

Originalan naučni rad
UDC 327:341.3::316.7:00.5
341.233
Primljeno: 09.04.2014.
Odobreno: 18.05.2014.

Evgeny Pashentsev,
Faculty of the Presidential Academy of
National Economy and Public Administration, Moscow, Russia

ENFORCING “HUMANITARIAN WARS”: A CASE OF COMMUNICATION MISMANAGEMENT

Abstract

The author of this paper researches the phenomena of “humanitarian wars”. Humanitarian intervention or humanitarian war is defined as the use of military force against any foreign state or any forces on its territory in order to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe or genocide. At the same time, humanitarian intervention is not supposed to be a new conduit for traditional military invasion or foreign interference with internal affairs of other states in the pursuit of ulterior political goals. Double standards in official statements and media coverage flourish everywhere, and the double talk is not only enforcing unipolarity, but also uni-vision. The rising role of deception in defense of ‘humanitarian operations’ brings chaos to the world order and increases global instability and mutual suspicion between different states and peoples. In general, technologies of regime destabilization are more effective the greater the degeneration of the regime proceeds. In the very end of this process, there is an uncontrollable chaos or a generation of the new revolutionary upward force which is hard or impossible to counteract. As a rule, technologies of “pseudo-revolution” are used from the outside in order to prevent a democratically-oriented way out of the crisis. This requires a new sentence (as it is the sentence now is incomplete), not to allow uncontrollable chaos in the nuclear-weapon state (or in any other, where there is some interest. In practice, we see democracy being used as a front for advancing forces, policies, and goals which then bear little resemblance to democracy as such. When authentic democratic forces are weak, it is possible to establish pseudo-democratic bodies which

lead the “revolution” for the benefit of a new reaction and they do so by means communication methods.

Key words: humanitarian wars, communication mismanagement, management, humanitarian intervention, public relations

Humanitarian intervention versus “humanitarian intervention”

Humanitarian intervention or humanitarian war is defined as the use of military force against any foreign state or any forces on its territory in order to prevent a humanitarian catastrophe or genocide. At the same time, humanitarian intervention is not supposed to be a new conduit for traditional military invasion or foreign interference with internal affairs of other states in the pursuit of ulterior political goals. Unfortunately, the continuation of these old habits under the cloak of a new slogan or term is what we have seen in practice. In other words, under a closer scrutiny, “humanitarian intervention” appears to be closely intertwined more with warfare than with humanitarianism, and that proper designation of such warfare is information warfare and psy-ops, which entails among other things strategic deception in support of the not-so-humanitarian goals.

Humanitarian intervention then becomes an instrument and a false front of neo-militaristic aggression. While such use or rather abuse of promised humanitarianism by means of war seems to be available as a fair method and policy to any nation, the U.S. and its allies have been rather adamant to claim “humanitarian interventions” as their own exclusive prerogative and business and only, in some cases, they were willing to “outsource” it to others.

The experience with humanitarian interventions thus also reveals its arbitrary and self-serving character, which is not lost on Western researchers either Brigadier Michael Arnold from Deakin’s Centre for Defence writes:

Peace interventions, as implied by the name, are operations designed to end conflict and/or provide succor to a suffering population. They include peacekeeping, humanitarian and post-conflict stabilization operations. Non-peace interventions are simply all the other forms of intervention and are

conducted with self-interest and the primary motivation of the intervening state (s).¹

Arnold shows that the adopted classifications are arbitrary; one form of intervention can lead to another. For example, the provision of military advisers by the U.S. to South Vietnam in 1959 quickly escalated into mass deployment of combat troops and large scale war-fighting throughout the 1960 and early 1970s. The 2003 Iraq intervention turned into a "nation-building" mission in the conditions of an unexpectedly ferocious and wide-spread insurgency and resistance.² According to Brigadier Arnold, the intervention in Iraq was initially a type of non-peace intervention which is "conducted with self-interest [as] the primary motivation of the intervening state (s)". The liberation mission of Soviet troops transformed with time in construction of the bureaucratic centralized alliance etc.

