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Unarmed insurrectionary (UI) campaigns demanding irregular regime change seem destined to failure, but such social movements surprisingly succeed more often than not. Explanations for campaign outcome tend to focus on movement skill or variation in domestic-level structural factors. Few studies shift attention to the potentially decisive role of external intervention during these domestic struggles. Despite some well-known exceptions like the Iranian Revolution, patron states have played an important role in determining the fate of several unarmed insurrections as intended. The outcome of UI campaigns rests not only on the domestic balance of forces and the decisions of key elite players, but also on the disposition of great powers and regional powers with a stake in the result.

This dissertation addresses three interrelated questions to advance our understanding of the role patron states play during these domestic struggles over control for the state. First, do great powers and regional powers systematically alter the likelihood of UI campaign success? Using a novel measure for patron state intervention, quantitative analysis suggests that the probability of UI campaign success depends on how patron states react. Second, how do patron states transform latent leverage into actual influence aside from the explicit threat or actual use of military force? After reviewing all cases of patron intervention, I identify three generalizable causal mechanisms – isolate and unite, feast or famine, and decapitation – patron states employ to channel the dynamics of UI campaigns to a desirable outcome. Third, why do some external
interventions fail? The deviant cases suggest that several factors limit the patron's ability to shape the outcome of UI campaigns. Nonetheless, domestic institutional configurations that intimately link the institutional interests of the security services to the current regime leadership and/or competing bureaucratic and business interests within the patron state that hinders the formulation of a coherent foreign policy appear most important. Ultimately, this dissertation seeks to advance the emerging research program in security studies on nonviolent resistance and irregular regime overthrow by capturing the role patron states play during UI campaigns.
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Preface

The use of nonviolent resistance to force substantial concessions from the state and alter fundamental aspects of political regimes is not a novel tactic. Such political contestation has advanced individual and collective rights throughout the modern era. The wave of unarmed insurrectionary (UI) campaigns – social movements demanding irregular regime change – that accompanied the end of the Cold War revitalized a belief in the "power of the powerless."¹ When large numbers of ordinary citizens peacefully mobilize behind a cause, even the most oppressive political systems are not immune. Western policymakers, aggrieved populations, and leaders of non-democratic regimes have all taken note.²

Scholars of state breakdown, regime survival and democratization also began to pay more attention to this phenomenon, giving rise to a multifaceted research program that has helped bridge the fields of security studies and peace studies. Are violent or nonviolent movements more effective at realizing irregular regime change? Which type of movement is more likely to contribute to post-conflict stability and democratization? What factors determine whether a movement adopts violent, nonviolent, or mixed tactics? Why do some nonviolent resistance campaigns fail or devolve into various forms of intrastate or extra-state violence? To date, such research concentrates on domestic-level variation even though related research on civil war,

¹ John Keane ed., The Power of the Powerless: Citizens Against the State in Eastern Europe (London: Hutchinson, 1985). Czech playwright and dissident, Vaclav Havel, uses this term to describe the latent power disenfranchised individuals and populations possess against the seemingly impervious powers of even totalitarian states.
² Unarmed insurrectionary (UI) campaigns have been given various monikers, such as nonviolent revolutions, democratic revolutions, negotiated revolutions, and refolutions. See Kurt Schock, Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Sharon Erickson Nepstad, Nonviolent Revolutions: Civil Resistance in the Late 20th Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Mark Thompson, Democratic Revolutions: Asia and Eastern Europe (London: Routledge, 2004); George Lawson, Negotiated Revolutions: The Czech Republic, South Africa and Chile (Farnham: Ashgate, 2005); Timothy Garton Ash, "Revolution in Hungary and Poland," New York Review of Books 36, No. 13 (1989).
revolution, and democratization have identified several ways in which the international dimension broadly shapes and directly influences domestic conflict processes and outcomes.

Several potential avenues exist to explore the nexus between UI campaigns and international politics. This dissertation seeks to address three inter-related questions. First, do great powers and regional powers systematically alter the likelihood of UI campaign success? Second, how do patron states transform latent leverage into real influence in a fast-paced, information scarce setting? Third, why do some external interventions fail? To answer these questions, the dissertation is structured in the following manner.

Chapter one introduces the concept of UI campaigns and situates this phenomenon within the rich research traditions of revolution and democratization. A brief discussion follows concerning the proper case population for analyzing the dynamics and outcomes of UI campaigns. The nonviolent and violent conflict outcome (NAVCO) 2.0 dataset provides one possibility, but I propose a temporally extended and slightly modified case population. Both are used in subsequent chapters to test the validity of the claim that patron state interventions systematically affect the short-term outcomes of UI campaigns.

Chapter two presents a literature review on dominant domestic-level explanations for UI campaign success before addressing the counterintuitive consensus that patron states may play decisive roles during particular UI campaigns, but do not appear to influence the dynamics and outcomes of UI campaigns in any generalizeable pattern. In contrast to this line of reasoning, I propose that patron states can significantly affect UI campaign outcomes via three broad causal mechanisms: "feast or famine," "isolate and unite," and "decapitation." Interventions that activate these mechanisms change the expected costs and benefits faced by elite domestic actors, which alters the likelihood of campaign success. The chapter concludes with a quantitative empirical
test of the central hypothesis. I demonstrate the presence of a robust, statistically significant relationship between patron state intervention and UI campaign success.

Chapter three builds on this finding by constructing a typological space for all known patron state interventions during UI campaigns. This explanatory typology uncovers a set of common factors shared by the outlier cases where external intervention failed. Specifically, certain domestic structural regime configurations appear less susceptible to external pressure during UI campaigns. Patron support for campaigns appears more likely to fail when regimes possess medium or high military morale and share intimate ethnic or economic relations with the coercive apparatus. A brief exploration of six deviant cases probes the plausibility of this hypothesis and identifies other patterns related to failed patron interventions.

The subsequent chapters present six episodes of patron state intervention during UI campaigns. In an effort to strike the right balance between theoretical description, theory-testing, and theory development, I apply three criteria to guide case selection. First, cases that approximate the different ideal-type mechanisms are chosen to provide a detailed illustration of how patrons employ various tactics to influence UI campaign outcomes. Second, the United States is the patron in each case study and it supports the removal of the incumbent regime. This helps reduce the number of potential confounding factors. Third, I strove to create pairs of complementary cases in an effort to approximate Mill's most similar case design and address some methodological concerns related to assessments of causality based on single case studies. The case studies include South Korea in 1980 and 1987, Panama from 1987 to 1989, and Yemen in the spring and fall of 2011. The dissertation concludes with a summary of the key findings from the quantitative and qualitative analysis.
Chapter 1

Situating the Phenomenon of Unarmed Insurrections

The collective struggle for responsiveness, enfranchisement, equality and protection (REEP) has contributed to the formation and ongoing transformation of the modern state. An individual cannot single-handedly alter political, economic, or social patterns of everyday interaction; the power necessary for substantial change in any dimension of social and political life requires numbers and coordination. This introductory chapter first situates UI campaigns within the research traditions of revolution and democratization. I then offer a conceptual typology that distinguishes the concept of UI campaigns from other forms of mass collective action from below. While the theoretical construct provides guidelines for compiling a case population, reality is messy and subject to interpretation. Thus, a brief discussion follows concerning potential discrepancies with the NAVCO 2.0 case population. The chapter concludes by presenting an alternative case population and describing how this project attempts to reconcile these slightly different case populations in the remaining empirical chapters.

I. Revolution, Democratization, and Unarmed Insurrections

Dissent against oppressive regimes begins with an individual's recognition of an unjust political order, social practice, or law. Having acknowledged injustice, individuals are left with the choice of loyalty, exit, or voice. Some accept cooptation to advance their careers or effect

---

gradual change within the political system. Others choose a passive form of exit – retreat into private life – and outwardly demonstrate sufficient loyalty to avoid suspicion or negative sanction. Either alternative can perpetuate and legitimate unjust political orders and social practices. Emigration, or "voting with one's feet," is another form of exit with seemingly ambivalent consequences. The form of voice most familiar in freer societies includes various repertoires of open dissent.

An advocate championing a cause must first decide whether to pursue change within or outside officially sanctioned institutionalized channels. In modern societies based on legal-rational authority, institutionalized change occurs largely by amending or introducing laws in legislative bodies or challenging the dominant interpretation of a law in the court system. The ability to address a grievance through institutionalized channels depends on whether a political system is open or closed, which is defined by the degree of accessibility to and responsiveness of the governing institutions. If grievances remain, an individual may resort to extra-institutional tactics either as a complement or alternative to institutional action. Less open political systems are more likely to experience social movements seeking redress to REEP grievances because

---

5 The collapse of the East German state illustrates the degree to which this choice can undermine a regime. Albert O. Hirschman, "Exit, Voice, and the Fate of the German Democratic Republic: An Essay in Conceptual History," *World Politics* 45, No. 2 (1993); Roland Bleiker, *Nonviolent Struggle and the Revolution in East Germany* (Cambridge: The Albert Einstein Institution, 1993), 10-13. Most cases are not this extreme. Often, only a privileged class of individuals has the option to emigrate. Once abroad, they are able to voice their views freely, but their influence on politics back home usually diminishes. Therefore, a dissident's choice to exit a political system may actually bolster a repressive regime's control over society.

6 Clandestine acts of "everyday forms of resistance" in public spaces are a different form of voice available to oppressed communities. Scott sees such behavior as distinctly political acts that captures the refusal of individuals from subaltern groups to accept the hegemonic narrative adopted by the dominant class to legitimate the political order. Such patterns of behavior are an initial step in shifting individual dissidence to collective resistance. James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).


9 McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly, *Dynamics of Contention*, 7-8.
such issues are not efficiently handled through normal politics. Under rare circumstances, a significant number of dissidents may mobilize, reject the social contract that undergirds the entire political order, and declare itself sovereign. Such acute challenges from below are often assigned the label "revolution."

Jeff Goodwin provides two definitions for this term. Generally speaking, revolutions are "instances in which a state or a political regime is overthrown and thereby transformed by a popular movement in an irregular, extra-constitutional and/or violent fashion." A stricter definition insists that "revolutions entail not only mass mobilization and regime change, but also more or less rapid and fundamental social, economic and/or cultural change, during or soon after the struggle for state power." The latter formulation closely aligns with popular conceptions of genuine revolutions, often referred to in scholarly discourse as social revolutions. Tilly challenges the latter definition as only one type of revolution that emerges when contingent streams of independent processes combine to produce this unique outcome. He opts for an inclusive definition of revolution as "a forcible transfer of power over a state in the course of which at least two distinct blocs of contenders make incompatible claims to control the state." This helps avoid conflation of process with result by clearly separating revolutionary situations from revolutionary outcomes. Although such a case population is arguably composed of heterogenous events making conceptual stretching a valid concern, Tilly preserves this definition to avoid idiosyncratic coding rules.

---

10 Johnston, States and Social Movements, 36. Since dissent against particularly repressive political systems is disproportionately dangerous, students of social movements generally accept the existence of a curvilinear relationship for protest prevalence along the open-closed political system continuum.
12 Social revolutions are "rapid, basic transformations of a society's state and class structures" that "are accompanied and in part carried through by class-based revolts from below." Theda Skocpol, States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 4.
This distinction significantly broadens the number of potential revolutions and helps avoid selection on the dependent variable by recovering several cases of failed revolution.\textsuperscript{14} It also allows for the study of revolutions with adjectives.\textsuperscript{15} Instead of ascribing constitutive properties to the concept, attributes become clear scoping conditions or dependent and independent variables. For instance, varying degrees of domestic and interstate violence often accompany revolutionary situations and outcomes, but violence does not necessarily make the situation more or less revolutionary. Thus, we may associate violence with revolution, but it is not actually a constitutive aspect of the phenomenon.

Similarly, not all revolutions entail class conflicts where the state merely represents the interest of the dominant class as posited by orthodox Marxist theories. Political change always involves winners and losers, but the degree of losses and the number of losers varies substantially. One interesting feature of UI campaigns cum revolutionary situations is the tendency of the movement to make relatively moderate demands as far as irregular regime change from below is concerned. UI campaigns that significantly impinge on the interests of key individuals and collective actors are less likely to realize large-scale defection of regime elites and key members of the repressive institutions, which is often a necessary condition for UI campaign success. For instance, insinuations of plans to collectivize private property would alienate the middle class and business elite, which are often important allies during UI campaign struggles. These inclusive, multivocal frames have led some observers to call these episodes


\textsuperscript{15} See David Collier and Steven Levitsky, "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research," \textit{World Politics} 49, No. 3 (1997).
democratic revolutions, which incorrectly conflates the revolutionary situation with outcome.\textsuperscript{16}

Yet, UI campaigns have caused political openings resulting in democratization, which is an important observation because the literature on democratic transitions often emphasizes a gradualist path based on elite pacts.

The literatures on revolution and democratization are seldom cross-referenced partly due to the lasting impact of O'Donnell et al's strategic interactionist model to political transitions.\textsuperscript{17} In explaining the third wave of democratization, these authors eschewed deterministic structural explanations in favor of a contingent actor-centric approach.\textsuperscript{18} According to this analytic model, democratic openings occur when a hurting stalemate between political elites makes the status quo intolerable. The regime composed of soft- and hardliners is compelled to seek solutions when confronted with a recalcitrant opposition also divided between soft- and hardliners.\textsuperscript{19} Democratic transitions emerge when the soft-liners from both sides dominate the transition process and negotiate a series of elite pacts.\textsuperscript{20} Gradual pact-making provides credible signals that neither side will hijack the process and allows all parties to seek a win-win situation even if only as a second-best outcome.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{16} See Thompson, \textit{Democratic Revolutions}. Another tempting term is middle-class revolution, but this moniker adds little more than the recognition that the middle class is one of many important collective actors participating in these large-scale social movements. Francis Fukuyama, "The Middle-Class Revolution," \textit{Wall Street Journal}, 06/28/13.


\textsuperscript{20} O'Donnell and Schmitter (\textit{Tentative Conclusions}, 41) define elite pacts as temporary political arrangements between a "select set of actors" that attempt to "(1) limit the agenda of policy choice, (2) share proportionately in the distribution of benefits, and (3) restrict the participation of outsiders in decision-making."

Such periods of liberalization enable the restoration of civil society and free spaces, which are important aspects of mature democratic orders.\textsuperscript{22} During the fluid and uncertain process of political transitions, however, free spaces and perceived political opportunities also facilitate large-scale mobilization, demagoguery, and scapegoating.\textsuperscript{23} According to transitologists, the masses constitute a threat to vested interests that can derail the elite driven process of compromise and bargaining.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, this formulation of democratic transitions as "prolonged and inconclusive struggles" between powerful elite actors largely removes collective agents as an important engine for democratic change.\textsuperscript{25}

This "myth of moderation" obscures the role mass actors often play at pivotal points during democratic transitions, especially the "democratic breakthrough" phase that ousts the incumbent regime.\textsuperscript{26} In contrast to transitologists, for example, Michael McFaul offers a non-cooperative model to explain the so-called fourth wave of democratic transitions. This winner-take-all theory recognizes the contribution mass mobilization plays in democratic transitions.\textsuperscript{27} Although the transitology paradigm tends to lump democratic breakthroughs, transitions, and consolidation together into one extended process, the dynamics of each step are not necessarily identical.\textsuperscript{28} Democratic breakthroughs may require large-scale social movements from below to

\textsuperscript{22} Larry Diamond, \textit{Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation} (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 221-239.
\textsuperscript{24} O'Donnell and Schmitter, \textit{Tentative Conclusions}, 48-56.
\textsuperscript{26} See Nancy Bermeo, "Myths of Moderation: Confrontation and Conflict During Democratic Transitions," \textit{Comparative Politics} 29, No. 3 (1997).
 induce the hurting stalemate, which prompts elites to defect from the political status quo. Yet, stable democratic institutions cannot take root under conditions of persistent societal mobilization and populism.

Ultimately, the pacted transition and winner-take-all models are ideal type theories that capture recurrent processes associated with successful transitions to stable democratic political orders. A large proportion of studies on democratic transitions focus on elite pact-making thereby downplaying the role played by the popular masses. While some democratic openings are controlled transitions from above, others emerge due to various challenges from below, including large-scale social movements that adopt nonviolent tactics. The latter form of democratic breakthroughs shares many elements in common with revolutionary situations. Thus, by deconstructing particular phases within democratic transitions and removing violence as a constitutive aspect of revolutionary situations, UI campaigns provide a link between the processes of revolution and democratization.

II. What is an Unarmed Insurrection?

Several conceptual issues surrounding UI campaigns remain. To facilitate the accumulation of knowledge, this dissertation borrows heavily from Chenoweth and Stephan’s NAVCO 2.0 dataset. I retain their definition for unarmed insurrections as a series of observable, mass events in pursuit of a political objective where the type of tactics employed by movement

---

31 Still other political transitions precipitated by UI campaigns ended in the establishment of a new non-democratic political order. See Barbara Geddes, Joseph Wright, and Erica Frantz, "Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set," *Perspectives on Politics* 12, No. 2 (2014).
32 Thompson, *Democratic Revolution*, 1-17.
participants are primarily nonviolent. This section unpacks three concepts embedded in this definition and situates UI campaigns into a conceptual typology of challenges to the state from below. Despite agreement on the definition given for UI campaigns, however, I occasionally differ on the inclusion or exclusion of certain cases. One examples of divergent interpretations is provided to illustrate the types of disagreements that arise between the NAVCO dataset and my alternative. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how these similar, yet distinct case populations are handled when evaluating the hypotheses posited in the rest of this dissertation.

The first aspect of UI campaigns is significant societal participation that presents a coherent challenge to the regime’s rule. A related question is why only some campaigns experience scale-shift in size. To answer this question, one could look more attentively at regime efforts to pre-empt large-scale mobilization. The point is that potential UI campaigns failing to reach a certain threshold in size do not break from politics as usual. They are social movement within a stable political order, where the toolkit of domination remains intact. Thus, the phenomenon of interest is a large-scale movement that challenges a regime’s right to rule, but does not necessarily succeed in removing the regime from power. In terms of the cascade metaphor, the cascade starts (t1) but does not necessarily reach a definitive tipping point (t2).

---


34 NAVCO appears to select 1,000 participants as the specific cut-off. This is a very small number and the coding for violent campaigns probably influenced this decision. Unsurprisingly for UI campaigns, the demand is roughly proportionate to campaign size. Thus, the emergence of 1,000 participants actively making the demand of regime change over an extended period remains a defensible, if rather low minimal threshold.

Second, the series of events that constitute a campaign must predominantly employ nonviolent tactics. Importantly, property destruction or fringe interpersonal violence does not disqualify a case as nonviolent. Also, UI campaigns sometimes occur alongside violent ones, as in the Philippines during the mid-1980s, or change tactics over time, as in Syria in 2011. Under such circumstances, the UI campaign is included. This leaves questions of radical flank effects or tactical shifts open to further research. Third, the demand of irregular regime change is a widely shared goal. This is a complex statement. UI campaigns are composed of different groups making various demands that do not necessarily overlap; a difference must be drawn between a movement seeking regime reform versus regime overthrow. Additionally, regime overthrow cannot occur without a coherent regime to topple, which I define as:

"a particular political game, consisting of two basic elements: (1) a set of actors, or players, who possess available resources and pursue certain strategies for achieving their goals and (2) a set of institutions, or the actual 'rules of the game,' which impose certain constraints on or provide certain incentives for the political actors' actions."\(^{37}\)

\(^{36}\) Movements typically start with less dramatic demands aimed at economic, political, or social reforms. Disproportionate repression or unexpected concessions can trigger further demands, but cases are included only if the UI campaign reaches broad consensus over regime overthrow. Movement leaders often do not make such extreme demands unless success seems achievable. This partly explains why UI campaigns succeed more often than not and raises some pertinent questions about the utility of directly comparing the relative effectiveness of violent and non-violent forms of resistance. For instance, the demands voiced at the December 2012 Bolotnaya Ploschad protests against Putin's bid for a non-consecutive third term never directly challenged his right to run. Instead, demands centered on legislative changes to party registration and flawed electoral institutions, the freeing of political prisoners, and the opportunity to carry out fair parliamentary elections.

Movement leaders may also shy away from extreme demands for other reasons. For instance, the donor community played a critical role in supporting the Saba Saba movement that compelled President Moi of Kenya to initiate political reforms in 1990-1991. The threat to suspend aid to Kenya in late 1991 prompted Moi's decision to legalize opposition parties. Yet, the 1992 elections were not free or fair. The opposition rejected the results. After pressure from the international donor community and the church, however, the opposition took their seats in parliament and contested the results through the judicial system. As a result, mobilization of the opposition forces never occurred. Stephen Brown, "Authoritarian Leaders and Multiparty Elections in Africa: How Foreign Donors Help to Keep Kenya's Daniel Arap Moi in Power," Third World Quarterly 22, No. 5 (2001): 731. Thus, the UI campaign ended in 1991, not after the electoral loss in 1992. Cf. Nepstad, Nonviolent Revolutions, 103-106.

\(^{37}\) Vladimir Gel'man, "Out of the Frying Pan, into the Fire?: Post-Soviet Regime Changes in Comparative Perspective," International Political Science Review 29, No. 2 (2008): 158. The demands for the removal of a single leader without significant changes to formal institutions, like the Civic Crusade campaign against Noriega, are included because many contemporary non-democratic regimes do not abide by their own formal rules. Thus, a
A UI campaign must demand fundamental changes to either one or both of these aspects to create the revolutionary situation.

To distinguish this phenomenon from other challenges to state power from below, I modify Goertz’s conceptual typology on revolutions by including a fourth category, namely unarmed insurrections. A UI campaign emerges when multiple sovereignties exist even if those claiming sovereignty possess no territory, or only occupy delimited public spaces. Nonviolent revolutions are also distinguished from political revolutions and rebellions in that the former abstain from violent tactics to realize their goals. Failed UI campaigns occur when large-scale acts of civil resistance prove insufficient to effect irregular regime change.

Table 1.1 Revolutions with Adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Popular involvement</th>
<th>Change in Governing Body</th>
<th>Minor Political Structural Change</th>
<th>Major Political Structural Change</th>
<th>Stratification Changes</th>
<th>Occurs around Election Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skocpol</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schock</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunce-Wolchik</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garr</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Goertz, Social Science Concepts, 78.

The category of UI campaigns is clear enough to operationalize and compare in a meaningful manner, but the conceptual boundaries are not black and white. The definition leaves some room leadership change may lead to a qualitative change in a political regime where the new elite abide to the spirit of the laws and formal institutions.

38 Goertz, Social Science Concepts, 79. Because this study focuses solely on de jure sovereign entities, it excludes cases of secession and anti-occupation that also appear in the NAVCO 2.0 dataset.
for interpretation over what constitutes the correct case population. Table 2 lists the NAVCO 2.0 and an alternative case population for all UI campaigns since 1930.

**Table 1.2: UI Campaign Case Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NAVCO</th>
<th>ALTERN</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NAVCO</th>
<th>ALTERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1989-91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1977-83</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2006-10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>1990-92</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2003-4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1987-90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1956-60</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1977-82</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1990-94</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.R.</td>
<td>1990-93</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1983-89</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1991-93</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1976-79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>2003-08</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1987-00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1988-90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2000-05</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1977-79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1993-98</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the case populations overlap considerably; there is agreement on 63 campaigns and 143 country-year observations. Nevertheless, there are 20 cases with 65 country-year

---

39 After reviewing secondary sources on the cases in the NAVCO 2.0 dataset, I determined whether the case conformed to my understanding of a UI campaign. I then cross-referenced several other datasets, studies, encyclopedias, and bibliographies on irregular regime change and nonviolent struggle to develop a population of
observations only found in the NAVCO 2.0 dataset, and 24 cases with 42 country-year observations only found in the alternative case population.\textsuperscript{40} The reason for these differences between the case populations appear to concern divergent interpretations regarding campaign demand, size, and violence.

One example of how differing interpretations about events can affect decisions to include or exclude particular cases concerns opposition behavior during competitive elections in illiberal democracies. In contrast to the NAVCO dataset, my alternative case population considers the cases of Guyana in 1990, Croatia in 1999, as well as Ghana and Senegal in 2000 to have approached the conceptual boundaries of a UI campaign without crossing the threshold.\textsuperscript{41} In these cases, the opposition rallied around a challenger, closely monitored the electoral process, and prepared to defend the results in case parallel vote counting and exit polls indicated significant fraud.\textsuperscript{42} Yet, these cases do not seem to fit the definition of UI campaigns because the incumbent conceded defeat immediately after losing in competitive elections. In contrast, the 2000 and 2004 elections in Serbia and Ukraine respectively are included because the opposition mobilized to prevent the incumbent's attempt to steal elections.

Ultimately, Chenoweth and Stephan justify the NAVCO dataset as the correct case population based on scholarly consensus. Review by several experts in nonviolent conflict is a productive means to verify and refine the case population. Still, issues of inter-coder reliability among these experts remain. Presumably, the principal investigators incorporated expert advice cases potentially excluded from the NAVCO 2.0 dataset. The secondary literature was used to determine whether these cases fit the scope conditions of the definition.\textsuperscript{40} The alternative dataset captures ten cases and 16 country-year observations that occurred between 2006-2012, a period not covered in the NAVCO 2.0 dataset.\textsuperscript{41} All these cases except Senegal are coded as demanding significant institutional reform or policy change, not reform change. Therefore, disagreement over case population between the NAVCO 2.0 dataset and my alternative shrinks to 7 cases and 25 country-year observations in the period between 1946-2006.\textsuperscript{42} Valerie J. Bunce and Sharon L. Wolchik, \textit{Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Postcommunist Countries} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 248-262.
when constructing the final case population, which likely required judgment calls when experts disagreed on specific cases. The point is not to impugn the NAVCO dataset as incomplete or inaccurate.\(^4\) Rather, the contentious issue of the case population lies in the ambiguities inherent in the definition. Despite using the same coding rules as Chenoweth and Stephan, I develop a slightly different case population. This is a useful addition because it provides confirmation that the conclusions reached about UI campaigns are not contingent on particular coding decisions.

The remainder of the dissertation deals with the case population issue in the following manner. The statistical analysis combines all cases found in either population. This yields 108 UI campaigns with 250 country-years observations. To ensure that the quantitative results are not driven by case selection, I run robustness checks using the NAVCO and alternative case populations respectively. For the typological and qualitative analyses, I explore only the cases included in the alternative case population.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

This chapter introduced the concept of UI campaigns and situated the phenomenon within the research traditions of revolution and democratization. After categorizing UI campaigns as a type of revolution, I discussed remaining ambiguities that complicate efforts to determine a single correct case population. As a result, I suggested an alternative case population that differs slightly from the consensus dataset constructed by Chenoweth and Stephan.

\(^4\) As the creators of the NAVCO 2.0 dataset note, the process of determining which cases fit within the assigned definition "requires judgment calls." Making a list of "close call" cases of UI campaigns since 1930 publicly accessible would enhance the transparency of the NAVCO dataset. Particularly useful would be source citations and clear explanations that justify case exclusion.
Chapter 2: 
External Interventions During UI Campaigns

On February 17, 2011 the Bahraini monarchy adopted a policy of repression to crush a UI campaign inspired by events in Egypt and Tunisia. The conflict culminated a month later when the King of Bahrain announced a three-month state of emergency. Despite continued resistance, the al-Khalifa regime survived what was, in per capita terms, the largest UI campaign in modern history. This feat would not have been possible without external support.\(^1\) Before the Bahraini authorities declared martial law, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) deployed the Peninsula Shield Force composed of 4,000 Saudi troops and 500 United Arab Emirates policemen. The US meanwhile offered rhetorical support to the ruling family because of Bahrain's strategic importance as home to the US Fifth Fleet. Yet, patrons cannot always determine the fate of UI campaigns; the Shah of Iran fell notwithstanding US support. Little consensus within policymaking and academic circles exists regarding the effect external interventions have on the dynamics and outcomes of UI campaigns.

Current research on UI campaigns is diverse, but understanding why some movements succeed against non-democratic regimes and others do not remains a key puzzle. To date, this research agenda has focused predominantly on domestic-level variation. Previous studies that incorporate various types of external intervention into quantitative models do not identify robust statistical relationships.\(^2\) Coupled with the observation that external intervention is not a sufficient condition to determine campaign outcomes, the international dimension is dismissed as not mattering in any systematic way. In their study comparing the relative effectiveness of

---

nonviolent and violent resistance, for instance, Chenoweth and Stephan state "that domestic mechanisms are the most critical components of the success of nonviolent campaigns... While foreign support or international sanctions may have been critical in some cases, there is no general pattern indicating that they are necessary for successful campaign outcomes."\(^3\) This is a surprising assertion as research on the second-image reversed is prominent in related fields.\(^4\) I argue instead that external interventions may lead to unintended consequences, but they also generate patterns that can be generalized to the larger case population.

This chapter begins with a summary of current research on actor-centric, institutional, and structural domestic explanations for why UI campaigns succeed. The next section argues for the conceptualization of external intervention in terms of interstate relationships, where the "client" regime facing a UI campaign is asymmetrically interdependent with one or more powerful "patron" countries. Because patron states have intervened in approximately one-third of all UI campaigns since 1931, such actions warrant further study. Using this broad definition for patron-client relationships, I then develop a generalizeable theory that links external intervention to UI campaign outcome via three causal mechanisms: 1) isolate and unite; 2) feast or famine; and 3) decapitation. The final section tests the validity of the dissertation's central hypothesis through quantitative analysis, which reveals a statistically significant relationship between external interventions and UI campaign outcomes.


I. Domestic-Level Explanations for UI Campaign Outcomes

Early research on civil resistance as a means to achieve major political goals was mostly a theoretical enterprise meant to raze the Manichean dichotomy between security and peace studies. In particular, Gene Sharp denounced material accounts of political domination and rejected the implicit assumption that radical political demands necessitated violent resistance.\(^5\) Borrowing from contract theorists, Sharp posited that regimes derive power from a consenting population. Power is given by society, not imposed on it. Individuals maintain the right to withdraw consent from regimes that abrogate the social contract. If enough individuals mobilize against an illegitimate regime and resort to various forms of nonviolent resistance, a regime's ability to survive no longer rests on its asymmetric advantage in violent means. Through the collective denial of performing vital activities and raising governance costs, ordinary citizens can create sufficient pressure to topple even the most oppressive political orders. To substantiate his theory, Sharp presents several case studies to demonstrate the power of civil resistance, but these illustrative examples do not seek to explain why only some campaigns are successful.

With the sudden onset of several UI campaigns at the end of the Cold War, scholars began to compile tentative case populations that actively incorporated negative cases. In particular, Thompson and Shock each attempted to weigh the relative causal importance of structural and actor-centric variables to explain campaign outcomes.\(^6\) Both scholars recognized that elite defections are practically a necessary condition for UI campaign success, but arrived at different explanations for why defection occurs. Thompson reasoned that the probability of defection is related to regime type. Regimes with higher levels of elite cohesion were more likely to survive acute challenges. He argued that ideological cohesion was a crucial factor in the

---


\(^6\) Thompson, *Democratic Revolutions*; Schock, *Unarmed Insurrections*. 
Chinese Communist Party's ability to suppress the 1989 pro-democracy movement. The shared experience of fighting a brutal guerilla war enabled old-guard hardliners to dominate internal debate and order effective mass repression. Regime moderates held subordinate positions within the Chinese Communist Party and were unable to formulate sufficiently compelling frames to persuade hardliners to adopt an accommodationist approach. With a new generation of leaders, Thompson implies that the regime's ideological cohesion has diminished; a similar pro-democracy movement is more likely to succeed today if one should emerge.7

Plausible alternative explanations exist to explain the failure of the 1989 Chinese pro-democracy movement. In particular, the student movement sacrificed a long-term strategy for short-term radical tactics, failed to reach a discontented peasantry, and predominantly occupied one public space.8 While not discounting the possible importance of structural factors, Schock develops a voluntarist account to explain UI campaign success. He demonstrates that tactical innovation, movement resilience, the formation of a national umbrella organization loosely coordinating actions of affiliated groups, as well as shifts between methods of concentration and dispersion allow campaigns to survive repression and undermine the regime's pillars of support.9 In sum, a well-run campaign with mass, broad-based participation crossing salient societal cleavages is more likely to cause large-scale elite defection. Leadership, skill and tactical ingenuity surely tip the scale in favor of one side, but an ex-ante determination of such factors is

---

9 Schock, *Unarmed Insurrections*, 142-173. In an overarching critique on instrumentalist and ahistoric theories of "democratic mobilizations," Dan Slater suggests that campaign strength is best captured by a movement's ability to embody nationalist and religious authority. Securing the sources of symbolic power strengthens the movement's solidarity and purpose. It creates a sort of fanaticism not purview to instrumentalist logic, thereby creating a much more resilient movement. It also erodes a regime's hegemonic narrative that justifies the necessity to stay the current course. Slater, "Revolutions, Crackdown, and Quiescence: Communal Elites and Democratic Mobilization in Southeast Asia." *American Journal of Sociology* 115, No. 1 (2009): 208-214.
difficult to measure. The risk of overinflating the importance of these variables based on the outcome is substantial. Post-mortems of failed campaigns are more likely to emphasize "tactical errors" and "missed opportunities." Similarly, empirically observable factors like the number of participants is problematic because imminent regime collapse attracts larger crowds as tipping point models suggest. Potential endogeneity also looms: elite defection is likely to contribute to a well-run and broad-based campaign.

