

When states choose to use military force

A comparative study between Operation Thunderbolt and
Operation Neptune Spear

Abstract

States use military force on a regular basis in international politics. By implementing the theory of Realism, it can provide a perspective on why states choose to military intervene over international diplomacy. The use of military force is apparent, even though international politics is said to be controlled by International Law. The purpose of this thesis is to get an explanation for military force by using a comparative method on two cases, Operation Thunderbolt and Operation Neptune Spear. The chosen cases are two stealth operations, not being acts of war, operated 35 years apart with Operation Thunderbolt happening 1976 and Operation Neptune Spear 2011. These two cases bare noticeable similarities. By comparing the similarities and differences of the two cases with the questioned theory of Realism, it will try to provide clarity to the thesis and try to redeem the theory of Realism.

Keywords: Operation Thunderbolt, Operation Neptune Spear, Realism, Sovereignty, Self-help

Words: 9518

Characters: 60084

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Purpose and Research Question	2
1.3	Demarcation	3
1.4	Method and Material	3
1.4.1	Operationalization	3
1.4.2	Method	3
1.4.3	Material	4
2	Theory.....	5
2.1	The theory of Realism	5
2.2	Realism and Security.....	6
3	Operation Thunderbolt.....	8
3.1	States as central actors.....	8
3.2	The Survival of states	10
3.3	Self-help	10
4	Operation Neptune Spear	12
4.1	States as central actors.....	12
4.2	The Survival of states	14
4.3	Self-help	15
5	Analysis.....	17
5.1	Analysis: States as central actors	17
5.2	Analysis: The Survival of states.....	18
5.3	Analysis: Self-help	19
6	Conclusion	21
7	References.....	22

1 Introduction

This spring, two movies that had a great impact in Hollywood and rest of the world, were *Argo* and *Zero Dark Thirty*. These movies had in common that they portrayed actual events with a state acting in another state on secret missions, with the rest of the world not being informed. However, the world is said to be in constant change. With the process of globalization and the end of the Cold War, scholars mean have made states adjust their way in acting in international politics. The international community plays a larger role, through the organization of United Nations and its International Law. In this system co-operation between states is highlighted and awarded, whereas when states act individually often are punished for their actions. With states acting individually, especially through military force, it contradicts with the current political system that is said to exist between states in international politics. This Bachelor Thesis will explore the forces of states actions in international politics and other states, through a realistic perspective using two case studies that shows how states simply not only rely on acting through a consent from the international community and that states still are affected by the security dilemma and the international anarchy that prevails between the states. The two cases chosen for this Thesis are the Israeli Operation Thunderbolt (also referred to the names Operation Thunderball and Operation Jonathan)¹, in Uganda in 1976 and the American Operation Neptune Spear (also known as Operation Geronimo)² in Pakistan in 2011.

1.1 Background

As Carl von Clausewitz put it "War is politics with other means". He meant that states act with force towards or in other states to achieve political goals that would be unreachable without the use of force (Johansson 2010: 33). War and military force are in international politics, highly regarded as intrusions on political sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of states. States are keen on protecting the own sphere that is the state, and therefore also respect other states spheres. Rules and laws are set up in International Law to protect states' rights of an own sphere, preventing the use of force by states to escalate. Though, there are loopholes in the International Law (Byers 2005:1f).

¹ From now only mentioned as Operation Thunderbolt

² From now on only mentioned as Operation Neptune Spear

Realists mean that international politics is anarchic with sovereign states acting selfishly on their own behalves. The political anarchy is said to be a constant battle between states for gaining power and for controlling the gained power (Nye 2011:7). The power balance in the political anarchy is said to be controlled mainly by a hegemonic state. States like France, Spain and Great Britain are said to have been the hegemonic states from on different occasions between 16th century and a larger part of 19th century where the United States was appointed as new hegemonic state. The reign as hegemonic state is said to have stretch from the end of 19th century to late 20th century. Hegemonic states are tested by other states through war and military force. Military force is the key instrument in international politics for states to use on other states in order to keep the balance of power (Nye 2011: 14).

From the end of the 1970's and onwards, international politics is said to have evolved increasingly in new ways, hence exposing the limitations of Realism. The end of the Cold War is said to have changed the structures in international relations and politics. The process of globalization, made it difficult for states to keep control by traditional means. The importance of military power and states being the only central actors in international politics, were seriously questioned and therefore seemingly questioned the realistic theory, arguing that it being an “out of date” political perspective (Sheehan 2005: 23).

1.2 Purpose and Research Question

This thesis will focus on states when they felt it necessary to use military force in other states. The cases used will focus simply on the political aspects of using military force, not how the operations themselves were operated. The aspect of political actions is the aspect that suits the theory of Realism best, since it is analytical tool for politics. It will try to give an explanation and give an answer to how states reason in political situations.

The purpose with this bachelor thesis is to investigate the use of military force by states in other states, through a realistic perspective and see if it is possible to get a general explanation of military actions, through the choice of the specific cases. It will argue, by using the cases Operation Thunderbolt and Operation Neptune spear, if Realism is still be considered as an “out of date” perspective or if states are acting in international politics in a “realistic” way. The cases that I have chosen for the thesis are two events that happened with thirty-five years a part. Operation Thunderbolt happened 1976 and Operation Neptune Spear 2011. Operation Thunderbolt therefore should be a classic case to explain through the perspective of Realism. Operation Neptune Spear is chosen to be compared with the other case and if similarities are found, that would mean a strong argument of Realism still being a relevant perspective on international politics.

- Why is military force used by states in other states?

The research question is directed for it to become a part of the general discussion of military interventions in international politics.

1.3 Demarcation

There are many ways for states to act in international politics. They have the tools to solve problems by diplomacy, sanctions, etc. The demarcation of this thesis will be only focusing on cases where states use military force as political tools, through the perspective of the theory of Realism.

Realism as well, is a theory with many directions. This thesis will emphasize on using the general elements of Realism, not simply only use for example classical realism or neorealism. The emphasis of the Realism as a whole concept helps me to operationalize the thesis and get a more general view of Realism on the chosen cases.

