



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

# **Friend or Foe: A Discourse Analysis on Responses to Political Justifications for Violating Non-Combatant Immunity in Unites States Counterterrorism Operations from 2001-2018**

Wassenaar, Daniella

## **Citation**

Wassenaar, D. (2024). *Friend or Foe: A Discourse Analysis on Responses to Political Justifications for Violating Non-Combatant Immunity in Unites States Counterterrorism Operations from 2001-2018*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master Thesis, 2023](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3765044>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

**Friend or Foe: A Discourse Analysis on Responses to Political Justifications  
for Violating Non-Combatant Immunity in Unites States Counterterrorism  
Operations from 2001-2018**



**Universiteit  
Leiden**

**Daniella Wassenaar (S2492598)**

Bachelor Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor  
of Science in Political Science: International Relations and Organisations

Bachelor Project: International Law, Use of Force and Protection of Human Rights

Academic Year 2023-2024

Embargo: published open to public in Leiden University's digital Student Repository

Supervisor: Dr. Müge Kinacioglu

Second Reader: Dr. Martijn Mos

Word Count (excluding references): 7,999

Date: 24/05/2024

## List of Abbreviations

**UNSC:** United Nations Security Council

**UN:** United Nations

**PNCI:** The principle of non-combatant immunity

**IHL:** International Humanitarian Law

**SED:** Supreme emergence justification

**DDE:** The double-effect justification

**R:** Reprisal justification

## Table of contents

Introduction.....	4
Historical evolution and Legal Framework.....	5
Historical Background.....	5
Legal framework.....	6
Literature review.....	6
Research question.....	8
Theoretical Framework.....	9
Methodology.....	12
Analysis & Discussion .....	14
Political Justifications.....	14
Global Security Threat.....	16
Evolution of Responses and Justifications.....	23
Conclusion.....	24
Literature List.....	27
Bibliography for Newspapers & Foreign Affair Statements.....	29
Bibliography for Legal Documents.....	40
Appendix A – Coding Framework.....	41
Appendix B- Coded Tex.....	44

## Introduction

‘All means necessary’, is the resounding imperative echoing from UNSC Resolution 1373, as it underscored the urgent mandate to combat threats to international peace and security posed by terrorist acts. After the events of 9/11 the war on terror emerged as a modern warfare in which states were now allowed to use force art 2(4) UN Charter in anticipatory self-defense art 51 UN Charter against terrorism (Melzer, 2014, p. 298).

The international community now recognized that States could justify their right to anticipatory self-defense with the argument of necessity, stating that terrorism poses an imminent threat to their survival and leaves no time for deliberation. However, this does not remove the obligation to states to apply the rules of *jus in bello* when using force (Gade, 2010, p. 222). One of those rules is the principle of non-combatant immunity (PNCI), which entails that civilians and non-combatants may not be targeted during war, and only combatants may be targeted (Gade, 2012, p. 219). However, in the realm of counterterrorism, states frequently utilize political justifications to circumvent the imperative of distinguishing between legitimate (foe) and illegitimate targets (friends), thereby undermining the legal norm of PNCI (McMahan, 2012, p. 137).

Political justifications, rather than legal justifications, are employed to justify PNCI violations in counterterrorism due to the absence of legal exceptions to PNCI. Analyzing the credibility of these political justifications is crucial, as they can create exceptions and erode PNCI as a norm, potentially endangering civilian lives further during warfare, particularly amid increasing global counterterrorism efforts. This thesis specifically examines the responses of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) permanent members to assess which political justifications they deem credible. As integral members of the Security Council, they hold the responsibility of evaluating peace and security violations and deciding on appropriate responses. Consequently, their actions wield significant influence in shaping the norms governing international conduct, particularly from a constructivist standpoint. This is why this thesis aims to answer the research question: *In what ways have the responses of the UNSC permanent members to the violation of the principle of non-combatant immunity in US counterterrorism practices impacted the norm itself?*

This thesis will utilize the constructivist norm-cycle approach to analyze the stage of norm erosion of PNCI. It aims to analyze the shaping and alteration of PNCI through state

interactions and discourse. Employing discourse analysis, this exploratory research will examine the relationship between language and power dynamics.

Furthermore, the thesis will commence with a historical evolution and legal context of PNCI, followed by a literature review. It will then delve into the constructivist norm-cycle theory and relevant as the primary theoretical framework. Subsequently, the methodology will be outlined and findings will be analyzed. The findings of this thesis will suggest that the responses of UNSC permanent members to U.S. violations of PNCI in counterterrorism operations reinforce the norm, although there is some potential erosion during perceived global security threats. However, these implications do not definitively establish a causal relationship, given the limited time frame. Lastly, recommendations will be offered for future research and encountered limitations will also be acknowledged.

### Historical evolution of PNCI and the legal context

#### **Historical Background**

PNCI originates from Christian conflicts and the medieval Just War Theory, which questioned the morality of warfare. According to this theory, a war is just if it has a legitimate justification, such as protecting the innocent (Gade, 2010, p. 219; Gardam, 2023, p. 10). Grotius distinguished between the innocent, namely one's own citizens, non-combatants, and combatants (not permitted to be attacked) and the enemy, encompassing all residents of the state against whom war was waged (Gardam, 2023, p. 13). This distinction emphasized the separation between "us as a nation" and the targeted "other" state.

Over time, PNCI has significantly evolved, influenced by scholars like Rousseau (Gardam, 1993, p. 395). Rousseau's view of war as a conflict between state armed forces, aimed at weakening the enemy's military, laid the groundwork for distinguishing between combatants and civilians (Gardam, 2023, pp. 15-16). The World Wars, marked by widespread and horrific attacks, underscored this need (Gade, 2010, p. 224). This progression, along with the Geneva Conventions and Hague Peace Conferences, led to the formal codification of this principle in Article 48 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention (Dinstein, 2002, p. 156-157; Gade, 2010, p. 225; Gardam, 2023, pp. 15-16). Thus, this customary law became part of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and the universally recognized Law of War (Melzer, 2014, p. 297). PNCI now asserts that civilians and non-combatants are inherently innocent, defined as refraining from hostilities, and thus entitled to protection (Gade, 2010, p. 223).

## Legal Framework

PNCI legally mandates the prohibition of indiscriminate attacks, placing the obligation on armed forces to distinguish between combatants and civilians. PNCI encompasses three core criteria: distinction, proportionality, and precaution (Rose, Blokker, Jong, Van Den Driest, Heinsch, Koppe, & Schrijver, 2022, pp. 241-242). The criterion of distinction dictates that combatants must differentiate between fellow combatants and civilians/non-combatants, with the latter being expressly protected from attack (Rose et al., 2022, p. 241). These distinct categories of individuals on the battlefield are delineated as follows. Combatants are individuals who serve in a state's armed forces or satisfy the seven cumulative conditions outlined in Article 4(A)(2) of the Geneva Convention and established case law (Dinstein, 2002, p. 160). These conditions include being under a responsible commander, wearing a recognizable emblem, openly carrying weapons, adhering to *jus in bello*, functioning as part of a military unit, belonging to a conflict party, and not aligning with the detaining power (Dinstein, 2002, p. 171). Hence, combatants are considered legitimate targets. Conversely, civilians and non-combatants constitute distinct categories (Dinstein, 2002, p. 171). Civilians are individuals who are innocent and unarmed, refraining from any involvement in fighting or hostilities (Dinstein, 2002, p. 171). Non-combatants, although not directly engaged in combat, may have roles supporting military operations (Dinstein, 2002, p. 152). However, in literature, these terms are sometimes used interchangeably. Scholars generally agree that both civilians and non-combatants are individuals who refrain from participating in hostilities and should therefore not be targeted during warfare (Gade, 2010, pp. 220, 223). Moreover, the criterion of proportionality stipulates that the foreseeable civilian casualties resulting from a military strike should not be excessive (Rose et al., 2022, p. 242). Finally, the criterion of precaution requires continuous efforts to protect civilians and infrastructure during military activities (Rose et al., 2022, p. 242).

## Literature review

The scholarly debate and literature start with the observation that the terms used in PNCI are often vague and ambiguous. What remains clear is that much about PNCI is still unclear. This review will present discussions on PNCI's scope and limitations.

Gade delves into the core limitations of PNCI, namely the difficulty in identifying civilians for protection due to the absence of objective criteria, leading to subjective judgments by decision-

makers (2010, pp. 235-236). Slim and Wheeler support Gade's argument, highlighting the risks of subjective judgments influenced by biases. In Kosovo and Goma, gender biases led to women and children receiving more PNCI protection, while men of battle-age were targeted (Slim, 2003, p. 482; Wheeler, 2002, p. 212).

In contrast, Dinstein asserts that the Geneva Convention's Article 4(A)(2) and case law provide clear criteria to distinguish between civilians and combatants. He goes even further by legitimizing the Bush administration's concept of "unlawful combatant" for those meeting some, but not all, criteria (Dinstein, 2002, p. 171). However, Meisels challenges this, arguing that the lawful/unlawful combatant division lacks clarity and should be explicitly defined within international law, as it relates closely to the broader, ambiguous differentiation between combatants and civilians (Meisels, 2007, p. 61).

Zehfuss expands on these points, asserting that there's no universally accepted justification for PNCI. She argues that the justifications, like innocence and intent, are flawed, which undermines the protection of civilians in war (Zehfuss, 2012, p. 424). The differentiation between combatants and civilians hinges on innocence, defined as abstaining from harmful activities and warranting protection (2012, p. 427). However, Gregory argues that determining harmful actions lacks clear, logical, or objective criteria. For instance, drones have targeted weddings, presuming large gatherings as terrorist camps (Gregory, 2017, p. 213). Zehfuss contends that in modern warfare, where civilians are involved in various capacities and objectives are often unclear, determining innocence becomes nearly impossible, heightening the risk to civilians (Zehfuss, 2012, p. 424).

Several scholars critique the justification of intent underlying PNCI. This concept involves whom one may deliberately target. They argue that if there was no deliberate intent to target civilians, then PNCI cannot be considered violated (Gade, 2010, p. 229; Zehfuss, 2012, p. 429). Foot and McMahan caution against the argument of lack of intent, known as the doctrine of double effect from just war theory. They warn of political opportunism, as it allows decision-makers to avoid accountability for civilian casualties by claiming they did not intend harm (Foot, 2005, p. 423; McMahan, 2012, p. 150).

The skeptical scholars mentioned advocate for new legal frameworks based on objective criteria rather than subjective ones (Gade, 2010, p. 239; Gregory, 2017, p. 231). Yet, some



scholars take a less pessimistic view of PNCI. Melzer, for example, contends that despite confusion over PNCI, its military rationale and humanitarian imperative remain valid. He advocates for a disciplined analysis of modern armed conflict circumstances and careful interpretation of legal concepts (2014, p. 331). Furthermore, Hathaway, a legal scholar, advocates for the adaptation and development of legal frameworks to address the evolving nature of warfare. She emphasizes the importance of ensuring that PNCI is effectively implemented and respected. Hathaway suggests that this should be done based on the obligations states have under Article 1 of the Geneva Convention to respect and ensure PNCI, rather than creating an entirely new legal framework (Hill-Cawthorne, 2023, p. 871; Hathaway, 2024, p. 31).

Scholars also debate exceptions to PNCI. Legally, there are none, as it is customary international law binding on all states (Hathaway, 2024, p. 31). However, discussions continue about political justifications that could create de facto exceptions not recognized in legal doctrine. Gross attempts to illustrate several prominent political justifications for violating PNCI, including the logic of reprisal, the doctrine of double effect, and Walzer's concept of supreme emergency (Gross, 2005, pp. 556-567). Reprisal justifies civilian casualties as retaliatory self-defense, invoking the principle of "an eye for an eye" (2005, p. 568). Double effect doctrine absolves culpability by asserting the absence of intent to harm (2005, p. 558). Walzer's concept of supreme emergency allows for extreme measures, including civilian casualties, to prevent imminent disaster (2005, p. 573). Bellamy challenges Walzer, advocating for preserving PNCI even in extreme emergencies. He argues that there are always better moral and strategically advantageous alternatives (Bellamy, 2004, p. 831). McMahan expands upon the critique and argues against targeting non-combatants, asserting their immunity is a fundamental moral boundary. He believes combatants are only ethically justified in killing other combatants (McMahan, 2004, p. 694).

The literature reveals extensive debate on PNCI's ambiguity and validity, and on political justifications for its violation. However, there is minimal coverage on the international community's responses to these justifications in counterterrorism and how these responses might influence PNCI as a norm. Consequently, there is a gap in the literature regarding which political justifications are deemed credible by the international community for violating PNCI and the implications for PNCI as a norm itself.

## Research question

As previously noted there remains ambiguity regarding which political justifications are deemed credible for violating PNCI in counterterrorism and the implications this holds for the norms viability. These questions are of paramount importance in real-world scenarios, as the lives of innocent civilians hang in the balance when political justifications, lacking explicit legal basis, are employed to justify PNCI violations. This practice opens avenues for politicians and those in positions of power to potentially exploit their authority and evade accountability for violating IHL (Foot 2005, pp. 422-423).

This is especially pertinent in today's political climate, where counterterrorism warfare is increasingly prevalent, and PNCI itself is already a subject of contention. Using the constructivist norm-cycle approach, this research aims to determine whether violations of PNCI are condemned or accepted and understand the implications for its viability. Since counterterrorism operations began only after 9/11 in 2001, there is insufficient time to establish a causal relationship between responses to political justifications and their impact on PNCI. Consequently, this exploratory research will identify responses to political justifications and infer their potential effects on PNCI. Thus, the research question this thesis seeks to answer is:

*In what ways have the responses of the UNSC permanent members to the violation of the principle of non-combatant immunity in US counterterrorism practices impacted the norm itself?*

## Theoretical framework

This thesis explores how the permanent members of the UNSC respond to PNCI violations and the implications it might have for PNCI as a norm. Therefore, a constructivist approach, particularly the norm-cycle framework, is applicable to this research. The norm cycle framework posits that norms undergo continuous change and evolution over time, describing their life cycle within the international system. This cycle unfolds through distinct stages: emergence, cascade, contestation, and internalization (Baylis, Ownes, & Smith, 2017, p. 155).

During the contestation phase, international actors debate and adjust the norm's interpretation and application. These responses shape its trajectory, affecting acceptance, challenges, or modifications (Baylis et al., 2017, p. 155). Even after internalization, norms continue to evolve, influenced by societal attitudes, power dynamics, and responses to violations (Sandholtz, 2009,

p. 2). This research focuses on the ongoing evolution of norms, particularly the stage where norm erosion can occur, with a specific emphasis on PNCI.

### **Great Powers**

Within the constructivist framework, this research examines great powers' responses. It argues that studying how multiple great powers shape norms fits the constructivist paradigm, even if it hints at realism. Constructivism emphasizes the importance of socially constructed norms, identities, and beliefs in international relations, rather than solely material power dynamics (Baylis et al., 2017, p. 145). Analyzing great powers' impact on norms involves examining their interactions, conflicts, and efforts to promote or challenge norms, aligning with constructivist views on normative evolution (Sandholtz, 2009, p. 3). Constructivism highlights how ideas, identities, and perceptions influence state actions, implying that even decisions motivated by material interests are influenced by interpretations of norms and aspirations to uphold or contest certain principles based on self-image and identity (Baylis et al., 2017, p. 151). It also recognizes states' ability to shape global outcomes by propagating norms, underscoring the normative authority of great powers (Sandholtz, 2009, p. 19). Thus, despite realism's focus on power, studying how great powers shape norms is inherently constructivist, emphasizing social constructs, norm contestation, and the role of ideas in international relations.

### **Responses**

Conceptualizing responses to norm violations and their implications according to the norm-cycle framework is essential. States' responses can be categorized into condemnation, acceptance, and neutral response. While literature often focuses on condemnation and acceptance (Sandholtz, 2009, p. 14), including neutral responses is crucial for a nuanced analysis. Given the lack of universal definitions, this study combines existing definitions with additional descriptions to clarify these responses and discuss their implications for norm viability.

Firstly, condemnation of a violation involves public denouncement with the intent of political consequences for the offender (Lebovic & Voeten, 2006, p. 864). This includes public resolutions, statements, and formal punishments (Lebovic & Voeten, 2006, pp. 865-866). In this thesis, condemnation is defined as any public expression highlighting violations of IHL, acknowledging war crimes, or criticizing reckless attacks that fail to protect civilians (Hathaway, 2024, p. 76). In the norm-cycle framework, condemning norm violations signifies

upholding and strengthening the norm. Thus, while violations may occur, condemnation does not necessarily indicate erosion of the norm (Deitelhoff & Zimmermann, 2019, p. 9).

Secondly, acceptance of a violation involves speech acts or symbolic gestures that acknowledge the legal and moral status of state actions (Bartelson, 2013, p. 110). This includes justifying violations, denying criminal acts, or asserting compliance with IHL. Accepting violations undermines and diminishes norms within the norm cycle. It allows exceptions to arise, potentially leading to reinterpretations or the demise of a norm even after internalization. (Sandholtz, 2009, p. 3; Deitelhoff & Zimmermann, 2019, p. 9).

Finally, a neutral response actively promotes peace, security, and social progress by maintaining non-alignment and abstaining from military alliances (Czachor, 2021, p. 13). Such states, not part of any counterterrorism coalition, may provide factual statements, like reporting civilian casualties, but refrain from judging the offender's actions. Instead, they advocate for broader advancements in international human rights to protect civilians. Neutral responses can create ambiguity and uncertainty about the norm's validity and enforcement, neither reinforcing nor challenging it. This lack of clarity may undermine the norm's effectiveness and contribute to its erosion (Deitelhoff & Zimmermann, 2019, p. 9).

