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Abstract
The Syrian regime used chemical weapons against its own citizens in 2013, and since then the U.S. has debated whether they should intervene or not. The purpose of this study is to find, analyze and explain the arguments presented by American politicians regarding the intervention in Syria. The study will be a qualitative and abductive desk study, that is done through a text analysis. This study will examine the different arguments from the politicians over the years and explain the arguments over the years through the theoretical lenses used. The theoretical lenses that will be used in thesis study is humanitarian intervention, democratic peace, just war, realism, and liberalism. The findings of this thesis will be arguments that are coming directly from the politicians, by looking into published statements, speeches, press-releases et cetera. This study will look into three selected representatives each from the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. What this study has found is that the representatives from the two parties present rather similar arguments for intervention as well as non-intervention in Syria. They argue that interventions are necessary for humanitarian reasons, as well as for protecting American national security and interests. For non-intervention they argued that the U.S. was not affected by the conflict, and that intervention would drag the U.S. into another war. The theoretical lenses in this study could all somewhat explain the arguments presented by the politicians, and it became clear that the politicians are stuck in the same pattern when it comes to policies on this issue. Thus, the American foreign policies regarding Syria became rather predictable. For future research it is necessary to find if this is true in other western countries, or if it is a phenomenon isolated to the U.S.
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In this file I present the sources which I have used for finding arguments presented by the politicians.
1. Introduction
The United States has on multiple occasions intervened in a foreign country with the ambition to improve the situation in that nation. Throughout the history, the U.S. has intervened in countries in Europe, Asia, Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, such as Vietnam, Laos, Iran, Persian Gulf, Panama, Iraq, Bosnia, Korea, Somalia, Macedonia, Haiti, and many more (Torreon, Plagakis, 2018).

The most recent intervention by the United States (U.S.) occurred in Syria. In 2013 the Syrian Bashar Al-Assad government attacked its own citizens with chemical weapons. This had been declared as a “red line” by president Barack Obama, meaning that if the Syrian government used chemical weapons the U.S. would have to intervene. Obama ordered an airstrike against Syrian targets (President Obamas full Syria Speech, 2013). Congress denied the authorization in 2013. However, congress authorized airstrikes against strategic targets in Syria with the aim to defeat the Islamic State in 2014 (Politico, 2017). This would be the starting point of U.S. intervention in Syria. The intervention in Syria has been both justified and condemned by different U.S. politicians over the years.

1.1. Previous Research and Research Problem

1.1.1 Previous Research
In one article written by Chang (Chang et al, 2011) the author asks themselves if there is an ethical specter to the American foreign policies. This challenge the realist idea of foreign policies. The realists claim that foreign policies should be determined from national interest, but this article argues that the ethical dimension might be what determines foreign policies. Furthermore, Chang mentions that the debate regarding foreign policies and interventions has shifted to focus on the moral responsibility of democracies, especially since the fall of the Soviet Union. The discussion reminds very much of the Responsibly to protect (R2P). Since the 1990’s, the international arena is no longer about the Soviet Union and the United States cold war, the focus is on what should be done if human rights are discriminated, and how the world can be improved (Chang 2011). This paper reflects on whether or not foreign intervention has shifted from national-interest realist thinking, to responsible and moral liberal thinking.

Another author, Erameh, argues that the R2P, which is a commitment by the U.N. to protect civilians from human rights violations that was created as a reaction of the lack of efficient intervention in both the Rwandan Genocide and the Kosovo killings, is the reason for modern
intervention. R2P claims that every state has a responsibility to protect all people in this world from genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. In the case of Syria, the government has used chemical weapons against their own citizens, which would, in accordance to this paper, be a reason for intervention. Furthermore, the Syrian regime violates Human rights and is unable to protect its citizens. This study discusses the R2P in Syria, Human rights and intervention, and the R2P in Libya. Even if the U.S. could enter Syria and overthrow Bashar Al-Assad and his regime after the use of chemical weapons against its own people, they did not. This shows that the R2P is a highly complicated concept. (Erameh, 2017)

Bret Stephens has written a book called “America in retreat: The new isolationism and the coming global disaster” in which he discusses the importance of American foreign policies. Further he discusses the pros and cons of American retreat. The message of the book is that U.S. needs to remain the world’s policeman to maintain peace and stability globally. If the U.S. fails to act as the world’s policeman, there will be serious consequences as there is no above state authority to punish the wrong-doers. This argument is closely linked to the realist school, and the entire book is very conservative. This book is one of the few that argues for the necessity of U.S. intervention in a global anarchic arena. (Stephens, 2014)

The Congressional Research Service (CRS), the official research organ for the American congress, has done some research on both the U.S.-intervention in Syrian and the Syrian Civil War. The first is “The Islamic State and U.S. Policy”. This document describes the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), what their goals and their means to achieve these goals are. This paper also discusses the American policies towards The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) in Syria. Later it proposes some challenges for the U.S. policymakers to discuss, and some policies that should be made (Humud and Blanchard, 2018). The second paper is the “Syrian Conflict Overview: 2011-2018”. This study quickly summaries the Syrian Civil War by describing what has happened and how the international society, especially U.S., has acted during the years. This paper, while it is independent from political parties, it is written from an American point of view, and is pro-American. It does not contribute a lot to the debate of the U.S.-led intervention in Syria but does provide the reader with good information on the Syrian conflict (Humud, 2019). The third document posted by Congressional Research Service is “Armed conflict in Syria: Overview and U.S. Response”. This document also gives an overview of the Syrian conflict, and how the U.S. has responded to it over the years. However, this paper establishes the main issues for the U.S. in Syria and provides the U.S. congress with policy issues. It further described the recent changes of the conflict in more
detail than what the previous document did. This paper also discusses in more depth what the U.S. policies has been and currently is in Syria and gives the diplomatic approach to the conflict more detail (Humud Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019). Congressional Research Service and its published documents on the Syrian Conflict and the U.S. policies toward the conflict as well as IS are good for gaining general knowledge on the issues, but it does not contribute to the academic research.

Caitilin Alyce Buckley published a study on the issue of intervention in Syria in 2012, called “Learning from Libya, acting in Syria”. The study compares the case of Syria to that of Libya in the sense that the international community should intervene in Syria. However, the international community has some restrictions regarding involvement in Syria. The author argues that even if interventions in Syria could be deemed as humanitarian, and even moral, as the regime has used chemical weapons against its own citizens, and the conflict has seen thousands of casualties, the international community still has its doubts on whether or not they should intervene. This is because of the community’s own self interests. Most notably the U.S. and Russia. As international superpower they would be able to intervene in Syria, to end the suffering of the Syrian people. However, Russia is hesitant to intervene due to its ties to Syria. Syria is their only ally in the Middle East, and they have one of their biggest military bases in Syria. The intervention in Syria would affect their influence in the Middle East. The U.S. is hesitant to intervene in Syria due to the fact that Russia has given military support to Syria, notably air support. Furthermore, U.S. intelligence claims that Syria has both chemical and biological weapons which would be damaging for the U.S. military. The U.S. were also worried that intervening in Syria would be a highly complicated intervention, and it would mean participation in a conflict much more complicated and messier than the case of Libya. The author does point out the differences between the Syrian and Libyan conflict. This study shows that even if there are clear-cut reasons for a humanitarian intervention and the use of R2P, the international community might still be reluctant to intervene due to national self-interest. Both the U.S. and Russia has the possibility to intervene in Syria and protect its citizens from human rights violations and chemical warfare, but they didn’t, until 3 years into the conflict, due to national self-interests. This study contributes to the debate on Realist and Liberal international theories, and the debate on intervention and non-intervention. (Buckley, 2012)
1.1.2 Research Problem

With America having been in war with both Afghanistan and Iraq since the 2000’s, they were hesitant to start a new war in the region. President Obama said in a speech that his mission as president has been to put an end to wars where the U.S. is involved, and not to start new wars (Obama: “I was elected to end wars, not start ‘em”, 2013). The Americans, politicians and civilians, were hesitant to intervene in the Syrian conflict when it began. The U.S. is divided in the debate on Syria and has been since 2011. Some are pro intervention, and some are opposed. However, the U.S. did intervene in Syria, and has been active in the conflict since 2014 (Humud, 2018). The question is why the U.S. decided to intervene, what the arguments for intervention and non-intervention was, and how the debate has changed over time.

1.2. Relevance

There is a lack of studies done on the political debates, political actors, and political decisions take that led up the intervention, and how these political discussions changed over the years. It is therefore relevant to do this research. It is important to do research on American foreign policies leading up to military interventions to analyze the reasons for intervention, by looking at the arguments presented by politicians. Even if the politicians claim that the intervention is done because of human rights protections, or to aid an ally, it is necessary to analyze the arguments to find the reason for the intervention and to try and explain it. This study on the arguments from American politicians regarding intervention or non-intervention, can in the future contribute to anticipate interventions by the U.S., with regard to understanding the development of political arguments and the debates. When looking into the representatives and their policies it might be possible to see a pattern repeat itself, and therefore foreseeing future interventions. Furthermore, it can help understand the U.S. foreign policies and how the U.S. politicians understand the international community and their role in it.