Following the controversy surrounding NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) was established by the Canadian Government. The ICISS published its report, "The Responsibility to Protect," in December 2001. The very first sentence of the report reads:

This report is about the so-called 'right of humanitarian intervention': the question of when, if ever, it is appropriate for states to take coercive – and particular military – action against another state for the purpose of protecting people at risk in that other state.³

Despite the obvious efforts to rationalize humanitarian interventions and to establish some objective grounds for them, the whole concept remains vague and ambiguous and is more opportunistic than a matter of clear and well-articulated principle. Where clear principals and established accountability are lacking, what remains of humanitarian intervention is then a communication strategy driven by policies and decisions which a war or intervention in the name of humanitarianism is to achieve. Humanitarian interventions then becomes a new political brand made of "deeds, words and images."

1 Arnold M. *Intervention. The Unity of Force in International Politics// Contemporary Security and Strategy*, ed. Craig A. Snyder. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 268.

2 Ibidem., 269.

3 Cit.: Heir A. *The Responsibility to Protect. Rhetoric, Reality and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2012, p. 255.

Let us consider Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. The situation in all these countries is catastrophic, and the purported humanitarianism either failed to happen or it happened, but failed to meet its stated goals. There are no effective institutions of civil society; all these countries are now classified as the most failed states in the world; their integrity is in shambles. Violence continues. Religious, ethnic, social, and political divisions remain deep. Human rights continue to be severely violated. Breaches of basic civil rights are numerous. Democracy has not become a reality. Corruption is rampant. Authoritarianism, warlords, and oligarchs rule., The number of victims among civilians during the humanitarian occupation of Iraq exceeded 100,000 people. And the number of victims among the Afghans, Libyans and Syrians – the new candidates for the peacekeeping operation- is increasing every day.

As such, this new humanitarianism by means of force, invasion, and occupation has failed. This, however, does not mean that the struggle for control and energy resources has been suspended by such humanitarianism. Russia and China were removed from the Libyan market after Gaddafi's capture, lynching, and brutal execution. In Iraq, as a result of the withdrawal of the U.S.-led troops, which increased the autonomy of the Iraqi government, Russia and China were invited back as Iraq's important business partners.

On the whole, as shown by the polls, the Western positions in the Muslim world are far from being stable. This seems to indicate that strategic communication in conflict stabilization and post-conflict recovery by NATO and the U.S. is not yielding desired results. Instead, violence and instability has been disseminated, and more radicalism rather than less has been generated.

In 2005 Russia became an observer in the Organization of the Islamic Conference. This was followed in March 2006 by the formation of a Russia-Islamic World Strategic Vision Group, which held its inaugural meeting in Moscow, where representatives from about twenty Moslem states were present. When the Secretary-General of the Arab League Amr Moussa visited Moscow in February 2007, he commented : "Relations between Russia and the Arab world are flourishing today and we greatly value Russia's policy in the Middle East. The policies of other countries regarding our region have not proved as successful, perhaps. Russia is one of the few countries whose policy is distinguished by an understanding of the reality of our region."⁴

4 Smith Mark A. Russia and the Persian Gulf, *The Deepening of Moscow's Middle East Policy*, Watchfield, Conflict Studies Research Centre at the Defence Academy of the United Kingdom. p. 6.

