

Deterrence and Compellence in Iraq, 1991-2003: Lessons for a Complex Paradigm

Frank P. Harvey, Dalhousie University
frank.harvey@dal.ca

Patrick James, University of Southern California
patrickj@usc.edu

1. Introduction

This chapter tests rational deterrence and compellence theory based on evidence from six major exchanges involving the United States (with support from the United Kingdom and United Nations) and Iraq from 1991 to 2003. The study pertains to the pre-insurgency era but may not be without implications for present policy-making. Dissecting the US-Iraq rivalry reveals a series of separate (though interrelated) encounters that highlight the crucial importance of specifying the precise time frame and exact sequence within which appropriately designated deterrent/compellent threats, counter-coercive strategies and retaliatory responses unfold over time. By identifying discrete exchanges, counterproductive debates over coding successes and failures shift to a more basic and considerably more relevant level of analysis. In contrast to conventional approaches to testing¹, coding decisions do not require compressing all relevant information from these exchanges into a single data point (e.g., Cuba 1962, Six Day War 1967, Yom Kippur 1973, Kosovo 1998, Gulf War I 1991, Gulf War II 2003). None of these cases encompass a single, dominant encounter -- they typically include multiple exchanges that provide theoretically relevant information about the core prerequisites for testing deterrence

success and failure. One implication of this reassessment of the US-led coalition's exchanges with Iraq is that complex, multidimensional encounters may represent the **norm** rather than the exception in the history of coercive diplomacy.

Indeed some individual exchanges encompass both deterrence and compellence encounters, and both successes and failures. Complexity is the basic trait that comes through here and perhaps this is not so new as it might look. Some conflicts are recurrent and their complexity is reflected in both the stages of (de)escalation within a given crisis and connections across such discrete events. Paul (this volume) identifies four "ideal relationships" vis-à-vis deterrence: between great powers; nuclear states; nuclear great powers and regional powers armed with Weapons of Mass Destruction; and nuclear states and non-state actors. The events covered by the present study fall within the third category; their aftermath – a chaotic occupation and insurgency – belongs in the fourth.

A protracted crisis approach can also help to answer important questions about deterrence stability in the same case over time -- failures at one stage can provide relevant information for interpreting and explaining successes later on, because credibility and resolve are typically reinforced after failures. In a similar way, success may breed complacency and discourage innovation on the part of the victor. The approach also helps to disentangle the relevance of deterrence prerequisites as they interact in different contexts throughout the same case. Instead of assuming that the presence of resolve and capabilities are always positive forces when combined, a protracted crisis framework helps to identify different ways in which the presence or absence of prerequisites matter. More, in other words, is not necessarily better in every case, with the complexity of the deterrence paradigm coming out directly in this way. The

relationship between context and causation, however, remains relatively unexplored in the literature on coercive diplomacy).²

In sum, by expanding the pool of evidence appropriate for testing, the proposed protracted crisis approach is expected to provide a more relevant, accurate and complete body of information for evaluating deterrence and compellence theory.

This chapter will unfold in four additional stages. The first stage outlines a framework of analysis for deterrence theory. Second, deterrence and compellence are assessed over six exchanges between the United States and UK (and loosely associated allies) on one hand and Iraq on the other. The third stage consists of observations derived from the preceding exchanges. Fourth, and finally, conclusions are offered about the viability of the deterrence paradigm in light of the evidence. The overall objective of this study is to derive lessons for deterrence as a complex paradigm, with an emphasis on relevance to both theory and policy.

2. Framework of Analysis

The standard, four-condition defender-oriented model of rational deterrence theory stipulates that a retaliatory threat should succeed in preventing a challenge if leaders of the deterring state (A) clearly define the behavior deemed to be unacceptable, (B) communicate to challengers a commitment to punish violations, (C) possess the means (capability) to defend the commitment by punishing adversaries who challenge it or denying the challenger the specific objectives sought through its aggression, and (D) demonstrate their resolve to carry out the retaliation if the challenger fails to comply.³ If these four prerequisites (A-D) are satisfied, the expected net costs of the threatened

sanction (to the challenger) should be greater than the expected net gains from noncompliance because the punishment (if carried out) would prevent the challenger from achieving intended military, political, or economic goals.⁴

3. Deterrence/Compellence Exchanges

The six exchanges described below occurred after the end of major military hostilities in the first Gulf War, 1991, and just before the onset of major hostilities in 2003. For all exchanges, dates are assigned for initiation and termination as precisely as possible. A background to each exchange is followed by a narrative that conveys deterrence/compellence threats, probes and responses. Discussion then turns to outcome in terms of the success or failure of the deterrent/compellent threats observed.

Exchange # 1 -- April 10 to 24, 1991

The Establishment of a Northern No-Fly Zone in Iraq

Operation Provide Comfort (Operation Northern Watch)

Background:

This “no-fly zone” resulted from the 5 April 1991 United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 which stated that the Security Council condemned the repression of the Iraqi civilian population in many parts of Iraq, demanded that Iraq put an end to it and open a dialogue to ensure that the human and political rights of all Iraqi citizens are respected.⁵ The United States ordered Iraq to end all military activity in northern Iraq and established a no-fly zone to prevent Iraqi aircraft from attacking the Kurdish population.

US, British and French planes patrolled the zone north of the 36th parallel in an operation the US military dubbed “Operation Provide Comfort (OPC).”⁶ Operating from Incirlik in eastern Turkey, the no-fly zone was enforced above the 36th parallel. The no-fly zone also provided air cover for ground forces and humanitarian assistance to the Kurds who remained fearful about another Iraqi military incursion. From April to September 1991 the operation led to over 40,000 sorties, relocated over 700,000 refugees and restored 70-80 percent of the villages destroyed by the Iraqis.

Deterrence/Compellence Threats, Probes and Responses:

On April 10, the Iraqi government rejected a European plan to establish a Kurdish safe haven in the Northern Iraq (UNSCR 678, April 8, 1991).⁷ Note from the outset that involvement of the UN at various points and with different degrees of perceived support for one adversary or another clearly introduces multi-actor complexity as conceived of by Paul (this volume).

In response, on April 11, the Bush administration issued a warning to Iraqi officials not to use military force in northeastern Iraq – a message directly conveyed to Iraqi officials in Washington and at the UN.⁸ This was characterized by the New York Times as an explicit demand; the Bush administration made it very clear that “no land or air forces would be allowed to function in the area involved,” with an explicit threat to fire on helicopters or planes approaching Kurdish areas.

But the credibility and resolve of US. and European threats to prevent Iraqi ground forces from attacking Kurdish areas was seriously weakened by subsequent statements by the President on April 11:

I am not going to involve any American troops in a civil war in Iraq. . . . we are going to do what is right by these refugees, and I think the American people expect that, and they want that. But I don't think they want to see us bogged down in a civil war by sending in the 82d Airborne or the 101st or the 7th Cavalry. And so, I want to get that matter cleared up.⁹

As expected in the context of a weak or watered down threat (and consistent with deterrence theory), on April 12 Iraqi forces launched attacks on Kurdish forces around Irbil, north of the 36th parallel, in direct violation of US warnings.¹⁰ Other Iraqi attacks reportedly occurred in Kurdish areas south of the parallel, including Sulaymaniyah.¹¹ Bush Administration spokesmen did not confirm the reports, adding that there had been no attempts by Iraq to impede the refugee relief operations for the Kurds in northern Iraq. On April 14 President Bush reaffirmed his reluctance to 'interfere' in Iraq's civil war.¹²

Consistent with findings from case studies of Bosnia and Kosovo (Harvey 1998, 1999), weak threats are often worse than no threat at all. Like Milosevic, Saddam often exploited signs of weaknesses and used these occasions as an opportunity to demonstrate relevance and control to domestic and regional constituencies. However, as security concerns for Kurdish civilians grew, a stronger, more credible retaliatory threat was issued by the President on April 16 in an effort to deter further Iraqi incursions into Kurdish territory. The President announced a joint US-European plan to send US troops into northern Iraq to build refugee camps and guarantee protection for the Kurds.¹³ This commitment superseded the rhetoric about limiting United States involvement and

dramatically upgraded the credibility and potency of the threat to Saddam Hussein from the coalition. Note also the coalitional solidarity at that point, which at least temporarily removed an important aspect of complexity that has been an obstacle to deterrence and compellence in other contexts.

Outcome:

As predicted by standard deterrence theory, the revised threat led on April 18 to Iraq and the United Nations signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) providing for a UN humanitarian presence in Iraq and the stationing of 500 UN security guards in northern Iraq to protect the relief operations, and an agreement to remain in force until December 31, 1991, with the possibility for renewal.¹⁴ While Saddam Hussein responded with statements that “the Western [US] relief operation was ‘not necessary in practical terms’ because Baghdad and the United Nations had reached agreement in principle on easing the crisis”, nevertheless, Iraqi troops satisfied the condition stipulated in the MOU on April 21 – approximately 200 armed Iraqi policemen entered the Kurdish town of Zakho as Iraqi soldiers withdrew, a direct result of the agreement between the allies and the Iraqis to establish a safe haven for the Kurds.¹⁵

Several senior US military and political officials interpreted the stationing of Iraq police units as undermining the spirit of the agreement -- yet another typical probing effort by the Iraqi regime to test the resolve of coalition forces.¹⁶ Additional probing efforts followed on April 22 as Iraqi troops, which withdrew from Zakho under the agreement with the US military, returned to the outskirts of Zakho and thereby deterring many Kurds from returning to their homes. Iraqis in and around Zakho were generally

viewed as friendly, with a preference to avoid confrontation, but some Iraqi troops overlooking Zakho did fire machine-gun and mortar rounds in an effort to harass the Kurdish population.¹⁷

On April 24, and in direct response to additional US warnings, Iraqi officials agree to move the troops several kilometers away from Zakho. Iraqi Kurdish leaders announced their agreement in principle with the Iraqi government on a formula to allow them autonomy in northern Iraq. In an obvious public relations move, Iraq welcomed several foreign journalists into Kurdistan to witness the conditions.¹⁸ The United States Administration followed these events with an additional diplomatic and military warning, ordering Iraq to withdraw "all policemen and other security forces from the area in northern Iraq" around a Kurdish refugee camp. A similar note was presented in the UN.¹⁹

Consistent with Paul's (this volume) observation that deterrence can operate in both directions in a given case, the circumscribed and largely symbolic actions from Saddam Hussein served notice regarding further interactions. Specifically, Iraq hoped to deter further encroachments upon its sovereignty and did so while simultaneously being deterred itself from a frontal challenge to the distasteful agreement it had just made with the United States.