This study will further contribute to the academic discussion surrounding foreign interventions and foreign policies and to the discussion and research of doing a theoretical analysis of the arguments from American representatives. The aim is to give an as true analysis of the issue which can contribute to the topic of U.S. interventions in other cases as well. This study can in the future be used to support studies on American foreign policies and intervention, and to develop the understanding of this issue.
1.3. Research Objective and Research Questions
The objective is to study the arguments presented by representatives of the two major American political parties, the Democratic party and the Republican Party (GOP), on U.S. intervention in Syria and then find how the representatives have presented their arguments from 2013 to 2019, why the representatives argued for intervention or non-intervention, and how these arguments can be explained by the theories chosen for this research.

The research questions are as follows;

- What are the democratic representatives’ arguments on U.S. intervention in Syria?
- What are the republican representatives’ arguments on U.S. intervention in Syria?
- How have different party members shifted in their views on U.S. interventions in Syria?
- How can the theories used in this thesis explain the arguments presented by the representatives?

1.4. Theories used
In this study the theories humanitarian intervention, democratic peace, just war, realism, and liberalism will be used. Humanitarian intervention claims that if a state violates human rights, or fails to protect its citizens from human rights violations, the international community has a responsibility to intervene and protect the civilians from violations. Democratic peace underlines the relationship between democratic and non-democratic states. Democratic states generally do not gain anything from going to war with other democratic states, but undemocratic states pose a threat to democratic states. Therefore, it is more likely that democratic states engage in war with undemocratic states, than with democratic states. Just war discussed the justification of war. For a war to be just, it has two follow two principles; that the war is fought for a just reason, and that the war is fought in a just way. Realism and Liberalism are theories that in two different way explain the international community and the relationship between states. Realism claims that the international community is an anarchical system where states are the main actors. Liberalism argues that the international system is populated with states, non-governmental organizations, over-state authorities, and cooperation’s that all co-exist.

1.5. Methods used
This study will be a qualitative and abductive desk study, done through a text analysis. This means that I will use the theories in this study to discuss and eventually explain the arguments presented by the chosen politicians’ in this study.

1.6. Thesis structure

The thesis will start with an introduction chapter where previous literature and relevance will be discussed. In this chapter, the objective and the question of the research will also be presented, as well as a quick presentation of the theories and methods used in this thesis. In the second chapter I will present background information that is necessary to understand the conflict in Syria.

The third chapter will discuss the different theories that are used for the thesis. Following that, the methods and the sources of the thesis will be discussed in chapter 4. In chapter 5 I will present the findings of the different representatives, where I present them one by one, and then summarize them by their two parties. In the following chapter I will present the analysis of the findings, where each theory is used to explain the arguments and then concluded in the end. In the seventh chapter the conclusion will be discussed, where I also present future recommendations.
2. Background
In this chapter I will present background information that is vital for understanding the Syrian conflict, and how the U.S. has acted during the conflict.

2.1. U.S. relations in the Middle East
The United States has a complicated relation to the Middle East. During most of the 90’s the United States increased their presence in the Middle East as a security measure taken to try and contain Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iran. While the U.S. tried to contain Hussein in Iran, they also aimed at implementing peace between Israel and their neighboring countries who themselves have a very complicated history. Of course, this was not successful (Byman, Moller, 2016; 1). After the terrorist attack against the U.S. on September 11th, 2001, the U.S. increased their presence in the Middle East drastically, they increased their counterterrorist alliance with Egypt and Jordan, and they aimed at strengthening their ties with Yemen and Libya. In 2003 the U.S. invaded Iraq with the aim to overthrow the Gadhafi government. This resulted in that the U.S. remained present in the region until 2011. As the U.S. troops left Iraq, the Arab Spring spread across the region which resulted in conflict all around the Middle East (Byman, Moller, 2016; 1).

2.2. Syrian Civil War
The Syrian civil war is highly complex. There are three main combatants in the conflict. The Syrian regime, rebel opposition, and IS. The Syrian regime is backed by Russia and the opposition is backed by the U.S. IS is a jihadist terrorist organization, who’s main goal is to reestablish the caliphate (Humud, Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019:3; Jenkins, 2013:7-9).

The Syrian conflict has been active since 2011. In March of 2011, there was an outburst of protests as the police arrested a group of students (History, 2018). The students had spray-painted graffiti of anti-government messages. The protests were part of the Arab Spring revolutions that started back in Tunisia, 2010, and spread to Syria in 2011 (NBC News, 2018; History, 2018). The demonstrators protested against the regimes in the middle east. For the most part, the protests were peaceful, and they called for a change both politically and economically. At first, the protests were concentrated to the region of Dar’a. However, when the police started arresting and opening fire against peaceful protesters, the protests spread across the country (Humud, 2019; Mariwala, 2017). Those who opposed the regime created two groups. The first group, the Syrian National Council (SNC), was created by a collection

---

1 The middle east is a region spreading over Western Asia, Arab peninsula and northeast Africa.
of political groups. It would later be the Syrian Opposition Coalition (SOC). The second group, the Free Syrian Army (FSA), created was created by those who had abandoned the Syrian army. FSA claimed to be the leader of the armed forces fighting against the government. (Humud, 2019; Jenkins, 2013:8). In 2011 the Islamic State of Iraq (ISI) sent terrorists to Syria to fight for ISI. The group called themselves Nusra Front. The group eventually became the Islamic State (IS) which would generate infighting between jihadist groups. For example, Al-Qaeda cut its ties to IS (Humud, 2019) (Humud, Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019:3; Jenkins, 2013:9-10).

In 2012, the Syrian government started to use heavy military equipment against the rebel groups and opposition. Attacks from rebels and terrorist groups increased during 2012. One year after the first suicide bombing by Nusra Front, they had been responsible for approximately 600 attacks. The international society suspected in 2012 that the Al-Assad regime had used chemical weapons against its own citizens. In August of 2013, the Assad regime used chemical weapons which killed approximately 1,400 people (Mariwala, 2014; Humud, 2019)

As rebels gained control over Raqqa and most of northeast Syria in 2013 Russia, Iran, and Lebanon increased support for the Syrian government, while the United States, Turkey, different European and Arab countries increased their support for the opposition (Humud, 2019) In 2014, IS would capture central and northeastern Syria, while also having captured territories in northern Iraq. IS proclaimed this as the Caliphate (Yacoubian, 2019). Later that year, the U.S. implemented a train and equip program for Syrian forces, which began was authorized in 2014. The program meant that the US would train and equip selected moderate Syrian opposition troops. The aim was to create local opposition forces that could fight IS and hold its territory (Humud, Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019:26). The oppositional forces and the regimes forces fought each other over the control of Aleppo, the largest city in Syria. The battle ended with victory for the regime forces. Both sides were accused of war crimes (Humud, 2019). In 2015, the YPG aligned itself with other opposition forces and created Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF), which the U.S. backed (Barfi, 2016:32). In 2017, SDF recaptured Raqqa from IS, and by December, IS had lost 98 percent of their previously controlled areas. In the beginning on 2018, the conflict in Syria had changed to the regimes favor. The government had taken back most of the previously illegally occupied territories (Humud, Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019:3; Humud, 2019).
2.3. U.S. Intervention in the Syrian Conflict

The first American action towards the Syrian conflict came in 2011, when President Obama called for the removal of Bashar Al-Assad, because of the increase in violence in Syria (Humud et al, 2019:1; Keulman, 2018). Furthermore, the U.S. together with several allies imposed tighter sanctions on the Assad regime in 2011 (Politico, 2017).

In 2012, President Obama claimed that the use of chemical weapons is a red line, and if they are ever used in Syria by the government, the United States would have to intervene in the conflict (Humud, 2019; Keulman, 2018). In 2013 the government actually used chemical weapons and Obama urged Congress to authorize military intervention, but congress denied the authorization (Huffpost, 2017). The United States cooperated with Russia in 2013 and signed a deal to remove and destroy all of Syria’s chemical weapons. The deal called for the Syrian government to first dispose all of its chemical weapons. Syria’s entire chemical weapons arsenal was removed in mid 2014 (Politico, 2017; Humud, 2019).

During the conflict the United States has used airstrikes to fight IS. The first airstrike came in 2014 as a response to the increase of territories held by IS. The aim was to eventually eliminate the terrorist organization. The U.S. used other means to help the opposition forces in Syria. (BBC News, 2017; Humud, 2019). The United States began a train and equip program that was aimed at existing opposition forces and groups. Since 2014 and forward, the U.S. policy in Syria has put focus on counterterrorism, but also some focus on helping the opposition forces to fight the regime. The US opposition against the Syrian government is carries out through non-violence means such as, diplomacy and political settlements and support to the opposition forces. The opposition forces have, with the help of the U.S., taken back almost all of the territory captured by IS (Humud, Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019). In 2015, the U.S. decided to increase its troops in Syria from 50 to 2000 by the end of 2017. In 2018, President Trump decided to remove all troops from Syria, but in 2019 a statement clarified that a few hundred troops would remain in Syria (Humud, Blanchard, Nikitin, 2019:1).
3. Theoretical Framework
For this study, three theories will be used to explain the reasoning for foreign intervention, *Humanitarian intervention*, *Just war*, and *Democratic peace*. The three theories will be used to analyze and explain the arguments presented by the six chosen politicians to create a deeper understanding of their arguments, and what they mean. This study will further use the two grand theories of *Liberalism* and *Realism* which explain the international community. These two theories will be used to connect the three other theories, and to give a greater picture of the international community and how that can explain why the politicians are pro intervention or non-intervention.

