true nature of genocide is enigmatic and generates legal difficulties in preventing and stopping genocide.

The following analytical approach supports the argument that ambiguous war termination criteria, identity conflict, and the opaque nature of genocide are the critical factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars involving genocide. First, a discussion of the concept of war termination as it relates to doctrine and theory demonstrates the difficulty in ending wars. Second, a discussion of social identity and identity conflict theories demonstrate the social reasoning link between identity and genocide that make it such a difficult social phenomenon to understand and prevent or stop. Third, a discussion of the concept of genocide, the difficulty in studying genocide, and how genocides have ended historically delineates the characteristics of genocide that contribute to its inexplicit nature. Finally, a discussion of the convergence of these three critical factors demonstrates the complexity of employing military forces to end wars involving genocide.

War Termination, Identity Conflict, and Genocide: A Road Map

The concepts of war termination, identity conflict, and genocide are very distinct. Each concept is also complex in and of itself. Therefore, understanding how the interrelationships between these three concepts contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars involving genocide requires an understanding of the complexities of each concept individually. First, a review of doctrine, theory, and history provides an understanding of the context related to the ambiguous nature of the concept of war termination. Second, a review of geopolitics theory and social identity theory provides the context for linking identity conflict and genocide. Third, a discussion of the opaque nature of genocide and genocide as a US national interest provides the context for understanding and fighting genocide. Finally, a short summary of how the three concepts interact introduces a conceptual understanding of the interrelationships that contribute to the complexity in employing military forces to stop genocide.

The Ambiguity of the Concept of War Termination

A natural place to begin the discussion of employing military forces to end wars involving genocide is war termination. This paper focuses on conducting military operations and, therefore, the discussion should begin with the only critical factor that relates directly to the military, war termination. Understanding the importance of war termination dates back to the great grandfather of war theory, Carl von Clausewitz. He stated that “no one starts a war – or rather, no one in his senses ought to do so – without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war and how he intends to conduct it.”¹⁵ Thucydides stated that there are three reasons nations go to war: fear, honor, and interest.¹⁶

¹⁵ Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, trans. and ed. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 579.

¹⁶ Thucydides, *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to The Peloponnesian War*, ed. Robert B. Strassler (New York: The Free Press, 1976), 43.

A great deal of academic study has focused on why nations decide to go to war. However, there is a dearth of literature focusing on why nations stop fighting. Although the study of war termination has increased attention in the last few years, war termination as a focus of academically rigorous research is surprisingly lacking. Understanding the importance of war termination, the US hosted the War Termination Conference in June 2010 at the United States Military Academy (USMA). Molten served as the general editor for the published proceeding of the conference. He stated that war termination is a seminal issue that military, civilian, and especially political leaders must understand and address when contemplating the employment of military force to achieve a national aim.¹⁷ A thorough review of the literature reveals how the ambiguous nature of ending wars makes it difficult to understand and define war termination. However, at the foundation of all military operations is doctrine. Therefore, a review of existing US Joint and Army doctrine provides context for the discussion of and exposes the existing lack of clarity related to war termination. Additionally, an overview of the prevailing theories related to war termination provides an understanding of how wars actually end. Furthermore, the prevailing literature suggests the following three trends that contribute to the difficulty in understanding war termination: the establishment of ambiguous end states, military commanders focusing on combat operations as opposed post-combat operations, and the difficulty of commanders to understand the nature of the conflict.

The Lack of Clarity in the Military Doctrine of the United States. Doctrine provides the military with a framework to plan and execute operations. Commanders and planners use doctrine to develop operations using a commonly shared language. However, doctrine is not an unbreakable constraint or the unequivocal answer to every operational challenge or foe. It is merely a guideline to help planners and commanders to achieve the most favorable mission

¹⁷ Matthew Molten, *War Termination: The Proceedings of the War Termination Conference* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2001), iii.

results. For doctrine to be effective, it must be clear. The concept of war termination in US doctrine is unclear at best. A review of several Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of the Army (DA) doctrinal publications presents a better understanding of the lack of clarity relating to war termination in current US doctrine.

Joint Publication 1 (JP 1), Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States argued that “it is absolutely essential to understand that termination of operations is an essential link between NSS, National Defense Strategy (NDS), NMS, and the national strategic end state.”¹⁸ However, the mention of, or reference to, war termination is noticeably absent from any of the publications espousing US national security or defense strategy (NSS, NDS, NMS, or Quadrennial Defense Review Report). The NSS discussed the perceived current global strategic context, the world the US seeks to support/build, and a strategic approach to advance the national interests of the US. The NDS provided a strategic context for national defense objectives, how to achieve those objectives, and the employment of capabilities to achieve the ends. The NMS discussed ways in which the US military will support or achieve enduring national interest and military objects. The Quadrennial Defense Review Report (QDR) focused on the how the US military is structured, supported, and employed.

Further examination of joint doctrine only helps to cloud the issue of war termination. *Joint Publication 5-0 (JP 5-0), Joint Operations Planning* blurred the meanings of concepts such as conflict termination, transition, end state, and war termination.¹⁹ JP 5-0 described termination as an element of operational design. In this context, the President of the United States (POTUS) and the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) define how they intend to end joint operations while assuring enduring strategic outcomes. The doctrine emphasizes the development of termination

¹⁸ U.S. Department of Defense, *Joint Publication 1, Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 2009), I-19.

¹⁹ U. S. Department of Defense, *Joint Publication 5-0, Joint Operations Planning* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 2011).

criteria that includes the achievement of operational tasks such as transition to post-conflict operations. Operational planners then use termination criteria to develop the military objectives required to achieve the military end state. However, doctrine does not provide a solid definition of termination. Is termination the end of major combat operations? Is termination the transition from major combat operations to stability operations? Is termination the redeployment of all military personnel?

As the second element of operational design, the concept of end state more closely resembles the concept of termination. Achieving the end state means achieving defined military objectives that lead to the achievement of the termination criteria. JP 5-0 referred to end state in terms of the employment of the military element of national power. Successful achievement of the end state occurs when the conflict progresses beyond the point when the military element of national power is no longer the primary means employed to achieve the remaining desired strategic aims. Therefore, the application of logic implies that achieving the military end state equates to either conflict termination, war termination, or both.

Joint Publication 3-0 (JP 3-0), Joint Operations is more direct in defining the concept of termination. Although JP 3-0 again fell short of an actual definition of termination, it did define termination criteria as “the specified standards approved by the President and/or the Secretary of Defense that must be met before a joint operation can be concluded.”²⁰ Furthermore, it generally described termination as the end of joint military operations and redeployment of military personnel. Additionally, JP 3-0 related termination to enabling civil authority through the transition of operations to either a legitimate host nation civil authority or another authority such as the UN. By this definition, transitioning from combat operations to stability operations could equate to either conflict termination or war termination. Additionally, definite achievement of war

²⁰ U. S. Department of Defense, *Joint Publication 3-0, Joint Operations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 2011), GL-17.

termination happens only when another civil authority takes control and after the redeployment of all US military forces. Considering that the US maintains a military force in South Korea, does it mean the US is still at war with North Korea?

Army doctrine focused more on conflict termination that, in itself, is vague and encompasses many different kinds of conflict with different logic. The recently published *Army Doctrinal Publication 3-0 (ADP 3-0), Unified Land Operations* mentioned conflict termination directly. *ADP 3-0* discussed the military conditions required to achieve conflict termination. These conditions include aggressively and unpredictably exploiting the initiative in order to destroy the enemy's ability to fight and to destroy or capture the enemy's sources of power. *Field Manual 3-07 (FM 3-07), Stability Operations* however clouded US Army doctrine related to the concept of termination. *FM 3-07* used the term conflict transformation instead of conflict or war termination. The manual defined conflict transformation as "the process of reducing the means and motivations for violent conflict while developing more viable, peaceful alternatives for the competitive pursuit of political and socioeconomic aspirations."²¹ *FM 3-07* suggested that conflict consists of simultaneous offensive, defensive, and stability operations or civil support operations, also referred to as full spectrum operations (FSO). Although military operations focus on one element of FSO depending on the phase of the conflict, the conduct of FSO suggests that conflict may continue even when the focus of military efforts transitions to stability operations.²² Furthermore, *FM 3-07* suggested that conflict transformation measures go beyond military power and require the integration of all the elements of national power. This suggests that achieving conflict transformation may include the achievement of non-military objectives even after major

²¹ U. S. Department of the Army, *Field Manual 3-07, Stability Operations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 2008), GLOSS-7.

²² *Ibid.*, V-6. See Figure V-3 for an overview of the joint operational plan phases: Phase 0 Shape, Phase I Deter, Phase II Seize the Initiative, Phase III Dominate, Phase IV Stabilize, and Phase V Enable Civil Authority.

combat operations cease. Finally, *FM 3-07* stated that conflict transformation is equivalent to imposed or negotiated settlement. Achieving a settlement sets the conditions for a transition to post-combat operations through disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of the enemy.

Considering that doctrine is the basis for all military operations, it is easy to understand that the lack of clarity in doctrine translates to a difficulty in understanding the concept of war termination. Does current US Joint and Army doctrine define termination to mean conflict termination, transition from combat operations to post-conflict operations, focusing full spectrum operations on stability operations, enabling civil authority, or complete redeployment of all military personnel? The characteristics and circumstances surrounding each armed conflict are unique. Therefore, it is understandable that it is difficult for the US military to institutionalize the concept of war termination through the establishment of clear doctrine. In the absence of an institutionalized understanding of war termination, the next logical step is to examine the non-doctrinal literature related to war termination theory. However, the review of such literature only serves to add to the ambiguity surrounding the concept of war termination.

Using War Termination Theory to Understand How Wars End. As we know, there is a difference between war termination and conflict termination. However, similar to doctrine, the literature addressing the issue of war termination theory does not do a sufficient job of differentiating between the two terms. Although the following discussion highlights theory related to war termination, it was not possible to identify any literature that made a clear distinction between war termination and conflict termination. Therefore, the literature reviewed below provides a general understanding of how scholars understand the concept of war termination.

Modern war termination theory traces back to the seminal work published by Geoffrey Blainey, a prominent Australian historian and author.²³ Blainey stated that wars end for the converse reason wars begin. Wars begin because belligerents are unable to agree upon a mutually acceptable covenant of peace. This creates an uncertainty that manifests into war. Belligerents are uncertain about the balance of power, the costs or benefits of fighting, and the strength of the enemy's resolve.²⁴ Therefore, belligerents use war as a method for collecting information to overcome this uncertainty. Conversely, Blainey argued that wars end because combat allows for the convergence of the war expectations of the opposing belligerents. Information obtained through fighting illuminates each side's chances for victory and influences their will to persist. Slantchev referred to this as an information narrative to war termination. Two prominent war termination theories use an information narrative as their foundation.

Dan Reiter, an associate professor of political science at Emory University, suggested that most situations involving conflict are essentially situations involving some form of bargaining.²⁵ He defined bargaining as "the process by which two actors strive to divide a disputed good."²⁶ Reiter suggested that wars begin because of issues with uncertainty and problems with unenforceable commitments. Belligerents understand that with war comes at great financial and human cost. If they knew who would win the war and the resulting division of the disputed goods, it is easy to surmise that they might choose not to fight the war and simply accept the terms of the divisible goods as if they had fought the war. However, war is unpredictable. It is this uncertainty that drives nations to war. Uncertainty, or disagreements as Reiter called them,

²³ Branislav L. Slantchev, "War Termination," *American Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 4 (2004): 813.

²⁴ Elizabeth A. Stanley and John P. Sawyer, "The Equifinality of War Termination: Multiple Paths to Ending War," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53, no. 5 (2009): 652.

²⁵ Dan Reiter, *How Wars End* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 2.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

falls into five categories: aggregate military power, military technology, opposing military strategies, resolve, and third-party intervention.²⁷ Reiter used this fundamental understanding of why nations fought wars as a foundation for this theory of war termination.

Reiter's theory on war termination centered on what he called the interaction of information and commitment dynamics.²⁸ His theory suggested that belligerents determine their willingness to continue to fight based on the information they obtain during battles. As each side fights their opponent, they obtain a better understanding of their probability for victory. As the probability for victory diminishes, the losing belligerent is more amenable to a less favorable negotiated settlement. Conversely, the winning belligerent may increase the demands required of the losing belligerent. Furthermore, even in the face of discouraging information, belligerents may choose to continue the fight. This is typically a result of what Reiter argues is the fear of commitment compliance. If one belligerent believes that the other will not honor post conflict commitments, they may choose to continue fighting even in the face of unfavorable odds.