Exchange #2 -- August 26, 1992 to January 19, 1993

Establishment of Southern No-Fly Zone

Operation Southern Watch

Background:

On 26 August, 1992, the United States, Britain, and France established a no-fly zone (NFZ) in Southern Iraq along the 32nd parallel. President George H.W. Bush stated that the NFZ was a direct response to “Saddam’s use of helicopters and...fixed-wing aircraft to bomb and strafe civilians and villages” in Southern Iraq, a clear indication, he added, that Iraq was “failing to meet its obligations under United Nations Security Council Resolution 688...demand[ing] Saddam Hussein end repression of the Iraqi people.”²⁰

Iraq was given 24 hours to comply with the NFZ. With the President’s announcement, US Central Command activated Joint Task Force – Southwest Asia (JTF-SWA), a command and control unit for coalition forces monitoring the no-fly zone, consisting of American, British, French, and Saudi Arabian units. JTF-SWA’s mission was dubbed Operation Southern Watch, its mission being to monitor and uphold the surveillance area and enforce the NFZ if and when Iraqi forces infiltrated the area. While Baghdad vowed to eliminate the NFZ through the use of force, the Pentagon reported that Iraqi forces had begun removing their helicopters and airplanes north of the 32nd parallel by the evening of 26 August.²¹

Deterrence/Compellence Threats, Probes and Responses:

JTF-SWA coalition forces flew their first Southern Watch sortie within 24 hours of the NFZ activation, and reported no Iraqi activity. In fact, for the next several months, Iraq complied completely with the ‘no fly’ restrictions and coalition forces controlled the airspace south of the 32nd parallel.

Tensions between Iraq and the Coalition over the Southern NFZ flared up in December 1992. On the morning of December 27, 1992, while flying a routine mission in the NFZ, US Air Force F-15s encountered a pair of Iraqi MiG-25s flying south of the 32nd parallel; they were warned to return north of the NFZ. The MiGs did so, but a second set of Iraqi MiG-15s were intercepted by two US Air Force F-16s later in the day. One of the Iraqi MiGs, after having locked its air-to-air radar on one of the F-16s, was shot down.²² American officials commenting on the incident argued that Baghdad's decision to breach the 32nd parallel was a deliberate move by Iraq to "test the willingness of the United States" to uphold the NFZ, especially in light of American involvement in Somalia and Bosnia, the relocation of the USS Ranger – an American aircraft carrier central to enforcing the NFZ – from the Persian Gulf to the water's off Somalia, and the upcoming transfer of power to the newly-elected Clinton Administration.²³

In an effort to counter a seemingly emboldened Iraqi policy regarding the southern NFZ, Washington sent an extra two squadrons of Navy warplanes to the region on 28 December to augment coalition forces already enforcing the area.²⁴ While Iraqi air incursions into the NFZ abated slightly in the days that followed, by the beginning of January 1993 Iraqi ground forces had begun deploying surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) south of the 32nd parallel that could be used to destroy Coalition airplanes patrolling the zone. Thus, along with the meta-theme of US-led deterrence efforts surrounding the NFZ, Iraq can be seen as investing in military efforts to compel the coalition to abandon its efforts toward enforcement.

On 6 January, 1993, an ultimatum was presented to the Iraqi representative to the United Nations by American, British, French, and Russian representatives. The

ultimatum read: “All SAM systems which have been moved into new positions south of the 32d parallel should be returned to their original sites or configurations within 48 hours of the delivery of the demarche.” This ultimatum warned that if Iraq did not remove the missiles, coalition forces would respond “appropriately and decisively.”²⁵ Initially, Iraqi officials rebuffed the Coalition’s ultimatum and continued to vocalize their displeasure with the demands. Yet despite Iraq’s defiant rhetoric, continued political pressure by the United States and the Security Council, along with a doubling of JTF-SWA flights over the NFZ on 8 January, compelled Iraq to dismantle and remove some missile batteries in the NFZ before the deadline. By 9 January, White House officials asserted that Iraq had indeed “backed down” in the face of allied demands and had removed several SAM sites north of the 32nd parallel.²⁶

While the immediate confrontation seemed to have been defused, Iraq continued its provocative actions on 11 January by relocating several dismantled SAM sites to the northern NFZ and taking the unprecedented step of sending several hundred armed Iraqi soldiers across the border into Kuwaiti territory, apparently to retrieve six anti-ship missiles left behind when Iraqi forces were driven from Kuwait in 1991. Both the United States and the UN Security Council strongly condemned the incursion, warning of “strong consequences” if any further action was taken on the border.²⁷ But a second Iraqi incursion into Kuwait took place on 12 January and Iraq’s continued ambivalence over further removing SAM sites from the NFZ prompted a strong and vocal response from the Bush Administration.

Pentagon officials reported that a plan to attack Iraq had been made “in principle” adding that it was “just a matter of when to pull the trigger.” British and French officials

further reiterated the American position.²⁸ On 13 January, more than 100 American, French, and British strike aircraft launched a 30-minute bombing raid, the first large-scale attack since the cessation of conflict in 1991, on Iraqi targets inside the NFZ, targeting and destroying various missile sites, radar units, and low-level command bunkers.²⁹ A battalion task force of 1,250 American troops was also dispatched to the Kuwait-Iraq border a move designed specifically to deter further Iraqi incursions.³⁰ Officials in Washington, Paris, and London all expressed their resolve to uphold the NFZ and warned that further military action against Iraq would be taken if it continued its pattern of “cheat and retreat” in violating UN-sanctioned restrictions.³¹ In the days immediately following the bombing raid, further warnings of renewed hostilities were issued by Allied officials. A Tomahawk cruise missile attack, consisting of 45 missiles, on the Saafaraniay industrial complex near Baghdad took place on 17 January and a day-time air raid against SAM sites in the NFZ, involving American and British fighter planes, took place on 18 January.³²

Outcome:

Both raids were of limited military scope, but represented a strong political message to Iraq that Allied forces were prepared to continue enforcing the UN mandate. On 19 January, in an apparent policy reversal, Iraq announced that it had ordered a cease-fire against allied jets in the NFZ.³³

Although further small-scale attacks, mostly against Iraqi fighter-jets and SAM sites continued in the southern NFZ in June and July of 1993, the January Crisis ended with an Allied victory. Iraq was compelled to accept the southern No-Fly Zone and was

ultimately deterred from continuing its attacks against Shiites in Southern Iraq. Of further interest, Iraq's reaction to the January 1993 air strikes initiated a pattern of cyclical response that was later repeated time and again in future confrontation with Allied forces. Specifically, Iraq policy ventured on a 'tit-for-tat' arrangement, beginning first with rhetorical rejections of UN resolutions that resulted in eventual policy moves that challenged US resolve, followed by a period of military entrenchment while under Allied attack (which were usually successfully absorbed by Iraqi forces), followed next by a reversal of policy that adhered to Western demands, that eventually – and almost always – lead to an eventual period of renewed Iraqi rejection of various UN demands. This pattern is consistent with the presence of **escalation dominance** – a standard concept in the lexicon of deterrence theory – in favor of the US-led coalition. It also reinforces the continuing relevance of the rationality axiom even under conditions of multi-stage, multi-actor complex deterrence. Iraq backed off from extreme confrontation in the face of clear and powerful threats; when the message began to fade, it started to probe again and test for new limits.

Exchange # 3 – October 7 to 16, 1994

Iraqi Aggression against Kuwait

Operation Vigilant Warrior

Background:

In October 1994, renewed Iraqi aggression against Kuwait resulted in a brief, yet significant international crisis in the Persian Gulf. Known as Operation Vigilant Warrior,

the October 1994 crisis was a direct result of Iraq's apparent hostility towards Kuwait and was answered by swift and forceful action on the part of the United States and allied forces from Europe.

On 7 October, 1994, Iraq repositioned an estimated 10,000 troops, including a contingent of elite Republican Guard, to the southern town of Basra, 30 kilometres from the Kuwaiti border. Pentagon officials reported that the deployment brought the number of Iraqi troops on the border with Kuwait to approximately 50,000.³⁴ Washington's reaction was firm, with President Bill Clinton taking immediate "precautionary steps" in the Gulf region, and further warning Iraq, in a White House press release, that "It would be a grave mistake for Saddam Hussein to believe for any reason that the United States would have weakened its resolve" on issues similar to those that had developed in 1990.³⁵

Several US officials conceded that the Iraqi deployment was probably "saber-rattling" intended to underscore Baghdad's demands for a lifting of UN-approved economic sanctions and elicit support from members of the Security Council – notably Turkey, France, and Russia, all of which had already voiced concerns about sanctions. Tariq Aziz, Iraq's Deputy Prime Minister, indicated as much in a speech that day to the General Assembly, where he called on the UN to lift sanctions that had caused "unbearable hardships" to Iraqis.³⁶ Thus, embedded within the overarching efforts to deter Iraq from aggression against Kuwait is a limited attempt at compellence in the opposite direction. Iraqi saber-rattling clearly aimed at forcing an end to the damaging sanctions.

