CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

First think first this thesis is about the consistency of practice humanitarian intervention in international politics especially related with the US foreign policy by humanitarian intervention in certain countries where conducted human rights to their citizen. In the 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.

The term of humanitarian intervention beginning from human rights principals in after 1945 era and especially in the globalization era, by the signals that world can see many government and non governmental organizations as declarations or agreements that which give more attentions about human rights issues such as Amnesty International, IMF, and others. And then the human rights principals develop and more develop while under some International Protection of Human Rights. The ideas of human rights more and more develop year by year and be universal as a norm in every decision making process of governmental, moreover the US as super power state has commitment to promote this ideas.

The ideas about human rights that came from democratic values, it is not only effected toward domestic governmental system in the US itself, but also US has commitment to promote democratic and human rights values in over the world as the best way to conduct governmental system. And the issues of human rights had
have been one of the consideration of the US in decision making process, particularly in the post cold war era. In the cold war, the issue about human rights was ignored because highly competitive between US and Soviet Union.

In the post cold war era, the significant changing in decision making process of the US in foreign policies with the signal when the fall down of Wall Berlin so it makes US be super power country. So it makes the US as if as lose the issue about communism as be basic of US foreign policy change to issue around environment, democracy, and human rights. By human right issue, US starts to intervene other country with the reason responsibility to protect countries' citizen. The US intervenes some countries such as Iraqi in 1991, Somalia in 1992 until 1993, Haiti 1994 until 1995, Yugoslavia in 1999, Irak and Afghanistan in 2001 until now, and Libya in 2011.

But those kinds of foreign policies of America by humanitarian intervention in some countries that was mentioned before is different with US foreign policies with Myanmar. Whereas Myanmar has almost similarity case with those countries. Myanmar is under authoritative and dictatorship regime for about 40 years. Many credible sources from international organization through picture, video, or directly interviews with the victims show the atrocities of Myanmar government are very clear. Those atrocities like as the democracy life in Myanmar is improperly with US democracy principals and the arbitraness of Myanmar military government toward Aun San Suu Kyi as democracy figure, the suffering of Myanmar people because of poverty, here there is no fair distribution between government and citizen. Then suppression of junta military government in
Myanmar toward minority ethnics such as killing, rape, forced labour, expulsion from their land. Myanmar government also apply brutal actions toward protester actions such as demonstration by shoot and the last is the highly human rights abuses in around Yadana gas project such as killing, military training with the force for protecting the pipeline corridor, forced labour, land confiscation for forest areas. But those kinds atrocities did not make for the US to apply humanitarian interventions by military invasion toward junta military government.

As a tool of analysis, the pluralism theory which explained about its objection for legitimizing humanitarian intervention can be proven here. One of the contents argued that humanitarian intervention can be low, failed or nothing because of selectivity of response. A state always apply principles of humanitarian intervention selectively, resulting an inconsistintency in policy. Because state will be governed by what they judge to be their national interest. By seeing some human abuses in Myanmar and policies of the US that not conduct humanitarian intervention in that country, it can be proven that in the same case and same year, the US implements different policies. It can be called selectivity of response by the US. Those response can be seen from the president of the US, beginning from Clinton until Obama.

In applying humanitarian intervention, the US also consider costs and benefits of all kinds all aspect for national interest of the US. Related with cost and benefits considerations, here the second theory can be proven, that is rational actor theory. Where the US as a rational actor has considerations if conducted humanitarian intervention in Myanmar. Those considerations involved of political
and economic considerations. Political considerations of the US are the US thinks that there is no strong opposition except junta military power which hold all power than others and problematizing Myanmar is highly cost in South Asia because Myanmar has very strategic relations with China especially in military and economic aspect. Then the economic considerations of the US are the cost of Iraqi and Afghanistation invasion contribute economic recession for the US then those invasions give effect toward lack of international trusty for the US and Chevron as one of the biggest US company is operating in Myanmar. Those kinds considerations so it makes the low level of the US to promote humanitarian intervention in Myanmar.

The writer hopes that with existence of this thesis can give more understanding about pluralism theory with explaining about objections of legitimizing of humanitarian intervention in international politics especially to make deep analysis toward the US foreign policies which often conducted invasion with the reason responsibility to protect. In this thesis, the combination of pluralism theory and rational actor theory is very suitable to analyze this thesis, because the pluralism theory explained that there is no humanitarian intervention is failed or nothing if a state especially US solely by national interest. And