However, the relative balance of power between belligerents is not enough. It is the interaction of information and commitment that provides the narrative for why belligerents chose to continue the fight. Reiter provided many historical examples to support his theory. One is of the Allies during WWII.²⁹ The speed and power of Germany and her Axis allies was well known. Their early victories were quick, vast, and devastating. Germany was on the verge of invading England and Japan gained quick control of half of the Pacific Ocean region.³⁰ This was the first real threat of global domination since the Roman Empire. An analysis of the balance of power suggests that the Allies should have negotiated with Germany to preserve their existence.

²⁷ Ibid., 11-13.

²⁸ Ibid., 4.

²⁹ Ibid., 92.

³⁰ Ibid.

However, Reiter suggested that the Allies chose to fight for three reasons.³¹ First, the Allies believed that Germany would not honor any post conflict peace agreement. Second, Germany and Japan, left unchecked, posed a grave danger to the immanent or eventual sovereignty of Great Britain and the US. Lastly, the Allies unwittingly clung to the idea of eventual victory.

On the other hand, the Soviets may have lost hope in 1941. Evidence suggested that as Hitler was seemingly marching steadfast to Moscow, Stalin attempted to contact Hitler to negotiate a settlement.³² Stalin understood that Hitler loathed Bolshevism and would likely dishonor any peace agreement over time. However, the Soviet's were losing on the battlefield and the Soviet leadership lost hope that victory was possible. Therefore, they believed that even an unstable peace was better than fighting on with no hope of victory.

If the British and US considered only the bleak information obtained in battle in the early years of the war, they most likely would have sought to negotiate a peace settlement. However, their fear of post conflict commitment compliance compelled them to fight on even in the face of what seemed like overwhelming odds. Conversely, if the Soviets only considered their commitment compliance fears, they should never have attempted to contact Hitler to consider a negotiated settlement. Stalin knew Hitler would eventually violate any commitments he made to preserve the Soviet Union. However, the information they were obtaining through battle destroyed their hopes for victory. Therefore, they considered seeking limited victory through negotiated settlement. This historical example illustrates Reiter's argument that a complete understanding of the concept of war termination must consider the dynamic interaction of information and commitment.

Elizabeth A. Stanley and John P. Sawyer, both professors at Georgetown University, provided an alternate theory of war termination. Their theory is based on what they called

³¹ Ibid., 93.

³² Ibid., 94.

domestic coalition shifts.³³ Stanley and Sawyer defined domestic coalition shifts as “either (1) a consequential change in the identity of the decision makers or (2) a substantive change in the type of government.”³⁴ The first type of coalition shift refers to an actual change in the head of state, cabinet members, or parliament members. The second type of coalition shift refers to a change in the type of regime controlling the state; for example, shifting from a democracy to an oligarchy. The result of either type of coalition shift is a potentially significant change in policy. The new members of the coalition in power inject new perspectives, interests, and resources into the system. Therefore, Stanley and Sawyer argued that war termination is contingent upon a shift in domestic policy because of a change in the composition or attitudes of the coalition in power.

The theory espoused by Stanley and Sawyer used the Bayesian bargaining model as a foundation. They stated that war can end only when one of the belligerents changes or updates their expectations about the potential costs or benefits of continuing to fight. This creates the overlapping bargaining space necessary to end the war. This change or update of expectations occurs when there is either a change in the existing coalition’s attitudes concerning the war or the composition of the existing coalition changes resulting in expectations that are more appropriate.³⁵

However, a change in the attitude of the existing coalition is not likely. Stanley and Sawyer suggested there are three obstacles to changing the attitudes of the existing coalition.³⁶ First, the preference obstacle suggests that sometimes leaders simply choose not to stop the war. Even with perfect information concerning the costs and benefits of fighting, there may be some compelling reason why they chose to continue the fight. Leaders may feel compelled to continue

³³ Elizabeth A. Stanley and John P. Sawyer, “The Equifinality of War Termination: Multiple Paths to Ending War,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53, 5 (2009): 651.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 655.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 658.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 656-657.

the war for personal reasons such as staying in power, protecting their personal reputation, or fear for their physical or financial security. Furthermore, they may choose to fight for reasons of necessity such as defending their country from invasion. The second obstacle is the information obstacle that suggests belligerents do not know they should end the war. Poor quality information, individual or organizational biases, or inconsistent assessment indicators deteriorate the effectiveness of the rational updating process. Coalition members simply do not have the correct information to make the appropriate decision. The entrapment obstacle is the third obstacle. Entrapment occurs when the leader feels a sense of sunken costs and either internal or external constituencies apply pressure to continue the war. Internal entrapment occurs when the leader feels that ending the war would threaten their continued position as head of state if he or she chooses to end the war. Furthermore, internal entrapment can occur when the constituency considers the mobilization of the nation as a sunken cost and feels ending war would be wrong. External entrapment occurs when the leader values a strong alliance with another nation. This alliance may be important during or after the war. Either way, the leader feels it is necessary to continue the war to support their ally with intentions of a continued partnership.

Therefore, Stanley and Sawyer suggested that there are three elements to war termination. First, for war termination to occur there must be a fundamental change in attitudes or policies concerning the war for one or more belligerents. Second, it is unlikely that the existing coalition in power will change their attitudes or policies due to preference, information, or entrapment obstacles. Therefore, war termination requires a change in the position of head of state or a significant change in the cabinet or parliament membership. Finally, this change creates a domestic coalition shift that allows new perceptions and resources to reduce obstacles and open bargaining space to end the war.

In the wake of the protracted and continuing coalition wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, understanding war termination became important. Furthermore, these conflicts highlighted the need for and glaring absence of significant rigorous study and understanding of war termination.

The theory espoused by Reiter and the theory espoused by Stanley and Sawyer were attempting to address this academic void. However, both the theories require the understanding of one major fundamental assumption. Both theories apply to war involving rational state actors. It is reasonable to assume that rational state actors will adhere to how information management, commitment compliance, expectation convergence, and domestic coalition shifts influence the logic of war. However, Reiter suggested that international agreements and accepted norms of behavior do not apply to rogue regimes or terrorist networks.³⁷ Often, these organizations are willing to risk everything, even suicide, to support their cause. Civilian casualties are irrelevant and sometimes even seen as a necessary means to their ends.

Rogue regimes and terrorist organizations are willing to expend great costs in terms of human lives, money, and time to achieve their aims. This makes it very difficult to terminate any war in which they participate. It becomes too costly and possibly impossible to inflict enough cost on these rogue regimes and terrorist organizations to bargain, coerce, or frighten them into capitulation. Therefore, the rational state actor is incapable of achieving the bargaining space required by Reiter's and Stanley and Sawyer's theories to allow for the convergence of belligerent expectations. Moreover, this may be the exact effect that the rogue regime or terrorist organization is attempting to achieve. Protracted war and increasing war costs may force the rational state actor to capitulate eventually. Therefore, Reiter's dynamics of information and commitment and Stanley and Sawyer's domestic coalition shifts may apply less to terminating wars of this nature.

Christopher Tuck, lecturer at King's College London and the Joint Service Command and Staff College, discussed Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) to provide an understanding of the

³⁷ Reiter, 225.

barriers to war termination in an environment involving rogue regimes and terrorism.³⁸ He suggested that three issues contribute to making war termination difficult. First, military leaders continue to see war and peace as two separate entities.³⁹ In Iraq, the US quickly achieved conflict termination with the defeat of the conventional Iraq forces. The US declared victory and moved on to stability and peacekeeping operations. However, war termination, or what Tuck calls it, conflict resolution, was elusive. Although the US moved into stability operations, the conflict was not over. The US failed to recognize the underling disputes of the conflict and attempted to begin rebuilding the nation of Iraq while the conflict waged on in a different, non-conventional form. Second, the coalition in Iraq continued to “stove pipe” operations.⁴⁰ The military was responsible for combat operations and the politicians and associated governmental agencies managed building the peace. This created a post facto separation of the military means with the political aims. Lastly, supports arguments made earlier in this paper concerned with the inadequacy of doctrine related to the concept of war termination.⁴¹

The preceding review of literature related to war termination theory provides a general understanding of how US military leaders perceive war termination. However, the most poignant conclusion gleaned from this review is that the quantity of literature related to war termination theory remains inadequate. Furthermore, the limited amount of literature available is incomplete. Although the war termination theories espoused by Reiter and Stanley and Sawyer seem applicable to conventional wars between rational state actors, Tuck’s analysis of OIF suggested that they are less applicable to the nature of today’s wars and the nature of the wars expected in

³⁸ Christopher Tuck, “Conflict Termination in Iraq,” *RUSI Journal* 149, no. 5 (2004): 17. Tuck earned a Master of Science degree in Strategic Studies from the University of College of Wales and is currently pursuing his doctorate degree at Reading University. His previous experience includes lecturer at the Royal Military Academy and research intern at Saferworld.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 21.

the future. Furthermore, similar to doctrine, the literature related to war termination theory fail to make a clear distinction between conflict termination and war termination. In addition to the inconsistencies in doctrine and theory, some additional trends that contribute to the difficulty in understanding war termination require discussion.

Three Trends That Contribute to the Difficulty in Understanding War Termination.

Although humans have been fighting wars since the beginning of time, the concept of war termination is relatively new. Roger Spiller, a retired US Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC) history professor, suggested that the concept of victory has served as the ultimate indicator of the end of war for centuries.⁴² Early military thought suggested that a war will only end through decisive military defeat of the enemy.⁴³ Through decisive victory, the enemy capitulates to either imposed or negotiated peace. However, the term victory is absent from current doctrine. As previously alluded to, war termination is also absent from current military doctrine. End state and termination criteria are the only two terms in current military doctrine that resembles the concept of war termination. A review of non-doctrinal literature suggests that the ambiguity of war termination relates to the evolving and elusive nature of the end state, efforts focusing on the planning and execution of combat operations, and understanding the conflict.

The first issue contributing to the difficulty in understanding war termination is its relation to end state. Determining the desired end state before the initiation of a war is difficult. Current US doctrine clearly states that the POTUS and/or SECDEF are responsible for

⁴² Roger Spiller, "War Termination: Theory and American Practice," in *War Termination: The Proceedings of the War Termination Conference*, ed. Matthew Molten, 7-16 (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2001), 8. Roger Spiller served as a history professor at the U.S. Army's Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, KS for nearly 30 years. He has authored, co-authored, and edited many literary works relating to the military and war termination.

⁴³ See Clausewitz, Jomini, and Sun Tzu.

determining the end state of a war and defining the associated termination criteria.⁴⁴ In determining the end state, the POTUS receives advice and pressure from both military and civilian/political leaders. Clausewitz stated that war is nothing more than the extension of policy by other means.⁴⁵ Defining the end state is an excellent example of a way in which policy dictates the conduct of war. Through the POTUS, policy defines the end state. However, most politicians are not familiar with US doctrine. Additionally, strategy is typically ambiguous which suggests that there may be some benefit in keeping the end state ambiguous. Therefore, the US continues to conduct operations in ambiguous operating environments with allusive or ill-defined end states.⁴⁶ The US failed to define the strategic end state clearly prior to conducting operations for all of the major US conflicts since 2001.

Determining the end state before the initiation of combat operations does not always guarantee success either. The inconsistency of US doctrine and the common misunderstanding of the nature of the conflict may lead both military and political leaders to identify the end state incorrectly. William Flavin, the Directing Professor for Doctrine, Concepts, Training and Education Division at the US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), suggested that ambiguous end states are a product of inadequate interagency planning.⁴⁷ Personal agendas, congressional pressure, interservice/departmental infighting, and bias impede the ability

⁴⁴ *JP 5-0*, I-2. See the section on Strategic Direction.

⁴⁵ Clausewitz, 87.

⁴⁶ For example: Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Odyssey Dawn.