1.4 Method and Material

The purpose of the thesis is to investigate states use of military force in other states through a comparative case study between the chosen cases Operation Thunderbolt and Operation Neptune Spear. By doing so, it enables the possibility of drawing a causal conclusion between the similarities of the two cases. Since the both cases happened with thirty-five years apart, it is interesting to see if states have changed their attitudes towards similar situations. The use of a qualitative argumentation-method is also used in the thesis as a complement to the comparative case study method.

1.4.1 Operationalization

In order to be able to answer the research question, the thesis has to be operationalized. The operationalization will be the three elements of Realism, described in the chapter “Realism, by Tim Dunne and John Schmidt in the book “the Globalization of World Politics”. The three elements are essential for all types of realism, hence the choice of them. They offer the criteria to execute the purpose and the chosen method of this thesis (Bjereld 2009: 111f). The operationalization criteria are:

- States as central actors
- The Survival of states
- Self-help

The operationalization criteria are further explained in the theory section of the thesis.

1.4.2 Method

The method used in this thesis will be a comparative case study method, steered by the theory of Realism. This chosen theory helps structure the case through the operationalization in the seeking of causal connections between the two cases. The cases are divided into different variables. The dependent variables (y-axel) of both cases are the violations of state sovereignty, military action on terrorism, two acts not being direct acts of war. The independent variables (x-axel) of the two cases are to be investigated, and if they fit with the chosen theory, it will help answer both the research question and purpose of this thesis (Teorell 2012: 236f).

The qualitative argumentations-analysis reflects the theory of Realism, since Realism is a perspective that uses arguments to prove its points. It provides a necessary tool for the analysis of the used secondary sources. The authors argue and reason for their causes and objectives differently. With different reasons being discussed, a demarcation is essential, hence the need of an argumentations-analysis to meet with the purpose of the thesis (Bergström 2012: 24).

1.4.3 Material

The use of material in this thesis is exclusively secondary sources such as books and scientific articles published in journals and at universities. I chose to only focus on secondary sources, since I felt the subject and purpose of the thesis would not suffer from the lack of primary sources.

The chosen articles and books are of both famous authors such as Noam Chomsky, and of more unknown authors. The unknown authors have I felt obliged to complement and check with other sources, for the absolute certainty of being able to use their research in my thesis. I have chosen to summarize a fitting piece of writing from one of my sources that describes the situation of my cases and describes how different perspectives and preconceived understandings and notions affect the outcome of scientific research:

The conflict between Al-Qaeda and USA can be understood in many ways. The “war on terrorism” is described everything from being a transnational armed conflict to being a political slogan where it simply only gets a label of being a war. There is though, an evident conflict between both parties, shown by the armed violence used. To understand the conflict, various theoretical approaches are used. In the end, the chosen approach has the effect to affect the conclusion and analysis of the conflict (Wallace 2012: 370f)

2 Theory

The main theory used in this Bachelor Thesis is the one about Realism. It describes the different elements of realism, making it possible to make a comparison between the two case studies for explaining states military actions in other states. The Realistic view on security is wider explained in the Theory-section of this thesis.

2.1 The theory of Realism

Realism is a widely divided theory where scholars have different opinions on the definition of Realism. Many different types of Realism have therefore sprung out of the fundament of Realism. There is Classical Realism, Structural Realism, Neoclassical Realism, etc. They are basically the same, but vary differently on minor details (Dunne 2011:89ff). Though, what all forms of Realism can agree on are the three main elements that exist in any form of Realism. In the book “The Globalization of World Politics” in the chapter “Realism” by Tim Dunne and Brian C. Schmidt, the three elements are noted as States as central actors, the Survival of states and Self-help. These elements will be used in the Thesis for operationalization as well as demarking The Realistic Theory (Dunne 2011:93ff).

Statism is the element of how realists consider states being the central actors in international politics and how sovereignty is the distinguishing trait. Keywords of this first realistic element are; sovereignty, political anarchy and zero-sum terms. State sovereignty give states the right of controlling an own territorial space, where it has supreme authority to create and enforce laws and rules. The sovereignty is to ensure inhabitants living within the state, security. Realists argue that states easily provide security domestically, but outside in the international arena of politics, anarchy exists. The anarchy is the phenomena in international politics where states are affected by the non-existence of a sovereign power enforcing laws. The anarchic system pretty much lets states act as they want, which creates a competition for power and security. The competitions are on zero-sum terms and mean that one state competes for relative gains. This according to realists, creating coexistence in international politics where states seemingly are able to tolerate each other for the possibility of gaining something in the competitions of power and security (Dunne 2011:93f).

The survival of a state is the pre-eminent goal for all states. Keywords of this second element of Realism are; security and power. The distinction between what is most important for states, security or power, is widely argued by realists. Security is though regarded to be of highest concern for states. The survival of a

state is simply for it to keep its independence. The survival is therefore a great responsibility on state leaders' shoulders, as they are responsible of protecting their state from domestic and international threats. The protection of a state can go as far as sacrificing citizens for the survival of the state. An ethic of responsibility is the guide for states, which weighs carefully the consequences of states actions for serving the greater good, even though they may be immoral and unjust. The ethic of responsibility helps keeping most states from an uncontrolled behavior of ruthless actions on other states and in their own states (Dunne 2011:94f).

Keywords of the third element of Realism are; security dilemma, self-help and hegemonic state/superpower. The security dilemma is the term of the insecurity that is in international politics where states are to coexist. The security dilemma is managed by a self-help system, where states construct a balance of power between each other, creating situations where states only have themselves to look after. Through the emergence of the security dilemma, states get suspicious and feel that to fight the balance of power and give themselves advantages, they need to enhance the own military sources. With a strong defense, it is supposed to make states feel more secure. However, ironically most states invest in their military, meaning that they do not feel more secure after the undertaken measures for security. Realists are of the opinion that international politics are best dealt by a unipolar or hegemonic state. This state has most power and authority in international politics, making the balance of power easy to understand for other states. The hegemonic state controls international politics, taking away the notion of cooperation between states. In a self-help system, states strive for relative gains in any situation, dismissing the fact of states cooperating (Dunne 2011: 95f).