3.1. Humanitarian Intervention
The United Nations’ (U.N.) charter on human rights declares that human rights are fundamental and a universal right (United Nations, 1948:71-77). While the U.N. declares that everyone should have these human rights, these human rights are constantly abused in oppressive or failing states (Human Rights Watch, 2019:1-12). It is the duty of the state to protect the human rights of its citizens and the state has failed its duty as soon as it abuses the human rights, or once it fails to protect the citizens from non-governmental forces that violate the human rights, as stated in the R2P. R2P is a principle that has been endorsed by the U.N. and was adapted by the U.N. in 2005. If a state then fails to protect its citizens, or systematically violates human rights, the international community has a responsibility to do what is necessary to protect the human rights. The main goal is to protect the world from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing (Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, N.D).

*Humanitarian intervention* argues that we must respect basic fundamental rights and protect them if there is a possibility that they will be violated. Humanitarian intervention is implemented when the human rights violations occur in a foreign country (Lee, 2010:22). The very core of humanitarian intervention is when a state, or a number of states threatens to use force, or uses force to end human rights violations in a foreign (Holzgrefe, 2003:18). The idea consists of two pillars; *Humanitarian* and *Intervention*. Intervention is described as the active interference of one state in another state. In more detail it is the action where a state, a number of states, and different international actors, intervenes in a different state.

*Humanitarian* is the notion of preserving human rights and fighting human rights violations (Krieg, 2013: 8). Humanitarian intervention is thus, the use of armed forces in one state by one of multiple other state(s), without the consent from the state, and either with or without
the permission from the U.N. This is done with the aim of protecting and preserving human rights. Humanitarian intervention therefore differentiates itself from normative armed interventions. Armed interventions in itself is used to protect a country’s own citizens and interests. Humanitarian intervention however, aims to protect the lives and rights of strangers (Krieg, 2013:8).

3.2. Just War
The theory of Just War asks one important philosophical question in times of war: When is war justified? The theory has its roots in the works of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century, but the theory first became popular during the intervention in Iraq, 2003, and then again with the works of McMahan in 2009 (Brooks, 2014:1).

A just war has to, according to the theory, follow two conditions. The first is: Jus ad bellum, or justification of war. This prevents unlawful governments from invading states, and it prevents politicians from declaring war or authorize military actions for their own gain. Further it aims to protect the innocent’s life and their human rights. A war must be just. The second condition is Jus in bello, or justice arising from the war. This condition means that the combatants in a war must follow certain rules for it to be just, namely, discrimination and proportionality (Brooks, 2013:1-2)

These two conditions are further categorized with different objectives. Jus ad bellum contains five principles that must be considered. Just cause: the war has to have a justifiable cause, like ending the violations of human rights, or ending a genocide. Legitimate authority: the war has to be justified by a legitimate authority, like a legitimate state or the U.N. Integrity of intentions: the state or the politician that declares a war or authorizes a military action must have justifiable intentions with this. The goal should always be peace, and nothing else. Action as last resort: all of the other peaceful solutions, such as economic sanctions and diplomacy should have been tested and failed and armed conflict should always be used a last resort for settling the conflict. Reasonable chances to win: the side that declares war should always have a reasonable chance to win the conflict, preferably a short war against a weaker opponent (Lemmenicier, 2012:2-3)

Jus in Bello contains three different principles that must be met, which I will describe further. Discrimination: This means that the combatants of a war should always be separated from the non-combatants. Non-combatants are the innocent, civilians, prisoners, usually women, and children. Proportionality: Armies and combatants must use proportionate actions to end or
win the war. This means that the means used by the armies should have a as small effect on goods and humans as possible. Nor should an army use atomic or chemical weapons as a means to win a war. **Responsibility of the combatants**: Those who participate in a war cannot kill civilians or combatants that surrender according to the Geneva convention and the Nuremberg Court of Justice. Combatants are responsible for their own actions during a war or conflict (Lemmenicier, 2012:2).

### 3.3. Democratic Peace

**Democratic Peace** was originally developed by Kant in 1795. The foundation of the theory is that democratic states behave in one way when they engage with other democratic states, and in another way when they interact with non-democratic states (Layne, 1994:5). Different policy makers who are proponents of the democratic peace theory argue that there is a strong connection between America’s foreign security policies and the spread of democracy and that these two are the main building blocks of future world peace (Layne, 1994:5). The theory argues that democracy as we know it today promotes peace between democratic states, and therefore, the security of democratic states depends on whether or not foreign states are democratic (Caranti, 2013:2). Therefore, it is logical to use this theory as an argument for intervening in a country with an un-democratic regime, such as the Iraqi war or the Syrian war. This theory can be used to argue for the case that it is necessary for democratic states such as the USA, United Kingdom, and France to intervene in undemocratic states, overthrow the undemocratic regime, and install democracy. This would increase the peace in the world, as there is lasting peace between democratic regimes (Caranti, 2013:2).

Democratic Peace is divided into two different understandings of the logic that democratic states don’t go to war with each other. One understanding is that democratic states don’t engage in conflict with each other because of the institutional constraints. This means that states remain peaceful due to the negative effect conflict has on the public opinion, or because of the check and balances of government; the executive power cannot make decisions on its own, it needs legislative and legal support. The second understanding of the logic is that it is the culture and norms of democratic states that explains the absence of wars and conflict between democratic states (Layne, 1994:6). The first understanding of the logic explains that a democratic state does not want to go to war because the state then has to answer to its citizens for why the state chose conflict over peaceful solutions. This means that the citizens have the power to change their leaders if they do not agree that conflict was the right choice. Furthermore, because democratic states are transparent and working for the people, and under
constant auditing by the media, the choice to go to war is not a choice that is taken behind closed doors; both the public and all of the policymakers knows the risks and reasons of the conflict (Layne, 1994:9).

Although this theory claims that democratic states don’t engage in conflict with another democratic states, the theory does not argue that a democratic state is less prone to war than other states. Democratic Peace Theory explains that when democracies face another democracy, they are both aware of the fact that both states follow the democratic norms, and therefore it is unlikely that they use force or threaten to use force. However, when a democratic state faces an undemocratic state, they know that the undemocratic state does not obey the democratic norms. Therefore, the democratic state might feel obligated to use hasher methods and in some cases force, to not be defeated by the undemocratic states (Layne, 1994:10).

3.4. Realism

Realism is built up from three different pillars. The first pillar is Self-Help, the second is Survival, and the last one is Statism. Self-help means that state has to do what is best for the state, and not what is best for the global arena. Survival is the notion that states has to do what is needed to survive. As there is no one else on the global arena to protect the states, they have to manage to survive on their own. Statism is the idea that on the global arena, the only players are the states. There are no over-state authority or organizations that exists on the global arena. The global arena can be compared to an anarchy. There are only the individual states, with the main goal of survival through doing what is best for themselves (Baylis et al, 2001:150-153). A realist would argue that a state engages in conflict or interventions only if it serves their purpose. For example, if one state increases their military budget and their military capacity for the sake of defensive purposes, this action can be understood as a threat to the nearby states or concurrent states. Therefore, the states that are being threatened will also increase their military capacity for security reasons (Baylis et al, 2001:153). An example of this arms race is the Cold War where the U.S. and the Soviet Union increased their military capacities due to the threats from each other.

Realists criticizes the idea of Humanitarian Intervention and Just War. Realists argue that an intervention is never truly just humanitarian and purely moral. Instead, interventions are always, no matter if they are humanitarian or not, based on real interests. A state can never act unselfishly (Seay, 2007:4). Indeed, a realist could argue that it is their responsibility to intervene in a country if there is a humanitarian crisis, however, the underlying reasons are
always self-interest. An example is the U.S.’s argument for continued intervention in Afghanistan in 2002. The U.S. mentioned that they would provide humanitarian, political, economic and security assistance to help rebuild Afghanistan so that it will not oppress its people again and to end the safe-space for terrorists. The arguments for intervention here are that the intervention is in national interest, fighting terrorism, but also in humanitarian interest, helping the civilians of Afghanistan. The dilemma here is whether or not the real reason for the intervention is humanitarian or national interest. A realist would argue that the real reason is national interest, to protect its own state and its own citizens (Seay, 2007:4-5).

3.5. Liberalism

Liberalism is first and foremost a theory of governments. The main goal of liberalism is the security and equality of the individual. Liberalism in international relations argues that the security of the individual domestically is not possible without security and peace on the global arena (Baylis et al, 2001:163). What the liberal scholars mean here is that if states exist as individually, just like people did in the state of nature, the goal of global peace is impossible to achieve. The liberal theory here argues that the global arena described by realists is unable to create lasting world peace (Baylis et al, 2001:163). The challenge then is, how do we change this system, and how do we create lasting peace? One branch of liberals argued that economic interdependence would create a world where conflict does not exist, because attacking a state that you trade with would not be beneficial for neither of the states. It would decrease each states prosperity. Another branch of liberals claimed that the spread of democracy was the best way to create ever-lasting peace, as democratic state are the most peaceful states. The third brand of liberalism would argue that global organizations can increase security by decreasing state selfishness through cooperation (Walt, 1998:32). As opposed to realists, liberals recognize that there are more actors than the state on the international arena. The global arena is populated with states, organizations, institutions and transnational corporations, and they are all capable of working together towards their goal of peace (Baylis et al, 2001:171). Some liberal scholars would argue that there is a need for an over-state authority, or a global government to judge state and to maintain order on the global arena (Baylis et al, 2001:167).