⁴⁷ William Flavin, "Planning for Conflict Termination and Post-Conflict Success," *Parameters* 33, no. 3 (2003): 102. Flavin currently serves as the Directing Professor for Doctrine, Concepts, Training and Education Division at the US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), located at the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Prior experience includes service as a senior foreign affairs analyst with Booz Allen and Hamilton (working on doctrine development for the US Army PKSOI), and as a Colonel in the US Army (Deputy Director of Special Operations for the Supreme Allied Commander Europe at the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe). He holds a Bachelor's of Arts degree in history from the Virginia Military Institute and a Master's of Arts degree in History from Emory University. Additionally, he was a Center for Strategic Studies senior fellow and served as a professor at the US Army War College.

of planners to determine clear and achievable end states. Additionally, as the conflict progresses, the understanding of the nature of the conflict increases. Upon the discovery of new information such as the true intentions of the belligerents, accurate enemy unit dispositions, or an insurgent uprising, the end state becomes a moving target that requires change and refinement as the conflict evolves. Typically, this causes the outcome of the war to diverge significantly from the original defined end state.

The second issue contributing to the difficulty in understanding war termination is the tendency of military commanders and planners to focus on combat operations while neglecting the conduct of operations after the shooting has stopped or has reduced significantly. Flavin referenced Operation Just Cause to illustrate this point.⁴⁸ Units executed combat operations with speed and efficiency. However, commanders issued little guidance to units operating in Panama concerning restoration operations. Once the focus shifted from combat operations to stability operations, it was obvious that planners neither understood nor properly addressed the historical or strategic context shaping the changing nature of the conflict. With the cessation of combat operations, the military struggled with many unknowns such as how to determine the end state, replace the Panamanian Defense Force (PDF), and establish a new civil government. They also had to determine the form of government that would work in Panama, the time required to stabilize the government so units could redeploy, and the military's role in establishing the new government. Charles A. Ford, an experienced major in the US Army and a graduate of the US Army's School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS), went a step further suggesting that the lack of clear guidance from political leaders facilitates a commander's tendency to narrow their planning focus to functional tasks.⁴⁹ Without a clear understanding of the strategic end state,

⁴⁸ Ibid., 108.

⁴⁹ Charles A. Ford, "Military Governance and War Termination" (master's monograph, U.S. Command and General Staff College, 2010), 15. Ford is a Major in the United States Army and 2010

commanders focus on what they know, combat. This can lead to the neglect of accomplishing long-term national objectives.

Additionally, both Ford and Flavin suggested that it may be difficult for combat units to conduct post-conflict peace or stability operations.⁵⁰ History shows that headquarters focus on military victory or “winning the fight” and give little attention to post-conflict operations. Flavin again referenced Operation Just Cause in his description of how the J5 planned and prepared for post-conflict operations, also known by the code name “Blind Logic.”⁵¹ However, security concerns prevented coordination with outside agencies. Therefore, the planning did not include any input from interagency partners essential for post-conflict operations. Additionally, as a staff officer, the J5 did not have the authority to warrant the attention of the commander or direct coordination with international or interagency organizations.

Ford argued that developing a military governance capability will alleviate combat commanders from such duties and allow for a timely transition to a civilian-lead authority.⁵² Flavin provided a successful example of this referencing the creation of Task Force Freedom (TFF) during Operation Desert Storm.⁵³ Swain suggested that as a separate command, TFF focused on stability operations and successfully transitioned responsibility to the Secretary of the Army.⁵⁴ Due to its size and unique capabilities, the US has the only military capable of

graduate of the School of Advanced Military Studies. His experience includes battalion assistant operations officer (plans), battalion battle captain (Iraq, 2004-2005), and infantry company commander (Iraq, 2006-2007).

⁵⁰ Ford, 26. Flavin, 108.

⁵¹ *JP 5-0*, II-17. The J5 is the plans directorate of the joint staff.

⁵² Ford, 51.

⁵³ Flavin, 110.

⁵⁴ Richard Swain, “*Lucky War*”: *Third Army in Desert Storm* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Press, 1994), 321. Swain currently serves as a contractor for Booz Allen Hamilton and focuses on Systemic Operational Design in support of UNIFIED QUEST and the School of Advanced Military Studies (SAMS). He is a previous Professor of Officership at the William E. Simon Center for the Professional Military Ethic at West Point. Swain served as the Director of Fellows at

conducting large-scale stability operations. However, understanding the need to civilianize stability and reconstruction operations, the US created the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) under the Department of State (DOS).

The third issue contributing to the difficulty in understanding war termination is the ability of commanders and planners to understand the character of the conflict and operating environment. It is commonly understood that intelligence is imperative in war. Relevant intelligence improves the ability to identify targets valuable to enemy and improves the understanding of the enemy's decision-making process. However, understanding just the enemy is not enough. Ancient philosopher Sun Tzu understood the importance of knowing yourself, knowing the enemy, and understanding the terrain.⁵⁵ Understanding the context in which the operation will take place allows the commander and planners to apply operational art properly in accordance with the character of the conflict. Additionally, Ford referenced the *2010 Joint Operating Environment* publication and argued that understanding the character of the conflict requires the commander to understand the challenges of the operating environment that exist beyond the battlefield.⁵⁶ He broke down the operating environment into two dimensions: winning the fight and winning the peace. Commanders must consider both dimensions when planning and executing operations. Affording inadequate attention to either dimension jeopardizes the mission.

To understand the character of the conflict, commanders must understand how technology, doctrine, ideology, societal norms, and operational approach influence the manner in which the enemy fights and how belligerents/populations will act during stability operations. Understanding the needs, values, and interests of the nation's people is paramount in determining

SAMS where he taught courses in ethics, military history, and the history of military thought. He graduated from West Point in 1966 and earned a doctorate degree from Duke University

⁵⁵ Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, trans. J. H. Huang, (New York: Quill, William Morrow Publishers, 1993), 129.

⁵⁶ Ford, 2.

a strategy for stability operations. Michael Rampy, a retired US Army colonel and the director of Washington Operations for Quantum Research International, Inc., suggested that the character of a conflict is either interest based or values-based but most likely is a combination of both.⁵⁷ An interest-based conflict suggests concern for issues that may be amenable to negotiation such as territory. Values-based conflicts are less amenable to negotiation. Belligerents seem less likely to yield to concessions over such issues as religion, societal norms, or equality. Knowing thyself and thy enemy is important. However, Ford argued that to achieve war termination, the focus must be on the aims of the opposing belligerents. For war to truly end, all parties involved in the conflict must consent to war termination. However, Ford argued that achieving war termination requires the loser to stop fighting.

A war involving genocide amplifies these three issues. Although a discussion on genocide is forthcoming, it is important to understand how genocidal activity in the conduct of war influences the context of war termination. Considering that the true extent of genocidal activity is commonly secret, the projected end state of the conflict will most likely change as military and political leaders glean more information. Furthermore, as genocide is an elusive humanitarian mission, the focus of military commanders will most likely remain on combat operations. As a result, it is likely that social identity context inherent in genocidal activity may be misunderstood or even ignored when attempting to decipher the true character of the conflict and operating environment.

In summary, the modern operating environment is complex. Understanding why nations go to war is relatively transparent. However, understanding how wars end is difficult. The

⁵⁷ Michael Rampy, "The Endgame: Conflict Termination and Post-Conflict Activities," *Military Review* 72 (1992): 46. Rampy is a retired US Army colonel and currently serves as the director of Washington Operations for Quantum Research International, Inc. He earned a Bachelor's of Arts degree from Old Dominion University, Master's degrees from the National War College and the School of Advanced Military Studies, and a doctorate degree from Trinity University.

policies and publications that govern how the US terminates war are inadequate, incomplete, and at times contradictory. Additionally, literature concerning war termination theory is limited. Furthermore, political leaders provide military commanders with insufficient guidance concerning the strategic aims of today's conflicts. This leads to commanders focusing on combat operations and neglecting important stability and transition operations. Therefore, the ambiguity related to the concept of war termination results from the lack of clarity in US military doctrine, the limited academic understanding of war termination as a concept, US policy defining ambiguous end states, commanders focusing on combat operations, and a disconnect between strategic guidance and operations planning that leads to the misunderstanding of the character of conflict.

Understanding how the US interprets the concept of war termination based on history, doctrine, theory, and literature provides a foundation for relating war termination to employing military forces to stop genocide. Logically, the next step would be to provide an understanding of genocide in the same context. However, as was argued earlier, there is an intermediate step that requires attention. Identity conflict serves as the social reasoning for genocide. Therefore, a discussion of social identity and identity conflict provides a contextual framework to understand the subsequent discussion of genocide.

Identity Conflict as a Social Reasoning for Genocide

By definition, genocide is inseparable from the concept of identity. Perpetrators base their justification for genocidal activity on the identity of a particular national, ethnical, racial, or religious group. Therefore, understanding genocide requires an understanding of social identity theory. Furthermore, understanding the connection between identity conflict and genocide is equally important. To provide this understanding, a review of the literature related to geopolitics theory, social identity theory, and their relation to genocide illustrates the linkage between identity conflict and genocide.

The Evolution of Geopolitics. According to David Newman, professor of Political Geography and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Ben-Gurion University in Israel, geopolitics is the study of the “changing role of the state and the dynamic nature of the relationships between states at both global and regional levels.”⁵⁸ Gerard Toal, professor of Government and International Affairs and Director of the Government and International Affairs program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, suggested that a significant evolution in the world politics narrative is taking place.⁵⁹ He attributed this evolution to the failure of nation-states and the emergence of global threats.⁶⁰ The feudal society dominated the geopolitical landscape during the pre-modernity era from 1500 to 1850.⁶¹ The industrial society dominated the classic modernity era between 1850 and 1950 using the state-centric Westphalia system as a foundation.⁶² Three geographic related assumptions characterize this system: state sovereignty guarantees the exclusion of direct foreign influence on internal actions, states conceive of domestic and foreign realms as distinct, and state boundaries define societal boundaries and norms.⁶³ Toal suggested that the current post-modern narrative depicts the

⁵⁸ David Newman, “Geopolitics Renaissance: Territory, Sovereignty and the World Political Map,” in *Boundaries, Territory and Postmodernity*, ed. David Newman (Abingdon, England: Frank Cass & Company, Ltd., 1999), 1-16. Newman holds a PhD in geography, is the editor of the *Geopolitics* journal, and serves as a professor of Political Geography and as Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Ben-Gurion University in Israel. Newman suggested that geopolitics relates to international relations with an emphasis on the influence of geography. On page three, he discussed five key themes related to the contemporary study of geopolitics.

⁵⁹ Gerard Toal, “De-Territorialised Threats and Global Dangers: Geopolitics and Risk Society,” in *Boundaries, Territory and Postmodernity*, ed. David Newman (Abingdon, England: Frank Cass & Company, Ltd., 1999), 17-31. Gerard Toal holds a Ph.D. in Political Geography from Syracuse University and is a professor of Government and International Affairs and Director of the Government and International Affairs program at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, National Capital Region campus. His article describes the evolution of geopolitics from pre-modernity to classic modernity to reflexive modernity (what he calls risk society). See page 23 for a detailed description of his model.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 21. Toal describes global threats as terrorism, criminal activity, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, etc.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 17.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

breakdown of the Westphalian system due to the effects of globalization on power, capital, information, an increase in technological capability, and a de-emphasis of territorial mass.⁶⁴ This breakdown in the Westphalian system prompted the emergence of de-territorialized threats and ethnic nationalism.⁶⁵ State sovereignty is not as sacred as it once was, non-state/transnational actors defy borders, and global media connects the inhabitants of the world. This has perpetuated an increase in state failure, an ever-increasing move toward a borderless world, and deterritorialization.⁶⁶

In other words, the dominance of the Westphalian state system of government forced multiple societal categories into single state governing systems. Even through periods of intergroup violence and peace, groups were typically able to govern themselves internally. With the definition of nation-state boundaries, groups compete with one another over conflicting interests related to defining social norms, access to services, equal representation, accessing resources, wealth, etc. Additionally, the definition of state borders often resulted in the separation of populations from territorial lands such as holy lands now located outside defined state boundaries and the reality of societal boundaries spanning multiple nation-states. Therefore, individuals identify themselves with their global connected group as opposed to the state. The next section discusses social identity theory in an effort to understand the connection between the state and individual identity further.