"It is highly likely that these "other countries" would include the USA," observed Academic Researcher at UK Defense Academy Mark Smith. "The chaos in Iraq," Smith continued, "has probably convinced many Arab leaderships that US policy in the Middle East is seriously flawed. American rhetoric and policy since September 2001 have often given the false impression in the Arab world that the USA is engaged in a crusade against Islam, and the Arab world has long resented what it sees as excessive US support for Israel. Russia is not perceived in this way...⁵. If one country is losing its game because of a reckless and the short-sighted policy, then logically, countries with more balanced approach wins the hearts and minds. Smith further pointed out:

Russia is currently in the fortunate position of being able to talk to everyone in the Middle East, unlike the USA. Moscow can talk to both conservative and radical Arab regimes, to Sunni and Shi'ite alike, to Israel and Hamas, and to Iran. This gives her a flexibility that the USA does not have. Whilst it does not mean that Moscow will be in a position to supplant the US presence in the Middle East, it does mean that Russia is re-emerging as a significant player in this part of the world, and that her role and presence are likely to increase in the years ahead...⁶

This is not to say that Russia may not face problems in her relations with the Middle East and Moslem world. It may not be possible in the long term to maintain cordial relations with all nations and movements in the Middle East. Close support for Iran and Syria could damage Russia's relationship with Israel and the neighbors of Iran⁷.

Recently, we have seen that the relations between Russia and the Arab League, especially the countries of Persian Gulf, seriously worsened by the events in Libya and Syria. We can see here a rising divide between Russia and China (and BRICS countries as a whole), on one side, and NATO, on the other. The real geopolitical context of the situation in the Middle East is thus more explicitly entering the picture. And it is difficult to believe that Saudi Arabia or Qatar do their militant and expansionist policies, whether in Libya or Syria, without any counsel with the

5 Ibidem.

6 Ibidem, p.7.

7 Smith Mark A. Russia and the Persian Gulf: The Deepening of Moscow's Middle East Policy, Watchfield, Conflict Studies Research Centre at the Defence Academy of the United Kingdom, p.8.

USA, their chief protector and sponsor, which has its fleet bases in the region and multibillion deposits of the Persian Gulf monarchs in American banks.

Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" has also become a clash of words and images, which rather tend to foreclose debate than to encourage it, and thus possible alternative visions are for now being silenced. Double standards in official statements and media coverage flourish everywhere, and the double talk is not only enforcing unipolarity, but also uni-vision. Joshua Foust, a fellow at the American Security Project and a columnist for *The Atlantic* magazine, lists the following instances of such double standards:

- The NATO silence on Bahrain's crackdown and its saber rattling in Syria.
- Bitter criticism of the atrocities of Qaddafi regime and keeping silence about the atrocities of the current regime in Libya.
- The creation of South Sudan, lauded by human rights and other activists as a victory when the small country was established last year, has created unspeakable misery.
- The last 11 years of bloodshed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has inspired a small, toothless U.N. mission there, but no calls in the Security Council to immediately end the violence against civilians.
- U.S.-allied Saudi Arabia is a notorious abuser of human rights and engages in social violence, but no one is clamoring to remove the Saudi family regime for the sake of its people.
- In Western Sahara, U.S.-allied Morocco engages in torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, and repression of civilians. But most humanitarian interventionists don't even know where that is on the map.
- Why the images and video of the mass slaughter in Internet coming from Libyans and Syrians find the global audience and the Congolese, Yemenis, Sudanese and others are being ignored? The blatant hypocrisy of those same western countries not intervening in their own abusive client regimes — while angrily condemning the Russians and Chinese for identical policies — is, one supposes, to be ignored.⁸

During the early part of the Libyan war, NATO targeted the Libyan intangible assets before the main strike. Both governmental bodies and mass media were

⁸ Foust J. Double standards of intervention// PBS. February 14, 2012. URL: <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/opinion/double-standards-of-intervention/13096/> (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).

involved. Thus, on the one hand, in the Western mainstream media the negative traits of the regime were exaggerated, creating an image and perception of “a cruel dictator of a long-suffering country”.