However, there has been times when liberal ideas were set to action. For example, after the first world war saw the creation of the League of Nations – an institution that was supposed to end wars forever. After the second world war we saw the creation of the United Nations, another institution that would end all wars. We have also seen the economic and political
cooperation European Union. The essence of liberalism is that co-operation, corporations, and organizations are all players on the global arena. Furthermore, liberalism claims that free-market capitalism, free movement, economic interdependence, and world-wide democracy is the way to create lasting peace. As Liberalism is a school of peace, there are few reasons for a liberal to argue for foreign intervention. However, there are two instances when liberals argue that intervention is necessary. One of those is when there have been massive human rights violations in a foreign state. States then do not only have a legitimate reason for intervention, they have a moral obligation to intervene. The argument here is that when a state is tyrannical and oppresses its citizens, it has given up its right to independence (Global Policy, 2014). This argument is very closely related to the theory of Humanitarian Intervention and the R2P. The reason for intervention, according to all three arguments, are that human rights are being violated, or a state is acting in a way that is no acceptable, and that cannot go unpunished. Indeed, it is every states responsibility to protect the human rights. Furthermore, liberals would argue that it is legitimate to engage in intervention if the intervention do more good that it does harm. This argument is also used by the Just War theory. For a war or intervention to be justifiable, it has to do more good than it does harm. Liberals would further justify interventions in the spirit of ending civil wars and help the population from slaughter and mass-murder (Global Policy, 2014).
4. Methodological Framework
For this thesis the chosen method is an abductive qualitative desk-study. This study will be qualitative as the research will be done by analyzing the arguments put forth by American politicians, and this will further be done through a text analysis.

4.1. Text Analysis
The data for this thesis will be collected from different interviews, press releases, policy-documents, statements and speeches, by the politicians. A text analysis is a method used in research when the intention is to interpretant what someone; an author, a publisher, a politician et cetera, want to say with their text (McKee, 2001:3). The aim is to find the argument of the text rather than discuss its content in terms of a debate. In the case of this study, the use of the text analysis is to collect the political arguments in the text, and to analyze them through the analytical framework. (McKee, 2001:4-5).

4.2. Qualitative study
This study will be a qualitative study, rather than a quantitative. A qualitative study is a study where the research is done through non-numerical data. The aim of qualitative research is to understand social life through carefully chosen variables. Qualitative research in social sciences helps us interpret the social understanding of individuals though the use of interviews, journals, observations, and analyzes of textual material as well as spoken words (Mohajan, 2018:2). It is therefore the logical method to use in this study, as this study will research the arguments of politicians to describe why the U.S. intervened in Syria.

4.3. Abductive Study
As this study will be done by analyzing texts and finding arguments it is only logical to do this as a desk-study rather than as a field-study. For this study the use of an abductive approach was the most relevant choice. By doing an abductive research, the aim to use analytical frameworks to try and explain a phenomenon. By using multiple theories, the goal is to find which theory can best explain why the U.S. came to intervene in Syria. The three steps of an abductive approach as described by Danermark is: (1) There is an empirical event or phenomenon. (2) We can relate this event or phenomenon to a rule – or a theory- (3) This rule leads us to a new assumption of the event or phenomenon, this is presented as the conclusion in social sciences. (Danermark, 2002:90). In the abductive approach the aim is to present a very possible conclusion, that is not necessarily true (Danermark, 2002:90). By collecting arguments from different sources, put forth by different politicians, the intention is
to look at these arguments and find which analytical framework best describes the arguments. This is why this research will be an abductive qualitative study.

4.4. Limitations and delimitations concerning the selection of the sources used

In this part I will present the limitations and the delimitations for this thesis. Limitations are limits put on the research not chosen by the author, but rather forced upon the author because of various circumstances. A delimitation of a study is a limitation that the author does chose.

This research will only focus on the years from 2013 to 2019, even if the conflict in Syria has been going on since 2011. This is because I find it irrelevant to find the arguments for the Syrian intervention from 2011-2012 as there was no real debate on the issue. The debate came relevant in 2013 when then President Obama urged congress to authorize airstrikes against strategic targets in Syria. As this research will study the timeline of American politics behind the U.S. intervention in Syria, from 2013 to 2019, I have narrowed it down to just researching members of congress instead of studying the entire debate. There is a good amount of information and sources for finding information regarding politicians’ policies on Syria. However, this study will not focus entirely on official congressional documents, rather this study will research politicians’ own arguments and policies on Syria. This will be done through different press-releases, interviews, and debates – not limited to congressional documents. To study all of the debate – social media, news articles, NGO’s, and political debates – would be too much to study and would not come to any logical conclusion. Therefore, I have narrowed it down into researching only the Democratic Party and the Republican Party as the American political system principally consists of those two groupings. Furthermore, I have chosen to only look into members on congress, and to just look at the political key-people and leaders. This is because the congress holds 535 elected members, 100 senators (United States Senate, N.D. A) and 435 members of the house, House of Representatives (United States House of Representatives, N.D). I think that the leading politicians of the two parties are the ones that best represents the ideologies of their party. The politicians that this study will research are; Eliot L. Engel (D), Nancy Pelosi (D), Elizabeth Warren (D), Marco Rubio (R), Kevin McCarthy (R), and Mitch McConnell(R).

I have chosen to look into these politicians as they are meaningful members of their party, and they can therefore represent their parties in a way that less known politicians could. They have been active politicians for a long time, and they all serve their parties in congress. Eliot L. Engel is a democratic representative in the HoR, and Engel also serves as Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee which is why he is a good representative of the democratic party.
Nancy Pelosi serves as the speaker of the house and as a representative in the HoR, and she is very outspoken on her policies which is why she is a good representative of the democratic party (Pelosi Full biography, N.D. B). Elizabeth Warren serves as a Senator for Massachusetts, as Vice Chair of the Senate Democratic Caucus, and she is running for president in 2020, Warren is a good progressive representative of the democratic party (United States Senate, N.D.) (Warren About Elizabeth, N.D.). Marco Rubio serves as a Senator for Florida and serves in the foreign relations committee, Rubio ran for president in 2016 but lost to Trump in the primaries (Rubio Biography, N.D.). Rubio is a good representative of the GOP and their position on foreign relations. Kevin McCarthy is a representative in the HoR where he also serves as House Minority Leader and where he has served as House Majority Leader (McCarthy About, N.D.). Mitch McConnell serves as a senator for Kentucky and is the Senate Majority Leader and he previously served as the Senate Minority Leader, McConnell is also the longest serving U.S. Senator for the GOP, which makes him a good representative of the GOP (McConnell Biography, N.D.).

The reason for choosing to study representatives from the two parties instead of studying the two presidents Trump and Obama, is that the two presidents have served during different periods of the Syrian war. The chosen politicians have all severed before and during the US-involvement in the conflict. Obama was the president in office when the U.S. decided to intervene in Syria, both with air strikes and by deploying troops. President Trump is the president that is serving from 2017 to present day, and Trump is also the president that claimed that IS has been defeated and that the U.S. will withdraw its troops. The presidents have therefore served two very different periods of the conflict and cannot represent their respective parties during the entire conflict.

The sources for the politician’s arguments will most of the time be collected from the politician’s own webpages, where there are press-releases, statements, transcription of interviews, hearing and speeches, posted. Where this is not possible, the sources will be collected from other government webpages where similar sources are posted. This study will also use the politician’s social media in some rare instances, video-sharing platforms such as YouTube and, news pages that either quote the politicians or publish the politician’s statements. What is important is that the arguments for this thesis are arguments that either the politicians have said themselves, or that representatives of the politicians have said. The sources used for the theories chapter will be mainly published sources, but there will be instances where other sources unpublished sources will be used. In order to find the right
sources for each politician, I have read through multiple publications on the politician’s webpages, and other government webpages and I have read transcriptions of speeches and hearings. I have also browsed news sources for information when I could not find the information needed on the politicians and the governments webpages. All of the sources used for the politicians will be found in Annex 1.

For the Syrian conflict and the U.S. intervention the main source of information will be Congressional Research Service which is a non-partisan and official research service that serves the U.S. congress, where Carla E. Humud is the main authors of the research that is used in this study. (Library of Congress, 2019). However, other sources will also be used to strengthen the credibility of the information in the Syrian conflict case-study. The sources used will be different published sources, and some news articles regarding the Syrian-conflict and US-intervention.

4.5. Ethical Consideration
As this is a desk study, any major ethical consideration will not be taken into account. Ethical consideration is mainly associated with field-studies, where data is collected by interviews, surveys et cetera. However, there is reason to take ethical considerations into account even in this study. This study’s findings will be collected from statements presented by elected U.S. politicians regarding a highly politicized issue. It is absolutely necessary to consider the sources from where the findings are collected, and to reflect over whether or not the statements are true. Because the findings will be found on the internet, the risk that some statements might be corrupted is ever present. Therefore, it is important to consider if this is an official statement, or if it has been fabricated. It is further important to present the findings, and analysis of the finding in a as unbiased way as possible to minimize the risk of misinterpretation.
5. Presentation of Findings
What this study will research is the arguments six selected American politicians used to legitimize intervention, and non-intervention during the years 2013 to 2019. The politicians will be presented one by one and in the end, there will be a summary of their main arguments.