To better identify the relative importance of structural factors on UI campaign outcomes, other scholars use the nonviolent and violent conflict outcome (NAVCO) dataset, which compiles the outcomes of all UI campaigns with maximalist demands. Chenoweth and Stephan find that no structural variable is statistically significant in determining why nonviolent campaigns succeed. Instead, the number of active participants and elite defections are key factors. This finding leads the authors to "make the case that voluntaristic features of campaigns, notably those related to the skills of the resisters, are often better predictors of success than structural determinants." Yet, these agent-centered variables are explanatory only

---

10 The NAVCO 2.0 dataset operationalizes several factors that could potentially capture campaign strength. One such variable is opposition group unity, which could proxy for movement cohesion. Unfortunately, this variable alone says little about overall movement strength. Others variables measure whether a campaign embraces diversity across a broad spectrum of demographic factors thereby capturing a movement's ability to attract participants from different backgrounds. Yet, this set of variables is most important in societies where salient social constructs facilitate the rise of societal divisions. As such a measure is not present in the dataset, it is difficult to determine whether diversity in a particular category is relevant. A final variable included in the NAVCO dataset is the number of named organizations that join a movement. This variable should indicate the size of umbrella organizations that are vital to coordinate action between extant social movement organizations (SMOs), the backbone of collective resistance. Similar to the other factors, this variable is misleading when used as a measure for movement resilience and strength. For instance, over 100 named organizations joined the UI campaign in Panama that sought General Noriega's ouster. Yet, the groups disproportionately represented the middle class and liberal business community. Membership in these organizations also overlapped significantly. This all meant that the addition of another group did not indicate a stronger campaign. Richard L. Millett, "The Failure of Panama's Internal Opposition, 1987-1989," in Conflict Resolution and Democratization in Panama: Implications for U.S. Policy, ed. Eva Loser (Washington DC: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1992), 26. The number of missing observations presented an additional issue that reduced the value of using these variables as proxies for campaign strength.


in the most circumscribed sense as proximate causes, and endogeneity is again an issue: as success is increasingly likely, the more elites and others will join the opposition.

In contrast, Svensson and Lindgren show that UI campaigns in highly polarized societies or against minority-led regimes are less likely to succeed. In such societies, coalitions of convenience between collective societal actors are harder to forge and easier to divide. Additionally, a winner-take-all situation is more likely to emerge, leading to fears of majority rule that likely increase regime cohesion and lower incentives for elite defection. In a recent typological theory about the Arab Spring, Brownlee et. al. add oil wealth and hereditary regimes as further structural and institutional factors that may help explain the trajectory of UI campaigns. Access to significant oil rents enables leaders to enhance the capabilities of the coercive apparatus and buy loyalty. In regard to dynastic rule, this variable proxies for the extent of support the ruling family has historically enjoyed from the security forces. Indeed, the loyalty of the armed forces to the regime is fundamentally important because it serves as the last line of defense to disperse particularly vociferous UI campaigns that overwhelm hired thugs, police, and the intelligence services. Therefore, large-scale security defection is often a necessary condition for campaign success. UI campaign leaders are aware of this fact and encourage

---


15 Other observers of the Arab Spring argue that monarchies were more insulated from UI campaigns than other types of regimes because the king is often one degree removed from protest demands. By staying above the fray, the king avoids the lion's share of blame for societal woes and can play the role of neutral arbitrator. Lisa Anderson, "Absolutism and the Resilience of Monarchy in the Middle East," *Political Science Quarterly* 106, No. 1 (1991): 12-15. Importantly, such reasoning does not extend to the ability of monarchies to survive against a UI campaign. As shown by the successful UI campaigns in Nepal, once the monarchical system becomes the target of protest, there is little reason to assume this institutional arrangement is more resilient than any other.

followers to court soldiers to the people's side. The question remains what factors explain the willingness of soldiers to obey orders to shoot unarmed civilians.

The decision of the security forces to side with the protesters is never purely altruistic. Rather, it is motivated by material and non-material institutional interests. The best predictor for security force defection involves the relationship between the regime and those forces. The punctual payment of wages sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living is a minimal threshold for ensuring a modicum of loyalty from the coercive apparatus. Greater material benefits compared to alternative civilian careers increase this sense of commitment to the regime. In situations where the military's interests seep into the political and economic realms, members of the armed forces will have even less incentive to defect. This is especially true when the UI campaign threatens to dismantle these institutional prerogatives. Equally important are latent fault lines within the armed forces that undermine regime cohesion during a revolutionary situation. Acute conflict among the high-ranking officers is a particularly salient feature to explain significant episodes of regime defection. In his study on the Philippines in 1986 and Indonesia in 1998, Terrence Lee demonstrates that high-ranking officers who hold grievances against the regime are primed to perceive societal mobilization as a political opportunity. Defection of these disaffected elements contributes to the momentum of UI campaigns and increases the likelihood of irregular regime overthrow. Ironically, the creation of parallel military

Stephan, Why Civil Resistance Works, 46-49. Security defection takes two forms. Either a portion of the military sides with the protesters and carries out a pre-emptive coup d'état against recalcitrant hardliners, or the chain of command breaks down so that when the dictator demands a violent crackdown, soldiers and/or the commanders refuse the order. The latter allows the campaign to grow large enough to require the leadership to leave office.


Levitsky and Way, Competitive Authoritarianism, 60.

Barany lists several potential fissures within the armed services that could become activated during a crisis. Zoltan Barany, "Armies and Revolutions," Journal of Democracy 24, No. 2 (2013): 63-68.

structures and uneven distribution of material incentives across different branches of the coercive apparatus – rational efforts to protect the regime against military coups – can promote the likelihood of military defection during unarmed uprisings by creating such grievances.

Finally, non-material sources of cohesion between the regime and armed forces decrease the likelihood of military defection.\textsuperscript{21} In contrast to the aforementioned, material coup-proofing techniques, one based on family, ethnic, and/or religious loyalties is effective at deterring large-scale defection during UI campaigns.\textsuperscript{22} These non-material relationships help reinforce in-group and out-group boundaries between the regime and society. As posited by social identity theory, these bonds confer status to individuals belonging to the in-group and increase concerns about relative gains.\textsuperscript{23} The segments of the coercive apparatus that advance the interests of a particular societal group to which they belong, are more likely to side with the extant political order. Thus, the chances of military defection and UI campaign success diminish when the internal balance of power within the coercive apparatus is represented by such in-groups.\textsuperscript{24}

Fear also motivates a soldier's decision to defect or repress. Individuals within the coercive apparatus who are intimately associated with performing the dirty work for highly repressive regimes are more likely to fight rather than face subsequent retribution. Similarly, choosing defection becomes even more difficult when the individual fears for the future security

\textsuperscript{21} Levitsky and Way, \textit{Competitive Authoritarianism}, 60-61.
\textsuperscript{24} An alternative way to circumvent the moral dilemma that emerges when troops are ordered to shoot on unarmed compatriots is to hire foreign mercenaries as Bahrain's monarchy did in 2011. Sharon Erickson Nepstad, "Mutiny and Nonviolence in the Arab Spring: Exploring Military Defections and Loyalty in Egypt, Bahrain, and Syria," \textit{Journal of Peace Research} 50, No. 3 (2013): 343.
of their in-group. The presence of an external security threat can also contribute to the military's willingness to repress. In certain circumstances, isolated military units will ruthlessly suppress large crowds of peaceful demonstrators which the regime leadership describes as wolves in sheep's clothing, a pernicious fifth-column.

In conclusion, scholars have offered various explanations for why UI campaigns succeed, but discerning the relative causal importance of domestic-level factors remains contentious and elusive. In his description of civic resistance, Schelling famously notes, “[the] tyrant and his subjects are in somewhat symmetrical positions... It is a bargaining situation in which either side, if adequately disciplined and organized, can deny most of what the other wants, and it remains to see who wins.” Although this actor-centric approach is instructive, such statements obfuscate the fact that the deck is sometimes stacked to favor one side. This section has introduced several structural and institutional explanations that help explain the ease with which UI campaigns can erode the pillars of support for the regime. Before offering a theoretical foundation for why external interventions should matter as well, a brief digression about operationalizing the international dimension is necessary.

II. International Dimensions to UI Campaign Outcomes

This section reviews the few comparative studies that explore the international dimension during UI campaigns. As mentioned above, the absence of quantitative evidence raises concerns

about whether specific examples of successful external interventions produce generalizeable patterns applicable to the larger case population. The results of such statistical analysis, however, appear partly driven by the manner in which various aspects of the international dimension are operationalized. I suggest that narrowing the scope of external intervention only to cases where patron-client relationships exist offers one productive path forward. Therefore, I conclude by presenting a replicable means to operationalize "hierarchy under anarchy" that is essential for constructing the key explanatory variable in this dissertation.

In their seminal study on the dynamics and outcomes of violent and nonviolent conflicts, Chenoweth and Stephan test several proxies for the international dimension. These include formal support from external states for the campaign or regime, diaspora and international non-governmental organization support for the campaign, as well as international sanctions targeting regime repression. While foreign state support for the campaign and international sanctions against the regime increase the likelihood of violent campaign success, none of these variables are statistically significant at the p > .1 level for UI campaigns. Chenoweth and Stephan provide some plausible explanations for these null findings.\(^{29}\) First, overt external support to the opposition can delegitimate the movement's cause and help regimes whip up nationalist sentiment by demonstrating that the movement is a marionette for external machinations. Second, external support for the campaign may exacerbate the free rider problem both within the opposition leadership. Such assistance may lessen campaign organizers' efforts to foster local support which is important for creating robust UI campaigns. Similarly, if bodily harm is a real possibility, campaign sympathizers may not participate under the assumption that the external

\(^{29}\) Stephan and Chenoweth, "Strategic Logic," 22-23.
actor will force change either way. Combined with the fact that the theory does not pass two "most-likely cases" – US support for the Shah in 1978 and US efforts to overthrow Manuel Noriega from 1987-1989 – the case for the null hypothesis that external interventions do not have a systematic effect on UI campaign outcomes appears strong.

Despite these counterintuitive findings, external actors do appear to influence UI campaign outcomes in some expected ways. With regard to military defection, Barany argues that credible threats of foreign intervention on the side of the regime or campaign is an important piece of information that soldiers and military commanders use to update their priors about the likelihood of regime survival. Nepstad extends this reasoning further by loosening the rationality assumptions about soldiers' ability to make complex decisions during periods of acute crisis. The emotional effect of an external patron changing its relationship with the regime may affect perceptions about the regime's strength or fragility more than the material changes alone would suggest. Importantly, both these scholars note that the external dimension is most significant when the targeted regime is asymmetrically dependent on particular external actors. Therefore, the absence of a statistical relationship may be due to the difficulty of devising a simple coding scheme for the international dimension.

A measure that captures shifts in crucial relationships between the regime and specific international actors appears the most appropriate proxy for external intervention during UI campaigns. Possible international actors who shape the dynamics and outcomes of UI campaigns

---

30 In regard to international sanctions specifically, the decision of international actors to apply and remove sanctions often does not occur in close consultation with the domestic opposition. Ultimately, external actors do what appears to advance their interests. This control over the purse-strings of dependent countries creates a unfortunate scenario for UI campaign leaders who often want to push harder for real change, rather than accept a negotiated settlement. Nepstad, *Nonviolent Revolutions*, 133-135.

31 On the role of "crucial cases" in causal inference, see John Gerring, "Is there a (viable) crucial-case method?," *Comparative Political Studies* 40, No. 3 (2007).


33 Nepstad, "Nonviolence in the Arab Spring," 340.
include patron states, international financial institutions (IFIs), international organizations (IOs), international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), transnational networks of activists (TNAs), or diasporas. INGOs, TNAs and diasporas sometimes provide crucial resources useful for overcoming barriers to opposition mobilization under authoritarian rule. However, with the onset of substantial societal mobilization these external networks lack the resources necessary to influence subsequent events. They can still help "extend the battlefield" beyond national boundaries to create a "great chain of non-violence" that enlists powerful states to intervene. IFIs matter when the target regime faces acute economic challenges. For instance, austerity provisions encouraged by the IMF can significantly reduce a regime's ability to maneuver during crisis. Yet, the bark of IFIs and IOs is often bigger than their bite without state action. Therefore, I focus on states as the key external agents most capable of preserving or undermining the domestic status-quo.

Not all third-party state actions antithetical or favorable to regime survival are equal. When investigating the effect of external intervention on UI campaign outcomes, measuring a state's asymmetric interdependence, or leverage, over the target regime is key. High levels of asymmetric interdependence result in hierarchical relationships often described in patron-client terms. If an external power does not possess significant leverage over the target, actions resemble weak verbal rebukes not serious attempts at diplomatic coercion. For the purposes of this project, the hierarchical relationship is operationalized into two tiers, patron and super-

---

34 Bunce and Wolchik, *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders*, 335-38.
36 In the case of IFIs, technocratic decisions are sometimes overturned or expedited by powerful states for political ends. See John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security* 19, No. 3 (1994/95).
patron, using three alternative measures: trade, aid, and defense. Countries that are major trading partners with the target regime are considered super patrons if combined import and export dyadic trade flows exceed 30 percent of the target regime's GDP, and patrons if combined trade exceeds 10 percent. Donor states are considered super patrons if combined economic and military aid exceeds 3 percent of the target regime's GDP, and patrons if combined aid exceeds 1 percent. Finally, a powerful country is considered a military super patron if over 5,000 troops are stationed in the target country and a patron if troop presence exceeds 500. One important caveat remains. If two or more states act in concert to influence the outcome, then they are considered a collective patron if the combined degree of asymmetric interdependence with the target regime meets the criterion mentioned above.

Capacity alone is a necessary, but insufficient condition for altering the dynamics and outcome of UI campaigns. In some cases, patron states are largely indifferent to the outcome or

38 These proxies are crude measures for degrees of "hierarchy under anarchy" and likely over-identify the number of patron-client relationships. Nevertheless, these transparent, replicable measures offer a useful way to focus attention on a subset of external actors most capable of influencing particular UI campaign dynamics and outcomes.

39 Bilateral trade flow statistics were calculated using the Correlates of War (COW) international trade data set. Katherine Barbieri, Omar Keshk, and Brian Pollins, Correlates of War Project Trade Data Set Codebook, version 3.0, http://correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/bilateral-trade. The World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI) data set is used for the country GDP measure. World Bank, World Development Indicators, 1960-2014, http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators. Both trade flows and GDP are in current US dollar amounts. If the potential patron's GDP is not ten times larger than that of the target regime, then the relationship is no longer considered a case of asymmetric interdependence.

40 Bilateral official development assistance (ODA) dispersal was calculated using the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD), Query Wizard for International Development Statistics (QWIDS) dataset. See, http://stats.oecd.org/qwids. This includes most Western donors and Japan. Reports of aid flows by important non-DAC members, namely Russia, China, India, and Saudi Arabia are missing. In such cases where external aid was potentially significant, secondary sources were used to estimate the size of aid programs compared to GDP. Military aid flows were harder to find for some bilateral relationships. As with economic aid, there are some relevant country dyads with missing information. USAID's US Overseas Loans and Grants, Obligations and Loan Authorizations was used for US military aid flows, online: https://explorer.usaid.gov/. Military and development aid figures are in current US dollars.

distracted by more pressing matters thereby exercising minimal influence prior to and during UI campaigns. In cases where patrons do intervene, it is necessary to code the action as support for the regime or campaign.\(^{42}\) Less intrusive actions, such as public announcements calling on the regime to respect the right of peaceful protesters to demonstrate or backroom threats to cut aid if excessive force is applied, are considered external intervention only when the external actor is coded as a super patron. In contrast, patron states are only coded as intervening when an robust action is taken in the area for which the country is coded as a patron, i.e. application of sanctions by trade patrons or reduction of development assistance for aid patrons.\(^{43}\) Figure 2.1 depicts the array of diplomatic tools patrons may employ to influence UI campaigns.

---

\(^{42}\) Some patron interventions are difficult to categorize especially when the main form of mediation is undertaken by the United Nations or other regional international organizations. Because the coding decisions of external intervention for the purposes of this project focus on external states, the involvement of such international bodies matter in so far as patron states are pushing for a particular outcome. For instance, Saudi Arabia and the United States insisted Yemeni President Saleh step down in 2011 as part of any mediated UN settlement. In contrast, international donors and regional states urged Antananarivo mayor Rajoelina and Madagascar President Ravalomanana to reach an inclusive negotiated settlement. Sanctions and other coercive measures only followed the military's decision to oust Ravalomanana in favor of Rajoelina's High Transitional Authority (HAT) interim government. For more on UN mediation during such regime crises, see Charles Call, *UN Mediation and the Politics of Transition after Constitutional Crises* (New York: International Peace Institute, 2012).

\(^{43}\) I coded the direction of patron state intervention using a variety of secondary sources, including academic studies, historical dictionaries, encyclopedic dictionaries on nonviolent struggle, and newspaper articles. On some occasions, the patron's stated position differed from activities adopted behind closed doors. If the clandestine actions constitute intervention according to the coding scheme, then patron intervention is coded in the affirmative. On rare occasions, only one or two sources indicate that patrons placed strong pressure on the regime to make concessions, but do not explain how this was done. For instance, one expert of El Salvadoran history and politics notes that the "general strike and strong pressures from the United States" in 1944 "persuaded Martinez to resign on 8 May," but does not explain how exactly US actions mattered. Enrique A. Baloyra, *El Salvador in Transition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 15. Because other sources do not make reference to the US actions, the case is not included as patron intervention on the side of the UI campaign. Under such circumstances, the case remains coded as neutral pending more evidence to confirm the general statements. Overall, there is some risk in coding patron intervention that includes forms of covert action and quiet diplomacy. Although new information may emerge that alters the interpretation of whether or not a patron "intervened" in particular cases, I consider this approach the best among imperfect options. In extreme cases of patron-client relationships, the use of sanctions or reductions in aid is actually a sign that threats of coercive diplomacy were insufficient. The need to capture super patron threats of these actions is necessary to avoid potential selection effect issues. See Daniel W. Drezner, "The Hidden Hand of Economic Coercion," *International Organization* 57, No. 3 (2003).
Given this narrowed definition of external intervention, there are 41 cases out of 108 UI campaigns where an external patron's actions potentially altered the bargaining game between the opposition and the regime. Of those cases, the patron's preference is realized all but five times: Iran 1977-78, Panama 1987-89, Ukraine 2004, Togo 1991, and Burma 1988. This high success rate suggests that external interventions may alter the domestic balance of forces in a systematic way. Yet, unlike violent insurrections, external actors seldom change the strategic stalemate during UI campaigns by directly aiding the regime or opposition with logistics and weapons. What remains unclear are the mechanisms through which external interventions alter UI campaign outcomes short of the threatening or using military force.
III. A Theory of Patron Intervention During UI Campaigns

A modified version of Tilly's polity model helps identify generalizeable mechanisms related to the effect of external intervention across different types of political systems. Figure 2.2 offers a homeostatic representation of a political regime facing a UI campaign.

**Figure 2.2: Static Model of Unarmed Insurrections**

The cylinder in the regime space represents the leadership of the polity that commands the coercive institutions and decides how state revenue is extracted and allocated. The cubes represent constituted collective political actors that often have proper names and maintain some kind of organizational structure. The dotted lines connecting these actors represent strategic political coalitions. The political actors in the regime exchange their support with the leadership for privileged access to the regime's agents and resources. In a non-democratic regime, this

---

45 The term leadership does not necessarily refer to a single individual, but rather the individuals who collectively create national policy. Challenger refers to key emergent personalities and groups of a UI campaign.
coalition enjoys private goods.\textsuperscript{46} As the boundary between the regime and society becomes less porous, the degree of institutionalized uncertainty concerning alteration of major political forces into positions of state power diminishes.\textsuperscript{47} Such exclusion can lead powerful collective political actors in society, not enjoying the spoils of state power, to challenge the leadership. Potential challengers are more likely to resort to contentious politics to effect regime change as institutionalized means no longer appear sufficient to dislodge the current leadership.\textsuperscript{48}

When a UI campaign emerges, political entrepreneurs and collective political actors outside the regime articulate injustice frames, coordinate collective action, and spur on large-scale acts of civil disobedience. The revealed challenger attempts to effect elite defection from the regime and the state's coercive institutions via "people power."\textsuperscript{49} Recognizing the immediate threat to political survival, the leadership adopts a mixture of policies to counteract this eventuality: 1) continue or increase the amount of private goods to members within the regime; 2) offer targeted concessions or promises of future private goods to moderates in the political opposition in an effort to fracture the UI campaign; 3) apply selective repression to increase the costs of coordination goods that makes collective action more difficult; or 4) adopt a military solution of blanket repression. Whether the challenger or current leadership "wins" largely depends on which side remains more cohesive during the subsequent bargaining process. Or, as shown in Figure 2.2, does collective actor A essential to regime survival defect or does collective actor B crucial for UI campaign success defect?

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{46} Bruce Bueno De Mesquita et al., \textit{The Logic of Political Survival} (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), 38-55. In general, selectorate theory adopts a similar state-society conceptualization to advance a parsimonious theory of the causes, consequences, and logic for expanding or shrinking regime "selectorates" and "winning-coalitions."
\item \textsuperscript{48} Johnston, \textit{States and Social Movements}, 36.
\item \textsuperscript{49} McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly, \textit{Dynamics of Contention}, 221-223.
\end{itemize}
A well-positioned patron state typically maintains relations with individuals and organizations in both the campaign and regime. If this external state decides to exercise its leverage, it can affect the dynamics and outcome of UI campaigns by independently altering the cohesion of the campaign and regime, or the strategic decisions reached within each group concerning the best way to resolve the crisis.

In regard to campaign cohesion and size, patron interventions may increase or decrease a UI campaign's strength by changing participant perceptions that victory is obtainable. Larger UI campaigns are more likely to cause elite defection as a tipping point appears imminent. This causal pathway may link external intervention to UI campaign outcome. Yet, patrons rarely send such unambiguous public signals that would independently alter mass perceptions over the probability of success. External intervention may contribute to campaign size in particular cases, but a consistent effect across the entire case population seems less likely. First, as already discussed, explicit external support may hinder a campaign's ability to form broad coalition across key societal groups or may increase the incentive to become a free rider. Second, patrons often discourage large-scale mobilization in fear of a complete devolution of political order. The causal arrow appears to move from campaign size to patron policy to regime elite action to campaign outcome, not from patron policy to campaign size to regime elite action to campaign outcome. While these sets of explanatory variables are endogenous and case-dependent, identifying external intervention's effect on the actions and decisions among elite actors likely provides a stronger theoretical link. External states with asymmetric leverage can independently alter the cost-benefit calculations of military and civilian regime elites through three causal mechanisms thereby changing the probability that a UI campaign succeeds.
First, through a subtle policy of "isolate and unite," patrons may alter the receptivity of regime elites to hardline or soft-line actions. Like much research on democratization, this study assumes that members of the regime and its "leadership" are not monolithic. Rather, regimes consist of various factions – hardliners, fence-straddlers, and soft-liners – possessing different cost-benefit ratios for maintaining the status-quo. When responding to a UI campaign, these intra-regime factions also differ on the appropriate levels of repression and conciliation to employ against the opposition. Whereas hardliners and soft-liners are predisposed to harsh repression and conciliation respectively, fence-straddlers are more inclined to respond to contextual cues, but least likely to advocate a firm position. The policy preferences of fence-straddlers emerge through strategic interdependence with the UI campaign, other regime elites, and powerful external actors.

In general, civilian and security elites should rationally seek new information to update priors on how others will react. Specifically, by signaling to fence-straddlers in the regime that hardline actions are tolerated or not, external actors may prevent groupthink and shape internal debates over the potential costs and benefits of solutions forwarded by more dedicated

---

50 O'Donnell and Schmitter, Tentative Conclusions, 15-17.
51 There is a need to distinguish between "hardliners" and "hardline" policies. Risk insensitivity is one way for understanding hardliners and soft-liners. Przeworski, Some Problems, 54. Generally, hardliners with maximalist ambitions are risk-acceptant and encourage hardline, repressive tactics. Soft-liners are risk-averse and advance soft-line, conciliatory policies. The question remaining is what informs this risk-insensitivity. Non-material factors undoubtedly motivate an individual's preference for hardline or conciliatory action during UI campaigns, but so do material interests. Individuals whose vested interests in the status quo political arrangement are acutely threatened by the UI campaign often become archetypal hardliners. They tend to view the confrontation as a single play game of Prisoner's Dilemma. Thus, their choice to "defect" and select a policy of harsh repression is "rational," and has little to due with risk-insensitivity. Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," World Politics 30, No. 2 (1978): 171. In contrast, the interests of soft-liners are minimally threatened, which enables them to view the conflict in terms of repeated games of Prisoner's Dilemma. Accordingly, fence straddlers who lie in between these two positions are neither hardliners nor soft-liners, but may advocate hardline or soft-line policies.
"hardliners" and "soft-liners" in the regime. This matters for the resolution of UI campaigns. Patrons can encourage opposition and regime elites to make substantial concessions to reach a compromise. If the patron maintains strong contact with opposition leaders, then it may influence the UI campaign to avoid provocative escalatory actions that could provide an excuse to regime hardliners to crackdown. In this way, patrons "unite" moderates and “isolate” hardliners. By bridging moderates on both sides of the conflict and functioning as an external broker to alleviate credible commitment problems, the patron can midwife a successful UI campaign through a pacted transition. Alternatively, patrons may support regime hardliner preferences to employ draconian repressive measures that circle the wagons around existing state-society boundaries.

Second, through a policy of "feast or famine," patrons can alter the decisions of individual and collective actors within the regime by increasing or decreasing the financial support necessary to maintain the status quo. Without a substitution for these financial resources, a regime cannot buy continued loyalty, especially from the security forces. Obversely, with additional subsidies during crisis, a regime may survive through the provision of a non-tax source of income that reduces the need for concessions and increases the level of regime cohesion. Such rents diminish the immediate power of nonviolent resistance because the widespread withdrawal of consent is less important to the regime's short-term ability to survive.

---

This "feast or famine" mechanism is often the most public form of external intervention short of threatening or using military force.

Third, UI campaigns often demand leadership removal as a minimum condition to help hold an often disparate coalition of opposition forces together. This delimited focus enables the patron to defuse the immediate domestic legitimacy crisis through a policy of "decapitation." One option is to offer an embattled leader a golden parachute. A credible offer lowers the costs of exit by ensuring the personal security of key veto players within the leadership. This exit option can reduce the likelihood leaders gamble for resurrection and risk the possibility of civil war. Alternatively, patrons can encourage and provide logistical support to elements in the armed forces planning a coup d'état, thereby playing a direct role in security defections.

To realize their preferences, patrons combine a variety of coercive diplomatic tools to activate these three causal mechanisms. Figure 2.1 presents typical policy options available to patrons seeking to influence UI campaigns in client regimes. In regard to the "isolate and unite" mechanism, a patron can signal its preferred resolution to the crisis and the extent to which state violence against peaceful demonstrators is acceptable through public statements and symbolic actions. Such policy tools empower various regime factions advancing particular solutions to the UI campaign. These signals ultimately rely on a carrot and stick policy related to future changes in the patron-client arrangement depending on the regime's response. Because embattled elites may discount the future or may not consider the threats credible, a patron can also adopt a variety of immediate measures to signal resolve. In such cases, a patron can remove aid and implement sanctions. In extreme situations, the provision or removal of key subsidies that keep the client regime solvent constitutes the "feast or famine" mechanism. Alternatively, a patron may collude with the security forces to precipitate a coup d'état that enables some form of political transition.
Finally, more coercive tactics such as occupation or foreign imposed regime change (FIRC) are available, but are much more costly and seldom exercised. In certain circumstances, however, the threat of an occupation or FIRC is used in an attempt to demonstrate the patron's resolve. In general, patrons mix and match these tactics to realize a particular outcome. The fact that different combinations of patron tactics during UI campaigns lead to the same outcome may partly explain why testing for any one type of foreign policy tool is inadequate.

**IV: Quantitative Analysis of Patron Intervention**

Assessing the independent effect of external intervention during unarmed insurrections is difficult. Case studies are an effective approach for theory-building, mechanism testing, and explaining how a process unfolds, not parsing the probabilistic causal effect of multiple factors. To gauge whether further inquiry into this puzzle is warranted, I evaluate the central claim of this dissertation that external interventions systematically affect UI campaign outcomes. The following analysis uses an amended version of the NAVCO 2.0 dataset, which covers 108 UI campaigns from 1931–2012, resulting in 249 country-year observations.

The central dependent variable – "success" – measures whether a campaign realizes irregular regime change (1), or not (0). Irregular regime change occurs when the status-quo political arrangement is dislodged. Either the UI campaign ousts the leadership or compels fundamental changes to the procedural rules of the game. Such irregular regime change does

---

57 Appendix 3 presents several robustness checks. For example, table 1a of the appendix uses UI campaigns as the unit of analysis. The results are largely consistent with those presented below.

58 The NAVCO 2.0 dataset operationalizes two categories for successful campaigns – "full success" and "partial success." In practice, determining whether a case is completely successful is difficult. My slightly different understanding of irregular regime change leads to some discrepancies with the NAVCO 2.0 coding decisions. Namely, I changed the coding for the following cases from partial success to full success: Bulgaria 1989, East Germany 1989, Indonesia 1998, and Pakistan 1969. In all four situations, leadership turnover took place and a period of transition ensued that included elections. Such short-term success is not equivalent to a successful transition. For instance, the transfer of power from Ayub Khan to Yahya Khan in Pakistan led to divisive elections in 1970, as well as large-scale military operations, genocide, and the eventual secession of East Pakistan in 1971.
not necessarily translate to a democratic transition or transformative social change, but this critical juncture is sometimes an important step in these longer-term processes.\textsuperscript{59} Because security and civilian elite defection often lead to UI campaign success, these factors are included as dependent variables measuring whether large-scale elite defection occurred (1), or not (0).\textsuperscript{60} I also include as a dependent variable a six-tier measure from the NAVCO 2.0 dataset for campaign size, which ranges from less than 1,000 participants (0) to over 1,000,000 (5) in a given campaign year.

As discussed earlier, the key explanatory variable is intervention by external powers that maintain substantial leverage over regimes facing UI campaigns. The regime support and

---


\textsuperscript{60} Stephan and Chenoweth ("Strategic Logic," 22-23) show that UI campaigns are 46 times more likely to succeed when mass security defections occur. Since no statistically significant relationship exists between security defection and violent campaign success, this result is informative. When evaluating the causes of UI campaign success, however, the relationship is less illuminating because mass security defection is practically a sufficient condition for campaign success. Thus, the causes of security defection during UI campaigns is more interesting than the effect security defection has on UI campaign outcome.
campaign support variables measure whether a patron bolstered a particular side (1), or not (0). Where no third-party state possessed the minimal requirements for patron status, a dummy variable is constructed to distinguish between cases of patron neutrality (1) and the absence of a patron (0). The three following hypotheses present testable statements related to the effect of external intervention on the dynamics and outcomes of UI campaigns.

**Hypothesis 1:** UI campaigns are more likely to succeed as a patron shifts support away from the target regime and toward the campaign.

**Hypothesis 2:** Security and civilian elite defections are more likely to occur as a patron shifts support away from the target regime and toward the campaign.

**Hypothesis 3:** Campaign size is likely to increase as a patron shifts support away from the target regime and toward the campaign.

61 The correlation between the regime support variable coded in NAVCO 2.0 and my regime support variable is .28. One possibility for this low correlation is that the NAVCO 2.0 dataset includes cases where external actors maintained amicable relations with the targeted regime, but the country-dyad did not reach the threshold required for patron-client status. In this study, short-term material assistance from such countries is a different form of "black knight" support. The NAVCO coding for this form of short-term assistance also appears somewhat uneven. For instance, China's delivery of 18 truckloads of arms to Nepal in late 2005 appears to be coded as regime support for the 2006 UI campaign. "China aiding Nepal's fight with Maoists," Agence France Presse, November 25, 2005. Similarly, China's rapprochement with Burma in 1989 appears to be coded as regime support against the UI campaign from 1988-1990. In neither case was China a patron state with these targeted regimes. In contrast, regime support is not coded for the 2000 UI campaign against Milosevic when Russia extended a $102 million loan. "Mr. Putin's New Client," Washington Post, May 19, 2000. Similarly, regime support is absent in the Panama case even though Libya reportedly provided a $20 million emergency loan in early 1988 and Taiwan injected around $40 million in loans throughout that year. Frederick Kempe, *Divorcing the dictator: America's Bungled Affair with Noriega* (London: IB Tauris, 1991), 287-288. When the NAVCO 2.0 variables for campaign support and regime withdrawal are combined into a single variable, the correlation with my campaign support variable is .42. Most often, the cases only coded as campaign support in NAVCO 2.0 appear to refer to support from non-patron countries. The most controversial coding decision in my alternative dataset is the removal of campaign support in El Salvador from 1977-1979. Consistent with my coding, the US was not a super patron in El Salvador in the mid-1970s. Total military and economic aid amounted to less than .5 percent of El Salvador's GDP and total trade was approximately 20 percent of El Salvador's GDP. El Salvador pre-emptively rejected military assistance in 1977 to prevent potential embarrassment in case Congress subsequently cut the small aid package. The actual material effect of this cut was minimal. The other action taken by the US was a three-month delay in 1978 for a $90 million Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) loan. In its effort to strengthen the political center, the Carter administration proved ambivalent on linking economic packages to human rights. Sandy Vogelgesang, *American Dream, Global Nightmare: The Dilemma of US Human Rights Policy* (New York: Norton, 1980), 172-178. Because the US is not coded as a super patron, the threat of sanctions from 1977-1981 was insufficient to code as a case of patron support for the campaign. Importantly, these coding decision can matter. When campaign support is coded as present in the El Salvador case, statistical significance of my campaign support variable changes from p>.01 to p>.05 for model 2 and from p>.05 to p>.1 for model 3 in table 2.1 below. Similarly, table 3 in the supplement reveals that the campaign support variable only reaches statistical significance at the p<.1 level when the delimited case populations – the NAVCO 2.0 and my alternative dataset – are used. Thus, the statistical significance of the campaign support variable is sensitive to certain coding decisions and case population specifications. This raises some cause for skepticism about a patron's overall ability to tilt the playing field decisively in favor of the UI campaign.
I include several domestic-level control variables plausibly associated with the prospect of UI campaign success. First, a dummy variable for the Cold War (1948-1988) captures the potential effects of great power ideological competition, which plausibly influenced patron behavior and campaign outcome. Second, the composite index of national capabilities (CINC) is suggestive of a country's coercive capacity and ability to suppress large protests. Third, the Polity IV score lagged one year proxies for the degree to which a regime's institutions are democratic. The institutional concentration of political power potentially affects the leadership's willingness to crack down on demonstrators. Fourth, logged regime age offers a rough estimate for regime cohesion. In particular, a regime's grip on power is arguably most tenuous during the early years of its existence. Fifth, the logged share of the excluded ethnic population from central state power relative to the entire ethno-politically relevant population captures an important aspect of socio-political polarization, a factor previously shown to influence the outcomes of UI campaigns. Sixth, a four-tier variable measuring the actual use of state violence toward a campaign ranges from none to extreme. Finally, the campaign size variable is used as a proxy for campaign strength.