The number of negative articles about Qaddafi overwhelmingly outweighed the number of the articles about the unsavory policies of theocratic monarchies of the Gulf and their leaders. The information campaign quickly and easily turned the majority of the population into supporters of the military operation against “the bloody dictatorship”. It is noteworthy that, just shortly before this disinformation campaign started, Western countries as well as Arab reactionary and authoritarian regimes had been appreciative of the advances in human rights under Qaddafi:

- Canada welcomed improvements made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in its respect for human rights.
- Qatar praised the legal framework for the protection of human rights and freedoms, including, *inter alia*, its criminal code and criminal procedure law, which provided legal guarantees for the implementation of those rights.
- Bahrain noted that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya adopted various policies aimed at improving human rights, in particular the right to education and the rights of persons with disabilities.
- Saudi Arabia commended the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya’s achievements in its constitutional, legislative and institutional frameworks, which showed the importance that the country attached to human rights, and for the fact that international treaties took precedence over its national legislation⁹.

The above are statements from official UN documents composed only a few months before despotic Arab theocracies and NATO combined in a collusion that sponsored and then directly fought the “humanitarian” regime change in Libya, using human rights as the main argument for intervention. Such an abrupt about-face makes us believe that either there was an analytical incompetence of the

9 Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Human Rights Council Sixteenth session. United Nations General Assembly, 4 January 2011//Universal Periodic Review. Pp.7-11

respected governments or that we have here a textbook example of synchronized strategic deception of both the public and the foe.

**“Humanitarian interventions” begin before they are
officially declared**

The Director-General of RUSI Michael Clarke¹⁰ wrote in summer 2012:

We are not moving towards intervention but intervention is certainly moving towards us. For western policy-makers the issue is rapidly resolving itself into questions over the purposes and most appropriate modes of intervention. Indeed, in some important respects, Western intervention has already commenced...Western countries have backed the growing supply of arms, via Arab sources, to rebel forces for some months now¹¹.

In a RUSI Syria Crisis, Colonel (Rtd) Richard Kemp adds:

External intervention has been under way in Syria for months, with Russia arming the regime. At the same time Saudi Arabia and Qatar, with US and Turkish facilitation, have been arming and funding the opposition; and this covert support has been substantially responsible for the progress opposition forces have made in recent weeks.¹²

These assertions are, of course, debatable. Is mass slaughter of the civilians a result first all of government repression or the activities of the rebels supported with foreign money, weapons, and other kinds of assistance? Who started the war? And who can safely say that the theocratic dictatorships of Saudi Arabia or Qatar could not first finance clashes and organize produce first victims like the Nazis did when they needed to justify the war with Poland?

“Because we saw it and it’s horrible” is not a valid reason for intervening in other-country’s affairs. Nor is it valid to claim that the international community should

10 The Royal United Services Institute. On its site, one can read the following: “The Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) is an independent think tank engaged in cutting edge defence and security research. A unique institution, founded in 1831 by the Duke of Wellington, RUSI embodies nearly two centuries of forward thinking, free discussion and careful reflection on defence and security matters.”

11 Clarke M. A collision course for intervention//RUSISyria Crisis Briefing. July 25, 2012.P.2-3.

12 Kemp R.Options for Intervention//RUSISyria Crisis Briefing. July 25, 2012.P.5.

do whatever it can (whatever it is) because "doing nothing is not an option". The question of how the conflict actually started is very crucial for it makes difference between a humanitarian operation to save people from a dictator's genocide and an illegitimate use of force, which violates international law.

We badly need a better understanding of the activities and relationships of Al-Qaeda and other international Salafist and Syrian jihadists that are now entering Syria in increasing numbers. For these elements have the support of Saudi Arabia and Qatar and they would undoubtedly have a leading, if not decisive role in Syria if the Assad government falls.¹³

British Prime Minister David Cameron, visiting a camp for Syrian refugees in Jordan on November 7, 2012, said that the U.S., Britain and other allies should do more to "shape the opposition" into a coherent force and open channels of communication directly with rebel military commanders: "There is an opportunity for Britain, for America, for Saudi Arabia, Jordan and like-minded allies to come together and try to help shape the opposition, outside Syria and inside Syria." He further said, "And[we must] try to help them achieve their goal, which is our goal of a Syria without Assad."¹⁴