Characteristics of Group Behavior based on Social Identity Theory. Social identity theory states that individuals identify themselves by the social category in which they believe

⁶⁴ Ibid., 18.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 18-19.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 18.

they belong.⁶⁷ Two socio cognitive processes are essential to social identity theory and serve as the foundation to group identity and ultimately identity conflict: categorization and self-enhancement. First, categorization suggests that the group defines clear boundaries to establish norms for the group and assigns members to categories both within and external to the group.⁶⁸

According to Michael A. Hogg, a professor of social psychology at Claremont Graduate University, Deborah J. Terry, Vice Chancellor and President at University of Queensland, and Katherine M. White, an associate professor of psychology and counseling at the University of Queensland, “categorization is a basic cognitive process that operates on social and nonsocial stimuli alike to highlight and bring into focus those aspects of experience which are subjectively meaningful in a particular context.”⁶⁹ Individuals self construct their social category and use that construct to define who they are, what they believe, and how they behave. This construct defines in-group norms and stereotypes. Conversely, through exclusion it also defines out-group stereotypes and norms. Both in-group and out-group stereotypes become evaluation criteria for intergroup relations. Conflict arises when these evaluation criteria take on competitive or discriminatory properties. Second, self-enhancement suggests that members of a group have a basic desire to see themselves in a positive light in comparison to other groups. Therefore, group members also see their norms and stereotype as positive. Considering the self-evaluative nature of

⁶⁷ Michael A. Hogg, Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White, “A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory,” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58, no. 4 (1995): 255. Additionally, see the following works for a better understanding of the origins and evolution of social identity theory: Hogg 1992, 1993; Hogg and Abrams 1988; Tajfel and Turner 1979; and Turner 1982 (full citations provided in the bibliography). Hogg is a professor of social psychology at Claremont Graduate University and earned a Doctor of Philosophy degree in social psychology from Bristol University. Terry is the Vice Chancellor and President at University of Queensland and earned a Bachelor of Arts degree and Doctorate of Philosophy degree from the Australian National University. White is an associate professor of psychology and counseling at the University of Queensland.

⁶⁸ For more detail on self-categorization theory, see Turner 1985, Turner et al. 1987, Oakes et al. 1994, and Turner 1991 (full citations provided in the bibliography).

⁶⁹ Hogg et al. 1995, 260.

comparisons, the group seeks to maintain comparisons that favor the in-group. This ensures the persistence of the group's norms, the group itself, and ultimately the individual.

Lastly, social identity theory formally connects categorization and self-enhancement through subjective belief structures.⁷⁰ Whereas norms and stereotypes are well defined and easily identifiable, group beliefs that are often ideological in nature frame its legitimacy and stability in relation to intergroup status and social mobility.⁷¹ In-group cohesion hinges on whether or not the group believes that their social status is legitimate and stable and whether or not they have the adequate social mobility to ascend the social later individually.⁷² When the group believes the social status of the group is relatively legitimate and stable and that social mobility is possible, individuals may feel empowered with the possibility of upward social mobility.⁷³ These empowered individuals seek to disassociate themselves from the group in order to gain the favor of the desired group, thus weakening the collective strength of the group.⁷⁴ Additionally, such individuals will most likely refrain from participating in any direct intergroup competition. In contrast, if the group believes that their status position is illegitimate and unstable and that social mobility is not possible, the cohesion of the group will likely intensify.⁷⁵ As a whole, the group will collaborate in direct intergroup competition in an attempt to invoke a favorable change in the social construct of intergroup relations.⁷⁶ Understanding social group dynamics provides a framework for understanding social phenomenon such as genocide.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 260.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

Identity Conflict as a Social Reasoning for Genocide. Thankfully, genocide is not a common occurrence. Although even one instance of genocide is atrocious, true acts of genocide are rare. Furthermore, genocide does not happen overnight. Often, once the killing starts, the scale and scope of the atrocity grows quickly. However, long before the killing begins, the perceived justification for genocide typically develops over time through the enactment of policy and reinforcement of stereotypes. The reason for genocides is a very complicated and controversial topic. However, there does seem to be consensus among genocide scholars concerning the fundamental casual properties of identity. “Genocides and mass killings are mostly perpetrated by ordinary people playing social roles in groups, institutions, and practices to which they are politically, religiously, philosophically, ideologically, morally, professionally, economically, and/or personally committed.”⁷⁷

By identifying with a group, a dichotomous situation develops which results in an us-them group mentality or in-group/out-group social construct. As one group identifies with the “goodness” of their social construct, it counterbalances their goodness by identifying the out-group social construct as inadequate, less desirable, bad, or even evil. This leads the in-group to objectify the members of the out-group. As the dichotomous nature of the intergroup relations intensifies, the in-group justifies the elimination or destruction of the dehumanized out-group as a necessary action to ensure the survival of their group. Additionally, perpetrators of genocide deny wrongdoing because, as David Moshman, a professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, stated, “it is precisely our own identity as moral agent(s) that

⁷⁷ David Moshman, “Us and Them: Identity and Genocide,” *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 7, no. 2 (2007): 117-18. See pages 117-118 for a further discussion of the literature connecting individual identity and group identity, psychology, and genocide. See works by the following scholars on the connection between identity and genocide: Arendt 1963/1994; Ashmore, Jussim, Wilder, & Heppen 2001; Browning 1998, 2004; Maybury-Lewis, 2002; Moshman, 2004a, 2004b; Osiel, 2001; Sereny, 1983; Staub, 1989, 2001, 2003; Totten et al., 2002; Waller, 2002; Weitz, 2003; Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005 (full citations provided in the bibliography). Moshman is a professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and is a theorist, teacher, and activist who focused on adolescent development, intellectual freedom in education, and the psychology of genocide.

forces us to deny the identities of those we destroy.”⁷⁸ Finally, it is this deep-rooted connection to personal and group identity that makes stopping genocide so difficult. The application of traditional conflict resolution techniques is applicable to the termination of material warfare. However, conflicts rooted in divergent identities such as genocide require unique diplomacy strategies to reach reconciliation.⁷⁹

In summary, geopolitics and social identity theory provide a context for understanding individual behavior in relation to a group and group behavior overall. Failing nation-states, the emergence of global threats, and the convergence of multiple societal categories into single state governing systems creates a geopolitical landscape ripe for repression, exclusion, and potentially genocide. Additionally, identity conflict theory provides a framework for understanding the interrelationships of parties involved in armed conflict. More specifically, identity conflict theory provides a foundation for understanding the intense, personal nature of genocide that makes it so difficult to understand and prevent or stop. Categorization and self-enhancement can turn competitive and discriminatory. The result can lead to a dichotomous good versus bad social construct that provides leaders and policy makers of oppressive regimes with a social reasoning for genocide. With that foundation established, it is now possible to discuss the characteristics of genocide that contribute to its turbid nature.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 127. Denial allows the perpetrators to maintain their moral self-consciousness through dehumanization, outright rejection of what happened, selective memory of events, manipulating the definition of genocide to exclude the actions of the perpetrators, and/or recontextualization of events to portray perpetrator’s action as normal.

⁷⁹ Yehudith Auerbach, “Forgiveness and Reconciliation: The Religious Dimension,” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 17, no. 3 (2005): 469-485. Auerbach argued that identity conflict results from hatred rooted in the perception that another group has usurped their legitimate rights. Furthermore, Auerbach argued that reconciliation of conflicts involving identity requires an intimate level of forgiveness not found in traditional warfare.

The Opaque Nature of Genocide

The Nazi's murdered six million Jewish people in Europe. The Ottoman Empire destroyed eight hundred thousand Armenians. The Hutu-led Rwandan government exterminated eight hundred thousand Tutsis in less than 100 days. The 20th century was the deadliest on record when it comes to genocide.⁸⁰ Instances of genocide in the 20th century were more frequent, more widespread, and more systematic than in any other century in recorded history.⁸¹ However, genocide is not a new phenomenon that originated in the 20th century. The earliest accounts of recorded human history show cases of humans exterminating other humans.⁸² What is new, however, is the use of the term genocide. Raphael Lemkin, a Polish lawyer of Jewish descent, coined the term genocide. Additionally, he successfully fought for international recognition of the term and the creation of international policy for the prosecution of its perpetrators.⁸³ However, genocide remains an elusive concept. Several factors contribute to the obfuscation of genocide: the concept of genocide is ill-defined and not well understood, genocide as an academic discipline is still in its infancy, and how or why genocides end is not truly understood. Nevertheless, one question about genocide continues to linger. Why is the US concerned with genocide at all? Therefore, before a discussion of the equivocal nature of genocide as a critical factor contributing to the complexity of employing military forces to stop genocide, a discussion

⁸⁰ Eric Markusen and David Kopf, *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing: Genocide and Total War in the Twentieth Century* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc., 1995), 7.

⁸¹ Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan, eds., *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 21.

⁸² Eric D. Weitz, *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 8. Weitz illustrated this point by referencing the Book of Joshua that depicts the destruction of the Israelites in Canaan and the annihilation of Carthage by the Roman Empire.

⁸³ Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 1, 17, & 19. While studying linguistics at the University of Lvov, Raphael Lemkin (a Polish Jew) became interested in the murder of an Ottoman man by Soghomon Tehlirian (an Armenian survivor). Lemkin's interest in the subject of mass atrocity and the protection of state sovereignty grew. He became a lawyer, fled to the United States to escape German invasion, and spent the rest of his life fighting for the international recognition of his definition of genocide and prosecution of its perpetrators.

of genocide as a viable US national interest establishes the importance of relating genocide to military operations.

Genocide is a US National interest. In support of a growing international commitment to the R2P, Sewall founded the MARO Project in 2007 to help the military better plan for operations related to mass atrocity through the development of concepts and planning tools.⁸⁴ She collaborated with the Carr Center for Human Rights, the US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), and a long list of retired and active military personnel. The project resulted in the publishing of the *MARO: A Military Planning Handbook* in 2010. The handbook identified the achievement of four military objectives essential to the successful termination of MARO: “vulnerable populations are secure from atrocities, leadership of perpetrators are identified, captured, and detained, humanitarian assistance is enabled where needed, and transition to appropriate civil entity that will promote good governance, permanent security, and social well-being is accomplished.”⁸⁵

However, the MARO Handbook suggested that the US military is ill prepared to respond to acts of mass atrocity.⁸⁶ Additionally, several references in the MARO Handbook suggested that the DOD should incorporate MARO into doctrine, policy, planning, and training.⁸⁷ President Obama seemed to agree with the assertions expressed in the MARO Handbook. The US government first officially recognized the importance of combating genocide in 2010. With the publishing of the 2010 NSS, the US endorsed the concepts associated with stopping genocide and

⁸⁴ Sewall et al., 5.

⁸⁵ Sewall et al., 52.

⁸⁶ Ibid, 8.

⁸⁷ Sewall et al., inside cover. As the commander of the United National Assistance Mission for Rwanda, Canadian Senator and retired Lieutenant General Roméo A. Dallaire suggests that the MARO handbook moves the military closer to incorporating MAROs into doctrine (inside cover). Additionally, Genocide Prevention Task Force (GPTF) co-chairs Madeleine Albright and William Cohen recommended the US incorporate genocide prevention guidance and response operations into doctrine (13).

mass atrocity as national policy.⁸⁸ By expressing this commitment in policy, the US made preventing and stopping mass atrocities a national interest. Furthermore, in his 2011 Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocity (PSD-10), Obama suggested that the US government lacked the policy and execution mechanisms required to engage in actions proactively that would prevent identified situations from escalating into mass civilian atrocities.

Therefore, PSD-10 directed the establishment of an interagency Atrocities Prevention Board. The intent of the board is to consider, determine, and employ a whole of government approach to the policies and actions required to prevent mass atrocities and genocide. To establish the board and its structure, PSD-10 directed the National Security Advisor to conduct an interagency study.⁸⁹ The desired outcome of the study is the identification of operational protocols, intelligence integration requirements, and a policy framework for action. Additionally, the intent of the study is to build upon the findings and recommendations of the 2007 Genocide Prevention Task Force, co-chaired by former Secretaries Madeleine K. Albright and William Cohen.⁹⁰

The US recognizes that mass atrocities are an unfortunate reality that requires the employment of all the elements of national power to combat: diplomacy, information, military, and economic. As suggested by Sewall, Obama, and several others, the US seems ill prepared to respond to instances of mass atrocity and/or genocide. More specifically, Sewall recognized that it is likely that the US military will encounter instances of mass atrocity and/or genocide.

Furthermore, that the US military is not prepared to deal with the complexity of genocide in the

⁸⁸ Canada, *International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*, “The Responsibility to Protect” (Ottawa, ON: The International Development Research Centre, 2001), VII. R2P addresses the issue of one state violating another state’s sovereignty in order to prevent and/or stop a mass atrocity.

⁸⁹ President, Presidential Study Directive 10, “Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocity” (August 4, 2011).