---

62 Dating the end of the Cold War is an issue of considerable debate. According to Neorealist logic, the Cold War ended in 1991 with the official dissolution of the Soviet Union into 15 independent countries. A constructivist point of view may emphasize the fall of the Berlin Wall as ending the Cold War with the symbolic collapse of the iron curtain. I used an earlier date; the UN address General Secretary Gorbachev delivered on December 7th, 1988. During this speech, he declared the unilateral military Soviet retrenchment from Warsaw Pact countries.

63 The usefulness of the composite polity score is a topic of debate in comparative politics. In particular, this score should not be included in models where the dependent variable is the onset of civil conflict. See James Raymond Vreeland, "The Effect of Political Regime on Civil War: Unpacking Anocracy," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52, No. 3 (2008). Such critiques do not directly apply to outcomes of civil conflicts. Nonetheless, robustness checks using alternative variables for regime type did not significantly change the coefficient or statistical significance of the patron intervention variables as shown in table 4 of appendix 3.


65 Although coercion against nonviolent protesters is more likely to backfire, consistently harsh repression may guarantee short-term regime survival by cowing dissidents into submission as intended. Alternatively, a
In addition to these country level controls, I include two dyad-level variables to ensure that the nature of the patron-client relationship is not driving both patron behavior and campaign outcome. The first variable distinguishes between democratic and non-democratic patrons. Theoretically, democratic patrons seem more likely to support UI campaigns often cast in terms of political rights and civil liberties. Moreover, significant political, economic, social, and cultural linkage with such patrons should foster the formation of an independent civil society and imbue regime elites with a more liberal worldview. Both these factors should increase the likelihood that UI campaigns succeed. The second variable isolates patron-client dyads that share similar ideological underpinnings, namely communist and monarchic political systems. Patrons may be less likely to abandon such a client especially when the leadership fears that unrest may diffuse within its own borders. Under such a hierarchical relationship, a patron may also expend more resources on strengthening the client's political institutions, thereby strengthening the latter's ability to fend off an acute political challenge.

To test the effect of external interventions on UI campaigns, a logitistic model is used for the dichotomous dependent variables, while an ordinal logistic model is used when campaign size is the dependent variable. Thus, the equation for finding the predicted probabilities of campaign success based on a patron's policy is:

disproportional use of force may amplify injustice frames, incite an emotional response not purview to rational calculus, and ultimately backfire so that repression leads to further mobilization. For a summary on the repression-mobilization nexus, see Johnston, *States and Social Movements*, 97-135.


SUCCESS = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \text{REGIME SUPPORT} + \beta_2 \times \text{CAMPAIGN SUPPORT} + \beta_3 \times \text{PATRON} + \beta_4 \times \text{COLD WAR} + \beta_5 \times \text{CINC} + \beta_6 \times \text{POLITY IV} + \beta_7 \times \text{REGIME AGE} + \beta_8 \times \text{EXCLUSIVE EXECUTIVE}, \text{cluster (CAMP_ID)}

### Table 2.1: Regression Models for All UI Campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully Successful UI Campaigns (logit)</th>
<th>Security Defection (logit)</th>
<th>Civilian Defection (logit)</th>
<th>Campaign Size (ologit)</th>
<th>Patron Intervention (logit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (9)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model (11)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.2: Predicted Probabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Success (Cold War)</th>
<th>Full Success (Post Cold War)</th>
<th>Security Defection (Cold War)</th>
<th>Security Defection (Post Cold War)</th>
<th>State Defection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron Supports Regime</strong></td>
<td>2% (0% - 6%)</td>
<td>5% (0% - 12%)</td>
<td>16% (1% - 31%)</td>
<td>16% (0% - 31%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron Remains Neutral</strong></td>
<td>14% (4% - 23%)</td>
<td>26% (13% - 39%)</td>
<td>31% (18% - 44%)</td>
<td>38% (25% - 51%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron Supports Campaign</strong></td>
<td>33% (18% - 48%)</td>
<td>52% (37% - 67%)</td>
<td>54% (36% - 72%)</td>
<td>64% (44% - 83%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rival Patrons Compete</strong></td>
<td>7% (0% - 17%)</td>
<td>15% (0% - 31%)</td>
<td>33% (5% - 62%)</td>
<td>35% (0% - 51%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Obs</strong></td>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results found in table 2.1 support the first hypothesis. Shifts in patron support from the regime to the opposition is associated with an increased likelihood of campaign success. The predicted probabilities found in table 2.2 indicate that full UI campaign success in any given year is about six times more likely when a patron remains neutral rather than sides with the regime. A shift from patron neutrality to campaign support approximately doubles the probability of success. Overall, patron support to the campaign is useful for generating irregular regime change via civil resistance, but patron neutrality appears essential.

Results for the second hypothesis are mixed. Patron support for UI campaigns is positively correlated with military and civilian elite defections at the $p<.05$ level. Yet, the relationship between patron support for the regime and elite defections rarely reaches statistical significance at the $p<.1$ level, but is in the hypothesized negative direction. Table 2.2 shows an approximate two-fold increase in the predicted probabilities for elite defections when a neutral patron decides to support a UI campaign. However, a statistically significant correlation does not address the possibility of reverse causality. Mass defections by regime elite may add pressure on the patron to abandon what appears to be a lost cause. I return to this issue below.

Finally, the data do not reveal any noteworthy relationship between patron action and campaign size. Model 7 suggests that patron support for the regime and greater participation in UI campaigns are positively associated at the $p<.05$ level. This counterintuitive result appears driven by the fourteen country-year observations that occurred in Poland during the Cold War. Moreover, no model specification seems to fit the data well, which raises concerns about any substantive interpretation.\footnote{The value of Prob>chi2 is somewhat concerning in some models. For instance, the null hypothesis at the $p<.5$ level that all variables except the constant are equal to zero remains a possibility in model 6 and 10.} It seems more likely that patrons feel compelled to react as the
extent of internal instability is revealed. Model 11 indicates that campaign size and a patron's decision to intervene are positively associated at the p<.05 level.

In regard to the control variables, the results largely confirm previous quantitative findings. First, campaign success and large-scale civilian defection appear more likely after the Cold War. Second, UI campaigns seem less likely to succeed in older and less democratic regimes. Third, higher levels of ethnic polarization over central state power are strongly associated with campaign failure. Fourth, UI campaign success appears less likely when regimes resort to harsh forms of repression, and more likely when campaign participation is high. Higher levels of campaign participation are also associated with a greater chance of large-scale elite defection. Finally, the data does not indicate a relationship between repression levels and campaign size as suggested by the phenomenon of backfire, where repression catalyzes greater campaign participation.

While the NAVCO 2.0 effort to disaggregate violent and nonviolent campaigns into country-year observations is useful, a fundamental endogeneity issue concerning the temporal causal chain linking the independent variables to the outcome of interest remains. In short, there is reason to suspect that patron states are also fence-sitters. Like regime elite, patrons bide their time to support the imminent winner. During this process, patrons take cues from events unfolding in the street. When selecting a course of action, regime elites incorporate the patron's revealed preference and vice versa. Such endogeneity is the most pressing concern for the research question explored in this dissertation and no quantitative solution readily addresses this.

---

115 See Brian Martin, Justice Ignited: The Dynamics of Backfire (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).
116 Another potential, but theoretically less concerning form of endogeneity is a selection effect bias where unobserved heterogeneity could affect selection into the UI campaign case population. If selection is systematically correlated to both the dependent variable (campaign outcome) and key explanatory variables (patron intervention), then this unobserved heterogeneity could systematically bias the results.
methodological issue.\textsuperscript{117} Completely resolving endogeneity issues related to such a complex phenomenon as revolution, however, is unrealistic. As King et. al. point out, "... endogeneity is not always a problem to be fixed but is often an integral part of the process by which the world produces our observations... If bias is unavoidable, we should at least try to understand its direction and likely order of magnitude."\textsuperscript{118} This task of untangling the endogenous process between patron intervention, elite defection, and campaign participation is an important component explored in the rest of the dissertation.

\* \* \* \* \* \*  

In this chapter, I reviewed recent theoretical contributions addressing UI campaign success. Because powerful external countries often constitute an important pillar of support for smaller regimes, such actors should also maintain sufficient leverage to influence UI campaign outcomes. The paucity of systematic research and evidence on this relationship within the extant literature is striking. In contrast to previous research, I delineate a set of criteria to operationalize the external dimension according to whether a patron-client relationship is present. The next section examined various policy tools patrons can employ during UI campaigns to activate three mechanisms that I hypothesize should alter the outcome in predictable ways. Finally, I presented

\textsuperscript{117} Fifty of the 108 UI campaigns began and ended in the same year. Even for campaigns lasting longer than a year, the relationship between the variables of interest is crudely captured by shifts in values according to the calendar year. The NAVCO project is creating an updated version that structures the data according to the event level. Chenoweth and Lewis, \textit{Unpacking Nonviolent Campaigns}, 416. Such a dataset is better suited to address issues related to temporal sequencing of conflict processes. For instance, survival analysis could help determine whether the rate of mass defection changes after patron intervention. However, patron intervention and elite defection are often hard to assign as discreet events. A feedback loop between patron and regime elite behavior seems to capture the actual process. Winks, nods, plots, and backdoor threats are more likely to culminate into measureable actions. In this case, even the most granular event data do not offer a panacea to this endogeneity concern. An alternative statistical solution is an instrumental variable. A suitable instrument should affect the likelihood of UI campaign success only through its effect on the patron's decision to intervene for a particular side and should not be correlated with the error term. Such a variable is difficult to imagine.

quantitative evidence that suggests the presence of a statistically significant relationship between patron intervention and UI campaign outcomes.
Chapter 3
Typological Theory and Case Selection

The quantitative analysis revealed a robust relationship between patron intervention and UI campaign outcomes. Such a method of inquiry, however, is less well equipped to deal with complex interaction effects, to evaluate the validity of proposed causal mechanisms, to explore endogeneity between key explanatory variables, or to generate theoretical insights from deviant cases. Qualitative methods are better suited to examine such matters.¹ This chapter first introduces a typological space for all known cases of patron intervention. Such an approach is useful for establishing contingent generalizations regarding the conditions under which patron intervention is most and least likely to succeed.² The next section briefly explores six deviant cases to discern patterns and form tentative hypotheses related to the limits of patron intervention. In particular, certain domestic institutional configurations that bind the military to the regime seem to function as an omitted variable that links four of the six outliers. The final section uses the typological space to help identify the cases most appropriate to explore in greater detail in the remainder of the dissertation.

I. A Typological Space for Cases of Patron Intervention

There are 36 cases of patron intervention during UI campaigns.³ Patron support for the regime failed to maintain the status quo in two out of thirteen cases. Similarly, regimes managed to survive in only three of the 23 cases where the political leadership had to fend off a UI intervention.

---

¹ A mixed-method nested analysis research design can create synergies between quantitative and qualitative methods. In particular, small-N analysis is useful to "assess the plausibility of observed statistical relationships between variables, to generate theoretical insights from outlier and other cases, and to create better measurement strategies." Evan S. Lieberman, "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review* 99, No. 3 (2005): 435.


³ These cases are derived from my alternative case population, which includes 91 UI campaigns. Thus, patron intervention has occurred in approximately 40 percent of UI campaigns since 1930.
campaign and a hostile patron. These five deviant cases provide an opportunity to construct a typological space that refines the theoretical edifice presented thus far.

One substantial limitation of quantitative analysis in the study of UI campaigns is the difficulty of capturing key aspects of regime strength. The proxies for this multifaceted concept remain particularly rough. For instance, the CINC score measures a regime's overall coercive capability, but coercive scope is less important during domestic legitimacy crises. The concept that requires accurate measurement is regime cohesion. In this regard, the polity score and regime duration variables are imperfect proxies. The degree of control exclusionary ethnic control over central state power is a better measure, but approximates only one potential source of cohesion. Of particular interest is the willingness of the coercive institutions to carry out orders given by the leadership. The literature on coup proofing advances several ex ante indicators that should influence the loyalty of the armed forces to the regime. Yet, a statistically significant relationship between the majority of these factors and UI campaign outcomes does not exist. Therefore, deconstructing aspects of regime cohesion appears a productive avenue for

---

4 A large body of literature exists on what attributes best capture the distinction between strong and weak states. Levitsky and Way (Competitive Authoritarianism, 54-70) usefully separate the concept of organizational power into four categories: state coercive scope, state coercive cohesion, party scope, and party cohesion. Importantly, these authors distinguish between regime robustness during normal politics and domestic crisis. They note that state coercive cohesion is particularly important during periods of crisis.

5 See table 4, model 1 of appendix 3. Jonathan Powell tests various structural factors that should affect the probability of coup attempts and outcomes. He derives three indicators from the COW dataset. First, larger militaries should decrease the likelihood of a coup attempt due to coordination challenges. If a coup does take place, however, it should be more likely to succeed. Second, military expenditure per soldier captures troop "contentment and quality." Again, this should decrease the likelihood of a coup taking place, but increases the chance of success if it does. Third, a negative relationship should exist between coup attempts and the change in military expenditure from year to year. The relationship of these variables on campaign outcome is interesting. Military size and soldier quality appear unrelated to campaign outcome, whereas the percent change in year to year military expenditure is negatively correlated with campaign outcome at the p>.01 value. In contrast, Powell's results suggest that the correlation between the former variables is often statistically significant with coup attempts and outcomes, but change in military expenditure is not. Jonathan Powell, "Determinants of the Attempting and Outcome of Coup d'état," Journal of Conflict Resolution 56, No. 6 (2011): 1029-33. The robust relationship between military expenditure and campaign outcome corresponds to arguments concerning the regime's ability to buy its soldiers' short-term loyalty. Given the fickle nature of changes in year to year military expenditures, I ran further robustness checks with two and
A truism in research on UI campaigns is that the military can make or break these movements. Elliott Abrams, the Undersecretary of State during the Reagan administration, apprehended this reality as the US struggled to help Panama's National Civic Crusade (NCC) oust General Manuel Noriega from power. He observed, "Our experiences with Marcos and Duvalier had led us to believe this would work. We now realize that it is easier to remove civilian dictators than military ones. In analogous circumstances Marcos and Duvalier were gone already."

Yet, this observation is somewhat misleading. Military regimes are no more likely to survive a UI campaign than civilian autocracies. The democratic transition in South Korea the year before Abrams made this comment is a case in point. However, regimes resilient to the joint pressure of UI campaigns and patron states appear to share certain similarities that link the military to the regime leadership in salient ways. Three types of material and non-material cohesion are included in the typology below.

---

uncovering potentially omitted variables that provide theoretical insight into why external intervention sometimes fails.

three year moving averages regarding the change in military expenditure. This variable is significant in all functional forms, and does not change the statistical significance or coefficient size of the patron intervention variables.

Other ways exist for operationalizing coup-proofing according to divide-and-rule tactics for large-N studies. See Aaron Belkin and Evan Shofer, "Toward a Structural Understanding of Coup Risk," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47, No. 5 (2003); Ulrich Pilster and Tobias Böhmelt, "Coup-proofing and Military Effectiveness in Interstate Wars, 1967-99," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 28, No. 4 (2011). Unfortunately, such attempts to measure the military and paramilitary balance are temporally confined from 1966-1986 and 1970-1999 respectively. Moreover, missing country year observations are prevalent. Overall, inclusion of these variables in the models significantly reduces the number of observations so that the Prob > chi2 is no longer statistically significant at the p>.05 level. Constructing these indices for missing observations would prove a useful exercise for future research on UI campaign outcomes since a fair share of these contentious episodes end in military coups.


7 See table 4, model 2 of appendix 3.
Table 3.1: Typological Space for External Interventions During UI Campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>External Intercenter</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Rival patron exists</th>
<th>Campaign success</th>
<th>Military Morale</th>
<th>Ethnic minority rule</th>
<th>Military-economic relation</th>
<th>Military goal realized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2001-04</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>KSA-USA</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Russia-Iran</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom Rep.</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1910-82</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1915-88</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROK</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1937-89</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1989-96</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>1990-94</td>
<td>The West</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>1991-93</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1992-95</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>The West</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2009-18</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2009-18</td>
<td>donors</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>USA-USA</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first factor is based on the material and non-material aspects of the armed forces. Military morale is coded high if the generation of the top military brass participated in large-scale interstate conflict without defeat, an acute interstate military or ideological rivalry, or a successful revolutionary or anti-colonial struggle. Morale is coded as low if high-ranking security officers carry out significant forms of insubordination, the country recently experienced a defeat in major interstate conflict, or the regime consistently fails to pay the salaries to officers or rank-and-file troops on time. In all other cases, military morale is coded medium.

---

8 The first and second variables provided as sources of coercive cohesion borrow extensively from Levitsky and Way (Competitive Authoritarianism, 376-377).
A second source of coercive cohesion is non-material. This variable distinguishes regimes where the leadership and military elite share an ethnic or sectarian identity that constitutes a salient cleavage in society. Such regimes often represent a minority population that fears majority rule. The third source of potential cohesion is material and captures the institutional links between the military and the national economy. This includes regimes where the military is deeply involved in profitable licit or illicit sectors of the national economy. When UI campaigns present a clear threat to these prerogatives, the military is more likely to rally around the institution and fight to maintain the status-quo. I code the latter two sources of coercive cohesion as dichotomous variables.

Two other factors are arrayed in the typological space presented in Table 3.1. Campaign strength is a trichotomous measure. It is considered high when peak support is massive – over 500,000 participants in larger countries, or over 100,000 in countries with a population less than five million – and low when peak support is minimal – under 100,000 participants in larger countries, or under 10,000 in countries with a population less than 5 million. Campaign strength is medium for cases between these extremes. The final variable distinguishes cases based on the presence of a dueling patron that supports the opposite side in the domestic political struggle.

---

9 This aspect is difficult to code in certain cases where neo-patrimonial regimes co-opt powerful military generals through patronage networks. For instance, President Saleh bought the support of General Ali Mohsin, widely considered the second most powerful person in the country, in part by allowing the latter to sell state discounted gas on the black market to neighboring countries at a significant profit. Saleh granted other high-ranking officers leadership roles in the Yemen Economic Corporation (YECO) that supplied the military with subsidized goods easily turned into windfall profits. These personalized networks of grand corruption between a neo-patrimonial regime and certain military officers is less indicative of the military's penetration in the national economy than cases where the military as an institution enjoys jurisdiction or mass control over large swaths of the economy. For example, before the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak, the Egyptian military was estimated to control 25 percent to 40 percent of the national economy. Zeinab Abul-Magd, "The Army and the Economy in Egypt," Jadaliyya, December 23, 2011. Regardless, most of the ambiguous cases of grand corruption disappear with the added condition that the UI campaign needs to present a perceived threat to the military's institutional purview. Where this is not the case, the military has less incentive to save a tottering dictator. Nepstad, "Nonviolence in the Arab Spring," 340.
II. Theory Building from Cases of Failed Patron Intervention

No common feature links the outlier cases where UI campaigns succeed despite patron support for the regime. A pattern does emerge in Figure 3.1, however, for cases of regime survival despite patron support for the campaign. Regimes that combine medium or high military morale with intimate ethnic or economic relations between the coercive apparatus and regime leadership appear more resilient to joint external and internal pressure.

**Figure 3.1: Typological Theory Based on Domestic Institutional Configuration**
This section briefly explores six deviant cases – Iran 1977-78, Ukraine 2004, Ukraine 2013-14, Nigeria 1993-95, Burma 1988-90, and Togo 1991 – in an effort to probe the plausibility of the domestic institutional hypothesis regarding regime resilience and develop other mid-range, contingent hypotheses concerning a patron's ability to intervene successfully.

The 1978 overthrow of Shah Pahlavi in Iran highlights the inherent contingency of revolutionary situations. In retrospect, the UI campaign is a textbook case of disciplined nonviolent resistance. Extant social networks and organizations forged unlikely alliances that crossed key societal cleavages. The Shah inconsistently mixed repression and concession that contributed to greater mobilization. As growing numbers joined the campaign, the ubiquity of discontent became obvious. Of equal importance, Iranians began to believe the movement's goals were obtainable. For its part, the US intelligence community only began to realize the enormity of the challenge facing the Pahlavi regime starting in early September 1978, many months after the protests had become a coherent threat to the political order. Caught off-guard and divided internally by a bureaucratic struggle over the best way forward, the administration continued to send conflicting messages that autumn. This likely added to the Shah's emotional malaise and general inability to adopt a decisive course of action.

14 Emery, The Cold War Dynamics, 43. One camp around National Security Advisor Brzezinski encouraged a hardnosed military solution while another, belatedly formed around Secretary of State Vance, urged political reform and incorporation of key opposition leaders. The administration failed to adopt either alternative and was unprepared to deal with the political situation following the Shah's departure in early January 1979.
In regard to patron interventions during UI campaigns, this case raises two related issues. First, a patron's attention is divided; it often reacts to events as it operates in an environment of incomplete information. Among other major foreign policy issues, the Camp David negotiations preoccupied top officials in the early fall of 1978. By the time attention fully turned to Iran, the crisis had arguably reached a point where the status quo was no longer tenable. Second, distinct organizational cultures and bureaucratic politics in the patron state can contribute to mixed signals during crisis situations. The absence of decisive leadership dilutes patron efforts to influence the decision-making process in the client regime.

The other deviant case of failed regime support is Russia's attempt to assist in the stage-managed political transition from Leonid Kuchma to Victor Yanukovych in the 2004 Ukrainian presidential election. The primary reason the attempt to steal the election failed was the determination of protesters who stubbornly occupied Maidan Nezalezhnosti (Independence Square) for weeks. Nevertheless, threats of sanctions from the US and European Union likely mattered in two ways. First, increased interdependence with European markets raised the potential costs for powerful oligarchs associated with the regime and likely made their support for Yanukovych conditional on avoiding excessive preventive force following the November 21st elections. Second, Russia appeared unwilling to risk open confrontation with the West over the

---

15 No external actor manufactured the Orange revolution. Rather, democracy promotion programs created an intellectual and technical foundation that empowered Ukrainian citizens to monitor the domestic political environment and hold politicians accountable. See Michael McFaul, "Importing Revolution: Internal and External Factors in Ukraine's 2004 Democratic Breakthrough," in Democracy and Authoritarianism in the Postcommunist World, eds. Valerie Bunce, Michael McFaul, and Kathryn Stoner-Weiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Thus, this case is coded as campaign support because Western countries issued threats to hold free and fair elections and espoused a proactive role as mediators to the crisis who insisted that new elections take place.

16 After the electoral fraud, the European Commission President Barroso warned of possible "consequences" if a full review of the election did not occur. President Bush had made similar threats the day before elections. See "Bush Warns US Will Review Relations with Ukraine if Election Unfair," Agence France Presse, November 20, 2004; Constant Brand, "EU Chief Warns Ukraine that Contested Election Results Must be Reviewed," Associated Press International, November 24, 2004. As participation in the protests peaked to 1.5 million a week later, a hurting stalemate appeared to emerge that required compromise from both sides to avert potential large-scale violent
electoral outcome in Ukraine. In other words, the future of Ukraine was not cast in zero-sum terms. Russia believed it possessed sufficient economic and cultural capital to prevent Ukraine's outright turn to the West.

At the height of the protests, Polish President Kwaśniewski and Lithuanian President Adamkus emphasized the need for a negotiated settlement to Kuchma and Yanukovych during mediation efforts following the fraudulent election. The speaker of the Russian Duma, Boris Gryzlov, represented the Kremlin at the talks. He was pro-Yanukovych, but did not play spoiler to the negotiated settlement midwifed by his European counterparts for a presidential run-off election that Victor Yushchenko won on December 26th. However, part of the December grand compromise transferred significant executive powers to parliament, including the power to form a government. This constitutional amendment partly undermined Yuschenko's ability to fulfill the economic and political aspirations of the Orange Revolution during his presidency. Russia's wager that it could foment conflicts in Ukraine's fractious domestic political scene to frustrate post-crisis reform efforts proved correct.

While beyond the temporal scope of this dissertation, the violent aftermath of the recent 2013-14 protests in Ukraine differed from the 2004 campaign in some noteworthy ways that merit a few brief remarks. First, Yanukovych won a tightly contested, but free and fair presidential run-off election in 2010. Second, his victory confirmed the degree of regional polarization in Ukraine. He won nearly 80 percent of the vote in Eastern Ukraine, but could not


muster 50 percent of the popular vote. Third, he did not try to build bridges after assuming office. Instead, he consolidated his power through a series of strong-arm tactics and blatant cronyism. This confirmed his opponents' fear about democratic backsliding. Fourth, Putin's penchant for viewing his Western partners with suspicion shifted to outright distrust after the 2011 protests against flawed Russian legislative elections. Interactions with the West, especially the US, became increasingly characterized by zero-sum logic. Specifically, Moscow aggressively pushed a common market cum geopolitical project, the Eurasian Economic Union (EEC). Ukraine was the crown jewel, and Putin applied considerable pressure on Yanukovych to join. Western Ukrainians viewed this as an attempt to prevent Ukraine from moving closer to the West. Many Western policymakers shared these concerns. As a result, Yanukovych's decision to delay the signing of the EU Association Agreement on November 21\textsuperscript{st} came to symbolize a referendum on Ukraine's future. On November 30\textsuperscript{th}, disproportionate force against a crowd of 10,000 demonstrators in Kiev backfired. Scale-shift in protest demands and size occurred. The final difference was that mass civilian and security defections failed to materialize as in 2004. Widespread mistrust and vocal hardliners frustrated efforts to broker a negotiated settlement.

After three months of mass protest, the violence crescendoed with mysterious shootings on February 20\textsuperscript{th} that left dozens dead. That same day, the Polish, French and German foreign ministers pushed opposition leaders toward compromise, with Polish Foreign Minister Sikorski telling one of them, "If you don't support this deal you will have martial law, the army. You'll be

---

21 Compelling evidence exists that suggests some Maidan organizations, like Right Sector, and a few opposition leaders were involved in these shootings. See Ivan Katchanovski, “The ‘Snipers' Massacre’ on the Maidan in Ukraine,” unpublished. This perspective runs counter to narratives of these events found in most Western media outlets. If proven true by an independent commission, the Russian account that violent actions taken by right-wing groups caused the collapse of Yanukovych's regime would gain some credence. Such a reality, however, by no means justifies the subsequent actions taken by the Kremlin.
dead. A deal was signed early on February 21st that included a return to the 2004 Constitution, early presidential elections no later than December 2014, and an independent investigation into recent acts of violence. Hours later, the Verkhovna Rada voted to dismiss Interior Minister Vitaliy Zakharchenko due to the excessive use of violence against protesters. Meanwhile, demonstrators on the Maidan refused any deal short of Yanukovych's immediate resignation. Reading the tea leaves and fearing a subsequent witch hunt, thousands of riot police, Interior Ministry forces, and members from other security units disbanded and fled Kiev. Yanukovych followed suit that evening. The negotiated settlement that appeared suitable to the Kremlin was scuttled a day after it came into effect. By the early morning of February 23rd, Putin initiated plans to annex the Crimea in what appears to have been the opening salvo in a developing strategy to destabilize Ukraine.

Although few cases exist where dueling patrons support opposing sides during a UI campaign, some working hypotheses emerge. First, the domestic balance of power remains a decisive factor in the outcome. The relatively high level of state capacity enabled the Lukashenko regime to anticipate, undermine, and eventually crush the 2006 efforts by the Belarusian opposition to replicate Ukraine's Orange Revolution. Second, in cases where neither side of the domestic struggle appears strong enough to achieve outright victory, the degree to which the patrons view the conflict in zero-sum terms seems to affect the ability to reach a negotiated settlement and avoid a civil war. When patrons compete in proxy battles where the

---

24 "Putin Describes Secret Operation to Seize Crimea," Agence France Presse, March 8, 2015. For its part, the transitional government failed to send conciliatory signals to the apparent losers of the confrontation. In fact, the actions taken following Yanukovych's overthrow inflamed the situation and provided grist to the Russian propaganda mill. Especially provocative was the voiding of Ukraine's minority language law that recognized Russian as the second official language just two years earlier.
outcome of a UI campaign is perceived in winner-take-all terms, the risk of civil war appears to increase substantially as happened in Syria in 2011 and Ukraine in 2014. Under such circumstances, a negotiated settlement that incorporates all parties' minimal interests is the responsible choice, but this option is more difficult to achieve due to mistrust between domestic and international actors as well as myriad principal-agent issues.

As mentioned earlier, the likelihood of campaign success when a patron adopts a hostile stance vis-à-vis the regime appears to decrease substantially when military morale is medium or high and intimate ethnic or economic relations between the coercive apparatus and regime are present. Out of the five cases that fit these conditions in Figure 3.1, patron support ended in successful UI campaigns only in South Africa 1990-1994 and Nigeria 1993-1998. A closer examination of the latter case raises doubts about the degree to which US and EU sanctions against General Sani Abacha's ruthless military dictatorship actually contributed to the 1998 democratic transition.

In 1993, General Ibrahim Babangida formally aborted his transition to democracy by annulling Chief Moshood Abiola's victory in presidential elections that had been widely praised as free and fair. A massive civil resistance movement organized by the Campaign for Democracy (CD), an umbrella organizations of 35 civic organizations, managed to pressure Babangida to make a modest concession of establishing the Interim National Government (ING). Three months later, General Sani Abacha, the Minister of Defense, led a coup to overthrow the ING with promises of quickly establishing the equivalent of a sovereign national conference.

Members of the CD who urged this corrective coup soon regretted their entreaties. Abacha reneged on his promises. Despite its name, the Provisional Revolutionary Council (PRC) was not meant to inaugurate a real political transition. Throughout the following year, he demobilized a relatively robust UI campaign with the proven formula of brutal repression and co-optation of an opportunistic political class.\(^{27}\) Massive oil rents and a society rife with ethnic, regional, and religious cleavages proved important assets to secure his military junta by 1995.

With respect to the international response to the military's reassertion into politics, moral outrage never transformed into serious action. When Babangida nullified the June elections, Brussels and Washington adopted limited sanctions, such as canceling entry visas for some military officers, suspending economic and military aid, and restricting arms sales. As repression worsened, the West threatened to freeze personal assets or to impose sanctions on oil, which accounted for 90 percent of Nigeria's export revenues. Unlike the weaker sanctions, the Abacha regime had reason to fear such measures.\(^{28}\) Nevertheless, the PRC believed that if the regime "soft-peddled" and failed to execute Ken Saro-Wiwa and his Ogoni compatriots it would appear "a weakling." Regarding the threats of the West, the council preferred "not to yield to the pressure" and appeared confident that a firm response would not materialize.\(^{29}\)

They correctly called the bluff. Washington and Brussels tightened some non-economic sanctions, but personal asset freezes never occurred during Abacha's tenure. Transnational

---


\(^{29}\) Ken Saro-Wiwa led a non-violent campaign against the alliance between the government and multinational oil companies that exploited the oil rich regions in the Niger river delta. The military arrested Saro-Wiwa along with eight other individuals collectively referred to as the Ogoni nine on trumped up charges for the murder of Ogoni chiefs at a pro-government gathering. For brief of the meeting leading to the decision, see "Inside the Secret Abacha Memo Approving Execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa, Others," *The Premium Times*, December 30, 2012.
business interests of four major oil companies and Nigerian hired lobbyists in Washington helped block momentum toward an embargo. As is often the case when strategic assets are involved, the West as a collective patron had the means to challenge the junta's grip on power, but not the stomach. During the next two years, the dispirited democratic forces had trouble mobilizing any credible challenge to General Abacha's increasingly apparent designs to succeed himself as an elected civilian president. For its part, the Clinton administration's willingness to normalize relations with Nigeria if Abacha's plan succeeded remain uncertain partly because Abacha suddenly died of mysterious causes on June 7th, 1998. Regardless, it is difficult to describe either the UI campaign or external pressure as a cause for this political breakthrough that eventually led to a democratic transition under General Abdulsalami Abubakar.

The Nigerian case appears to correspond better with the other deviant cases of failed patron intervention on the side of UI campaigns. Four themes resonate with these other cases. First, the leverage of civil disobedience campaigns diminishes when the targeted regime controls a national economy with a large, non-tax base of revenue. Second, hardline military officers benefitted handsomely from the rentier economy and feared losing access to these spoils in a transition to a civilian regime. Thus, the risk-acceptant regime core tested US and European resolve to back up tough talk with deeds that actually inflicted real pain, which never

31 Campaign participation from 1995 to 1998 is estimated between 1,000-9,999 active participants in the NAVCO 2.0 dataset. The secondary literature confirms the relative dormant state of the major opposition umbrella organizations, including the CD, the National Democratic Coalition (NADECO), and the United Democratic Front (UDF). Given the size of Nigeria, a strong argument can be made for questioning whether the last three years should be considered a UI campaign at all.
33 De Mesquita and Smith, "Leader Survival," 938.
34 *Human Rights Watch*, *Price of Oil*, 46-48. The level of corruption under Abacha was immense. He is estimated to have stolen over $3 billion in state assets during the four and one-half years he ruled. "Nigeria: Rogues and Rackets on Trial," *Africa Confidential*, December 4, 2009.
materialized. The revenue also provided funds to co-opt military officials and cut out reform-oriented officers to reduce the likelihood of a successful coup, which arguably posed the greatest danger to the status-quo after 1994. Third, patrons are sometimes unwilling or unable to send credible threats to the target regime if these measures impinge on powerful interest groups within the patron state. In the Nigerian case, the Clinton administration and other Western governments hesitated implementing tougher sanctions against the regime partly because multi-national oil corporations lobbied against such a policy direction. Finally, coordination between the anvil, UI campaigns, and the hammer, external intervention, is very difficult. Even had the US adopted harsh sanctions after Ken Saro-Wiwa's execution in December 1995, the UI campaign no longer posed an formidable challenge. In cases where a coterie of hardliners dominate, the regime gains time by adopting a recalcitrant position that batters the opposition and exhausts the patron into accepting the status quo. In other words, the regime faces fewer coordination challenges compared to an alliance between the patron and broad opposition coalition.