A Cordiale Entente of NATO, Saudi Arabia and Al-Qaeda in Defense of Democracy? The wrong message at the wrong time

It is a paradox but NATO countries are working hard to bring freedom to the country with the only remaining secular regime in the Middle East in Syria and they are doing so hand in hand with the most "notorious abuser of human rights" like Saudi Arabia and Al-Qaeda, which attack and will continue to attack the West. Should this mission succeed, Saudi Arabia and Al-Qaeda would become yet stronger and more deeply entrenched. Even the Americans do understand that wrong and mutually incoherent messages and images have been coming to public attention as a result of such self-contradictory policies.

13 Kemp R. Options for Intervention // *RUSISyria Crisis Briefing*. July 25, 2012. P.8.

14 Galvak D., Stringer D. Obama re-election signals new phase in Syria war // *Associated Press*. November 7, 2012. URL: <http://news.yahoo.com/obama-election-signals-phase-syria-war-112519191.html> (Accessed: 14 March, 2013).

One can see then a potential split in the US on the question of direct aid to the opponents of the Assad regime. The majority of people in the USA are against a new “humanitarian intervention” of the USA in Syria that makes the Obama administration more cautious. For example, typical readers’ comments (more than 700) on Dale Galvak’s and David Stringer’s article, “Obama re-election signals new phase in Syria war” reflect positions of many ordinary Americans:

- Read “The Everlasting Hatred” - to make sense of this madness. The West is helping to bring in the Muslim Brotherhood who has a goal of defeating the West. It is insane, self-destruction.
- Who would have thought that the U.S. will officially become an ally of a terrorist organization?
- Now would be a good time to learn to speak Russian or Chinese.
- Someone please let me know when Obama starts his nation-building here at home.
- So the Muslim Brotherhood will be running Syria too.
- Obama’s re-election = endorsement of the “Arab Spring” and imposition of Sharia law on minority communities.....Congratulations, Libs.
- Nice, after the election we find out the war monger is going to get us involved.

Deception involving top political leaders

In London in November 2012, British Foreign Secretary William Hague said that talks with rebel military leaders would not involve advice on military tactics or support for their operations. Hague also insisted that Britain would not consider offering weapons to Assad’s opponents¹⁵.

But more recent reports have stated that British and French Special Forces have been actively training members of the FSA from a base in Turkey all along. Some reports indicate that training is also taking place in locations in Libya, Yemen, and Northern Lebanon. British MI6 operatives and UKSF (SAS/SBS) personnel have reportedly been training the rebels in urban warfare as well as supplying them with arms and equipment. CIA operatives and special forces are believed to be providing communications assistance to the rebels. In March 2013, Cameron declared that Britain could break with the European Union arms embargo on

¹⁵ Galvak D., Stringer D. Obama re-election signals new phase in Syria war // *Associated Press*. November 7, 2012. URL: <http://news.yahoo.com/obama-election-signals-phase-syria-war-112519191.html> (Accessed: 14 March, 2013).

Syria, allowing flow of weapons to anti-government rebels battling Syrian President Bashar al-Assad¹⁶.

President Barack Obama signed a covert directive authorizing U.S. support for Syrian rebels battling President Bashar al-Assad’s forces, U.S. officials told CNN. It was unclear when the president signed the authorization for Syria, but the sources said it was within the past several months.¹⁷

Earlier, in the process of the informational-psychological warfare against Libya, the Obama administration was also much more directly and heavily involved in the war, as was subsequently revealed.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton accused the forces of Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi of using rape and violence against women as “tools of war.” Clinton said that the United States was “deeply concerned” by reports of wide-scale rape in Libya and “troubled” by reports that governments across the Middle East and North Africa were using sexual violence to punish protesters. “Rape, physical intimidation, sexual harassment, and even so-called ‘virginity tests’ have taken place in countries throughout the region,” she said in a statement.¹⁸