5.1. Arguments from Democrats

5.1.1. Eliot L. Engel
Since 2013 Eliot L. Engel has been supportive of the U.S. involvement in Syria. Engel has been consistent in his opinion as well as his arguments for involvement. However, Engel’s stance of deploying troops has changed over the years.

A recurring argument used by Engel is that the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian government is a war crime. When president Obama in 2013 requested authorized airstrikes against the Assad regime, Engel claimed that Obamas “red line” had been crossed by Assad’s use of chemical weapons. Engel argued that Assad had committed war crimes and therefore it was the responsibility of the West to take action against Assad’s regime. Engel said “…it is crystal clear that the United States must provide appropriate arms to those in Syria fighting for their lives and freedom. Further delay is not an option.” (Committee on Foreign Affairs, 2013).

In 2013 Engel further argued that the use of chemical weapons was a threat against American national security and their allies. Furthermore, Engel underlines that the use of limited military strikes is necessary because it uphold the U.S.’s credibility as a superpower, it hinders the regime from using chemical weapons again, and it sends a message to dictators all over the world that there will be consequences for committing war crimes. Engel was however opposed to putting military troops in Syria in 2013, instead, he urged for a larger strategy to respond to the humanitarian crisis in Syria, support the U.S.’s allies in the region, and bringing peace to Syria (C-Span, 2013).

Engel was supportive of the train and equip program authorized in 2014. Engel saw it as an effort to combat both ISIS and Assad, with the aim to help Syrians fight for a future that they deserve, and to create a Syria without Assad. The effort would further protect American security and their allies (Engel, 2014a)

In 2015, Engel changed in position on sending troops into Syria, as he supported the president’s decision to send troops to Syria. Engel argued that this was necessary to defeat ISIS and prevent a future large-scale intervention. (Committee on Foreign Affairs, 2015)
When the U.S. in 2017 again used missile strikes against the Assad regime Engel once again argued that this was appropriate as the regime had used chemical weapons, and that this will not be accepted. Engel further argued that there can be no military solution to the conflict, rather it needs a political settlement. Lastly, Engel argued that there is a need for American leadership to this conflict, because when the U.S. does nothing, it means that regimes like Assad’s regime can continue to oppress its population (Engel, 2017b).

When Trump in 2018 decided to withdraw from Syrian Engel issued a statement, where he argued that this was a poor decision, and that this serves the interest of Russia and Iran. Once again Engel argued that the situation in Syria is a security concern for the U.S. Engel underlines again that the American leadership is needed for a solution to the Syrian conflict (Engel, 2018c).

In 2018 Engel again supported the airstrikes against the regime in Syria as a response to chemical weapons, but just like in 2017, Engel demanded a strategy from the president to defeat Syria (Engel, 2018d).

In 2019 Engel argued that the withdrawal of troops from Syria would be a disaster and once again, without American involvement, the conflict will escalate even further (Engel, 2019e).

5.1.2. Nancy Pelosi

Similarly, to her fellow party member Engels, Nancy Pelosi has been supportive of the U.S. intervention in Syria since 2013. She has since the beginning condemned the Syrian regime, and she has been supportive of the airstrikes.

The use of chemical weapons was used extensively as an argument in Pelosi’s statements. In 2013 she remarked that she condemns Assad’s use of chemical weapons and claimed that it is in the U.S.‘s security interest to stop the use of chemical weapons in Syria. Pelosi supported the use of airstrikes against the regime, as it did not require putting troops in Syria, which she was against in 2013. Bringing stability and security to the middle east is in the U.S.’s own national interest, Pelosi argues (Pelosi, 2013a). Pelosi also argues that:

“It is in our national interest to respond to the Syrian government’s unspeakable use of chemical weapons. Indeed, it has been, and remains, a core pillar of our national security – under Democratic and Republican administrations – to prevent, limit, and halt the spread and use of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. This is a matter of national, regional, and global security.” (Pelosi, 2013b).

In 2014 Pelosi stated that she supported the president’s request to train and equip Syrian moderates as it is an effort to defeat ISIS, which Pelosi argues is absolutely necessary as ISIS threatens both American interests and national security. This strategy will also help build
peace in Syria, Pelosi says (Pelosi, 2014c). However, Pelosi does not support putting troops in Syria, as she says in a floor speech:

“This is not an authorization of the use of military force, as we had in 2001 and 2002. I do not support, nor will I support, combat troops on the ground. That’s not what this is about.” (Pelosi, 2014d).

However, in 2015 Pelosi supported the president’s decision to deploy 50 troops to Syria, because "this action, combined with increased support to groups fighting ISIS and strengthened focus on the Turkey-Syria border, is intended to degrade ISIS"(Pelosi, 2015e). Pelosi argues that it is vital for the international community to defeat ISIS and find a solution to the Syrian conflict (Pelosi, 2015e).

Pelosi was also supportive of president Trumps airstrikes against Syria in 2017, as it found it to be an appropriate response to the use of chemical weapons, and she condemned Assad for committing these war crimes. Pelosi argued once again that the conflict needs a political solution, military force cannot solve the conflict (Pelosi, 2017f). In 2018 Pelosi again argued that the use of chemical weapons by Assad are inhumane, and a war crime which must be met with a strong response (Pelosi, 2018g). In 2018 Pelosi argued that it was too early to proclaim victory over ISIS, and that the humanitarian crisis is still active (Pelosi, 2018h). Withdrawing troops from Syria is not a good idea and Pelosi further argues:

“When we take the gavel, our Democratic Majority will uphold the Congress’ constitutional oversight responsibilities to ensure that the President’s decisions advance our national security interests, not his personal or political objectives” (Pelosi, 2018h).

5.1.3. Elizabeth Warren
Warren has been very consistent in her arguments regarding intervention. While she supported the interventions in 2013, she has continued to argue for more elaborate and strategic plans for the U.S.’s involvement in Syria.

In 2013, Warren was supportive of the president’s decision to aid Syrian opposition forces but argued that the consequences might not be what the president had predicted. There is a risk of the U.S. being dragged into another conflict, Warren argues. Warren claims that there needs to be a goal to achieve, before they can take any action (Boston News, 2013). When Assad’s regime in 2013 used chemical weapons Warren argued that there was a need for a U.S. response to the attacks, but there has to be an achievable goal before any response can be made. Once again, Warren argues that there might be unintended consequences, she says "We may have good intentions, but the consequences of our acts are not limited by those intentions." (Warren, 2013a)
Warren was not supportive of the president’s decision to train and equip moderate Syrians in 2014, Warren said:

“I do not want America to be dragged into another ground war in the Middle East, and it is time for those nations in the region that are most immediately affected by the rise of ISIS to step up and play a leading role in this fight.” (The Hill, 2014).

In 2017, Warren argued that the chemical weapons used by the Assad regime was a violation of international law and that the regime had to be held accountable, further she argues that this attack should show Americans that they need to aid those who are seeking refuge from Syrian. If Trump wants to use airstrikes against Syria, Trump needs to seek authorization from congress and he must show congress a strategic plan, with clear cut goals, for stopping the conflict in Syria (Warren, 2017b) (Boston News, 2017). Warren wrote later in 2017 that using military airstrikes is not a strategic plan, and that Trump has to present a plan to congress (The Hill, 2017). In 2018, Warren argued that the use of chemical attacks is a clear violation of international law, and the U.S. should be a part of a “planned” and “coordinated” effort to hold Assad accountable. However, Trump must seek authorization from congress, and present a strategy with goals and plans to achieve said goals, if he wants to use military force (Warren, 2018c).

In 2019 Warren says in an interview that she supports the president’s decision to withdraw the U.S. troops from Syria, but that the presidents needs to withdraw as a part of a plan, and the president has to know what he wants to accomplish in the middle east (MSNBC, Elizabeth Warren: Endless War in Syria, Afghanistan is Not Working | Rachel Maddow | MSNBC, 2019).

5.2. Democratic arguments: a summary

When looking into the democratic representatives it is not made obvious where the party line stands on U.S. interventions. Indeed, Pelosi and Engel both have been supportive of the intervention and different actions taken in Syria since 2013, and both are opposed to withdrawing from Syria as the American presence is needed. However, Elizabeth Warren has been opposed to the intervention since 2013, and the senator has been opposed to all actions in Syria and supportive of withdrawing troops from Syria, as she believes that the conflict will not be resolved by American military force.

The two democratic representatives that support intervention have been arguing that the interventions are done to protect American national security and their allies, stabilize the region and bring peace to Syria. The politicians have also argued that holding Assad and other
dictators accountable for war crimes and using chemical weapons are of utmost importance. While both Pelosi and Eliot were against putting boots on the ground in Syria in 2013, they did support the train and equip program in Syria, and putting boots on the ground in 2015, because this was vital to assist the Syrian moderate opposition forces in their fight against both Assad and ISIL/ISIS. Warren however, has argued that the use of force in Syria might not have the same consequences as the president expects, and the senator has called for a strategic plan with clear goals before taking action. Warren has further argued that the region needs to solve the conflict on their own, as they are most affected by it. Warren does however argue that the U.S. needs to respond to the use of chemical weapons, but not by force.

5.3. Arguments from Republicans

5.3.1. Marco Rubio
Marco Rubio was at first opposed to airstrikes in Syria against Assad, but he was supportive of the fight against ISIL. However, in 2017, Rubio shifted and became support of interventions in Syria.