Deterrence/Compellence Threats, Probes and Responses:

American resolve was re-affirmed in a speech given by Madeline Albright, the chief American delegate to the UN, responding to Mr. Aziz's assertions, further warning Iraq against pursuing aggressive action against Kuwait.³⁷ In addition to these verbal warnings, President Clinton ordered the American aircraft carrier George Washington to set sail from its position in the Adriatic to the Red Sea, instructed a Marine amphibious group to leave the United Arab Emirates and steam towards the northern Gulf, ordered the deployment of maritime pre-positioning ships towards the area from the American naval base at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, and stepped up reconnaissance flights over the Southern No-Fly Zone.³⁸

Further American signals were given on 8 October, with 4,000 US Army troops ordered to leave for Kuwait. President Clinton re-iterated his earlier resolve, stating at a press release that he wanted "to make it clear...[that] it would be a grave error for Iraq to repeat the mistakes of the past or to misjudge either American will or American power."³⁹ US Secretary of State Warren Christopher was also dispatched to the Middle East, stating that Hussein "must not be allowed to intimidate either Iraq's neighbours or the United Nations Security Council."⁴⁰ The President of the Security Council also expressed his disapproval of the Iraqi troop movements and re-affirmed the UN's readiness to uphold the "sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kuwait."⁴¹

Ignoring these initial statements and warnings, Iraq continued to reinforce its military presence on the border, sending in a third division of elite Republican Guards to the area, augmenting the total number of Iraqi troops on the border with Kuwait to 80,000 – a force many American officials argued could invade Kuwait "in a matter of days."⁴² Pentagon officials called the Iraqi build-up "irresponsible and dangerous" and a "serious

challenge” to regional stability.⁴³ In response, and as a clear indication of how seriously Washington regarded these developments, President Clinton, on 9 October, dispatched 36,000 troops along with 51 additional combat planes to Kuwait.⁴⁴ Note in this third exchange the increasing size of military deployments on both sides, which points toward ‘credibility inflation’. With additional troops and hardware intended to sustain credibility come issues of command and control; in making such deployments, each side conveyed its willingness to go closer to the brink of war and endure greater risk than in past exchanges.

Outcome:

On 10 October, Iraq’s Ambassador to the United Nations, Nizar Hamdoon, asserted to the General Assembly that Iraqi troops had been given the order to withdraw from the border with Kuwait.⁴⁵ However, as the statement could not be immediately confirmed by American intelligence, the remark was met with scepticism. In a television address from the Oval Office on the evening of 10 October, Clinton reaffirmed that the US was “committed to defending the integrity of [Kuwait] and to protecting the stability of the gulf region.” He also confirmed the deployment of another 350 Air Force aircraft to the Persian Gulf region.⁴⁶ Sensing the immediate crisis had been averted, debate regarding how to “contain” Iraqi aggression in the future began in the White House, and the idea of establishing a southern “containment zone” in Iraq was first mentioned by American Officials.⁴⁷

Confirmation that Iraqi troops had in fact begun moving north from their earlier positions near Basra came on 11 October, and the confrontation between Iraq and the

United States eased somewhat.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, US deployment to the Gulf region continued – and a further 155,000 ground troops were put on alert – amid a flurry of discussion regarding a US plan for the future “containment” of Iraq. American officials commented that the United States was considering establishing a “buffer zone” in southern Iraq, the territorial equivalent of the Southern No-Fly Zone that would bar Iraq from moving its elite ground forces within striking range of Kuwait.⁴⁹ To that end, Ambassador Albright held discussions, on 12 October, with her counterparts in the Security Council on establishing an “exclusion zone” that would restrict Iraq’s Republican Guard from deployment into southern Iraq.⁵⁰

This was the first case in which visible fissures between Allies became apparent, with France suggesting that American deployment to the Gulf was “not unconnected with domestic politics” while Russia announced its Foreign Minister Andrei V. Kozyrev would fly to Baghdad on an official state visit.⁵¹ With support for the ‘containment zone’ plan dwindling both within the United States⁵² and within the Security Council, American Defense Secretary William J. Perry announced on 13 October a revised plan to deter Iraq that involved increasing “the American military presence in the Persian Gulf region”, including the positioning of American warplanes and a division’s worth of tanks and armor on the borders of Iraq – mainly in Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait – even after the immediate crisis passed.⁵³ Perry also commented on an American proposal to the Security Council, to be officially tabled within a few days, that would condemn Iraq’s recent deployment and acts of aggression. American deployment to the Gulf region continued and a small-scale military exercise, involving 125 US

Marines – accompanied by an “army of international photographers and reporters” – began in Kuwait.⁵⁴

One way to read the preceding French and Russian statements regarding the crisis is in connection with mounting costs of commitment and danger of escalation via Iraqi behavior. The backing away by these two powers suggests at least temporarily successful deterrence by Iraq, which (1) all parties believed to possess WMDs and (2) seemed to be more willing than ever to go to the brink against the United States, its allies and the UN. (This is true in the sense of causing France and Russia to retreat into the background even though, in this particular exchange, they ultimately did vote with the United States on the Security Council.) All of this returns to Paul’s (this volume) speculation regarding the likely presence of multiple interactions and different agents within complex deterrence. Exchange 3 is archetypal in that sense, with deterrence and compellence also operating in both directions.

On 14 October, the Clinton Administration, in conjunction with the British government, formally introduced a Security Council resolution to the United Nations and, ignoring Russian pleas for delay, pressed for a “quick vote” on the resolution. The Security Council vote took place on 15 October where Resolution 949 passed unanimously.⁵⁵ Resolution 949 “Condemns recent military deployment by Iraq” toward Kuwait, “demands” that Iraq continue to “withdraw its troops to their original position”, and “demands” that Iraq “not redeploy to the south” nor use its forces in any “hostile or provocative manner.”⁵⁶

On 16 October, government-controlled news media in Iraq indicated that Resolution 949 had been accepted by Baghdad and that the government would comply

with its demands to withdraw elite forces from southern Iraq. In an unusual move, all the details of the Resolution were read aloud on Iraqi radio and television news bulletins, further signalling the Allies that Iraq would comply with its demands.⁵⁷ This action effectively and intentionally substituted for the naturally credible signalling that would have taken place in a regime with open media. Iraq's compliance to Resolution 949 indicates the last phase of October 1994 crisis.

Exchange # 4 – August 31 to September 13, 1996

The Irbil Offensive

Operation Desert Strike

Background:

On August 30, 1996, US military officials in the region reported observing renewed mobilization and deployment of Iraqi troops toward Kurdish districts in northern Iraq.⁵⁸ Clinton Administration officials responded with warnings that “we will consider any aggression by Iraq to be a matter of very grave concern”.⁵⁹ The objective was to send a strong signal and warning to deter Iraq from crossing the ‘exclusion zone.’ Glyn Davis, a State Department spokesman, reiterated the threat, stating, “we would view any aggressive moves by Iraq with utmost seriousness. The Iraqis are in no doubt of our views on this.”⁶⁰ Other media reports confirmed Pentagon plans to deploy additional warplanes to the region if Iraq violated the UNSC exclusion zone resolution and began, once again, to move forces in preparation for retaliation against any Iraqi incursions into Northern Iraq.⁶¹

On August 31, a 30,000-40,000 strong Iraqi armored force invaded the Kurdish provisional capital of Irbil.⁶² It was apparent to most observers that Saddam Hussein was repeating previous patterns of probing to test US and coalition resolve.⁶³ In this case, however, the seizure of Irbil by the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan posed a more direct challenge to Iraqi sovereignty and status. It therefore would be more difficult for the United States to mount a sufficiently capable and costly threat to deter Iraqi forces. In addition, the credibility of the retaliatory threats were becoming less potent (and, therefore, less effective and more difficult to mount) as France and Russia became increasingly vocal about their opposition to the sanctions regime and to US/UK military retaliations. These signals were continuously exploited by Saddam Hussein in ways that made it much more difficult for deterrence to succeed -- a pattern that became increasingly more challenging (and detrimental) over time by undermining the credibility of US threats. These patterns help to explain the most recent coercive diplomatic failure in the period preceding the 2003 Iraq war -- a point addressing more detail in the overview of Exchange 6.

