

## **A. Background**

Relations among US (United State) and countries over the world is interesting to be research, basically US has strong principals in every single relations with countries over the world. In every different countries that has social, geographic, and politic differentiations, US applied different policies also in each countries that called foreign policies. Generally, in implementing its foreign policies America has some principals *based on experience*, and those kinds of experience that can give big influence to positive and negative effect for US national interest.<sup>1</sup>

US insist that countries over the world will be welfare and peace if those countries implement democracy principals. Sometime, US not concern the internal conditions in each countries, and to declare democracy principals whatever actions was implemented by US by peace then can be a war. Such as in the 1960th president Kennedy prevent communism in Berlin from Uni Soviet power, prevent Asia Tenggara from communism, pig gulf invasion to bring down Fidel Castro, by this invasion US almost involved the world in nuclear war, and warning for third world in order that not make relations with Moskow.<sup>2</sup>

Focus of US to use gun when there is a country will disturb democracy practices, because US regard that democracy is the best ideology that they have. If

there is democracy abuses, undoubtedly US makes a doctrine, intervention, then finally involved on the war. The examples of doctrine are, doctrine Monroe in 1823 with the purpose to prevent Europe colonialism in Latin America. So this doctrine make trade relations is close with some countries in US such as Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and even US success to decolonize Cuba from Spain then US build Guantanamo navy in Cuba and US people free in and out Cuba region with the reason to maintain law and order.<sup>3</sup> Then other doctrine that was created 1947 until 1980, such as Johnson doctrine (1965) with the purpose to fail other power in west world and also US believes that there are efforts to coup Dominica, and to prevent communism in Nicaragua that was helped by Cuba and Soviet with coup El Salvador government. Then Carter doctrine (1980) to prevent threaten in Persian Gulf which has oil rich, US intervention because of gun crisis in Cuba, then war of American and Vietnam to prevent Communism in South East Asian.<sup>4</sup>

After the Cold war, with the signal of Glasnost Perestroika and the collapsed Berlin wall, US does not have reason to intervene some countries that has accused as communism. Firstly, international politics relations is hard power change to be soft power, so US more promote democracy involved of human rights principals. Even cold war was end, but US intervention keep go on and keep use force, especially in some countries that do human rights abuses.

In the 1990th, International politics knows term of *Humanitarian intervention*, which is a country has right to intervene other country by force, if

there is human rights abuses in order that to protect human rights. But what actually interest of US, US want to achieve in controlled state after intervence. Such as US intervention by bombing Yugoslavia in 1999, with the reason to prevent second change of human rights abuses in Bosnia, but this bombing was critized international communities because create many victims as civilians and then finally US build military camp in Kosovo, Albania, Bulgaria, Makedonia, Hungaria, Bosnia dan Kroasia.<sup>5</sup> Then US bomb Afganishtan with the reason to stop Taliban rezim that was accused as terrorist nest and must be responsible to WTC and to build system of democracy government in 2001, but finally US build military camp Afganishtan, Pakistan, Kazahkstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kysgysztan, Georgia, Yaman, dan djibouti.<sup>6</sup> After that, US attacks Irak because Irak was accused by US has Weapon Mass Destruction (WMD) and then finally US creates controlled state in Irak, so America has freedom to control Irak.<sup>7</sup>

Since after cold war in 1990th, describe that US has big spirit to intervence countries, even it is clear that cold war was end and issue of international community changed from communism to be human rights where this issue be reason for US to do humanitarian intervention. US also use force to intervence Haiti, Dominica, and the last Libya in 2011.

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1999\\_NATO\\_bombing\\_of\\_Yugoslavia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1999_NATO_bombing_of_Yugoslavia), was taken on April 22, 2011

<sup>6</sup> [http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate\\_c?hl=id&langpair=en|id&rurl=translate.google.co.id&u=http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War\\_in\\_Afghanistan\\_%282001%25E2%2580%2593present%29&usg=ALkJrhg7y-CwkQ4Z6IUEntj7CvyQTEL\\_HA](http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?hl=id&langpair=en|id&rurl=translate.google.co.id&u=http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_in_Afghanistan_%282001%25E2%2580%2593present%29&usg=ALkJrhg7y-CwkQ4Z6IUEntj7CvyQTEL_HA), was taken on April 22, 2011