### **Justifications**

Once a norm is internalized, it is perceived as the widely accepted standard among most states in the realm of international relations (Finnemore, 1996, p. 329). This norm essentially becomes the established rules of the game that all states are expected to adhere to (Risse, 2000, p. 2). With the emergence of public spheres, states are now required to regularly justify their actions, including any breaches of internalized norms, to these public forums (Risse, 2000, pp. 21-22). These public spheres encompass various audiences, not limited to the general public but also including other state actors in international settings (Risse, 2000, p. 22). Public discourses play a role in "civilizing" actors, making it difficult to present self-serving arguments or justify actions based solely on self-interest (Risse, 2000, p. 22). Even rhetorical arguments attempting to justify egoistic interests often need to reference universal values or commonly accepted norms (Risse, 2000, p. 17; Checkel, 2005, p. 804). While national governments may still contest specific allegations of norm violations within the global human rights discourse, it is increasingly challenging for them to outright reject the validity of global human rights norms without risking being marginalized as "pariah" states (Risse, 2000, p. 17).

Consequently, all state actors are compelled to justify their actions based on shared values or common goods (Risse, 2000, p. 22; Checkel, 2005, p. 812). This behavior invites scrutiny and criticism from other actors within a common normative framework that is agreed upon by the audience (Risse, 2000, p. 22).

### Methodology

This thesis aims to explore the intricate connections among language, power dynamics, and ideological frameworks (Halperin & Heath, 2012, p. 368), a fundamental aspect of critical discourse analysis. To accomplish this objective, the thesis will adopt this methodological approach and conduct discourse analysis utilizing a coding framework.

### Case Selection and operationalization

Moreover, this thesis seeks to explore the discourse surrounding violations of PNCI, along with the justifications provided by the offenders and the responses to these violations by great powers in the public sphere. Specifically, this thesis will focus on analyzing political justifications rather than legal justifications. Legal justifications are grounded in specific laws (Held, 1975, p. 2), such as those outlined in Article 51 of the UN Convention, which allows for self-defense. However, it is noteworthy that states often do not rely on legal justifications when violating PNCI, as there are no legal exceptions to this norm (Wheeler, 2002, p. 209). Consequently, states resort to political justifications, which are based on moral, security, and necessity arguments.

This thesis will examine the United States (US) as the perpetrator of violations against the PNCI in three separate counterterrorism operations. The US was selected as the offender due to its extensive documentation of counterterrorism activities and acknowledgment of civilian casualties, uncommon among most states. Moreover, its prominent role in global counterterrorism efforts has attracted significant attention and responses to its operations (Foot, 2005, p. 423), providing ample material for analysis.

Furthermore, the decision was made to focus on the responses of great powers to the political justifications provided by the US, particularly the permanent members of the UNSC, namely France, the United Kingdom (UK), Russia, and China. These great powers were specifically chosen because of their membership in the UNSC, where they assess breaches of peace and security and determine appropriate measures in response. Consequently, they wield considerable influence in shaping the norms that guide international behavior. Excluding the

UNSC as an organization from analysis was deliberate due to potential conflicts of interest arising from the US's veto power as a member.

The three analyzed counterterrorist operations led by the US are Operation Enduring Freedom 2001 in Afghanistan, Operation Iraqi Freedom 2003 in Iraq, and Operation Inherent Resolve 2014 in Iraq. These operations were chosen due to documented civilian casualties from PNCI violations and their significant recognition and discussion in the international community. Operation Enduring Freedom is particularly notable as the first US counterterrorist operation, providing insights into initial global perceptions of PNCI violations. Operation Iraqi Freedom, marked by controversy, offers valuable opportunities for analysis. Lastly, Operation Inherent Resolve, a more recent case, contributes to the breadth of analysis.

Sources for this study will comprise English-language newspaper articles and statements from foreign affairs ministers, chosen due to language limitations and restricted access to national reports. Newspaper articles were sourced from the Leiden University platform Nexus Uni, utilizing search terms related to the state and its response to civilian casualties in specific counterterrorism operations. Various newspaper sources, including reputable ones like The New York Times and The Guardian, were analyzed to ensure comprehensive discourse analysis. Foreign affairs statements from China and Russia were accessed from their official websites, supplemented with English translations. This thesis analyzed three to six sources per case per country to ensure thoroughness while considering variations in state expression. Limiting to six sources ensures realistic analysis within the research's time constraints.

### **Coding framework**

The coding framework comprises two categories: political justifications and responses. Political justifications include four sub-categories: reprisal, double-effect, supreme emergence, and other. These sub-categories were selected based on their prominence in the literature. Additionally, the "other" sub-category serves as a catch-all for identifying additional political justifications. The detailed definitions of these sub-categories will be provided in the analysis section and in the coding framework.

Secondly, the responses category comprises three sub-categories: condemn, accept, and neutral. This category examines the responses of UNSC permanent members to US political justifications for PNCI violations in counterterrorism. These categories adhere to the

definitions outlined in the theoretical framework. For further clarification of these responses, readers are directed to the coding framework provided in Appendix A.

## Analysis & Discussion

This analysis will begin by outlining the definitions of political justifications. These are categorized into two types: first, those discussed in the existing literature, and second, those identified under the sub-category of "other" as a result of this research. Clarifying these definitions beforehand will aid in comprehending the subsequent in-depth analysis.

### Political Justifications

In this thesis, "political justifications" refer to the arguments states provide to explain or justify their actions. For the US, these justifications attempt to rationalize violations of PNCI. For the permanent members, the justifications explain their responses to US violations. The most prominent political justifications discussed in the literature include the logic of reprisal from self-help theory, the logic of double effect from just war theory, and Walzer's concept of supreme emergency. Additionally, this thesis identifies and discusses political justifications found in the discourse under the category "other." This research focuses exclusively on these arguments to explore their complexities in depth. The following sections will discuss these justifications.

The sub-category reprisal (R) justifies actions as necessary to end an evil-doer (Leiser, 1975, p. 163). The state using this justification sees the conduct as a decisive measure to stop or deter unlawful acts, even if civilians die (Gross, 2005, pp. 567, 569). With no higher authority to remedy the situation, they feel justified in taking matters into their own hands (Leiser, 1975, p. 163; Gross, 2005, p. 567). This aligns with the principle of "an eye for an eye." (Gross, 2005, p. 568).

Secondly, the double effect (DDE) argument justifies civilian casualties during legitimate and proportionate military operations if they are unintended but foreseen. The absence of intent to harm absolves moral culpability (Wheeler, 2002, p. 208). This doctrine can allow evasion of accountability by claiming a lack of intent to harm, as punishable actions require both *actus reus* (the act) and *mens rea* (intent). Without intent, the act is considered unpunishable (Gross, 2005, p. 573).

Moreover, the justification of supreme emergence (SED) applies to situations where extreme threats to human values justify any measures, including violating PNCI (Gross, 2005, p. 573). This principle acknowledges that in extraordinary circumstances, leaders may need to override moral norms to prevent catastrophic consequences. While such actions may breach moral standards, they can be seen as necessary to avert imminent harm (Primoratz, 2011, p. 373).

Lastly, the 'other' sub-category within the coding framework functions as an umbrella for political justifications not falling under R, DDE, or SED. These justifications were gathered through discourse analysis. In the subsequent sections, the most relevant and frequently occurring justifications will be outlined, first from the US perspective justifying violations, and then from the perspective of the permanent members justifying their responses.

From the US perspective, firstly, blame-shifting is prominent. This involves attributing fault for civilian casualties to another actor or diminishing responsibility for their own actions. This is evident in the following:

*“United States ... was not always to blame for civilian deaths and destruction”* (Wiener, 2001).

Secondly, asserting compliance with the law and minimizing collateral damage to justify civilian deaths. This justification appears in the following statement:

*“Execute more than 50,000 airstrikes ... in accordance with a rigorous approval process that prized being “discriminate,” “proportional” and in compliance with the law of armed conflict”* (Khan, 2021, p. 9).

Moreover, a comparable justification is when the US acknowledged civilian casualties but justified them by affirming that they had successfully targeted their military objective:

*“many civilians have been killed by airstrikes hitting precisely the target they were aimed at”* (Filkins, 2002, p. 2).



Furthermore, there is a justification often tinged with a white savior complex or promoting democratic states, suggesting civilian deaths are justified for this cause:

*“ I felt terrible about those who died because of the liberation and I felt terrible for those who died prior to the liberation. And I believe that 25 million people are better off without Saddam ”* (Bush memoir: 'We got things wrong in Iraq, but the cause is eternally right', 2010).

*“the United States Armed Forces ... the peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you ”* (President Bush Addresses the Nation, 2003).

From the perspective of the permanent members, three main alternative justifications emerged. Firstly, advocating for political dialogue and peaceful resolution of conflicts.

*“the Chinese Government has always insisted on a political solution within the framework of the United Nations ”* (China's Position on the US War in Iraq, 2003).

Secondly, asserting that the war was executed flawlessly and vehemently denying any allegations.

*“a “perfect” war in Iraq, one in which British weapons did not harm a single civilian ”* (Harrison & Dyke, 2023)

Lastly, expressing sympathy for the US and thereby justifying its actions.

*“opposition to the war was somewhat tempered from the first by memories of a French plane hijacked in Algeria in 1994 ”* (Henneberger, 2001).

### **Global Security Threat**

A notable difference in political justifications given by the US for violating PNCI and the responses to these violations by the UNSC permanent members was noted when there was a considered global security threat compared to when there was not. In this section, the justifications and responses for Operation Enduring Freedom 2001 and Operation Inherent Resolve 2014 will be analyzed together, as both involved a perceived security threat. This contrasts with Operation Iraqi Freedom 2003, where no such threat was perceived.

### *Operation Enduring Freedom 2001 & Operation Inherent Resolve 2014*

In both operations, the international community recognized a global security threat: Al-Qaeda and the Taliban in 2001, and ISIS in 2014. Additionally, the UK and France were coalition members in both instances.

Regarding the political justifications provided by the US for violating PNCI, a notable pattern emerged. In both operations, the US predominantly made DDE justifications. These statements often included words like "mistake," "wrong," and "terrible," expressing remorse while simultaneously absolving responsibility and indicating a lack of *mens rea*. For example:

*“the US was forced to admit that a drone strike last month killed 10 civilians including seven children – and not militants ... A “terrible mistake” was made”* (Sabbagh, 2021).

*“McKenzie told reporters that the strike – which he said killed seven children – was a “mistake” and offered an apology”*(Coren, Hollingsworth, Sighu & Cohen, 2021).

Furthermore, a notable difference in responses between the operations was that in 2001, the second most used justification was SED, while in 2014, the second most used justification fell under the sub-category ‘other’. For an example of the 'other' justification, refer to the section on political justifications under the US. Below is an example of an SED justification in 2001:

*“Those threats ... are credible, they are real and they offer the prospect of still thousands of more people being killed”* (Wiener, 2001).

The US response in these operations implies the following. The US did not predominantly use SED justifications, as it did not need to convince the world that civilian casualties were necessary due to a grave threat, since the global security threat was already established. This type of justification would have been redundant and inappropriate, potentially raising questions. Instead, the US employed DDE justifications, which were more appropriate. By arguing that mistakes happened while combating the threat, the US could express remorse without admitting intent, which was more acceptable given the circumstances. There was also more leeway to use this justification because the world, shocked by the terrorist attacks, had more compassion, making the DDE justification more palatable.

In the following the responses of the UNSC permanent members will be discussed. First, the UK aligned itself with the US and adopted a stance of acceptance. The UK's acceptance was not a direct acknowledgment of civilian deaths but rather a recognition of a supreme

emergency, primarily employing SED justifications to justify their response. This is evident in the following quotes:

*“The world understands that whilst of course there are dangers in acting as we are, the dangers of inaction are far, far greater ... the threat to the stability of the world”* (Attacks on Afghanistan: Tony Blair statement, 2001).

*“There is no practicable alternative to the use of force to degrade and deter the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime”* (UK jets fire at Syrian base in ‘limited and targeted strike’, 2018)

However, in 2014, there was a shift in how they accepted the US actions. Rather than acknowledging an imminent threat, they denied allegations of civilian casualties. They mainly used justifications under the sub-category ‘other’, claiming flawless warfare to justify their response, as shown by the following:

*“stood by the claim that in terms of protecting ordinary Iraqis, the UK fought a “perfect” war against Islamic State (IS) militants in Iraq”* (Harrison, Varghese & Nueno, 2023).

France also hesitated directly addressing the civilian casualties caused by the US. In both operations France predominantly accepted the actions of the US. In 2001 France often expressed acceptance a political justification sub-categorized by ‘other’, citing sympathy with the terrorist attacks it had experienced. For example:

*“opposition to the war was somewhat tempered from the first by memories of a French plane hijacked in Algeria in 1994”* (Henneberger, 2001).

Conversely, France expressed minimal condemnation, primarily stemming from disagreements with the methods employed by the US. France advocated for more peaceful, calculated, and lawful approaches to dealing with the conflict:

*“You can’t strike blindly,” ... military strikes must be “proportional, strategically and militarily justified, and politically coherent”* (Benedicte & Philip, 2002).

In 2014, a transition was observed in France's stance towards US actions, with greater acceptance backed by SED justifications, recognizing the risk to civilian lives while still pursuing military objectives to counter the threat:

*“take extraordinary efforts to strike military targets in a manner that minimizes the risk of civilian casualties’ but claimed that ‘in some incidents casualties are unavoidable”* (Dearden, 2017).

Russia predominantly responded by condemning the US actions and the civilian casualties they caused in both operations. In both cases Russia condemned the US political justifications of SED and DDE. In the following quote from 2001, Russia makes it clear that extreme measures to defeat the threat are not necessary, suggesting that the threat is not as grave as presented by the US SED justification:

*“he disputed Bush's contention that a missile-defense system was needed as protection against terrorists”* (Hutcheson & Dorgan, 2001).

In 2014, Russia mainly condemned the US's use of DDE as a justification, distinguishing it from the previous operation. Russia argued that civilian deaths were not mistakes anymore but a consequence of poor planning, inappropriate methods, and the consistent, repeated actions that inevitably led to civilian casualties. Russia emphasized that these factors invalidated the DDE justification. This perspective is evident in the following:

*“Moscow is seriously concerned over the reported facts of mass deaths of Iraqi civilians as a result of the incessant bombings by the United States and its allies in the anti-ISIS coalition. The scale of the human toll is shocking”* (Comment by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova on the Iraqi Civilian Victims of Western Coalition Strikes, 2017).

Similarly, China primarily condemned the actions of the US in both operations. However, unlike other states, China also responded neutrally, advocating for human rights and emphasizing the importance of international law. China countered the political justifications provided by the US, arguing that there was neither a case of SED nor that of DDE. This is exemplified by a condemning response that asserts the DDE justification lacks credibility due to the systematic nature of the mistakes.

*“They are persistent, systemic, and prevalent recurrences, stated Wang Wenbin, spokesperson of the Foreign Ministry” (Human rights abuses by US, allies persistent, systematic: FM spokesperson, 2022).*

In contrast, this is an example of a neutral response that supports human rights while simultaneously rejecting the idea of SED, as claimed by the US, as justification for civilian casualties.

*“Every human life, regardless of nationality, race, religion, or values, is equal and precious,” stated Zhao” (Huaxia, 2022).*

In 2014, China also more frequently condemned the US's use of the DDE justification, suggesting that the deaths were not mere mistakes but a result of the methods employed.

*“U.S. forces, using fake intelligence gleaned from a video staged by 'White Helmets' as evidence, conducted the 'most precise air strikes in history' in Syria, killing more than 1,600 innocent civilians” (Huaxia, 2022).*

The responses to the operations yield several implications. A clear division emerges among coalition members, with the UK and France largely endorsing US actions, while Russia and China condemn them. However, overall, aside from Russia, there appears to be a greater acceptance of US actions. This inference is drawn from the UK and France's acceptance and China's neutral responses, affording more leeway for US violations of PNCI. This thesis posits that this trend may stem from the global consensus on the existence of a significant threat, leading to a more lenient response. However, the acceptance of these PNCI violations contributes to the erosion of norms, introducing ambiguity and potentially establishing exceptions. This erosion could establish a precedent wherein exceptions to the norm are permissible in the presence of a global threat.

### *Operation Iraqi Freedom 2003*

In this operation the world was not convinced that Iraq possessed nuclear weapons or that Saddam Hussein posed an imminent threat to global security. Among major nations, only the UK joined the coalition.

The US primarily used SED justifications for violating PNCI in this operation, surpassing other operations in their frequency and prominence, as exemplified by statements such as:

*“These folks are savages, mass murderers. The international community should never think about anything but winning the battle against them”* (Twin bombing kills many in Iraq town, 2005).

Furthermore, DDE and R arguments were seldom presented in this operation. The sub-category 'other' surpassed DDE and R, with arguments revolving around a white savior complex, asserting that the developments were crucial for nation-building. Examples of such quotes can be found in the political justification section.

These justifications suggest the following. Given the global skepticism regarding the existence of a security threat, the US sought to persuade the world of its necessity to justify civilian casualties, hence the frequent use of SED justifications. DDE or R justifications would have been inappropriate, as the world would not accept civilian casualties without a clear threat, and retaliatory action lacked credibility without a prior attack on the US. Moreover, the US attempted to bolster its position by invoking 'other' justifications, framing actions within a nation-building narrative from a white-savior perspective, even at the cost of lives. These efforts aimed to provide justifications deemed suitable for the circumstances.

The subsequent analysis pertains to the responses of the permanent members. Similar to 2002, the UK responded by not addressing the civilian deaths caused by the US. Instead, it continued to accept the actions of the US by asserting that there was a case of supreme emergence.

*“Tony Blair echoed this sentiment ... affirming that Hussein could activate chemical and biological weapons "within 45 minutes, including against his own Shia population”* (Marsi, 2023).

France once again refrained from explicitly addressing the civilian deaths caused by the US. However, it responded by predominantly condemning the actions of the US. The political justifications provided by France to condemn these actions were diverse. A frequent response is exemplified by an instances where France denied the SED argument:

*"Think it over seriously before you take action that is not necessary and that can be very dangerous"* (Chappel, Beardsley, 2019).

Russia strongly condemned the civilian casualties caused by the US in this operation. They were vocal on the matter, asserting that the US argument of SED held no weight, as illustrated by statements such as:

*"What they are getting ready to do in Iraq is not just rampaging of a drunken cowboy ... That's playing with the lives of peoples and the world"* (LaFraniere, 2003).