Deterrence/Compellence Threats, Probes and Responses:

On September 1, the Clinton Administration issued several explicit military threats to punish the Iraqi regime for its blatant violation of several UNSC resolutions.⁶⁴ This was followed on September 3 with US forces launching 27 cruise missiles at military targets in southern Iraq, 14 from the USS Laboon guided missile destroyer and the USS Shilo cruiser in the Persian Gulf, and 13 from two B-52 bombers from Guam.⁶⁵ Clinton's speech following the attacks confirmed the intention to pressure Iraqi forces to retreat: "I

want to reaffirm to you what I said to all the American people early this morning: Our objectives there are limited, but our interests are clear.... These steps are being taken to further all of these objectives and the policy of containing Iraq that I have pursued for four years now, and it was developed before me under President Bush.”⁶⁶ President Clinton followed this with an official statement on September 3: “Earlier today I ordered American forces to strike Iraq. Our missiles sent the following message to Saddam Hussein:to make Saddam pay a price for the latest act of brutality, reducing his ability to threaten his neighbours and America's interests.”⁶⁷

These efforts produced very limited diplomatic and/or military support from key allies.⁶⁸ Russian officials called the US-led military operation “an inappropriate and unacceptable reaction to the latest events in northern Iraq.”⁶⁹ The reception at the United Nations was even colder.⁷⁰ These escalating fissures within the coalition led Saddam Hussein to dismiss the restrictions and issue several counter-coercive threats to down any foreign aircraft flying over Iraq territory.⁷¹ Defence Secretary William J. Perry clearly expressed Washington’s concerns here -- “the issue is not simply the Iraqi attack on Irbil...our concern is that if Saddam Hussein is emboldened by what he would see as a success in the north he might strike out in areas which are of greater strategic importance to him as well as to us in the south.”⁷²

In response, on September 4, President Clinton announced his intention to widen the no-fly zone over southern Iraq, extending it northward from the 32nd to the 33rd parallel. He also rejected calls for a limited oil sale by Iraq (under a recent UN resolution) until Iraq abandoned its current policy.⁷³

Outcome:

The military actions and related threats appeared to have succeeded. On September 4 Clinton announced that “our mission has been achieved...There has been a withdrawal of the forces, a dispersal of the forces...” and that Iraq has “pulled back most of its troops from a contested Kurdish enclave [and] United States-led air patrols met only token resistance enforcing a newly expanded prohibition on Iraqi military flights.”⁷⁴ A week later, on September 13, the Iraqi government announced that it would no longer attack coalition fighters enforcing the flight-exclusion zone in northern and southern Iraq.⁷⁵ Pentagon officials also reported that Iraq had halted repairs to its air-defence sites, in response to specific US demands.⁷⁶

However, debate over the success of the operation still lingered. Saddam maintained a strong military presence just outside the exclusion zone. Russia, France and China were beginning to reject almost any US/UK diplomatic and military strategies and policies in the region – divisions that continued and escalated for years.⁷⁷

Exchange # 5 – July to December, 1998

Operation Desert Fox

Background:

On 23 February 1998 the UN Secretary-General obtained an undertaking from the Iraqi Government to resume full co-operation with the UN Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).⁷⁸ A Memorandum of Understanding was signed in Baghdad by the Secretary-General and the Iraqi Deputy

Prime Minister, Tariq Aziz, in which the Government of Iraq reconfirmed “its acceptance of all relevant resolutions of the Security Council” and undertook “to accord UNSCOM and the IAEA immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.”⁷⁹ Under the terms of the Memorandum, a special group of senior diplomats was assigned to accompany UNSCOM and IAEA members during inspection of the eight disputed presidential sites. The Memorandum also noted that the lifting of sanctions was of “paramount importance to the people and Government of Iraq” and the Secretary-General undertook to “bring this matter to the full attention of the...Security Council.”⁸⁰

The UN Security Council endorsed the Memorandum of Understanding in Resolution 1154⁸¹ on 2 March 1998 and warned that any violation of the agreement would have the “severest consequences for Iraq.”⁸² Washington and London had pushed for a more explicit threat but, once again, met with resistance from the other permanent members. There was also a dispute within the Council over the precise meaning of the term “severest consequences”, with the United States maintaining that the Resolution provided the authority to act in the event of further Iraqi non-compliance. China insisted, however, that the resolution was “not an automatic green light to use force.”⁸³ The UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, also stated that the United States should hold “some form of consultations with the other members [of the Security Council]” before any military action was launched.⁸⁴ Reports suggest the UN is “divided over the Iraq issue.”⁸⁵ The pattern was virtually identical to events preceding the 2003 Iraq war.

On 5 March 1998 UNSCOM inspectors returned to Iraq and carried out a number of inspections of sites, without hindrance.⁸⁶ However, question marks remained over access to the presidential sites, after the initial inspections found that all the rooms had

been stripped bare of files, personnel and even furniture.⁸⁷ The Iraqi Government claimed it had not agreed to any further inspections of the sites, whereas inspectors believed the initial visits had only served to establish the right of access prior to future visits.

In spite of the declarations of co-operation, relations between UNSCOM and Baghdad began to deteriorate during late June and July 1998, following allegations that Iraq had sought to conceal the extent of its program to develop and weaponize VX nerve agent. Iraq claimed the allegations were fabricated by UNSCOM in an attempt to delay the lifting of sanctions and insisted it had provided all the necessary evidence on the weapons programs.⁸⁸

Talks between Baghdad and UNSCOM on the next stage of the inspection process broke down in early August, despite indications from UNSCOM that work was almost complete on both the missile and chemical weapons files. On 4 August Tariq Aziz demanded that Richard Butler should report to the UN Security Council that the disarmament process was complete, but the UNSCOM chief executive refused, saying he did not have sufficient evidence to make such a declaration.⁸⁹

On 5 August, 1998, Iraq announced it was suspending all cooperation with UNSCOM and the IAEA inspection teams and restricting monitoring activities to existing sites.⁹⁰ In contrast to the rhetoric of the February 1998 crisis, the international response to the Iraqi decision was relatively muted. The UN Security Council declared the move to be “totally unacceptable,”⁹¹ but London and Washington sought to play down the crisis, believing Iraq had created the dispute in order to provoke a split in the Security Council over how to respond.⁹²

On 26 August 1998 UNSCOM inspector Scott Ritter resigned in protest at what he perceived to be a weakening of US and UK policy towards Iraq. Mr. Ritter, a former intelligence officer with the US Marine Corps, joined UNSCOM in the autumn of 1991 and played a key role in developing a more proactive approach to UN arms inspection in Iraq.⁹³ In his resignation letter Mr. Ritter accused the United States and the United Kingdom of putting pressure on UNSCOM to abandon planned intrusive inspections of controversial sites, so as to avoid a fresh confrontation with Iraq. He declared that Washington and London were pushing UNSCOM “towards something that would produce the illusion of arms control rather than our stated policy of disarming Iraq.”⁹⁴ He also accused the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, of acting as a “sounding board” for Iraqi complaints and claimed that the failure of the Security Council to punish Iraq for its decision of 5 August to suspend co-operation with UNSCOM constituted “a surrender to the Iraqi leadership”: “The issue of immediate, unrestricted access is, in my opinion, the cornerstone of any viable inspection regime, and as such is an issue worth fighting for. Unfortunately, others do not share this opinion, including the Security Council and the United States.”⁹⁵ US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright dismissed the allegations and claimed Mr. Ritter did not “have a clue” about the overall policy towards Iraq, arguing that the United States had in fact been the “strongest supporter of UNSCOM.”⁹⁶

US officials admitted in private that Washington and London had sought to control the pace of confrontation with the aim of keeping other members of the Security Council on board. According to one administration official: “We're learning that this is a marathon race and we cannot threaten military action every time Saddam Hussein rattles his cage.”⁹⁷ In all likelihood it also represented a non-linear effect (Paul, this volume)

from the complexity of multi-actor, iterated deterrence and compellence. At this point the United States and UK realized that, with the rest of the UN Security Council off the bandwagon, pursuit of rapid compellent or deterrent initiatives toward Iraq no longer could take place with the certainty of escalation dominance.

In a number of interviews following his resignation Scott Ritter made a series of further allegations, saying he believed Kofi Annan had secretly promised Baghdad that intrusive inspections of the disputed “presidential sites” would take place only once within a four month timeframe. If true, such a deal would have effectively created safe havens for the Iraqis to hide weapons and material.⁹⁸

Deterrence/Compellence Threats, Probes and Responses:

On 9 September 1998 the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1194⁹⁹, condemning the decision by Iraq of 5 August to suspend co-operation with UNSCOM and the IAEA. The Council also decided not to conduct the six-monthly review of sanctions scheduled for October 1998, or any further reviews, until Iraq rescinded its decision.¹⁰⁰ As a potential incentive to Baghdad, the Resolution offered the prospect of a comprehensive review of the state of Iraqi compliance if co-operation resumed.

Iraq was initially keen on the idea of a review, believing it would accelerate the lifting of sanctions by demonstrating that most of the requirements had been met. However, it soon became clear that the United States had refused to include in the terms of the review any reference to paragraph 22 of Security Council Resolution 687, which stipulated that the oil embargo would be lifted once Iraq was declared free of WMD.¹⁰¹ Baghdad declared the terms of the review to be too restrictive and refused to co-operate.

Iraqi Deputy Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz said on 28 September 1998: "The idea of a comprehensive review is not a reward to be given to Iraq and then Iraq has to make concessions before such a review takes place. When the review

is conducted in an honest and professional manner, we hope that it will lead to the lifting of sanctions."¹⁰²

In October 1998 the UN Assistant Secretary-General and Chief UN Relief Coordinator for Iraq, Denis Halliday, resigned in protest at the impact of sanctions on the Iraqi population.¹⁰³ The lack of blame attached to Saddam Hussein for any of the side-effects from sanctions, such as the suffering and death of children, is instructive regarding the overall UN position as it evolved across the exchanges included in this study. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan held direct talks with Iraqi officials during early October 1998 in an attempt to resolve the impasse over weapons inspections, but failed to make progress.¹⁰⁴ The Iraqi ambassador to the United Nations, Nizar Hamdoon, reiterated Baghdad's refusal to hand over a document sought by UN weapons inspectors.¹⁰⁵ And on 31 October Iraq's ruling Ba'ath party and Revolutionary Command Council declared an end to all cooperation with UNSCOM and the restriction of the IAEA to monitoring activities only. The UN continued efforts to defuse the crisis with Iraq.¹⁰⁶

On November 2, 1998, Tony Blair repeated his warning to Saddam Hussein, who had halted co-operation with UN weapons inspectors -- "If the use of force is necessary that is the course that will be taken," he said. Defence Secretary George Robertson already had warned President Hussein to stop obstructing UN weapons inspections or 'face the consequences'".¹⁰⁷ These threats were followed on 5 November with the

passage of a UN Security Council Resolution 1205¹⁰⁸, condemning Iraq's decision as a “flagrant violation of resolution 687 [the cease-fire resolution of 1991] and other relevant resolutions,” and demanding that Iraq provide “immediate, complete and unconditional co-operation” with UNSCOM and the IAEA.¹⁰⁹ The possibility of a comprehensive review of sanctions was kept open to encourage Iraq to comply.