The 1988 democracy summer in Burma offers a similar case of a military junta's ability to survive a UI campaign despite simultaneous pressure from international donor states. After a successful coup in 1962, General Ne Win launched the Burmese Way to Socialism. Under this ideological program, Burma sought to reduce foreign political and economic influence. Notably, the Revolutionary Council espoused a policy of economic autarky, in which the military (Tatmadaw) enjoyed a privileged role.\(^{35}\) Disappointing economic performance over the next decade turned into crisis by the mid-1970s. Persistent student and labor unrest culminated in a 1976 plot by younger officers to carry out a coup. In the following twenty months, mass purges took place in the Burma Socialist Program Party (BSPP) and Tatmadaw. Ne Win extirpated

\(^{35}\) By the mid-1980s, estimates for spending on defense as a proportion of the national budget exceeded 50 percent. Maureen Aung-\text{Thwin}, "Burmese Days," *Foreign Affairs* 68, No. 2 (1989), 147.
reformist elements in the regime, but appeared to take note of the coup leaders' aspiration to abolish the command economy and promote foreign capital investment.\textsuperscript{36}

In 1977, Burma enjoyed a good reputation for paying back its debts. Once Ne Win acknowledged the World Bank's recommendation to initiate economic liberalization, foreign aid dramatically increased. For instance, Japanese official development assistance (ODA) grew five-fold from 1977 to 1978. Yet, Ne Win never followed through on his promises of reform. Aid continued to flow as the economy floundered. The regime survived in part due to the international donor community's help.\textsuperscript{37} In 1987, the economic situation in Burma significantly worsened. GDP shrank 4 percent and inflation grew by 25 percent. To make matter worse, Ne Win decided in September to demonetarize 20, 30, and 75 kyat banknotes in an ill-conceived effort to reign in Burma's thriving black market. This removed 70-80 percent of the currency circulating in the system and wiped out much of the population's personal savings. At the end of 1987, Burma's debt was $5 billion, its debt service ratio (payments of interest and capital as a proportion of all foreign earnings) was around 90 percent, and its foreign exchange reserves were $27.1 million.\textsuperscript{38} From this perspective, Burma appeared quite vulnerable to external donor pressure on the eve of a UI campaign.

Student efforts to agitate against the regime failed in the fall of 1987 notwithstanding the economic downturn. The population remained quiescent. The catalyst for the mass 1988 demonstrations occurred in mid-March when riot police shot dead a student protesting the


\textsuperscript{37} Donald M. Seekins, \textit{Burma and Japan Since 1940: From 'Co-prosperity' to 'Quiet Dialogue'} (Copenhagan: NIAS Press, 2007), 79-84. By 1988, Burma received $332.7 million in total bilateral ODA, $259.6 million of which came from Japan. ODA constituted roughly 6.7 percent of Burma's GDP.

\textsuperscript{38} Seekins, \textit{Disorder in Order}, 122-126. The population stashed their personal savings in these denominations rather than open bank accounts due to the associated risks of the inefficient banking system.
premature release of a BSPP official's son, who was arrested the previous night for assaulting another student at a local tea shop. The regime's heavy-handed repression in the following months caused moral outrage. Mass pro-democracy demonstrations culminated in Ne Win's retirement on July 23rd when he suggested holding a future plebiscite to implement a multiparty political system. These announcements were little consolation because his successor, General Sein Lwin, had orchestrated some of the regime's most brutal violence. A large cross-section of society, unwilling to accept cosmetic change, joined mass demonstrations on August 8th, 1988.

Despite brutal repression, protesters forced Lwin to resign within four days. A week later, Dr. Maung Maung, a civilian BSPP member, became head of the government and suspended martial law. Significant reductions in the level of repression contributed to an efflorescence of civil society in the following month. Referendum talk persisted, but activists were unwilling to wait and see whether the regime was earnest. With few extant civil society organizations after years of harsh dictatorial rule, efforts to coordinate actions and channel pressure were elusive. A leadership struggle in the opposition complicated matters and hampered student efforts to form an interim government on September 14th. Four days later, General Saw Maung launched a coup, announced the formation of the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) solely composed of Ne Win hardliners, and imposed a military solution to the crisis. The opposition's ability to resist slowly withered over the next two years. The opposition resoundingly defeated the military in the 1990 elections, but was unable to marshal a coherent challenge to the military's decision to annul the results. The state successfully imposed its will on society.

39 Steinberg, State of Myanmar, 9. Neither was Ne Win's speech particularly conciliatory. He ominously declared, "If the army shoots, it hits - there is no firing into the air to scare."
40 Fink, Living Silence, 56-58.
41 Seekins, Disorder in Order, 175-178.
Burma's international donors did react to these events. Already in April 1988, Japan intimated the possibility of reappraising its ODA disbursements to Burma if real economic reforms did not begin. This warning appears connected to Ne Win's advocacy to liberalize the economy that summer.\footnote{Steinberg, \textit{State of Myanmar}, 256.} As repression worsened, however, donor concerns grew. On August 11th, the US Senate unanimously passed Resolution 464 that condemned the gross violation of human rights and called for the restoration of democracy. The House followed suit on September 7\textsuperscript{th}. Washington suspended all but humanitarian aid on September 23\textsuperscript{rd}. In late August, West Germany, the second-largest foreign aid donor, announced the suspension of aid disbursements on similar grounds. Even more worrisome to the \textit{Tatmadaw}, Tokyo announced an aid freeze due to political instability on September 13\textsuperscript{th}. Under considerable US pressure, Japan suspended aid on September 28\textsuperscript{th}. Yet, this united front was short-lived.\footnote{Seekins, \textit{Burma and Japan}, 95-97.} Japan recognized the SLORC in February 1989 once plans for the 1990 elections were announced.\footnote{Seekins, \textit{Disorder in Order}, 187.} Unlike Washington, Japan had economic, bureaucratic, and strategic interests that made a principled foreign policy based on human rights and democracy much more difficult to sustain.\footnote{Seekins, \textit{Burma and Japan}, 97-100.} When key national interests appear threatened, patrons tend to support the status quo. If such patrons support the campaign, however, the policy is often indecisive or bifurcated due to competing domestic interests.

Even had Japan remained steadfast, a real political transition during 1988-1990 seemed unlikely. The \textit{Tatmadaw} faced major challenges, not least of which was the need to increase officer salaries to stave off a coup when hard currency reserves were nearly depleted. By increasing the pace of liberalization, the generals managed to prevent a complete economic
collapse by exploiting the country's abundant natural resources. For instance, contracts with Thai firms over logging concession of teak forests on the Thai-Burmese border and Thai fishing rights in Burmese waters netted the regime roughly $130 million annually until 1993. The 1989-1990 sale of Burma's embassy in Tokyo also brought in $435 million during this crucial period. The ability to ensure short-term funds was vital, but so was finding a substitute patron. The 1988 normalization in Sino-Burmese relations provided a longer-term lifeline to the regime. China rapidly became the main provider of low-cost loans and guns. Although over-dependence on China posed a long-term strategic threat, knowledge of a stable economic relationship undoubtedly reduced short-term apprehensions among officers within the SLORC of complete international isolation. Access to "black knight" support enables regimes to survive crises by reducing the leverage of traditional patrons. This task is easier for regimes like the Tatmadaw's that possess abundant natural resources and are located at important geopolitical cross-roads.

Togo offers another example of fair weather patron support for a UI campaign unable to oust a deeply entrenched, quasi-civilian military dictatorship. The armed forces served as a linchpin to the longevity of President Gnassingbé Eyadéma. One artifact of Togo's independence was the dominance of northern tribes in the military, particularly the Kabye from Eyadéma's home region. After his 1967 coup, Eyadéma reinforced this pattern. Officer promotion policies favored northerners; new soldiers were predominantly Kabye; and, Kabye officers and soldiers

---

46 Seekins, Disorder in Order, 252-254.
47 The term black knight originally referred to countries that undermine the effectiveness of international sanction regimes by providing the targeted regime assistance. History and Current Policy, Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Jeffrey J. Schott, and Kimberley Ann Elliott, vol. 1, Economic Sanctions Reconsidered. 3rd ed. (Washington DC: Peterson Institute, 2007), 47. More recently, this term has come to refer to external states that bolster authoritarian regimes. Levitsky and Way, Competitive Authoritarianism, 41.
48 While the Tatmadaw unlikely possessed a visionary strategy, its policy to normalize relations with China created significant pressures on India, Japan, and Thailand to prevent China from gaining economic and geopolitical hegemony in this part of Southeast Asia. These fears contributed to the diplomatic strategy of "constructive dialogue" that further reduced the Tatmadaw's isolation after the early 1990s.
exclusively filled the ranks of powerful army units, like the Presidential Guard. This coup-proofing strategy based on ethnic loyalties provided a key source of regime cohesion. The creation of the Rassemblement du Peuple Togolais (RPT) offered another means to institutionalize the army into political life. Finally, regime control over key industries beginning with the nationalization of phosphate production in the mid-1970s increased the number of patronage positions and contributed to the development of state corporatism. Relative stability held sway for the next decade. However, a prolonged economic downturn in the 1980s significantly shrunk the available sources of patronage and increased political dissent. The World Bank's structural adjustment programs (SAP) also caused mass layoffs in the large public sector. Aware of the political developments in Eastern Europe and its neighbors, the Togolese opposition channeled these economic grievances into demands for political change.

Foreseeing these developments, Eyadéma attempted to demonstrate an early willingness to initiate political reforms. For instance, in response to an Amnesty report on torture, he created a national human rights commission in 1987. In May 1990, the RPT discussed political reforms, but rejected the option of multi-party elections. As opposition pressure mounted, however, insistence on a one-party political system softened. After a bloody crackdown on pro-democracy demonstrations, Eyadéma convened a constitutional commission in October 1990. The resulting draft document included a provision for a multi-party political system and encouraged a national referendum by December 1991. During the following spring, several clashes, often violent, occurred between the police and protesters, many of whom were students. The opposition

49 Morency-LaFlamme, "Missing Link."
51 Ibid., 1033.
formed an umbrella organization, the Collective Democratic Organization (COD), and continued to push for a national conference similar to the one held in Benin the prior year. By mid-June, Eyadéma conceded to this demand, but insisted the conference not be sovereign. Yet, the June accords "stipulated that the conference decisions could not be over-ruled by any of the signatories," which the opposition interpreted as sovereignty in all but name.

The opposition refused to recognize the domestic balance of power and overplayed its hand by declaring the National Conference sovereign on the second day. Regime and military representatives walked out, with only the regime delegation returning under the pretense that conference decisions were non-binding. The subsequent insistence to hold the regime responsible for past crimes played into Eyadéma's hands as he warned that the Southern-dominated transitional legislature, the High Council of the Republic (HCR), would carry out pogroms against Northerners.

The conclusion of the National Conference marked the beginning of dual sovereignty. Intense extra-institutional bargaining between the HCR's elected Prime Minister, Kokou Koffigoh, and Eyadéma persisted over the next two years. With de facto control over the coercive apparatus, the latter held the trump card. In October, the armed forces attempted to

---

53 The COD I actually emerged from the formation of earlier umbrella organizations, the Front des associations pour le renouveau (FAR) and Front d'opposition démocratique (FOD). COD II succeeded COD I in the struggle against Eyadéma in mid-1992.


55 Although Togo and Benin share important structural similarities, such as high ethnic fractionalization and "politcized tribalism," several differences exist between these cases. For instance, Benin was absolutely bankrupt; Togo merely faced a serious economic downturn. Such observations on the differences between the economic conditions in these countries complement the thesis posited here concerning the importance of patrons and military cohesion. First, in regard to the loyalty of the military to the political status-quo, this economic difference was crucial. Whereas President Kérékou faced the real possibility of a coup in 1988 due to constant cuts in the military budget, Eyadéma increased the salaries of the Togolese armed forces by five percent. Kathryn Nwajiaku, "The National Conferences in Benin and Togo Revisited," *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 32, No. 3 (1994): 432.

carry out coups against Koffigoh twice. On both occasions, Eyadéma stayed above the fray by appealing to national unity and urging the soldiers to respect the HCR. Yet, after Koffigoh reiterated the HCR's decision to dissolve the RPT in late November, the armed forces kidnapped him. In subsequent consultations with Eyadéma, the PM acquiesced to the president's demands that included the maintenance of the ruling party.

Tensions within the opposition mounted in 1992 as Eyadéma reconsolidated power through a campaign of intimidation, assassination, and managed chaos. To emasculate the opposition further, the military held the HCR hostage in October 1992. This set in motion a nine month general strike widely followed in Southern Togo, where most of the country's economic activity occurs. Despite this display of civil disobedience, disillusionment with Koffigoh caused an open split within opposition ranks in early 1993. Having finally divided his opponents, Eyadéma bargained from a position of strength. During an international mediation effort in the Burkinabé capital of Ouagadougou in July, the opposition begrudgingly agreed to multi-party elections in August. The subsequent refusal to allow popular opposition candidates to compete coupled with numerous pre-election irregularities led to an opposition boycott. Eyadéma won with 96.4 percent of the popular vote.

Throughout this crisis, France possessed considerable leverage. French bilateral aid annually averaged four percent of Togo's GDP between 1989-1991 and France maintained tight control over the value of Togo's national currency, the CFA. A defense agreement also existed between the two countries and the metropole historically displayed little compunction in

---

57 Eyadéma often argued that the RPT enabled the country to "overcome tribal divisions." Heilbrunn, "Stalled Reform," 230.
58 By the fall of 1992, "Eyadéma was powerful enough to unilaterally modify articles the HCR had drafted to prevent him running for executive office again." Seely, "Legacies of Transition Governments," 368.
violating the sovereignty of its former colonies when intervention suited its interests.\(^59\) Similar to other dictators in Francophone Africa, Mitterand's address at the annual Franco-African summit at La Baule in April 1990 stunned Eyadéma. Upending years of practice, the French president linked aid to democracy. The challenge for Togo's leader was to discern the extent to which Mitterand meant what he said. French words and deeds were unclear. Two months before La Baule, Jacques Chirac, the leader of the French opposition party (RPR) and mayor of Paris, described multi-partyism as a 'political error' for developing countries.\(^60\) Yet, the newly appointed French ambassador, Bruno Delaye, pressed Eyadéma to accept the June Accords under the assumption that a National Conference would cause Eyadéma's regime to collapse.\(^61\) Once a smooth political transition proved elusive, the French position toward Togo appeared to undergo a serious policy review.

By November 1991, President Mitterand seemed to have had a change of heart. To Koffigoh's dismay, the French President explained that France would not interfere in its African partner's political affairs, adding that "each country would move at its own 'rhythm.'"\(^62\) Days later, Eyadéma seemed ready to test France's commitment to the HCR by kidnapping Koffigoh, who requested, but never received military assistance to protect his mandate from the national conference.\(^63\) To add insult to injury, Koffigoh was informed that the head of government could not make such requests. This right was reserved for the head of state, Gnassingbé Eyadéma.\(^64\)

\(^{59}\) For instance, an attempted coup in 1986 activated a secretive defense pact. France sent 250 paratroopers to Togo to help Eyadéma's re-establish political order over the following fortnight.


\(^{61}\) Heilbrunn, "Stalled Reform," 229.


\(^{63}\) Nwajiaku, "The National Conferences," 440-41. France dispatched only ten of its 300 soldiers to Benin's capital into Lomé with the sole purpose of protecting French citizens.

\(^{64}\) Houngnikpo, "Democratization in Africa," 60.
Fears of ethnic violence subsequently increased the number of cross-border refugees and contributed to growing tensions with Ghana, which eventually mobilized troops on its border with Togo in early 1993. The French priority became stability and Paris appeared more than willing to stick with the devil they knew. Just to clarify matters, the French Prime Minister, Pierre Bérégovoy, privately stated at the 1992 Franco-African summit held in Gabon that "when confronted with the simultaneous and potentially conflicting goals of promoting democracy, ensuring development, and maintaining security, francophone African leaders were expected to adhere to the following order of priorities: first and foremost, security; followed by development and, finally, democratisation." A visit to Togo in December by Jacques Pasqua, a leading RPR figure, provided further assurance, "If the opposition (RPR) wins the March elections and forms the new government, do not doubt that we will deliver all necessary assistance to Togo." Eyadéma had little reason to worry about the general strike. He had the support from the North, the military, and key members of the French political elite forecast to retake power in Paris. In a coup de grâce, France helped broker the agreement reached in Ouagadougou by making "it known to the opposition that its only option was to cooperate with Eyadéma." Most Western nations did not recognize the August elections riddled with irregularities, but France readily endorsed the results.

This UI campaign reveals patterns apparent in other deviant cases. First, Togo's regime was insulated from domestic and external pressure due to the ethno-military ties with the regime's leadership. Dislodging this equilibrium required sustained, firm, and coordinated action

---

66 *Agence France Presse*, December 25, 1992 quoted in Nwajiaku, "The National Conferences," 441-442, author's translation. Despite reductions in aid assistance from Germany and the US, the Paris Club of international creditors devised ways to alleviate Togo's debt. Such generous packages, however, were not forthcoming when Beninese president Kérékou faced similar circumstances in 1989.
67 Houngnikpo, "Democratization in Africa," 61.
from France and the COD, which never materialized. Second, patron states are not unitary actors with extant blueprints on how to react to these unforeseen upheavals in client regimes. The foreign policy process is messy. Bureaucratic, organizational and domestic politics contributes to the prevalence of mixed messages. In Togo, French resolve for real reform was unclear despite the La Baule proclamation. As Eyadéma gathered information, he correctly gauged the French commitment to the opposition's goals for democracy as cosmetic and ratcheted up pressure on his opponents accordingly. Third, patrons are risk-averse when anarchy appears a possibility. Besieged leaders are aware of this fact and attempt to inflate such apprehensions. In Togo, Eyadéma played on Kabye fears of Ewe domination and fostered fears in France of Togolese and regional instability. Thus, France came to support Eyadéma partly because large-scale, inter-communal violence along salient ethnic cleavages seemed possible.

In conclusion, this section assayed to identify volitional and institutional factors that clarify why patron interventions during UI campaigns sometimes fail. Given the complexity and contingency of these events, this exercise is fraught with countless pitfalls. That said, certain hypotheses do emerge from this subset of deviant cases that deserve attention. In regard to failed patron intervention on the side of the campaign, certain domestic institutional arrangements appear resilient even under substantial multi-vector pressure from UI campaigns and patron states. One shortcoming of the strategic interactions approach to political transitions is the failure "to address the factors that shape actors' preferences and capabilities ... and the conditions under which they might change over time."68 Regimes where the military institution benefits disproportionately from the political and economic status quo produces a scenario that empowers hardliners and incentivizes them to reject opposition demands as second-best solutions. Fear of

---

losing key prerogatives and faith in its ability to resort to significant levels of repression if necessary makes these regimes tough targets for UI campaigns. External pressure can close the negotiation gap between the two sides, but under these conditions even the patron may not possess sufficient leverage or resolve to bend the entrenched regime willing to protect the status quo at great costs.

A few other factors appear to affect a patron's ability to influence UI campaign outcomes. First, patron intervention should have a greater impact on regime elite calculations if no substitute patron is available. Aside from the cases of dueling patrons, short-term black knight support can diminish the effect of "feast or famine" tactics. Second, strong leadership from top decision-makers in the patron state is required to prevent mixed signals. In the case of patron support for a political transition, the need for an unambiguous message backed by credible threats increases when UI campaigns target resilient regimes. Third, patron states place stability and national interest before abstract ideals, like democratization. If the patron prefers the opposition challenger to or minimally perceives it as a tolerable substitute for the regime leadership, then it may shift support to the opposition. Similarly, if state collapse appears a possibility, the patron will back the regime or attempt to broker a pacted transition depending on which policy seems the most expeditious way to re-establish an acceptable political order. The problem here is that the patron is not monolithic. Government bureaucracies, interests groups, and political parties assess these issues differently. Even if there is overall agreement on the strategic aim, significant differences can still emerge over tactics. Under these circumstances, strong leadership is necessary to overcome coordination problems and present an unambiguous message for political transition. If this is not forthcoming, leaders of entrenched regimes will "stall for survival," seeking to create wedges in the opposition and to win back the patron.
III. Case Selection for Qualitative Analysis of Patron Intervention

The previous section introduced six cases deviating from the expectation that patron state interventions alter UI campaign outcomes. These brief analytic narratives revealed several working hypotheses related to a patron's ability to adopt an effective policy during UI campaigns, and functioned as plausibility probes for the domestic institutional hypothesis. The next six chapters explore four UI campaigns in greater detail in the hope of striking the right balance between theoretical description, theory-testing, and further theory development. Four criteria guide case selection. First, I select cases that approximate the ideal-type causal mechanisms – "isolate and unite," "feast or famine," and "decapitation" – to illustrate in greater detail how these tactics affected specific UI campaigns. Second, to reduce the number of potential confounding factors, the US is a key patron seeking to oust the incumbent regime in each case study. Third, I strove to create pairs of cases that approximated Mill's most-similar case design when possible to address some methodological concerns related to assessments of causality based on single case studies. Finally, the typological space presented in figure 3.1 proved useful for identifying "tough cases" that did not appear over-determined by domestic-level factors. These last two criteria are important for selecting appropriate cases that address the endogeneity concerns related to patrons as fence-sitters. The rest of this section provides further justification for the selection of each in-depth case study.

---


70 George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development*, 253. Over-determined cases are less useful for testing or building a theory of external intervention. This includes hypothetical cases "A" located in the typological space in figure 3.1. In contrast, hypothetical case "B" would provide a tough test for the hypothesis that external intervention is a sufficient condition that determines UI campaign outcomes.

71 The key question regarding the statistical correlations is whether the relationship is causal, and if so, whether causation runs from probability for success to probability of patron switch, or vice versa, or sometimes one and sometimes the other. The statistical models implicitly assume that a patron's decision whether and how to intervene
Chapters four and five investigate the UI campaigns that occurred in South Korea during the 1980s. Figure 3.1 reveals that US support for the campaign in South Korea during 1987 presents a "least likely" case for successful patron intervention.\(^72\) The military regime was highly cohesive due to the acute external military threat posed by North Korea. Washington's ability to leverage its asymmetric relationship with the regime was limited because of the strategic value attached to ensuring the territorial integrity and free-market system of South Korea. As a result, the Reagan administration relied on a strategy of "isolate and unite" that combined timely public statements with private warnings to potential spoilers. Sustained, low-level pressure strengthened the voices of moderation within the regime and nudged the military toward compromise in 1987. In contrast, the Carter administration largely remained a honest broker during the UI campaign from 1979 to 1980. Such quiet diplomacy attempted to steer the political transition toward a civilian government without exerting undue pressure on any side. This risk-averse effort to remain a neutral facilitator provided room for regime hardliners to sideline a significant number of elite reformers. In line with expectations, the 1980 campaign ended with the slaughter of about 200 protesters, the imposition of martial law, and authoritarian retrenchment for seven additional years. In contrast, the 1987 campaign culminated in a political opening that led to free and fair democratic elections six months later.

The similarities between these two cases suggest that a "structured, focused comparison" using Mill's method of difference is appropriate.\(^73\) First, the main opposition and military is orthogonal to the unfolding domestic processes. However, like key domestic actors, patron states adopt policies that maximize interests. The fatalistic withdraw of support from a client regime whose collapse is inevitable indicates the presence of an omitted variable. Thus, the identification and careful illustration of causal mechanisms in particular historical cases is necessary to demonstrate how patron state policies independently influence campaign outcome. This methodological challenge presents an additional reason for undertaking qualitative case studies to establish process-tracing evidence that provides insight into potential endogeneity concerns.

\(^72\) George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development*, 120-123.

\(^73\) Ibid., 67-72.
protagonists are the same, as are structural and institutional factors that vary substantially across countries. Second, theories based on economic conditions run counter to expectations. The military regime survived despite economic stagnation in 1980, whereas a political transition took place as the economy boomed in 1987. Third, the Carter administration's decision to avoid public pressure on the regime was significantly motivated by events far removed from local developments on the Korean peninsula, such as the Nicaraguan and Iranian revolutions as well as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. In other words, US reaction was not solely driven by the size of the campaign thereby alleviating some concerns related to endogeneity. While many factors are held constant, one flaw with Mill's method of difference is the potential of omitted variables. Indeed, some alternative explanations exist that purportedly account for the variation in outcomes. Thus, process-tracing evidence helps determine the degree to which US intervention alone was a necessary and/or sufficient condition to alter the regime's decision to shoot in 1980 and concede in 1987. One final reason for selecting these two cases is related to the quantitative results discussed earlier. A shift from patron neutrality to campaign support appeared to affect UI campaign outcomes, but to a far lesser degree than a shift from regime support to neutrality. These cases offer a real world example to unpack this less robust statistical finding.

Chapter six explores the way patron states adjust financial aid or apply economic sanctions during UI campaigns. Regimes that face a budgetary or debt crisis are particularly vulnerable to this "feast or famine" mechanism. I present two mini-case studies on Haiti in 1985-86 and Cameroon in 1991 to illustrate how manipulation of aid influences UI campaign outcomes. I then explore Panama as an important deviant case. Beginning in the summer of 1987, the highly asymmetric patron-client relationship turned openly sour. In contrast to half-hearted patron support of UI campaigns in Nigeria, Togo, and Burma, the US espoused a series
of coercive measures to help topple General Manuel Noriega. By the spring of 1988, normalization in bilateral relations appeared impossible without Noriega's exit from power. Despite aggressive economic sanctions, the US failed to remove the general from power. Given Noriega's ability to survive US and domestic pressure, this "most-likely" crucial case raises doubts about a patron's ability to influence UI campaign outcomes in general.74

The linkage between the military's perceived institutional prerogatives and the current regime combined with several coup-proofing measures helped Noriega survive the acute liquidity crisis. Yet, the economic rents available to the regime paled in comparison to those in Nigeria and the US was not dependent on the rent source. In fact, the US actively opposed drug-trafficking and gun-running in the late 1980s, which were key sources for rents when Noriega came to power a few years earlier. Moreover, the general could not court an alternative patron as Myanmar had because the US considered the country a non-substitutable strategic asset. Thus, Noriega's ability to survive appeared to hinge on other factors. Importantly, some key figures in the Reagan administration were unprepared to apply maximal psychological and material pressure during this period of acute vulnerability. Bureaucratic infighting and a lack of strong presidential leadership contributed to a patron policy that attempted to nickel and dime the dictator, thereby missing a window of opportunity. Thus, Noriega's anomalous ability to survive joint internal and external pressure confirms many of the patterns uncovered from the other deviant cases.

The final three chapters investigate the golden parachute tactic associated with the "decapitation" mechanism, whereby key actors are provided guarantees from future prosecution

74 Nepstad (Nonviolent Revolutions, 73-4) investigates the resilience of Noriega's regime with the underlying implication that the effectiveness of external interventions during UI campaigns is questionable due to regime counterstrategies and difficulties patrons face in targeting the leader's, not the population's, interests.
of past crimes in exchange for enabling a political transition. This policy tool should lower the cost of leadership exit and make the likelihood of campaign success greater. Yet, assessing the effectiveness of this mechanism is difficult. First, such offers are discussed behind closed doors. The revealed case population does not capture the actual number of attempts where golden parachutes are offered, but ultimately rejected. Second, in some cases, such as Haiti and the Philippines in 1986, leaders take the opportunity for golden exile only when regime collapse is imminent. To evaluate how instrumental this policy tool is in facilitating a political transition, I compare golden parachute offers to Noriega in 1987 and 1988 as well as to Yemeni President Saleh in the spring and fall of 2011. Admittedly, the differences between these cases are far greater than the similarities; however, few cases exist where patrons negotiate golden parachutes during extended political stalemates caused by UI campaigns. Moreover, President Saleh eventually accepted personal security, but Noriega did not. More revealing than the ultimate outcomes, however, are the similarities in negotiating the leadership's exit. Noriega rejected offers on two separate occasions, while Saleh rejected a golden parachute several times before finally accepting one seven months after the initial severance package offer. This temporal variation provides additional insight into the multiple challenges confronting all parties involved in such negotiations and the conditions under which these guarantees are satisfactory to risk-acceptant leaders.

The subsequent chapters divide each of the aforementioned case studies into several subsections roughly arrayed in the following manner. First, I analyze the nature of the regime, the opposition, and the client regime's relationship to the patron. The next section provides a brief narrative of the UI campaign. This background information provides the necessary context for the subsequent causal analysis. I then discuss the actions taken by the patron during each UI
campaign and review the effect such policies appear to have had on the outcome. The final section reviews alternative hypotheses related to other factors that purportedly explain the campaign outcomes. An overview of alternative causal explanations is useful for addressing issues related to the causal chain of events, endogeneity, and potential factors that mediate the ability of patrons to intervene effectively.

* * * * *

By focusing on the deviant cases, this chapter developed a typological space to determine whether certain domestic institutional factors that are difficult to operationalize for quantitative analysis may explain why external interventions sometimes fail. No common variable links the two cases where UI campaigns succeeded despite patron support for the regime. However, regimes where the military institution enjoys unique benefits from the political and economic status quo appear more resilient in the face of acute domestic and international pressure. The following section explored six deviant cases. These brief analytic narratives probed the plausibility of the domestic institutional hypothesis and identified other patterns that appeared to affect the patron's ability to shape the short-term outcomes of UI campaigns. The final section presented the criteria used to select four in-depth case studies, which I use to illustrate the theoretical causal mechanisms, to evaluate issues related to endogeneity, and to refine the overall theoretical framework.
Chapter 4: 
Isolate and Unite I: South Korea 1979-1980

In chapter two, I identified three mechanisms patrons use to alter elite defection rates or to change the intra-regime balance of power between hardliners and softliners. Tactics linked to the "divide and unite" mechanism often entail more subtle forms of external intervention. Patrons rely on such tactics when the perceived degree of asymmetric interdependence diminishes, that is, when threats of overt coercion are considered not credible, impractical, or counterproductive. The US-Korean relationship is useful to tease out a patron's ability to influence UI campaign outcomes using such tactics. As discussed earlier, the 1979-80 and 1987 UI campaigns share many similarities that render the application of Mill's method of difference appropriate.

This chapter explores the role played by the US during the 1979-1980 case. The first section describes key features of Park Chung Hee's regime, its relationship to an emerging civil society, and the US-Korean security relationship. After providing a narrative of key events that occurred during the 1979-1980 UI campaign, I review the US quiet diplomatic approach to the transition crisis. The final section explores whether the US goals of stability, economic growth, and political liberalization left the Carter administration any choice but to adopt a role as neutral mediator. Whether this foreign policy approach contributed to the Korean leadership's tragic decision to adopt a military solution that culminated in the Kwangju massacre of May 1980 is also touched upon in this section, but this line of inquiry is pursued further in chapter five.

I. The Political Environment

I.a. The Yushin System

The 1960 elections provided a focal point for the opposition to challenge the ruling Liberal Party (LP) and strongman President Syngman Rhee. The 86-year-old President's re-
election appeared secure as the opposition candidate had died weeks earlier, but his age required preparation for leadership succession. Regime hardliners proceeded to steal the Vice Presidential elections from incumbent Chang Myŏn of the Democratic Party (DP) in favor of LP candidate, Yi Ki-Bung.\(^1\) Up to 10,000 citizens protested the electoral fraud in Masan on March 15\(^{th}\). Police brutality inflamed the situation, but the military's arrival the following day restored order. On April 11\(^{th}\), a fisherman found the body of a young student killed during the mid-March unrest. This discovery reignited rage over the election and general discontent with the status quo.\(^2\)

On April 19\(^{th}\), 100,000 students converged on the presidential palace to denounce police violence and demand new elections. Once more, the police employed excessive force by firing live rounds into the crowd. Riots ensued. The implementation of martial law that evening restored a semblance of order, but 186 people had been killed, and over 1,600 injured. In the days that followed, regime moderates and US officials pushed Rhee to make significant concessions and disabused him of the notion that the unrest was due to North Korean machinations.\(^3\) For its part, the Martial Law Command (MLC) under General Song adopted a

---


2 In regard to demographics and revolution, a high rate of youth unemployment in urban centers creates an environment ripe for revolt. Jack A. Goldstone, "Understanding the Revolutions of 2011," *Foreign Affairs* 90, No. 3 (2011): 12. This condition is applicable to Korea in 1960. From 1948 to 1958, the number of college and university students grew from 35,000 to 140,000. Gregg A. Brazinsky, *Nation Building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the Making of a Democracy* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 44. This population was concentrated in major metropolitan areas, particularly Seoul, and quickly internalized Western political ideals, especially democracy and human rights. Meanwhile, Rhee's import substitution industrialization policy kept the pockets of regime insiders lined, but achieved meager 3 to 4 percent growth rates. Not only was North Korea's post-war economic recovery far more robust, but such anemic growth exacerbated the student problem. Only somewhere between 10-50% of graduating students could find gainful employment. This left a sizeable portion of ideologically motivated individuals with little to lose. One student of Korean politics describes Seoul in the late 1950s as "one of the greatest and most incendiary concentrations of student and intellectual discontent anywhere in the world." Gregory Henderson, *Korea: The Politics of the Vortex* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 170.

strict policy of impartiality. The decision of about 200 professors to march in solidarity with students on April 25th reinvigorated the flagging demonstrations. Noting the decision of the military and police not to stop this small protest in downtown Seoul, bystanders joined. The protest swelled to over 100,000 participants leading to Rhee's resignation the following day. As a formative experience for future politicians and civil society leaders, the "4.19" protest left an indelible mark on the collective conscience of an entire generation.

One year later, incessant street demonstrations coupled with continued economic malaise incapacitated Chang Myŏn's government, which lacked mature institutions to channel discontent. Impatient with the "turmoil" associated with democratic practices and suspicious of the young democracy's ability to maintain order, Park Chung-Hee along with 30 colonels and junior generals carried out a bloodless coup on May 16th, 1961. Despite initial reservations concerning Park's character and path to power, the allied governments reached a satisfactory modus vivendi. Park reluctantly allowed democratic elections in 1963 with the implicit understanding that the system would continue to curtail certain basic rights associated with liberal democracies. These authoritarian tendencies proved useful for overcoming popular protests in the mid-1960s related to two US priorities: the normalization of relations with Japan and the deployment of Korean troops to Vietnam.