<sup>7</sup> [http://books.google.co.id/books?id=pMJb3KKYEgC&pg=PA8&lpg=PA8&dq=%22jenisjenis+intervensi%&source=bl&ots=XUgpsmbe2f&sig=8yewk0Ff7yhewewUyVJ1jgH138&hl=id&ei=pLyxSuB7z4GRBaiDwd4L&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=6#v=onepage&q=%22jenisjenis%20intervensi%22&f=false](http://books.google.co.id/books?id=pMJb3KKYEgC&pg=PA8&lpg=PA8&dq=%22jenisjenis+intervensi%&source=bl&ots=XUgpsmbe2f&sig=8yewk0Ff7yhewewUyVJ1jgH138&hl=id&ei=pLyxSuB7z4GRBaiDwd4L&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=6#v=onepage&q=%22jenisjenis%20intervensi%22&f=false), was taken on April 22, 2011

Those kinds of US interventions are clearly different with some US policies toward Myanmar. Myanmar<sup>8</sup> is one of the country in South East Asian that do human rights abuses. It is indeed that US give sanctions but have not humanitarian intervention yet.

In making policies toward Burma, US as if as reluctantly involved on this issue, whereas Myanmar is not implement democracy principals and human rights abuses since 30 years. And even sanctions that was given by US did not give any kinds of changes and there is no follow up.<sup>9</sup>

The arbitrariness of Myanmar government to take over the process of democratization in Myanmar in the serious conditions. Since the winnings of NLD party that was led by Aun San Suu Kyi in the general election on 1990, then junta military government refuse the result of general election. The actions of junta military were full of struggle of power, dirty politic, and tricky. They didn't give welfare hoping for entire society, in other hand military junta accuse that Aung San Suu Kyi as a leader of NLD didn't obey the remand center and even military justice sentenced that if Suu Kyi will be punished for five years and practically she can not follow the general election 2010.

Some years, junta military government make Burma's people suffered. Junta military use strategy of violence and destruction campaign with the actions as follows killing over 3.500 ethnic in their villages, using rape as a weapon of war, make Burmese people to be poor and ask them to be forced laborers, killing

---

<sup>8</sup> In this thesis, the writer will use term of Myanmar and Burma to mention this country

<sup>9</sup> Keren Kompos, *Suu Kyi Berhentikan Rakyatnya*, November 15, 2010, pg 9.

unarmed civilians, and over 2 million people were forced to leave their homes as refugees and automatically make them as homeless around of the regions or even countries.<sup>10</sup>

This regime also takes the ownership from rich people to make nationalization with the purpose to make farmer and labor more welfare but the implication is not based on promising conditions before and even the power is not owned by labor and farmer but the power was owned by military elite. Government also do cruel actions for their people that just ask justice and demonstration to the government about their policies that not tend to the Myanmar's people and Junta tortured some Buddhists who demonstrate about the rising of fuel toward junta military government in 2007.<sup>11</sup>

This case should be strong reason for US to do humanitarian intervention toward Myanmar, moreover those kinds abuses since long time ago and cause Myanmar people suffered and lose their rights such as education, secure, partisipation in politic and organizations.

Based on the writer, this phenomenon is interested to be research, because based on example above US always do hard pressures to intervense a country that do human rights abuses and even until make state collapsed then involved of making state to control new state. But in Myanmar case, US makes different policies, US do not implement hard pressure but those kinds of pressure did not many changes and even Junta military government in Myanmar still exist until

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://uscampaignforburma.org/>, was taken on January 19, 2011

<sup>11</sup> *Kansas Newsroom Myanmar*, Boston: 455 (Newspaper Distribution), November 24, 2010, Pg. 10

now. So by this case, there is question that will be describe in the next explanation.

## **B.Research Question**

Based on the background so research question is **“Why the US in promoting humanitarian intervention in Myanmar is weak?”**

## **C.Theoretical Framework**

### **1. Humanitarian Intervention by Pluralism**

Humanitarian intervention emerged because of the emerged of the commitment of the society after Holocaust, genocide and mass killing. But this will be hard for international society vis a vis principles of sovereignty, non-intervention, and the non use of force.

In the classic definition, R.J.Vincent defined intervention as activity undertaken by a state, a group of state or an international organization which interferes coercievely in the domestic affairs of another state. It is a discrete event having a beginning and an end , and it is aimed at the authority structure of the target state. It is not necessariy lawful or unlawful, but it does break a conventional pattern of international relations.<sup>12</sup> The main point in that definition is traditionally intervention defined as coercive breach to intervence other country and its sovereignty and coercive breach violates to collide the norms of non

---

<sup>12</sup> John Baylis and Steve Smith (2005). *The Globalization of World Politics : An introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press. Page

intervention 'essentially prohibits domestic jurisdiction of any state' (customary international law and article of 2(7) of the UN Charter).<sup>13</sup>

Humanitarian intervention is the controversial issue in international relations, because there is two basic of laws. Firstly, Legitimate of use force in the practices of Humanitarian intervention by the reason The Right of Self Defence in the Article 51 of the Charter. Secondly, the majority of international lawyers, called *restrictionists* argued that the prohibition the use of force in Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter render forcible humanitarian intervention is illegal.