Furthermore, Russia made it clear that the political justification of DDE used by the US did not stand a chance, as the number of civilians killed amounted to a massacre and could not be considered a mistake:

*"It is not that people were killed and children and young men who lived in those countries were physically and psychologically scarred for the rest of their life, but simply, new people were not born. This massacre continued for 10 years, expanding from the active phase into the phase of fighting terrorists who had never existed in that region. Then people in nice expensive suits appear on 8/26 camera, apologize and bear absolutely no responsibility"* (Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova, Moscow, June 29, 2017, 2017).

China also vehemently condemned the actions of the US that resulted in civilian casualties in this operation and contended the justification of SED, asserting the value of all lives.

*"The 2003 Iraq War resulted in some 200,000 to 250,000 civilian deaths, including over 16,000 directly killed by the U.S. military"* (US hegemony and it's perils, 2023).

*"Both Iraqi and US lives are innocent"* (Chinese paper calls attention to increasing Iraqi deaths in US-led war, 2004).

Several implications arise from these responses. Overall, the predominant reaction in this operation was to condemn the actions of the US, with the notable exception of the UK. This thesis suggests that this divergence may stem from the global perception of the absence of a significant threat, unlike the situations in 2001 and 2014, where greater acceptance was observed. This shift led even former coalition member France to condemn the US. While the condemnation of violations can be seen as upholding the norm, it also reinforces the

implications drawn from the 2001 and 2014 operations. This underscores the argument that while the norm is generally upheld, there may be greater flexibility in its application when confronted with a global threat.

### **Evolution of Responses and Justifications**

Beyond the global threat in justifications and responses, notable trends emerged over time, which will be detailed in the next section. France is excluded here due to inconsistent responses without a clear pattern. Specific examples can be found in the earlier sections with relevant quotes. For specific examples of justifications or responses, readers can refer to the previous sections where relevant quotes were provided.

Throughout all operations, Russia consistently condemned the US for violating PNCI. Initially, China responded with a mix of neutral and condemning statements, but over time, it increasingly condemned US actions. Notably, both countries began to more frequently criticize DDE justifications. By the final operation, they argued that civilian deaths were not mistakes but the result of US recklessness. For example, in a 2001 statement from Russia, the word "mistakenly" was used, indicating a condemning response that still acknowledged an element of remorse and error:

*“the USAF mistakenly dropped 25 1000 lb Mark 83 bombs on the village of Kama Ado” (White Book on Facts of Civilian Deaths in Afghanistan Caused by Unlawful Acts of the US and Its Allies, 2022).*

However, in this 2014 quote, the tone shifts markedly. Russia no longer acknowledges mistakes with remorse. Instead, it asserts that the high number of civilian deaths is a direct consequence of the US's reckless practices:

*“mass deaths of Iraqi civilians as a result of the incessant bombings” (Comment by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova on the Iraqi Civilian Victims of Western Coalition Strikes 1047-26-05-2017, 2017).*

This development in responses has several implications. Firstly, the consistent condemnation by these permanent members, and China's increasing criticism over time, suggests that the PNCI norm is being upheld. Despite US violations, the persistent condemnation indicates that the norm remains strong. Additionally, the growing rejection of DDE justifications by these



countries strengthens this argument. A violator cannot continue to claim mistakes indefinitely; at some point, the justification loses credibility as it highlights clear violations of PNCI and a failure to learn from past errors. The continued expectation for credible and appropriate justifications from the US by these permanent members further demonstrates that the PNCI norm is still robust and enforced.

The argument is further bolstered by examining the evolution of political justifications from the US and UK. The UK is included because it consistently supported the US, presenting a united front throughout all operations and thus also needing to provide credible justifications for its actions. Initially, in 2001, the US primarily used DDE justifications. Over time, however, the frequency of DDE justifications decreased. In 2001, justifications falling under the "other" sub-category were used sparingly, but by 2014, this sub-category had become the second most common justification. This shift from DDE to "other" justifications, in conjunction with Russia and China's growing rejection of DDE justifications, suggests that the US was attempting to find more credible and appropriate justifications for its actions to maintain legitimacy and avoid becoming a pariah state.

Similarly, the UK started by justifying its supportive stance with SED justifications, eventually transitioning to "other" justifications related to the concept of a "perfect war." This shift likely reflects an effort to provide appropriate justifications for supporting a state violating a norm, especially as the credibility of the violator's justifications waned over time. The need for both the US and UK to provide credible justifications for norm violations or support of such violations indicates that the norm is still upheld. If the norm were not valued, there would be no effort to justify these actions.

## Conclusion

The aim of this research was to explore the responses of the UNSC permanent members to US violations of PNCI in counterterrorism practices through discourse analysis, and to examine the potential implications of these responses on the PNCI norm. The focus was on the stage of norm erosion within the norm cycle theory to identify possible implications for the norm. This thesis did not aim to establish a causal relationship, nor did it achieve one, due to the insufficient time elapsed to do so. Therefore, the research question addressed in this thesis was:

*In what ways have the responses of the UNSC permanent members to the violation of the principle of non-combatant immunity in US counterterrorism practices impacted the norm itself?*

The response of the UNSC permanent members to violations of the PNCI in U.S. counterterrorism practices suggests that the norm remains largely intact. Throughout various operations, Russia and China have consistently condemned these violations, reinforcing the norm's validity. In contrast, the UK and France, as coalition members in the 2001 and 2014 operations, did not uniformly condemn such actions. However, the consistent condemnation from Russia and China implies that the norm is being upheld. Additionally, the condemnation by France in 2003, despite being a former coalition member, when there was no global security threat, suggests that substantial grounds, such as the lack of a global threat, can lead former coalition members to condemn U.S. actions. This indicates that when U.S. actions or use of force are perceived as unacceptable, even previous allies tend to condemn such actions, highlighting the norm's influence.

On the other hand, there is an implication that recognized global security threats may allow more leeway in violating PNCI. This is based on findings that during global security threats, permanent members, except for Russia, were more accepting of violations. Therefore, one might argue that the norm experiences some erosion, creating exceptions in cases of global security threats. However, this thesis suggests that if such erosion exists, its impact on the norm is minimal. Despite the violations, the norm remains robust, as evidenced by the consistent condemnation of these violations. Additionally, over time the DDE justification for mistakenly killing civilians has lost its credibility among certain UNSC members, who increasingly view such violations as reckless. This shift indicates a growing expectation for appropriate justifications when the norm is breached, underscoring its strength.

The persistent demand for appropriate justifications itself signals the norm's resilience, as these would be unnecessary if the norm were weakening. Additionally, the U.S.'s shift away from DDE and SED arguments towards alternative justifications further demonstrates the norm's persistence. Similarly, the UK's transition from SED to other justifications, such as claiming the war was perfect, reflects a continued adherence to the norm. If the norm were truly weakening, neither the U.S. nor the UK would feel compelled to seek acceptable justifications for their actions. Ultimately, the responses of UNSC permanent members to U.S. violations of

PNCI in counterterrorism operations suggest a strengthening of the norm. However, there may be a minimal erosion when global security threats are perceived, allowing more leeway for PNCI violations.

There are several limitations to this research. Firstly, analyzing the discourse of UNSC permanent members entails recognizing the political nature of the UN, where responses may be influenced by political incentives rather than intrinsic commitment to the PNCI norm. Another limitation is the potential for interpretation bias in coding discourse, subject to researchers' biases. Additionally, the study relies on newspaper sources, which may contain biases, and analyzes a limited number of documents. Future research should use more reliable sources and examine more documents per case and per country for enhanced reliability and comprehensiveness.

In terms of future research recommendations, it is imperative to investigate whether there is a causal relationship between the responses of UNSC permanent members and their impact on the PNCI norm itself, particularly with the passage of time. Additionally, exploring the necessity of a new legal framework for this norm, or the potential development of such a framework to incorporate accountability mechanisms and measures to prevent violations, would contribute significantly to advancing international legal standards in counterterrorism operations. This thesis has enriched our understanding of the dynamic responses to PNCI violations and the resilience of international norms within the realm of counterterrorism. While the question of whether the PNCI will erode or endure remains open for future exploration, our current understanding is anchored in the consistent condemnation of violations.

## Literature List

- Bartelson, J. (2013). Three concepts of recognition. *International Theory*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175297191300002X>
- Baylis, J., Owens, P., & Smith, S. (2017). *The globalization of world politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press.
- Czachor, R. (2021). The Actuality of the Permanent Neutrality of a State in Contemporary International Law. *Moscow Journal of International Law*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.24833/0869-0049-2021-3-20-30>
- Checkel, J. T. (2005). International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and framework. *International Organization*, 59(04). <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020818305050289>
- Dinstein, Y. (2002). UNLAWFUL COMBATANCY. In *Israel Yearbook on Human Rights* (Vol. 32). [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004423169\\_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004423169_007)
- Finnemore, M. (1996). Norms, culture, and world politics: insights from sociology's institutionalism. *International Organization*, 50(2), 325–347. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020818300028587>
- Gade, E. K. (2010). Defining the non-combatant: How do we determine who is worthy of protection in violent conflict? *Journal of Military Ethics*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2010.510863>
- Gardam, J. G. (1993). Proportionality and Force in International Law. *American Journal of International Law*, 87(3). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2203645>
- Gardam, J. G. (2023). Non-Combatant Immunity as a Norm of International Humanitarian Law. In *Non-Combatant Immunity as a Norm of International Humanitarian Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004632400>
- Gregory, T. (2017). Targeted killings: Drones, noncombatant immunity, and the politics of killing. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 38(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2017.1336296>
- Gross, M. L. (2005). Killing civilians intentionally: Double effect, reprisal, and necessity in the Middle East. In *Political Science Quarterly* (Vol. 120, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-165X.2005.tb00557.x>
- Halperin, S., & Heath, O. (2012). *Political Research: methods and practical skills*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB08760053>
- Hathaway, O., & Khan, A. (2024). “Mistakes” in war. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 173, No. 1. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=4799550](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4799550)
- Held, V. (1975). Justification: legal and political. *Ethics*, 86(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1086/291976>
- Hill-Cawthorne, L. (2023). COMMON ARTICLE 1 OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS AND THE METHOD OF TREATY INTERPRETATION. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 72(4). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589323000337>

- Iyase, B. N., & Folarin, S. F. (2018). A Critique of Veto Power System in the United Nations Security Council. *Acta Universitatis Danubius International Relations*, 11(2).
- Lebovic, J. H., & Voeten, E. (2006). The politics of shame: The condemnation of country human rights practices in the UNCHR. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2006.00429.x>
- Leiser, B. M. (1975). The Morality of Reprisals. *Ethics*, 85(2). <https://doi.org/10.1086/291951>
- McMahan, J. (2012). Targeted Killing: Murder, Combat or Law Enforcement? In *Targeted Killings: Law and Morality in an Asymmetrical World*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199646470.003.0006>
- Melzer, N. (2014). The Principle of Distinction Between Civilians and Combatants. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Law in Armed Conflict*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/law/9780199559695.003.0012>
- Primoratz, I. (2011). Civilian Immunity, Supreme Emergency, and Moral Disaster. *Journal of Ethics*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10892-010-9077-8>
- Risse, T. (2000). “Let’s Argue!”: Communicative Action in world Politics. *International Organization*, 54(1), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081800551109>
- Rose, C., Blokker, N., Jong, D. D., Van Den Driest, S., Heinsch, R., Koppe, E., & Schrijver, N. (2022). *An introduction to public international law*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108377232>
- Sandholtz, W. (2009). Prohibiting Plunder: How Norms Change. In *Prohibiting Plunder: How Norms Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195337235.001.0001>
- Wheeler, N. J. (2002). Dying for ‘Enduring Freedom’: Accepting Responsibility for Civilian Casualties in the War against Terrorism. *International Relations*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117802016002003>
- Zehfuss, M. (2012). Killing Civilians: Thinking the Practice of War. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 14(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2011.00491.x>

## Bibliography for Newspapers & Foreign Affair Statements

AFP. (2015, November 16). Coalition jets pound Daesh 'capital' in Syria, oil trucks. *Jordan Times*. <https://jordantimes.com/news/region/coalition-jets-pound-daesh-capital%E2%80%99-syria-oil-trucks>

Attacks on Afghanistan: Tony Blair statement. (2001, October 7). *CNN*.  
[CNN.com - Attack on Afghanistan: Tony Blair statement - October 7, 2001](https://www.cnn.com/2001/10/07/afghanistan.blair.statement)

AZERTAC. (2015, November 20). APEC leaders condemn terrorism. Retrieved from  
[https://azertag.az/en/xeber/apec\\_leaders\\_condemn\\_terrorism-903901](https://azertag.az/en/xeber/apec_leaders_condemn_terrorism-903901)

Bumiller, E. (2005, December 13). Thursday's Election Won't Stop The Violence in Iraq, Bush Says. *The New York Times*. [Thursday's Election Won't Stop Violence in Iraq, Bush Says - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](https://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/13/us/politics/13iraq.html)

Bush: The battle in Iraq is noble, it is necessary and it is just. (2008, March 20). *The Guardian*. [Revealed: UK forces linked to deaths of nearly 300 Afghan civilians | Military | The Guardian](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/mar/20/bush-iraq)

Bush memoir: 'We got things wrong in Iraq, but the cause is eternally right'. (2010, November 2010). *The Guardian*. [Bush memoir: 'We got things wrong in Iraq, but the cause is eternally right' | George Bush | The Guardian](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/nov/20/bush-memoir-iraq)

Chappell, B., & Beardsley, E. (2019, September 26). Jacques Chirac, French president who opposed U.S. Iraq war, is dead at 86. *NPR*.  
<https://www.npr.org/2019/09/26/764561501/jacques-chirac-french-president-who-opposed-u-s-iraq-war-is-dead-at-86>

Chinese paper calls attention to increasing Iraqi deaths in US-led war. (2004, October 21). *Xinhua Agency*. [https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=f167eaf5-5711-4639-](https://advance.lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=f167eaf5-5711-4639-)

b230-

14d0119ccc4c&pdcontentcomponentid=8078&pdteaserkey=sr0&pdcontentcomponentid=8078&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk

00&pdcontentcomponentid=8078&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk  
&earg=sr0&prid=fcc86bc8-d593-4288-a73d-96ed0b55f67d

China's position on the US war in Iraq. (2003, March 26).

[http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/ylk/200902/t20090214\\_8417803.htm#:~:text=We%20stand%20for%20settlement%20of,solution%20to%20the%20Iraq%20question.](http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/ylk/200902/t20090214_8417803.htm#:~:text=We%20stand%20for%20settlement%20of,solution%20to%20the%20Iraq%20question.)

China: U.S. violates rights near, far. (2004, March 2). *The Philadelphia Inquirer*.

<https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=b2adfd08-5344-4c0e-83bc-ebda9a96e83f&pdcontentcomponentid=247189&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=b492721e-357b-498b-b38d-2cbf4088e748>

China issues report on US human rights. (2016, April, 14). *China Daily*. [https://advance-](https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=1fea2075-bcfe-4d0e-b1f9-79e3769bf351&pdcontentcomponentid=411371&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=dc52b306-e1ca-40da-8446-76acb9d3e7ec)

[lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=1fea2075-bcfe-4d0e-b1f9-79e3769bf351&pdcontentcomponentid=411371&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=dc52b306-e1ca-40da-8446-76acb9d3e7ec](https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=1fea2075-bcfe-4d0e-b1f9-79e3769bf351&pdcontentcomponentid=411371&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=dc52b306-e1ca-40da-8446-76acb9d3e7ec)

*Comment by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova on the Iraqi civilian victims of Western coalition strikes 1047-26-05-2017.* (2017, May 26). [Press release]. [https://mid.ru/en/foreign\\_policy/news/1547464/](https://mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/news/1547464/)

Coren, A., Hollingsworth, J., Sidhu, S., & Cohen, Z. (2021, September 17). US military admits it killed 10 civilians and targeted wrong vehicle in Kabul airstrike. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2021/09/17/politics/kabul-drone-strike-us-military-intl-hnk/index.html>

Cowell, Alan. (2003, March, 10). Threats and responses: London Revolt; A senior aide to Blair says she may quit. *The New York Times*. [THREATS AND RESPONSES: LONDON REVOLT; A Senior Aide To Blair Says She May Quit - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/10/us/politics/THREATS-AND-RESPONSES-LONDON-REVOLT-A-Senior-Aide-To-Blair-Says-She-May-Quit.html)

Dearden, L. (2017, January 3). Official total of civilians killed by US-led coalition air strikes against Isis in Syria and Iraq rises to 188; US central command says several strikes, including one that hit a hospital car park, remain under investigation. *The Independent*. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/isis-air-strikes-syria-iraq-civilian-casualties-killed-us-led-coalition-america-britain-france-total-latest-international-law-a7508031.html>

Dettmer, J. (2016, July 6). British inquiry finds Iraq war 'went badly wrong'. *VOA News*. <https://www.voanews.com/a/long-awaited-british-iraq-war-report-being-released-wednesday/3405893.html>

Devereaux, R. (2015, November 25). As France bombs ISIS, civilians are caught in the middle. *The Intercept*. <https://theintercept.com/2015/11/19/as-france-bombs-isis-civilians-are-caught-in-the-middle/>

France and Germany unite against Iraq war. (2003, January 22). *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jan/22/germany.france>

Filkins, D. (2002, July 21). Flaws in U.S. air war left hundreds of civilians dead. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2002/07/21/world/flaws-in-us-air-war-left-hundreds-of-civilians-dead.html>

Following is the full text of President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the



nation. (2001, September 2001). *The Washington Post*.  
[https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress\\_092001.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html)

Fournier, R.(2001, October 19). Bush says China stands 'side by side' with U.S. in campaign against terrorism; Jiang urges caution. *BC Cycle*. [https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crid=5d4fa397-c657-4205-afc4-3b36db0a0745&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A447S-YPJ0-009F-R4F0-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=304478&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=aed93877-d87a-42f5-a22b-9a1b19cdd5af](https://advance.lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crid=5d4fa397-c657-4205-afc4-3b36db0a0745&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A447S-YPJ0-009F-R4F0-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=304478&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=aed93877-d87a-42f5-a22b-9a1b19cdd5af)

Gordon, P. H. (2003, February 24). The crisis in the alliance. *Brookings Institution*.