At the same time the chief reporter for *Amnesty International*, who had been staying in Libya for three months at the beginning of the insurrection, stated that he did not find any evidence or a single victim of rape or a doctor who knew about somebody being raped.¹⁹

International Human Right Organization Human Rights Watch also reported that they failed to find the evidence. On the contrary, Canadian researcher Andrew Marshall reported that the rebels had been very active, in fact, in manufacturing and propagating lies that supported intervention and war. For example, they stated that

16 Abbas M., Griffiths P. Cameron: Britain could break with Syria arms embargo// Reuters. March 12, 2013. URL: <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2013/03/12/uk-britain-cameron-syria-idUKBRE92B0TX20130312.html> (Accessed: 14 March, 2013).

17 Labott E. Obama authorized covert support for Syrian rebels, sources say//CNN. August 1, 2012. URL: http://articles.cnn.com/2012-08-01/us/us_syria-rebels-us-aid_1_syrian-rebels-syrian-opposition-free-syrian-army (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).

18 Clinton accuses Gaddafi of using rape as a tool. // Hindustan Times. June 17, 2011. URL: www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/Americas/Clinton-accuses-Gaddafi-of-using-rape-as-a-tool/Article1-710387.aspx (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).

19 Marshall A. G. Lies, War, and Empire: NATO’s “Humanitarian Imperialism” in Libya. August 26, 2011. URL: www.andrewgavinmarshall.com/2011/08/26/lies-war-and-empire-nato%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%9Chumanitarian-imperialism%E2%80%9D-in-libya/ (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).

Qaddafi had foreign thugs and gunmen sent against his own people, to kill, destroy and quell the uprising in eastern Libya. But Amnesty International produced no evidence. An Amnesty International representative reported that these purported foreign thugs were in fact working migrants in Libya who were afterwards they were released. Others, less lucky, were executed while the political leaders kept speaking about foreign thugs and further inciting social unrest.²⁰

Christopher Paul from Rand Corporation points out:

If we must retain “black” information capabilities (and I accept that there are compelling arguments for doing so), carve them off and sequester them from other sources of messages and signals. Do not have the same organizations and personnel conducting both truth-based and false messaging. Retain some kind of conduit or connection between those who deceive and manipulate and the rest of the communication community for deconfliction and coordination purposes, but keep such “black” information capabilities small and away from the light. Freeing routine communication conduits from the suspicion of falsehood both internally and externally will increase credibility and make coordination and integration easier.²¹

The rising role of deception in defense of ‘humanitarian operations’ brings chaos to the world order and increases global instability and mutual suspicion between different states and peoples.

The architecture of the regime destabilization

In general, technologies of regime destabilization are more effective the greater the degeneration of the regime proceeds. In the very end of this process, there is an uncontrollable chaos or a generation of the new revolutionary upward force which is hard or impossible to counteract—the feudal counterrevolution broke down facing the iron will of the Jacobins; the Triple Entente was not able to stop the Bolsheviks.

20 Ibidem.

21 Paul Chr. Getting Better at Strategic Communication. Testimony Presented Before the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on July 12, 2011. Pittsburgh, 2011. P.17

The declining stage of the process while the situation is not inflammable faces the programmes of the radical reforms on behalf of the potential-bearing part of the elites (the New Deal) or there is some downward revolution (a military coup against Farouk in Egypt, the Carnation Revolution in Portugal). This whole sentence needs to be rewritten and I am not sure how

As a rule, technologies of "pseudo-revolution" are used from the outside in order to prevent a democratically-oriented way out of the crisis. This requires a new sentence (as it is the sentence now is incomplete), not to allow uncontrollable chaos in the nuclear-weapon state (or in any other, where there is some interest.

In practice, we see democracy being used as a front for advancing forces, policies, and goals which then bear little resemblance to democracy as such. When authentic democratic forces are weak, it is possible to establish pseudo-democratic bodies which lead the "revolution" for the benefit of a new reaction and they do so by means communication methods.