Marco Rubio was in 2013 against military action in Syria, however Rubio recognized the need to remove Assad from power. As a response to Obama’s request to authorize airstrikes in Syria, Rubio argued that Assad is a dangerous anti-American dictator that helps terrorists to kill Americans in Iraq and that it is important to respond to Assad’s use of chemical weapons to show rogue states like North Korea, Iraq, and Syria that war crimes will not be done without repercussions. However, military force and airstrikes will not be successful, might even prove to be counterproductive Rubio says. Further Rubio argues that the only way to stop Assad is by removing him from power and install a moderate and stable government in Syria. This is why Rubio argues that the conflict is very much an important conflict for the U.S. to resolve (Rubio, 2013a) (Rubio, 2013b).

While Rubio in 2013 was against airstrikes against the regime, in 2014 he was supportive of the airstrikes against ISIL facilities stating,

“I have argued for months that President Obama has the authority to confront this threat to the United States wherever they seek refuge. Defeating this menace to all who value freedom and tolerance will not be easy but is essential to our security.” (Rubio, 2014c)

In 2015 Rubio said in a press release that “For four years the Assad regime and violent extremists in Syria have committed horrific human rights violations at the expense of millions of innocent Syrians.” (Rubio, 2015d).
In 2017 Rubio however showed his support to Trumps airstrikes against Syria. Rubio argued that he hoped that the airstrikes will decrease Assad’s capacity to commit such horrible acts again, by attack the facilities from where the chemical attack was launched. Rubio further argued that this attack made it clear to Assad and his allies that war crimes will not be unpunished (Rubio, 2017e). Rubio supported the airstrikes again in 2018 as it protected American national security interest by preventing rogue states like Syria from using chemical weapons and weapons of mass destruction. However, Rubio urged the president to present a strategy to defeat Assad and end his threat to the Syrian people, the middle east, and the American security (Rubio, 2018f).

In 2018, Rubio wrote to the president that he was concerned with the president’s choice to withdraw from Syria as it was premature and a mistake that will threaten the safety of the U.S. and strengthens ISIS, Assad, Iran, and Russia. Rubio argues that ISIS is not yet defeated, and the U.S. troops gives support to Kurdish troops fighting ISIS (Rubio, 2018g).

5.3.2. Kevin McCarthy
At first McCarthy was unsure on whether or not U.S. intervention was right or not. However, over the years, McCarthy changed his stand on U.S. interventions, as he was supportive of the airstrikes later on.

In 2013 McCarthy argued that he has strong reservations against military action against Syria. McCarthy claimed that there are still many unanswered questions regarding the mission in Syria and the goals. Because of this, McCarthy cannot formulate an effective authorization of force for the president (Projects, 2013). Although McCarthy was against interventions in 2013, he argued in 2014 that ISIL had grown as strong as they grew because of failed policies by Obama. Furthermore, McCarthy argues that U.S. allies had begged the U.S. to assist them in fighting both ISIL and Assad, but because the U.S. was passive, ISIL and Assad gained more power. McCarthy further argues that it is time to act now against the threats in Syria if the U.S. wants to avoid another 9/11 attack. This is why McCarthy supports airstrikes against ISIL and the use of force to defeat ISIL. However, the U.S. also needs to deploy troops in Syria to defeat ISIL, McCarthy claims (USA Today, 2014).

In 2015 when the president put troops in Syria, McCarthy said:

“The President’s decision comes after years of neglect of our Syria policy and a failed Syrian training program. Putting small numbers of troops in Syria is yet another tactical move in the absence of a comprehensive strategy for Iraq, Syria, and the broader
McCarthy argues that the president does not do enough, and that the president has no strategy for Syria. In 2016, McCarthy said that there is no more time to waste in Syria, and that something has to be done because just ignoring the problem will not make it go away. McCarthy argues that:

“ISIL is committing genocide. They are targeting non-Muslims—Christians, Yazidis, and more—and pushing them to extinction. But we also can’t ignore what else is happening in Syria. The Assad regime and its allies are indiscriminately killing on a breathtaking scale. Torture, rape, chemical weapons, barrel bombs, forced starvation.” (McCarthy, 2016b).

In 2017 McCarthy was supportive of the president Trump’s decision to use airstrikes against Assad. McCarthy argues “Assad has made his disregard for innocent human life and longstanding norms against chemical weapons use crystal clear” (McCarthy, 2017c) because it shows Assad that the use of chemical weapons will have consequences. (McCarthy, 2017d).

In 2018, McCarthy was once again supportive of the president’s airstrikes against Assad, as he wrote in a tweet:

“The barbarism from the Assad regime will not be tolerated. America and its allies are together to deliver the consequences from such heinous action. God bless our men and women in uniform.” (McCarthy, 2018d)

5.3.3. Mitch McConnell

McConnell was not supportive of airstrikes against Assad in 2013, but he was supportive of airstrikes against ISIL. Later on, McConnell was also supportive of the airstrikes against Assad.

In 2013 McConnell said that he has a different view of America than the president. America is a superb country with the duty to maintain international order and the balance of power. McConnell further says that the Syrian War has been a great tragedy which has led to the international community to look to America for support. McConnell argues that the airstrikes would just be a display of force. The Syrian government should be held accountable for its actions, but as it was not attack on the U.S. or their allies, it is not the U.S.’s responsibility. Had the attack been on the U.S., or one of their allies, there would be immediate action. McConnell is further skeptical about the consequences of airstrikes in Syria. There is no certainty that airstrikes will stop Assad’s attacks, airstrikes can weaken the government control over weapons in Syria, leading to jihadists gaining control over them, it can shift the military balance in Syria and give weak opposition groups power in Syria, it can give Assad
the perception that the U.S. is starting a campaign to overthrow Assad which can lead to even more ruthless attacks from Assad, and lastly it can make the political settlement more difficult, McConnell says. This could eventually drag the U.S. into a large-scale war argued McConnell (McConnell, 2013a). In 2014, McConnell was supportive of the president’s decision to use airstrikes against ISIL targets in Syria because:

“These strikes against ISIL and the engagement of our regional allies are important steps in defeating ISIL and I support these ongoing efforts. The President is right to keep the country and Congress updated on military and diplomatic efforts—just as it will be important for the President to update on how the air campaign will fit into the overall strategy to destroy ISIL.” (McConnell, 2014b).

In 2016, McConnell argued that it lies within the U.S.’s national security interest to defeat ISIL, as that is the only thing that can stop ISIL from attack the U.S. again. This statement came after a terrorist attack on U.S. soil in 2016. McConnell argues that the U.S. has to defeat ISIL, not just contain them (McConnell, 2016c)

In 2017 McConnell was supportive of the airstrikes against Assad as it was done as a response to the Assad regimes attack with chemical weapons. The attack will also prevent Assad from using chemical weapons again, McConnell argues (McConnell, 2017d). In 2018, McConnell was once again supportive of the airstrikes against Syria. McConnell said that:

“The tactics the Assad regime has employed to consolidate gains and terrorize the people of Syria have stood in defiance of the clear U.S. position that the use of chemical weapons is unacceptable. It was time to act.” (McConnell, 2018e)

In 2019 McConnell argued that he was not supportive of the decision to withdraw from Syria as there is still work that has to be done in Syria and that if the U.S. leaves while the conflict is unresolved, the conflict will just get worse. McConnell argues that:

“We are not the world’s policeman. But we are the leader of the free world. And it is incumbent upon the United States to lead, to continue to maintain a global coalition against terror, and to stand by our local partners who are engaged in a daily fight against the terrorists.” (McConnell, 2019f)

5.4. Republican arguments: a summary

None of the GOP representatives were supportive of the airstrikes in 2013, two were opposed and one was unsure on the issue. Rubio and McCarthy argued that the U.S. needs to do something, but military force is not the solution, and McConnell was opposed any U.S. involvement as it had nothing to do with the U.S. in his opinion. Rubio argued that the U.S. had to show rogue states that the use of chemical weapons and that committing war crimes will not be unpunished. McConnell also argued this but argued that the U.S. should only hold state accountable if they attack the U.S. and U.S. allies. In 2017 all three GOP representatives
were supportive of the airstrikes against Assad, with the same arguments: to show that Assad
cannot use chemical weapons without facing the consequences. The three GOP
representatives does argue that it is vital for the American national security and the security of
their allies to hold Assad accountable, somehow end the conflict, and defeat ISIS.

When Obama was president, the representatives were against military force against Assad,
however when Trumps became president, they were all supportive of airstrikes against Assad
both in 2017 and 2018 with the arguments that the U.S. has to show states like Syria that
using chemical weapons and committing war crimes will have serious repercussions.
6. Analysis
By looking at the arguments from different analytical perspectives it is possible to recognize the differences and similarities between not only the representatives, but the two parties. Furthermore, by looking at the politician’s arguments thought the lens of chosen theoretical frameworks, we can explain why the politicians argued in the way that they did.

6.1. Theoretical analysis of Democratic representatives
The arguments presented by democratic representatives Engel and Pelosi can be explained by analyzing their arguments from the perspectives of democratic peace, humanitarian intervention, and just war. Warrens arguments can be explained through just war.