The threat of military action was reinforced on 11 November 1998 when it was announced that all UNSCOM personnel had been withdrawn from Iraq on the recommendation of the United States.¹¹⁰ The Secretary General and Arab leaders put additional pressure on Saddam by urging Iraq to find a diplomatic solution to the crisis. This was followed by a statement by eight Arab states, including Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Syria, warning President Saddam Hussein that he would be “solely responsible” for the consequences of his non-compliance.¹¹¹ This introduction of new actors into the confrontation – including several with established anti-US and -UK reputations – represented a qualitative change at both psychological and material levels for Saddam Hussein. The strong statement of the Arab states had high credibility in voicing disapproval and warned of Iraq’s isolation in the event that things got out of hand.

In a Veterans Day speech at Arlington National Cemetery, President Clinton made clear that US military action was a possibility if the weapons inspectors, UNSCOM, were not allowed to carry out their work.¹¹² The final component of the threat was issued on the afternoon of 14 November -- the American and British Governments authorized “substantial military action” against Iraq and an initial wave of strike aircraft was launched. Simultaneously, the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General in Baghdad, Prakash Shah, was involved in a last-ditch attempt to find a diplomatic

solution by providing Iraq with a face-saving formula. Although Kofi Annan could not personally attempt another mediation mission to Baghdad without Security Council authorization, he insisted on sending a personal letter to the regime in Baghdad through his Special Representative, stating his conviction that “Iraq [should] be allowed to join the community of nations free of sanctions.”¹¹³

Outcome (deterrence/compellence failure):

Just hours before the first strikes were due the response from Baghdad arrived, declaring that Iraq was willing to comply with UN demands. Upon receiving further clarification from Iraq that it agreed to comply unconditionally and to rescind its earlier decisions to halt co-operation, the United States and UK called off the strikes, but warned that their forces would remain ready to act.

UNSCOM inspectors returned to Iraq on 17 November 1998, with the UNSCOM Executive Chairman, Richard Butler, declaring that full Iraqi co-operation would enable the inspectors to complete their work on chemical weapons inside two to three months, before long-term monitoring could be put in place. Unfortunately, the apparent victory was short lived.

On December 8, Chief UN Weapons Inspector Richard Butler declared Iraqi officials were still impeding inspections.¹¹⁴ In his official report submitted on 15 December 1998 the Executive Chairman of UNSCOM wrote to the UN Secretary-General with an updated report on the state of Iraqi compliance since the resumption of cooperation in mid-November.¹¹⁵ This report, which became known as the "Butler report", asserted that Iraq's claims to have fulfilled its disarmament obligations could not

be accepted without further verification. It stated that the Iraqi Government had provided some clarifications sought by the Commission, but that in general Iraq had "not provided the full co-operation it promised on 14 November 1998." Moreover, the report concluded: "Iraq's conduct ensured that no progress was able to be made in either the fields of disarmament or accounting for its prohibited weapons programs."¹¹⁶

On 16 December 1998 at around 2200 hours Greenwich Mean Time (GMT), American and British forces initiated military action against Iraq in response to the refusal of the Baghdad Government to comply with United Nations weapons inspectors. The operation ended on 19 December, just prior to the onset of the Islamic holy month of Ramadan, which lasted from 20 December until 19 January 1999. In a televised address on 16 December President Clinton declared that the action, called Operation "Desert Fox" was "designed to degrade Saddam's capacity to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction and to degrade his ability to threaten his neighbours."¹¹⁷ Prime Minister Tony Blair also issued a statement on 16 December, saying: "There is no realistic alternative to military force. We are taking this military action with real regret but also with real determination. We have exhausted all other avenues. We act because we must."¹¹⁸ However, the air strikes provoked a strong response from some countries, in particular Russia, which recalled its ambassadors from the United States and UK in protest. China also criticized the action.

As the air strikes began on 16 December, the UN Security Council met in emergency session to discuss developments.¹¹⁹ Russia and China stated their opposition to military action. The Russian Ambassador to the UN "rejected outright" the justifications given by the United States and UK and declared that no one country could

act for the Council or "assume the role of a world policeman", Russian President Boris Yeltsin demanded an end to the US/UK strikes, Beijing also condemned the attacks and in the UN, the motion met severe criticism.¹²⁰

On December 19 military operations in Iraq were called off by President Clinton who suggested that the objectives had been achieved. Clinton said, "I am confident that we have achieved our mission. We have inflicted significant damage on Saddam's weapons of mass destruction."¹²¹

In the aftermath of the air strikes Iraq sought to demonstrate that it was unbowed by the US and British action. On 21 December 1998 the Iraqi Vice President, Taha Yasin Ramadan, declared Iraq was no longer willing to co-operate with the UN inspectors, saying: "all that has to do with inspection, monitoring, and weapons of mass destruction is now behind us."¹²² Iraq declared that UNSCOM would never be allowed to return.¹²³

Exchange # 6 – 8 November 2002 to April 2003

UNSC 1441 and Operation Iraqi Freedom

Background:

In December 1999, the UNSC replaced UNSCOM with UNMOVIC, the 'monitoring, verification and inspection commission.' Iraqi officials rejected the move and continued to refuse any and all inspections. Periodic talks collapsed over the next two years, with the final straw for Washington coming on July 5, 2002 when Iraq-UN talks in Vienna broke down without any agreement.

On September 12, 2002 President Bush addressed the UN and issued the first formal threat of military action if Iraq failed to comply with 17 UN resolutions. This was followed on September 16 with formal acceptance by Iraq of the 'unconditional' return of UN inspectors.¹²⁴ Formal negotiations between the UN and Iraqi officials resumed on September 30 but Iraq insisted on leaving eight presidential compounds off-limits. The deal was rejected by US officials who insisted on a final UN resolution before the return of inspectors.¹²⁵

On November 8, the UNSC voted unanimously to endorse 1441, declaring Iraq in "material breach" and reinstating inspectors after a four year absence. Saddam Hussein issues a formal reply on November 13 to the UN Secretary General accepting the conditions outlined in the resolution. Five days later UNMOVIC weapons inspectors arrived in Baghdad.

Deterrence/Compellence Threats, Probes and Responses in a Multilateral Context:

Clearly, the prerequisite for a return of UNMOVIC inspectors to Baghdad was UNSCR 1441. But to get unanimous consensus on 1441, other permanent members of the UN Security Council (France, Russia and China) needed a push -- the threat of unilateral deployment by the United States and UK of close to 100,000 troops to Kuwait, Qatar and Turkey. And the prerequisite for such a substantial and sustained deployment of American troops to the region began with the 'multilateral' domestic support George W. Bush obtained in the 2002 midterm elections -- the first time since 1934 that a sitting President's party picked up seats in the House during their first term, and the first time ever to pick up enough seats in the Senate to become the majority party. This level of

public support for Bush's foreign and security policy was essential for building multilateral consensus within Bush's cabinet, within the Republican leadership, rank and file Republicans in the House and Senate, the Democratic opposition and, ultimately, the American public.

The momentum was pushed further when the Senate voted on October 11, 2002, 77-23 authorizing President Bush "to use all means that he determines to be appropriate, including force, in order to enforce the United Nations Security Council Resolutions (regarding Iraq), defend the national security interests of the United States against the threat posed by Iraq, and restore international peace and security in the region." The House added its support to Bush's evolving 'multilateral' coalition by approving an identical resolution 296-133. The passage of these two resolutions was driven by a very strong conviction held by a significant majority of political leaders in both parties that the only way to get France, Russia, China (and other non-permanent members of the UN Security Council) to accept UNSC 1441 was to convey to these leaders US commitment to respond (alone if necessary) to what Americans perceived at the time as a growing threat to their security after 9/11.

The deployment by the United States and UK of close to 100,000 troops to Kuwait and Qatar established the credibility of US/UK resolve -- without those threats, and the fear in Paris, Moscow and Beijing that their substantial economic interests in a post-Saddam Iraq were in jeopardy, the UN would not have come close to achieving a unanimous resolution.

Saddam Hussein allowed UNMOVIC inspectors back into Iraq in 2002 (with a significantly more robust mandate than UNSCOM) as a direct consequence of the

application by the United States and UK of credible and resolute coercive diplomacy throughout this entire period. Take away the coercive threat of unilateral action at each stage and none of this 'multilateral' momentum (domestic or international) would have materialized. Unless compelled into action by coercive military threats of unilateralism, or until the interests and priorities of those directly affected by the intervention are sufficiently accommodated by offers of political rewards, financial assistance (grants and loans), or economic, foreign or military aid, there is very little chance the United States would have succeeded in producing the multilateral consensus in 2003 (or 1999, 1998, 1995, 1991, etc.). Multilateral coercion requires a major push, and "that push often requires coercive threats of unilateral action by major powers".¹²⁶

Outcome (compellence failure and war)

The problem with multilateral approaches to deterrence is that they are significantly more difficult to sustain over time, and even more difficult when coercion begins to have a direct impact on core interests of those in the original coalition. Saddam began to misinterpret French, Chinese and Russian reluctance to support a second resolution as a clear indication that the UNSC would prevent war.