2.2 Realism and Security

Security, according to realists, is a social construction. Security simply is given the meaning by people in an emergence of an intersubjective consensus. The term National Security, was coined after the ending of WWII to describe the area where public policy was concerned by preserving the independence and autonomy of states. Security later developed to become of great concern when the Cold War started, with National security being synonymous with national decision making and national and independence (Sheehan 2005: 6).

Security is created by states, from within the states where the security is to emerge outwards for other states to notice. This is done by states focusing on their military power and defense, as well as figuring out the threats to the state. The construction of security helps shaping out threats and enemies, being influenced by national and regional culture in states. The state-based meaning of security is said to be the understanding of the balance between violence and power. Security is imposed by the power that the state has and its military (Sheehan 2005:7).

The national security is achieved by states when they address the security dilemma. The security dilemma is dealt with when states think of worst-case scenarios in every political situation. States tend to assume the worst, since it

allows them to prepare against military attacks from other states (Sheehan 2005:9).

3 Operation Thunderbolt

When Israel gained independence after WWII, it triggered the start of the Israel-Palestine conflict and the Israel-Arab war (Lorch 2008: 1). Several battles for power, security and land were fought between the Arabic states and Israel in the years leading up to the hijacking and hostage situation at Entebbe and Operation Thunderbolt. Israel, as a state actor, were able to through its' offensive warfare gain new territory. The pro-Palestine actors' only form of warfare, since being non-state actors, was strategic terrorism acts (Lorch 2008: 3f). On June 27 1976, an airplane took air from Israel travelling towards France. After a brief stop in Athens, terrorists connected to Baader-Meinhof Gang and Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP)³ boarded the airplane and eventually seized control of it, ordering the pilot to land the airplane at Entebbe airport in Uganda (Carlson 1998: 29). The hijackers threatened with killing the hostages unless 53 pro-Palestinian terrorists were released from jails in France, Switzerland, Kenya, Israel and West Germany. During four days of the hijack, 147 non-Jewish passengers were let free to go. Even though the terrorist were conducting the hijacking in Uganda, the Ugandan president at that time, Idi Amin, took no apparent measures to try and rescue the remaining hostages. This made Israel take military action and on July 3 1976, Israeli commandos conducted a stealth rescue operation of the hostages. This operation is considered being highly successful. The operation was performed without notifying the Ugandan government, by having a small Israeli force to storm the landed airplane. The mission ended with only the death of all hijackers, 3 hostages, the leader of the commando unit Jonathan Netanyahu and several Ugandan soldiers (Byers 2005: 58).

3.1 States as central actors

Communications between Uganda and Israel were seen as most central when dealing in the hostage situation of Entebbe. The Israeli officials dealing with the situation addressed the situation and were willing to negotiate with the terrorists aboard. However, when the option of communicating with Ugandan president Amin fell short, the attitude towards negotiating with the terrorist changed as well. Israel's policy of not negotiating with terrorists was further motivated by the fact that the state of Uganda was not willing to help fellow state Israel. With the

³ Referred as PFLP in the rest of the thesis

choice of supporting the terrorists, a group of non-state actors, Israel started to consider the military option that were Operation Thunderbolt, as the most rational for Israel as state (Maoz 1981: 701).

Israel had to assess the situation of the hijacking, that Uganda and its' soldiers had to be considered as enemy threats. The defense of Uganda exceeded over 10000 Ugandan soldiers defending the Ugandan territory in the nation's capital Kampala. These soldiers were within 20 miles of Entebbe airport, and therefore meant that the Israeli operation had to be swift and effective in order of preventing the enforcement of having to fight more enemy soldiers (Carlson 1998: 30).

Israel and Uganda broke relations with each other in 1972. After that, Idi Amin became a proclaimed fighter for the Palestinian cause. He actively trained terrorists in his military and kept close ties with the leaders of Syria and Libya. During the hijacking at Entebbe, Amin openly declared of being a neutral negotiator, which intelligence though could report that he supported PFLP. When Israeli leaders found out that supposedly the Ugandan head of state was not going to help Israel, they got struck by a fear for losing Israeli civilians. Diplomatic and economic solutions were thought of, but would not work. Even though the Israeli attitudes towards negotiations with terrorist organizations were bad, the Israeli leaders felt it could be the only option for Israel to prevent the hostages from being killed by the hijackers (Bonham 1991: 31f). Suspicions towards the intentions of Ugandan authorities intensified when the hijackers broadcasted their demands in Radio Uganda, a broadcasting system controlled by the Ugandan state. MOSSAD, the Israeli Intelligence Unit who serves as collecting information regarding the security of the Israeli state, picked quickly up the information and found out that Ugandan soldiers were guarding the airport (Dobocan 2004: 40).

Under International Law, the actions from Israel are to be seen as the Israeli soldiers violated both the sovereignty of the Ugandan airspace and violated the Ugandan territory integrity. The use of force from Israeli soldier was a blatant act of aggression from Israel and Operation Thunderbolt, through the perspective of International Law, was both a threat and use of force towards the Ugandan independence as state (Krift 1977: 47f). But if Idi Amin really were colluding with the hijackers as he was suspected of doing, Operation Thunderbolt is to be interpreted in another way. This since Amin helped the terrorists with their mission to threaten Israeli nationals, hence confronting the Israeli rights of protecting its' civilians which challenged the Israeli sovereignty (Krift 1977: 53).