6.1.1. Humanitarian intervention
When comparing Engel and Pelosi to the humanitarian intervention it is clear that the democrats argue in the frame of this theory as well. They argue that Assad’s and ISIS’s war crimes, use of chemical weapons, and terrorism must have consequences. They support airstrikes against the dictator and the terrorist organization and further they support assisting those who fight both ISIS and Assad. In 2015 they support deploying troops to fight both Assad and ISIS. When Assad’s regime both violates human rights on its own and is incompetent of stopping the human rights violation from an outside organization, ISIS, the international community has a reasonability to protect the civilians in Syria. The U.S. as a global superpower especially has a leading role in protecting the civilians in Syria, as Engel said in 2013.

6.1.2. Democratic peace
It is clear in the arguments made by both Pelosi and Engel that the politicians have a harsh approach towards the Syrian regime. Democratic peace argues that democratic states, while friendly with other democratic states, are harsher in their approach to un-democratic states. Both Pelosi and Engel have argued for intervention in Syria on different grounds, but this is something that you arguably do not witness when they are confronted with an issue in a democratic state, according to democratic peace. Secondly, Pelosi and Engel are condemning the use of chemical weapons, and they are supportive of the moderate Syria opposition. Engel further wish to assist those who are fighting for freedom, building peace, and to create a Syria without Assad, which according to Engel is vital to American national security. This correlates to the theory of democratic peace in the sense that the presence of dictators is a threat to all democracies. Democratic peace can further explain the reason for why the democrats argue in the way that they do. The theory claims that the spread of democracy is
vital for U.S. security as the presence of dictators is a threat to the American people and the American state. Increasing the number of democratic states in the world would, according to democratic peace, increase the number of states that are friendly with each other. Thus, it is logical that the U.S. would aim to stabilize Syria and remove Assad from power, as he is de facto a threat to American security. This would increase the peace and security in the world, as well as in the U.S. according to both Pelosi and Engel and democratic peace. Pelosi and Engel do use this argument, that defeating Assad is a matter of national interest and for the security of U.S. allies, on multiple occasions. Furthermore, they argue that there can be no military solution to the conflict, it has to be political because as long as Assad is in power, the regime poses a threat to the U.S.

6.1.3. Just War
Furthermore, the democratic representatives Engel and Pelosi do argue in a way that relates to just war. First it is vital to ask how Engel and Pelosi justifies intervening in Syria, as there was no attack against U.S. targets or U.S. allies. As stated above, Pelosi and Engel argue that it is justifiable to intervene in Syria with airstrikes and military troops because it serves American security interests and it protects U.S. allies, which I have discussed above. They also justified it by arguing that both Assad and ISIS have committed war crimes in different ways. According to democratic peace and humanitarian intervention these are justifiable reasons for intervening in a sovereign state. However, while these are justifiable reasons for engaging in a conflict with another state, the issue of the authorization of engaging in a conflict still remains. Who, or what instance, can authorize the U.S. intervening in Syria, which is a sovereign state? In this instance, U.S. congress authorized their own military intervention to settle the humanitarian crisis in Syria and stopping Assad from committing war crimes. The issue is that the U.S. is not an authority that can justify one state to intervene in another state. Just war argues that the UN is an instance that can justify one state to intervene in another. Therefore, it could be argued that the U.S. can justify their intervention in Syria is legitimate, even without the justification from the UN security council, through the UN endorsed R2P. The R2P states that if a state fails to uphold the human rights of its citizens, or it violates the human rights of its citizens, instances where Assad’s regime has failed on both, the international community has a responsibility to protects the civilians. This is what Pelosi and Engel argued was one of the reasons for intervening in Syria. This does correlate to the Jus ad bellum criteria of just war.
Furthermore, just war states that the interventions have to be just as well, in the sense that the intervention should be proportionate, should spare civilians, and the military is responsible for their actions. Pelosi and Engel argued for airstrikes as they would be targeted against either ISIS territories, or against facilities from where Assad’s regime use and create chemical weapons. Further, they argued that airstrikes, the train and equip program, and deploying a small number of troops to assist those fighting Assad and ISIS, would prevent a future large-scale intervention. This in turn means that the intervention is proportionate as the U.S. would only attack strategic targets that poses a threat, such as chemical weapons facilities and ISIS strongholds. Furthermore, this minimizes the civilian casualties. When both Engel and Pelosi shifted in the question about putting troops on the ground in Syria, they both argued that this was necessary to prevent a future large-scale intervention. These arguments overlap with the \textit{Jus in bello} in just war.

Warren’s arguments overlaps with just war throughout the conflict. While Warren agrees that Assad indeed has to be held accountable for his crimes and Warren is supportive of airstrikes against Assad. However, Warren warns for unintended consequences of the airstrikes. Warren has over the years requested both president Obama as well as president Trump to present a solid strategy for defeating both Assad and ISIS, further Warren has requested achievable goals. The request for strategic plans with goals and ways to achieve the goals are of course to keep the interventions as small and efficient as possible which relates to the \textit{Jus in bello} part of just war; that wars have to be proportionate, and as quickly won as possible to be just.

Furthermore, Warren continuous to argue that the president must seek authorization for intervention from the U.S. congress. While this is required by the constitution, it is furthermore vital for just war. \textit{Jus ad bellum} claims that for a war to be just, it cannot be declared by politicians for their own gain, rather a war has to have a justifiable cause. Therefore, by arguing that the president must seek authorization from congress, Warren decreases the risk that the war is fought for the president’s own gain, rather it is a democratic decision. In 2017 Warren does argue that Assad needs to be held accountable for violating international law, but Warren continues to argue that the president has to present strategic plans for defeating Assad if he wants congress to authorize airstrikes. Warren is consistent in this argument, which relates to just war, as stated above. In 2019 Warren was supportive of the U.S. withdrawal from Syria. The decision to support the withdrawal continues to follow the line of just war, as Warren cannot justify the intervention in Syria.
6.1.4. **Realism**

Warren was against training and equipping moderate Syrian troops due to the risk of being dragged into another war in the middle east. Warren further argued that it should be the responsibility of the nearby states to solve the crisis in Syria. These arguments correlate with realist thinking, as Warren believes that it is in the U.S.’s national interest to not intervene, as it would damage the U.S., and because the U.S. is not directly affected. These arguments are similar to realist ideas as Warren argues for what is the best for the U.S.’s national interest.

Realists argue that the true underlying reason for a state to intervene in another sovereign state is to protect national interest. Both Pelosi and Engel have argued that defeating Assad and ISIS would protect American security, and American interest. The dilemma posted here is if the true reason for intervention in Syria is to protect national interests, or if the humanitarian and democratic arguments are the true intentions for intervention. A third option is that neither is the sole underlying reason, rather, all arguments used by Pelosi and Engel are all intentions for intervention. Pelosi and Engels argument that the US has to intervene in Syria to uphold their credibility as a global superpower, which compares to the realists understanding of the international community, where the realist argue that the only international actors are the states, and it is up to the states to solve the Syrian crisis. This again links back to the dilemma stated above, what is the underlying reason for intervention?

6.1.5. **Liberalism**

Engel and Pelosi have argued that intervention is vital for a few reasons; holding Assad accountable for his crimes, defeating ISIS and terrorism, protecting Syrian civilians, and protecting U.S. interest and security. Liberals would argue that states should only intervene in other states if there have been great human rights violations, to end a civil war, or stop mass-murdering. Engel and Pelosi have continuously argued that interventions in Syria is necessary to protect civilians from both ISIS and the Assad regime, as they continue to break international law and commit horrible crimes against humanity. Pelosi and Engel further argue that it is necessary to aid, assist, train, and equip Syrian opposition forces to help them defeat both ISIS and Assad. The goal is to end the civil war in Syria, and to protect Syrians from human rights violations from both Assad and ISIS. These arguments overlap with the liberal mind-set for intervening in another sovereign state, and the principle of the R2P - that every state has a moral obligation to intervene in a state where human rights are being violated.
6.2. Theoretical analysis of Republican representatives

6.2.1. Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian intervention claims that interventions are necessary to protect basic human rights and should be used only to protect human rights, to fight genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. When looking at the arguments from the GOP it is clear that they do urge the president to hold Assad accountable for his use of chemical weapons are oppression of Syrian civilians. However, none of them calls for direct military action against Assad in the early stages of the conflict. Rubio calls for a removal of Assad, McCarthy calls for a more elaborate plan against Assad, and McConnell claims that it is not the U.S.’s responsibility, but that Assad should indeed be held accountable. However, the GOP supported airstrikes against ISIL as they are committing genocide and targeting non-Muslims. This is an argument that fits well with the HI theory, however, it does not involve interventions in a state, rather it was interventions against an international terrorist organization that commits horrible crimes against humanity. In the later stages of the conflict, after Trump became president, the GOP was supportive of the interventions in Syria to discourage Assad from using chemical weapons, committing war crimes, and to prevent Assad from using chemical weapons again which does relate to humanitarian intervention.

6.2.2. Democratic Peace

Rubio argues that the U.S. has to remove Assad from power, as he is a dangerous anti-American dictator, and that is the only way to ensure that he does commit horrible crimes, which fits the democratic peace in the sense that liberal-democratic states wants to see more democratic states as that will increase the peace and security in the world. Therefore, the very existence of Assad’s regime is a threat to the American national security and thus it is logical that the U.S. wants to overthrow the dictator.