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-crisis-in-the-alliance/>

Gordon, M. & Saad, H. (2017, March 16). U.S. military denies reports it bombed mosque in Syria. *The New York Times*. [U.S. Military Denies Reports It Bombed Mosque in Syria - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/16/middleeast/us-denies-bombing-mosque-syria.html)

Harrison, E.(2014, September 27). UK attacks on Isis met with public support as antiwar protesters warn of long term threat. *The Guardian*.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/27/isis-uk-attacks-support-protesters-warn-threat>

Harrison, E., Varghese, S., & Nueno, J.(2023, May 21). Multiple civilian deaths linked to 2016-17 British airstrikes against IS in Mosul. *The Guardian*.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2023/mar/21/multiple-civilian-deaths-linked-to-2016-17-british-airstrikes-against-is-in-mosul>.

Harrison, E. & Dyke, J. (2023, March 21). Lives torn apart by British airstrikes in Mosul give lie to UK's 'perfect' precision war. *The Guardian*. [Lives torn apart by British airstrikes in Mosul give lie to UK's 'perfect' precision war | Iraq | The Guardian](#)

Henneberger, M. (2001, December 8). A nation challenged: The Allies; European critics of U.S. find that the war gives them little ammunition. *The New York Times*. [A NATION CHALLENGED: THE ALLIES; European Critics of U.S. Find That the War Gives Them Little Ammunition - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](#)

Huaxia. (2022, May 11). U.S. should conduct investigations into casualties caused by its air strikes: FM spokesperson. *Xinhua News Agency*. <https://english.news.cn/20220311/4a55a268e52649c888c78bd5b550b5da/c.html>

Human rights abuses by US, allies persistent, systematic: FM spokesperson. (2022, July 18). *Global Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202207/1270843.shtml?id=11>

Hutcheson, R., & Dorgan, M. (2001, October 22). Putin backs antiterror campaign; From Russia, firm support for U.S. in Afghanistan. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. [https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=5143ce57-23ff-4e26-98e0-c4c67976f056&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A44FC-MFN0-0190-X4D4-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=247189&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=b167353e-b187-4183-aebe-a1ab8a983c9](https://advance.lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=5143ce57-23ff-4e26-98e0-c4c67976f056&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A44FC-MFN0-0190-X4D4-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=247189&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnyk&earg=sr0&prid=b167353e-b187-4183-aebe-a1ab8a983c9)

Huaxia. (2022, May 11). U.S. should conduct investigations into casualties caused by its air strikes: FM spokesperson. *Xinhua News Agency*. <https://english.news.cn/20220311/4a55a268e52649c888c78bd5b550b5da/c.html>

Khan, A. (2021, December 18). Hidden Pentagon records reveal patterns of failure in deadly

airstrikes. *The New York Times*.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/12/18/us/airstrikes-pentagon-records-civilian-deaths.html>

LaFraniere, S. (2003, March 18). Russia's Putin calls Iraq war a mistake. *The Washington Post*.  
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2003/03/18/russias-putin-calls-iraq-war-a-mistake/7fff0ba1-bfda-4970-a1a9-f7c7afd6aaa2/>

Liu Jieyi. (2014, August 15). Explanatory Remarks by Ambassador Liu Jieyi after Security Council Voting on Draft Resolution on Combating the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant. Retrieved from [http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/chinaandun/201408/t20140829\\_8401423.html](http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/chinaandun/201408/t20140829_8401423.html)

Marcetic, B. (2023, March 23). For Putin, Iraq War Marked A Turning Point In US-Russia Relations. *Responsible Statecraft*. <https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2023/03/23/for-putin-iraq-war-marked-a-turning-point-in-us-russia-relations/>

MacFarquhar, N. (2017, April 7). Russia suspends cooperation with U.S. in Syria after missile strikes. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/07/world/middleeast/russia-iran-us-strikes-syria.html>

Marsi, F. (2023, March 19). *How the US and UK tried to justify the invasion of Iraq*. *Aljazeera*.  
<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/3/19/examining-justifications-us-invasion-iraq>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China. (2023, February). US Hegemony and Its Perils. Retrieved from [https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa\\_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220\\_11027664.html](https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220_11027664.html)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2016, February 18). Briefing by

Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova, Moscow [Press release]  
[https://archive.mid.ru/en/web/guest/foreign\\_policy/news/-/asset\\_publisher/cKNonkJE02Bw/content/id/2103129](https://archive.mid.ru/en/web/guest/foreign_policy/news/-/asset_publisher/cKNonkJE02Bw/content/id/2103129)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2012, October 22). Speech by Russian Foreign Ministry Commissioner for Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law Konstantin K. Dolgov during the parliamentary hearings in the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on the issue of «The problems of human rights by the United States of America» October 22, 2012 [Press release]. Retrieved from [https://www.mid.ru/en/foreign\\_policy/news/1643807/](https://www.mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/news/1643807/)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2017, June 29). Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova, Moscow [Press Release]. <https://mid.ru/1549436/?lang=en>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2017, May 26). Comment by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova on the Iraqi civilian victims of Western coalition strikes. Retrieved from <https://www.mid.ru/tv/?id=1547464&lang=en>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2019, April 4). Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova, Moscow. [Press release]. Retrieved from [https://mid.ru/en/foreign\\_policy/news/1457725/](https://mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/news/1457725/)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2022, April 20). Timeline of crimes committed by the United States and Great Britain. [https://mid.ru/en/foreign\\_policy/historical\\_materials/1804894/](https://mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/historical_materials/1804894/)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2022, December 7). Foreign Minister

Sergey Lavrov's remarks and answers to questions at the Primakov Readings International Forum, Moscow. Retrieved from [https://mid.ru/en/foreign\\_policy/news/1842506/](https://mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/news/1842506/)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. (2023, March 16). Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokeswoman Maria Zakharova, Moscow [Press Release]. [https://mid.ru/en/press\\_service/video/briefingi/1858321/](https://mid.ru/en/press_service/video/briefingi/1858321/)

Oakford, S. (2017, May 26). America's Allies Conceal Their Civilian Casualties in Iraq and Syria. *Foreign Policy*. [https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crld=c5c17e14-571b-45b6-b733-931d63a6f5e8&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A5NMS-2WP1-JCMN-Y26C-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=484244&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnynk&earg=sr0&prid=34a871b6-9f34-407b-873d-6001f44624a3](https://advance.lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crld=c5c17e14-571b-45b6-b733-931d63a6f5e8&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A5NMS-2WP1-JCMN-Y26C-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=484244&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmnynk&earg=sr0&prid=34a871b6-9f34-407b-873d-6001f44624a3)

OHCHR. (2009, October). Unprecedented unity prompted terrible evil of 11 September attack, says UN rights expert [Press release]. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2009/10/unprecedented-unity-prompted-terrible-evil-11-september-attack-says>

Rehbein, M. & Jones, J. (2017, April 3). Russia condemns US over 'absurd' response to Mosul civilian deaths. *CNN*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/04/02/politics/russia-us-mosul-civilian-deaths/index.html>

Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan. (2021, August 16). *The White House*.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/08/16/remarks-by-president-biden-on-afghanistan/#:~:text=Our%20mission%20in%20Afghanistan%20was,terrorist%20attack%20on%20American%20homeland.>

Revealed: British government refuses to accept evidence of civilian fatalities in UK

airstrikes. (2018, April 14). *Agence France Presse*.  
<https://www.france24.com/en/20180414-uk-jets-fire-syrian-base-limited-targeted-strike>

Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. (2003, March 26). China's Position on the US War in Iraq. Retrieved from [http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/ylk/200902/t20090214\\_8417803.html](http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/chinaandun/securitycouncil/regionalhotspots/mideast/ylk/200902/t20090214_8417803.html)

*President Bush addresses the nation*. (2003, March 20).

<https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319-17.html>

Pollard, R.(2015). Syria's hidden toll of air-strike victims. *The Sun Herald*.

[https://advance-lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=46e63c84-b5dc-448f-8f2e-d1f95e195ddc&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A5GYK-09P1-JD34-V224-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=314237&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmn\\_yk&earg=sr0&prid=a63089d1-6e4d-463f-b54d-4f453f7e1dee](https://advance.lexis-com.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/document/?pdmfid=1516831&crd=46e63c84-b5dc-448f-8f2e-d1f95e195ddc&pddocfullpath=%2Fshared%2Fdocument%2Fnews%2Furn%3AcontentItem%3A5GYK-09P1-JD34-V224-00000-00&pdcontentcomponentid=314237&pdteaserkey=sr0&pditab=allpods&ecomp=hmn_yk&earg=sr0&prid=a63089d1-6e4d-463f-b54d-4f453f7e1dee)

Sabbagh, D. (2021, September 23). Revealed: UK forces linked to deaths of nearly 300

Afghan civilians. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/sep/23/2380-for-a-life-uk-forces-linked-to-nearly-300-afghan-civilian-deaths>

Suzan, B., & Gordon, P. H. (2002, January 1). France, the United States and the “war on terrorism”. *Brookings Institution*. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/france-the-united-states-and-the-war-on-terrorism/>

Taylor, A. (2014, June 12). Russia on Iraq: We told you so. *The Washington Post*.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/06/12/russia-on-iraq-we-told-you-so/>

Twin bombing kills many in Iraq town. (2005, May 30). *Aljazeera*.  
<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2005/5/30/twin-bombing-kills-many-in-iraq-town>

UK jets fire at Syrian base in 'limited and targeted strike'. (2018, April 14). *Agence France Presse*. [UK jets fire at Syrian base in 'limited and targeted strike' - France 24](https://www.france24.com/en/middle-east/20180414-uk-jets-fire-at-syrian-base-in-limited-and-targeted-strike)

United Nations Human Rights Office. (2009, October 7). *Unprecedented unity prompted terrible evil of 11 September attack, says High Commissioner* [Press release]. OHCHR.  
<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2009/10/unprecedented-unity-prompted-terrible-evil-11-september-attack-says>

United Nations Human Rights Office. (2009, October 7). Foreign Minister of France: Commission on Human Rights world living dramatic events. OHCHR. [Press release].  
<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2009/10/foreign-minister-france-commission-human-rights-world-living-dramatic-events>

US bomb blunder kills 30 at Afghan wedding. (2002, July 2). *The Guardian*.  
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/jul/02/afghanistan.lukeharding>

US hegemony and it's perils. (2023, February 20). *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China News*.  
[https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa\\_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220\\_11027664.html](https://www.fmprc.gov.cn/mfa_eng/wjbxw/202302/t20230220_11027664.html)

Wiener, T. (2001, November 5). A nation challenged: Strategy; Rumsfeld says Ramadan won't halt U.S. Attacks. *The New York Times*. [A NATION CHALLENGED: STRATEGY; Rumsfeld Says Ramadan Won't Halt U.S. Attacks - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](https://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/05/us/politics/a-nation-challenged-strategy-rumsfeld-says-ramadan-wont-halt-u-s-attacks)

*White book on facts of civilian deaths in Afghanistan caused by unlawful acts of the US and its allies.*

(2022, November 16). [Press release].  
[https://mid.ru/en/foreign\\_policy/historical\\_materials/1838877/](https://mid.ru/en/foreign_policy/historical_materials/1838877/)

Wu Haitao. (2019, August 28). Statement by Ambassador Wu Haitao at a UN Security Council Meeting on the Situation in Iraq (UNAMI). Retrieved from [http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/lhghyywj/smhwj/20190211/201908/t20190829\\_8410994.html](http://un.china-mission.gov.cn/eng/lhghyywj/smhwj/20190211/201908/t20190829_8410994.html)



## Bibliography for Legal Documents

United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations. 1 UNTS XVI. Retrieved from:

<https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf>

International Committee of the Red Cross. (1949). Geneva Convention relative to the

Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (Fourth Geneva Convention), Article 1.

Retrieved from <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/380>

International Committee of the Red Cross. (1977). Protocol Additional to the Geneva

Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of

International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), Article 48. Retrieved from [https://ihl-](https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/470)

[databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/470](https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/470)

## Appendix A – Coding Framework

Category	Sub-category	Code	Description	Indicators
Responses	Condemn	C	Refers to Negative comments regarding the actions of the US	<p>Mentions that certain actions were unlawful or criminal</p> <p>Mentions words with negative connotation, such as massacre and destruction</p>
	Accept	A	Refers to positive comments regarding the actions of the US	<p>Mentions that they are acting according to law</p> <p>Denies allegations of civilian casualties</p>
	Neutral	N	Refers to neutral or factual remarks	<p>Mentions International Humanitarian Law</p> <p>Mentions diplomacy and UN frameworks to resolve conflict</p> <p>Mentions the number of civilian death without added judgement</p>

Political justifications	Supreme emergence	SED		<p>Mentions the necessity to use force or that the war is just</p> <p>Mentions that terrorist are inhumane or form a grave threat.</p> <p>Mentions it was necessary to kill civilians to strike their military objective.</p>
	Double Effect	DDE	Refers to a justification that states that there was no intent to kill civilians, therefore they elude that no punishment or accountability may be demanded.	<p>Mentions it was a mistake, tragedy, or unintended</p> <p>Mentions that the civilian casualties were caused by a lack of information or misinformation</p> <p>Mentions civilian casualties are uncommon</p>
	Reprisal	R	Refers to a justification aligns with the principle of "an eye for an eye," asserting that since a wrongdoing was inflicted upon them, the response must be equal to it,	<p>Mentions an 'eye for an eye' principle</p> <p>Mention revenge</p>

			regardless of the consequences.	Mention that no exceptions will be made for a wrongdoer
	Other	O	Refers to all justifications found that do not fit within the categories of DDE, SED, and R.	<p>Mentions to being in compliance with the law</p> <p>Mentions that they are not solely to blame</p> <p>Mentions a white savior complex or promoting democratic states</p> <p>Mentions a flawless war</p> <p>Mentions sympathy</p>

**Appendix B – Coded text**

**UNITED STATES**

US -2001 OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE
Following is the full text of President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the nation.	1. Tonight, we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom.	1. SED
		2. R
		3. R
	2. Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution.	4. R
		5. SED
	Whether we bring our enemies to justice or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.	6. SED
		7. SED
		8. SED
	3. Nor will we forget the citizens of 80 other nations who died with our own. Dozens of Pakistanis, more than 130 Israelis, more than 250 citizens of India, men and women from El Salvador, Iran, Mexico and Japan, and hundreds of British citizens.	9. SED
		10. SED
		11. SED
		12. SED
		13. SED
		14. R
		15. R
		16. SED
4. On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country.		
5. Al Qaeda is to terror what the Mafia is to crime. But its goal is not making money, its goal is remaking the world and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.		

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>6. The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans and make no distinctions among military and civilians, including women and children.</li><li>7. They are sent back to their homes or sent to hide in countries around the world to plot evil and destruction.</li><li>8. It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere</li><li>9. These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion.</li><li>10. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions, by abandoning every value except the will to power, they follow in the path of fascism, Nazism and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way to where it ends in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies.</li><li>11. We will direct every resource at our command--every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war--to</li></ol>	
--	---	--

	<p>the destruction and to the defeat of the global terror network.</p> <p>12. These measures are essential. The only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to stop it, eliminate it and destroy it where it grows.</p> <p>13. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight.</p> <p>14. Great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment.</p> <p>15. I will not forget the wound to our country and those who inflicted it.</p> <p>16. I will not yield, I will not rest, I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people.</p>	
<p>A nation challenged: Strategy; Rumsfeld Says Ramadan Won't Halt U.S. Attacks</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the Taliban maintains military and political "concentrations of power" throughout Afghanistan</li> <li>2. While the Taliban "are no longer functioning as a government," they are "using their power in enclaves throughout the country to</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O [focus on the power of terrorist organization, not SED because no mention of a threat]</li> <li>2. O [focus on the power of terrorist organization, not SED because no mention of a threat]</li> </ol>

	<p>impose their will on the Afghan people</p> <p>3. Those threats, Mr. Rumsfeld said, "are credible, they are real and they offer the prospect of still thousands of more people being killed.</p> <p>4. he said, "but also to see that we aggressively deal with the terrorist networks."</p> <p>5. While the United States has admitted destroying sites like a Red Cross complex in Kabul, it was not always to blame for civilian deaths and destruction in Afghanistan, Mr. Rumsfeld said.</p> <p>6. "The ordnance is coming to be sure, from the air down. But it is also coming from the ground up. It is also coming from opposition forces," Mr. Rumsfeld said.</p> <p>7. While the pace of bombing has increased, "We have been careful as humanly possible," he said. "I don't think there ever in the history of the world has been a bombing effort that has been done with such precision and attention and care to that issue."</p>	<p>3. SED</p> <p>4. SED</p> <p>5. O [deflect responsibility]</p> <p>6. O [deflect responsibility]</p> <p>7. DDE [eluding that any failures were unintended, because they take the best care]</p>
--	--	--



<p>Revealed: UK forces linked to deaths of nearly 300 Afghan civilians</p>	<p>1. the US was US forced to admit that a drone strike last month killed 10 civilians including seven children – and not militants from Islamic State Khorasan Province (ISKP), as was first claimed. A “terrible mistake” was made, said Gen Kenneth McKenzie, the commander of US Central Command, as he offered his US “profound condolences to the family and friends of those who were killed”.</p>	<p>1. DDE</p>
<p>Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan</p>	<p>1. We went to Afghanistan almost 20 years ago with clear goals: get those who attacked us on September 11th, 2001, and make sure al Qaeda could not use Afghanistan as a base from which to attack us again</p>	<p>1. R</p>
<p>US bomb blunder kills 30 at Afghan wedding</p>	<p>1. US plane mistakenly targeted a house full of wedding guests, killing at least 30 of them.  2. A US air patrol over-head wrongly concluded it was coming under fire and responded with devastating force.  3. Pentagon officials last night conceded that at least one bomb dropped on the village of Kakarak was "errant".</p>	<p>1. DDE  2. DDE  3. DDE  4. DDE  5. DDE</p>