Later, after the hijacking incident at Entebbe, reflections of what had complicated the situation landed on the inefficiency of the UN. Critics meant that its' governing body lacked the effective international machinery to prevent the use of force from states. The critics continued with that the problem was not the use of military force at Entebbe, but simply the fact that states continued using military force as the main option in international politics. States legitimize their use of force often on lackluster points, mainly because International Law needs a legitimization to be provided (Gordon 1977: 131) Critics towards International Law also further noted the fact with the Entebbe case that it involves only states and it is only for states to abide. This meant that the terrorists as non-state actors did not have to acknowledge the International Law leading to a situation where

the all pressure landed on Israel. The terrorist were able to violate Ugandan sovereignty and putting hostages in great danger without the need of justification, whereas Israel had to justify all their actions, creating the dilemma of illegitimate state action or let the hostages and Israeli citizens die (Gordon 1977: 133f).

3.2 The Survival of states

If Operation Thunderbolt would be regarded as a humanitarian intervention, it means that it has to be an operation neither seeking a territorial change nor challenge the political independence of the state involved. If so is the case, an operation can be performed on the basis to protect and give security to the citizens of the own state (Salter 1977: 332).

The Operation Thunderbolt, given its' situation, became also part of the bigger picture by becoming just one of the many events of the Israel-Palestine conflict and Israel-Arab war. In that sense, the side supporting the Palestinian cause could take advantage of conducting their warfare in outwardly neutral countries and thereby complicating the actions for Israel. Israel on the other hand, is put in a situation where their national citizens are under threat. The national security is challenged and for Israel, they therefore need to prioritize between the security of Israeli nationals and Israel's international reputation. In the end Israel chose to challenge International Law for the protecting of the own citizens and stabilize the security in Israel (Salter 1977: 335).

The military presence of Ugandan soldiers imposed possibly the biggest threat to Operation Thunderbolt and the hostages aboard the airplane at Entebbe. The military objective of the whole operation was to get to the plane undetected and since Israel suspected Idi Amin of helping the terrorists, the preventing of Ugandan and terrorist casualties were impossible (Carlson 1998: 31). The rescue operation in Entebbe, Operation Thunderbolt, was the opportunity of both saving hostages, gain international reputation and preserve the national security. The military action, that a rescue operation is, has to fit in with the political agenda of a bigger picture. The repercussions of a possible failure or win, affects the outcome of the future for a state's position in international politics (Flora 1998:1).

In Israel, the situation of the hijacking at Entebbe was to address the situation by, delicately balancing the options of negotiations and military actions. The Israeli attitude towards negotiating with the terrorists was negative, but had to be kept as an option if military actions were not to be an option. Israel was main option to solve the situation was to perform military actions that were to be under the circumstances, able to act out a rescue mission with acceptable consequences for Israel. The hostages were to be rescued and at the same time not denting the Israeli political reputation (Flora 1998:10).

3.3 Self-help

The reactions from the UN, in dealing with the hijackings, were very limited. This meant that Israel authorities had to take full responsibility of the following events, at the same time being confronted by the dilemma, do they stand by and watch their own national citizens be murdered by the terrorists for the respect of the state sovereignty, or do they take action and risk breaking International Law. Israel chose the latter, showing that their principles stood firm when dealing with terrorists (Gordon 1977: 129).

The International Law had hard controlling states using self-help as a tool in their politics, at the same time of Operation Thunderbolt. Unilateral responses by states feeling threatened, especially with terrorism involved, became a necessary for states. No international body had the tools or power to take the correct decisions in delicate situations. Therefore it was for the states themselves to act for the survival of its citizens and protect the security of the state (Krieff 1978:59).

Operation Thunderbolt is widely regarded to be the best example of Israeli military actions. It is a classic reassertion on the Israeli strategy to not negotiate with terrorists. Operation Thunderbolt also reflects its' military prestige, showing how Arab attacks on the Israeli sovereignty is treated. Operation Thunderbolt brought with it a worldwide admiration to the Israeli struggle, and further discredited its' Arab enemies (Fondacaro 1989:40). However, Israel did not consider Operation Thunderbolt being the same success as the rest of the world, since one soldier got killed by Ugandan military forces and three hostages also were killed during the operation. Therefore, the result of four casualties showed how everything was not performed as planned, became a point of self-criticism from Israel (Carlson 1998: 34).

Through the perspective of International Law, some scholars argue that Operation Thunderbolt does not qualify as being a humanitarian intervention. The operation served more in the purpose Israeli self-defense, however since Uganda is part of the United Nations, its sovereignty is guarded by International Law. The actions of Operation Thunderbolt can be interpreted as an individual state acting on own terms. International Law does not provide the inherent right for Israel to intervene in Uganda; therefore supposedly International Law was violated by the acts of Israel (Sulyok 2000: 81).

By Operation Thunderbolt being a unilateral action performed by Israel in Uganda, it lands under the category of self-help. Israel had the right to protect its' civilians, and if a country such as Uganda is unable or unwilling to offer that protection, it is possible for a state intervene alone. Since operation Thunderbolt was directed towards the hostage-takers and terrorists and not directed at the state of Uganda, the violation of Ugandan sovereignty even can be seen as justifiable (Krieff 1978: 55f).

4 Operation Neptune Spear

The Al-Qaeda, carried out on orders by Osama bin Laden, the largest terrorist attack by far, on American soil 11th September 2001. Al-Qaeda's discontent with USA was well known before 9/11⁴, but the attack is widely seen as the culmination of the relationship between Al-Qaeda and USA. The attack was carried out by nineteen hijackers on four different planes. The planes then were crashed into the Pentagon, World Trade Center and a field in Pennsylvania. More than 3000 US citizens were killed (Wade 2012: 104). Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda chose to direct the attacks towards USA, since USA was considered to be the international politics sole superpower/hegemon. Bin Laden felt a discontent with the power that USA had and how the power had been gathered. He therefore souk change and felt that attacking USA would be great blow to USA as a state (Hoffman 2011:310). Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaeda got the blame for 9/11 by USA and the international community, which started the largest manhunt in the history of the world Searches in countries such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, lead to the capture of the Al-Qaeda leader named Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, but Osama bin Laden still was able to hide. Though, on May 1st 2011, reports of the assassination of bin Laden surfaced in media all over the world. On orders from the American president Barack Obama, a Navy SEAL team had stormed a compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, being the hideout of Osama bin Laden and part of his family. The news of the assassination of bin Laden was met by the public with mixed reactions. Most American citizens were relieved and joyous, whilst Al-Qaeda condemned the actions of USA, stating that the death of bin Laden was to be retaliated (Wade 2012:104).