In response of humanitarian intervention practices, there is some objections reasons for legitimizing of humanitarian intervention which is called **Pluralism**. The writer will use this theory to analyzed the case of low level of the US to promote humanitarian in certain state, Myanmar.

Bhikhu Parekh argues that humanitarian intervention should be 'an act wholly or primarily guided by the sentiment of humanity, compassion or fellowfeeling, and is in that sense of disinterested'. But in the pluralism argues that, *firstly*, about its objection toward humanitarian intervention because state only pursue their national interest and thus humanitarian intervention is ruled out since state are motivated solely for national interest. *Secondly*, the legality the use of force for humanitarian intervention practices (Article 2(4)), this will lead to abuse, because state can abuse the force in the name of self defence without creating a new legal right of humanitarian intervention with the condition of

permissible, and state can espouse humanitarian intervention motives as a pretext to cover the pursuit of national interest. Here, humanitarian intervention just as a tool of weapon strong state to attack the weak state. *Thirdly*, humanitarian intervention can be low, failed or nothing because of selectivity of response. A state always apply principles of humanitarian intervention selectively, resulting an inconsistency in policy. Because state will be governed by what they judge to be their national interest, they intervene only when those cases are considered can give benefit for their national interest. The problem of selectivity arises when an agreed moral principles vis a vis more than one situation, but national interest dictates a divergence of response. For example in the same year, there is two or more human rights abuses are espoused by certain countries, but not all are applied humanitarian intervention.

In the US case with Myanmar, this theory can explained that the inconsistency the US to promote human rights issues over the world. So it makes the US low to promote humanitarian intervention in Myanmar because its selectivity.

## **2. Theory of Rational Actor**

Based on Karen Mingst in the book "Essentials of International Relations" the rational actor model is in which foreign policy is conceived of as actions chosen by the national government that maximize its strategic goals and objectives, the state to be assumed to be a unitary actor with established goals, a



set of options and an algorithm for deciding with options best meet it goals. It can draw as follows:<sup>14</sup>

**The Figure of 1 : The Rational Model of Decisonmaking**



Mochtar Masoed in the book “Ilmu Hubungan Internasional, Disiplin dan Metodologi”,,,explained that “foreign policies as the consequence of rational actor”, particularly intentionally created by certain purposes. Foreign policies process describe as intellectual process. Government actions was analogized as coordinative and common sense individual actions. In this analogy, in this analogy, individual passed intellectual steps, by applying reasonable choice which is available. So unit of analysis this decision making model is choice that was taken by government. So that analysis of foreign policy must focus on analyzing of national interest and state, alternatives choice that can be decided by its government, and calculate cost and benefits each alternatives.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> “Karen Mingst (1999) *Essentials of International Relations*”, London : Norton & Company.

<sup>15</sup> Mochtar Masoed (1999) *Ilmu hubungan internasional disiplin dan metodologi*” Jakarta: LP3S

According to Brown and Marcum, rational actors are simply goal-oriented, their goals may involve, for example, increasing individual wealth or improving the welfare of other actors. The decisions made are in accordance of long future orientation. The actors or decision makers need to calculate about the future and consider the consequences that would be risked in the long term period.<sup>16</sup>

In this case, the US still consider cost and benefit, if the US achieve hard politics in democracy process in Myanmar. In explaining that phenomenon, the writer try to analizing this case based on background and theory that explained above, that every countries that implementing their foreign must choose rational choices, is considering cost and benefit then how far those policies can be representative national interest of those countries and can improve national welfare. And also US foreign policy toward Myanmar, America more choose low intervence than other countries with same case, shortly US did not implement humanitarian intervention.