As all of the previous exchanges demonstrated, successful coercive diplomacy requires effective communication (e.g., an explicit threat of "serious consequences" and a timeline for compliance), a clear commitment to the issue(s) at stake, the capability to impose sufficiently painful military costs on the opponent, and the resolve to carry through on ones threats.¹²⁷ But heavy reliance on multilateral consensus as the benchmark for a 'legitimate' application of force occasionally undermines the credibility

and effectiveness of coercive threats, because opponents may mistakenly conclude that ‘legitimacy’ and ‘credibility’ are linked, when in reality they are not. The mistake that ultimately led to the demise of Saddam Hussein (and Slobodan Milosevic in 1998) was the assumption that the US-UK threat lacked credibility because it did not satisfy the requirements for legitimacy. Because of this miscalculation, Saddam underestimated (a) the probability of an attack that did not first obtain UN endorsement, and (b) the risks of non-compliance. Saddam dismissed what at the time was a very credible military threat by US/UK and overestimated the capacity of France, Russia and China to prevent the war from starting. Ironically, the obligation to demonstrate US-UK resolve became even more pronounced in light of efforts by France and Russia to deny legitimacy – from the point of view of Washington officials, this was the precedent setting case for establishing the credibility required to successfully manage and prevent threats from Iraq and other rogue regimes.

This completes the narrative analysis of the six exchanges between the US-led coalition and Iraq.

4. Observations, or, Lessons for Complex Deterrence

Deterrence and compellence succeeded and failed in each case for all the right reasons, consistent with expectations derived from the standard four condition model of deterrence theory. The first exchange, in which all conditions for deterrence were present, proved successful for the United States and UK. The coalition compelled Iraq to accept the southern NFZ and deterred it from attacking Shiites in Southern Iraq. This is especially impressive support for deterrence theory because there is some ‘white noise’

along the way, namely, equivocation by the president regarding how long the United States would remain committed if troops had to be deployed. But strong follow-up statements, which showed high levels of credibility and intensity of response, proved sufficient. In the second exchange, we notice escalation from words to deeds. Bombing raids and cruise missile attacks became necessary and represent deterrence by punishment. As a result of these actions, Saddam Hussein accepted the NFZ and eschewed attacking Shiites in Southern Iraq. Success in the third exchange revealed further escalation in the commitment of capabilities, ultimately producing a very explicit show of compliance by Iraq. This noteworthy act of termination to the exchange serves as strong confirmation for deterrence theory; Iraq went out of its way to prevent any miscommunication that could lead to a US-led attack.

Results in the next three exchanges began to change and combined to hint at ultimate failure by the United States and UK to deter Saddam Hussein. Mixed results occur in the fourth exchange. Support from France, Russia and China evaporated at this point as the confrontation between Iraq and the United States became even more militarized than before. Saddam gave up on his efforts toward compellence (i.e., no longer shooting at coalition fighters enforcing flight exclusion zones), but maintained a military presence just outside the NFZ. This partial achievement of compellence hinted at what was to come.

Exchange 5 featured very strong US actions that compelled Iraq to accept IAEA and USSCOM inspectors, but an important subtext also emerged: increasingly public commentary by China and others about no “green light” for the use of force in the future. Although the United States succeeded in the short-term, things turned around. The

United States and UK engaged in air strikes in response to Iraqi non-compliance on inspections. Iraq, however, remained defiant after the strikes ended, in all likelihood because of limited damage and major political gains from standing up to the United States and UK in that context.

Exchange 6 began well and ended badly for the United States and UK, now very much on their own in efforts to deter Iraq. Inspectors came back in at one stage, but miscommunication between Saddam Hussein on the one hand and the anti-war powers (Russia, China and France) on the other distorted Iraq's perception of the threat from the United States and UK. Hussein's overestimation of the power of Russia, France and China to stop an attack on Iraq led to the failure of compellence, full-scale war and his ultimate downfall.

After this review of events, it is clear that George and Smoke (1974) are still right -- deterrence fails over time and through stages. Their assertions anticipate this volume's focus on complex deterrence. A direct answer to the question posed at the outset of this chapter now can be provided: Deterrence remains relevant even in a complex security environment, although at times failure is to be expected when conditions for its implementation are not satisfied.

One aspect of complex deterrence that comes out in this case is the 'game within the game'. While the United States and UK attempted to deter or compel Iraq on various points, Iraq also probed its adversaries for weakness. Probes were a natural and almost inevitable feature of Iraq-US-UK-UN confrontation throughout the period in question, so successes and failures must be interpreted and evaluated in this context. Contextual meaning must be assigned to deterrence rivalries to acknowledge the content and

theoretical relevance of probes and their significance for linking probes, retaliations and outcomes to determinations of success and failure. Probes also provide an opportunity to demonstrate resolve, credibility and commitment, so their occurrence can not be viewed exclusively as an illustration of deterrence failure (in terms of both theory and strategy). In the absence of retaliation following probes, the theory predicts failure as opponents exploit weakness to demonstrate their own success.

States, no matter how powerful, rarely have the capacity to sustain credible threats over time without experiencing a few probes -- the exceptions to this rule are nuclear rivalries between advanced nuclear powers. Probes, therefore, should be expected because opponents in conventional rivalries rarely know precisely what the red line conditions are until the point of retaliation. Now, if the behavior (e.g., an attack) continues despite the presence of credible and resolute commitments then that would constitute grounds for failure of the theory.

As with Kosovo, the Iraq case reveals that no threat is better than weak threats because the latter led to escalation as opponents exploit weakness to demonstrate power, relevance and control. This logic is consistent with the Chain Store Paradox (CSP), a prominent game-theoretic model that emphasizes multiple players, sequential interactions and updating of beliefs regarding the other player as a function of prior behavior. For such reasons, the CSP may be a more relevant tool for the analysis of deterrence and compellence than more standard treatments based on Chicken or Prisoners Dilemma.

Deterrence complexity is an important yet still largely unexplored subject -- behavior throughout the pre-Iraq 2003 crisis was a direct consequence of interactions in the previous ten years. Comprehending the failure of 2003 is impossible without a clear

understanding of successes and failures and associated interactions over this entire decade long rivalry. Viewed in this context, US/UK/EU/UN and Iraqi calculations, perceptions and miscalculations are better understood. Iraq updated beliefs about coalitional breakdown, but went too far and engaged in wishful thinking about the implications regarding an attack by the United States and UK. It happened anyway.

Deterrence complexity in this case also helps to explain some of the apparent logical underpinnings and inconsistencies identified by Jervis (2003) -- e.g., Washington was convinced it could deter Saddam from using nuclear weapons, but also believed Saddam could deter Washington if he had them. But Jervis addresses only one small part of the deterrence puzzle in this case, because there were multiple, inter-related deterrence and compellence threats and objectives playing out. The US-UK coalition was attempting to send a multiplicity of simultaneous signals about their commitments, resolve and credibility to different target audiences: Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi military and other members of his regime, the Iraqi people, other terrorist groups and rogue states, other opponents in the Middle East, friends and foes in the European alliance, other members of the UNSC; etc. Moreover, deterrence in this case was about preventing nuclear weapons acquisition and related threats to the United States and allies; chemical and biological weapons acquisition and threats; etc. The United States was trying to simultaneously:

- deter the use and spread WMD
- deter threats against Israel
- compel France, Germany, Russia, China to accept 1441
- etc.

The behavior that appears to represent a logical inconsistency can be explained in the context of a more comprehensive understanding of the multiplicity of threats the United States was facing at the time and the various deterrence and compellence objectives that evolved.

The exchanges should be viewed separately for purposes of testing because of their distinct outcomes. This point helps to explain inconsistencies across existing data sets.

The protracted crisis approach is a much better way to test deterrence because it avoids neverending debates over single exchanges.

5. Conclusions

Deterrence remains relevant to the complex security environment of today. As will become apparent, three of the four of the assumptions of the deterrence paradigm (Paul, this volume) are confirmed by the present case.

Among the assumptions of the paradigm, the first is that states function in this case as rational actors. When exchanges are put under a microscope rather than being collapsed into a single case, cost-benefit calculations become clear in each instance. Among the states involved, it is especially interesting that Iraq is the one stereotyped at times as 'irrational' and ruled by a 'mad dictator' until his overthrow and execution. But in terms of instrumental rationality, it would be difficult to find a more prudent performance than the one put in by Saddam Hussein as he confronted a series of three American presidents from 1991 to 2003. During each of the six stages, he appeared to follow the advice given by the coach to the team's quarterback at the start of every football game: 'take what the defense gives you'.

Despite obvious losses in the Gulf War, Saddam was able to acquire sufficient resources to sustain and augment his power/regime, respond to Kurdish and Shiite insurgencies in the North and South, respectively, and continue developing an advanced WMD program (including a sophisticated nuclear program) that UNMOVIC, the CIA and MI6 seriously underestimated and slowly uncovered through a decade of inspections in the '90s.

Saddam successfully abused and exploited the UN's internally corrupt oil-for-food program amassing an additional \$10 billion in wealth, with a great deal of help from preferred customers -- France, China and Russia (Harvey 2004). Saddam's support from allies on the UNSC exceeded Washington's. In fact, Saddam's major power allies were more than willing to accept lucrative contracts and preferential treatment in exchange for their pressure on Washington to ease sanctions. Several high ranking UN officials were found to be on the payroll as well.

Moreover, Saddam was clearly winning the public relations battle against the US/UK -- Iraq's spin on who deserved all of the blame for the effects of sanctions convinced Osama bin Laden that Iraq should be included among the grievances inciting the 9/11 attacks.

Things were going very well for Saddam (not to mention Paris, Beijing and Moscow) up to the point at which UNSC 1441 was signed declaring Saddam in 'Material Breach'. It was at this late point that Saddam mistakenly assumed the support he was receiving from key allies would be sufficient, in terms of both credibility and capability, to deter the US/UK/Australia/EU (new Europe) coalition from attacking. He was wrong, but for reasons entirely consistent with Rapid Deployment Teams -- he miscalculated his

capability at the very last stage, but everything he did up to that point was perfectly reasonable and entirely rational. The only thing Saddam had to do to avoid failure at the last stage in 2003 was what precisely what Momar Kadafi did in 2002 -- relinquish the country's WMD program and open up the entire state to comprehensive inspections. It was really that simple.