	<p>4. "At least one bomb was errant. We don't know where it fell," he said. "We are aware of reports of civilian casualties but don't know if casualties were caused [by] the bomb."</p> <p>5. In April four Canadian soldiers died when a US fighter bombed them by mistake during a training exercise.</p>	
<p>Flaws in U.S. Air War Left Hundreds of Civilians Dead</p>	<p>1. The American air campaign in Afghanistan, based on a high-tech, out-of-harm's-way strategy, has produced a pattern of mistakes that have killed hundreds of Afghan civilians.</p> <p>2. On-site reviews of 11 locations where airstrikes killed as many as 400 civilians suggest that American commanders have sometimes relied on mistaken information from local Afghans.</p> <p>3. They are even hinting that if the mistakes continue, they may limit America's future military activities.</p> <p>4. That information may be incomplete or inaccurate, and sometimes even deliberately misleading.</p>	<p>1. DDE  2. DDE  3. DDE  4. DDE  5. DDE  6. DDE  7. O [denied civilians were killed]  8. DDE  9. O [claiming success, without having the number of civilian deaths]  10. DDE  11. DDE  12. O [admitting civilians died, but eluding it was permitted because they struck the military objective]  13. DDE  14. DDE</p>

	<p>5. the military has too often struck without a full understanding of what it was attacking.</p> <p>6. American military commanders insist they take pains to ensure that civilians are spared, often verifying their targets with several sources of information.</p> <p>7. Often, despite evidence on the ground, they denied that civilians were killed.</p> <p>8. "We painstakingly assess the potential for injuring civilians or damaging civilian facilities, and positively identify targets before striking," said Col. Ray Shepherd, the spokesman for the United States Central Command in Tampa, Fla.</p> <p>9. American commanders say they have not kept track of civilian deaths in Afghanistan, but they say their strategy has succeeded. Earlier this year, Gen. Tommy R. Franks, the head of Central Command, called the Afghan campaign "the most accurate war ever fought in this nation's history."</p> <p>10. A reporter visiting the mosque after the strike found evidence</p>	<p>15. O [because the enemy, we can use excessive force]</p> <p>16. O [exaggeration of the conditions/ lack of info on cultural conditions, to justify their acts]</p> <p>17. O [admitting civilians died, but eluding it was permitted because they struck the military objective]</p> <p>18. A senior American military commander said that both the convoy and the villages were valid military targets filled with enemy forces, and that several senior Taliban leaders were killed or wounded.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>to substantiate Afghans' claim that at least 65 civilians died. American military officials acknowledged that the mosque had been struck in error, but a senior American military official was not able to give the precise number of dead.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>11. Those kinds of incidents have been rare.</li><li>12. the evidence suggests that many civilians have been killed by airstrikes hitting precisely the target they were aimed at.</li><li>13. The civilians died, the evidence suggests, because they were were made targets by mistake, or because in eagerness to kill Qaeda and Taliban fighters, Americans did not carefully differentiate between civilians and military targets.</li><li>14. The most recent errant strike, around the village of Kakrak in Oruzgan Province, appears to have resulted from a reliance on faulty intelligence and</li><li>15. the use of sudden and excessive force in trying to kill people who the American pilots thought were enemy fighters.</li></ol>	
--	---	--

	<p>16. American pilots fired on Kakrak after Special Operations forces on the ground reported seeing anti-aircraft guns firing, military officials said. According to the villagers, there were two engagement parties that night, and some of the men were firing their guns in celebration, an Afghan tradition. The Americans said their planes had been fired on, but the villagers denied aiming at anything.</p> <p>17. An American military official interviewed about Niazi Qala did not deny that civilians were killed there, but he insisted that the village had been a base for Taliban and Qaeda fighters. "This compound was in use by Taliban and Al Qaeda senior leadership," he said.</p> <p>18. A senior American military commander said that both the convoy and the villages were valid military targets filled with enemy forces, and that several senior Taliban leaders were killed or wounded.</p>	
--	--	--

US -2003  
OPERATION  
IRAQI  
FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE
<p>How the US and UK tried to justify the invasion of Iraq</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In a speech in Cincinnati in the US state of Ohio on October 7, 2002, the US president declared that Iraq “possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons.”</li> <li>2. He then concluded that Hussein had to be stopped. “The Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons and diseases and gases and atomic weapons,” Bush said.</li> <li>3. Bush stated in no un certain terms that the US would combat “terrorist groups” or any country deemed to be training, equipping or supporting “terrorism”.</li> <li>4. “States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, aiming to threaten the peace of the world,” he said.</li> <li>5. “Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror,” the US president said.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SED</li> <li>2. SED</li> <li>3. SED</li> <li>4. SED</li> <li>5. SED</li> </ol>

	6. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilised world.	
Thursday's Election Won't Stop The Violence in Iraq, Bush Says	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "No nation in history has made the transition to a free society without facing challenges, setbacks and false starts," Mr. Bush said.</li> <li>2. Mr. Bush effectively said that the administration had made mistakes in Iraq</li> <li>3. "The vast majority of Iraqis do not want to live under an Iranian-style theocracy, and they don't want Syria to allow the transit of bombers and killers into Iraq," Mr. Bush said, vowing that the "United States of America will stand with the Iraqi people against the threats from these neighbors."</li> <li>4. The president responded that "there was a serious international effort to say to Saddam Hussein, 'You're a threat,' and the Sept. 11 attacks extenuated that threat." Mr. Bush added that "knowing what I know today, I'd make the decision again.'</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O [the deaths of civilians was justified because the nation was making a transition to a free society]</li> <li>2. DDE</li> <li>3. SED</li> <li>4. SED</li> </ol>
Bush: The battle in Iraq is noble, it is necessary and it is just	1. George Bush marked the fifth anniversary of the Iraq invasion yesterday with an uncompromising speech in which	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SED</li> <li>2. SED</li> <li>3. SED</li> <li>4. SED</li> </ol>

	<p>he described the war as noble, necessary and just</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The answers are clear to me: removing Saddam Hussein from power was the right decision - and this is a fight Americans must win. Because we acted, the world is better and the United States of America is safer.</li> <li>3. "The battle in Iraq is noble, it is necessary, and it is just. And nece with your courage, the battle in Iraq will end in victory."</li> <li>4. "its ambitions to acquire weapons of mass destruction to attack America and other free nations".</li> </ol>	
<p>Bush memoir: 'We got things wrong in Iraq, but the cause is eternally right'</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Dear Dad, at around 9.30am, I gave the order to SecDef to execute the war plan for Operation Iraqi Freedom. In spite of the fact that I had decided a few months ago to use force, if need be, to liberate Iraq and rid the country of WMD [weapons of mass destruction], the decision was an emotional one."</li> <li>2. "My speech made clear that our work was far from done. But all the explaining in the world could not reverse the perception. Our stagecraft had gone awry. It was a big mistake."</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O [white savior]</li> <li>2. DDE</li> <li>3. DDE</li> <li>4. SED</li> <li>5. R</li> <li>6. SED</li> <li>7. O [White savior, they are better of now]</li> </ol>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. He says: "There are things we got wrong in Iraq,</li> <li>4. but the cause is eternally right."</li> <li>5. "He was an enemy, he had invaded countries everybody thought he had weapons of mass destruction, that he had affiliations, not with those who killed Americans on 9/11 but that he had affiliations with terrorist networks.</li> <li>6. And the biggest danger facing the free world was the confluence of haters and weapons of mass destruction."</li> <li>7. "I feel terrible about them too. I felt terrible about those who died because of the liberation and I felt terrible for those who died prior to the liberation. And I believe that 25 million people are better off without Saddam."</li> </ol>	
Twin bombing kills many in Iraq town	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "These folks are savages, mass murderers. The international community should never think about anything but winning the battle against them", he said</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SED</li> </ol>
President Bush Addresses the Nation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SED</li> <li>2. SED</li> <li>3. O [white savior]</li> <li>4. O [deflect blame]</li> <li>5. O [white savior]</li> <li>6. SED</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Every nation in this coalition has chosen to bear the duty and share the honor of serving in our common defense.</li><li>3. To all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces now in the Middle East, the peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you. That trust is well placed.</li><li>4. Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women and children as shields for his own military - a final atrocity against his people.</li><li>5. We come to Iraq with respect for its citizens, for their great civilization and for the religious faiths they practice. We have no ambition in Iraq, except to remove a threat and restore control of that country to its own people.</li><li>6. My fellow citizens, the dangers to our country and the world will be overcome. We will pass through this time of peril and carry on the work of peace. We will defend our freedom. We will bring freedom to others and we will prevail</li></ol>	
--	--	--

US -2014  
OPERATION  
INHERENT  
RESOLVE

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE
<p>America's Allies Conceal Their Civilian Casualties in Iraq and Syria</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These confirmed deaths caused by non U.S. airstrikes came to light in the most recent coalition civilian casualty report[1], released April 30. The report quietly referred to 80 new deaths referenced only as 'attributable to coalition strikes to defeat ISIS in Iraq and Syria from August 2014 to present [that] had not been previously announced.'</li> <li>2. Three U.S. Central Command officials confirmed to Airwars and Foreign Policy that the 80 deaths occurred in incidents that U.S. investigators concluded were the responsibility of partner nations</li> <li>3. U.S. forces first admitted their own civilian casualties in May 2015, and have so far confirmed their responsibility for 377 civilian deaths —</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O [pointing the finger at others while there are four fingers pointing back]</li> <li>2. O [pointing the finger at others while there are four fingers pointing back]</li> <li>3. O [admit responsibility]</li> <li>4. O [distributing responsibility amongst all coalition parties]</li> </ol>

	<p>including 105 killed in a single incident in Mosul in March.</p> <p>4. 'We will just say 'Coalition,' and we won't say if it was U.S. or not,' confirmed Centcom Director of Public Affairs Col. John Thomas.</p>	
<p>US military admits it killed 10 civilians and targeted wrong vehicle in Kabul airstrike</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. McKenzie told reporters that the strike – which he said killed seven children – was a “mistake” and offered an apology</li> <li>2. “This strike was taken in the earnest belief that it would prevent an imminent threat to our forces and the evacuees at the airport,</li> <li>3. but it was a mistake and I offer my sincere apology,” he said.</li> <li>4. McKenzie added that he is “fully responsible for this strike and this tragic outcome.”</li> <li>5. President Joe Biden’s promise to <u>make the terror group “pay”</u> for its deadly suicide attack in Kabul.</li> <li>6. The Pentagon had maintained that at least one ISIS-K facilitator and three civilians were killed in what Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Mark Milley had previously called a</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DDE</li> <li>2. SED</li> <li>3. DDE</li> <li>4. DDE [admits responsibility to the act /actus rea but says it was a mistake/ lack of mens rea]</li> <li>5. R</li> <li>6. SED</li> <li>7. DDE</li> <li>8. DDE [justify it by saying they thought they had it right, not having it right was the mistake thus unintended]</li> <li>9. DDE</li> <li>10. SED</li> <li>11. SED</li> <li>12. O [minimizing the gravity of the attack]</li> <li>13. O [ indirectly admitting to violation]</li> <li>14. DDE</li> <li>15. DDE</li> </ol>

	<p>“righteous strike” on the compound on August 29. The investigation released Friday found that all of those killed in the residential compound were civilians.</p> <p>7. Tragically, it was the wrong vehicle, a US military official familiar with the investigation told CNN earlier Friday, adding that reasonable certainty is not 100% certainty.</p> <p>8. “We didn’t take the strike because we thought we were wrong – we took the strike because we thought we had a good target,” McKenzie said.</p> <p>9. While he acknowledged that the strike “was a terrible mistake,”</p> <p>10. he said he would “not qualify the entire operation” as a failure.</p> <p>11. Previously, US Central Command pointed to “significant secondary explosions” as evidence of a “substantial amount of explosive material” in the vehicle.</p> <p>12. the US military source said that after reviewing footage</p>	<p>16. SED</p> <p>17. DDE</p>
--	---	-------------------------------

	<p>from infra-red sensors, they would no longer characterize this as an explosion – instead, it was more of a flare up.</p> <p>13. A US official with direct knowledge of the standards for a strike of this nature told CNN earlier this month that 10 civilian deaths is an “astronomically high” number and the military would have conducted collateral damage estimates beforehand, meaning commanders were aware that there was a potential for civilian casualties.</p> <p>14. On Friday, Milley released a statement on the strike calling it “a horrible tragedy.”</p> <p>15. “In a dynamic high-threat environment, the commanders on the ground had appropriate authority and had reasonable certainty that the target was valid, but after deeper post-strike analysis, our conclusion is that innocent civilians were killed,”</p> <p>16. “This is a horrible tragedy of war and its [sic] heart wrenching and we are committed to being fully</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>transparent about this incident,” he added.</p> <p>17. “We now know that there was no connection between Mr. Ahmadi and ISIS-Khorasan, that his activities on that day were completely harmless and not at all related to the imminent threat we believed we faced, and that Mr. Ahmadi was just as innocent a victim as were the others tragically killed,”</p>	
<p>Hidden pentagon records reveal patterns of failure in deadly airstrikes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In November 2015, after observing a man dragging an “unknown heavy object” into an ISIS “defensive fighting position,” American forces struck a building in Ramadi, Iraq. A military review found that the object was actually “a person of small stature” — a child — who died in the strike</li> <li>2. President Barack Obama called it “the most precise air campaign in history.”</li> <li>3. which American officials said had destroyed a vehicle laden with bombs, had instead killed 10 members of one Afghan family.</li> <li>4. But in the rare cases where failings are publicly</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DDE [UNKOWN, LACK OF INFO]</li> <li>2. O [neglect]</li> <li>3. SED</li> <li>4. DDE/SED</li> <li>5. DDE</li> <li>6. DDE</li> <li>7. O [CONFIRMATION BIAS] /DDE</li> <li>8. O [CONFIRMATION BIAS] / DDE</li> <li>9. SED/DDE [arguing that it's necessary, but also saying it's tragic]</li> <li>10. O [having to save your more precise weapons for more serious threats]</li> <li>11. DDE/SED</li> <li>12. DDE</li> </ol>

	<p>acknowledged, they tend to be characterized as unfortunate, unavoidable and uncommon</p> <p>5. Bill Urban, the spokesman for the U.S. Central Command, said that “even with the best technology in the world, mistakes do happen, whether based on incomplete information or misinterpretation of the information available.</p> <p>6. And we try to learn from those mistakes.” He added: “We work diligently to avoid such harm. We investigate each credible instance. And we regret each loss of innocent life.”</p> <p>7. People streaming toward a fresh bombing site were assumed to be ISIS fighters, not civilian rescuers.</p> <p>8. Men on motorcycles moving “in formation,” displaying the “signature” of an imminent attack, were just men on motorcycles.</p> <p>9. The military spokesman, Captain Urban, pointed out that, “In many combat situations, where targeteers face credible threat streams</p>	<p>13. DDE</p> <p>14. O [in compliance with law]</p> <p>15. O [in compliance with the law and civilian deaths are mitigated]</p> <p>16. O [civilian deaths uncommon due to PNCI violation]</p> <p>17. SED</p> <p>18. O [admitting to confirmation bias]</p> <p>19. O [blame shifting onto terrorist]</p> <p>20. SED</p> <p>21. O [in compliance with the law]</p> <p>22. O [collateral damage was alleviated so it's okay]</p> <p>23. O [in compliance with the law]</p> <p>24. O [neglect]</p>
--	--	---



	<p>and do not have the luxury of time, the fog of war can lead to decisions that tragically result in civilian harm.”</p> <p>10. Indeed, the Pentagon records detail how in Mosul in 2016, three civilians were killed when a bomb aimed at one car instead struck three — in part because the military official approving the strike had decided to save more-precise weapons for other, imminent strikes.</p> <p>11. Officials often describe these as awful but inescapable accidents.</p> <p>12. In many cases, the command that approved a strike was responsible for examining it, too. And those examinations were often based on incorrect or incomplete evidence.</p> <p>13. “An honest mistake, on a strike taken with the best available information and in keeping with mission requirements that results in civilian casualties, is not, in and of itself, a cause for disciplinary actions as set forth in the law of armed conflict.”</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>14. execute more than 50,000 airstrikes in Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan, in accordance with a rigorous approval process that prized being “discriminate,” “proportional” and in compliance with the law of armed conflict.</p> <p>15. the Pentagon’s inspector general completed a classified report evaluating the policies for ensuring that “only valid military targets are struck,” and that “damage to property and loss of civilian life is mitigated to the maximum extent possible.</p> <p>16. according to the Pentagon records, misidentification was involved in only 4 percent of cases.</p> <p>17. The targeted vehicle “sustained a direct hit,” according to the military assessment. The group on the sidewalk “sustained weapons effects.” But the review of the footage found no evidence that the vehicle was a car bomb.</p> <p>18. The military spokesman, Captain Urban, acknowledged that “confirmation bias is a real concern,” citing the Kabul</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>airstrike in August that killed the 10 members of a family</p> <p>19. Captain Urban said the targeting process had been vastly complicated by enemies who “plan, resource and base themselves in and among local populace.”</p> <p>20. “They do not present themselves in large formations,” he added, “do not fight coalition forces with conventional tactics, and use geography and terrain in ways not conducive in every way to easy targeting solutions.</p> <p>21. Moreover, they often and deliberately use civilians as human shields,</p> <p>22. and they do not subscribe to anything remotely like the law of armed conflict to which we subscribe.</p> <p>23. analysts had examined still images of children “interacting” with the hospital but had determined that striking at night would “alleviate collateral concerns.” Four civilians were killed and six injured</p> <p>24. The military investigation found that there was no</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>evidence of negligence or wrongdoing; that the “policies, procedures and practices” were “sufficient for continued operations”; and that “no further action” was necessary. No condolence payments were authorized.</p> <p>25. The military deemed this case noncredible, finding that the target was an ISIS site and that no civilians had been harmed. But interviews with survivors, as well as video footage and photos, showed that 16 civilians were killed</p>	
<p>U.S. Military Denies Reports It Bombed Mosque in Syria</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “We did not target any mosques,” said Col. John J. Thomas, a spokesman for the Central Command, which has responsibility for American military missions in the Middle East. “What we did target was destroyed. There is a mosque within 50 feet of that building that is still standing.”</li> <li>2. While the American military said it had struck a legitimate target, Colonel Thomas said an investigation would be carried out to determine if</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O [neglect]</li> <li>2. O [compliance with the law]</li> <li>3. DDE</li> </ol>