4.1 States as central actors

The assassination of Osama bin Laden woke the question of whether the American government and the American president Barack Obama attitude towards the hunt of Osama bin Laden, was direct and offensive. He addressed the public at a university in Nashville, stating that if the United States were to be the only state able to capture or kill bin Laden, they would grab the opportunity once

⁴ From now on only mentioned as the 9/11 attacks

and for all even if that meant operating in another state such as Pakistan. The national security depended on getting rid of Bin Laden, seeing as the Al-Qaeda were still considered to be a major threat to security of the United States of America (Govern 2012: 351f). The importance of hunting down bin Laden, culminated in the killing of him in Pakistan on May 1 in 2011. During the raid at bin Laden's hideout in Abbotabad, documents and other intelligence were retrieved, proving Osama Bin Laden still being a part of the Al-Qaeda. He was still able to run the Al-Qaeda while hiding and therefore still a threat to USA. Operation Neptune Spear took place within the territorial space of Pakistan. The raid shocked the Pakistani leaders, stating that USA should have informed and involved the Pakistani government in the operation. They also felt a great embarrassment by the Pakistani military not noticing the raid. The then Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton said the decision of Operation Neptune Spear was a necessity for USA and that the relationship with Pakistan was not a priority at that time (Stathis 2013:18f).

Operation Neptune Spear was carried out worthy a state representing a law-abiding country. The operation violated the sovereignty of Pakistan, killed bin Laden in front of his family and buried him in the North Arabian Sea. The intervention and the dumping of the body all was carried out hastily, showing how important it was to get rid of Osama bin Laden. He has been described as pure evil and the ultimate enemy to USA, hence the quick action of the American military forces. USA showed no hesitation in the importance of the situation, even though it could be argued that USA lacked the legitimacy to carry out the operation (Dixon 2013: 6)

The role that Pakistan played in Operation Neptune Spear has been hard to define. The Pakistani government and media portrayed their role of being USA friendly and helpful in the hunting of Osama bin Laden. They are said to have seen themselves as eager to please American coalition forces, putting all of their military resources for the American military to use. Yet, the American intelligence was suspicious of Pakistan, accusing them of knowing of the whereabouts of bin Laden. Therefore, USA Operation Neptune Spear executed in the territorial space of Pakistan without letting Pakistani Government officials know, since USA felt Pakistan were unreliable (Soherwordi 2011: 359). In the war on terror, USA leads the way. Pakistani sovereignty and integrity is said to be respected, but actions as Operation Neptune Spear as well as drone attacks in Pakistan, show that the relationship between the both states is singlehandedly on American terms (Soherwordi 2011: 355).

However, it is argued that Operation Neptune Spear when carried out risked starting something larger than a simple dispute between two states, since USA violated the Pakistani sovereignty. The Pakistani military are to protect Pakistani territory against any threat to its state's sovereignty. The American soldiers therefore, if detected by Pakistani soldiers, were vulnerable. Consequently, American military were not only prepared for fighting the protectors of Osama bin Laden, but Pakistani military as well. American actions had before the raid in May 2011 already tested and irritated Pakistan through bombings by drones on Pakistani soil. If not dealt with carefully, the Operation Neptune Spear could have

been the start of an inter-state war between Pakistan and USA (Chomsky 2011:19). Those opposing mean that Operation Neptune Spear instead marked an evolution of conflict-solving. By extensive research and gathering of intelligence, the operation marked how fighting enemies in a stealth way to be more effective than with conventional military forces. Even though the territorial sovereignty of Pakistan was violated, this way of fighting is said to spare casualties and get a more precise military objective (Hasian 2012: 1804).

The assassination of Osama bin Laden violated several norms in International Law. In the way that the operation was performed, it showed how International Law were disregarded by the Navy SEALs by killing bin Laden, instead of trying to capture him and get a trial. Osama bin Laden's death shows how USA chose seeking vengeance for the 9/11 attacks over getting justice through a capture and trial of bin Laden (Chomsky, May 6 2011).

4.2 The Survival of states

In international politics, USA still can be considered to be the only hegemonic state. Before Operation Neptune Spear, USA was felt by some to lose their power. The state was domestically affected hard by the financial crisis and their power in international politics to be in decline. But, by acting internationally with authority, Obama is said to have both saved the status of USA being a superpower and to even increase its power (Stathis 2013: 1).

Operation Neptune Spear evokes several moral dilemmas, where the assassination of bin Laden is the most questionable action of the whole operation. Scholars argue between whether he was rightfully assassinated or if he should have instead been captured and put on trial. The assassination was a political act, part of the bigger picture "War on Terror". It was justified by the American government for being a necessary act, by having Osama bin Laden portrayed as being too dangerous enemy for the western world for him to be kept alive. Barack Obama put it in a speech that bin Laden was a major threat to all what USA stand for, freedom and democracy. The act was simply an act for defending the American democracy (Dixon 2013: 6f). No documents support that President Obama and his advisors felt morally obliged in dealing the matter of capturing or killing Osama bin Laden. What is supported is that Operation Neptune Spear was to be operated swift and smooth, without complications. The ethic of responsibility seemingly in the case of Operation Neptune Spear, was not of highest priority. Most important was having Osama bin Laden in one way or another "put out of play" (Govern 2012: 364).

The raid in Pakistan was seen through the perspective of the White House as a great success. It was a triumph for the national security in USA and that the media coverage would help justify Operation Neptune Spear. The reactions were mixed with scholars either stating that it was a violation of the International Law, or stating that the actions were necessary for the American national security (Hasian

2012: 1807). Hence, American media starting a moral and ethical discussion by simply create a bipolar structure in the argumentation. Operation Neptune Spear as a situation was addressed by painting it simply as good vs. evil, freedom vs. oppression, etc. (Dixon 2013: 2).