In sum, Saddam Hussein looked remarkably obedient to the strictures of deterrence theory and ended up in disaster only because of misperception caused by an error in calculating resolve on the basis of a coalitional breakdown that appeared to reduce greatly the likelihood of war. The strident anti-war positions of China, Russia and France, along with their considerable power, created an illusion of authority through which it proved difficult to see.¹²⁸

Another axiom of the paradigm, which asserts that deterrence operates mainly among states, is confirmed. While the UN played an intermediary role, and the activities of Secretary General Kofi Annan should not be overlooked, it is clear that the decisive exchanges involved the great powers, with the United States in the foremost position, along with a major regional power, Iraq.

Rivalry, the third assumption, is perhaps the most easily confirmed by this case. The United States and Iraq sparred with each other for almost 15 years, on and off, before regime change occurred. Each state waited eagerly for its next opportunity to gain advantage over the other, with non-existent trust and near-constant risk of war.

Fourth, and finally, is the axiom regarding conventional, chemical/biological and nuclear weapons as different layers of deterrence as calculated by states. The six

exchanges leave this matter unclear. It is certain that much of the conflict surrounded efforts on the part of the coalition to discover Iraq's WMDs. But it is not clear that the quasi-endowment of Iraq with these weapons, which may have existed mostly in the minds of its adversaries anyway, played a role in determining strategy and tactics on the part of the nuclear powers at various stages of confrontation. Instead, the latter seemed willing to run the risk of a chemical or biological weapons attack in their quest to force Iraq to back off from abusing its population and reveal more about its military infrastructure.

Overall, the implications of this study may best be summarized as follows:

1. Deterrence encounters are complex and multidimensional.
2. The mixed forms are likely to remain as long as the power disparity in the international system is so huge and asymmetric wars are likely to happen.
3. Near-unipolarity means that the United States will try to compel and deter at the same time; success or failure may be based on how complex the situation is and how clear the vital interests are and how effectively threats can be used.
4. If threats are difficult to execute, deterrence/compellence may not happen.

Complex deterrence is a paradigm that recognizes multiple actors and iterations as reality within the contemporary security environment. The case of Iraq now is unfolding in a different way, with non-state actors coming to the fore in terms of concerns about deterrence and compellence. Complications such as value-oriented utility may arise in confrontation with non-state actors who espouse messianic goals. Only time will tell, but it is hoped that the present study will provide some lessons to the paradigm with relevance for the future.

Notes¹

-
- ¹ Paul Huth and Bruce Russett, What makes deterrence work? Cases from 1900-1980. *World Politics* (1984) 36:496-526; Deterrence failure and crisis escalation. *International Studies Quarterly* (1988); 32:29-45; Testing deterrence theory: Rigor makes a difference. *World Politics* (1989) 42:466-501; Richard N. Lebow and Janice Gross Stein, Beyond deterrence. *Journal of Social Issues* (1989); 435-71; Rational deterrence theory: I think, therefore I deter. *World Politics* (1989); 41:208-24; When does deterrence succeed and how do we know? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 28-April 1, London; Deterrence: The elusive dependent variable. *World Politics* (1990): 42:336-69.
- ² Frank P. Harvey, Practicing Coercion: Revisiting Successes And Failures Using Boolean Logic And Comparative Methods. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* Vol. 43, No. 6. (Dec., 1999): 866.
- ³ Paul (this volume) collapses these conditions into three premises: “a deterrer should have sufficient capability; its threat should be credible; and it should be able to communicate the threat to its opponent.” These premises for success are nearly identical to those noted in the text, although Condition A makes the requirements imposed in this chapter more restrictive. It recognizes an additional complication – the inability of the target to comprehend what is unacceptable behavior – that appears in a range of cases.
- ⁴ Frank P. Harvey, Rigor mortis or rigor, more tests: Necessity, sufficiency, and deterrence logic. *International Studies Quarterly* (1998): 42:675-707; Harvey, Practicing Coercion.
- ⁵ <http://www.fas.org/news/un/iraq/sres/sres0688.htm>
- ⁶ http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/provide_comfort.htm
- ⁷ <http://www.fas.org/news/un/iraq/sres/sres0687.htm>; NY Times, April 10, 1991, p. A-12.
- ⁸ NY Times, April 11, 1991, p.A-10.
- ⁹ <http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers/1991/91041102.html>
- ¹⁰ NY Times, April 12, 1991, A-6.
- ¹¹ Kenneth Katzman, "Iran and Iraq: U.S. National Security Problems Since the Gulf War -- A Chronology", Washington, Congressional Research Service, CRS 93-638F, July 8, 1993.) -- <http://www.pennyhill.com/iran/94-561f.html>
- ¹² NY Times, April 14, 1991, A-1.

13 <http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/papers/1991/91041608.html>.

14 Katzman, "Iran and Iraq," p. 20; see also, U.S. State Department Dispatch --
15 <http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/erc/briefing/dispatch/1991/html/Dispatchv2no16.html>
16 NY Times, April 18, A-16; NY Times, April 22, 1991, A-1; NY Times, April 23,
17 A-1
18 NY Times, April 22, 1991, A-8.
19 Katzman, "Iran and Iraq", p. 20.
20 *Ibid.*; NY Times, April 24, A-10
21 The NYT editorial noted the political motivation behind this Iraqi concession, and
22 expressed doubt regarding the intentions behind the about-face. (NY Times, April
23 25, A-1); NY Times, April 25, A-12.
24 President George H.W. Bush, "Excerpts from Bush's Talk: Iraqi Air Zone is Off-
25 Limits", *New York Times*, August 27, 1992, A14.
26 William E. Schmidt, "Iraq Says it is Ready to Fight Allies over Air Zone", *New*
27 *York Times*, August 27, 1992, A14.
28 Michael R. Gordon, "U.S. Shoots Down an Iraqi Warplane in No-Flight Zone",
29 *New York Times*, December 28, 1992, A1.
30 *Ibid.*, A11.
31 Michael, R. Gordon, "U.S. Sends Jets to Iraq Zone from a Carrier off Africa",
New York Times, December 29, 1992, A4.
Michael R. Gordon, "Iraq Given Friday Deadline on Missiles", *New York Times*,
Thursday, January 6, 1993, A8.
Eric Schmitt, "U.S. Tries to Verify Compliance as Iraqi Missile Deadline
Passes", *New York Times*, Saturday, January 9, 1993, A6; Michael R. Gordon,
"U.S. Says Baghdad Removed Missiles", *New York Times*, Sunday, January 10,
1993, A10.
Youssef M. Ibrahim, "Iraqi Aide Defends Removal of Equipment in Border
Zone", *New York Times*, Tuesday, January 12, 1993, A2.
Michael R. Gordon, "Bush Said to Plan Air Strike on Iraq over its Defiance", *New*
York Times, Wednesday, January 13, 1993, A1, A2.
R.W Apple, Jr. "U.S. and Allied Planes hit Iraq, Bombing Missile Sites in South
in Reply to Hussein's Defiance", *New York Times*, Thursday, January 14, 1993,
A1.
Eric Schmitt, "Allied Strike: Swift and Unchallenged", *New York Times*,
Thursday, January 14, 1993, A8.
Michael R. Gordon, "Hitting Hussein With a Stick, Keeping a Sledgehammer
Ready", *New York Times*, Thursday, January 14, 1993, A8.

32 Thomas L. Friedman, "U.S. Leads Further Attacks on Iraqi Antiaircraft Sites; Admits its Missile Hit Hotel", *New York Times*, Tuesday, January 19, 1993, A1.

33 Michael R. Gordon, "Iraq Says It Won't Attack Planes and Agrees to U.N. Flight Terms", *New York Times*, Wednesday, January 20, 1993.

34 Michael R. Gordon, "U.S. Sends Force as Iraqi Soldiers Threaten Kuwait", *New York Times*, October 8, 1994, A1.

35 Ibid., A1.

36 Barbara Crossette, "Iraqi Denounces Sanctions", *New York Times*, October 8, 1994, A6.

37 Ibid., A6.

38 Gordon, "U.S. Sends Force as Iraqi Soldiers Threaten Kuwait", A6.

39 Michael R. Gordon, "Pentagon Moving a Force of 4,000 to Guard Kuwait", *New York Times*, October 9, 1994, A1.

40 Ibid., A10

41 Security Council Statement, S/PRST/1994/58, October 8, 1994.

42 Robert S. Greenberger, "Clinton Orders More Soldiers to Persian Gulf", *The Wall Street Journal*, October 10, 1994, A14.

43 Ibid., A14

44 Douglas Jehl, "Clinton's Line in the Sand", *New York Times*, October 10, 1994, A1.

45 Jeffrey H. Birnbaum, "U.S. Dispatches More Aircraft to Persian Gulf", *The Wall Street Journal*, October 11, 1994, A3

46 President William J. Clinton, "Transcript of Clinton's Address: No Evidence the Iraqis Have Pulled Back", *New York Times*, October 11, 1994, A11.

47 Michael R. Gordon, "Keeping the Iraqis Back", *New York Times*, October 11, 1994, A12.

48 Robert S. Greenberger, "U.S. Plan to Block Future Iraqi Moves on Kuwait Amid Signs of Withdrawal", *The Wall Street Journal*, October 12, 1994, A3.

49 Michael R. Gordon, "U.S. Sees Signs of Iraqi Retreat but Continues Buildup", *New York Times*, October 12, 1994, A1.

50 Robert S. Greenberger, "U.S. Plan Would Bar Elite Iraqi Units from Moving Toward Kuwait Again", *The Wall Street Journal*, October 13, 1994, A18.