	<p>innocent civilians had been killed or injured</p> <p>3. . A military inquiry later concluded that the military officers who had planned the mission thought they were targeting Islamic State militants and that “unintentional” mistakes had led them to bomb Syrian forces</p>	
--	---	--

**Appendix C – United Kingdom coded Text**

<p>UK -2001 OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM</p>			
SOURCE	TEXT	RESPONSE CODE	PJ CODE
<p>Revealed: UK forces linked to deaths of nearly 300 Afghan civilians</p>	<p>1. In the British logs, many of the incidents are recorded only briefly. Murray Jones, the author of the research, said: “These files do not make for easy reading. The banality of language means hundreds of tragic deaths, including dozens of children, read more like an inventory.”</p>	<p>1. A 2. A 3. A</p>	<p>3. SED</p>

	<p>2. British officials say that efforts are routinely made to minimise the impact of military operations on civilians. But in other contexts the UK has only made limited admissions</p> <p>3. “Every civilian death is a tragedy and the UK always seeks to minimise the risk of civilian casualties through our rigorous targeting processes, but that risk can never be removed entirely,”</p>		
<p>Attacks on Afghanistan: Tony Blair statement</p>	<p>1. As you all know from the announcement by President (George W.) Bush, military action against targets inside Afghanistan have begun. I can confirm that UK forces are engaged in this action.</p> <p>2. We made clear following the attacks upon the U.S. on September 11 that we would take action once it was clear who was responsible.</p> <p>3. "It is now almost a month since the atrocity occurred. It is more than two weeks since an ultimatum was delivered to the Taliban to yield up the terrorists or face the consequences. It is</p>	<p>1. A</p> <p>2. A</p> <p>3. A</p> <p>4. A</p> <p>5. A</p> <p>6. A</p> <p>7. A</p> <p>8. A</p> <p>9. A</p> <p>[NOT REAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE CIVILIAN DEATHS BUT MOR SUPPORTING THE CASUE]</p>	<p>2.SED</p> <p>3.SED</p> <p>4.O [mindful attack to avoid civilian deaths]</p> <p>6.SED</p> <p>7.SED</p> <p>8.SED</p> <p>9.SED</p>

	<p>clear beyond doubt that the Taliban will not do this.</p> <p>They were given the choice of siding with justice, or siding with terror. They chose terror.</p> <p>4. The military plan has been put together mindful of our determination to do all we humanly can to avoid civilian casualties.</p> <p>5. I cannot recall a situation that has commanded so quickly such a powerful coalition of support -- not just from those countries directly involved in military action but from many others in all parts of the world.</p> <p>6. The world understands that whilst of course there are dangers in acting as we are, the dangers of inaction are far, far greater - the threat of further such outrages, the threats to our economies, the threat to the stability of the world.</p> <p>7. Britain. But even if no British citizen had died, we would be right to act. This atrocity was an attack on us all, on people of all faiths</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>and people of none. We know the al Qaeda network threatens Europe, including Britain, and indeed any nation throughout the world that does not share their fanatical views. So we have a direct interest in acting in our self-defence to protect British lives.</p> <p>8. "It was an attack on lives and livelihoods. The airlines, tourism and other industries have been affected, and economic confidence has suffered with all that means to British jobs and business.</p> <p>9. But we know that sometimes to safeguard peace, we have to fight. Britain has learnt that lesson many times in our history. We only do it if the cause is just. This cause is just</p>		
<p>A nation challenged: The Allies; European critics of U.S. find that the war gives them little ammunition</p>	<p>1. In Britain, there was always less protest than elsewhere. With the Labor prime minister, Tony Blair, so staunchly behind the campaign, anti-war marches attracted only sparse crowds and few major politicians</p>	<p>1. A</p>	



UK -2003 OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM			
SOURCE	TEXT	RESPONSE CODE	PJ CODE
British Inquiry Finds Iraq War 'Went Badly Wrong'	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blair told Britain's parliament, "Iraq has biological and chemical weapons." The claim was crucial in persuading a majority of British lawmakers to endorse the country's participation in toppling Saddam Hussein.</li> <li>2. However he insisted the world is a better place because of the removal of Saddam</li> <li>3. Blair issued a defiant statement Wednesday, saying, "The report should lay to rest allegations of bad faith, lies or deceit. Whether people agree or disagree with my decision to take military action against Saddam Hussein, I took it in good faith and in what I</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A</li> <li>3. A</li> <li>4. A</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SED</li> <li>2. SED</li> <li>3. SED</li> <li>4. SED</li> </ol>

	<p>believed to be the best interests of the country.”</p> <p>4. “There are times when interventions are necessary,” he said. “It would be wrong to conclude that intervention is always wrong.</p>		
<p>How the US and UK tried to justify the invasion of Iraq</p>	<p>1. On March 20, 2003, the United States led a coalition that launched a fully fledged invasion of Iraq, closely supported by the United Kingdom.</p> <p>2. Then-British Prime Minister Tony Blair had said the same thing on September 24, 2002, as he presented a British intelligence dossier affirming that Hussein could activate chemical and biological weapons “within 45 minutes, including against his own Shia population”</p>	<p>1. A</p> <p>2. A</p>	<p>2.SED</p>
<p>Threats and responses: London Revolt; A senior aide to Blair says she may quit</p>	<p>1. While there was no immediate public comment from Mr. Blair, Ms. Short's remarks indicated the divisions within the prime minister's ranks as he seeks international support for a new United Nations resolution sanctifying the</p>	<p>1. A</p> <p>2. A</p> <p>3. A</p>	

	<p>use of force against Saddam Hussein.</p> <p>2. Britain has earmarked some 40,000 troops to join the 200,000-plus American soldiers poised to invade Iraq, making it the only significant non-American contributor of forces to President Bush's "coalition of the willing." But Mr. Blair's unswerving support for the Bush administration's invasion plans -- with or without a second resolution - - has turned into by far his riskiest political gamble since taking office in 1997</p> <p>3. "We are proceeding through international law to deal with Saddam," said Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott. "We are working very hard to get agreement for the second resolution."</p>		
<p>Chinese paper calls attention to increasing Iraqi deaths in US-led war</p>	<p>1. The US and British military officials insisted they had done what they could to avoid civilian casualties</p>	<p>1. A</p>	<p>1. DDE/O (following the law)</p>

UK -2014 OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE			
SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
UK attacks on Isis met with public support as anti-war protesters warn of long-term threat	<p>1. Both Isis brutality and the group's slick promotion of atrocities on the internet and through social media had helped swing public opinion across the UK strongly behind military action, said Ben Page, chief executive of polling organisation Ipsos MORI.</p> <p>2. "Does everybody think we are going to fix it? Probably not, but it's just this feeling of absolute revulsion at what has happened," Page said. "The public in both Britain and America have switched ... in both countries you've now got between 65% and 71% saying they support the government attacking Isis."</p>	<p>1. A</p> <p>2. A</p>	<p>1. SED</p> <p>2. SED</p>

<p>UK jets fire at Syrian base in 'limited and targeted strike'</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prime Minister Theresa May said the "limited and targeted strike" was part of joint action with France and the United States in response to Syria's latest alleged chemical weapons atrocity</li> <li>2. "There is no practicable alternative to the use of force to degrade and deter the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime," May said in a televised statement.</li> <li>3. "This is not about intervening in a civil war. It is not about regime change.</li> <li>4. "It is about a limited and targeted strike that does not further escalate tensions in the region and that does everything possible to prevent civilian casualties," she said.</li> <li>5. "I have done so because I judge this action to be in Britain's national interest," she added</li> <li>6. Defence Secretary Gavin Williamson said in the statement that the strikes</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A</li> <li>3. A</li> <li>4. A</li> <li>5. A</li> <li>6. A</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O (limited and targeted strike)</li> <li>2. SED</li> <li>3. O (intervening in a civil war)</li> <li>4. SED</li> <li>5. SED (justified)</li> </ol>
---	--	--	---

	were a "legal and proportionate" response to the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime		
Revealed: British government refuses to accept evidence of civilian fatalities in UK airstrikes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Ministry of Defence told the Sunday Herald that it will not investigate reports of deaths on the ground in Syria and Iraq - from anyone but UK military personnel, and "local forces" deemed friendly.</li> <li>2. He added one issue with monitoring the UK's activities is that half of all its airstrikes are carried out by reaper drones - and officials will not release any information about where those strikes are taking place which can be checked against reports of casualties.</li> <li>3. According to statistics compiled by Airwars, since August 2014 US-led coalition forces, including France, Canada, UK and Australia have carried out around 6,317 airstrikes in Iraq intended at targeting</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A</li> <li>3. A</li> <li>4. A</li> <li>5. A</li> </ol>	5. O (NO CASUALTIES)

	<p>Islamic State. Around 450 were carried out by the UK. The US began operations in Syria in September 2014 and has been joined by allies including Turkey, Australia, Canada and France. The UK joined in December last year. Around 3,204 US-led coalition air strikes have been carried out in Syria, with around a dozen carried out so far by the UK. Airwars has estimated that up to 2,332 civilian deaths have resulted from these attacks in both Iraq and Syria</p> <p>4. dismissal of any evidence of civilian deaths apart from confirmation by UK military personnel or "local forces".</p> <p>5. This idea the Government is trying to sell the UK airstrikes in Syria as 'civilian casualty free'</p>		
<p>Multiple civilian deaths linked to 2016-17 British</p>	<p>1. Britain's government and military have for years stood by the claim that in terms of protecting</p>	<p>1. A 2. A 3. A 4. A</p>	<p>1. O (perfect war) 2. O (perfect war, no</p>

<p>airstrikes against IS in Mosul</p>	<p>ordinary Iraqis, the UK fought a “perfect” war against Islamic State (IS) militants in Iraq</p> <p>2. The Ministry of Defence declined to confirm or deny whether the specific strikes were conducted by its forces, and said British troops had not killed or harmed civilians in Iraq. “There is no evidence or indication that civilian casualties were caused by strikes in Syria and Iraq,” a spokesperson said. “The UK always minimises the risk of civilian casualties through our rigorous processes and carefully examines a range of evidence to do this, including comprehensive analysis of the mission data for every strike.”</p> <p>3. Britain accepts carrying out that attack but denies civilian casualties, saying the dead were militants.</p> <p>4. The British military claims those strikes killed 3,052 militants in Iraq without causing a single</p>		<p>mistakes made)</p> <p>3. O (perfect war, no mistakes made)</p> <p>4. O (perfect war, no mistakes made)</p>
---------------------------------------	--	--	---



	civilian death. In Syria, the UK claims 1,017 fighters were killed and one civilian		
Lives torn apart by British airstrikes in Mosul give lie to UK's 'perfect' precision war	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The UK military claim to have fought a "perfect" war in Iraq, one in which British weapons did not harm a single civilian, even as missiles from their allies in the US-led coalition killed and maimed hundreds</li> <li>2. Britain says one Hellfire missile killed three militants in Mosul on 29 November 2016.</li> <li>3. The dense streets of Mosul were filled with ordinary people, some prevented from leaving, others too frightened to cross frontlines to escape the fighting. IS militants had dug in among them for a suicidal last stand. British authorities claim they were able to unleash thousands of kilos of hi-tech weapons on this complex frontline, and destroy a formidable</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A</li> <li>3. A</li> <li>4. A</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O (perfect war)</li> <li>3. POSITIVE SED</li> </ol>

	<p>extremist army without harming a single civilian.</p> <p>4. London has maintained its position that the Mosul campaign was flawless with such commitment, that it has even rejected the findings of its allies. In 2020 the coalition unit set up to assess civilian casualty found that one known RAF strike killed two civilians in the city; Britain insists all victims were fighters.</p>		
--	---	--	--

-

### FRANCE

#### FRANCE-2001 AFGHANISTAN – OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
France, the United States and the War on Terrorism	1. The French people and government have demonstrated extraordinary sympathy and solidarity for the United States in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks.	1. A 2. A 3. A 4. A/C (supporting the US, but also stating that it will not blindly	1.SED  5. O (advocating for diplomacy and non-military components)  6. O (advocating for following the law and not striking blindly)

	<p>2. French leaders from across the political spectrum have, with few exceptions, expressed solidarity with and support for the United States.</p> <p>3. France did not hesitate to support the invocation of NATO's Article 5 mutual defense guarantee.</p> <p>4. France, of course, has made it clear that its solidarity does not mean a "blank check" for the United States. In his September 24 address to the Institut des Hautes Etudes de la Défense Nationale, for example, Prime Minister Lionel Jospin stressed that while France would not "shirk its responsibilities,"</p>	<p>follow the US)</p> <p>5. A/C (support to take action but advocating for diplomacy)</p> <p>6. C</p> <p>7. C</p> <p>8. C</p> <p>9. C</p>	<p>7.O (advocating for following the law and not striking blindly)</p> <p>8. O (fear of involvement due to fear of retaliation)</p> <p>9.SED (they need the UN's permission to act and make it legitimate )</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>this would not prevent it from “making a free judgment about French participation in a military engagement.</p> <p>5. Thus, without excluding the possible need for a military riposte, French leaders foresee a campaign that will primarily involve diplomacy, law enforcement, and international intelligence cooperation. This emphasis on the non-military components of the campaign perhaps explains French leaders’ initial reluctance to use the word “war,” with its military connotations, to describe the anti-terrorism campaign.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>6. “You can’t strike blindly,” Chirac warned while in Washington. And Jospin emphasized that military strikes must be “proportional, strategically and militarily justified, and politically coherent.”</p> <p>7. French public opinion, according to polls, takes the same view, with 84% of those surveyed (compared with 56% of the Americans) saying that any military strike should involve only military, as opposed to civilian, targets.</p> <p>8. With more than four million Muslims resident in France, and given their own painful</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>experiences with extremist terrorism, the French are particularly concerned about what Védrine called “falling into the diabolical trap that the terrorists wanted to set, that of a ‘clash of civilizations.’”</p> <p>9. The French also stress the need for legitimacy for the response to September 11, which they believe will come from as broad an international coalition as possible and the approval and involvement of the United Nations.</p>		
<p>A NATION CHALLENGED: THE CONTINENT; Europeans Pledge</p>	<p>1. Spain and Italy joined France and Germany in pledging to send troops, if necessary.</p>	<p>1. A 2. C</p>	<p>1. Uncertain SED (if necessary ) 2. NEGATIVE SED</p>

Troops, if Necessary	2. "The military response launched by the Americans is an act of war against the Afghan people, a people who risk paying a high price for international terrorism," Mr. Mamere said		
A NATION CHALLENGED: THE ALLIES; European Critics of U.S. Find That the War Gives Them Little Ammunition	<p>1. I overreacted when I said the military response launched by the Americans is an act of war against the Afghan people, said the writer, Noel Mamere, a French legislator</p> <p>2. Like others across Europe, he remains concerned about civilian casualties, about what he called the cowboy tone of American politicians and media coverage, especially about what will happen now if President</p>	<p>1. A</p> <p>2. C</p> <p>3. A</p> <p>4. A</p> <p>5. C</p> <p>6. C</p>	<p>2. NEGATIVE SED/O (concern for civilian lives)</p> <p>3. O (sympathy because of their own experiences with terrorism)</p> <p>4. O (sympathy because of their own experiences with terrorism)</p>

	<p>Bush makes good on his promise to wage a long war against terrorists.</p> <p>3. In France, opposition to the war was somewhat tempered from the first by memories of a French plane hijacked in Algeria in 1994. The hijackers had been set to crash into the Eiffel Tower before commandoes shot them.</p> <p>4. That incident and subsequent revenge bombings in the Paris Metro seemed to make many in France more sympathetic to the United States response</p> <p>5. Still there was a lot of early criticism about the number of Afghan civilians being killed, especially children.</p>		
--	---	--	--



	<p>Soon after the bombing began on Oct. 7, 113 prominent intellectuals signed a letter attacking the United States though even then, that letter immediately prompted a backlash from other intellectuals.</p> <p>6. "The United States bombed Iraq and children over there are still dying." said one young Frenchman.</p>		
--	---	--	--

FRANCE -2003 IRAQ - OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
FOREIGN MINISTER OF FRANCE TO COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS: WORLD IS LIVING DRAMATIC	<p>1. Dominique de Villepin, the French Foreign Minister, this morning told the Commission on Human Rights that the world was living dramatic events with regard to the crisis in Iraq.</p>	<p>1. C</p> <p>2. C</p> <p>3. C</p> <p>4. C</p>	

EVENTS WITH IRAQ CRISIS	<p>2. Mr. de Villepin said that the world wanted law to prevail, and from now onwards, the international community should give a new efficacy to multilateral institutions, in particular to the Commission.</p> <p>3. He said that, with regard to Iraq, the Commission had every year condemned the violations of human rights there.</p> <p>4. However, if force should be the last recourse, it should not be a preventive and unilateral action. Such a situation could damage the confidence that existed between States, and could lead to violence and war. Particularly, it would damage the process of human rights.</p>		
The Crisis in the Alliance	1. the French President berating Central European countries for	1. C 2. C	6. O (don't want to go to war due to the