⁹⁰ Madeleine K. Albright and William S. Cohen, *Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers* (Washington, DC: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2008).

context of war. Therefore, it is important to understand the characteristics of genocide that make it such a complex concept to comprehend.

The Complex Characteristics of Genocide. As we know, the murder of large populations took place long before genocide became a term or concept. Over the centuries, humans found many reasons to justify the murder of their fellow man. Racial intolerance, beliefs of superiority, and believing the indigenous people were subhuman led to the extermination of Native Americans during the early expansion of the US and mass atrocities in Africa and Australia because of colonization. Other beliefs used for the execution of mass atrocities and mass killings include religion, political indifference, gender inequality, physical deformity, mental inferiority, hatred, to name a few.

To advance their interests and beliefs, nations use the machine of war. History shows that there is a connection between war and mass atrocities. War results in significant loss of life for both military personnel and civilians. During war, nations attempt to minimize the loss of military personnel and avoid civilian casualties wherever possible. Even in the event of mass civilian casualties, the loss is indiscriminant. However, mass atrocities, and more specifically genocides, are different from mass civilian casualties experienced during war. Genocide targets specific, non-combatant populations based on nationality, regional alliance, ethnicity, race, or religious beliefs. These populations can be external or even internal to the state. The extermination of the targeted population is state sponsored through policy and legislation and the methods used are deliberate and systematic.

The word genocide literally means the killing of a race. However, Lemkin's definition of genocide accepted by the 1948 United Nations General Assembly Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide states that genocide is

...any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole

or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.⁹¹

This definition of genocide is at the same time beneficial and problematic. Lemkin's definition more narrowly focuses the concept of mass atrocity through the identification of specifically targeted groups. It addresses the concept of intent, which aids in the intervention and/or prevention of genocide. The definition identifies controlling life conditions, preventing births, and transferring children as methods to perpetuate genocide. However, some argue that the definition is too broad. Specifically, the inclusion of bodily or mental harm suggests the classification of any attack as genocide. Additionally, others suggest that this definition is exclusionary. For example, Barbara Harff, a professor of Political Science at the US Naval Academy and a renowned researcher in the field of genocide, criticized Lemkin's definition of genocide because it does not include the mass murder of groups based on their political position or what she terms "Politicide."⁹²

Genocide is an ambiguous and unpopular subject because it is difficult to define and understand, the data related to genocide is often subjective, and the concept of genocide invokes caustic and [vexatious](#) psychological and emotional responses. Although Lemkin jumpstarted the international recognition and punishment of those committing genocide, his definition lies squarely at the root of the problem when it comes to studying and understanding genocide. With an understanding of the concept of genocide, it becomes possible to discuss the issues of developing a new discipline, clarifying the definition of genocide, collecting data related to

⁹¹ United Nations General Assembly Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, *Resolution 260 (III) A*, 1948, 1.

⁹² Barbara Harff, "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003): 58. Harff also criticized the definition based on the concepts of mental harm, intent to destroy, and non-state actors. Barbara Harff is a Professor of Political Science Emerita at the U.S. Naval Academy and renowned researcher in the field of genocide.

genocide, and identifying the psychological barriers inherent in genocide that make the academic study of genocide difficult.

The Difficulty in Studying Genocide. The increased recognition of genocidal activity sparked the development of the study of genocide into a formal scientific and academic discipline. As a result, the study of genocide began to take shape as early as the 1980s. The development of the discipline of genocide includes peer reviewed journals, conferences, undergraduate and graduate programs, and research centers. However, inconsistency inundates this social scientific discipline: genocide as a formal discipline does not adhere to the accepted characteristics of a formal discipline; developing a consensus in understanding the concept of genocide is allusive; the quality and quantity of data is inadequate and at times suspect; the study of genocide poses negative psychological affects for the researcher; and political implications impede truthfulness concerning genocidal activity.

Using the concepts espoused by Thomas S. Kuhn, American historian and philosopher of science, one might argue that genocide is still in its infancy as a discipline.⁹³ He defined a scientific discipline through the concept of a scientific community.⁹⁴ A scientific community consists of professionals united by an educational field supported by seminars, texts, and academic programs, formalized interaction at conferences and through journals, a common interest in specific problems, and an understanding of potential solutions to the problem. The discipline of genocide meets all the criteria of a scientific community. However, Kuhn also stated that within a scientific community there exist emerging and predominant paradigms. Kuhn defines a paradigm as a collection of facts related to a specific question or problem with the intent

⁹³ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 167. Kuhn coined the term “paradigm shift.” As an American historian and philosopher of science, Kuhn was a pioneer in understanding the evolution of scientific knowledge. His theory suggested that periodic paradigm shifts transform scientific fields in a non-linear fashion. Furthermore, consensus of a scientific community is required to validate the tenants of a scientific field (not just objective criteria).

⁹⁴ Ibid.

of stimulating inquiry. Paradigms determine parameters for the discipline by establishing avenues of inquiry, formulating questions, developing methodologies to examine questions, defining relevance, and establishing meaning. The distortion of and difficulty in determining the facts related to genocide create the tumultuous nature of genocide studies.

In addition, due to the inherently personal and subjective nature of genocide, the concept of genocide is difficult to define and understand. Although many scholars study the mass killing of groups of people by other groups of people, a standard agreed upon definition of genocide does not exist. Many scholars begin with Lemkin's definition that the UN adopted in 1948. Invariably, most add to and/or subtract elements from that definition to meet the needs of their research or discussion. This gives way to the creation and use of other terms such as politicide, gendercide, indigenocide, and democide.⁹⁵ Because of the many inconsistent and imprecise definitions that characterize the study of genocide, it is difficult to determine which instances of mass killing are actually genocide and which instances result from war or just indiscriminate mass murder.⁹⁶

Moreover, the data required to study genocide accurately is often difficult to collect, under / over estimated, often exaggerated, or outright missing. Most perpetrators of genocide do not keep records of their activity. The perpetrators do not see any reason to keep track of how many individuals they killed. They view their victims as subhuman and inconsequential. Even if

⁹⁵ Harff, 2003, 58. Harff defined politicide as the mass murder of people based on their political alliances, convictions, and/or actions. Adam Jones, "Gendercide and Genocide," in *Gendercide and Genocide*, ed. Adam Jones (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2004), 3. Jones defined Gendercide as the intentional targeting and extermination of a population of people based on their gender or sex. Raymond Evans, "Crime Without A Name: Colonialism and the Case for Indigenocide," in *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, ed. A. Dirk Moses (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 141. Evans defined indigenocide as the intentional destruction of an indigenous population by an invading group. R. J. Rummel, "From the Study of War and Revolution to Democide – Power Kills," in *Pioneer of Genocide Studies*, eds. Samuel Totten and Steven L. Jacobs (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002), 163-164. Rummel believed power kills. He defined democide as the murder of civilian non-combatants by the government. He considered genocide a form of democide.

⁹⁶ Markusen and Kopf, 6. Markusen and Kopf stated that mass killings in the Thirty Years' War, the conquests of the Mongol, and the destruction of Carthage appeared in historical accounts of war and in historical accounts of genocide.

they do keep records, they typically destroy or conceal the information. Victims and survivors of genocide concern themselves with survival, not record keeping. Therefore, most information about genocide comes from the memory of survivors. However, many survivors do not want to remember and therefore repress their memories. Even for those who do feel comfortable sharing the information, memories typically are incomplete, inaccurate, and /or biased. Additionally, reliability of the data is subject to deliberate distortion. To put themselves in a more positive light, perpetrators will outright deny the killings happened or deliberately underestimate the number of people killed. Lastly, a large number of people die indirectly from the actions of the perpetrators. How does a civilized society identify these individuals and how does it attribute their deaths to the actions of the perpetrators?⁹⁷

Finally, the study of genocide is a psychologically difficult, emotional, and stressful endeavor. Counting bodies and recounting horrific acts of violence, mutilation, and humiliation is difficult for both the researcher and the subject. Immersing oneself into the study of such a horrific world creates the potential for the researcher to become numb or indifferent to the subject. The study may become nothing more than an intellectual exercise while removing the human element from the process.⁹⁸ Moreover, the suggestion that a government perpetrated an act of genocide brings with it a multitude of political implications. Considering the difficulty in defining and understanding genocide, groups misapply the term genocide to a variety of other governmental actions. Groups may wrongly accuse a government of genocide in order to advance their political agenda. Organizations may politically exploit or inaccurately recount acts of genocide in order to free themselves of their own guilt.⁹⁹ Finally, conducting comparative studies

⁹⁷ Ibid., 6-8. Markusen and Kopf provided a detailed understanding of the issue of data in genocide studies.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 8-9.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 9-10.

of different acts of genocide is difficult and seen by some as impossible. Each act of genocide has unique elements to it. Many scholars believe that the Holocaust posed an irreducible uniqueness to it that precludes its comparison to any other instance of genocide. However, to understand, prevent, and stop genocide, it is necessary to identify and develop trends through comparative analysis.¹⁰⁰

Genocide is a complex social phenomenon. Therefore, the study of genocide is equally complex. However, the study of genocide must continue to increase understanding and awareness. Through study, an increased understanding of genocide provides insight into protocols, policies, and methods that support proactive engagement in the prevention of, the intervention in, and stopping genocide. Through awareness and understanding the moral conscience of the international community is engaged enough to make protecting humanity a national interest.

Understanding How Genocide Ends. The research and literature related directly to how or why genocides end is limited. Scholars and practitioners alike focus mainly on prevention. The limited amount of scholarly literature available makes studying how genocides end difficult. Therefore, authors construct generalizations to convey their concepts in most of the literature related to genocide. Generalizations in genocide literature suggest several contributing factors to stopping genocide: legal issues, defining what “stopping the killing” means, and political will. Additionally, a discussion of the limited amount of available literature related directly to how or why genocides end provides historical context and quantifiable data on the subject.

Sarah Glazer, renowned author on social policy, suggested that the ambiguity inherent in defining genocide creates a legal conundrum that paralyzes the action of the UN or any state with

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 10-16.

the desire to act.¹⁰¹ States generally understand that the UN approved legal definition of genocide is inadequate. Therefore, they are without a true mechanism to sanction action in opposition to genocide. Furthermore, if it is near impossible to agree upon a universal definition of genocide, how can one defend their actions in opposition to that which defies definition? Another legal issue addressed by Glazer is that of a legal obligation to intervene. Upon the identification of a case of genocide, UN statutes require action by its participating members.¹⁰² Therefore, by classifying an incident as genocide, the UN and its member states becomes legally obligated to intervene. Glazer argued that this legal obligation is a serious barrier to the official recognition of genocide and subsequent intervention.¹⁰³ As an associate professor at the Columbia Law School, Matthew C. Waxman's views reinforced those espoused by Glazer.¹⁰⁴ He suggested that the international legal regime is ineffective in identifying, responding to, and stopping genocide. Waxman credited this inefficiency to a bureaucratic system mired in complicated legal practices requiring extensive consultation that prohibits expeditious prevention and response efforts.

¹⁰¹ Sarah Glazer, "Stopping Genocide: Should the U.S. and U.N. take action in Sudan?," *CQ Researcher* 14, no. 29 (2004): 685. Glazer is a renowned author on social policy. Although she is an American journalist, her work focused on social policy in Europe and she was based in London. She is a contributing writer for the *Congressional Quarterly (CQ) Researcher* and *CQ Global Researcher* and holds Bachelor's of Arts degree American history from the University of Chicago.

¹⁰² United Nations General Assembly Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1.

¹⁰³ States attempt to avoid the moniker of genocide by using other terms like mass murder, mass atrocity, or criminal activity that do not invoke the same legal obligation to act.

¹⁰⁴ Matthew C. Waxman, *Intervention to Stop Genocide and Mass Atrocities: International Norms and U.S. Policy* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2009). Waxman's report focused on the legal challenges inherent in stopping or intervening in genocide or mass atrocities. Waxman is an associate professor at the Columbia Law School, an adjunct senior fellow for law and foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, and a member of the Hoover Institution task force on national security and law. He has held multiple positions within U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Defense. He earned his Juris Doctorate at Yale Law School and has published several works on international relations and genocide.