When, as expected, the government tries to defend itself and counteracts, images of "victims and casualties" via mass media and rumors are deployed increasing active support for the "democratic", "national" "opposition" against the "bloody regime" both inside the country and on the part of world opinion.

If, initially, the production of the victims is carefully organized, later due to the escalation, which produces violence and chaos, massacres are but inevitable as the regime loses power, and society is engulfed in by violent rage. In the condition of an open crisis, people are ready to appeal to arms, and violence becomes massive and more and more indiscriminate. , If constant mass media manipulations are still further added to this fire, the boiling pot of social discontent is no longer containable.

The unleashing of such chaos and violence—or regime change management by means of chaos and violence—excludes and blocks genuine democrats, making them as outsiders to the political process. In other words, the irony of "humanitarian interventions" has been the sacrificing of real democrats for the sake of new authoritarianism and radicalism—in the name of the democrats. As Sean M. Linn-Jones concluded, "in many famines or civil war—from North Korean to Afghanistan—parties to the conflict will try to manipulate humanitarian assistance to

advance their own interests.”²² And this is what we have seen in Libya and now in Syria.

This critique of information and communication technologies of “humanitarian wars” in no way idealizes or defends the regimes of Qaddafi or Assad, but appeals for a politically more accurate appraisal of the conflict and for greater and more honest respect for the well-being and rights of these nations.

What to do to

If Americans, British, Russians, French or Chinese intend to play a respectable role in the Arab world, their own hearts and minds need to acquire a new, progressive economic and social-political quality. The current global crisis “made in the USA” (J.Stiglitz) is not the best qualification for any kind of humanitarian intervention even with very good intentions.

One can support democratic revolutions or try to replace them with much needed reforms. It is also possible to do so by means of introducing new euphemisms that help introduce a controlled chaos (Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Syria...) as a tool for regime change if we soberly look at the results, it is hard to believe that the interests of the USA and the other Western countries in the Muslim world have been thereby served well. At the same time, the support of the Assad regime by Russia and China also falls short of enhancing stability of the country and the region as a whole. The crisis in the Arab world is the manifestation of the world system crisis. Ad hoc solution can hardly ever help when the problems are so deeply fundamental. No country can deal with the crisis of this depth and magnitude alone.

This means that mankind must overcome together the present crisis and its extremely grave dangers. For if the current systemic crisis is not properly addressed, the current and emerging conflicts are able to become the final mistake in the human history. This calls for new constructive solutions, for which, however, an effective model for development in the XXI century is needed as well. Old solutions do not work, the new ones are hidden in the fog of the crisis. The ability to listen and understand is perhaps one of the main conditions for finding the way out from the current extremely difficult and dangerous global situation and for moving ahead together.

22 Lynn-Jones S.M. *Realism and Security Studies// Contemporary Security and Strategy* (ed. Craig A.Snyder.London:Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.P.40. It is what we had seen in Libya and now one can observe in Syria.

References:

- Clarke M. A collision course for intervention//RUSI Syria Crisis Briefing. July 25, 2012.
- Craig A.Snyder, *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2012.
- Heir Aidan, *The Responsibility to Protect.Rhetoric, Reality and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2012.
- Kemp R.Options for Intervention//RUSISyria Crisis Briefing. July 25, 2012.
- Lynn-Jones S.M, "Realism and Security Studies", *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, (ed. Craig A.Snyder), Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2012.
- Paul Christopher, *Getting Better at Strategic Communication*, Testimony Presented Before the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on July 12, 2011. Pittsburgh, 2011.
- Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review.Libyan Arab Jamahiriya Human Rights Council Sixteenth session. United Nations General Assembly, Universal Periodic Review. 4 January 2011.

- Smith Mark, *Russia and the Persian Gulf: The Deepening of Moscow's Middle East Policy*, Watchfield, Conflict Studies Research Centre at the Defence Academy of the United Kingdom, 2007.