	<p>their support for the United States and threatening to block their accession to the European Union because of it</p> <p>2. European public opinion remains deeply hostile to the use of force under current circumstances, and France and Germany seem unlikely to waver in their opposition, especially if they manage to get other Security Council members on their side.</p> <p>3. The current dispute arises from the interpretation of those commitments. For the United States, the essence of Resolution 1441 was voluntary Iraqi disarmament—if Iraq failed to demonstrate that it was free of weapons of mass destruction, the threat of “serious consequences” meant the use of military</p>	<p>3. C (THE METHOD)</p> <p>4. C</p> <p>5. C</p> <p>6. C</p> <p>7. C</p> <p>8. C</p> <p>9. C</p> <p>10. C</p>	<p>debt they are owed)</p> <p>7. O (don't want to go to war due to the debt they are owed)</p> <p>8.NEGATIVE SED/ R</p> <p>9. O(advocating for an international approach and not unilateral)</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>force. Many Europeans, on the other hand—including at least the French, German, and Belgian governments—instead put the emphasis on weapons inspections.</p> <p>4. the French Foreign Minister’s call for more time for inspections with applause, all suggest that European opposition to use of force in Iraq right now may be more than the minor irritation caused by one or two European governments</p> <p>5. France and Germany, who are leading the charge against war in Iraq</p> <p>6. . France is indeed owed approximately \$5 billion from Iraq from previous deals, but it also understands that this money is highly unlikely to be paid so long as Saddam Husayn is in power. The same is true for oil contracts</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>that have reportedly been agreed between French oil companies and the current regime;</p> <p>7. The bottom line is that if commercial interests were the main factor driving policy, the appropriate strategy for France and Germany would be to back the U.S. threat of force</p> <p>8. but it is even true for a traditionally less pacifist country like France, which has also experienced “war, occupation, and barbarity,” as Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin reminded the Security Council on February 14.</p> <p>9. French leaders in particular are simply not prepared to accept that decisions about global war and peace should be decided unilaterally in Washington, especially if much of international opinion would prefer to</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>follow a different course.</p> <p>10. France has already said that it opposes such a resolution and has threatened to veto it.</p>		
<p>Jacques Chirac, French President Who Opposed U.S. Iraq War, Is Dead At 86</p>	<p>1. Jacques René Chirac, a champion of Europe and fierce opponent of the U.S. invasion of Iraq, has died.</p> <p>2. "I'm telling my American friends beware, be careful," he said on the eve of the war. "Think it over seriously before you take action that is not necessary and that can be very dangerous, especially in the fight against international terrorism."</p>	<p>1. C</p> <p>2. C</p>	<p>2. NEGATIVE SED</p>

FRANCE -2014 IRAQ – OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
<p>Coalition strikes pound IS 'capital' in Syria, oil tankers</p>	<p>1. France's defence ministry said the warplanes, including Rafale and Mirage fighters, had dropped</p>	<p>1. A</p>	<p>1. DDE (targets were hit, eluding to civilian</p>

	20 bombs on targets including a command post, a recruitment centre and arms depots south of Raqa.		deaths around being a mistake)
Syria's hidden toll of air-strike victims	1. Australia, along with a handful of other nations such as France, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Britain, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia, joined the international effort to defeat the so-called Islamic State last September.	1. A	
AS FRANCE BOMBS ISIS, CIVILIANS ARE CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "France is at war"</li> <li>2. Hollande vowed to triple his country's capacity to launch airstrikes against ISIS.</li> <li>3. "We will continue the strikes in the weeks to come," he pledged. "There will be no respite and no truce."</li> <li>4. Echoing his president the following day, France's defense minister Fra formally called upon the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A (support for the US)</li> <li>3. A</li> <li>4. A</li> <li>5. A</li> <li>6. A</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. POSITIVE SED</li> <li>3. R</li> </ol>

	<p>European Union to aid in its fight “either by taking part in France’s operations in Syria or Iraq, or by easing the Fra Fra load or providing support for France in other operations.”</p> <p>5. Fra France announced it would join the coalition air campaign in Syria a year after the Americans did, in mid-September 2015.</p> <p>6. Since Sunday night, French warplanes, taking flight from Jordan and the United Arab Emirates, have been dropping bombs on Raqqa daily.</p>		
<p>Official total of civilians killed by US-led coalition air strikes against Isis in Syria and Iraq rises to 188; US Central Command says several strikes, including one that hit a hospital car</p>	<p>1. A spokesperson said coalition members, including the UK and France, "take extraordinary efforts to strike military targets in a manner that minimises the risk of civilian casualties" but claimed that "in some</p>	<p>1. A 2. A</p>	<p>1. POSITIVE SED</p>



<p>park, remain under investigation</p>	<p>incidents casualties are unavoidable".</p> <p>2. The US, Britain, France and other members of the coalition have conducted more than 16,000 strikes so far as part of the anti-Isis Operation Inherent Resolve, with about two-thirds taking place in Iraq and the rest in Syria. A report by Amnesty International claimed that at least 300 civilians were killed in just 11 air strikes by the US-led coalition in Syria, with a report released in October finding adequate precautions were not always taken to minimise deaths and damage.</p>		
---	---	--	--

**RUSSIA**

RUSSIA -2001 AFGHANISTAN – OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
<p>Putin backs antiterror campaign;From Russia, firm support for U.S. in Afghanistan</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Russian President Vladimir V. Putin gave President Bush full support yesterday for the U.S. military campaign in Afghanistan, calling it a "measured and adequate" response to terrorism.</li> <li>2. U.S. officials welcomed Putin's unqualified support for the military operation in Afghanistan</li> <li>3. Putin's backing for the military campaign had come into question Saturday when he joined Chinese President Jiang Zemin in urging a quick end to U.S.-led air strikes.</li> <li>4. Standing next to Bush yesterday, Putin left no doubt about his commitment to the military campaign. He also agreed with Bush that the operation against Osama bin</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A</li> <li>3. C</li> <li>4. A</li> <li>5. A</li> <li>6. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. POSITIVE SED</li> <li>3. NEGATIVE SED (extreme weapons not necessary)</li> <li>5. POSITIVE SED</li> <li>6. NEGATIVE SED (extreme weapons are not necessary )</li> </ol>

	<p>Laden and his al-Qaeda organization should be the first phase of a sweeping counterterrorism campaign.</p> <p>5. "If we started fighting terrorism, it should be completed because, otherwise, terrorists might have an impression that they are not vulnerable," Putin said. "In that case, their actions would be more dangerous, more insolent, and would result in worse consequences."</p> <p>6. Putin said he also was willing to keep talking, but he disputed Bush's contention that a missile-defense system was needed as a protection against terrorists. "It would be difficult for me to agree that some terrorists will be able to capture intercontinental missiles and will be</p>		
--	---	--	--

	able to use them," Putin said.		
Speech by Russian Foreign Ministry Commissioner for Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law Konstantin K. Dolgov during the parliamentary hearings in the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on the issue of «The problems of human rights by the United States of America» October 22, 2012	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is the sad consequences of the United States democracy activities in Afghanistan and Iraq</li> <li>2. About 17 thousand civilians were killed in Afghanistan since the beginning of «Operation Enduring Freedom». There is the continuing of the practice of destruction (according to human rights activists extrajudicial executions) of people suspected in terrorist activity with the use of unmanned aircrafts.</li> <li>3. There are regular cases of jeering and inhumane attitude to people by the U.S. military, the shooting of pregnant women and children, the mutilation and dismemberment of corpses.  Characteristically, the perpetrators are brought</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. NEGATIVE DDE (no mistakes)</li> <li>3. NEGATIVE DDE (no mistakes)</li> </ol>

	to justice only in the most notorious cases		
White book on facts of civilian deaths in Afghanistan caused by unlawful acts of the US and its allies	<p>1. During the time of military presence of the US, NATO members and other international actors in Afghanistan in 2001–2021, the country saw mass war crimes killing and injuring Afghan civilians, crippling the national economy and infrastructure, and causing environmental damage.</p> <p>2. The most outrageous and deadly acts include the US airstrikes on the wedding ceremonies in Uruzgan province on July 1, 2002, (48 civilians killed, 117 injured)</p> <p>3. In February, at least 17 civilians, mostly women and children, were killed in coalition bombings in the mountains in Baghran district, Helmand province. [36] US military officials said</p>	<p>1. C</p> <p>2. C</p> <p>3. C</p> <p>4. C</p> <p>5. C</p> <p>6. C</p> <p>7. C</p> <p>8. C</p> <p>9. C</p>	<p>2.NEGATIVE SED (outrages)</p> <p>4.DDE (missed)</p> <p>5.NEGATIVE DDE (no mistake, pronounced guilty)</p> <p>6. O ( US denied their mistakes)</p> <p>8. NEGATIVE DDE (misguided, not a mistake)</p> <p>9.DDE (mistakenly)</p>

	<p>they had been conducting an operation to identify and eliminate militants of the armed opposition along a mountain ridgeline in the area</p> <p>4. In April, 11 Afghans, including 7 women, were killed, and one civilian was wounded when a laser-guided US bomb missed its target and landed on a house on the outskirts of Shkin, Gomal district, Paktika province</p> <p>5. On June 21, David Passaro, a CIA contractor and former US army ranger, killed an Afghan named Abdul Wali who was detained at a US base 16 km south of Asadabad city, provincial centre of Kunar province. Six years later – on August 10, 2009 – David Passaro was pronounced guilty and</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>sentenced to 8 years and 4 months in prison</p> <p>6. 6 civilians were killed when a US warplane dropped a bomb on Barmal district, Paktika province. The US was quick to deny this information, saying that they had killed five Al-Qaeda militants</p> <p>7. On July 1, 48 people were killed and 117 wounded in the bombing of a wedding ceremony in Deh Rawood distict, Uruzgan province.[46] The data of October 2006 reveals that 46 people were killed. It seems that US personnel mistook celebratory gunfire for shooting by the armed opposition. The air raid is reported to have lasted over an hour and was conducted by a B-52 bomber and an AC-130 attack aircraft. Many of the victims were women and</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>children. The incident led to a formal protest and condemnation by the Afghan 32/37 government.</p> <p>8. On October 11, the village of Karam (population of 450, 60 mud houses) in Nangarhar province was completely destroyed in a misguided carpet bombing by the USAF. Survivors say that between 100 and 160 people were killed.</p> <p>9. On December 1, in a massive carpet bombing of Tora Bora, Nangarhar province, the USAF mistakenly dropped 25 1000 lb Mark 83 bombs on the village of Kama Ado. Survivors say that between 100 and 200 people were killed. On the same day, two more villages were bombed – Khan-e-Mairjuddin (50 confirmed deaths) and</p>		
--	--	--	--



	Zaner Khel (numerous casualties).		
--	-----------------------------------	--	--

RUSSIA -2003 IRAQ - OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
Russia's Putin Calls Iraq War A 'Mistake'	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. President Vladimir Putin today called for a peaceful resolution to the Iraqi crisis and said a U.S. military attack would have the "gravest consequences."</li> <li>2. "We stand for resolving the problem exclusively through peaceful means," Putin said at a meeting with Muslim religious leaders at the Kremlin. "Any other option would be a mistake. It would be fraught with the gravest consequences. It will result in casualties and destabilize the international situation in general.</li> <li>3. "What they are getting ready to do in Iraq is</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. O (peaceful means)</li> <li>3. NEGATIVE SED (no justified reason)</li> </ol>

	<p>not just rampaging of a drunken cowboy," he said. "That's playing with the lives of peoples and the world, and no one but God has the right to do that."</p>		
<p>For Putin, Iraq War Marked A Turning Point In US Russia Relations</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Putin expressed to [Italian Prime Minister Silvio] Berlusconi his concern about the possibility of a U.S. military action in Iraq, noting that Russia wants to be able to collect on Iraq's heavy bilateral debt," an April 2002 cable reads. "Putin stressed the need to use the UN to deal with Iraq."</li> <li>2. Putin repeatedly Bush in public and warned in private that expanding the war on terror to Iraq would be a mistake and that the "problem" of Iraq should be resolved through the UN and weapons inspections instead of unilateral military force. Putin said he would use his</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> <li>4. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O (wanting their debt paid of by Iraq)</li> <li>2. O (peaceful means)</li> </ol>

	<p>veto power, if necessary, to block any potential UN authorization of force.</p> <p>3. Moscow's position was still shaped largely by its 'Iraq experience,' with Russia fearing that action in the UN Security Council would create a slippery slope leading to the use of force.”</p> <p>4. Putin’s own words to the Russian Federal Assembly, recorded in a May 2006 cable, are even more prophetic: “It is known that the use of force rarely brings the hoped-for results, and its consequences at times are more terrible than the original threat.”</p>		
<p>Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokeswoman Maria Zakharova, Moscow, March 16, 2023</p>	<p>1. On March 20, 2003, the United States and its allies launched an armed invasion of Iraq, which was done in violation of international law under the pretext of the need</p>	<p>1. C 2. C 3. C 4. C 5. C 6. C 7. C 8. C</p>	<p>1. NEGATIVE SED 2. NEGATIVE SED 5. NEGATIVE DDE (consistently disregard)</p>

	<p>to destroy those weapons.</p> <p>2. It was a conflict that, first, took place during the occupation of the territory in question by the United States and other countries of the anti-Iraq coalition, and, second, it was directly fomented by the Western countries without any reasonable justification.</p> <p>3. According to Western sources (I would like to stress that indeed those were Western sources), the invasion and the subsequent occupation of Iraq resulted in anywhere between 100,000 and 205,000 violent civilian deaths, with indirect civilian losses amounting to about 650,000.</p> <p>4. I would like to stress this once again: it is important to understand that we are not talking about the Iraqi military, or members of the</p>		<p>6. NEGATIVE DDE (hush up)</p> <p>7. Negative DDE (committed crimes, not mistakes)</p> <p>8. Negative DDE (committed crimes, not mistakes)</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>regular armed forces, or mercenaries, or security service agents. Nothing of the kind. They were peaceful civilians, who died as a result of the US Iraqi campaign.</p> <p>5. At the same time, Washington consistently disregarded the International Committee of the Red Cross' reports about cruel treatment of Iraqi prisoners and investigations conducted by Western NGOs, including Human Rights Watch, which implicated US service personnel in Iraq in systematic killings, torture and rapes of civilians.</p> <p>6. The Americans tried to hush up absolutely everything. They hushed up scandals caused by media leaks about torture at the Abu Ghraib and Camp Bucca prisons,</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>including the Iraq War Logs published by WikiLeaks. But the truth surfaced all the same. Years later, this was what the WikiLeaks founder, Julian Assange, who posted the relevant content on his website, paid for, falling victim to US lawlessness.</p> <p>7. Washington also cynically covered up crimes committed by the personnel of US private military companies.</p> <p>8. In December 2020, US President Donald Trump pardoned four employees of Blackwater, a notorious private military company, despite condemnation by the UN Working Group on the Use of Mercenaries. The four individuals were found guilty of killing 14 civilians on Nisour Square in Baghdad in 2007.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Timeline of crimes committed by the United States and Great Britain</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. According to official statistics, the United States lost 149 people in the first 21 days of active warfare, while the civilian death toll was around 7,300.</li> <li>2. Here's an interesting fact: Washington attacked Iraq without a formal declaration of war. George W. Bush ordered his troops to attack this country. For no particular reason.</li> <li>3. According to the WHO, some 151,000 Iraqis died in the violence that engulfed the country between the start of the operation and mid-2006. This is just an aggregated estimate of the confirmed cases. NGOs believe that there were hundreds of thousands or even millions in civilian casualties.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> </ol>	<p>2. NEGATIVE SED (no reason)</p>
<p>Speech by Russian Foreign Ministry Commissioner for Human Rights,</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is the sad consequences of the United States</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> </ol>	<p>3. NEGATIVE DDE</p>

<p>Democracy and the Rule of Law</p> <p>Konstantin K. Dolgov during the parliamentary hearings in the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on the issue of «The problems of human rights by the United States of America»</p> <p>October 22, 2012</p>	<p>democracy activities in Afghanistan and Iraq.</p> <p>2. According to the reports, by August of 2012 the conflict in Iraq has taken the lives of up to 117 thousand civilians, of which about 15 thousand were killed by the forces of international coalition led by the United States (often as a result of air strikes and the use of unmanned vehicles).</p> <p>3. There are regular cases of jeering and inhumane attitude to people by the U.S. military, the shooting of pregnant women and children, the mutilation and dismemberment of corpses.</p> <p>Characteristically, the perpetrators are brought to justice only in the most notorious cases.</p>		
<p>Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova,</p>	<p>1. We know numerous examples when countries that consider themselves civilised have taken criminal</p>	<p>1. C 2. C 3. C</p>	<p>2. NEGATIVE SED [No evidence/justification]</p>



<p>Moscow, June 29, 2017</p>	<p>actions on those grounds. Not just thousands but millions of people, including civilians, have suffered as a result. Nobody knows, and nobody has taken the trouble yet of counting civilian casualties in Iraq: hundreds of thousands of peaceful, innocent people at the very least.</p> <p>2. The 2003 aggression against Iraq has already demonstrated that simply anything can be used as evidence: detergent powder or some cleaning agent in a vial passed off as “sarin” or some student paper as a classified report.</p> <p>3. It is not that people were killed and children and young men who lived in those countries were physically and psychologically scarred for the rest of their life, but simply, new people</p>		<p>3. NEGATIVE DDE (bear no responsibility)</p>
------------------------------	--	--	---

	<p>were not born. This massacre continued for 10 years, expanding from the active phase into the phase of fighting terrorists who had never existed in that region. Then people in nice expensive suits appear on 8/26 camera, apologise and bear absolutely no responsibility.</p>		
<p>Briefing by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova, Moscow, April 4, 2019</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Getting back to Hook's statement, I would like to ask what the United States was doing in Iraq anyway? Why did they invade the country, essentially destroying it, in 2003?</li> <li>2. The US occupation led to the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, most of whom were civilians. I would like to stress that there is no exact figure. Nobody has counted the civilian population killed there.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> <li>4. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NEGATIVE SED</li> <li>3. NEGATIVE DDE</li> <li>4. NEGATIVE SED</li> </ol>

	<p>3. For example, we remember the video of 2007 that shows Blackwater private security company personnel shooting unarmed people with a machinegun in Bagdad. Who will answer for those victims? But they must be counted first.</p> <p>4. There should be no doubts that the US intervention in Iraq will remain in history as a grave violation of international law and, in fact, a criminal act.</p>		
--	---	--	--