Lastly, Glazer suggested that the threat of International Criminal Court prosecution serves as a weak deterrent to dictators pursuing genocidal objectives.¹⁰⁵

As with the definition of genocide, understanding and agreeing upon what “stopping the killing” means is difficult as well. In some instances, it is relatively clear as to when the killing stopped. For example, the Holocaust ended in 1945 with the defeat of Hitler and his genocidal Nazi regime.¹⁰⁶ However, de Waal and Conley-Zilkic argued that in most cases what seems like a stoppage of the killing is actually only a cessation of an episode of killing.¹⁰⁷ Rather than an identifiable abrupt ending to the killing, the killing simply winds down.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the perpetrator, which is usually the state, typically retains the right and ability to begin the killing again at a time and place of his or her choosing.¹⁰⁹ This gives genocide a cyclical characteristic that creates peaks and lulls in the killing. Therefore, the reoccurrence of genocidal activity becomes more probable and any enduring stoppage of the killing less likely. Lastly, the cyclical nature of genocide makes it even more difficult to understand, recognize, and respond to genocide.

Concerning political will, Glazer provided an exceptional depiction of the prevailing sentiment toward intervention in genocide. She suggested that although nations invoke a

¹⁰⁵ Glazer, 12. Glazer referenced the ineffective Yugoslavia tribunal as an example.

¹⁰⁶ Other examples include Stalin’s death, Nigerian victory in Biafra, and Bangladeshi independence.

¹⁰⁷ Waal and Conley-Zilkic, 7. Examples of the cyclical nature of genocide include Stalin in Russia (1930s), Mao in China (1930, 1950s, and 1960s), Suharto in Indonesia (1960s), Mengistu in Ethiopia (1970s), Milosevic in Bosnia (1990s), and the current Sudan government.

¹⁰⁸ Barbara Harff and Ted Robert Gurr, “Toward Empirical Theory of Genocides and Politicides: Identification and Measurement of Cases Since 1945,” *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1988): 367. Harff & Gurr suggested that an abrupt ending to genocide is typically associated with the deposing of the ruling party (the perpetrators).

¹⁰⁹ Retention of the ability to reinitiate the killing is a key point. As the historical record reviewed later in this paper will reveal, perpetrators have historically chosen to stop their killing activity while remaining in power. Additionally, upon the re-initiation of the killing, the perpetrator may chose to continue the prosecution of the same group, target an entirely different group, or simply expand their genocidal activity to include new groups.

humanitarian connotation to intervention, history proves that the nations will only act in response to a national interest or to achieve some form of political payoff.¹¹⁰ In relation to national interest, Glazer argued that the locality of the atrocity also plays a role.¹¹¹ Her article focused on issues in the African nation of Sudan. She suggested that peace in Africa is less politically important to the international community and therefore does not warrant a comparable response to similar atrocities perpetrated in a European nation.¹¹² Additionally, Africa is fraught with instability and widespread humanitarian issues. Glazer suggested that the US in particular views humanitarian focused missions as an unaffordable luxury.¹¹³ She argued that the US must focus their efforts on the Global War on Terror (GWOT).¹¹⁴ Therefore, little resources remain for humanitarian missions. Lastly, Glazer argued that even in the event that a nation state pursues intervention through the UN genocide convention, most nation states fear a veto of their request.¹¹⁵ Therefore, nations seek international justification and legitimization by pursuing action through other UN mandates without invoking genocide.

In contrast to generalizations, Waal and Conley-Zilkic provided the most direct scholarly literature pertaining to how genocides end. They conducted a study of 19 instances of genocide to offer insight into how genocides end. The cases chosen for their study included a variety of mass atrocities perpetrated during the 20th century.¹¹⁶ They identified four key trends in how genocides

¹¹⁰ Glazer, 4.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁴ Glazer, 1. The focus of efforts on GWOT includes fiscal resources, military assets, and diplomatic efforts (among others).

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

¹¹⁶ Waal and Conley-Zilic, 3. See page three of this article for a complete description of the cases used for this study. The article does not provide a clear understanding of the definition of genocide used or the methodology used to identify the cases of genocide included in the study. It is important to note that politicide is included as genocide. Lastly, the authors recognized that their list of genocidal incidents is incomplete and that some scholars do not recognize all of the incidents on the list as genocide.

end: goal achievement, elite dissention, successful resistance, and military intervention. Goal achievement refers to the concept that the perpetrators of genocide reached their desired aim. They may have desired to eliminate a section of the population, drive them from the territory, or simply reduce their numbers to represent insignificant existence. Whatever the case, the perpetrator stopped the killing because they believed they had obtained their goal.¹¹⁷ Elite dissention refers to disagreements between ruling elites, between policy makers and those typically tasked with the execution of the genocidal activity such as military leaders, or a change in ideology or leadership that lead to the cessation of the killing, such as the death of the renowned Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin.¹¹⁸ Successful resistance suggests that the victims possessed, developed and/or employed the means to defeat the perpetrators in order to stop the killing. Military intervention suggests that organized international military forces intervened to stop the killing. Unfortunately, Waal and Conley-Zilkic failed to identify clear quantifiable data related to their study.¹¹⁹ However, the table below provides an interpretation of their study and offers related quantitative data.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 5. However, Waal and Conley-Zilic suggested that genocide is cyclical in nature. They referenced several cases where it seemed that the killing had stopped. Nevertheless, the perpetrators retained the right and capability to start the killing again at any time. That is exactly what happened in several of these cases.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 3 & 5. Waal and Conley-Zilic referenced Somalia (5) and the death of Stalin (3) as examples of how a change in leadership led to a change in the logic of war.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 1. Waal and Conley-Zilic discussed each case of genocide and provided one or more reasons as to why the killing stopped. At the end of their article, they provided preliminary conclusions and identified four means for the de-escalation of violence. However, they failed to provide a clear connection between the cases of genocide and why the killing stopped. Lastly, they failed to provide a clear understanding of the quantifiable data related to their study. A table or graph depicting the cases of violence and the associated reason for violence de-escalation would have been helpful.

Table 1

Summary of Findings from Waal and Conley-Zilkic Study on How Genocides between 1900 and 2006 Ended

Genocide	Goal Attainment	Elite Dissent	Successful Resistance	Military Intervention
1. 1904 Namibia	X			
2. 1918 Turkey	X			
3. 1932-33 Soviet Union		X		
4. 1945 Germany				X
5. 1959 China	X			
6. 1965-6 Indonesia		X		
7. 1970 Biafra	X			
8. 1971 Bangladesh				X
9. 1973 Burundi	X			
10. 1970s Ethiopia	X			
11. 1979 Cambodia				X
12. 1980s Guatemala	X			
13. 1986 Uganda		X		
14. 1991 Iraq	X			
15. 1988, 91-92 Somalia		X	X	
16. 1992 Sudan		X	X	
17. 1994 Rwanda			X	
18. 1995 Bosnia				X
19. 1999 Kosovo				X

However useful it is to interpret the study by Waal and Conley-Zilkic in terms of quantifiable data, the resulting data analysis is somewhat problematic. The data above shows that

the majority of previous genocides ended because of the perpetrator achieving their goal or choosing to stop the killing. Obviously, this is not a viable option for preventing or stopping genocide. Furthermore, the data shows that international military intervention has not historically played a large role in preventing or stopping genocide. Waal and Conley-Zilkic suggested that even when military intervention stopped genocide, the purpose of the intervention was not for humanitarian assistance.¹²⁰ They suggested that a broader political aim was the true motivation for the intervention. However, as exhibited by the broad acceptance of R2P, the international community considers the use of military power as a viable tool for intervening in genocidal activity. Waal and Conley-Zilkic suggested that anti-genocide activists actually exhibit a gratuitous fixation on the option of employing military intervention to prevent or stop genocide.¹²¹ Therefore, it is important to understand that although military intervention may not have played a significant role in past genocides that does not mean military intervention in current or future genocides is not a viable option.

In summary, genocide is a complex, ambiguous, and difficult concept for humans to confront, study, and understand. Simply defining genocide seems to be an impossible task. Furthermore, the nature of genocide is nubilous and fraught with issues concerning legalities, state sovereignty, political will, the psychological effects, and the history of how genocides have ended. An agreed upon legal or common definition of genocide does not exist. Even using the UN definition of genocide, does one country have the right to violate another countries sovereignty to protect human lives? Moreover, will the civilian leaders of a country have the political will to risk the lives of their military personnel to protect the lives of citizens from another country? Furthermore, the academic study of genocide is still in its infancy and must overcome the issues of defining the discipline, data inadequacies, the negative psychological affects for the researcher,

¹²⁰ Ibid., 9.

¹²¹ Ibid., 10.

and impeding political agendas. However, the US has identified that combating international events of mass atrocity is a national interest. Therefore, it is imperative that US military and political leaders understand the characteristics of genocide. More specifically, it is important for US civilian and military leaders to understand the role military intervention plays in stopping genocide.

Understanding the Complex Interrelationships

The preceding discussion provides the contextual foundation for understanding the complex interrelationships between war termination, identity conflict, and genocide. Military action to stop genocide requires an understanding of what genocide is and what causes it. However, here lies the root of the problem. Genocide remains somewhat of an enigma. The concept of genocide continues to elude legal definition and empirical study. Furthermore, the involvement of external entities, with or without military intervention, raises questions of legality, state sovereignty, and political will. Additionally, the rudimentary cause of genocide seems to be rooted in social identity theory. Therefore, to fight and stop genocide, it is imperative to understand the underlying social construct contributing to the identity conflict related to the genocidal activity. Most often, very subjective and difficult to influence personal interests, beliefs, and values serve as the foundation for the identity conflict. This makes fighting wars rooted in identity conflict and resulting in genocide very difficult to understand and prosecute. Finally, the ambiguity of the concept of war termination makes any war difficult to end. However, the lack of clarity in US military doctrine, the limited academic understanding of war termination as a concept, and US policy defining ambiguous end states only exacerbates the already complex operating environment related to wars designed to stop genocide.

Destination Unknown

Total or limited, irregular or conventional, there are a variety of factors that contribute to the complexity of any kind of war. However, recent history suggests that the US's participation in

small, limited wars will only continue. As a result, the likelihood of encountering a mass atrocity event increases. Furthermore, the US has made protecting the citizens of the world from mass atrocity a national interest. This suggests that it is not only likely that the US will encounter a mass atrocity during war, but that the US will take military action for the specific purpose of preventing or stopping a mass atrocity. However, the preponderance of study and understanding focuses, rightfully so, on detecting and preventing mass atrocity. The best solution to stopping any mass atrocity event is preventing it. However, history illustrates that mass atrocities such as genocide are a reoccurring phenomenon.

Scholars such as Shaw argued that war and genocide are inexplicitly connected.¹²² Although stopping genocide requires the employment of all the elements of national power, Shaw also argued that once genocide begins, indirect forms of intervention such as diplomatic and economic pressure tend to be inadequate to stop it.¹²³ Indirect methods of intervention usually take time and will most likely result in an increased loss of life. Therefore, a decisive and timely stoppage of genocidal activity typically requires some form or degree of forceful military action. Therefore, it is imperative that US political and military leaders understand the factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to stop genocide. The purpose of this paper was to establish that ambiguous war termination criteria, identity conflict, and the opaque nature of genocide are the critical factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars initiated to stop genocide.

The ambiguity of war termination criteria applies to any war, not just wars initiated to stop genocide. Furthermore, making war termination a less ambiguous concept is a difficult task. Article Two of the US Constitution ensures that the President and Congress maintain power over

¹²² Martin Shaw, "War and Genocide: A Sociological Approach," Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence, http://www.massviolence.org/IMG/article_PDF/War-and-Genocide-A-Sociological-Approach.pdf (accessed November 28, 2011), 4.

¹²³ Shaw, 5.

the decision to go to war and the overall conduct of war.¹²⁴ Therefore, the purpose of war will always have an associated political aim determined by the US government.¹²⁵ Furthermore, politicians often intentionally define political aims ambiguously.¹²⁶ This allows for malleable war aims that, as the conduct of the war reveals new information, politicians can adjust. Therefore, it is likely that US military leaders will continue to have difficulty in delineating between the desired military end state and accomplishment of the political aim.

However, it is possible to provide some clarity to understanding the concept of war termination. US Joint and Army doctrine must standardize and consistently use clear and concise definitions of conflict termination and war termination. Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) provided an excellent illustration of how these terms differ. In 2003, US President George W. Bush declared victory in Iraq. In the eyes of the military forces, political leaders, citizens of the US, and citizens of the world, the US achieved war termination. Most believed that all that remained was for the politicians to reestablish the Iraqi government and the military forces would go home quickly. However, as history shows, the war was not over in 2003 and the military forces did not redeploy until the end of 2011.