---

4 Kim, The Fall of Syngman Rhee, 128-142. General Song Yo-Chan reportedly avoided and ignored Rhee's requests to visit the Presidential palace because he felt incapable of refusing orders he anticipated would include proactive repression. Years later, General Song contended that the soldiers would have faithfully carried out orders from commanding officers, including the use of deadly force on demonstrators.
7 Park benefitted handsomely for enacting these controversial policies. For the normalization of relations, Japan provided Korea a $300 million direct grant and $200 million in loans. Japanese private firms invested $300 million
An average GDP growth rate of 9% per year from 1963 to 1970 helped legitimate Park's early rule. Although political freedoms and civil liberties contracted, a free space to express discontent remained. Park's decision to seek a third-term as president, however, prompted pockets of resistance among students and intellectuals. More surprising was opposition candidate Kim Dae Jung's (DJ) ability to tap into underlying discontent in Korean society. Park won the elections, but the narrow victory raised questions about the regime's longevity in a competitive authoritarian context. An increasingly vocal opposition led the authorities to announce the restrictive "Law Concerning Special Measures for Safeguarding National Security" on October 15th, 1971. This measure provided Park "almost unlimited emergency power ... to restrict civil liberties, mobilize the whole populace for the purpose of national security and set wages and prices for economic needs." The war on dissident activity culminated one year later with the introduction of the Yushin (revitalization) Constitution. Indirect presidential elections in the National Council for Unification, a regime-controlled electoral college, safeguarded Park's position. The adoption of Emergency Measure Number 9 (EM-9) on May 13th, 1975 embodied the extent of the regime's intolerance for any dissent. This decree even made the act of criticizing the Yushin Constitution or reporting on such critiques punishable by more than one year in prison. By this juncture, Park had managed to tame his most tenacious foe, university students.

The dense network of security institutions allowed the regime to monitor and enforce these laws. The Korean CIA, established by Kim Jong Pil after the 1961 coup, was the most feared of these institutions. The KCIA became "a state within a state, a vast shadowy world of ...

---

more in the Korean economy. For the deployment of troops to Vietnam, Korea's infant industries received profitable military contracts. 94 percent of Korea's total steel export and 52 percent of its transportation equipment exports went to Vietnam. Bruce Cumings, Korea's Place in the Sun: A Modern History (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997), 322.

8 Jang Jip Choi, Labor and the Authoritarian State: Labor Unions in South Korean Manufacturing Industries (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1990), 117, quoted in Cumings, Place in the Sun, 371.

9 Chang, Protest Dialectics, 70-77.
bureaucrats, intellectuals, agents and thugs." When it came to silencing Korean dissidents living abroad, the reach of the KCIA knew no bounds and seemed largely indifferent to ruffling feathers in Tokyo and Washington. However, in testimony to Park's innate understanding of political survival, he created checks to prevent the KCIA from emerging as an alternative power center by creating parallel, autonomous security institutions, namely the Defense Security Command, the Presidential Security Force, and the Capital Garrison Command.

Unlike Syngman Rhee, Park also enjoyed the loyalty of the army and businessmen. Besides his military background, the armed forces were satisfied with Park as an assertive leader whose policies strengthened Korea and ensured stability. For instance, the military supported his 1972 heavy and chemical industrial (HCI) plan that ran counter to traditional neoliberal economic advice that Korea focus on its comparative advantage in light industrial products. Such an economic policy based on "industrial deepening" bolstered the military's self-reliance by creating a domestic military-industrial complex at a time when US support appeared suspect. Similarly, the HCI plan enabled the massive, family-run business conglomerates known as chaebôls to extend their economic empires. This powerful set of actors had no interest in altering

---

11 Most infamously, the KCIA kidnapped DJ in Japan with the apparent intention to murder him in 1973. Rapid American intervention spared Kim's life.
12 Some students of Korean politics considered this arrangement a unique form of bureaucratic authoritarianism. See Hyug Baeg Im, "The Rise of Bureaucratic Authoritarianism in South Korea." *World Politics* 39, No. 2 (1987). Others note the conservative rural population's support for the regime. See Chong Lim Kim, Young Whan Kihl, and Seong-Tong Pai, "The Modes of Citizen Political Participation: An Analysis of Nationwide Survey Results," in *Political Participation in Korea*, ed. Chong Lim Kim (Santa Barbara, CA: Clio Press, 1980), 45. This support was partly due to the popularity of Park's New Village (Saemaul) Program, which was meant to decrease the gap in rural-urban disparity. The degree to which this policy succeeded is disputed, but the political symbolism appeared to help bolster the regime's support in rural communities. Stephan Haggard and Chung-in Moon, "The State, Politics, and Economic Development in Postwar South Korea," in *State and Society in Contemporary Korea*, ed. Hagen Koo (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 79.
13 KCIA director Lee Hu Rak prevented the one alleged coup plan hatched by Yun Pil Yong, who commanded the Capitol Garrison. Clifford, *Troubled Tiger*, 147.
14 Haggard and Moon, "Postwar South Korea," 76.
an arrangement that benefitted them in at least two ways. First, Park provided preferential benefits to these favored firms "through tax concessions, special rates on railway transportation, and bank loans at preferential interest rates." Second, the state helped these corporations keep worker wages low by stifling autonomous labor organizations. For instance, the Committee to Counteract Labor Insurgency (Love the Company Corps) broke up factory strikes and sit-ins with the help of paratroopers and policemen.

By 1979, Park had forged a high-capacity, cohesive regime. The likelihood of defection was low; the military and powerful businessmen had much to lose and little to gain by challenging the political status quo. The real threat posed by North Korea provided an additional layer of cohesion and legitimacy to the conservative ruling coalition. The highly professional military remained fiercely loyal to President Park and the construction of a garrison state seemed justifiable to protect Korean society from pernicious elements, including a possible fifth-column.

1.b. The Opposition

The effect of the Yushin Constitution on the opposition and civil society was two-fold. First, periods of harsh, sustained repression make the cost of confrontational protest actions prohibitively high. Thus, disruptive demonstrations largely disappeared from Korean politics.


16 Brazinsky, Nation Building in South Korea, 146-147. For instance, chaebois obtained bank loans that amounted to a negative interest rate ranging between 7 to 15 percent. Clifford, Troubled Tiger, 134. This occurred because chaebois received subsidized bank loans during a period of high inflation. Because the state owned or tightly controlled most banks, it was as if the state was just giving the chaebois money. As Cumings (Place in the Sun, 317) wryly observes, "Not bad, somebody paying you nearly 7 percent to take his money."

17 Selig S. Harrison, "Dateline South Korea: A Divided Seoul," Foreign Policy, No. 67 (1987): 162. Cumings (Place in the Sun, 371) describes collective bargaining during the 1970s as "subject to the whim of the president; only the right to organize remained on the books."

after the anti-Yushin student movement in the early 1970s. The second, counterintuitive result was the formation of incipient alliances between different societal groups that broadened and deepened the opposition's capacity to challenge the regime in the future.19

The self-immolation of Chun Tae-II on November 13th, 1970 during a small protest in the Seoul garment district proved a critical event in the formation of the early labor movement. This desperate protest action by a 22-year-old tailor and worker rights advocate awoke students to the broader brutal reality of worker exploitation under the harsh Labor Standard Laws. Church organizations also reached out. Motivated by the politically-imbued liberation theology, where improving the living conditions of society was a central tenet, organizations like the Urban Industrial Mission provided avenues for workers to develop greater class consciousness.20 Thus, despite the harsh conditions imposed by the Yushin system, societal atomization typical of most communist dictatorships did not occur. Instead, extensive state repression provided the necessary pressure to forge interpersonal, ideological, and eventually institutionalized linkages between students, churches, journalists, lawyers, intellectuals, laborers, and politicians.21 The resulting minjung ("the mass of the people") movement took another decade to fully mature.22 Still, chaeya ("in opposition") movement associations increased during the mid- and late-1970s, which altered the qualitative nature of Korean civil society and the strength of the opposition.

The bridging process between individuals and activist networks formed "more stable, permanent, and extensive" national movement associations.23 This coalition building also tapped into the growing discontent of the labor class that increased from 31.7% of the total working

---

19 See Chang, Protest Dialectics, 175-195.
20 For more on the role of churches on the formation of class consciousness in the Korean context, see Hagen Koo, Korean Workers: The Culture and Politics of Class Formation (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), 74-78.
21 Chang, Protest Dialectics, 199-201.
22 Koo, Korean Workers, 142-146.
23 Kim, Democratization in Korea, 58.
population in 1960 to 44.7% in 1980. On the eve of Park's assassination, the opposition was more robust than in 1960. Network ties between opposition sites were thicker and a strategic alliance was beginning to form with certain politicians in the New Democratic Party (NDP), an opposition party that appeared increasingly capable of competing against Park's Democratic Republican Party (DRP). Nevertheless, ties across these various islands of opposition remained tenuous and "the coalition between civil society and political society, principally predicated on individual commitments and connections, was not very systematic or stable."  

1.c. US-ROK Relations

US-Korean relations underwent a significant evolution under Park due to the economic "miracle on the Han" and external geopolitical developments. From 1960 to 1979, Korea's GDP grew 28 fold, whereas total US non-military aid shrank 15 fold. As a result, US officials increasingly had difficulty identifying ways to apply sufficient pressure that could effectively deter its Korean ally from adopting undesirable policies.

The US military presence of 40,000 American troops was the main source of material leverage remaining, but most US officials were unwilling to make military assistance conditional

---

24 Koo (Korean Workers, 17) contends that this structural shift toward the cities and the concentration of workers provided propitious structural conditions for the formation of a working class consciousness. The university student and Christian community populations were also growing rapidly. Korea's college and university student population increased from 8,000 in 1945 to 223,000 by 1973. The Christian population grew from 300,000 believers in North and South Korea in 1945 to 4.3 million in South Korea alone in 1974. Don Oberdorfer, The Two Koreas: A Contemporary History (New York: Basic Books, 2001), 49-50. Urbanization also continued. In 1979, 55% of the population lived in cities up from 28.6% in 1961. In contrast, the proportion of people employed in agriculture shrank from 66% in 1960 to 35% in 1980. Young Whan Kihl, Transforming Korean Politics: Democracy, Reform, and Culture (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2005), 72. These trends are important because the rural population remained loyal under traditional hierarchical arrangements, while young, highly educated men living in urban areas were the demographic most likely to oppose the regime. Kim, Kihl, and Pai, "Citizen Political Participation," 44-46.

25 The NDP garnered slightly more votes than the DPR in the December 1978 legislative elections. As a result, the NDP gained nine more seats in the National Assembly and controlled 61 out of 231 seats overall. An internal NDP vote was even more disconcerting for the Park regime. Kim Young Sam (YS) narrowly defeated the former NDP president, Yi Ch'ol Sung. Sung adopted a conciliatory position toward Park's regime, but YS widely voiced his desire to fight the regime through any means at his disposal.

26 Kim, Democratization in Korea, 138.

on any particular issue because they feared Park would call their bluff.\textsuperscript{28} Yet, Park perceived American retrenchment as a real possibility. In July 1969, Nixon introduced a new foreign policy direction, known as the Guam Doctrine, where the "United States would assist in 'the defense and development of allies and friends' but would not 'undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world.'"\textsuperscript{29} Although words at the time, Park's worst fears of abandonment appeared justified; verbal assurances of America's commitment to Korean security were insufficient. In 1970, Nixon unilaterally informed his ally that he was withdrawing an entire army division, or 20,000 troops, from Korea. In 1973, Kissinger went behind South Vietnamese leader Thiệu's back and signed the Paris Peace Accords with Hanoi to end official hostilities in Vietnam. Park viewed this as a treacherous act. Saigon later fell in 1975. Park could not help but reach a pessimistic conclusion regarding the US commitment. He subsequently scrutinized the US strategy of détente worrying about backroom deals between the US and North Korea's patrons.\textsuperscript{30}

This sense of insecurity led Park to accelerate plans to obtain a nuclear weapon. Development of the bomb was well underway when India carried out its first successful nuclear test in 1974. In an effort to prevent further proliferation, the US began to search for other countries with the capability and motivation to develop nuclear weapons. South Korea was at the top of this list.\textsuperscript{31} In relatively short order, Washington had evidence of Park's contract to acquire French technology. For over a year, Park rebuffed US efforts to have him abandon his nuclear

\textsuperscript{28} Additionally, the US provided significant direct military assistance to Korea that helped the developing nation free funds that otherwise would have gone to finance its national defense. From 1961 to 1973, direct military defense assistance exceeded one billion dollars in all but two years and reached over three billion in 1971 and 1972. From 1974 to 1979, this assistance declined, ranging between $428 to $785 million dollars. See USAID, \textit{US Overseas Loans and Grants}.

\textsuperscript{29} Brazinsky, \textit{Nation Building in South Korea}, 149.

\textsuperscript{30} The US policy was largely unrelated to Korea. Nixon wanted Chinese support in negotiating a peace over Vietnam and sought to leverage tensions between the Soviet Union and China to his advantage.

\textsuperscript{31} James V. Young, \textit{Eye on Korea: An Insider Account of Korean-American Relations} (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2003), 15-21.
project. Eventually, however, he canceled the French contract when the US finally threatened a
full review of the US-Korean alliance. Contrary to pessimistic assessments about America's
ability to influence Korea, this episode demonstrated that the US "retained the clout in the mid-
1970s to overwhelm even the most determined intentions of the Seoul government."{32}

On the other hand, President Carter's inflexible policies demonstrated the limits of this
leverage. Only one week after his inauguration, Carter issued Presidential Review Memorandum
(PRM) 13 that requested the military's opinion on US ground force withdrawal from the Korean
Peninsula. PRM-13 did not ask whether or how many troops could be safely withdrawn. To the
dismay of many US officials, only three options were presented, all related to the speed at which
complete troop withdrawal should occur. Over the next two years, this policy was defanged.
Strong bureaucratic and strategic interests coupled with a new national intelligence estimate
concerning North Korea's increased capabilities prevented Carter from pushing his directive
through Congress.{33} Carter reluctantly accepted the face-saving measure of withdrawing one
battalion of troops and 2,600 non-combat personnel in April 1979. Carter's second major policy
initiative toward Korea was human rights promotion.{34} Despite advice to focus his human rights

---

{32} Oberdorfer, The Two Koreas, 73.
{33} The Defense Intelligence Agency spearheaded this reassessment. North Korean forces appeared much more
capable than previously assumed. These findings reinforced concerns related to the discovery of three secret tunnels
under the demilitarized zone (DMZ) from 1974 to 1978. North Korea once again appeared to have offensive
intentions and capabilities, which increased the fears among US policymakers and analysts regarding the unintended
consequences of withdrawing ground forces. Young, Eye on Korea, 41-46.
{34} Carter's desire to reduce troop deployments to Korea always had some backing within Washington since the
Eisenhower administration. Young, Eye on Korea, 174. The complete failure to achieve a significant reduction in
troop deployment was due to the manner in which he pushed the agenda. Why Carter did not link the issue of troop
reductions to human rights performance remains unclear. (The Two Koreas, 103) conveys a President with a visceral
belief that both policies were justified. Perhaps bargaining one for the other was dismissed outright. Other scholars
argue that the Carter administration was unwilling to link defense issues to political rights and civil liberties due to
security concerns. Manwoo Lee, "Double Patronage Toward South Korea: Security Vs. Democracy and Human
Lee, and Ronald McLaurin (Seoul: Kyungman University Press, 1988), 38. This was the case by late 1979, but
Carter appeared determined to change the fundamental nature of the defense alliance with Korea at least until the
beginning of that year.
agenda on communist and non-strategic allied regimes, Carter continued to nettle Park on the human rights front with modest success.\textsuperscript{35}

Given these two contentious policies, Carter and Park's personal relationship suffered, but the highly institutionalized alliance survived. During Carter's July 1979 visit to Seoul, the two leaders reconciled their differences. Carter made two reasonable demands. The Korean government was to cover more of its military expenditures and to take a significant step in addressing its poor human rights record.\textsuperscript{36} Shortly after Carter's departure, Park agreed to release around 180 political prisoners over the next six months. The alliance ties appeared strong once more. By the summer of 1979, the US maintained levers to pressure the Korean regime, but overt material leverage was limited. Compared to 20 years earlier, US economic and military assistance was minimal. US willingness to alter its security arrangement also appeared unlikely as the US bureaucracy buried Carter's withdrawal plan. Just as relations between Carter and Park began to normalize, a sit-down protest by a few hundred female employees rapidly escalated into a broad challenge to the entire Yushin system.

\textit{II. Narrative of Events}

2.a. 08/07/79 - 10/26/79

Long-simmering economic issues significantly contributed to the initial wave of protests in the late summer of 1979. Nearly twenty years of rapid economic growth had pushed prices upwards as average Koreans demanded more products. By 1978, annual inflation reached 20

\textsuperscript{35} The Park regime's record on civil liberties and political rights from late 1978 until August 1979 was inconsistent. In December 1978, the regime allowed relatively fair parliamentary elections and freed over 100 political prisoners, including DJ. In the spring, the opposition faced a broad crackdown to prevent major protests related to the 20\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the 1960 April Revolution. By the summer, however, YS could make relatively provocative comments without punishment.

percent.\textsuperscript{37} The 1979 energy crisis also had a deleterious effect because export markets for Korean manufacturers shrank, which led to a significant decline in firm revenue. As a result, several highly indebted companies were unable to pay wages at a time when workers sought higher pay to keep pace with inflation. Less profitable firms cut their losses and closed down.\textsuperscript{38} Under such circumstances, the regime's strategic alliance with the business community and labor unions became a liability because there were few independent mechanisms to resolve labor grievances.\textsuperscript{39} Due to the corporatist nature of the Korean political system, the government even had to mediate some labor disputes. This arrangement enabled the political opposition to blame the regime for poor macroeconomic performance and indifference to the workers' plight.

One such labor dispute occurred on August 7\textsuperscript{th} when the Y.H. Industrial Company, a wig-maker, closed. About 200 women demanded back-pay from the shuttered firm. Under the impression that the demonstrators would be safe and hoping to win some political capital, the NDP leader, Kim Young Sam (YS), allowed the laborers to continue their sit-in at the opposition's offices. On August 11\textsuperscript{th}, around 1,000 riot police brutally dispersed the peaceful protesters in the early morning. The police seriously injured 40 to 100 individuals and arrested 198 workers. Another worker died falling out of the window during the clash. The government claimed the protests involved "impure elements" seeking to provoke class conflicts. Adopting an increasingly strident position, YS condemned the regime's actions. Two days after the Seoul District Court stripped him of the NDP presidency on September 10\textsuperscript{th}, YS formally announced

\textsuperscript{37} Such demand-pull inflation was further aggravated by continuing investment in large companies and significant remittances from construction teams sent to the Middle East. Chong-Sik Lee, "South Korea 1979: Confrontation, Assassination, and Transition," \textit{Asian Survey} 20, No. 1 (1980): 65.

\textsuperscript{38} See Haggard and Moon, "Postwar South Korea," 76-77.

\textsuperscript{39} Yin-Wah Chu, "Labor and Democratization in South Korea and Taiwan," \textit{Journal of Contemporary Asia} 28, No. 2 (1998): 194. The only national trade union in the late 1970s was the Federation of Korean Trade Unions (FKTU), which Park effectively used to change "labor unions into company-controlled bodies under the protection of the state." Choi 1988: 34 quoted in Chang, \textit{Protest Dialectics}, 44.
his intention to start a movement to "overthrow the Park regime."  In an attempt to isolate YS further, he was expelled from the National Assembly on October 5th. In a sign of opposition solidarity and to the surprise of the ruling party, all opposition lawmakers resigned a week later.

Meanwhile, university students held several thinly veiled "pep rallies" to support worker demands and other grievances related to the Yushin constitution. Fearing these small protests might catalyze off-campus demonstrations incorporating discontented workers, the regime ordered police to disperse such events quickly. Despite preemptive measures, five thousand Pusan University students gathered on campus and marched downtown on October 16th, the seventh anniversary of the Yushin constitution. This action attracted ordinary citizens including members of the working and middle class. The government announced martial law in Pusan on October 18th after demonstrations devolved into violent clashes with the police the night before. The neighboring city of Masan fell under garrison law two days later when a relatively small anti-government demonstration turned violent. Overall, a ubiquitous unease loomed in Korea. Neither Park, nor the opposition appeared willing to make concessions. A confrontation

40 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Kim Yong-Sam's September 10 Press Conference," September 9, 1979, FOIA. The regime's efforts to oust YS first as NDP president and then from the National Assembly started on August 13th, when three NDP members filed a suit in the courts claiming YS's election as NDP president in May was illegal. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, " NDP President Kim Yong-Sam's Election Challenged by Ousted Chapter Chairmen," 20 Aug. 1979, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Court Suspends Kim Yong Sam from NDP Presidency," 7 Sept. 1979, FOIA.

41 During September, YS was planning to represent a rump faction of the NDP as a new party. Before this was accomplished, however, his ouster from the National Assembly took place. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Still No Break in NDP Leadership Dispute," September 27, 1979, FOIA.

42 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Student Demonstrations in Taegu," September 4, 1979, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance "Demonstration at Korea University," September 19, 1979 FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Demonstration Reported at Yonsei and Ehwa Universities," September 26, 1979, FOIA.

43 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "More on Pusan Demonstration," October, 17 1979, FOIA. Pusan was the home district of YS.

44 During this period, Ambassador Gleysteen captured the collective sense of foreboding. "I was struck by the pervasiveness within the establishment of worry about where the government's hardline policies were leading Korea. People in almost all sectors and all levels told us of their anxiety and were becoming increasingly bold in identifying President Park as the man making the wrong decision, listening to advisors who were telling him what they thought he wanted to hear. In our last conversation with him (October 18), even Park himself seemed to question the wisdom
seemed imminent and the outcome would likely involve much bloodshed. It was under this tense political environment that Kim Jae Kyu, director of the KCIA, had dinner with Park Chung Hee and his infamous hardliner bodyguard, Cha Chi Chul, on October 26th, 1979.

Kim reportedly wanted Park to respond to the protests with concessions, but felt Park was under the sway of Cha who unabashedly advocated draconian repression. Out of frustration and worry, Kim assassinated Park and Cha that evening. This act necessitated a political transition. General Chung Seung Hwa, the Army Chief of Staff, headed the martial law command (MLC); Choi Hyu Hah became acting president; and, General Chun Doo Hwan, head of the Defense Security Command (DSC), led the investigation into Park's assassination. A high stakes political transition characterized by intense uncertainty ensued during the following seven months.

2.b. 10/27/79-05/28/80

Much progress towards political liberalization took place in the 45 days that followed Park's assassination. First, the ruling DRP appeared flexible when working with the opposition NDP in the National Assembly. The DRP "unconditionally" allowed NDP assemblymen to return on November 9th. Shortly after reopening the National Assembly, a 28-member special committee was created on November 26th to draft a new constitution that required a national referendum for approval. Half the members were opposition assemblymen even though the NDP

of his hardline decision." Gleysteen to Vance, "Initial Reflections on Post-Park Chung Hee Situation in Korea," October 27, 1979 FOIA.

45 Kim's true motives remain a mystery. First, the degree to which the assassination was premeditated is unclear. Kim told his KCIA entourage to kill Park's bodyguards when they heard gun shots, but Kim used an antique .38 Smith and Wesson prone to backfire, which it did. Second, Kim double booked his dinner plans. He had invited General Chung Seung-hwa to dinner weeks earlier. Instead of canceling that engagement, Kim asked Chung to dine with his assistant until he returned from dinner with the president. This coincidence was used later to implicate Chung as a co-conspirator in Park's assassination, but some point to this event as evidence that Kim saw an opportunity to grab power for himself with the post-facto support of Chung. If this is true, it was a grave miscalculation. Chung arrested Kim within hours. A third version generously describes Kim's action as an attempt to prevent Park from adopting a security solution. It is possible that Kim thought his action would be perceived as an altruistic effort to prevent bloodshed. This did not occur either. Kim was executed by hanging on May 24th, 1980.
held only one-third of the seats in the National Assembly.\textsuperscript{46} The creation of this Constitution Revision Committee (CRC) satisfied a key opposition demand following Park's assassination. Second, General Chung was considered a neutral, apolitical military man.\textsuperscript{47} The character of the MLC was particularly important because his civilian counterpart, President Choi, was a cautious leader with no independent backing, who would "rather follow than lead."\textsuperscript{48} The military also appeared open to controlled liberalization as evidenced by the reopening of the universities on November 19\textsuperscript{th}. Third, President Choi released former President Yun Po-Son and the high-profile opposition leader DJ from house arrest. Choi also held a cordial meeting with YS.\textsuperscript{49} Most importantly, he lifted the widely despised EM-9 decree on December 7\textsuperscript{th} and released most violators of this law.

Yet, many warning signs emerged alongside these positive gains, especially for domestic actors largely marginalized since 1971. First, President Choi's speech on November 10\textsuperscript{th} failed to incorporate input from opposition leaders and presented an imprecise reform program.\textsuperscript{50} For those skeptical of the transitional government's intentions, this cautious speech looked like "footdragging" because it provided no clear deadlines or credible commitments.\textsuperscript{51} Second, the military did not hesitate to follow the letter of martial law strictly. When a large number of Christian dissidents held an indoor rally in Seoul on November 24\textsuperscript{th} to reject political "evolution" 

\textsuperscript{46} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Membership of Constitutional Revision Committee," November 29, 1979, FOIA. The exact breakdown of assemblymen to the committee was seven to the DRP, seven to the Yujonghoe, 13 to the NDP, and one to the DUP.
\textsuperscript{47} Kim, Democratization in Korea, 65.
\textsuperscript{48} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus -- Secretary's Discussion with Foreign Minister Park Ton-jin November 3, 1979," November 8, 1979, in Digital National Security Archive (DNSA), nsarchive.chadwyck.com.
\textsuperscript{49} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Acting President Meets Opposition Leader," November 22, 1979, FOIA.
\textsuperscript{50} Gleysteen, Marginal Influence, 70.
in favor of an immediate change in the political system, the army intervened immediately. This led to the arrest of over 200 dissidents in Seoul and Kwangju in late November. Third, MLC Chung's hardline press conference on November 28th left little doubt of the military's dislike for much of the opposition and unwillingness to accept any demonstration that may lead "to chaos which would invite a North Korean attack." Despite these warning signs, however, the prospects for liberalization and a democratic transition seemed feasible, partly because the military appeared as neutral as possible given the circumstances.

The first critical juncture during the political transition occurred on December 12th 1979. A tightly-knit group of lower ranking generals led by Major General Chun Doo-Hwan arrested MLC Chung. When gunfire erupted that evening, Defense Minister Ro Jae Hyun and the Joint Chief of Staff Kim Chong Hwan sought safe haven in the UN Command (UNC) bunker at Yongson. They contemplated mounting a counterattack with forces loyal to Chung. In fear of internecine fighting between ROK forces in Seoul at night, General Wickham, the head of the UN Combined Forces Command (CFC), urged the Korean generals to wait until morning. Around midnight, Ro decided to leave the bunker as American efforts to contact President Choi

---

52 This was an extension of the hardline position adopted by former President Yun Po-Son after his declaration on November 12th to reject the interim regime and to replace it with a "pan-democratic cabinet." Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, Former President Yun Challenges Incumbent Government, November 15, 1979, FOIA.
53 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Martial Law Administrator General Chong Song-Hwa Briefs the Press," November 28, 1979, FOIA. After meeting Chung on November 30th, Gleysteen noted that he "exuded determination to maintain public order, but also displayed understanding of [the] popular desire for political relaxation." While the military remained preoccupied with maintaining "order," he noted that Chung had appeared helpful in urging interim President Choi to clarify the transitional nature of the government to the populace. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: Meeting with Martial Law Administrator Chung, November 30." December 12, 1979, FOIA.
54 Gleysteen (Marginal Influence, p. 76) raises counterfactual reflections over the likelihood that a democratic transition would have happened had Chung remained in power.
55 John A. Wickham, Korea on the Brink: From the 12/12 Incident to the Kwangju Uprising, 1979-1980 (Washington DC: National Defense University Press, 1999), 57-66. Chun called in the Ninth Infantry Division stationed along the DMZ, which was commanded by Roh Tae Woo, a loyal friend of Chun and member of the Hanahoe, a tightly knit group of military officers mostly from the eleventh class of the Korean Military Academy. Chun understood this decision would alienate General Wickham and the US more generally in the short run, but considered breaking the chain of command necessary. Closer units – the Capital Garrison Command and the Special Warfare Command – were led by older officers whose loyalty likely lay with Chung. Clifford, Troubled Tiger, 145.
proved futile. Shortly thereafter, Ro was apprehended and forced to sign the arrest warrant for General Chung. This step was necessary to finalize the evening's events because Choi refused to sign the document without Ro. By daybreak, Chung was under arrest on conspiracy charges related to Park's assassination and Chun was in charge.\textsuperscript{56} These actions amounted to a "coup in all but name."\textsuperscript{57} Within days, purges in the army occurred and men loyal to Chun replaced about 40 high ranking officers arrested with MLC Chung.\textsuperscript{58} Chun appointed his most trusted associates to particularly sensitive and powerful positions, including the Capital Security Command, the Special Warfare Command, and the ROK Third Army Division.

Despite Chun's maneuvering to gain control of the military hierarchy, cautious political liberalization proceeded in halting fashion on the civilian side. On December 14\textsuperscript{th}, a new cabinet was appointed that included three holdovers, two transfers from one ministry to another, and 15 new faces. The cabinet members "most disliked by the opposition" had been "eliminated."\textsuperscript{59} These were positive signs of moderation and compromise, as was the granting of amnesty to several prisoners on December 21\textsuperscript{st}, the same day Choi Hyu-Hah officially became interim

\textsuperscript{56} Because the leadership of the civilian government was weak, many analysts dwell on the political psychology and cohort culture differentiating Chung Seung-Hwa and the older military cohorts from Chun Doo Hwan and the younger cohorts. As mentioned earlier, the older cohorts were largely considered apolitical soldiers only concerned with security and stability of the peninsula. See Wickham, \textit{Korea on the Brink}, 41-2, 50-51; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "General Lew's account of President Park's death," October 27, 1979, DDRS; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Ambassador's political assessment one month after Park's assassination," November 26, 1979, FOIA. The younger generation and Chun in particular are often characterized as ambitious men who hold civilian politicians in disdain. This split first became apparent during a secret meeting held on October 29\textsuperscript{th}, 1979 at the Ministry of National Defense. The "mainstream group" of older generals including Chung favored political change to the Yushin Constitution, whereas a "non-mainstream group" of mostly younger generals like Chun desired a more cautious approach and were highly skeptical of any substantive liberalization. Nam, \textit{Search for Political Consensus}, 186.

\textsuperscript{57} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Young ROK Officers Grab Power Positions," December 12, 1979, FOIA.


\textsuperscript{59} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "President Choi Announces New Cabinet," December 13, 1979, FOIA. This was a relief for NDP assemblymen who feared the cabinet would involve a reshuffling of familiar faces. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Conversation with NDP assemblymen," December 11, 1979, FOIA. Still, the selection of cabinet members did not impart unqualified optimism either. The 12/12 generals managed to pressure Choi to appoint individuals to powerful cabinet posts –Defense, Home, and Justice – who were not his first choice. Naturally, these appointees were closely allied with Chun. See Nam, \textit{Search for Political Consensus}, 188-89.
Yet, Choi’s long-awaited speech that evening was a disappointment. Instead of designating a specific roadmap for the political transition, Choi continued to offer a general plan for liberalization where a constitutional referendum would be held within a year and an election shortly thereafter. No specific date for ending martial law was included. Thus, dissidents and NDP officials who sought clear, detailed timetables remained skeptical of the government’s true intentions. Unfortunately, the interim government's proclivity to issue vague announcements and send mixed signals persisted throughout the spring.

Choi further exacerbated these fears in mid-January by announcing his plans to set up an official ROK government study team to deliberate constitutional change in mid-March. This move created uncertainty over whether the executive or legislature was charged with the final drafting of the constitution. Moreover, the constitutional process was unnecessarily drawn out even though the NDP and DRP presented similar drafts to the National Assembly’s CRC on February 14th. Many felt the minor differences between these versions could be ironed out by

---

60 The Yushin Constitution required that an election occur within 90 days in case of the president's death. Acting President Choi was elected president by the Yushin Constitution's electoral college on December 6th. He was the only candidate. Although some hardline dissidents opposed the indirect election of an interim president by a Yushin institution, many considered this a necessary stopgap measure to provide time for writing a constitution. Working under the extant political framework, no matter how discredited, seemed preferable to a period where no national laws existed. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Former President Yun Challenges Incumbent Government," November 15, 1979, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus -- Secretary Discussion with Acting President Choi Kyuh-ha," November 7, 1979, FOIA.

61 On March 11th, Premier Shin was quoted in a Japanese newspaper as saying that "there would be no 'rapid democratization' in the ROK which 'totally rejects the Yushin system.'” Shin provided the US ambassador the original Korean text to support his claim that he was misquoted; however, he did not publicly reject the quote in the Korean media. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "ROK Prime Minister Rules Out Democratization Without Yusin," March 11, 1980, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "ROK Prime Minister's Comments on Yushin Continue to Draw Criticism," March 17, 1980, FOIA. The controversy continued into late April when Shin told the New York Times that "the government must draft the new constitution, not the national assembly." This statement caused further anxiety "about what the government is up to" among "Koreans in general and national assemblymen in particular." Choi and Shin’s personal ambitions were unclear. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Prime Minister's Quote that Government will Take the Lead in Constitution Revision Makes Politicians Nervous," April 21, 1979, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Prime Minister Says Neither He nor President will Run in Elections to be held next year," April 24 1979, FOIA.