51 Elaine Sciolino, "U.S. Offers Plan to Avoid Threat from Iraq Again", *New York Times*, October 12, 1994.

52 Some Pentagon officials called the 'containment plan' "speculative", because the US did not want to encourage Iraq to test its resolve to uphold the zone by sending in one or two tanks at a time, and because the US feared creating a

-
- “military vacuum” in southern Iraq that could result in the dismemberment of the country. See *Ibid.*, A16.
- 53 Michael R. Gordon, “U.S. Plans to Keep Planes and Tanks in the Gulf Area”, *New York Times*, October 14, 1994, A1.
- 54 Joseph B. Treaster, “Marines Stage Desert Exercise in Show of Force”, *New York Times*, October 14, 1994, A16.
- 55 Barbara Crossette, “U.S. is Demanding a Quick U.N. Vote on Iraqi Pullback”, *New York Times*, October 15, 1994, A1; Barbara Crossette, “Security Council Condemns Iraqi’s Threat to Kuwait”, *New York Times*, October 16, 1994, A12.
- 56 Security Council Resolution 949, S/RES/949, 15 October, 1994.
- 57 Youssef M. Ibrahim, “Iraq Signals Acceptance of U.N. Move”, *New York Times*, October 17, 1994, A10.
- 58 NY Times, Aug.31, 1996, p.A1.
- 59 NY Times, Aug.31, 1996, p.A1, A2.
- 60 NY Times, Aug.31, 1996, p.A2.
- 61 <http://edition.cnn.com/WORLD/9608/30/us.troops.gulf/index.html>.
- 62 NY Times, Sept. 1, 1996, p.A1). See also CRS Issue Brief: August 1996 Crisis: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/crs/94-049.htm>).
- 63 NY Times, Sept. 1, 1996, p.A8.
- 64 NY Times, Sept. 2, 1996, p.A1, A6 and CNN.com: “Clinton Signs off on Military Action in Iraq” <http://edition.cnn.com/WORLD/9609/02/iraq.update/>).
- 65 CRS Issue Brief: August 1996 Crisis: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/crs/94-049.htm> and NY Times, Sept. 3, 1996, p.A1, A6). The Dept. of Defence Briefings from that day can be found at: http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/1996/t090396_t0903dst.html and http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/1996/t090396_t0903asd.html
- 66 <http://www.clintonfoundation.org/legacy/090396-speech-by-president-to-national-guard-association.htm>
- 67 <http://www.clintonfoundation.org/legacy/090396-presidential-statement-on-action-against-iraq.htm>).
- 68 NY Times, Sept. 4, 1996, p.A8, A10.
- 69 NY Times, Sept. 4, 1996, p.A10.
- 70 NY Times, Sept. 5, 1996, p.A10.
- 71 NY Times, Sept. 4, 1996, p.A1, A8.
- 72 NY Times, Sept. 4, 1996, p.A9.

- 73 Clinton's remarks on Iraq from Sept. 4 can be found at:
<http://www.clintonfoundation.org/legacy/090496-remarks-by-president-on-iraq-at-lunch-meeting.htm> . See also NY Times, Sept. 4, 1996, p.A1, A8; and CRS Issue Brief: August 1996 Crisis:
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/report/crs/94-049.htm>).
- 74 NY Times, Sept. 5, 1996, p.A1.
- 75 NY Times, Sept. 14, 1996, p.A1.
- 76 NY Times, Sept. 14, 1996, p.A1) As the NY Times stated, "after several days of taunting the United States, the Iraqis appeared today to be backing down..." (NY Times, Sept. 14, 1996, p.A3).
- 77 "The Strike" <http://edition.cnn.com/WORLD/9609/gulf.strike/index.html#strike>
"The Lead Up" <http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/9608/30/us.troops.gulf/index.html>
"The Attack" <http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/9608/31/iraq/>
- 78 "Annan Signs Deal with Iraq."
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/events/crisis_in_the_gulf/latest_news/newsid_59000/59232.stm
- 79 "Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations and the Republic of Iraq", 23 February 1998, as quoted in Tim Youngs and Mark Oakes. *Iraq: 'Desert Fox' and Policy Developments - Research Paper 99/13*. International Affairs and Defence Section, UK House of Commons Library, 10 February, 1999, p. 9-10.
- 80 Ibid, p.10.
- 81 UNSC Resolution 1154 (fulltext). [http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/RES/1154%20\(1998\)&Lang=E&Area=UNDOC](http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/RES/1154%20(1998)&Lang=E&Area=UNDOC)
- 82 UN Security Council Resolution 1154 (1998), as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.10 and available online at
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/crisis_in_the_gulf/61499.stm
- 83 Financial Times, 4 March 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.10. and "China says UN Iraq Resolution Doesn't Allow Automatic use of Force."
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/world/monitoring/newsid_61000/61626.stm
- 84 Ibid, 9 March 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.10.
- 85 "UN Divided over Action Against Iraq."
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/crisis_in_the_gulf/61576.stm
- 86 "New UN Weapons Teams Arrive in Baghdad."
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/62385.stm
- 87 *Daily Telegraph*, 18 April 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.10.
- 88 Youngs and Oakes, p.11.

89 Ibid, p.11.

90 “Iraq’s Statement.” <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/monitoring/146208.stm>

91 See document from Aug. 5 1998.

92 “Butler: No Crisis with Iraq.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/145102.stm and “US Dismisses
Iraqi Action.” http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/146169.stm

93 “UN Weapons Inspector Resigns, Guns Blazing”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/159276.stm

94 *Sunday Telegraph*, 27 September 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p. 11.

95 *Irish Times*, 28 August 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.12.

96 *Associated Press*, 1 September 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.12.

97 *Guardian*, 28 August 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.12.

98 For more detail on Scott Ritter's allegations see “Scott Ritter's Private War,” Peter
J. Boyer, *The New Yorker*, 9 November 1998.

99 UNSC Resolution 1194 (fulltext). [http://daccess-
ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/RES/1194%20\(1998\)&Lang=E&Area=U
NDOC](http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/RES/1194%20(1998)&Lang=E&Area=UNDOC)

100 “Security Council Cancels Review of Iraq Sanctions.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/168129.stm and
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/168134.stm

101 *Financial Times*, 29 September 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.15.

102 *Financial Times*, 29 September 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.15.

103 *Middle East International*, 13 November 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes,
p.16.

104 “Iraq and the UN: The Standoff Continues.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/188764.stm and “The UN Continues
Efforts to Defuse the Crisis with Iraq”
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/185507.stm>

105 “Iraq Refuses UN Request on Weapons Document.”
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/194536.stm>

106 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/monitoring/205206.stm> Also see document from
31 October 1998; <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/monitoring/205206.stm>

107 “UK Prepared to Use Force Against Iraq.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/205356.stm

108 UNSC Resolution 1205 (Fulltext). [http://daccess-
ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/RES/1205%20\(1998\)&Lang=E&Area=U
NDOC](http://daccess-ods.un.org/access.nsf/Get?Open&DS=S/RES/1205%20(1998)&Lang=E&Area=UNDOC)

109 UNSCR 1205 (1998).

110 UNSCOM Withdraws Monitors from Iraq.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/212123.stm

111 *Financial Times*, 13 November 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.18.

112 “Clinton Warns Iraq: Speech in Full.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/212578.stm and “Clinton Warning to Iraq.” http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/212416.stm

113 Ibid, 17 December 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.18.

114 “Iraq’s Inspection Block Unacceptable.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/231562.stm

115 "Letter from the Executive Chairman of UNSCOM to the Secretary-General of the United Nations", 15 December 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.24. (News Reports from this day are available at http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/iraq/1998/index_12_16.html)
<http://www.fas.org/news/un/iraq/s/butla216.htm>

116 See the December 15 documents.

117 *Financial Times*, 17 December 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.25.

118 "Statement by the Prime Minister, Mr. Tony Blair, Downing Street, London", Wednesday 16 December from FCO web site at <http://www.fco.gov.uk> , as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.25.

119 See December 16 1998 documents for UNSC Minutes and the US Announcement of the attacks.

120 “From Beijing, Condemnation of Iraq Attack.” BBC News online.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/> , as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.32; “Yeltsin Demands End to Strikes: Statement.”
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/monitoring/237086.stm>;
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/236871.stm; “UN Hears Calls for End to Raids.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/crisis_in_the_gulf/latest_news/236594.stm

121 “Iraq Bombing Completed.”
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/crisis_in_the_gulf/latest_news/238856.stm US government statements and US/global news reports from this day are available at: http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/iraq/1998/index_12_19.html)

122 *BBC Summary of World Broadcasts*, 21 December 1998, as quoted in Youngs and Oakes, p.36.

123 *History of the Department of State During the Clinton Presidency (1993-2001)*. The Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs,
<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/pubs/8528.htm> Excerpts from his speech can be found on the BBC at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/monitoring/240169.stm>

124 Saddam caves in on inspectors

125 US rejects Iraq inspections deal

126 Frank P. Harvey, *Smoke and Mirrors: Globalized Terrorism and the Illusion of Multilateral Security*, 2004. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

127 For a more complete discussion of the methodological and evidence-related requirements for evaluating success and failure, see Harvey, *Practicing Coercion*.

128 This characterization of Saddam Hussein is based on his tactics. At a strategic level, the story looks different. The long and costly war against Iran, the ultimately unsuccessful occupation of Kuwait, defiance of UN inspections and domestic repression look odious to the outside observer, but it is not the place of this study to make judgments about desired end-states. Instead, the focus is on deterrence and compellence over discrete intervals.