OIF illustrates that the conduct of war is fluid. Molten argued that both military and political leaders need to understand that there is not a clear line of demarcation between military operations and political aims.¹²⁷ Military operations are simply a means to achieve the political aims.¹²⁸ Military end states and political aims change throughout the course of a war.¹²⁹ Operations will most likely simultaneously consist of shaping operations, deterrence, combat

¹²⁴ U.S. Constitution, art. 2, sec. 8 and art. 1, sec. 8.

¹²⁵ Clausewitz, 87.

¹²⁶ Molten, 295.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 299.

¹²⁸ Clausewitz, 87.

¹²⁹ Molten, 299.

operations, stability operations, and enabling civil authority.¹³⁰ The key to effectively managing the war is managing the transition between and integration of these different types of operations. Therefore, it is imperative for US leaders to understanding that the achievement of conflict termination does not equate to war termination. Moreover, it is imperative for planners to understand this concept. When contemplating war, the US must not only plan military operations, but also consider the conduct of the war beyond major combat operations. They must understand and plan for the achievement of war termination.

The complexity of war and the difficulty in understanding war termination increases when conducting war to stop genocide. Geopolitics and social identity theory illustrate the underlying intense, personal social construct and identity conflict that makes genocide so difficult to understand and prevent or stop. Furthermore, the victims and perpetrators of genocide often share geographic locations, governance systems, and resources before, during, and after the genocidal event. Therefore, even in the event that military action successfully stops the genocide, tensions linger as the opposing groups work toward reconciliation. Auerbach argues that working toward reconciliation injects an element of forgiveness that is not typically a consideration in traditional warfare.¹³¹ Therefore, it is important for military planners and leaders to understand that while combat operations may or may not last very long, it is most likely that stability operations and enabling civil authority will take an extended amount of time and effort. Additionally, wars involving genocide will most likely be very fluid and require a continually transitioning focus on combat operations and stability operations to ensure that genocide does not reoccur.

Finally, genocide itself adds to the complexity of initiating, conducting, and terminating war. A clear definition of genocide continues to elude policymakers and scholars alike. Genocide

¹³⁰ *JP 3-0*, V-6.

¹³¹ Auerbach, 481.

is a social science. The study of genocide is not prescriptive. Furthermore, the study of genocide involves subjects related to human nature such as feelings, hatred, forgiveness, culture, and religion that are inherently difficult to study both empirically and psychologically. Therefore, it is understandable that multiple definitions and understandings of genocide exist.

Additionally, while Lemkin most likely intended to clarify genocide with the introduction of the 1948 UN General Assembly Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, this now recognized legal definition of genocide may actually be doing more harm than good. The definition in the UN convention is at the same time too narrow and too broad. It is so vague that genocide could include almost any act of violence. Furthermore, its mention of specific protected groups such as national, ethnic, racial, or religious groups may exclude other groups such as political groups. Additionally, once identified as genocide, the UN convention mandates action by its member states. Therefore, the ambiguous nature of the definition of genocide in the UN convention and the mandate to take action prohibits policymakers from properly identifying and reacting to genocide.

The growing support for the concept of R2P suggests that the US and the international community are working to get beyond the restrictions of the UN convention. R2P replaces the mandate to take action with a sense of responsibility that provides states with the flexibility to take action against a range of different types of mass atrocities. R2P simply makes it easier for states to classify instances of mass atrocity, to include genocide, properly and to take action. However, even with R2P, the political will of the US and international community remains in question.¹³² Political will remains the dominate consideration when determining if the US or other states will take military action to prevent or stop mass atrocities.¹³³ However, by identifying the protection of the citizens of the world from mass atrocity as a national interest, the US is

¹³² Waxman, 3.

¹³³ Ibid., 6.

suggesting that the political will needed to stop genocide exists. While the events in Libya in 2011 suggest the US does have the political will to deploy military forces to stop mass atrocities, the continued situation in Darfur and the escalating situation in Syria call the resolve of the US's political will into question.

Therefore, it is the confluence of war termination, identity conflict, and genocide as the three critical factors that make wars initiated to stop genocide so complex. Wars that include mass atrocities and genocide amplify the already complex nature of war. Due to the underlying social construct of identity conflict and the [nebulous](#) nature of genocide, the conduct of wars to stop genocide inherently involves ambiguous political aims and war termination criteria. The absence of an internationally agreed upon and legally recognized definition of genocide or mass atrocity compounds the issue further. Additionally, the increased tensions produced by genocide extend the time and resources required to achieve reconciliation and a lasting peace. Although wars initiated to stop genocide are complex, there does seem to be a way ahead in reducing the complexity.

The Way Ahead

With the US declaring the protection of the fundamental human rights of the peoples of the world a national interest and President Obama establishing the APB, it is obvious that the US is interested in developing a way ahead concerning the issue of mass atrocity prevention and response. In 2011 and 2012, the DOD began taking steps to transform mass atrocity response operations planning, training, and doctrine. Taking the lead, the US European Command (USEUCOM) co-hosted the Mass Atrocity Prevention and Response Operations Conference with US Africa Command (USAFRICOM) and submitted a draft mass atrocity response operations appendix to *Joint Publication 3-07.3 (JP 3-07.3), Peace Operations* to the DOD. The purpose of the proposed appendix is to provide Army leaders with joint doctrine to govern US military operations related to mass atrocity response, serve as a doctrinal basis for the coordination of US

military, US Governmental agency, and multinational efforts, and provide military guidance for the conduct of training exercises and for preparing plans. Additionally, the results of this study provide some recommendations for further study to facilitate continued understanding of and research in military operations related to mass atrocity prevention and intervention.

New US Joint Doctrine Relating to Mass Atrocity Prevention and Response. In 2011, as a result of PSD-10, USEUCOM and USAFRICOM co-hosted the Mass Atrocity Prevention and Response Operations Conference at the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany. Conference attendees consisted mostly of US military and government civilian leaders. The format of the conference consisted of a series of academic lectures, panel discussions, and a notional mass atrocity scenario. Working groups focusing on policy, military prevention operations, and military intervention operations reviewed the scenario. At the conclusion of the conference, the working groups presented policy, military prevention, and military intervention planning recommendations.

The conference resulted in the identification of three main themes. First, the newly formed National Security Staff APB must understand that a whole of government approach is critical to addressing mass atrocity events. The APB could potentially serve as a coordination board to synchronize interagency and military planning, facilitate policy refinement, and provide a unified US voice for communicating intent and interest related to mass atrocities. Second, DOD should leverage existing planning and training structures to improve preparation for mass atrocity prevention and response operations. US Geographic Combatant Commanders (GCC) should incorporate mass atrocity prevention and response in theater strategic guidance, campaign plans, and annual training exercises.

Third, conference attendees identified a tension related to time between policy decisions and military planning and operations. Often, mass atrocity prevention and response operations require expedient planning and action. Events leading to mass atrocities can accelerate quickly while policy decisions required to approve action to prevent or intervene in mass atrocities may

not keep pace. Therefore, it is critical to establish an open dialogue between policymakers and military planners to ensure a timely response to mass atrocity events. Furthermore, proper strategic guidance, planning, and training allow military commanders to deploy military forces rapidly and execute military operations effectively using options incorporated into theater campaign plans and contingency plans. Ultimately, the ability to make timely decisions facilitates greater flexibility in response options while belated action narrows available options and potential end states.

In conjunction with the Mass Atrocity Prevention and Response Operations Conference, USEUCOM began developing US Joint doctrine to incorporate mass atrocity prevention and intervention in US military doctrine. As a result, the DOD is currently staffing an updated draft of *Field Manual 3-07.3 (FM 3-07.3), Peace Operations*. The DOD is considering adding Appendix B, Mass Atrocity Response Operations, to *FM 3-07.3*. The draft appendix attempts to provide a general understanding of how mass atrocity events differ from other forms of violence and violations of human rights.¹³⁴ Additionally, it provides general guidance on mass atrocity response operations planning considerations such as situational understanding, unity of effort, and operational design, to include potential operational approaches.

Suggestions for Further Research. Increasing knowledge requires scientific inquiry. This research project resulted in an extensive examination of the interrelationships of military operations, war termination, identity conflict, and genocide. However, like most other research projects it was not all-inclusive. Therefore, in support of paving a way ahead in understanding the complexities associated with employing military forces to prevent or stop genocide, scholars should consider conducting additional research. Suggestions for further research include the following topics: a broader examination of mass atrocity beyond genocide, historical case studies

¹³⁴ United States Army, *Field Manual 3-07.3, Peace Operations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Unpublished Draft 2012): B-1.

to determine if early intervention would have saved more lives, and additional research into how genocides end.

This project examined genocide as one form of mass atrocity. Furthermore, the definition of genocide used for this study excluded specific forms of genocide mentioned. Therefore, there is merit in expanding the scope of this research project to include other forms of genocide and mass atrocity. For example, specific forms of genocide mentioned by scholars but not included in this study include politicide, democide, ethnocide, and gendercide. Furthermore, there is merit in examining the broader concept of mass atrocity. However, much like genocide, a commonly accepted scholarly definition of mass atrocity does not exist. The *MARO Handbook* defined mass atrocity as the “widespread and systematic use of violence by state or non-state armed groups against non-combatants.”¹³⁵ Furthermore, the broader concept of mass atrocity includes indiscriminate acts of violence that may or may not include an element the eliminationist intent that is inherent in genocide. Additionally, mass atrocities may include mass killings, rape, torture, and other forms of violence against classes of people based on political, economic, educational, or medical status or affiliation.

This study examined how genocides ended historically. However, as the research by Waal and Conley-Zilkic showed, very few genocides in recorded history ended as a result of military intervention. Therefore, without sufficient historical precedent, it is difficult to understand how the employment of military forces may or may not effectively prevent or stop genocide. Therefore, there may be merit in examining historical cases of genocide to determine if military intervention would have reduced the loss of life. For example, if the UN had used the military to intervene in the 1994 Rwandan genocide, would it have been effective enough to

¹³⁵ Sewall, Raymond, and Chin, 23.

actually stop the killing and save lives? Moreover, would early military intervention in the 1970 Biafra and 1973 Burundi genocides have stopped the killing?

Finally, the study of genocide prevention is prolific. Diplomatic, information, and economic efforts focus heavily on prevention. However, typically after the failure of attempts to stop genocide, countries use military force to stop genocidal activity. Unlike prevention, the concept of studying and understanding how genocides end is still new. Continued study can assist military planners and commanders with understanding the complexities related to the effective employment of military forces to stop genocide. Therefore, there is merit in continuing to research how genocides end and the underlying social identity conflict construct inherent in genocide.

Summary

History illustrates that genocide is a reoccurring phenomenon. A variety of indicators suggest that the potential for the US to deploy military forces to prevent or stop genocide or mass atrocity is increasing: continued involvement in limited warfare, recent events in Libya and Syria, the identification of preventing and stopping mass atrocities as a national interest, the creation of the Atrocities Prevention Board, and the introduction of mass atrocity response operations joint doctrine. Stopping genocide involves understanding the motives of all the actors involved, invoking R2P, addressing issues of state sovereignty, understanding the legality of actions taken in accordance with United Nations (UN) Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and much more. Conducting military operations in an environment such as this is challenging. Employing military means to combat genocidal activity only compounds the complexity of the issue. This study identified ambiguous war termination criteria, identity conflict, and the opaque nature of genocide as the critical factors that contribute to the complexity of employing military forces to end wars initiated to stop genocide. The convergence of these three critical factors creates an operating environment that is difficult to understand and navigate.