The aftermath of 9/11 became a focal point for the American government. USA, with George W. Bush leading the manhunt, reacted by condemning their attacker. USA's national security was severely threatened, and therefore Bush went on the offensive. He stated that the "evildoers" had to be punished and brought to justice. The justice though was more in the line of avenging 9/11 than actual justice (Dixon 2013 2f).

USA is to handle the war on terror with great caution according to Scott Nicholas Romaniuk, a scholar at the University of Aberdeen. His opinion is that the struggle against Al-Qaeda has to be in the best interest of westerners, by prioritizing security of westerners over the chase of vengeance and retaliation on the 9/11 attacks. With bin Laden dead, the conflict still continues, risking the lives of soldiers and civilians. Romaniuk means that the parties involved will never back down, any peace will not be achieved. Instead USA's only option is to aim for keeping it stable. He means that the stability will be the difference between having citizens of the west being safe and only feel safer (Romaniuk 2012: 161).

4.3 Self-help

A rumored agreement between former American president George W. Bush and then military leader in Pakistan Pervez Musharraf is said to have been set between the two states in late 2001. The agreement was to permit American military force and stealth operation to be used in Pakistan, in order for the capture of Osama bin Laden and other Al-Qaeda members. This leaked intelligence was quickly stated by Pakistan to be untrue, since they felt it would be too risky for the civilians and citizens of Pakistan to allow drone-attacks and American military action in Pakistan (Govern 2012: 361).

The relationship of USA and Pakistan was revealed being a restrained relationship by Operation Neptune Spear. Outwards, USA showed to be very positive to Pakistan, but by performing a stealth operation in Pakistan, it shows how the trust between the two states was fake and constructed for media. The American government felt that it was not possible for Pakistani officials to not know that Osama bin Laden hid in their country. Operation Neptune Spear therefore was necessary to be acted out, since it could put a dent in the organization of Al-Qaeda and be a victory in the "war on terrorism" (Stevenson 2011: 15). Anger from Washington was present over the failure from Pakistan to not turn Osama bin Laden over to American authorities. The American anger was answered by a Pakistani anger over American military forces violating their territorial integrity and state sovereignty. The American suspicions of the Pakistani government knowing about the whereabouts of bin Laden were grounded in the finding of the body of the Pakistani journalist Syed Saleem

Shahzad. He was found about the same time of Operation Neptune Spear. Shahzad was a respected journalist in Pakistan, known for his investigations of militants taking over institutions in Pakistan, especially the institution that is the Pakistani military. The recovered body became the assumption of American intelligence that Shahzad was coming too close to the truth of bin Laden hiding in Abbottabad and had to be taken out by Pakistani secret services (Chomsky 2011: 18f).

A reaction from Pakistan, after Operation Neptune Spear, was to go out in the media and express their anger on the violation of their territory. They put it as (Shoherwordi 2012) “This event of unauthorized unilateral action cannot be taken as a rule” (:360). They meant that a state cannot agree to build a trust with another state, but then act on individual basis without checking with Pakistani authorities and get confirmation to continue with the operation. The repercussions therefore could even be that USA is to be considered by Pakistan as a threat to their security. The Pakistani government stated that when USA use drones in Pakistan, they go undetected since they lack the technology for detecting the drones. This creates distrust from Pakistan, disabling the opportunity of cooperation and to rebuild the trust (Shoherwordi 2012: 360).

USA made the decision to intervene in Pakistan with Operation Neptune Spear, since they felt that the Pakistani government was not willing or able to make the needed actions for preventing bin Laden hiding out in the country. Therefore, it made sense for USA to do it themselves when they saw a possibility for bin Laden to plan future attacks against USA while hiding in Pakistan. By defining Al-Qaeda as a threat to USA and since Al-Qaeda is a non-state armed group, Pakistan had to compromise with the sovereignty. A non-state armed group is hard to control, considering it being able to choose and move the headquarters unseen from states. And since Al-Qaeda and USA were in a conflict together, it meant that when a non-state army group and its’ members moves, the conflict follows (Wallace 2012: 374).

5 Analysis

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the use of military force by states in other states, through a realistic perspective and see if it is possible to get a general explanation of military actions and the research question “Why is military force used by states in other states?” By focusing on the purpose and research question of this thesis, an analysis will be attempted by lining up the two cases to compare the results. The analysis will be structured in the way of simply analyzing the result of the cases and the three areas of operationalization, for the possibility of concluding it all together in the conclusion section.

5.1 Analysis: States as central actors

Operation Thunderbolt was the actions towards a non-state actor, the terrorists of Baader-Meinhof Gang and PFLP. The Israeli attitude towards the terrorists was very negative. They had to keep the option of negotiating open, but their main objective was obviously to solve the situation through military force. The Entebbe incident put Israel in a major dilemma by making it decide whether to respect the Ugandan rights as a state, or act selfishly to save its' own citizens. Seemingly, the UN was of no help for Israel, therefore leading to negative consequences whatever the choice of Israeli actions. Israel chose to violate the Ugandan territory risking the critique of the international community, but gained the possibility of saving the hostages on own terms. If Israel instead had chosen to diplomatically try and solve the Entebbe incident through diplomacy, that would mean Israel abandoning the policy of never negotiating with terrorist groups and giving the control of the situation to the terrorists. In the end, by the Israeli choice of Operation Thunderbolt, the general international opinion was that the operation is considered as a great success for Israel as state. Not only did were the majority of the hostages saved, Israel kept its policy against terrorism and were believed to have dealt with outcome best. Furthermore, Operation Thunderbolt strengthened the Israeli position against its opposition in the Israeli-Arab war as well. And since Operation Thunderbolt was directed towards the hostage-takers and not an act of war against the state of Uganda, the violation of Ugandan state sovereignty is regarded fully justifiable.