Considerations of Clinton, Bush and especially Obama, of course based on rational considerations such as observe and analyze the internal condition of internal and external condition. The internal condition involved of economic and politic in Myanmar, the external conditions such as Myanmar relations between South Asian countries and also other countries. In the political and economic sector, Myanmar is startegic country in South Asia for the US. Because of that reason, US policies toward Myanmar based on rational choice in order that not

---

<sup>16</sup> Brown N. Jonathan & Marcum S. Anthony, (May 2007) *Changing the linchpin: motivational foundations of rational choice in international relations*", Retrieved from: [http://www.brown.edu/acad/GVPT/innovations/2007-07-09/07-09-09/Brown\\_Marcum.pdf](http://www.brown.edu/acad/GVPT/innovations/2007-07-09/07-09-09/Brown_Marcum.pdf)

giving disadvantage for US in the future. US considers maximum result with minimum capital for national interest of the US. As the explanation about cost and benefit for US policies toward Myanmar, the writer will describe with the table as follows :

**Table 2: Optional Cost and Benefit**

<b>Options</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Benefit</b>
1. Alternative A	✓	✓
2. Alternative B	✓	✓
3. Alternative C	✓	✓

Based on table explained that US policies toward Myanmar is considering costs and benefits based on national interest of the US. With maximum gain and results, also choose the best alternatives which one the most suitable policies must be applied in Myanmar by observing internal and external condition of

## **D. Hypothesis**

By explaining some datas above and theoretical framework, the writer give the temporarily conclusion the low level of the US to promote humanitarian intervention achieve Myanmar because of US considerations involved of politically and economic aspects conditions and US tend to use pluralism theory to delegimate the practice of Humanitarian intervention in Myanmar.

## **E. Purpose of the Writing**

### **1.Objective Purpose**

This research was done with the purpose, firstly,to know more about the issue related with the low level of the US to promote humanitarian intervention in Myanmar. It is very exited to reserach, because based on some datas was found by the writer,the US has no consistency about their principals in human rights issues, paricularly in Myanmar and there which is Myanmar abuses human rights for more than 30 years but there is no significant changing for Myanmar people. And through this thesis, the write try to analyzed what factors actually the US do not apply humanitarian intervention in Myanmar, like in other countries with same cases which were applied humanitarian intervention by the US. In this case based the writer, the US facing dilemma as the world democracy promotor, US do not want if its reputation was falling down in international community remembering that the US is democracy peoneer, whereas case of not admitted general election result where Aun San Suu Kyi be a winner get many attentions from international community as human right and some democracy abuses in that country. This case

will be interesting because creating dilemma for US in implementing foreign policy especially in Myanmar.

Secondly, to know more about the relations between US and Myanmar in political and economic which is give big influence toward US foreign policies to Myanmar. And of course, to know the core problem of this research that is what factors actually that make low intervention of the US foreign policies in Myanmar.

## **2. Subjective Purpose**

Beside for the objective purpose which is related with intellectual development, this research also as the requirement to get academic title as the Master of Political Science in University of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.

## **F. Range of the Research**

In this thesis the writer will focusing discussion start on the condition after Cold War especially when there is no other reason for the US to intervene other country. But it is so wide, then the writer will do small elaboration each policies of the US presidents as rational actor toward Burma beginning Clinton, Bush, and will more focusing on the Bush and Obama policies. Because the writer thinks that it will be interesting beginning Clinton until Obama policies toward Burma, there is no significant changing for Myanmar people. The system of writing by mixed and combine with the Myanmar case and other countries which was applied forcible humanitarian intervention by United States.

## **G. Methode of Research**

Methode of the research was done by using secondary data from a paper, diktat, Journal of Encyclopedia, Mass Media nor electronic, internet, and other sources.

## **H. Writing Structure**

CHAPTER I : as a standarization of scientific writing involved of background, Research question, Theoretical framework, Hypothesis, Purpose of the writing, Range of the research, Methode of research, and writing structure.

CHAPTER II : explaining about human rights abuses that were done by junta military government in Myanmar. In this chapter will be seen that US did not fair in making policies related with promoting human rights.

CHAPTER III : explain about the history of human rights ideas, how can the human rights as a global universal values, then the promotions of human rights in international community by certain state especially US. As the general promotor, the US has particular role to promote ideas of human rights. This thesis will be limited on the time of the US promotion of human rights in the Cold War until after Cold War, related with some US foreign policies based on human rights values. By the spirit promotion of human rights values over the world toward some countries which did not implement human rights values in their governmmetal system. Then particularly US policies toward Myanmar related with the sanctions and embargo and the result of the sanctions for Myanmar

**CHAPTER IV : Explanation about some factors that influencing low level of the US to promote humanitarian intervention in Myanmar. Hence, the US considers for every foreign policies that it made, the writer will analyzed some considerations of the US which is involved of political and economic considerations in Myanmar and the Legitimation of the US actions toward Myanmar related with humanitarian intervention based on Pluralism Theory.**

**CHAPTER V : explanation about conclusion of Call to Arms and the conclusion of the**