Democratic peace could explain why the GOP does indeed want to intervene in Syria. As stated above, the very presence of Assad’s dictatorship is a threat to not only U.S. national security, but to the security of every democratic state, thus the removal of Assad is a necessity for the survival of democratic states. Rubio does argue that he wants to see Assad removed. The GOP does argue in the late stages of the conflict that they support American intervention in Syria, and they oppose withdrawing the U.S. troops from Syria as that will do no good.

The withdrawal from Syria will only increase Assad’s power, and it is the U.S.’s responsibility as leaders of the free world to defeat the terror in Syria. These arguments can be explained by
the democratic peace theory as they want to protect the democratic world from the Syrian dictatorship. The theory also claims that democratic state does not engage in conflicts with other democratic state, but they do engage in conflict with authoritarian states which is evidently true in this case.

6.2.3. Just War
When looking at just war, the theory does somewhat explain the GOP’s arguments. The GOP is skeptical to interventions in the early stages of the conflict as they don’t have enough information on the conflict, and there is no certainty that authorizing airstrikes against the Assad regime will efficiently stop the regime from committing war crimes. The GOP does not want to get into a new conflict without having clear goals and ambitions on how to reach said goals. These arguments relate to the *jus in bello*, which claims that there has to be a justifiable reason for intervention for it to be just, which the GOP representatives does not believe that there is. However, the Republican Representatives were quick to support military force against ISIS where they argued that it is absolutely vital to defeat ISIS in order to protect human rights and remove the threat of terrorism against Syrian civilians, and against Americans, pointing to the terrorist attack on September 1¹, 2001. McCarthy also argued that the airstrikes against ISIS are not enough, there is a need for military troops as well, which is an argument for *jus in bello*, fight the war in a way that does not prolong the conflict, and do what is necessary for a quick defeat.

When the GOP in the later stages of the conflict were supportive of the airstrikes against Assad it was because they believed that it was necessary means to defeat Assad and to stop him from committing war crimes, which relates to *jus ad bellum* in the sense that the U.S. had a just reason for intervening. Furthermore, the GOP argued that it was wrong from the president to withdraw the troops from Syria as the conflict in Syria is not over, and withdrawing would just worsen the conflict. This is also a just war argument in the sense that a state should fight the war until it is over, and not leave the country in ruins – the state should aim to win the war and end it as quick as possible to minimize casualties and other damage.

6.2.4. Realism
Prior to 2017 when Trump took office, the GOP representatives were all opposed to military force against the Syrian regime as they argued that it was not an attack against Americans, it will just escalate into a worse conflict which inevitably will drag the U.S. into another large-scale war in the middle east. The survival idea of realism can explain why the GOP representatives chose to argue in this way. For a state to survive in the anarchical international
system, it is necessary that a state does what is required to survive. To not engage in a conflict that has not affected the U.S. is to protect national interests, as intervening could possibly drag the U.S. into a war.

As the representatives of the GOP are conservative, it would be logical that their arguments follow the realist theory. However, realists would criticize humanitarian intervention as well as just war, the two theories that explain the GOP representatives’ arguments. Realists argue that intervention always have an underlying interest that serves the states interest. However, the GOP representatives argue that there is a need to defend American national interest, as well as holding Assad and ISIS accountable for their crimes against humanity. The conflict here is whether or not the real intentions for intervention is saving innocent civilians in Syria by removing Assad and defeating ISIS, or if it is to increase the American national interest and to protect the American people from another attack on American soil. However, in contrary to the realist mind-set, there might not be a conflict between the underlying intentions of intervention. Possibly, the GOP representatives deems it necessary to both protect innocent civilians as well as removing the threat of dictators and terrorist organizations. The GOP representatives have used the argument that the Assad regime is a threat to American national security, which I have discussed above.

The argument that the intervention against Syria is necessary to remove Assad and to defeat ISIS with the intention to increase American security relates to the realist mind-set. Realist’s understanding of the international arena is that a state has to do what is necessary to survive. Acting against threatening foreign states is something that is deemed as serving national security. That states are the isolated actors in the international community is also a realist idea, which associates with the argument that it is up to the states to fight ISIS and Assad. It was thus vital that the U.S. leads that fight, the GOP representatives argue. The realist ideas of survival and self-help could explain why the US had to intervene in Syria to protect the American national interest and security as well. Each state has to do what is best for themselves, in order to survive in the global arena where the realists argue that there is no over-state authority. This could also explain why the GOP representatives and Warren was against intervention in Syria in the sense that they argued that this could lead to unknown consequences and it would drag the US into another war, which was not in the states interest.

6.2.5. Liberalism
Liberalism would argue that liberal states would have reason to intervene in another sovereign state for two reasons, namely; to end massive human rights violation in a state, or to end a
civil war and save the civilians in a state from mass-murder. The GOP representatives have argued that the interventions in Syria is intended to stop the civil war by removing Assad from power, and to stop massive human rights violations by defeating both ISIS and Assad. Therefore, the arguments from the GOP is also following the liberal mind-set for justifying the intervention against Syria. The liberal argument for intervention is that if a state has acted in an oppressive way, it has given up its right to sovereignty, and the international community has a moral responsibly to intervene. However, liberals have a restriction as well; intervention is only acceptable if it can do more good than it does harm. These arguments are closely related to how GOP representatives have argued for intervention against Assad in 2017 and later, and for airstrikes against ISIS facilities.

I find that the liberal understanding of the international community failed to explain the bigger picture of why the politicians presented the arguments that they did. However, liberalism’s justification for conflict can explain the humanitarian arguments for interventions in Syria, as well as the argument that the US had to end the conflict in Syria. Liberals argue that a state should only intervene in another state if there has been human-rights violations, or to stop a civil war, which is associated with some of the representatives presented arguments.

### 6.3. Summary

Following the analysis of the politicians through the lenses of the chosen theoretical framework, the difference between the democratic representatives and the GOP representatives is not that big, with the exception of Warren. Pelosi and Engel have been consistent in their arguments from 2013 until 2019. The two representatives were always supportive of intervention in Syria, with airstrikes against Assad, airstrikes against ISIS, and assisting opposition forces in different ways, for the protection of human rights, as well as American national interest and security. GOP representatives however, argued in the early stages of the conflict that the U.S. should not intervene in Syria for different reasons such as lack of information, belief that interventions would not result in anything positive, and because the U.S. was not affected by the conflict. In 2014 however, GOP representatives were supportive of missile-strikes against ISIS, but not against Assad’s regime. When Trump took office in 2017, the GOP representatives argued that intervention in Syria in necessary to protect Syrian civilians and American national interest and security. What is interesting is that the two parties’ representatives now present their arguments in the same way. Defeating Assad and ISIS is necessary to protect Syrian civilians and American national interest because Assad has committed war crimes, and because ISIS is a terrorist organization, which both
threatens the U.S. Warren has also over the years been very consistent in her arguments. Warren has continuously requested strategic plans for intervention in Syria as well as for withdrawal from Syria, Warren further argued that congress and the president, both Obama and Trump, should be cautious as the interventions might not have the expected consequences, and it could drag the U.S. into another war in the middle east, which is similar to the arguments by the GOP representatives in the early stages of the conflict.

Both liberalism and realism could explain just war, humanitarian intervention, and just war in the sense that all three theories in some way related back to the two grand theories understanding of the international community, and the state’s role in the international community.
7. Conclusion
The arguments from the representatives follows a certain pattern that makes the U.S. foreign policy rather predictable. One could argue that when the U.S. wants to intervene in another sovereign state, they could continue to justify the interventions in the same way as they have done in Syria. One could further claim that this pattern means that the U.S. foreign policy is stuck in a mind-set where their politicians continues using the same, or similar, arguments for foreign interventions. Because the democratic representatives did not alter their stand-point after Obama left office, it shows that the representatives’ opinion on intervention is not definitely decided by party affiliation. Rather it shows that there is no real difference over party lines in their arguments for intervention. This study shows that, as I argued above, U.S. foreign policies has been limited to a number of arguments that will be presented by politicians for how the U.S. should act in the international community with regards to interventions. This is an evolution that we can see from the 90’s when the Cold War ended, and the Soviet Union fell. The U.S. has become the sole global superpower and therefore their foreign policies have changed as well.

What can be concluded from this is that the American politicians and their foreign policies can be evaluated trough the same theoretical lenses. Humanitarian intervention, democratic peace, and just war all explained parts of the arguments, and it showed how similar the representatives’ different arguments were, even over party lines. The theories could somewhat explain the arguments presented by the representatives. However, none of the theories could alone explain the complexity of this conflict. Rather it was necessary to use all three theories to give a better picture of why the representatives argued in the way that they did. Realism could through its analysis of the international community somewhat explain why the representatives argued one way or another, while liberalism failed to do so. Liberalism could however explain the humanitarian specter of interventions. What is clear however is that none of the theories could give a definite answer as to why the politicians argued in the way that they did.

There is a need to do more research on this topic, and to continue to evaluate the American foreign policies through different theoretical lenses. The findings that there is a reoccurring pattern in the U.S. foreign policies and that the politicians follow the same line of arguments over the course of the conflict is very interesting. Future studies should study U.S. foreign policies from other theoretical lenses as well. Further studies should also apply these theories.
to other countries foreign policies, especially Western countries, to find if their politicians also follow these patterns and arguments, or if this is a phenomenon isolated to the U.S.
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