Internet:

- Foust J. Double standards of intervention// PBS. February 14, 2012. URL: <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/opinion/double-standards-of-intervention/13096/> (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).
- Galvak D., Stringer D. Obama re-election signals new phase in Syria war // *Associated Press*. November 7, 2012. URL:<http://news.yahoo.com/obama-election-signals-phase-syria-war-112519191.html> (Accessed: 14 March, 2013).
- Abbas M., Griffiths P.Cameron: Britain could break with Syria arms embargo// Reuters. March 12, 2013.URL:<http://uk.reuters.com/article/2013/03/12/uk-britain-america-syria-idUKBRE92B0TX20130312.html> (Accessed: 14 March, 2013).
- Labott E. Obama authorized covert support for Syrian rebels, sources say// *CNN*. August 1, 2012.URL: http://articles.cnn.com/2012-08-01/us/us_syria-rebels-us-aid_1_syrian-rebels-syrian-opposition-free-syrian-army(Accessed: 10 November, 2012).
- Clinton accuses Gaddafi of using rape as a tool. // *Hindustan Times*. June 17, 2011. URL: www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/Ameri-cas/Clinton-accuses-Gaddafi-of-using-rape-as-a-tool/Article1-710387.aspx (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).

- Marshall A. G. Lies, War, and Empire: NATO's "Humanitarian Imperialism" in Libya. August 26, 2011. URL: www.andrewgavinmarshall.com/2011/08/26/lies-war-and-empire-nato%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%9Chumanitarian-imperialism%E2%80%9D-in-libya/ (Accessed: 10 November, 2012).

SPROVOĐENJE "HUMANITARNIH RATOVA": SLUČAJ LOŠEG KOMUNIKACIJSKOG MENADŽMENTA

Apstrakt

Autor ovog rada istražuje fenomene "humanitarnih ratova". Humanitarna intervencija ili humanitarni rat definiše se kao primena vojne sile protiv bilo koje strane države ili bilo kakvih snaga na njenoj teritoriji u cilju sprečavanja humanitarne katastrofe ili genocida. U isto vreme, humanitarna intervencija ne bi trebala biti nov provodnik za tradicionalne vojne invazije ili strana mešanja u unutrašnje poslove drugih država u potrazi za skrivenim političkim ciljevima. Dvostruki standardi u službenim izjavama i medijskoj pokrivenosti cvetaju posvuda, a dvosmislenost učvršćuje ne samo unipolarnost, već i uni-viziju. Rastuća uloga obmane u odbrani "humanitarnih operacija" uvodi kaos u svetski poredak i povećava globalnu nestabilnost i međusobno nepoverenje između različitih država i naroda. U principu, tehnologije destabilizacije režima su efikasnije što je veće propadanje prihoda jednog režima. Na samom kraju ovog procesa, nalazi se nekontrolisani kaos ili generisanje nove revolucionarne napredne snage kojoj je teško ili nemoguće suprotstaviti se. U pravilu, tehnologije "pseudo-revolucije" koriste se izvana kako bi se sprečio demokratski orjentisan način izlaska iz krize. Ovo zahteva novu kaznu (u sadašnjem obliku kazna je nepotpuna), koja ne bi dopuštala nekontrolisani kaos u jednoj državi sa nuklearnim naoružanjem (ili u bilo kojoj drugoj, gdje ima nekog interesa). U praksi, vidimo demokratiju koja se koristi kao paravan za napredovanje snaga, politika i ciljeva koji onda imaju malo sličnosti sa demokratijom kao takvom. Kada su autentične demokratske snage slabe, moguće je uspostaviti pseudo-demokratska tela koja vode "revoluciju" u korist nove reakcije i to uz pomoć komunikacijskih metoda.

Ključne reči: humanitarni ratovi, loš komunikacijski menadžment, menadžment, humanitarna intervencija, odnos sa javnošću.