62 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Government moves to take the lead in constitutional revision," January 20, 1979, FOIA.
early April at the latest if the executive's alternative constitutional committee did not exist. The legislature viewed this new body as an attempt by President Choi, Premier Shin, and perhaps the military to determine the timing and nature of political change. \(^{63}\) Because institutional design associated with the constitutional revision process would influence subsequent political competition, all parties considered the stakes high. \(^{64}\)

Despite these tensions, political liberalization appeared on track at the height of the "Seoul Spring" from late February to mid-March 1980. US Ambassador Gleysteen joined DRP chief Kim Jong-Pil, YS, and DJ at a high profile dinner on February 25\(^{th}\). \(^{65}\) Four days later, the civil rights of 686 individuals were restored. Among their ranks was DJ, whose name began to appear in the domestic media again. \(^{66}\) Finally, the university remained silent on national matters as the students campaigned for campus specific issues. \(^{67}\) In retrospect, Ambassador Gleysteen offered an overly optimistic prediction that "[t]he prospects for stability and democratic-mindedness through 1980 are not bad. The odds of a dangerous disruption, such as a military coup or massive student/worker uprising, do not seem high." \(^{68}\) This political forecast reflected the general sense of hope related to the aforementioned, observable indicators of tangible progress. Yet, the sudden political liberalization after Park's death complicated the national debate over the nature and timing of political transition by introducing several new players and

\(^{63}\) Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "The two parties submit similar drafts to the assembly's committee but many worry that the government may have its own conflicting ideas," February 14, 1980, FOIA.

\(^{64}\) Two particularly contentious issues the executive constitutional committee planned to address were the creation of a dual-executive and the ability of candidates to campaign directly to the populace. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "ROK President expresses concern about strong presidents and direct elections," March 13, 1980, FOIA.

\(^{65}\) Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Kim Jong-Pil, Kim Yong-Sam, and 'influential opposition figure' meet," February, 25 1979, FOIA.

\(^{66}\) Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Political Rights Restored," February 28, 1979, FOIA. Before then, Kim's name was always censored in the media. He was simply referred to as an "influential opposition figure."

\(^{67}\) Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "ROK Universities off to a calm start," March 13, 1980, FOIA.

\(^{68}\) Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Yet Another Assessment of ROK Stability and Political Development," March 11, 1980, FOIA.
potential spoilers. Traditional collective actors were dividing and forming complicated, contingent alliances with potential rivals for political expediency. As the rules of the game rapidly evolved, divisions within five key collective actors began to emerge.

First, DJ's political rehabilitation caused a rift within the political opposition as he and YS jockeyed for the leadership of the NDP. In a widely-read interview, DJ criticized the NDP's "party leader" as having "failed to lead the opposition ... effectively" since Park's assassination.69 Neither opposition leader openly broke ranks, but personal ambitions interfered with the opposition's ability to smoothly coordinate institutional and non-institutional pressure for change as a united front. On April 7th, DJ stopped trying to join the NDP and announced his intention to effect change among "the forces in the field" possibly by launching his own party.70

Second, members of the ruling political party had their own interests to protect. In particular, Kim Jong Pil recognized his vulnerable image as a corrupt insider who benefitted from the Yushin system. He sought to extend the transition period and preferred some form of indirect elections to improve his chances of becoming the next president. Yet, he simultaneously sided with the NDP in contests over executive-legislative powers and military involvement in civilian politics. Meanwhile, a faction within the DRP began a "rectification" campaign to uproot the undemocratic and corrupt practices of the party's leadership, including Kim Jong Pil. This campaign ended in early April with the expulsion of several "Young Turks" and a few disillusioned members of the old guard, like former KCIA director Lee Hu Rak.71

70 Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 196; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Kim Dae Jung hints at the formation of a new political party," April 16, 1980, FOIA.
71 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Eight young DRP Turks threaten to quit the assembly unless two of their colleagues are ousted from the party," March 18, 1980, FOIA.
Third, the weak civilian government of President Choi and Premier Shin continued to advance vague proposals for political transition where a new constitution and electoral laws would be in effect by the end of 1980 and general elections would occur between the spring and summer of 1981. Both these civilian leaders expressed a desire to achieve some form of political transition through a gradual process of elite pacts. What remained unclear was the pace and extent of reform these actors desired and the means available to them to check Chun's expanding power. Overall, the civilian government seemed over-confident about its control over political affairs. In a high profile trip to the US in mid-February, the deputy Prime Minister for Economic Affairs, Lee Hahn Been, referred to the events of December 12th as an "unfortunate incident." He argued that "[t]he important point is not that the incident occurred, but that its occurrence did not affect the political and economic progress of Korea. Given the highly professional character of the present military leadership ... an incident of this sort is most unlikely to recur in the future." This credulous impression was pervasive among the technocratic elite. On April 9th, Premier Shin claimed that "South Korea's military authorities wielded little direct influence over the civil administration except where 'the maintenance of order and security under martial law' was involved." Only five days later, President Choi appointed Chun as dual head of the KCIA and DSC. How Choi and Shin did not understand the

73 The US touted Lee's trip as an chance to strengthen the civilians in the government. Clifford, Troubled Tiger, 156.
74 The military's ability to conceal its true intentions extended to some dissidents. For instance, Reverend Kim Kwan-Suk – the secretary general of the Korean National Council of Churches (KNCC) that counted among the most outspoken dissident organizations – had dinner with Generals Yi Hui-Song and Roh Tae Woo on February 22nd. He was reportedly "impressed" with his interlocutors responses regarding the "army's new position on Christians and dissidents." Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Rev. Kim Kwan-Suk Comments on Eve of Departure from Secretary Generalship of KNCC," February 21, 1980, FOIA.
political implications of putting Chun in charge of the two most powerful branches of the internal security apparatus is hard to fathom.\textsuperscript{76}

Fourth, the military was rife with internal conflict despite Chun's best efforts to re-establish order after his own blatant disregard for professionalism on December 12\textsuperscript{th}. In late January, a representative of 30 lower ranking officers approached the US embassy with a plan to launch a counter-coup.\textsuperscript{77} The US declined the offer and notified the government about this incident. Chun subsequently strengthened an emerging commissar system whereby a note-taker would always accompany Korean officers during meetings with US counterparts. This policy succeeded in shielding the US from further signs of internal division within the military, but was indicative of Chun's recognition of his continued vulnerability.\textsuperscript{78} Nevertheless, as other key elites and collective actors busied themselves with grabbing a larger piece of the transition pie, Chun consolidated his grip over the state's extensive coercive apparatus.

Finally, Korean labor and student grievances tended to blossom during the spring. The manner in which these two collective actors campaigned for greater rights and privileges proved critical. Korean firms settle yearly contracts in March and April. In the first four months of 1980, a renaissance in labor activity transpired. There were 848 labor disputes, four times more than in 1979 and the same amount as during the entire Yushin period.\textsuperscript{79} In general, workers employed non-violent tactics like strikes and sit-ins to advance their cause as the government attempted to

\textsuperscript{76} In retrospect, Lee observed, "We didn't see the nature of the [December 12] incident. In fact, until General Chun combined that post [as head of the DSC] with the CIA, there was no indication whatsoever that the military had any intention or capacity to intervene into policy-making on economic affairs." Clifford, \textit{Troubled Tiger}, 156. The KCIA, which traditionally functioned as a check to the military, was largely absent during the transition period. The institution stayed out of the fray because its reputation had been badly tarnished after its director assassinated Park Chung Hee. When Chun was appointed KCIA director, his stated mission was to clean up the discredited institution and turn it into an effective intelligence community directed toward external threats.

\textsuperscript{77} Gleysteen, \textit{Marginal Influence}, 93-97.

\textsuperscript{78} Wickham, \textit{Korea on the Brink}, 79-81, 120.

\textsuperscript{79} Koo, \textit{Korean Workers}, 30.
assist firms to fulfill reasonable worker demands. In one violent exception, a large-scale miners' riot erupted in Sabuk in late April. The town was shut down for three days, but the government helped restore order and negotiate an agreement acceptable to the miners. In combination with other militant strikes at large companies like the Tongguk and Hyundai Group Steel Mills in Pusan and Inchon respectively, this episode left the business class and military elite rattled. For these vested interests, social chaos appeared around the corner. The goal of achieving collective bargaining rights on top of this labor activity did little to alleviate their anxiety. From a more objective standpoint, however, worker demands and tactics were overall quite moderate.

The government used life on university campuses as a barometer for the degree to which society may become involved in high politics. Until the end of April, students mostly pursued campus specific grievances, such as the dismissal of "Yushin professors." For its part, the government adopted a conciliatory position and did not intervene in campus affairs. For instance, faculty and students banned from universities under EM-9 were reinstated before the beginning of the semester. The first broad challenge to the interim government occurred during mid-April when some freshmen students from Yonsei University refused mandatory military training, describing it as a Yushin relic. The government disarmed these protests by promising a reduction in the number of required service hours. Yet, student demonstrations rapidly shifted to national political issues after Chun's unexpected dual appointment to the KCIA and DSC.

81 The former president of Ewha University and presiding Minister of Education, Kim Ok-Gill, convinced more conservative elements in the government to adopt this conciliatory approach. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korean universities reconvene: a difficult year ahead," February 29, 1980, FOIA. The government also allowed for the reorganization of the Student Defense Corps (SDC), which students named "Haksaenghoe," the name of the former student representative body before the SDC replaced it in September 1975.
82 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korean students refuse military drill," April 10, 1980, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Student mood on eve of anniversary of student revolution," April 15 1980, FOIA.
Continued opaque statements concerning the government's transition timetable contributed to a growing sense of mistrust pervasive among the opposition. On April 22<sup>nd</sup>, for instance, a high-ranking National Assemblyman announced information from an anonymous high administration official of another vague timetable for the political transition. Besides dragging out the process for more than another year, this plan once again failed to answer the most divisive questions: "how and by whom the constitution would be rewritten, whether future Presidents would be elected directly by the people, and how elections would be conducted in a free atmosphere."<sup>83</sup> By early May, several on-campus student demonstrations adopted sweeping demands including the dismissal of Shin and Chun as well as the lifting of martial law by no later than May 15<sup>th</sup>.<sup>84</sup> If the deadline for martial law was disregarded, moderate students agreed to hold large, off-campus anti-martial law rallies.<sup>85</sup> Overall, the balance of power within the student body at various universities shifted in favor of the "radicals," but the "moderate" student leaders still maintained enough clout to temper their overly zealous colleagues.

These divisions and rivalries within each key collective actor complicated the complex negotiation process. By late April, an emerging confrontation between hardliner factions from the "opposition" – the legislative parties and minjung – and the "regime" – the interim government and military – threatened the goal of political evolution. Yet, the Choi government appeared to make some concessions when Premier Shin appeared at the National Assembly CRC on May 5<sup>th</sup>.<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, YS and DJ continued to urge moderation and restraint from

---

<sup>83</sup> Nam, *Searching for National Consensus*, 211-12.
<sup>84</sup> Cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "Student Activism Turns to National Political Issues," May 4, 1980, FOIA. SecState is the term used after Vance resigned over the failed hostage rescue attempt in Iran and before Senator Edward Muskie (D-ME) became Secretary of State.
<sup>85</sup> Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Students take to the streets," May 14, 1980, FOIA.
<sup>86</sup> Cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "Prime Minister Appears Before Assembly Constitutional Committee," May 4, 1980, FOIA.
dissidents to avoid "overheated politics." Despite such pleas, student demonstrations briefly spilled off campuses on May 8th. Discipline was quickly restored when student leaders in 23 Seoul area universities met the following day and issued a statement that demonstrations for the following week should be peaceful and on-campus. In an apparent effort to offset student momentum, news spread on May 12th that North Korea appeared poised to attack with 60,000 troops reportedly gathering along the DMZ. Student demonstrations immediately ceased in a show of solidarity against a common threat and rumors that further demonstrations would trigger a military power-grab. When both rumors proved false, students launched off-campus protests the following day. Predominantly non-violent student demonstrations grew on the 14th and spread to several other cities including Kwangju, Iri, Taegu, Mokpo, and Pusan. Demonstrations culminated on May 15th when 70,000 to 100,000 students demonstrated in downtown Seoul at Namdaemun, Ankukdong rotary, and near Independence Arch. The police lines held despite student advances. By late evening, students peacefully returned to their campuses. In a show of moderation, student leaders decided to suspend demonstrations "until after a National Assembly session scheduled for May 20th."

---

87 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Kim Dae Jung's May 13 Press Conference: Moderate Language, No Concessions," May 12, 1980, FOIA. Despite these appeals for calm and non-violence, DJ and Yun Po Sun joined students on May 8th when the National Alliance for Democracy and Unification called for a prompt lifting of martial law, as well as the resignation of Premier Shin and KCIA director Chun. Cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "National Alliance calls for resignation of Prime Minister and Acting Chief of KCIA," May 8, 1980, FOIA. YS and DJ released a statement on May 16th urging students to exercise "maximum self-restraint." Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 219.
89 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Reports of Possible North Korean Invasion and ROKG Reaction," May 13, 1980 DNSA.
90 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Lull on campuses," May 12, 1980, FOIA.
91 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Students escalate confrontation," May 13, 1980, FOIA.
92 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Student Disorders: Late Update, May 14," May 13, 1980 FOIA.
93 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Seoul Sitrep, May 15-16: large demos on 15th, lull on 16th, possible renewal of actions on 17th," May 16, 1980, FOIA.
As student protests unfolded in early May, the National Assembly pushed the interim government on reform. On May 8th, the NDP suggested convening a 20-day special session to resolve the longstanding grievances related to the slow political transition. This included lifting martial law. The DRP made a similar proposal on May 12th when Kim Jong Pil called for the end to martial law in exchange for student assurances to halt off-campus demonstrations. On the interim government's side, a report in Dong-A-Ilbo on May 15th cited a "high government source" suggesting that President Choi would deal with the political timetable, lifting of martial law, and revision of the constitution upon his return from abroad. On May 15th, Premier Shin hinted during a televised address that the government intended to accelerate the process of adopting a new constitution. A political deal to resolve the constitutional crisis appeared tenuous, but still obtainable as President Choi returned to Seoul on May 17th.

Chun's window of opportunity to grab power was closing as the civilian interim government seemed ready to cooperate with the National Assembly to satisfy protest demands. During the evening of May 16th, the final stage of the "rolling coup" began. Without prior consultation, the military presented President Choi Emergency Decree No. 10 that granted the MLC the "full powers to govern." Early the next morning, the military deployed South Korean troops and tanks to major metropolitan areas, arrested key political figures, and extended the

---

95 Cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "Opposition demands prompt meeting of National Assembly; DRP agrees," May 8, 1980, FOIA; Clifford, Troubled Tiger, 157. The National Assembly had the power to lift martial law with a simple majority and likely would have done so, which would have compelled Choi to adhere to the vote or present clear evidence for maintaining martial law. Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 217.

96 Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "May 15 Press: President Choi to make major announcement on return from Mideast," May 15, 1980, FOIA. Whether and when Choi would make such a statement remains uncertain. Immediately upon his return, Choi blandly announced "that he has been reviewing reports on [the] domestic situation and wishes to thank [the] general public for their understanding and cooperation in maintaining social stability." Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "President Choi's arrival statement to be short in commentary on domestic affairs," May 15, 1980, FOIA.

97 Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 218.

98 Ibid., 220.
scope of martial law throughout the entire country. It claimed a North Korean invasion was imminent and accused a small number of "communist" agitators as the main cause for the student demonstrations. Publicly, the extension of martial law was justified through the familiar frames of national security and economic growth.

On May 18th, an uprising began in the provincial capital of Kwangju, South Korea's sixth largest city and DJ's home province. Two days of intense street conflict occurred as Korean paratroopers brutally assaulted and killed Kwangju residents, who fought back, gained access to an armory, and pushed the paratroopers out of the city. For five days Kwangju residents self-policied each other. On multiple occasions, the citizens held peaceful demonstrations that at times exceeded 100,000 participants. Despite efforts to negotiate a peaceful resolution with the government, the 20th Infantry Division surrounded the city on the 26th and regained control on the 27th with little bloodshed. The democratic experiment was over.

After the smoke cleared, no questions remained over where power lay. Chun won. The UI campaign and democratic transition failed. In the tradition of Park, Chun created the Special Committee for National Security Measures in late May and personally directed its Standing Committee. With power centralized under this institution, Chun's path to the presidency was clear. In mid-August, he received his fourth star, retired from the military, and was indirectly

---

99 After Park's assassination, the government declared limited martial law. This did not alter the nature or severity of martial law on the mainland, but excluded the small southern island of Cheju. Limited martial law, however, clearly subordinated the military hierarchy under the civilian government, whereas, complete martial law subordinated the civilian president under the MLC.

100 Wickham, *Korea on the Brink*, 128. The statement read: "At this critical moment the irresponsible rash attempts and blind behavior of some politicians, students, and workers have converted this society into a lawless one of chaos, disorder, agitation and subversion. Moreover, the aftermath of social disturbances has resulted in the slowing down of exports and creating an economic depression, thus increasing labor disputes and unemployment and further increasing social unrest. Our country is faced with a grave crisis."

101 For in-depth treatment of these events, see Katsiaficas, *South Korean Social Movements*, 162-220.

elected President a month later by the National Conference of Unification, the despised Yushin electoral college. South Korea experienced seven more years of authoritarian rule.

**III. US Actions: 08/11/79 - 05/31/80**

In February 1979, Secretary of State Vance informed Ambassador Gleysteen that the US goals were "peace and stability on the Korean peninsula, gaining a 'maximum US share of ... benefits from economic relations with (an) increasingly prosperous South Korea,' and 'improvement of the human rights environment through evolution of a liberal, democratic political process,' in that order."\(^{103}\) This statement captures the main contours of US policy during the ensuing political opening.\(^{104}\)

As mentioned earlier, the US urged Park to improve human rights with limited success during the summer of 1979. Despite the release of several political prisoners in accordance with the June summit agreement, the US continued to publicly criticize Korea's maintenance of EM-9.\(^{105}\) In a nod to regime moderates, American pressure intensified during and after the Y.H. Incident. On August 15\(^{th}\), the State Department's spokesman described the police action at NDP headquarters as "excessive and brutal" and urged the Korean government to take "appropriate disciplinary action."\(^{106}\) After his dismissal as NDP president, YS elevated the stakes in an open

---


\(^{104}\) Katsiaficas (*South Korean Social Movements*, 301-302) inflates the importance the US placed on South Korean economic growth. In particular, his neo-Marxist analytical lens assumes that corporations commandeered the US foreign policy apparatus. Aside from oversimplifying the foreign policy process, no clear evidence exists to suggest this occurred. Rather the theoretical predisposition infers corporate interference whenever a US official comments that the health of the Korean economy is an important US interest. Indeed, the Korean economy was tightly linked to the US and several business interests existed; however, US officials were more concerned about political stability. Economic growth was a natural remedy to this problem.

\(^{105}\) Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "US Criticism of EM-9," August 8, 1979, FOIA.

plea to Washington. On September 16th, he urged the US to "make a clear choice between a basically dictatorial regime ... and the majority who aspire to democracy."\(^{107}\)

Washington would not countenance the complete destabilization of Park's regime, but this series of events looked like an opportunity to eliminate the worst aspects of the Yushin system. Days after YS's removal from the National Assembly, the US took the provocative step of recalling Gleysteen to Washington for consultations. Shortly after the Pusan riots, Gleysteen returned with Defense Secretary Harold Brown on October 18th. Brown gave Park a personal letter from Carter regarding the political situation. Because Washington wanted to avoid further strain on the recently mended relationship, Brown publicly and privately decoupled security issues from domestic politics and human rights.\(^{108}\) The US appeared to have reached its limits in pushing Park toward reform.\(^{109}\)

After Park's assassination on October 26th, the US returned to a policy of "quiet diplomacy."\(^{110}\) The origins of this approach in Korea date back to the emergence of the Yushin system. In October 1972, the US ambassador to Korea, Philip Habib, urged his government to adopt "a policy of disassociation." He argued that "the US cannot and should no longer try to

---


\(^{108}\) Memo, Platt to Brzezinski, "Information on Secretary of Defense Harold Brown's visit to South Korea and Japan regarding security policies and domestic politics of both countries," October 24, 1979, DDRS.

\(^{109}\) In retrospect, Gleysteen (*Marginal Influence*, 57-62) could not help but wonder whether these actions inadvertently contributed to Park's assassination. Yet, at the time few believed the Pusan/Masan riots presented a true challenge to Park's regime. Even Gleysteen writes in mid-October that "none of our contacts, including the dissidents, see the current situation in Pusan as an indication that the Park government faces real problems in staying afloat." Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Update of martial law situation 10/22," October 21, 1979, FOIA.

\(^{110}\) Following Park's death, Gleysteen recommended that Washington "de-emphasize our proclivity to suggest architectural designs in favor of a quieter role in providing reassurances against the threat of North Korea, urging observance of the 'constitutional process' (we should avoid embracing the Yushin constitution), and gently working through all channels toward political liberalization." Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Initial Reflections on Post-Park Chung Hee Situation in Korea," October 28, 1979, FOIA. In a series top secret cables, Gleysteen and Richard Holbrooke, the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, agree upon a *modus vivendi* to avoid public commentary on the political transition. Despite disappointment that interim President Choi's failure to provide a detailed timetable for the transition period during his November 10th speech, for instance, Holbrooke reiterated to Gleysteen, "It is essential that your talks continue to receive no publicity, and that we continue to say nothing critical in public. I am pleased to tell you that these two points have been fully accepted by everyone here (in Washington)." Cable, Vance to Gleysteen, "Korea Focus," November 13, 1979, FOIA.

---
determine the course of internal political development in Korea." The "process of progressively lower levels of US engagement with Korea" has already begun and "disengagement should be accelerated."¹¹¹ Such a policy avoided public criticism and sought to guide Korean decision-makers gently through private persuasion. In this spirit, Washington issued strong statements concerning its firm commitment to South Korea's security after Park’s death, but remained publicly vague about the political transition. Gleysteen recounts the guidelines discussed privately among US officials:


In the following months, the last guideline often contradicted the others.¹¹³ In several public opinion surveys during the political interregnum, between 62.3 and 72.8 percent of South Koreans citizens "favored wholesale political reforms for the sake of 'democratization,'" hopefully "completed within six to nine months."¹¹⁴ Yet, when the population would seek to redress grievances related to human rights or democratic practices, the US remained publicly

¹¹² Gleysteen, Marginal Influence, 63.
¹¹³ Over time, US policymakers appeared to assume the preference of the Korean silent majority and this prognosis aligned with US interest for political stability. Unsurprisingly, Koreans dissidents who pushed for quicker change were characterized as "radicals" and "spoilers" not consistent with the desire of average Koreans. In a moment of particular exasperation after Chong's hardline speech on November 28th, 1979, Gleysteen comments that the political competition in "this society of garlic and pepper eating combatants has not changed its basic nature. Dissident elements and some of the political opposition, grooved over decades into extremist patterns by confrontation with authority, have rejected the acting government’s proposed scenario for reform and reiterated their extremist demands for immediate dismantling of the Yushin system." Quoted in Brazinsky, Nation Building in South Korea, 238.
¹¹⁴ Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 180.
quiet, privately tried to persuade the political elite toward a moderate course of action, and hoped for a good result. This approach adhered to Gleysteen's seventh guideline concerning the patron's marginal influence. US foreign policy for the next seven months was a mix of wishful thinking and perceived impotence, which created a permissive environment for any powerful domestic group with the political will, namely the military, to fill the power vacuum.

During the fall of 1979, Gleysteen's quiet diplomacy appeared rather effective. The distribution of power between the different factions was evenly distributed, which created a "hurting stalemate." More importantly, most factions were willing to adopt moderate positions that enabled political evolution within the parameters of the extant constitutional process. In a telling sign of this strategy's frailty, however, quiet diplomacy failed to convince interim President Choi to announce specific deadlines for political transition. If the US could not sway a docile leader such as Choi, there was zero possibility that Chun, a "ruthlessly ambitious...forceful man," would bow to US attempts at persuasion. On the other hand, the US made some progress by encouraging opposition leaders to avoid provocative actions and working with the DRP and interim government through institutionalized channels. The goal of this inclusionary approach was to incorporate potential spoilers and isolate proponents of hardline positions.

During the 12/12 Incident, US officials refused to intervene because the risk of internecine conflict was too high. The official reaction from Washington was a fairly strong statement carried through the Voice of America that warned "any forces within the Republic of

115 US policymakers, especially those stationed in South Korea, recognized the potential pitfalls related to the political transition, but often hoped for some miraculous resolution of acute tensions. See, for instance, Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Press Handling of Chun Doo Hwan Appointment as Acting KCIA," April 4, 1980. FOIA.
116 Wickham, Korea on the Brink, 118; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "How and Where to use US Influence," November 14, 1979, FOIA.
117 For example, the US encouraged the interim government to restore DJ's political rights and release him from house arrest. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: Involving KDJ in Political Equation," December 2, 1979, FOIA; Cable, Vance to Gleysteen, "Korea Focus: Nudging ROK Political Leaders," December 3, 1979, FOIA.
118 Gleysteen, Marginal Influence, 65.
Korea which disrupt" the promising political trends should "bear in mind the seriously adverse impact their actions would have on Korea's relations with the United States.\textsuperscript{119} Unfortunately, few average Koreans heard it.\textsuperscript{120} They witnessed instead the US broad acceptance of facts on the ground over the next few weeks.

Behind closed doors, several high-level conversations occurred between US and Korean officials after the coup.\textsuperscript{121} During these meetings, US officials blandly informed their Korean interlocutors about the possible negative repercussions political backsliding may have on the alliance. In turn, Korean officials assured the Americans that the 12/12 Incident was nothing more than an "accidental outgrowth" of investigating Park's assassination.\textsuperscript{122} Many ROK civilian and military officials considered the event a tragic blunder, but urged American officials not to punish the many for the unprofessional behavior of a few.\textsuperscript{123} In turn, Ambassador Gleysteen advised Washington to accept Chun's \textit{fait accompli} and focus on strengthening the image of the civilian government as the legitimate source of authority.\textsuperscript{124} He remained hopeful that the US "may find ... some of the officers ... more susceptible to reasoning than others."\textsuperscript{125} Holbrooke reaffirmed the continuation of quiet diplomacy when he told the Korean Ambassador to the US

\textsuperscript{119} "USG Statement on the Events in Kwangju," point 8.
\textsuperscript{120} 
Young (\textit{Eye on Korea}, 70) explains that "the embassy had no control over the local media, which were controlled by the ROK military, the only course of action was to release the statement in Washington." Press censorship under martial law fell under the purview of Chun's DSC, which never hesitated to exploit this tool to his advantage.
\textsuperscript{121} Gleysteen met President Choi on the 13th, DSM commander Chun on the 14\textsuperscript{th}, and Premier Shin on the 18\textsuperscript{th}. Wickham met soon-to-be dismissed Defense Minister Rho on the 14\textsuperscript{th}, new Army Chief of Staff Lee in late December and new Defense Minister Chu shortly thereafter. In the US, the Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke talked with the Korean Ambassador to the US, Kim Yong-Shik, on the December 13\textsuperscript{rd} and 18\textsuperscript{th}.
\textsuperscript{122} Oberdorfer, \textit{The Two Koreas}, 121.
\textsuperscript{123} Wickham (\textit{Korea on the Brink}, 69) notes that even Roh, who understood he would lose his position as Defense Minister, did not want the United States to make any changes to the security arrangement.
\textsuperscript{124} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Gleysteen's December 14 discussion with Chun Doo Hwan," December 16, 1979, FOIA.
\textsuperscript{125} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Younger ROK Officers Grab Power," December 13, 1979, FOIA.
that Washington had "no plans to publicly contest the Korean version of recent events" despite serious reservations of Chung Seung-Hwa's guilt.\footnote{Cable, Vance to Gleysteen, "Korea Focus -- Ambassador Kim Conveys ROKG Assurances on Political Development," December 18, 1979, FOIA.}

Throughout the spring of 1980, the US adopted a three-pronged policy to deal with the volatile political situation.\footnote{Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea: Ambassadors Policy Assessment, January 28, 1980, FOIA.} First, US officials would continue to encourage the Choi government to announce a specific timetable for lifting martial law and to accelerate the constitutional reform process underway in the National Assembly. These were prophylactic measures considered necessary to satisfy key dissident demands, isolate opposition hardliners, and defuse the attractiveness of large-scale protests. Unfortunately, interim President Choi and Premier Shin continued to stall and issue vague statements that fostered mistrust.\footnote{Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: May 9 Conversation with Blue House SYG Kwang Soo-Choi," May, 9 1980, FOIA.} Second, US officials would meet regularly with key opposition figures, particularly YS and DJ. They would request the opposition leaders remain patient, cooperate with the government and DRP, and encourage restraint and moderation from their constituents so as to avoid a military backlash. Overall, the opposition assented to these requests. Finally, the US would rigidly separate military and political affairs and deal with the "ROK army through normal military channels, rather than through Chun and his group." This policy sought to avoid accidentally bestowing Chun with symbolic legitimacy. The military-to-military meetings would underscore US "distress over ... [the] violation of the CFC chain of command," and the need for "maintenance of [the] civilian government and support of the constitutional process, moderation in the conduct of martial law, and patience [with the] political and dissident elements in Korean society."\footnote{Wickham, Korea on the Brink, 94.} When US officials did meet Chun or his associates, they would attempt to persuade this powerful set of actors with
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pragmatic arguments that further military involvement in politics would harm national security and economic growth.\textsuperscript{130} These appeals did not seem to resonate.

This approach persisted until Chun's dual appointment as director of the KCIA and DSC. US officials correctly perceived this maneuvering as further evidence that Chun's aspirations transcended military matters. After reviewing various options, the US decided to postpone the security consultative meeting (SCM) and cancel the US CIA director's upcoming visit to Korea. These moves were meant to signal US opposition to the apparent centralization of \textit{de facto} power. Additionally, US officials set up meetings with Korean counterparts to express US concerns candidly. On April 18\textsuperscript{th}, Gleysteen met with interim President Choi and Wickham talked with Defense Minister Choo. Neither meeting achieved the expressed aim of strengthening the civilian government's hand or altering the calculations of key military elites interested in extending their power into civilian affairs. Choi passionately defended his appointment of Chun, criticized US actions as premature, and emphasized the need to shore up his weak civilian government. Similarly, Choo claimed that the US was turning on its "friends in the military and inviting trouble from the radicals."\textsuperscript{131} The request to meet with Chun was only granted twenty days later. A frustrated Gleysteen was informed that the general was busy.

Gleysteen met Chun and Secretary General of the Blue House, Choi Kwang-Soo, on May 9\textsuperscript{th} as student demonstrations mounted. Chun blamed student and labor unrest on a "small number" of provocateurs and described the situation as "very serious but not yet critical."\textsuperscript{132} Both Choi and Chun expressed awareness about "the danger of overreaction and use of military

\textsuperscript{130} Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Discussions with the New Army Leadership Groups, January 25, 1980, FOIA. Bob Brewster, the senior US intelligence representative in Korea, met most often with Chun. Little is known of what exactly transpired during these meetings or whether the CIA had an alternative agenda, but most accounts describe Brewster as surprised by Chun's maneuvers as everyone else. Young, \textit{Eye on Korea}, 94.
\textsuperscript{131} Gleysteen, \textit{Marginal Influence}, 109-110.
\textsuperscript{132} Gleysteen, \textit{Marginal Influence}, 116.
force." Choi added that the "president was determined to do his utmost to avoid the use of the army in controlling students, although contingency plans had been made." Some critics controversially point to these meetings as evidence of US collusion in the regime's crackdown the following week. In a May 8th cable to Holbrooke, Gleysteen wrote:

"In none of our discussions [with Chun and Blue House officials] will we in any way suggest that [the] US government opposes contingency plans to maintain law and order, if absolutely necessary by reinforcing the police with the army. If I were to suggest any complaint on this score, I believe we would lose all our friends within the civilian and military leadership." Later that evening Deputy Secretary of State Christopher confirmed Gleysteen's approach by informing the ambassador: "we should not oppose ROK contingency plans to maintain law and order, but you should remind Chun and Choi of the danger of escalation if law enforcement responsibilities are not carried out with care and restraint." Unfortunately, Chun likely interpreted this cautious message as US resignation to a potential military solution.

Washington took this position even though a cable from the Defense Intelligence Agency to the Pentagon dated May 7th noted that movements by the Special Warfare Command (SWC) units were underway "for contingency purposes ... to cope with possible student demonstrations." Whether this piece of information reached the proper decision-makers or was unusual enough to attract red flags is unknown. According to investigative journalist Tim Shorrock, Gleysteen and Wickham both insist they did not recall seeing this cable. Even if they had, ambiguities existed that limited the commander of the US-Korean Combined Forces

---

133 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: Meetings with General Chun and Blue House SYG Choi," May 8, 1980, FOIA; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: May 9 Conversation with Blue House SYG Kwang Soo Choi." May 9, 1980, FOIA.
134 Shorrock, "The Cherokee Files."
136 Cable, Christopher to Gleysteen, "Korea Focus -- Tensions in the ROK," May 7, 1980, FOIA.
137 Cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "ROKG Shifts Special Forces Units," 05/06/80, FOIA.
Command (CFC) General Wickham's control over such units.\textsuperscript{139} Beyond legal technicalities, the CFC command structure ceded significant operational authority to their Korean counterparts, who were in charge of personnel and intelligence at CFC headquarters. Thus, the Korean military could keep the American commander "in the dark" if it so desired.\textsuperscript{140} Aside from treaty obligations, incomplete information about unit movements and uncertainty of intentions made any attempt to block such units practically infeasible.\textsuperscript{141}

Four days after Gleysteen's meeting, Wickham met an agitated Chun who claimed to know about "impure" elements within the student ranks, plans for a "mass rebellion," and North Korean efforts to incite students and laborers to overthrow the ROK government. Wickham handled Chun as an emotionally distraught man in need of reassurance, not someone imminently planning to use deadly force to subdue peaceful demonstrations. He assured Chun of four facts: (1) the US and China had no evidence that North Korea was planning an invasion, (2) the US commitment to ROK security was firm, (3) the US would not interfere in Korea's sovereign affairs, and (4) the US desire "to see orderly political progress consistent with the will of the people."\textsuperscript{142} Chun may have interpreted these observations as implicit consent crack down.

When full martial law was declared early on May 18\textsuperscript{th}, US policymakers had few palatable options from which to choose. A sudden rejection of the martial law authorities without prior public threats about this eventuality was too risky. The besieged opposition and an


\textsuperscript{141} Young (Eye on Korea, 104) argues that these units were technically trained to fight behind enemy lines in North Korea, not for crowd-control.