USA was put in a similar position as Israel, when dealing with the finding of Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad, Pakistan. They had the dilemma as well with the choice whether to use military force in Pakistan, or sit it out and wait for Pakistani authorities take the decision of what was to happen. The choice of American authorities was the use of military force in Pakistan to assassinate Osama bin

Laden. In the case of Operation Neptune Spear, the choice of violated the sovereignty of Pakistan was met with mixed reactions. USA acted towards a non-state actor, in another state hence starting the discussion of the legitimacy of Operation Neptune Spear. The general opinion of these American actions was that the actions were a necessity in the “war on terror”. The discussion though is more divided whether it was necessary for the American military to assassinate bin Laden. Many scholars see that Operation Neptune Spear lost its legitimacy when USA chose to kill Osama bin Laden over capturing him and putting him on trial. Critique on the American actions of Operation Neptune Spear also suggested that whatever was to gain from the operation, could easily be triumphed by the fact of starting a growing conflict and possible war between Pakistan and USA.

5.2 Analysis: The Survival of states

Operation Thunderbolt is to be seen in the bigger picture that is the Israel-Arab war. In that context, the aftermath of the whole operation played a big part in how Israel was to be perceived in the war. The element of survival in the theory of Realism focuses on two the balance between power and security. Operation Thunderbolt is to be seen as an operation by Israel for the preserving of its own independence as state and the protection of its national security. However, importantly the military force used by Israel is not to be seen as an act of war against Uganda. The intervention of Israeli forces in Uganda was not the seeking of territorial change or a challenge to the political independence of Uganda thus enabling military force on the non-state actors. Yet, the hijackers possessed the advantage of using the hostage-taking in another country than Israel. By doing so, it put Israel in a situation of insecure decisions. However, since the hostages were mainly citizens of Israel, it actually extended the Israel view of security. A basic right for states is the responsibility to protect the own national citizens. Through the hijacking, the hostages and Israeli citizens lives were threatened, which meant Israel was responsible of saving them. Hence the need of Operation Thunderbolt for the Israeli securing of own national citizens. The military action, versus diplomatic action, is to be seen as the most valid type of action for the security of the hostages given the time and space that Israel had to react.

In the case of Operation Neptune Spear, the action of USA was harder to analyze whether the intentions were gaining power or security for the state of USA. USA, in contradiction with the Israeli case, has long through history been considered as the hegemonic state of International Politics. Before Operation Neptune Spear and death of Osama bin Laden, the position of USA as the hegemonic state was strongly questioned. Therefore it gives a strong argument for the fact that USA operated on the premises of gaining more power, for the strengthening of its status as superpower in International Politics. But, Operation Neptune Spear can also be the act for strengthening the security of USA. Through the perspective of “the war on terror”, by using military force to get rid of the Al-Qaeda main leader, it should weaken Al-Qaeda who is poised in USA as the

major threat to their national security. USA faced the same problems as Israel faced with the terrorist groups being able to move their headquarters without the concern of sovereignty. This led to a chase and manhunt from USA and also meant if USA were to be successful in the hunt of bin Laden, would have to violate sovereignty of states such as Pakistan. Even though Al-Qaeda being a non-state actor, they had violated the sovereignty of USA many times before, especially through the 9/11 attacks, it legitimized American actions against Al-Qaeda, stating the organization being a threat towards USA as state. However, it seemingly is more realistic that Operation Neptune Spear is the action of showing the power of America and that by threatening and hurting the country of USA will not go unnoticed and unpunished. By assassinating Osama bin Laden over capturing and putting him to justice, the public statement of USA was that they are going to be victorious, no matter whatever the actions needed.

5.3 Analysis: Self-help

Israel chose to act solely, hence relying on the self-help element described in the theory of Realism. The choice of Israeli self-help was founded by the lacking of action from the international community. Full responsibility fell on Israel during the hostage-taking at Entebbe airport in Uganda. A big critique was to be directed after Operation Thunderbolt towards the international community for not having the juridical tools and availability to help Israel. By the incomplete laws of International Law it meant it was leading to the only option for Israel, which was self-help. Not only were the International Law seen as incomplete with dealing with the hostage situation, but the role of Uganda also played a part in the Israeli self-help. Since the difficulties of establishing a connection with Ugandan authorities and the growing suspicions of then Ugandan president Idi Amin's support of the cause of the hijackers, it entitled Israel for investigating the possibilities of performing Operation Thunderbolt. If Uganda were seen as either unable or unwilling do something for the rescue of the hostages, it simply justifies the self-help of Israel. Being the general assumption that Israel dealt with hijacking at Entebbe through Operation Thunderbolt it is to be considered as a great success for Israel in international politics, it helped discredit enemies of the Israeli state and Israel further influence in the political arena of International Politics after Operation Thunderbolt.

USA felt the need of using self-help as the only option when acting Operation Neptune Spear. When USA thought that they had found Osama bin Laden, at the same time the relations between USA and Pakistan were not good. USA are said to have confronted Pakistan trying to figure out the intentions of Pakistan and their relations with Al-Qaeda. After Operation Neptune Spear, the views on the situation differed depending on the country, Pakistan or USA. USA accused Pakistani authorities of knowing about Osama bin Laden hiding in their country, while Pakistan claimed they was always going to cooperate with USA when it came to the subject of terrorism. In the end, USA used military force in Pakistan

to assassinate bin Laden without letting any other state know about it or the intentions of American intervention in Pakistan. Subsequently, as in the case of Operation Thunderbolt, when a state is deemed to be unable or unwilling to help a fellow state, it allows space for states to think of self-help. In the case of Operation Neptune Spear, the necessity of the American use of military force is more difficult to justify, since it was a pure assassination act, in comparison with Operation Thunderbolt which purpose was to rescue hostages.

6 Conclusion

The main reasons of Israel choosing to execute Operation Thunderbolt, was the protection of the own national citizens and the refusal of Ugandan president Idi Amin to help Israel. Therefore, Israel focused on their national security and Operation Thunderbolt was a necessary force of action for Israel to stand strong in the anarchy of international politics. It can also be further argued that Israel was forced to rely on self-help by Ugandan authorities and International Law. The UN was not able to assist Israel, forcing Israel to take the decision themself. In the case of Operation Neptune Spear, as I discussed before in the analysis, the intentions of USA has been harder to define. The assassination of Osama bin Laden seems to be an act of power over being an act for security from USA. They accused Pakistan for not being willingly to help with their cause and therefore had to do the operation themself.