Therefore, it is important for military planners and commanders to understand the complexities of employing military forces to intervene in or stop genocide.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashmore, Richard D., Lee Jussim, David Wilder, and Jessica Heppen. "Conclusion: Toward a Social Identity Framework for Intergroup Conflict." In *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, edited by Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, and David Wilder, 213–249. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Adalian, Rouben P. "Finding the Words." In *Pioneer of Genocide Studies*, edited by Samuel Totten and Steven L. Jacobs, 3-36. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.
- Albright, Madeleine K., and William S. Cohen. *Preventing Genocide: A Blueprint for U.S. Policymakers*. Washington, DC: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2008.
- Alvarez, Alex. "Reflections on the Mass Atrocity Response Operations Project." *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (April 2011): 70-76.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. New York: Penguin, 1994.
- Ashmore, Richard D., Lee Jussim, David Wilder, and Jessica Heppen. "Conclusion: Toward a Social Identity Framework for Intergroup Conflict." In *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, edited by Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, and David Wilder, 213–249. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Auerbach, Yehudith. "Forgiveness and Reconciliation: The Religious Dimension," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 17, no. 3 (2005): 469-485.
- Burgess, Stephen F. "Comments on the Mass Atrocity Response Operations (MARO) Handbook," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (April 2011): 66-69.
- Canada, *International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. "The Responsibility to Protect." Ottawa, ON: The International Development Research Centre, 2001.
- Chalk, Frank and Kurt Jonassohn. *The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Charny, Israel W., ed. *Encyclopedia of Genocide*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 1999.
- Charny, Israel W. "Intervention and Prevention of Genocide," In *Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review* edited by Israel W. Charny, 20-38. New York, NY: Facts on File, 1988a.
- Charney, Israel W. "The Study of Genocide," In *Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review* edited by Israel W. Charny, 20-38. New York, NY: Facts on File, 1988b;
- Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Translated and edited by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Dadrian, Vahakn N. "Patterns of Twentieth Century Genocides: The Armenian, Jewish, and Rwandan Cases," *Journal of Genocide Research* 6, no. 4 (2004): 487-522.
- Drost, Pieter. *Genocide*. Vol. 2 of *The Crime State*. Leyden, The Netherlands: A.W. Sythoff, 1975.
- Evans, Raymond. "Crime Without A Name: Colonialism and the Case for Indigenocide," in *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, edited by A. Dirk Moses, 133-161. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008.
- Fein, Helen. "Genocide: A Social Perspective," *Current Sociology* 38, no. 1 (1990): 1-126.

- Flavin, William. "Planning for Conflict Termination and Post-Conflict Success," *Parameters* 33, no. 3 (Autumn 2003): 95-112.
- Ford, Charles A. "Military Governance and War Termination." Master's monograph, U.S. Command and General Staff College, 2010.
- Gellately, Robert, and Ben Kiernan, eds. *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Glazer, Sarah. "Stopping Genocide: Should the U.S. and U.N. take action in Sudan?," *CQ Researcher* 14, no. 29 (August 27, 2004): 685-708.
- Genocide Watch. "About Genocide Watch." <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus.html> (accessed January 25, 2012).
- Genocide Watch. "Current Countries at Risk." <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutus.html> (accessed January 25, 2012).
- Harff, Barbara. "No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (February 2003): 57-73.
- Harff, Barbara. "Recognizing Genocides and Politicides," *Genocide Watch*, 2 (1992): 27-41.
- Harff, Barbara and Gurr, Ted Robert. "Toward Empirical Theory of Genocides and Politicides: Identification and Measurement of Cases Since 1945," *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (September 1988): 367.
- Hiebert, Maureen A. "MARO as the Partial Operationalization of R2P," *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, 6, no. 1 (April 2011): 52-58.
- Hirsch, Herb. "MARO: Mass Atrocity Response Operations; A Military Planning Handbook: Selling the Mission and/or Protecting Human Rights?," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (April 2011): 1-6.
- Hogg, Michael A., Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White. "A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory," *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58, no. 4 (December 1995): 255-269.
- Hogg, Michael A. *The Social Psychology of Group Cohesiveness: From Attraction to Social Identity*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
- Hogg, Michael A. "Group Cohesiveness: A Critical Review and Some New Directions," *European Review of Social Psychology* 4, no. 1 (1993): 85-111
- Hogg, Michael A., and Dominic Abrams. *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Horowitz, Irving L. *Taking Lives: Genocide and State Power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1980.
- Jones, Adam. "Gendercide and Genocide," in *Gendercide and Genocide*, edited by Adam Jones, 1-38. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2004.
- Kuper, Leo. *Genocide: Its Political Use in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Kuper, Leo. *The Prevention of Genocide*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

- Kuperman, Alan J. "Mass Atrocity Response Operations; Doctrine in Search of Strategy," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (April 2011): 59-65.
- Luttwak, Edward N. "Give War a Chance," *Foreign Affairs* 78, no. 4 (July/August 1999): 36-44.
- Markusen, Eric, and David Kopf. *The Holocaust and Strategic Bombing: Genocide and Total War in the Twentieth Century*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc., 1995.
- Maybury-Lewis, David. "Genocide Against Indigenous Peoples," In *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, edited by Alexander L. Hinton, 43-53. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- Midlarsky, Manus I. *The Killing Trap: Genocide in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Moses, Dirk. "Why the Discipline of 'Genocide Studies' Has Trouble Explaining How Genocides End?" *How Genocides End*. <http://howgenocidesend.ssrc.org/Moses> (accessed August 18, 2011).
- Moshman, David. "Us and Them: Identity and Genocide," *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 7, no. 2 (2007): 115-35.
- Moshman, David. "False Moral Identity: Self-serving Denial in the Maintenance of Moral Self-Conceptions," In *Moral Development, Self, and Identity*, edited by Daniel K. Lapsley and Darcia Narvaez, 83-109. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004a.
- Moshman, David. "Theories of Self and Theories as Selves: Identity in Rwanda," In *Changing Conceptions of Psychological Life*, edited by Cynthia Lightfoot, Chris Lalonde, and Michael Chandler, 183-206. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004b.
- Mutengesa, Sabiiti, "From Pearl to Pariah: The Origin, Unfolding and Termination of State-Inspired Genocidal Persecution in Uganda, 1980-85," *How Genocides End*. <http://howgenocidesend.ssrc.org/Mutengesa/> (accessed January 23, 2012).
- Oakes, Penelope J., Alexander Haslam, and John C. Turner. *Stereotyping and Social Reality*. Oxford, England: Blackwell, 1994.
- Oliver, Frank. "The Army Reloads Its Training Strategy," *CQ Weekly* 68, no. 33 (August 2010): 1965-1966.
- Osiel, Mark J. *Mass Atrocity, Ordinary Evil, and Hannah Arendt: Criminal Consciousness in Argentina's Dirty War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Power, Samantha. *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- President. Presidential Study Directive 10. "Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocity" (August 4, 2011).
- Rampy, Michael. "The Endgame: Conflict Termination and Post-Conflict Activities," *Military Review* 72 (October 1992): 42-54.
- Reinhold, Theresa. *The United States and the Responsibility to Protect: Impediment, Bystander, or Norm Leader?* Boston, MA: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2009.
- Reiter, Dan. *How Wars End*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Rummel, R. J. "From the Study of War and Revolution to Democide – Power Kills," in *Pioneer of Genocide Studies*, edited by Samuel Totten and Steven L. Jacobs, 153-177. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

- Sereny, Gitta. *Into that Darkness: An Examination of Conscience*. New York: Vintage, 1983.
- Sewall, Sarah, Dwight Raymond, and Sally Chin. *MARO: Mass Atrocity Response Operations: A Military Planning Handbook*. Cambridge, MA: The President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2010.
- Shaw, Martin. "War and Genocide: A Sociological Approach." Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence. http://www.massviolence.org/IMG/article_PDF/War-and-Genocide-A-Sociological-Approach.pdf (accessed November 28, 2011).
- Shelton, Dinah, ed. *Encyclopedia of Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity*. New York, NY: Macmillan, 2004.
- Slantchev, Branislav L. "War Termination." *American Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 4 (October 2004): 813-829.
- Smith, Roger W., Eric Markusen, and Robert Jay Lifton. "Professional Ethics and the Denial of Armenian Genocide," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 1-22.
- Smith, Roger W. "Utopian Goals, Unasked Questions: Reflections on a Proposed Military Planning Handbook for Response to Mass Atrocities against Civilians," *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 6, no. 1 (April 2011): 77-80.
- Spiller, Roger. "War Termination: Theory and American Practice," in *War Termination: The Proceedings of the War Termination Conference*, edited by Matthew Molten, 7-16. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2001.
- Stanley, Elizabeth A., and John P. Sawyer, "The Equifinality of War Termination: Multiple Paths to Ending War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53, no. 5 (2009): 651-676.
- Stanton, Gregory H., "Genocides, Politicides, and Other Mass Murder Since 1945, With Stages in 2006," Genocide Watch. <http://www.genocidewatch.org/aboutgenocide/genocidespoliticides.html> (accessed August 18, 2011).
- Stanton, Gregory H., "The 8 Stages of Genocide." Paper presented as the first Working Paper (GS 01) of the Yale Program in Genocide Studies, New Haven, CT, January, 1998. <http://www.genocidewatch.org/images/8StagesBriefingpaper.pdf> (accessed January 25, 2012).
- Staub, Ervin. *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Staub, Ervin. "Individual and Group Identities in Genocide and Mass Killing," In *Social Identity, Intergroup Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*, edited by Richard D. Ashmore, Lee Jussim, and David Wilder, 159-184. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Staub, Ervin. *The Psychology of Good and Evil*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Steinberg, Donald. "Responsibility to Protect: Coming of Age?" Paper, The Responsibility to Protect: A Framework for Confronting Identity-based Atrocities Conference, New York, NY, March 10, 2008.
- Swain, Richard M. "*Lucky War:*" *Third Army in Desert Storm*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College Press, 1994.
- Thucydides. *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to The Peloponnesian War*. Edited by Robert B. Strassler. New York: The Free Press, 1976.

- Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict," in *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by W.G. Austin and S. Worchel, 33-47. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole, 1979.
- Totten, Samuel. "A Matter of Conscience," in *Pioneers of Genocide Studies* edited by Samuel Totten and Steven Jacobs, 545-80. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.
- Totten, Samuel, and William S. Parsons. *Introduction to Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts*, edited by Samuel and William S. Parsons, 1-13. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.
- Totten, Samuel, William S. Parsons, and Robert K. Hitchcock. "Confronting Genocide and Ethnocide of Indigenous Peoples: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Definition, Intervention, Prevention, and Advocacy," In *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, edited by Alexander L. Hinton, 54-91. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002.
- Tuck, Christopher. "Conflict Termination in Iraq," *RUSI Journal* 149, no. 5 (2004): 17-21
- Turner, John C. "Towards a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group." In *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, edited by Henri Tajfel, 15-40. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Turner, John C. "Social Categorization and Self-Concept: A Social Cognitive Theory of Group Behaviour." In *Advances in Group Processes: Theory and Research*, edited by E. J. Lawler, 77-122. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1985.
- Turner, John C. *Social Influence*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 1991.
- Turner, John C., Michael A. Hogg, Penelope J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, and M. S. Wetherell. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford, England: Blackwell, 1987.
- Tzu, Sun. *The Art of War*. Translated by J. H. Huang. New York: Quill, William Morrow Publishers, 1993.
- United Nations General Assembly. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. *Resolution 260 (III) A* (1948).
- U. S. President. "The National Security Strategy," (May 2010).
- Waal, Alex de, and Bridget Conley-Zilkic, "Reflections on How Genocidal Killings are Brought to an End," *How Genocides End*. http://howgenocidesend.ssrc.org/de_Waal/ (accessed August 18, 2011).
- Waller, James. *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Weitz, Eric D. *A Century of Genocide: Utopias of Race and Nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Whitaker, Benjamin. "Revised and Updated Report on the Question of the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide," Prevent Genocide International. <http://www.preventgenocide.org/prevent/UNdocs/whitaker/> (accessed November 25, 2011)
- Woolf, Linda and Michael Hulsizer. "Psychosocial Roots of Genocide: Risk, Prevention, and Intervention," *Journal of Genocide Research* 7, (2005): 101-128.

Government Publications and Manuals

- United States Army, *Field Manual 3-0, Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, January 2008.
- . *Army Doctrinal Publication 3-0, Unified Land Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 2011.
- . *Field Manual 3-07, Stability Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 2008.
- . *Field Manual 3-07.3, Peace Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Unpublished Draft 2012.
- . *Field Manual 5-0, The Operations Process*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 2010.
- United States Department of Defense, *Joint Publication 1, Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 2009.
- . *Joint Publication, 3-0, Joint Operations*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 2011.
- . *Joint Publication, 5-0, Joint Operations Planning*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 2011.
- United States Department of Defense. *National Defense Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: 2008.
- United States Department of Defense. *National Military Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, D.C.: 2011.
- United States Department of Defense. *Quadrennial Defense Review*. Washington, D.C.: 2010.
- United States of America. *National Security Strategy*. May 2010