\textsuperscript{142} Wickham, \textit{Korea on the Brink}, 121-125.
unpredictable Kim Il-Sung could interpret the signal incorrectly as an opportunity to adopt provocative actions that could lead to further instability or war. Moreover, the US would likely lose any remaining leverage within the highly nationalistic military hierarchy. Such an open rupture could threaten the alliance, which the US just re-certified as a necessary security bulwark. Thus, the State Department quickly issued a bland statement expressing deep apprehension over "the extension of martial law throughout the Republic of Korea" and "urg[ing] all elements in Korean society to act with restraint at this difficult time."¹⁴³ Meanwhile, the tragic events in Kwangju quickly unfolded.

In a May 22nd high-level policy review meeting on Korea, Brzezinski summarized US policy as "in the short term support, in the longer term pressure for political evolution." Short-term support was quite obliging. First, US officials learned that the ROK government was ready to deploy the 20th Division to Kwangju on May 20th. Despite fear that such action could inflame anti-American sentiment among the populace, Gleysteen and Wickham agreed to these plans because the 20th Division was trained in riot control unlike the SWC units deployed days earlier. Second, the US released several public statements on May 22nd meant for Kwangju's citizens. The Korean military agreed to distribute these messages via airdrops into the city, but instead broadcast that Washington approved the bloody crackdown by SWC troops. Once this betrayal was discovered, the US never publicly corrected the record. Finally, the residents of Kwangju asked Gleysteen to mediate the crisis on May 25th, but he refused the offer because the Korean army claimed the emerging movement leaders were hard-core radical dissidents with extreme demands.¹⁴⁴ Fortunately, the 20th Division retook the city with little bloodshed on May 26th.

¹⁴³ "USG Statement on the Events in Kwangju," point 36.
¹⁴⁴ Young, Eye on Korea, 105-106.
Following the Kwangju incident, the US scrambled to adopt an appropriate policy. On May 28th, Gleysteen cabled Washington to offer personal recommendations concerning how the US should deal with the emergence of a small, powerful group of "arrogant" military officers. He noted that US attempts at persuasion for further political liberalization were futile and options to coerce the cabal down such a path did not exist. As usual, Gleysteen placed the onus for decisive action on the Korean people, "[i]f ... most Koreans seem willing to live fairly comfortably with the newly emerging political structure, I think we should be able to also."

After a brutal crackdown accompanied by a widely-accepted disinformation campaign of US approval for such an action, Gleysteen knew that Korean "consent" was inevitable. He basically urged the US to accept another fait accompli. In contrast, young working-level staff members in the embassy formulated a more aggressive position that would – inter alia – "aggressively censor and disavow Chun and his followers." This policy battle was between the older and younger generations of US officials based in South Korea. The older generation came out on top.

Overall, the US did not collude in the crackdown, but neither did it issue clear public or private threats related to the unnecessary adoption of a military solution. US policy leading up to the declaration of full martial law revealed the priority was security; further political liberalization became an afterthought once students entered the streets. This focus cleared any remaining obstacles to Chun's power grab. The majority of key US decision-makers did not seem to find the return of authoritarianism in Korea particularly tragic. In a May 19th meeting,
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146 Young (*Eye on Korea*, 106-109) notes that bold steps after the Kwangju incident had virtually no chance to emerge out of the high interagency level that tend toward "lowest common denominator" solutions.
147 US guilt for the subsequent crackdown depends on how acts of omission are defined in patron-client relationships. The US performed a guilty act if preventing the bloody crackdown was considered its duty. Arguments that the US act of omission deserves public shaming are justifiable depending on how the question above is answered, but exaggerating the facts to make it appear as if the US performed an act of commission is inappropriate and false.
Gleysteen told Foreign Minister Park that the US concern "did not stem from some abstract American desire, but rather from our need to have political stability in Korea." Echoing the ambiguous goals set out right after Park's assassination, Gleysteen said the "key was not American preference but that any arrangements have adequate support of the Korean people." The US "had worked with President Park," ... "would be delighted to work with a liberal government" and "could work with something in between."¹⁴⁸ Rather, the tragedy US officials lamented was the harsh manner by which the equilibrium was reestablished, namely the Kwangju massacre, and the negative legacy it instilled among average Koreans' perceptions of the US. Anti-Americanism would increase substantially during the 1980s.

**IV. The US Factor in the 1979-1980 Political Transition**

On January 28th 1980, Ambassador Gleysteen observed, "our activist role is not an easy one and eventually we will be 'damned if we do and damned if we don't' by various elements of society seeking our support. The costs of miscalculation are high. If we don't do enough, dangerous events could occur; if we try to do too much, we may provoke strong, chauvinist reactions."¹⁴⁹ This statement accurately summarized the quandary facing US policymakers during this transition crisis. Korea's political elite jockeyed to obtain US support as a means of acquiring a stronger bargaining position during the political transition.¹⁵⁰ Meanwhile, the US felt impotent because the main coercive instruments available – the US security umbrella and the Korean economy's dependence on US markets – seemed too blunt to leverage credibly. US

¹⁴⁸ Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "May 19th discussion with Fonmin on domestic politics," May 18, 1980, FOIA. Some private conversations were more pointed. For instance, in a conversation with Korean Ambassador Kim on May 18th, Holbrooke injected a vague threat that the US would be more publicly critical if events "continued down the present path." "USG Statement on the Events in Kwangju," point 35.
¹⁵⁰ Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Reaction of the South Korean citizens to the death of President Park Chung Hee," October 27, 1979, DDRS; Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Widespread apprehension about a possible return to military rule unless the Americans stop it," November 1, 1979, FOIA.
policymakers only possessed weak "divide and unite" tactics. They also operated in a highly uncertain environment lacking "fairly good intelligence" and the "basic knowledge necessary to make sound decisions." Given these parameters, US officials involved in formulating the quiet diplomatic approach defend the decisions made as correct and necessary even if the short-term outcome was tragic. An accepted narrative about this period identifies the paradox of "massive entanglement, marginal influence." In contrast, as Gleysteen predicted, many Koreans still hold the US partly responsible for the Kwangju Massacre and Chun's subsequent dictatorship.

This section evaluates three key questions related to the broader counterfactual that had the US operated differently, Korea would have experienced a democratic transition in 1980. First, did US officials suspect the military might interfere in civilian politics? If so, when did these suspicions emerge and with what degree of confidence? Second, what policy options were available to US officials? Did the US employ all reasonable measures that would leave the security on the peninsula and the alliance relationship intact? Third, if the US had applied more graduated coercive diplomacy, would such an approach have changed the calculations of key actors? I present qualitative evidence to suggest that US officials suspected Chun's motives and could have employed certain policy tools beyond its passive role as neutral mediator. The final and most crucial question proves difficult to answer definitively. Single case studies are not well-suited for testing the ultimate effect of the path not taken. I suggest reasons to suspect US action may have mattered, but to move this proposition beyond the realm of speculation, it is necessary to introduce the 1987 UI campaign examined in chapter five.

Days after the 12/12 Incident, Chun replaced senior officers holding key military posts with younger officers. The political implications of this action were arguably greater than the
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152 Ibid. This is the title Ambassador Gleysteen chose for his book on these events.
coup. From that point forward, US officials knew that *de facto* power lay with Chun. What remained unknown were his intentions. Much evidence suggests US officials were suspicious, if not confident, of Chun's ultimate intentions from the start. After his first conversation with Chun on December 14th, Gleysteen retrospectively noted that he "never doubted" his determination "to become the controlling figure in Korea." At the time, Gleysteen openly expressed concerns that the events of December 12th were "a planned power grab by a group of officers who at a minimum expected to play a powerful background role as mentors of a weak civilian government, even if they did not currently intend to take full power into their own hands." Meanwhile, Wickham "was convinced that Chun and his partners fully intended to seize absolute power but had simply lacked a comprehensive plan for how to go about it." In Washington, the assessment was similar. An internal memo to Brzezinski states, "[i]t seems clear ... that the reins of power will be in the hand of Chon Tu-hwan ... known as a hardliner." Despite these premonitions, the US adhered to Gleysteen's original plan not to judge "the new crowd" until they "have blotted their copybook." The US waited for more information about Chun's true intentions before adopting more aggressive measures.

During the spring, US officials updated their priors and appeared increasingly confident that Chun sought to extend his power into civilian affairs if an opportunity arose. Gleysteen
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153 Young, *Eye on Korea*, 73, 80-82.
154 Wickham (*Korea on the Brink*, 71) mentions that little was known about Chun and the 11th KMA class before the coup. Such a statement implies that US interactions with these Korean officers were minimal and information regarding their intentions was absent. Young (*Eye on Korea*, 64), a US military attaché at the embassy in Seoul, rejects this claim, but accepts the possibility that information may not have been widely distributed throughout the bureaucracy.
156 Young, *Eye on Korea*, 88.
157 Wickham, *Korea on the Brink*, 67-68.
158 Memo, Platt to Brzezinski, "Comments on the internal coup within the South Korean military, led by Defense Security Commander Chon Tu-hwan," December 12, 1979, DDRS.
159 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Initial Reflections on Post-Park Chung Hee Situation in Korea," October, 27 1979, FOIA.
recognized a "progressive erosion" of Choi's authority as he became increasingly a figurehead for the "real power holders." As time passed, Chun's presence was ubiquitous. Gleysteen recounts a source informing the US Embassy that Chun "is all over the place," to which Gleysteen parenthetically added, "we agree." Even in Gleysteen's overly optimistic mid-March assessment, he noted that Chun "generally ... gives the impression of a man biding his time to take over power – either directly or behind a civilian facade." At this juncture, Gleysteen judiciously urged the US to "resist oversimplifying Korean politics by making Chun Doo Hwan the sinister source of all evil." Still, he clearly recognized Chun as one potential source.

Wickham similarly described Chun after their first meeting in late February as a man who "is on the make, has a taste for power, knows how to use it, and does not strike me as a man to be trusted." His second and third meeting with Chun before May 17 reinforced these impressions. When Choi appointed him dual director of the KCIA and DSC on April 14, Chun's true intentions were more or less clear. The remaining hope was that the civilians would reach a working consensus and foreclose any pretext for a power grab.

Given this recognition of Chun's accumulation of power and apparent ambitions, the next question concerns whether and when the US could have reasonably adopted more forceful measures to deter a potential military takeover. After the 12/12 Incident, US officials considered a gamut of coercive measures available to channel the political transition toward a desirable end.
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164 Wickham, *Korea on the Brink*, 118.
Strong coercive tactics included explicitly leveraging Korea's dependence on US military and economic interdependence. Concerning the security arrangement, US choices included troop withdrawals, reductions in supplies of military equipment, and/or the cancellation or postponement of the SCM. Adopting these measures was controversial. First, with different degrees of resolve, the US military opposed such tactics which could send a dangerous countervailing signal to American security assurances. Second, Gleysteen discouraged "sanctions, symbolic or otherwise, against the ROK, which in any way diminish ROK and US/ROK defense capabilities" because the US must not "do anything which would appear to the Korean public as anti-Korean, as opposed to anti-December 12." Regarding economic dependence, US options ranged from direct economic sanctions to the postponement of export-import (EXIM) loans. Once again, US officials considered such actions too risky because they could harm the entire society and cause further unrest, which would increase the likelihood of a military crackdown. In sum, US officials saw these strong measures as disproportionately excessive and potentially harmful to core US national interests.

Quiet diplomacy remained the dominant strategy. US officials met Korean counterparts to encourage political liberalization under civilian leadership and to focus the military's attention on the North. Carter sent a personal letter in early January that mentioned his deep distress over "the events of December 12 and warned that similar occurrences in the future 'would have serious consequences for our close cooperation.'" In a smart move, the letter was widely circulated throughout the government, but the threat was weak and vague. The US lacked contingency plans to pressure recalcitrant or reluctant factions even though many US officials
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understood these actors could derail the political liberalization trend. Again, most options beyond the limited toolkit associated with quiet diplomacy were considered too blunt and risky to use.

Some policy options were justifiably dismissed as too extreme. For example, in a letter to the US Embassy, a well-known Korean professor suggested removing Chun from the DSC to "teach Koreans a lesson that the United States does not support just anyone." While brilliant in its simplicity, Gleysteen responded that he "cannot act as a colonial governor." Similarly, in late January, a Korean military officer approached the US Embassy to probe its willingness to support a coup against Chun. Gleysteen rebuffed the offer. In hindsight, these decision points may appear as lost opportunities to remove Park's ultimate successor, but such direct action was questionable for several reasons. First, the top priority during the political transition was to avoid conflict within the ROK military ranks. A countercoup was full of risks and uncertainties. Second, there was no guarantee that Chun's replacement would be more docile or pro-democratic. Third, either option required direct and potentially extensive US involvement that could produce a nationalistic backlash. Nevertheless, nuanced policy options existed between these drastic measures and a modest policy of quiet diplomacy based on persuasion.

First, some forms of military sanctions were unlikely to produce the types of unintended consequences outlined above and therefore were plausible instruments for coercive diplomacy. The threat or actual postponement of the SCM was a weak, but highly symbolic point of leverage. Carter did apply this measure, but only after Chun's appointment to the KCIA. Such action was ineffective because it appeared weak after Chun's bold move. Canceling the SCM after the 12/12 Incident may have signaled firmer resolve. The US also could have threatened to reduce foreign military sales including F-16s and the co-production of F-5s. Because Korea

169 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Telegram from Professor Choi and Response," December 18, 1979, FOIA.
170 Young, Eye on Korea, 85, 169.
relied on US air support, these projects were not vital to national security and would not harm the economy.\textsuperscript{171} The risks of such moves were minimal when coupled with statements reaffirming the US security guarantee and promising to restore these programs after the political transition. In effect, these measures would have more effectively targeted narrow military interests.

Second, private threats to revisit the security arrangement in 1981 in case of unsolicited military interference in civilian affairs remained a viable option. Carter had previously announced this eventuality after his temporary suspension of troop withdrawal plans in April 1979. Wickham initially adopted such a tactic when he met Defense Minister Rho on December 14\textsuperscript{th} and General Chun in mid-February. On both occasions, Wickham describes his interlocutors' great consternation, but these fears of abandonment were fleeting because other US officials, particularly Gleysteen, abstained from echoing this threat.\textsuperscript{172} Such a strong measure raised a few fundamental concerns. Key US officials worried about damage to America's reputation if the "bluff" was called because of analogical reasoning. As an embassy officer in Tokyo, Gleysteen disagreed with how the US chargé in Seoul and the U.N. commander handled Park's 1961 coup. Instead of calmly gauging the situation, emotion appeared to overtake these officials who made the pragmatically unreasonable demand that the coup plotters return to the barracks and respect the constitutional process. Gleysteen believed "the highly public failure of these orders" greatly harmed "American authority."\textsuperscript{173} This formative experience "left a lasting impression" on him, but making a direct parallel to the situation in early 1980 seems largely unfounded. Unlike the

\textsuperscript{171} Gleysteen (\textit{Marginal Influence}, 151) continued to find this option quixotic following the Kwangju massacre. Some observers may contend that this option would have significantly undermined US assurances to Korea's security. Whether this was too large a risk remains debatable. Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: Relations with ROK Military," December 27, 1979, FOIA. However, from a purely material perspective, South Korea did not require these planes for self-defense as the Soviet Union was not providing North Korea with modern aircrafts or other advanced equipment. "Aircraft Procurement." 06/79 DNSA. Also see, HRG-1980-FOA-0036, at 17-18 (1980) (Armacost).

\textsuperscript{172} Wickham, \textit{Korea on the Brink}, 69.

\textsuperscript{173} Gleysteen, \textit{Marginal Influence}, 11.
1961 coup, the type of threats Wickham issued were meant to deter future behavior, not reverse a coup. Furthermore, US demands did not risk Chun's personal security, which was not the case for Park in 1961. Finally, such a measure would not have linked US threats to a specific public demand. If the bluff were called and a *fait accompli* issued, the US would still have substantial flexibility to determine how firmly to treat its ally.

Many US officials also worried that threats to revisit the security arrangement could worsen political stability on the peninsula. Paramount among these concerns was the fear of inadvertently encouraging another coup. The US categorically rejected the late January coup proposal, but military officers could still interpret – cynically or not – any US threat as an invitation for "pro-democracy" officers to overthrow Chun. The US could have significantly minimized this risk by consistently coupling the private threat to revisit the security arrangement with public and private warnings against future coup attempts. The final concern linked with the threat to revisit the security arrangement was the fear of inciting a nationalistic backlash. Very few South Koreans and no political elites wanted the US security commitment to diminish. Still, some key players could have decided to denounce private US efforts to link liberalization to security. Such an approach would require members in the military hierarchy or Choi's government to frame US policies as anti-Korean and not just anti-December 12th. Although the military and interim government had firm control over the media, the risk of such an open escalation with its security patron was unlikely. Many elites inside and outside the interim government would support the message for further liberalization, even if many would disagree with the nature of the threat. Chun could complain that US actions curtailed his ability to
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175 Korean officials sent barbed messages to their US counterparts not to interfere in the domestic conflict. See cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "Gist of Chun Doo Hwan Press Conference," April 29, 1980, FOIA.
safeguard political order, but would likely consider the message more damaging if made public because it could galvanize protests and send the wrong message to the North Koreans. If any party did attempt to distort the fundamental nature of the threat in the media, the US still had the ability to correct the public record through official public statements.

Third, the US could have more actively countered the controlled messages in the media that distorted the reality of the political and security situation. Such propaganda played a particularly decisive role in the final stages of Chun's power grab. For example, in a press conference after his dual appointment to the KCIA and DSC, Chun falsely claimed that the "misunderstandings' [with the US] following the December 12 Incident have been completely overcome." A few weeks later, the press slandered DJ and YS at the height of the protest movement, claiming they were inciting instability and violence. The military's dominance over the distribution of such information arguably curtailed the movement's ability to win over more cautious segments of society. It also revealed the limits of quiet diplomacy as the regime distorted the truth about particular US policy positions.

Gaining direct access to a broad domestic audience was not an option during this transition period. Yet, the US could have partly prevented the interim government and military from manipulating information to their advantage. One productive practice initiated by Gleysteen was weekly background sessions that outlined US views on the unfolding situation to Korean columnists and editors. Unfortunately, this exercise did little to alleviate the information deficit. To supplement this practice, the US could have broadcasted these meetings on Voice of America to clarify its position. Because Koreans actively sought out the US position, this

176 Cable, Gleysteen to SecState, "Comment on Chun Doo Hwan Press Conference," April 29, 1980, FOIA.
information would likely spread. Such bold moves, however, involved considerable risks. Most importantly, the rumor mill would likely distort the US message and correcting the record afterwards would prove difficult. If used judiciously, however, the sum total of such efforts could signal the patron's resolve to potential spoilers.¹⁷⁹

Fourth, other ways to demonstrate public support for political evolution and the civilian government existed. The most poignant example is an attempt by the Choi administration to gauge US interest in arranging a presidential working visit in 1980. Gleysteen recommended that the administration seriously entertain this option. Such a meeting could have reaffirmed the US security commitment, bolstered the civilian government, and supported the political liberalization trend.¹⁸⁰ Nothing came of this suggestion partly due to time constraints associated with the upcoming 1980 presidential campaign, but such a proactive effort may have mattered. If members of Chun's inner-circle believed US interests went beyond political stability, the expected costs of continuing down the path of a "rolling coup" would have increased.

Finally, the US could have adopted more forceful tactics to convince the interim government to announce a clear timetable for the political transition and to cancel martial law. Quiet diplomacy seemed appropriate in the fall, but the interim government equivocation on these issues in March and April fueled mistrust and unnecessarily aggravated tensions. Yet, US officials only complained privately about interim President Choi's hesitance to take a proactive stance.¹⁸¹ Increased public or private pressure on the interim government to defuse the escalatory

¹⁷⁹ US officials appeared obsessed to "do everything possible to avoid acrimonious public debates because the process could easily get out of control in both countries, causing great damage to our mutual interests." Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Korea Focus: Meeting with Chun Doo Hwan," May 6, 1980, FOIA.
¹⁸⁰ Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Trial balloon, re. visit of President Choi to US," January 6, 1980, FOIA.
¹⁸¹ Only after Choi left on a diplomatic mission to the Middle East in early May did Gleysteen appear to bring additional private pressure to bear on the interim government to act more decisively. Just before his meeting with Blue House Secretary General Choi, Gleysteen was advised by Washington "to use the meeting to state our concerns
spiral never materialized. Had the US pressured these civilian fence-sitters to reach a bargain with the National Assembly, Chun would never have had the requisite excuse to seize power.

The common apologia for the American position during this political transition was that the US did not maintain the right kind of leverage to safely discourage the machinations of a small, determined cabal of military officers. According to this narrative, President Choi lacked the necessary fortitude to advance the reform agenda consistently and quickly. He was an "instinctively cautious" man, who "agonized over his political weakness" and was generally "unwilling to use his authority to run a real risk and actively push for change."\(^{182}\) Certainly, a more resolute leader in the Blue House would have increased the likelihood of a democratic transition in 1980, but such a counterfactual is not worth entertaining. The US had to deal with Choi. At least he appeared amenable to a potential democratic transition. Ironically, American accusations about Choi's character succinctly capture its own foreign policy. The refusal to apply graduated coercive diplomacy reflected a low risk tolerance that contributed to an all or nothing view of policy options. With a slightly greater risk acceptance, the US could have adopted any mix of the aforementioned measures. Thus, the US did not lack the ability to channel domestic contestation toward a democratic outcome, but rather the willingness.

Having provided affirmative answers to the first two questions, the pivotal counterfactual for the purposes of this dissertation remains. Would a clear policy of support for the UI campaign demands have sufficiently altered the calculations of key actors to keep the transition on a democratic track? Counterfactuals often identify a decision or event temporally proximate to the outcome of interest in which a conceivable alternative action would have likely generated about the potential gravity of the situation very bluntly, including ... that only the president can sufficiently cool the situation." Cable, Vance to Gleysteen, "Korea Focus: Tensions in the ROK," May 7, 1980, FOIA.\(^{182}\) Gleysteen, \textit{Marginal Influence}, 69.
a different result. In this case, however, the counterfactual is based on a culmination effect. The assumption is that an unambiguous preference for a democratic outcome would have altered the balance of power between regime soft-liners and hard-liners. When the critical juncture arrived in early May, the strategic environment would have changed sufficiently to allow the US to adopt more vigorous private and public actions. This would have increased the likelihood of a democratic transition in Korea in 1980. In other words, the decisions made after the 12/12 Incident were path dependent. The number of palatable options to nudge the precarious transition toward a stable democratic conclusion narrowed each day.

Quiet diplomacy left the US with little leverage by the time Gleysteen and Wickham met Chun on May 8th and 13th respectively. At this point, civilian and military soft-liners were largely sidelined and the US was left with three unsatisfactory options. First, the US could side with the protesters. Such an audacious volte-face would have alienated the military and risked emboldening the opposition to adopt even more confrontational tactics in an effort to realize other demands immediately. Second, the US could privately threaten serious sanctions if the military unnecessarily suppressed protests. Key decision-makers would question the credibility of a threat based on such a sudden policy shift and likely call the bluff. Both these options were high risk. Third, the US could remain an observer and hope for the best. This policy was low risk, could possibly produce the most desired outcome of democracy and stability, and was unlikely to cause a worst case scenario. The US unsurprisingly proceeded with quiet diplomacy at this critical juncture, which enabled Chun to seize power. Yet, if the US had adopted coercive diplomatic measures beyond quiet diplomacy sooner, its options and the environment in which it weighed these options would have been different.

Gleysteen expressed fears of "radicals" hijacking the demonstrations and adopting more confrontational tactics. Cable, Gleysteen to Muskie, "Students take to the streets," May 15 1980, FOIA.
A mix of early private threats directed toward Chun's group, US public appeals in clear support of a democratic transition, and enhanced pressure on the interim government to produce a transparent timetable would have strengthened the soft-liners position within the interim government and military and diminished Chun's ability to co-opt and subordinate fence-sitters. Such actions could also have shown resolve that affected the cost-benefit analysis of members in Chun's inner-circle. By raising the stakes earlier, Chun's ability to seize upon the perceived window of opportunity in mid-May would have decreased and the US ability to help midwife the political transition would have increased. As mentioned earlier, the repeal of martial law and a grand bargain between the interim government and opposition elements appeared within reach in May. Thus, it is plausible that the right mix of early and consistent American pressure would have increased the chances of UI campaign success by providing the necessary impetus to push Korea toward a democratic path, rather than providing a permissive environment for authoritarian retrenchment.

* * * * *

This chapter explored the inability of Washington to guide the political breakthrough in Korea toward a democratic transition through quiet diplomacy. The US attempt to play the role of honest broker failed to help the opposition, interim government, and military extricate themselves from a political impasse. Although Chun's grand ambitions were increasingly apparent to US officials in the spring of 1980, the Carter administration did not take available steps to actively discourage Chun's rolling coup. In general, US officials perceived their options in dichotomous terms. There were only strong and weak policy instruments. The strong ones were too blunt to employ, while the weak ones appeared too limited. Once Chun made his move,
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the US satisﬁced to avoid a worst case scenario – chaos on the peninsula. Thus, quiet diplomacy
based largely on persuasion was basically equivalent to neutrality and inadvertently created a
permissive environment for the armed forces to adopt a military solution and reconsolidate
power under Chun Doo Hwan.

The US failed to employ a variety of "divide and unite" tactics, which begs the following
question: did the US have the ability to alter the situation had it behaved differently? Here, the
answer is a qualiﬁed yes. Once Chun carried out the May 17th fait accompli, palatable US
options to compel a reversal were seriously limited. Yet, coercive diplomatic actions that raised
the perceived costs and beneﬁts of actors within the interim government and military may have
deterred the power grab. If Chun's brief window of opportunity passed, there is reason to believe
a democratic transition would have occurred. Ultimately, it is impossible to know whether the
risk-acceptant Chun would still have rolled the iron dice to obtain power. Fortunately, the 1987
UI campaign provides a reasonable real-world "replay" to better evaluate this counterfactual.
Chapter 5:
Isolate and Unite II: South Korea 1987

The previous chapter argued that US foreign policy couched purely in quiet diplomacy essentially amounted to patron neutrality. This approach provided the permissive environment that enabled the military to seize power illegally in May 1980 instead of embarking on a genuine political transition, which was the eventuality the US most preferred. As a single case study, this hypothesis was couched in counterfactual analysis, but the 1987 UI campaign lends credibility to the contention that patron support would have increased the chance of campaign success. In contrast to the 1980 campaign, Washington publicly and privately supported the opposition's effort in 1987 to realize genuine political reforms, the equivalent of regime change. Since different patron reactions to domestic discord produced outcomes in line with this dissertation's central argument, a most-similar case design seems appropriate. Indeed, the similarities between these cases are numerous. The "divide and unite" tactics used in 1987 were viable options seven years earlier; the protagonists remained similar; and, certain alternative hypotheses, like economic performance and personal security, would predict the opposite outcomes.

This chapter begins by describing salient features related to the evolution of the regime, the opposition, and the US-Korean relationship. The next section presents a narrative of key events that occurred between 1985 legislative elections and Chun's decision to allow competitive presidential elections on June 31st 1987. I then discuss the actions Washington adopted during the tense stand-off in the spring of 1987. A direct comparison of the two cases follows. I then explore alternative explanations to evaluate whether US actions independently affected these outcomes or whether the end results were over-determined by other factors. I argue that US actions did ensure success in 1987, which bolsters the claim that a different US policy would
have increased the probability of success in 1980. The section concludes with a few reasons why a different policy in 1980 would not have guaranteed success.

I. The Political Environment

1.a. The Chun Regime

Following the Kwangju massacre, the fate of the military and Chun were intimately intertwined. The only way forward was to consolidate power. On May 31st, President Choi Kyu Hah established a military-dominated Special Committee for National Security Measures (SCNSM) as "an advisory and assistant body to the president."1 Ostensibly, this new agency was meant to coordinate actions between the civilian cabinet and the Martial Law Command (MLC). In reality, the SCNSM rendered the Cabinet powerless. With de facto decision-making power completely under military control, the greatest obstacle to institutionalizing the incipient regime's rule was the lack of legitimacy caused by the irregular and violent way power was acquired. To address this legitimacy deficit, Chun and his associates focused on three pillars.

First, the regime waged a highly publicized fight against corruption. This was a smart public relations maneuver because much of the population resented the venality associated with politicians and bureaucrats. Thus, the SCNSM adopted a campaign to "purge impure elements," "rectify amoral business activities," and "purify the nation by rooting out various social vices."2 The first major action occurred on June 18th 1980 when ten top officials from the Park regime, including Kim Jong Pil, Pak Chong Kyu, and Lee Hu Rak, were required to donate all of their ill-gotten wealth "voluntarily," approximately $150 million, and retire from public life.3 The removal of these old-guard, discredited figures was strategic and symbolic. Chun eliminated
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1 Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 232-233.
2 The "social purification" drive enforced bureaucratic loyalty, removed potential adversaries, and created vacancies of higher level government offices for ambitious young bureaucrats. Clifford, Troubled Tiger, 164-67.
political rivals and struck off on his own path that rectified some of the less attractive aspects of Park's legacy. Three major government purges followed because "purification of society could not be expected without the Government first being clean."⁴ On July 10th, 232 senior officials were ousted, followed by 4,760 lower-ranking officials on July 15th, and 1,819 officials from banks and state-run corporations on July 22nd. Overall, the "social purification" campaign received some popular support because the transitional government appeared as social reformers willing to challenge vested interests.⁵

This potential avenue for legitimating the regime would prove ephemeral due to a major "curb-loan scandal" in 1982, which irreparably harmed the perception that Chun was part of the solution to curtailing endemic corruption, not part of the problem. The informal "curb" market was a perennial feature in the highly regulated Korean financial system. Bank loans were often limited to firms investing in government-approved projects. Companies seeking to invest in other sectors sought capital from private citizens, who provided loans at high interest rates. Beginning in 1981, former deputy director of the KCIA Lee Chol Hi and his wife began a pyramid loan scheme. Using their Blue House connections, they bullied banks to lend them money at low interest rates and sold the borrowed money to six cash-starved, but reputable companies at high interest rates. Then, they sold the promissory notes, typically held by lenders as collateral, back onto the curb market.⁶ In this fashion, the couple handled almost $1 billion in promissory notes and accumulated approximately $300 million within 15 months.

The scandal broke in May 1982 when a company filed an official complaint after finding promissory notes on the curb market of debts it had repaid in full. Economic ramifications of the
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⁵ Nam, *Search for Political Consensus*, 237.
scandal were substantial, but the political implications for Chun were far greater. The First Lady's uncle was among those implicated. This was the beginning of corruption and scandal charges levied against members of Chun's family, which erased the political dividends obtained from the purification drives. Despite efforts to regain the political initiative by dismissing half his cabinet and arresting all those involved in the scandal, the first pillar of legitimacy crumbled. Chun never again resorted to an anti-corruption campaign to boost the popularity of his regime. He increasingly relied on the second pillar, economic growth, to legitimize the Fifth Republic.

In 1980, the economy was sputtering. GNP declined by 5.7% in real terms and unemployment was rising. The drastic decline in economic growth occurred for several reasons. Externally, the 1979 oil crisis exacerbated tensions within the export-driven, resource-poor economy. Not only did the cost of oil imports double from $3 to $6 billion dollars, but also the OECD countries that purchased Korean light industrial exports entered a recession. This in turn contributed to an average 40-44% inflation rate in 1980, a $4.4 billion current account deficit in 1981, and a $40 billion national debt by 1984. Coupled with the uncertainty surrounding political stability following Park's assassination and Chun's creeping coup, international investors began to consider Korea a real risk. This acute period of stagflation revealed the limits and inefficiencies of Park's economic approach.

Facing this sudden downturn, a group of technocrats would come to dominate economic policymaking during the Fifth Republic. In a series of private lectures, Kim Jae Ik, the Economic Planning Bureau's director general, taught Chun the principles of economic liberalization and need to rationalize the economy to respond to the competitive pressures of the free-market. Unlike Park, Chun lacked preconceptions about the proper structure of the economic system.
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7 Several financial scandals in the following years also de-legitimated Chun's newly formed Democratic Justice Party. Nam, Search for Political Consensus, 290-291.
Convinced that economic liberalization was the appropriate remedy to the faltering economy, Chun empowered this group of technocrats with an enviable degree of autonomy to develop a reform program. As president, Chun reportedly told Kim, "You are the president of economic affairs." With such insulation from powerful special interests groups, the technocrats quickly initiated reforms meant to cut the government deficit, curb inflation with tight monetary policies, and reduce costly subsidies through fiscal constraint. The economic prescriptions and remedies were quite successful. Inflation dropped to single digits by 1982 and economic growth resumed at 5.9% in 1981, 7.2% in 1982, and 12.6% in 1983. However, this undertaking increasingly alienated traditional allies and failed to win over the middle class and businessmen of small and medium enterprises, who were the intended beneficiaries of the reforms. Ironically, Chun's success in jumpstarting the economy had pernicious effects on his regime's durability.

Perhaps the most significant change of the macro-economic reforms was the chaebol-state relationship. Raising interest rates was one key initiative to stem inflation. This approach affected the chaebol strategy to sustain high-levels of growth. Under Park, chaebols borrowed money at preferential rates that they later repaid at a real-value sometimes less than the amount borrowed thanks to high inflation. In combination with limiting the number of subsidized loans, higher interest rates reduced inflationary pressure and helped remove sources of rents. Yet, the legacy of concessional loans and protectionism in strategic industries remained with "excessive and duplicative investment, surplus capacity, and business concentration." The technocrats rationalized the economy through a variety of measures. In April 1981, for instance, the government enacted the Monopoly Regulation and Fair Trade Law to stem "conglomerate
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9 Brazinsky, *Nation Building in South Korea*, 146-147.
10 Haggard and Moon, "Postwar South Korea," 83.
concentration through cross-investment, reciprocal buying, and cross-subsidization among chaebol subsidiaries."\(^{11}\) This was one of several legislative efforts to increase the efficiency of the chaebols and level the playing field for small and medium-sized firms. More blunt forms of state interventionism also emerged. In 1980, the regime ordered radical corporate restructuring by forcibly merging competing companies in an effort to address issues related to surplus capacity.\(^{12}\) Although these reforms addressed some inefficiencies within the chaebols, efforts to reduce these business conglomerates' concentrated share of the economy were not very successful.