The theory of Realism is a rational theory for analyzing these two cases. Both cases show relevance with all the three elements of Realism. The case of Operation Neptune Spear, though show more tendencies of USA being a hegemonic power and therefore taking its own decisions. Operation Neptune Spear was the chosen by USA to be executed, whereas Operation Thunderbolt Israel was forced to act, since Israeli national lives depended on Israeli military force. Through the result of these two chosen cases, the theory of Realism still is to be considered as relevant for analyzing international politics.

Further aspects, such as Operation Eagle Claw in Iran 1980, focus on a fixed orientation of Realism or solely focusing on the analyzing the role of USA was considered to be used in this thesis but had to be cast aside, for this current structure of the thesis. These presented aspects could therefore be interesting for future and further research on the subject of military force.

7 References

- Bjereld, Ulf. Marie Demker. Jonas Hinnfors (2009) *Varför vetenskap?* Studentlitteratur AB, Lund, Sweden.
- Bergström, Göran. Kristina Boréus (Edit). (2012) *Textens Mening och Makt*, Studentlitteratur AB, Lund, Sweden.
- Bonham, Gordon C. (1991) *Special Operations Forces: The Combination Tool in the CINC's Operational Toolbox*. [Electronic] Found: <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA240406> 17/5-13
- Byers, Michael (2005) *War Law*, Grove Press, New York, United States of America
- Carlson, Mark J. (1998) *SOF Planning for Uncertainty: Creative Thinking in Dynamic Environments*, [Electronic] Found: http://edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/theses/1998/Dec/98Dec_Carlson.pdf 18/5-13
- Chomsky, Noam (2011) *my reaction to Osama Bin Laden's death*, [Electronic] Found: http://www.guernicamag.com/blog/2652/noam_chomsky_my_reaction_to_osama_bin_laden 16/5-13.
- Chomsky, Noam (2011) *9-11, Was there an alternative?* Griffin Press, Crawley, Australia.
- Dixon, Izabela. *The moral undertones of the state-sponsored execution of Osama bin Laden in the context of the war on terror*. [Electronic] Found: <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/probing-the-boundaries/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/dixonpunpaper.pdf> 14/5-13
- Dobocan, Claudiu O.(2004) *Decisions integration a critical necessity for special operations*, [Electronic] Found: <https://calhoun.nps.edu/public/handle/10945/1316> 18/5-13
- Dunne, Tim. Schmidt, Brian (2011). "Realism" in Baylis, John. Steve Smith. Patricia Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, New York, United States of America.
- Flora, Ed (1998) *Op Art to the Rescue: Fundamentals for a Hostage Crisis*, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA351735> 18/5-13.
- Fondacaro, Steve A. (1989) *Airland Battle and SOF: a Proposal for an Interim Doctrine for Joint Special Operations*, [Electronic] Found: <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA215563> 16/5-13.

- Gordon, David J. (1977) “Use of Force for the Protection of Nationals Abroad: The Entebbe Incident”, *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 117-134.
- Govern, Kevin (2012). “Operation Neptune Spear: Was Killing Bin Laden a Legitimate Military Objective?” in Altman, Andrew. Claire Finkelstein. Jens Ohlin. *Targeted Killings: Law and Morality in an Assymetrical World*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA.
- Hasian, Marouf Jr (2012) “American Exceptionalism and the bin Laden Raid”, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 10, pp. 1803-1820.
- Johansson, Alf (2010) *Europas krig*, Norstedts Förlagsgrupp AB.
- Krift, Thomas R. (1977) “Self-defense and Self-help: The Israeli Raid on Entebbe”, *Brooklyn Journal of International Law*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 43-62.
- Maoz, Zeev (1981). “The Decision to Raid Entebbe: Decision Analysis Applied to Crisis Behavior”, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 677-707.
- Nye, Joseph Jr (2011) *Att förstå internationella konflikter*, Ashford Colour Press Ltd, Gosport, United Kingdom.
- Romaniuk, Scott (2012) *Slaying the Dragon: Combating Al-Qaeda and the Threat of Militant Islam*, [Electronic] Found: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v5n1p151> 13/5-13
- Salter, Leonard M. (1977) “Commando Coup at Entebbe: Humanitarian Intervention or Barbaric Aggression?”, *International Lawyer*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp 331-346.
- Sheehan, Michael (2005). *International security: an analytical survey*, Lynner Rienner Publishers, Boulder, Colorado, United States of America.
- Shoherwordi, Hussain (2011) “Operation Geronimo: Assassination of Osama Bin Ladin and its implications on the US-Pakistan relations, War on Terror, Pakistan and Al-Qaeda”, *A Research Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, July-December 2011, pp.349-365.
- Stathis, Michael (2013) *Imperial Restoration? Barack Obama and American Foreign Policy*, [Electronic] Found: <https://www.suu.edu/faculty/stathis/ImpRestorText.pdf> 13/5-13
- Stevenson, Jonathan (2011): Echoes of Gunfire: bin Laden, the US and the Greater Middle East, Survival, *Global Politics and Strategy*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 11-18.
- Sulyok, Gabor (2000) “Humanitarian Intervention: A Historical and Theoretical Overview”, *Acta Juridica Hungarica*, Vol. 41, No. 1-2, pp. 79-109.
- Teorell, Jan. Torsten Svensson. 2007. *Att fråga och att svara: Samhällsvetenskaplig metod*, Liber AB, Malmö, Sweden.
- Wade, Brooke (2012) “Al-Qaeda” in Baumgardner, Shane (Edi). Jon Bateman, *Gold Book*. [Electronic] Found: <http://www.trainingminds.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/2011-Gold-Book.pdf#page=103> 13/5-13

- Wallace, David (2012) Operation Neptune's Spear: The Lawful Killing of Osama Bin Laden, *Israel Law Review*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 367-377.