RUSSIA -2014 IRAQ – OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
Russia condemns US over ‘absurd’ response to Mosul civilian deaths	1. Russia’s Ministry of Defense issued a statement Sunday that derides US officials’ comments about the US-led coalition’s possible role in more than 100 civilian deaths in Mosul last month.	1. C 2. C 3. C	2.NEGATIVE DDE(not a mistake, a lack of planning)  3.NEGATIVE DDE (the bombs were smart, why is it a mitsake)

	<p>2. “Absurd statements of the Pentagon representatives justifying civil casualties caused by American bombing in Iraq give more information on the operation planning level and the alleged supremacy of the American “smart” bombs,” the statement reads</p> <p>3. Second, why (did) the US-led coalition, having this information, make strikes with their ‘smart’ bombs on buildings with civilians dooming them to a terrible death?</p>		
<p>Russia on Iraq: ‘We told you so</p>	<p>1. "We are greatly alarmed by what is happening in Iraq. We warned long ago that the affair that the Americans and the Britons stirred up there wouldn't end well," Russian Foreign</p>	<p>1. C</p>	

	<p>Minister Sergei Lavrov said Wednesday, according to Voice of Russia. He also described the Iraq war as a "total failure" and said Russia was forecasts had come true</p>		
<p>Comment by Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Maria Zakharova on the Iraqi civilian victims of Western coalition strikes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Moscow is seriously concerned over the reported facts of mass deaths of Iraqi civilians as a result of the incessant bombings by the United States and its allies in the anti-ISIS coalition. The scale of the human toll is shocking.</li> <li>2. Washington belatedly published admissions by the US military command of the simultaneous death of over a hundred civilians in Mosul's Al Jadida District on March 17 as a result of the US air strike on residential areas. Some media write that up to</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> <li>4. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NEGATIVE DDE(incessant)</li> <li>2. NEGATIVE DDE (regular episode of contactless war)</li> </ol>

	<p>200 civilians were killed. And this is just a regular episode of the contactless war that the Americans are conducting in Iraq and neighbouring Syria.</p> <p>3. . This is eight times more than mentioned in the weary confessions of the Americans that continue to embellish the ugly reality of Iraqi events in cooperation with their Western allies.</p> <p>4. We express our condolences over the death of Iraqi civilians and reaffirm our solidarity with the leaders and people of Iraq, a friendly country that is undergoing hard times.</p>		
<p>Director of the Foreign Ministry Department for Non-Proliferation and Arms Control</p>	<p>1. United States and its allies were absolutely indifferent to identical events that took place in Mosul, Iraq, several weeks ago, when a</p>	<p>1. C 2. C</p>	<p>1. NEGATIVE DDE (indifferent) 2. NEGATIVE SED (based on</p>

Mikhail Ulyanov's interview with the Interfax Agency, April 6, 2017	<p>number of peaceful civilians suffered in an ISIS chemical attack, including adolescents.</p> <p>2. As is clear, this is yet another demonstration of double standards based on anything but humanitarian considerations.</p>		double standards)
---	---	--	-------------------

**CHINA**

CHINA -2001 AFGHANISTAN – OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE response	CODE
China: U.S. violates rights near, far	<p>1. Alleging decades of unilateral military action, the report criticized Washington for going to war against Iraq without U.N. authorization and for civilian deaths there and during the military campaign in Afghanistan.</p>	1. C	1. Negative SED (unilateral military actions, without UN authorization)

<p>APEC leaders to condemn terrorism</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pacific Rim leaders wrap up their weekend summit today with an unprecedented political declaration expected to condemn terrorism but stop well short of all-out support for the U.S.-led strikes on Afghanistan.</li> <li>2. China's APEC senior official and vice foreign minister Wang Guangya said leaders will stop short of a show of support for the strikes on Afghanistan, which Washington launched in response to the Sept. 11 hijack attacks in the United States.</li> <li>3. This draft expresses in general terms the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. N (not supporting or condemning)</li> <li>2. N (not explicitly supporting or condemning)</li> <li>3. N (advocating for general terms to strengthen international cooperation)</li> <li>4. C (qualms referring to unease)</li> <li>5. C</li> </ol>	
--	--	---	--



	<p>condemnation of the terrorist activities and also expresses in general terms to strengthen international cooperation in the face of terrorism</p> <p>4. Predominantly Muslim Indonesia and Malaysia, as well as China, all have qualms about attacks on Afghanistan.</p> <p>5. A spokesman for Russian President Vladimir Putin said the Russian and Chinese leaders, who met on Saturday, wanted an end to the military hostilities "as soon as as possible" so a coalition government could be formed.</p>		
<p>Bush says China stands 'side by side'</p>	<p>1. Chinese President Jiang Zemin cautioned the</p>	<p>1. N (not condemning or supporting</p>	

<p>with U.S. in campaign against terrorism; Jiang urges caution</p>	<p>United States to "avoid innocent casualties" while bombing Afghanistan.</p> <p>2. Jiang gave qualified support for the military action in Afghanistan. "We hope that anti-terrorism efforts can have clearly defined targets and also should hit accurately and also avoid innocent casualties," he said.</p> <p>3. But the Chinese have cautioned Bush that their support of the bombing campaign depends on the United States limiting casualties to only terrorists.</p>	<p>just advocating)</p> <p>2. A/ N (gives support but also advocates for human rights)</p> <p>3. A/N (gives support but also advocates for human rights)</p>	
<p>U.S. should conduct investigations into civilian casualties caused by its</p>	<p>1. A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson on Thursday said the United States should conduct a</p>	<p>1. C 2. N 3. C 4. C 5. C 6. C</p>	<p>2. NEGATIVE SED 5.NEGATIVE DDE 6.NEGATIVE DDE</p>

<p>air strikes: FM spokesperson</p>	<p>credible, independent and impartial investigation into civilian casualties caused by U.S. air strikes, and hold those concerned accountable.</p> <p>2. "Every human life, regardless of nationality, race, religion or values, is equal and precious," Zhao said.</p> <p>3. In recent years, the international community has been calling for investigations into the deaths of civilians in U.S. overseas military operations," Zhao said.</p> <p>4. It has been reported that over almost two decades, the United States has conducted over 90,000 air strikes in countries</p>	<p>7. C</p> <p>8. C</p>	
-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------	--

	<p>including Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria, which have killed up to 48,000 civilians.</p> <p>5. But the U.S. military has time and again covered up the facts and refused to apologize, admit its crimes or hold the perpetrators accountable.</p> <p>6. "It has done everything possible to evade its responsibilities," Zhao said.</p> <p>7. "There has been an overall pattern of negligence from the U.S. government on the issue of civilian harm," Zhao said.</p> <p>8. The United States has also obstructed the International Criminal Court's investigations into its war crimes in Afghanistan.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Human rights abuses by US, allies persistent, systematic: FM spokesperson</p>	<p>1. "It reminds me of the earlier revelations of the killing of Afghan civilians by US and Australian troops. The US and its allies' atrocious abuses of human rights that challenge human conscience are not isolated cases.</p> <p>2. They are persistent, systemic and prevalent recurrences," Wang Wenbin, spokesperson of the Foreign Ministry</p> <p>3. The US' track record was even more abhorring. Over the past 20 years, the US launched more than 90,000 air strikes on countries including Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria, claiming as many as 48,000</p>	<p>1. C 2. C 3. C 4. C 5. C 6. C</p>	<p>2.NEGATIVE DDE 3.NEGATIVE DDE 4.NEGATIVE DDE 5. NEGATIVE SED</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>civilian lives. Farmers harvesting in the fields, children playing on the streets, families fleeing from wars and villagers hiding inside buildings all became US troops' targets.</p> <p>4. the US tried every possible way to deflect the blame</p> <p>5. These are the facts. Those who are most vocal about defending human rights have turned out to be the deadliest murderers of innocent civilians; and those most fervently attacking other countries' human rights conditions are the ones who should be put in the dock on human rights, Wang noted.</p> <p>6. The Chinese Foreign Ministry</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>spokesperson urged that there should be a thorough international investigation into the UK's and US's war crimes and human rights violations, let justice be done for the innocent victims and protect people all over the world from more bullying and cruelty.</p>		
<p>US Hegemony and Its Perils</p>	<p>1. After World War II, the wars either provoked or launched by the United States included the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the Kosovo War, the War in Afghanistan, the Iraq War, the Libyan War and the Syrian War, abusing its military hegemony to pave</p>	<p>1. C 2. C 3. C 4. C</p>	<p>1. NEGATIVE SED (there was no necessity, not justified) 2. NEGATIVE SED (there was no justification for killing so many civilians) 4. NEGATIVE DDE(no mistake, just used horrible methods)</p>

	<p>the way for expansionist objectives.</p> <p>2. Since 2001, the wars and military operations launched by the United States in the name of fighting terrorism have claimed over 900,000 lives with some 335,000 of them civilians, injured millions and displaced tens of millions.</p> <p>3. The two-decades-long war in Afghanistan devastated the country. A total of 47,000 Afghan civilians and 66,000 to 69,000 Afghan soldiers and police officers unrelated to the September 11 attacks were killed in U.S. military operations, and more than 10</p>		
--	--	--	--



	<p>million people were displaced.</p> <p>The war in Afghanistan destroyed the foundation of economic development there and plunged the Afghan people into destitution</p> <p>4. The United States has also adopted appalling methods in war. During the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the Kosovo War, the War in Afghanistan and the Iraq War, the United States used massive quantities of chemical and biological weapons as well as cluster bombs, fuel-air bombs, graphite bombs and depleted uranium bombs, causing enormous damage</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>on civilian facilities, countless civilian casualties and lasting environmental pollution.</p>		
--	---	--	--

CHINA -2003 IRAQ - OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
<p>China's Position on the US War in Iraq</p>	<p>1. On the Iraq issue, Hu said the Chinese Government has always insisted on a political solution within the framework of the United Nations and has made unremitting efforts to this end.</p> <p>2. China calls for the countries involved to stop military actions as soon as possible and return to the correct path of solving the Iraq issue by political means.</p> <p>3. The Chinese Government has</p>	<p>1. C</p> <p>2. C</p> <p>3. C</p> <p>4. C (advocating for HR of Iraqi people)</p> <p>5. C</p> <p>6. C</p> <p>7. C</p> <p>8. C</p> <p>9. C</p>	<p>2. O (return to the correct path of solving issues)</p> <p>5. O (rejecting the use of force in international affairs)</p>

	<p>already sent and will continue to offer humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people suffering from war, Hu said.</p> <p>4. The Chinese premier called for an early cessation of the war in Iraq and the return to the right path of political solution within the framework of the United Nations so as to reduce the humanitarian catastrophe suffered by the Iraqi people and to safeguard the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq.</p> <p>5. The Chinese Government is always committed to peace and stability in the world. We stand for settlement of international</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>disputes by political means and reject the use or threat of force in international affairs.</p> <p>6. The Chinese Government strongly appeals to the relevant countries to stop military actions and return to the right path of seeking a political solution to the Iraq question.</p> <p>7. We hereby express our grave worries.</p> <p>8. We express our great indignation and condemnation over the military actions against Iraq by the United States and some of its allies, who have ignored the diplomatic mediation and efforts made by the international community to avoid war and the anti-war</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>voices expressed by the people in different countries, including the American people.</p> <p>9. We are also concerned about and sympathetic with the Iraqi people who are suffering from the agony of war. We call the United States and other countries to stop military operations, and return to the correct path of political settlement of the Iraq issue.</p>		
<p>China: U.S. violates rights near, far</p>	<p>1. China issued a stinging report yesterday that criticized the United States for what the document called government crimes and racism at home and "military aggression around the world."</p> <p>2. the report criticized Washington for going to war against</p>	<p>1. C 2. C</p>	<p>1. NEGATIVE SED [not justified] 2. NEGATIVE SED [not justified]</p>

	Iraq without U.N. authorization and for civilian deaths there		
China condemns war on Iraq; Australia, Japan, South Korea voice support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. China and leading Muslim nations in Asia called for an immediate end to the war on Iraq on Thursday as Japan and South Korea backed the US-led campaign and Australia said its troops had swung into action</li> <li>2. China, one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and an opponent of military action by the United States without UN sanction, said it was "seriously concerned" by the outbreak of hostilities</li> <li>3. "We urge relevant countries to stop their military action and return to the</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> </ol>	2. O (not the right political route to solve conflict)

	<p>right path," said Chinese foreign ministry spokesman Kong Quan. "We strongly appeal to the relevant countries to stop the use of force."</p>		
<p>Chinese paper calls attention to increasing Iraqi deaths in US-led war</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Equal attention should be given to the increasing deaths of innocent Iraqi people in the US-led war in the country while each and every US casualty was counted, said China's English-language newspaper China Daily on Thursday.</li> <li>2. "Both Iraqi and US lives are innocent,"</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. N</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. O (all lives matter)</li> </ol>
<p>U.S. should conduct investigations into civilian casualties caused by its air strikes: FM spokesperson</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It has been reported that over almost two decades, the United States has conducted over 90,000 air strikes in countries including Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria, which</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NEGATIVE DDE (wont take accountability for crimes, not recognizing a lack of intent)</li> <li>2. NEGATIVE DDE</li> </ol>

	<p>have killed up to 48,000 civilians. But the U.S. military has time and again covered up the facts and refused to apologize, admit its crimes or hold the perpetrators accountable. "It has done everything possible to evade its responsibilities," Zhao said.</p> <p>2. "There has been an overall pattern of negligence from the U.S. government on the issue of civilian harm,"</p>		
<p>US Hegemony and Its Perils</p>	<p>1. After World War II, the wars either provoked or launched by the United States included the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the Kosovo War, the War in Afghanistan, the Iraq War, the Libyan War and the</p>	<p>1. C 2. C 3. C</p>	<p>1. NEGATIVE SED (there was no necessity)</p> <p>3. NEGATIVE DDE (there were no mistakes inhumane methods used)</p>



	<p>Syrian War, abusing its military hegemony to pave the way for expansionist objectives.</p> <p>2. The 2003 Iraq War resulted in some 200,000 to 250,000 civilian deaths, including over 16,000 directly killed by the U.S. military, and left more than a million homeless.</p> <p>3. The United States has also adopted appalling methods in war. During the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, the Kosovo War, the War in Afghanistan and the Iraq War, the United States used massive quantities of chemical and biological weapons as well as cluster bombs, fuel-air</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>bombs, graphite bombs and depleted uranium bombs, causing enormous damage on civilian facilities, countless civilian casualties and lasting environmental pollution</p>		
--	--	--	--

CHINA -2014 IRAQ – OPERATION INHERENT RESOLVE

SOURCE	TEXT	CODE RESPONSE	CODE PJ
<p>Statement by Ambassador WU Haitao at the Security Council Briefing on Iraq</p>	<p>1. At present, Iraq is still dealing with an array of political, economic, humanitarian and counterterrorism challenges. The international community should continue to give greater attention to Iraq, enhance its engagement in the country, support all the parties involved in staying committed to resolving their</p>	<p>1. N 2. A/N (Supports but doesn't say anything about the US)</p>	<p>1. O (advocating political dialogue)</p>

	<p>differences appropriately through political dialogue, support the Iraqi Government in promoting national reconciliation throughout the country and support a continued role for the United Nations in providing good offices and coordination.</p> <p>2. China supports the international community's efforts in that country by providing Iraq with assistance to fight terrorism.</p>		
<p>Explanatory Remarks by Ambassador Liu Jieyi after Security Council Voting on Draft Resolution on Combating the Islamic State in</p>	<p>1. China supports the Security Council's adoption of resolution 2170 (2014), aimed at combating such terrorist groups as the Islamic State in the Levant (ISIL) and the Nusra Front. Recently, ISIL and</p>	<p>1. A/N (support but not specifically towards the US)</p> <p>2. A</p>	<p>1. POSITIVE SED (terrorists are killing civilians)</p> <p>2. POSITIVE SED/ O (we have also been a victim and understand</p>

Iraq and the Levant	<p>the Nusra Front have been rampantly and deliberately attacking civilians and persecuting people of other religions and ethnicities, resulting in large numbers of casualties among innocent civilians and the displacement of millions of civilians. That has become a serious threat to peace and security in the Middle East and the world as a whole.</p> <p>2. China is also a victim of terrorism. We strongly oppose all forms of terrorism and will continue to actively participate in international counter-terrorism cooperation and to combat the threat of terrorism together.</p>		everything must be done against it)
------------------------	---	--	-------------------------------------

<p>China issues report on US human rights</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It also quotes figures to show that the United States continued to trample on human rights in other countries, causing tremendous civilian casualties.</li> <li>2. From August 2014 to December 2015, the United States launched 3,965 air strikes in Iraq and 2,823 in Syria, causing an estimated number of civilian deaths between 1,695 and 2,239.</li> <li>3. Though the United States repeatedly vowed to defend "human rights," it still has not ratified core human rights conventions of the UN, and took an uncooperative attitude towards international human rights issues, says the report.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> <li>3. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NEGATIVE DDE (no mistake)</li> <li>3. NEGATIVE DDE (no mistakes, unproactive)</li> </ol>
<p>U.S. should conduct</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Zhao said that five years ago, U.S.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. C</li> <li>2. C</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. DDE</li> </ol>

<p>investigations into casualties caused by its air strikes: FM spokesperson.</p>	<p>forces, using fake intelligence gleaned from a video staged by "White Helmets" as evidence, conducted the "most precise air strikes in history" in Syria, killing more than 1,600 innocent civilians.</p> <p>2. "The U.S. media also disclosed at the end of last year that from 2014 to 2019, the U.S. military turned its guns on farmers in the middle of their harvest, on children playing in the streets, on families fleeing the fighting, and on villagers taking shelter in buildings," Zhao said, noting that these devastating crimes were deliberately concealed and whitewashed.</p>	<p>3. C</p>	<p>3. DDE</p>
---	--	-------------	---------------

	3. "There has been an overall pattern of negligence from the U.S. government on the issue of civilian harm,		
--	---	--	--