Meanwhile, the heads of chaebols grew further disillusioned with the regime for unrelated reasons. Namely, the average quasi-tax rate, "a forced donation for semi-governmental purposes," increased from 0.48% to 0.85% of total annual sales at Korean companies. This amounted to billions of dollars over eight years.\(^{13}\) While these "voluntary" donations sometimes covered socially desirable programs, like veterans' care or disaster relief, no real oversight existed, which left substantial leeway for graft. The most egregious aspect of the increased quasi-tax rate was that Chun, his wife, brothers, and distant relatives increasingly resorted to these extortive practices as businesses suffered from the technocratic slow-growth policies. In comparison to regimes like Marcos's Philippines, the scale of corruption was small, but the parochial greed of Chun's family harmed the coalitional cohesion between big business and the regime. Given the state's immense capacity to destroy any one chaebol, no businessmen would openly break ranks.\(^{14}\) Instead, big business sought to increase its competitiveness on the open

\(^{11}\) Haggard and Moon, "Postwar South Korea," 84.
\(^{12}\) Clifford, Troubled Tiger, 185-190.
\(^{13}\) Ibid., 209.
\(^{14}\) Most infamously, the regime dismantled Kukje, the sixth largest chaebol, in 1985. Many observers saw political motives behind this action, but the main motivation appears to be linked to the technocrats continued dislike of the
market and decrease its dependence on the state. When the Fifth Republic struggled to survive in 1987, capitalist interests were largely detached from the fate of the regime. Businessmen did not defect *en masse* to the side of protesters during the regime crisis, but neither were they completely hostile to the opposition's political demands.

The economic reforms also disillusioned the rural community, which was the other key coalition member of the regime under the *Yushin* system. In contrast to Park's ideology of self-reliance, economic reformers like Kim Jae Ik did not regard domestic agricultural production as a vital national interest.\(^{15}\) Korea did not enjoy a comparative advantage in agriculture, and so the size of this sector represented a market distortion. Thus, when considering which expenditures to cut in the fiscal budget, subsidies to farmers were an obvious target. The technocrats shrank the grain management fund and eliminated the provision of fertilizer, two popular subsidies in rural communities.\(^{16}\) The political repercussions of this policy became apparent when vote-share for the regime's party shrank in rural communities in the 1985 parliamentary election.

The technocratic reforms not only pushed allies away, but also failed to win support from other powerful collective groups. For instance, the government froze worker wages in an effort to stem inflation. Although inflation decreased substantially, workers real wages still declined significantly. At a time when worker consciousness was rising, this policy helped direct frustration toward the state, not just the firm. Finally, as the main beneficiary of the reforms, the regime expected the growing middle class to display greater loyalty. Instead, the middle class increasingly challenged the traditional national security narrative that characterized civil and
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\(^{15}\) Ibid., 219-226.

\(^{16}\) Haggard and Moon, "Postwar South Korea," 87.
political liberties characteristic of Western democracy as luxuries South Korea could ill afford
given its hostile environs. As a result, the regime could no longer easily cow the silent majority
to remain quiescent while dissidents agitated for democratic reforms. Overall, the technocratic
reformers succeeded in prolonging the "economic miracle," but a high level of economic growth
was no longer sufficient to legitimize the unpopular political regime.

The third way Chun legitimated his rise to power was a promise to be the first president
to transfer power peacefully. He would repeat this intention publicly and privately throughout his
entire tenure. In an apparent effort to bolster the credibility of his commitment, he also included
a clause in the constitution of the Fifth Republic that limited the president to serving one seven-
year term. Thus, Chun's final pillar of legitimacy also provided a focal point for the opposition to
incite a succession crisis if the regime refused to liberalize political competition.

Despite the legitimacy deficit, Chun maintained a high capacity state where all coercive
institutions remained loyal to him. Thus, the material strength of Chun's regime remained high. It
lacked the strong cohesion present during the Yushin system between the regime, the capitalist
class, and rural community, but was in a more commanding position than during the 1980
transition when authority was diffuse and in flux. Equally important, the economy was strong
particularly after 1985 when low petroleum prices, low interest rates, and low dollar-yen ratio
coincided. These "three blessings" erased fears of growing unemployment, fueled economic
growth, and further reduced the current accounts deficit. Despite the material strength of the
regime, the opposition presented a strong, coherent challenge so that the regime could not
"withdraw in good times" on its own terms.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{17}\) As Kihl (Transforming Korean Politics, 80) points out, Haggard and Kaufman's ("Political Economy of
Democratic Transitions," 268-70) account of the 1987 Korean transition conflates outcome with process. As
1.b. The Opposition

The 1980 purification campaign also sought to restrict all facets of civil society and the political opposition. The effort to "cleanse" civil society began in earnest on June 17th, when the MLC issued arrest warrants for 329 individuals on charges ranging from corruption to the incitement of unrest. This list included professors, students, politicians, and journalists. The campaign expanded in August to include the mass arrest of over 30,000 people described as "hooligans, racketeers, gangsters, and gamblers," 20,000 of whom were forced to attend a month-long "re-education program." To ensure an uneventful, controlled transition to the Fifth Republic, the SCNSM also adopted specific preventive measures directed against potentially subversive groups, including the media, students, labor, and opposition politicians.

Muzzling critical voices in the media was a paramount concern. Adhering to a SCNSM suggestion, the Korean Newspaper Association and Korean Broadcasters' Association agreed to "voluntarily and resolutely get rid of detrimental elements and root out all irregularities committed in the name of the press" in late June. Shortly thereafter, 172 periodicals and 80 magazines were abolished for "instigating social confusion." These included the best academic and liberal publications. In mid-December, the government also forced two major and five minor news agencies to merge into Yonhap News Agency. This government-controlled newswire became the primary source for domestic and international news for all Korean newspapers and broadcasters. The Legislative Council for National Security (LCNS), which replaced the
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dissolved National Assembly, further limited press freedoms on December 26th with the adoption of the Basic Press Laws, which empowered the Minister of Culture and Information to cancel or suspend the licenses of remaining publications for any number of questionable, idiosyncratic reasons. By the end of 1980, the regime restored its hegemonic grip on information which had been partly lost after Park’s assassination.

Considered a wellspring of unrest, students were accordingly targeted after the May 1980 protests. On June 11th, the Ministry of Education banned all student demonstrations on and off campus and warned university presidents that institutions might be closed down for such disturbances. When a few hundred students held demonstrations at the Korean Theological Seminary and Korea University in October, the government carried through with its threat and closed down both institutions. In addition to arresting students, the government threatened those involved in political activism with expulsion from the university. Ultimately, the government failed to eradicate the deeply entrenched spirit of resistance, but the message was clear. Student dissent in the form of campus demonstrations declined in the early 1980s.

The ever-present menace of organized labor also faced a series of setbacks during the early years of the Fifth Republic. In particular, the LCNS passed five "basic" labor laws in late 1980 that harshly sanctioned collective action without prior approval, forced individual workers to join company-controlled "labor-management councils," decentralized unions to the enterprise-level, and forbid involvement of outside actors like the Urban Industrial Mission. In a demonstration of the government’s resolve to neutralize independent labor, Chun dissolved the
powerful Cheonggye Garment Workers' Union (CGWU) in 1981 by administrative decree. The significance of this action was immense because this union emerged from Chun Tae-II's self-immolation in 1971. The CGWU symbolized the larger fight for labor rights.\(^{27}\) Under such stifling conditions, coordinated action by organized labor remained rare until 1984.

The final aspect of the purification campaign was the purging of potential political adversaries. In November, the LCNS appointed a Political Purification Committee that created a blacklist, which included the majority of legislators from the recently dissolved National Assembly and hundreds of other "stained" individuals.\(^{28}\) By 1981, 567 individuals were banned from political activity for eight years, i.e. after Chun's successor would assume the presidency. The blacklist included the two most prominent members of the opposition, YS and DJ.

With these measures in place, Chun successfully neutralized all potential obstacles and formally began his seven-year presidential term in February 1981. Similar to life under the \textit{Yushin} system, however, blanket repression unintentionally strengthened networks within and across the collective actors that made up the opposition. Cognitive liberation accelerated as students and intellectuals sought alternative paradigms to understand their situation. The intellectual traditions of Marxism, dependency theory, and liberation ideology provided salient frames for understanding the subordination of the masses and the need to resist. Coupled with the apparent US acceptance of Chun, these radical ideologies fueled anti-Americanism.\(^{29}\) Radical members of the opposition increasingly attacked symbols of American influence. The economic reforms aimed at liberalizing the financial system and international trade also contributed to the

\(^{27}\) Cumings, \textit{Place in the Sun}, 379.
\(^{29}\) Koo, \textit{Korean Workers}, 103.
opposition's ability to co-opt nationalism. Thus, unlike Park's image as protector of Korean self-dependence, Chun appeared willing to sell his nation to foreign interests.

These resonant frames infiltrated factories due to the labor praxis approach that became more prevalent during the early period of Chun's rule. The main objectives of this strategy was for students to join the workforce in factories and "try to promote class consciousness among the workers and help them organize unions." Around 3,000 students became factory workers at this time. These student-turned-workers helped provide injustice frames that linked the workers' sense of economic deprivation to the political subjugation supported by the capitalist system. As cognitive liberation unfolded, the crude methods used by police to suppress worker efforts to voice their grievances reinforced this connection. The labor-praxis strategy also contributed to thicker interpersonal ties and the overlap of umbrella organizations, like the Youth Coalition for Democracy Movement (YCDM) and the Korean Council for Labor Welfare (KCLW).

The vibrancy of the opposition was revealed when a political thaw occurred in 1984. For civil society, this period of political decompression mattered in two ways. First, the regime withdrew riot police from the university, permitted students to demonstrate on-campus, and allowed expelled students and dismissed professors to return to campus. Second, the press acquired some space to report on strikes, demonstrations, and opposition actions. These reforms led to a substantial increase in the number of small student and anti-government demonstrations. Yet, as an indicator of opposition strength, these actions were the most predictable, and therefore least meaningful byproduct of political liberalization. Rather, the degree of coordination among collective actors in the opposition revealed a heightened level of resilience and capacity, while

30 Koo, *Korean Workers*, 104.
32 Chu, "Labor and Democratization," 197.
testing the limits of the political opening. Nowhere was this more evident than labor's struggle to regain the right for workers to form independent unions.

In March 1984, the CGWU launched a campaign that demanded its reinstatement as a union, which it achieved one month later. The CGWU and KCLW subsequently advocated for the repeal of the Basic Labor Laws through public forums and street demonstrations with open support and assistance from church leaders, pro-democracy organizations, and students. During October and November, several mass demonstrations in which two thousands students participated occurred in downtown Seoul. This series of contentious episodes contributed to the growing number of student-worker contacts and the realization by radical students of the worker's central role in the struggle against Chun's dictatorship.

The 1985 Kuro solidarity strike continued this trend of labor politicization and cross-cutting coalitional cooperation within the emerging pro-democracy campaign. When the union leader and two union officials of Daewoo Apparel were arrested in June for an unlawful sit-in during spring wage-negotiations, union representatives decided to initiate a strike with distinctly political demands, including the repeal of the Basic Labor Laws. The Daewoo Apparel strike, situated in the sprawling Kuro Industrial Park which housed several other factories, spread quickly. The Kuro solidarity strike lasted six days and grew to include eight firms and 2,500 workers. During this time, several anti-government and religious groups voiced solidarity with the strikers' demands. Twelve students also demonstrated their support by delivering food to the workers and weathering a beating during the violent dispersal of the strike on June 29th.

Although the solidarity strike failed to realize its immediate goals, these actions demonstrated
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that the recently founded People's Movement Coalition for Democracy and Reunification (PMCDR), an umbrella organization of 24 groups and organizations, was more than a fragile coalition of disparate interests. By 1985, the deepening and bridging of civil society groups was far more advanced than six years earlier.\(^{37}\) The political opposition would greatly benefit from this resilient triple alliance between labor, students, and the churches after its unexpectedly competitive showing in the 1985 legislative elections.

\textit{I.c. US-ROK Relations: 05/31/80 - 02/06/87}

After the military crushed the Kwangju uprising, Washington's primary goal was ruthlessly pragmatic. In late May 1980, during a CNN interview, Carter "stressed that security interests must sometimes override human rights concerns in allied countries."\(^{38}\) Besides maintaining security on the peninsula, the administration sought an expeditious return to a semblance of civilian politics, which included moderating state repression, repealing martial law, implementing constitutional reforms, and running an election. As Wickham acknowledged on August 7\(^{th}\) in an off-the-record interview, the US would accept Chun's ascension to the presidency "if he comes to power legitimately."\(^{39}\) This was a relatively easy task to accomplish because all \textit{de facto} power was already under his command.

In August, Chun acquired his fourth military star, nudged interim-president Choi from office, donned civilian clothes, and was unanimously elected president by the National Conference of Unification. In the fall, the constitution of the Fifth Republic was unveiled and approved by popular referendum. The document was relatively democratic, but the office of the president remained indirectly selected by an electoral college system, where representation was

\(^{37}\) For more on the deepening process regarding the increased organizational capacity and support of particular civil society groups, see Kim, \textit{Democratization in Korea}, 82-84.

\(^{38}\) Gleysteen, \textit{Marginal Influence}, XX.

\(^{39}\) Wickham, \textit{Korea on the Brink}, 156.
skewed to ensure the regime's continued dominance. The final step in re-normalizing the alliance occurred on January 24th 1981, when Chun commuted DJ's death sentence and lifted martial law. A resounding victory in legislative elections for the new pro-regime Democratic Justice Party (DJP) in February was followed by Chun's re-election to the presidency two weeks later, once more through indirect elections. In fourteen months, Chun completed his rolling coup without altering the basic contours of the US-ROK relationship.

As Chun formalized his control over Korea, a transformation in the basic direction of US foreign policy was underway. The incoming Reagan administration entered office with a different conception of how best to advance US interests and counter Soviet expansionism. In particular, Reagan believed the previous administration's universal application of human rights to friends and foes contributed to the destabilization of anti-communist allies. In contrast, Reagan pursued "double standards" when applying human rights to dictatorships. Proponents did not see this strategic shift in foreign policy as hypocritical, but rather the best way to advance the national interest. Known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, this foreign policy approach had important ramifications for the US-ROK alliance.
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40 The DJ trial and subsequent death sentence were the final roadblocks to reaffirming the status-quo arrangement between the allies. For several months, US diplomatic activity centered on saving Kim's life, which was not a forgone conclusion. These actions seem to have contributed to the commutation of his death sentence by making the costs appear greater than any potential benefits of eliminating a charismatic leader, which was the preference among regime hardliners. The incoming Reagan administration offered a meeting with Chun as quid pro quo for sparing Kim's life. Chun desired such a meeting to legitimize his power at home. For good measure, the Reagan administration issued serious threats. Richard Allen, Reagan's key foreign affairs adviser, reportedly told South Korean officials that the US reaction to Kim's death would be "like a lightning bolt from the heaven striking them." Richard Allen, "On a Korean Tightrope," *New York Times*, 01/21/1998.

41 See Jeanne Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards," *Commentary Magazine* 68, No. 5 (1979). Jeanne Kirkpatrick, who was Reagan's foreign policy adviser during the 1980 elections, outlined this position most clearly. Nevertheless, Carter's policy of championing human rights had never been completely genuine toward allies considered essential to US national interest. This increasingly became the case by the end of Carter's presidential term. Thus, by the time Reagan became president, the strategic goals of the two administrations vis-a-vis Korea differed in presentation, not substance.
Most significantly, Chun was the first head of state to visit the newly inaugurated Reagan administration in early February 1980. As outlined in Secretary of State Haig's briefing memo to Reagan, the purpose of the visit was "to restore normalcy to our relations with a valued ally" and "underscore the constancy of the American commitment to peace and stability in Northeast Asia." In this spirit, economic and security issues were the primary topics of discussion. Comments concerning the repressive atmosphere in Korea and future prospects of democratization were conspicuously absent. In fact, the State Department's human rights report on Korea was belatedly released a week after Chun's visit to avoid any embarrassment for the new leader. For Chun, the political dividend of this visit was great. US actions certified his leadership position, which helped boost his prestige at home. The benefit to the US was less tangible. In effect, the meeting restored trust within the alliance and between the leaders. This increased goodwill arguably enabled the Reagan administration to employ quiet diplomacy more effectively and nudge its authoritarian ally gently toward political liberalization.

For the next six years, the US attempted to balance its commitment to Korean security with its desire for political reform. The Reagan administration understood that political liberalization in an authoritarian context risks greater societal upheaval, but the goal to promote gradual political reform slowly replaced the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. As a result, US representatives combined praise with reminders that the US fully endorsed plans for political reforms in Korea. The apparent goals were to entrap Chun in his own rhetoric, empower reformist factions in the regime, and protect the moderate opposition from future episodes of excessive repression. This strategy defined Chun's subsequent meetings with Vice President Bush and President Reagan.
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42 Memo, Haig to Reagan, "Your Meeting with Chun Doo-Hwan," January 28, 1981, FOIA.
In April 1982, Vice President Bush visited Korea to celebrate the centennial anniversary of US-ROK relations. This visit was noteworthy on two accounts. First, in an address to the National Assembly, Bush reminded the legislative body that Chun told Reagan the previous year he would work for a "freer, more abundant and democratic society." As such, Bush encouraged the National Assembly to "build on such a commitment," noting that the US saw "political diversity" as "a source of strength, not of weakness." Second, Bush had breakfast with a cross-section of non-governmental leaders, including those from the "responsible dissident" community. Foreshadowing Reagan's speech to the British Parliament months later, Bush stressed that the US "will not pursue a policy of selective indignation. Every act of torture is equally repugnant to the American people, no matter who commits it." Despite this implicit critique, Chun praised Bush's general approach of reaching out to "responsible Korean opinion leaders" as consistent with his regime's policy. In this way, Bush initiated the strategy of offering strong support, while prodding South Korea to continue political development.

Despite the Soviet's recent downing of a Korean airliner and the North Korean assassination attempt on Chun during his state visit to Burma, Reagan adhered to this strategy during his visit to Seoul in November 1983. The US president praised Chun's handling of enemy provocations and reaffirmed the US commitment to Korea's security, but also gently encouraged further political reforms. In a speech to the National Assembly, the US president
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45 Cable, Walker to Haig, "The Vice President's meeting with President Chun," April 29, 1982, DNSA.
46 In early September 1983, a Soviet interceptor shot down the civilian Korean Airlines flight 007, killing 110 Koreans, 61 Americans, and 98 other nationals. Then, a month later during a state visit to Rangoon, a failed North Korean assassination plot to kill Chun led to the death of 21 people, including three senior South Korean officials.
acknowledged the inherent tensions between stability and political development particularly in Korea's geopolitical environment. Yet, he insisted that democratic change was "the surest means to build the national consensus that is the foundation of true security." He also welcomed the goals Korea had "set for political development and increased respect for human rights and democratic practices," as well as "President Chun's farsighted plans for a constitutional transfer of power in 1988." The final Chun-Reagan meeting occurred after the opposition won a substantial share of the votes in the February 1985 legislative elections. In response to Chun's conciliatory gestures after these surprising results, Reagan expressed his support for the steps the Korean government "has taken to further promote freedom and democracy" and reiterated his support for Chun's pledge to step down in 1988.

These friendly messages from the top were partly effective because lower-level US officials reiterated the need for political reform and protection of basic human rights. These public and private messages became increasingly common after 1985. For instance, the State Department spokesman verified and condemned the torture of three Korean journalists in October 1985, the rape of a young female labor organizer in August 1986, and the regime's repeated attempts to stifle the freedom of association and speech throughout 1986. Members of Congress and congressional committees also issued public statements describing the emergence of a genuine democracy in Korea as a vital US interest. Not to be mistaken as cheap talk, US

diplomats often reinforced these public statements by petitioning the government against excessive repressive measures.\textsuperscript{51} Although none of these actions forced Chun's hand to initiate immediate democratic reforms, the consistent message made the potential costs of authoritarian retrenchment abundantly clear.

Nevertheless, the opposition grew increasingly frustrated with the US unwillingness to side with them completely. In a highly publicized meeting in May 1986, Shultz said the US would continue to support political reform that unfolded "in a stable and orderly way." He added that positive political change was "moving pretty fast... very much in the right direction" and rejected comparisons between Chun and Marcos.\textsuperscript{52} Although his statements rankled the opposition, the general content did not deviate from the overall US policy. The primary objective was to encourage a compromise solution within the National Assembly. American policymakers did not appear concerned over the specific content of this compromise. By mid-1986, any deal to the constitutional crisis would have entailed some democratic progress because the ruling DJP accepted the need to reform the Yushin era electoral college. The US wanted an elite pact that left all sides satisfied enough to avoid further brinkmanship. The Reagan administration feared open support for either side's preference would incentivize bad behavior. In short, Washington exhorted Chun to avoid mass repression, while encouraging the Korean opposition to remain patient and avoid street demonstrations so as not to give Chun any reason to renege on his promises of reform.

The Koreans foiled the American master plan for a controlled, elite-led democratic opening. A grand compromise proved unobtainable. Each side made demands the other refused to accommodate. Both sides were willing to risk open confrontation in the belief that they held

\textsuperscript{51} Steven Butler, "Chun's reputation for courage will be tested again," \textit{Financial Times}, 10/2/85.
the stronger bargaining position. On April 13th 1987, in the opening gambit to the final act of the Korean pro-democracy drama, Chun canceled debate over constitutional reform until his departure. As in 1980, the US would have to pick a side and stick its head in the sand, again.

II. Narrative of Events

2.a. 02/13/85 - 04/12/87

The origins of the 1987 constitutional crisis date back to Chun's decision to initiate a broad program of political liberalization in 1984. In addition to the increased space for free speech and association, these reforms also lifted the political ban on all but 14 individuals, allowed the formation of an independent opposition party, and ensured a relatively free 1985 legislative election. With 84.6% voter participation, the highest since the 1950s, the recently formed New Korea Democratic Party (NKDP) received 29.2% of the vote compared to the DJP's 35.3%. Not only did the NKDP win the majority of votes in Korea's two largest cities, Seoul and Pusan, but also 35 assemblymen from the quasi-opposition Democratic Korea Party (DKP) and Korean National Party (KNP) defected to the NKDP in April. This helped form a minority coalition representing 48.7% of voters and constituting more than 1/3 of the members in the National Assembly. Thus, although the DJP retained majority control of the National Assembly through a skewed system of proportional representation, it lacked the 2/3 majority necessary to revise the constitution unilaterally. In short, the opposition considered the results a mandate for its agenda and attempted to realize its demands for immediate constitutional revision and direct presidential elections in 1988. It pushed these demands by alternating between institutional and
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53 Several factors contributed to the decision to liberalize the regime. Externally, the US used rhetoric couched in protection of basic human rights, the freedom of assembly, and the freedom of speech to encourage Chun to relent on the opposition. Chun also wanted to burnish Korea's international image for the upcoming Asian Olympics in 1986 and the Olympic Games in 1988. Finally, the decision was driven by misperception and strategic miscalculation. Given the degree of economic recovery, Chun appears to have misjudged his regime's popularity. He likely perceived radical demands as isolated and expected that an election in which the regime gained a substantial vote-share of the "silent majority" would be the most effective way to derail the vociferous opposition.
non-institutional tactics during the following two years. Meanwhile, students, labor, and anti-
government dissidents maintained steady pressure for reform using demonstrations, strikes, and
other forms of contentious politics.

Shortly after the 1985 elections, the regime made a series of concessions. In early March,
the ban on the 14 remaining politicians was lifted and DJ, who had recently returned to Korea
after living in exile for two years in the US, was released from house arrest. Roh Tae Woo, the
new DJP secretary-general, also encouraged dialogue in the National Assembly to resolve
opposition and regime differences over constitutional revisions. The opposition agreed to open
the National Assembly in May, but found an unreceptive audience in the DJP leadership who
refused to discuss constitutional reform until after 1989. The regime instead began a renewed
crackdown on dissent.\(^{54}\) By December, the NKDP attempted to force the issue with a sit-in at the
National Assembly that linked a commitment to constitutional revision with the passage of the
national budget. This protest action failed. At the end of 1985, the NKDP and PMCDR formed
the National Coalition for Democracy Movement (NCDM) and decided to resort to non-
institutional political action to complement the efforts in the National Assembly.

During the spring and early summer of 1986, the NCDM pushed its demands using a
three-pronged, non-violent, no-confidence campaign.\(^{55}\) First, on the anniversary of the 1985
elections, the opposition launched a popular campaign to collect 10 million signatures in support
of constitutional reform. After a brief crackdown to quash this campaign, Chun backed down. In
addition to external criticism by Washington, the opposition demonstrated a surprising degree of
decentralized coordination to continue the signature drive despite the arrests of several dissident
leaders and opposition politicians. On February 24\(^{th}\), Chun offered an olive branch and
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\(^{55}\) Kim, \textit{Democratization in Korea}, 88-89.
guaranteed his party's support for constitutional revision after 1988. Given the opposition's lack of trust in the regime and their desire for immediate change, the signature drive continued. Second, in a series of statements and open petitions, church leaders and intellectuals expressed support of the opposition's demand for prompt constitutional reforms and direct presidential elections in 1988. Finally, inspired by the overthrow of Marcos via people power in February, the opposition launched a series of large-scale street demonstrations in major metropolitan centers to place further pressure on the regime. The rally in Kwangju on March 30\textsuperscript{th} attracted over 50,000 participants, the largest anti-government demonstration since May 1980. By late April, Chun acquiesced to the demand for a constitutional amendment before 1988, if the DJP and the opposition could reach a compromise.

This offer became more attractive to opposition politicians when radicals turned a planned NCDM rally in Inchon into a large anti-government, anti-US riot. Publicly, the mainstream opposition blamed the government for instigating the crowds, but also decried "radical leftist ideas" and the use of violent tactics. Coupled with the brief seizure of the US Cultural Center in Pusan, opposition moderates feared the possibility of losing greater control to the more radical forces on the streets. By the end of May, the opposition agreed to return to the bargaining table in the National Assembly despite the deep reservations of some, who preferred to continue the pro-democracy struggle through confrontational, non-institutional means. In particular, DJ's faction agreed to drop preconditions for opening negotiations in an effort to avoid a split within the NKDP. The NCDM still held mass demonstrations in Masan and Chonju in

57 Walker to Shultz, "DJ on Shultz Visit, Anti-Americanism, and Political Prospects," May 23, 1986, DNSA; Don Oberdorfer, "Violent Clashes Block Rally by Opposition in South Korea," Washington Post, 05/04/86.
late May, but the primary goals were to reassert the opposition's image as moderate and maintain pressure going into negotiations.

On June 25th 1986, the National Assembly created a Constitution Revision Committee that would devise a draft bill for revising the constitution by December 18th, the end of the next National Assembly regular session. While the opposition's draft for the amended constitution called for a strong president elected by a direct popular vote, Chun regained the initiative by offering a parliamentary system with a strong prime minister, selected by a simple majority. This "compromise" solution ensured the DJP's grip on power due to the skewed system of representation and made the opposition appear unreasonable. Unsurprisingly, YS rejected the proposition and promised to end formal negotiations and "launch struggles" if agreement on a draft constitution remained elusive by early October.

Following the Asian Olympic Games, the opposition proposed possible solutions to the deadlock while attempting to start a second wave of mass rallies. The ruling party rejected, as unconstitutional, the suggestion of a national referendum to choose between the two draft proposals and ignored DJ's promise to withdraw from the next direct presidential election. Simultaneously, the regime launched a broad crackdown on civil society and adopted a policy of pre-emption toward mass rallies. Most infamously, the regime deployed 70,000 riot policemen in Seoul to block the opposition's attempt to organize a rally of one million citizens on November 29th. Although the opposition vowed to continue challenging the regime through non-institutional means, cooler heads prevailed two weeks later. The potential volatility of the situation induced both sides to seek a temporary truce.

By late December, the regime's goal of cultivating dissension within the opposition appeared to be working. The powers behind the NKDP, YS and DJ, continued to insist on direct
presidential elections. However, the nominal leader of the party, Lee Min Woo, insinuated the possibility of revisiting the DJP's proposal if the ruling party included a seven-point program that expanded democratic rights. The US reportedly supported Lee's plan as the type of grand compromise necessary to overcome the crisis. Yet, Park Chong Chol's untimely death by torture during a police interrogation derailed any chance for an elite bargain. Despite Chun's personal apology and efforts to punish those responsible, this student's death galvanized the opposition. Neither side introduced novel ideas to resolve the deadlock. The regime intimated the possibility of martial law, reiterated its interest in compromise, and continued its blanket repression of opposition rallies. Similarly, the NKDP encouraged a referendum and organized more anti-government rallies.

The stalemated situation ended in March, when DJ and YS broke ranks with Lee. The resulting Reunification Democratic Party (RDP) included 73 out of the 90 NKDP members and would continue to press its demands for direct elections aggressively. This made a possible breakthrough via an elite pact even more remote. Still, Chun's abrupt announcement on April 13th came as a surprise not only to the opposition, but also many members within the regime. In a nationally televised event, he suspended debate over constitutional reform until his indirectly elected successor took office in February 1988. The battle for Korea's future returned to demonstrations of resolve on the streets.

2.b. 04/13/87 - 06/31/87

Tens of thousands of students reacted to Chun's announcement by adopting a mix of nonviolent and violent tactics. After years of practice with various repertoires of contention, these highly resilient student protests would continue until Chun's resignation eleven weeks later.

---

Religious leaders and intellectuals also voiced dissent and took part in protests. Representing 10% of the population, the Korean National Council of Churches (KNCC) and the Catholic church denounced the decision as "relentlessly dashing the dreams of opening a new era through constitutional revision." Priests subsequently began anti-government hunger strikes in several cities. Similarly, on April 22nd professors at Korea University released a public statement in opposition to Chun's decision that grew to include 1,475 professors from 48 universities a month later. Workers also participated in protests, but often as individual citizens. Overall, various strands of civil society condemned the announcement to delay constitutional reform, but coordinated action through a broad national front remained elusive. As in the past, Chun planned to weather the storm through a policy of pre-emptive repression.

On April 14th, Chun warned that he would "resolutely deal" with continued protests over constitutional amendments, "rigorously restore social discipline," and "sternly deal with violent leftists." His regime placed DJ under house arrest, indicted an opposition MP for questioning the "government's IQ," and sentenced two other MPs for allegedly inciting riots in 1985. With regard to civil society, the regime arrested prominent dissidents, leaders of anti-government organizations, and three journalists who broke ill-defined national security guidelines on media coverage. Finally, Chun placed the entire national police force under high alert and deployed tens of thousands of police across the nation to disperse daily protests. The goal of preemptive repression was to contain dedicated anti-government protesters and to intimidate the moderate social forces, namely the middle class, from siding with the progressive elements of society.

61 Kim, Democratization in Korea, 91.
62 Katsiaficas (South Korean Social Movements, 309-332) details the subsequent labor struggle that was far less successful in achieving its goals.
Chun's solution failed to demobilize anti-government protests partly because social movement groups no longer relied on fragile informal networks or particular personalities. However, repression did stymie efforts to form a coherent national movement. The regime appeared in control until revelations surfaced of a police conspiracy to protect senior officers from prosecution related to the student torture-death in January. This mid-May scandal was a proximate catalyst to the June uprising. During the rest of May, Chun scrambled to dispel suggestions that this incident was a microcosm of the pervasive corruption and cronyism within his regime. He arrested three senior police officers and accepted resignations of the Prime Minister and seven cabinet members. These concessions were woefully inadequate.

On May 27th, political, religious, and anti-government leaders announced the formation of the National Movement for a Democratic Constitution (NMDC) representing "the great power of the masses" that would struggle "to oust the military dictatorship and set up a democratic government." The NMDC chose June 10th to begin a nationwide resistance campaign, which coincided with the DJP's national convention where Chun would officially name his successor. Given the experience of seven additional years of collective struggle, the opposition's organizational capacity quickly transformed words into action. Within two weeks, the NMDC activated opposition networks across the entire country. Its national headquarters in Seoul maintained "affiliated centers in eight cities, regional offices in counties, and committees in towns and villages -- for a total of at least 22 local formations." Thus, the NMDC represented the most serious type of challenge – an umbrella organization bent on the regime's overthrow that loosely, but effectively coordinates protest actions of a broad cross-section of autonomous social movement organizations representing various facets of society.

---
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While the specified date provided the opposition a focal point to align their respective efforts, the regime also utilized this advanced warning. Tens of thousands of police officers were deployed in Seoul alone, while the remaining 120,000 members of the national police force were spread throughout the country. On June 9th, the police searched universities for subversive material and detained over 2,600 individuals, over half of whom received 30-day jail sentences for "security" reasons related to "political matters." In an overly sanguine assessment, a top government official described the planned opposition campaign as "not beyond our capability to handle. Basically the situation is under control." Preemptive mass repression worked in the past; there was little reason to believe it would now be insufficient.

The June 10th "Rally to Defeat the April 13th Decision and to End Dictatorship" commenced as the DJP nominated Roh Tae Woo as its presidential candidate. Up to 400,000 protesters across 20 cities joined anti-government demonstrations with pitched street battles against the national police. Forbidden to carry guns in an effort to limit violence, the police relied on batons and massive amounts of extremely potent teargas to disperse the demonstrators. The use of teargas was so pervasive that a Korea-Egyptian friendly soccer match was cancelled as gas drifted into Masan stadium. Despite violent clashes with police and the targeted destruction of regime symbols, demonstrators respected private property. Much to the chagrin of the police,

67 The state targeted students because they were the only collective actor that could mobilize large numbers of protesters capable of weathering unremitting repression. Although the NMDC formally excluded student associations in fear of appearing sympathetic to dangerous leftist tendencies, student activists tapped into their national web of organizations across university campuses to support the pro-democracy campaign. Katsiaficas (South Korean Social Movements, 284-86) correctly observes that student protesters were a necessary condition for the success of the 1987 pro-democracy campaign. First, students helped overcome the initial coordination problem of mobilizing large numbers against a heavily armed, highly disciplined police force on June 10th. Second, they provided continuity by returning to the streets on the days immediately following the mass rally. This helped prevent demobilization efforts as the regime successfully confined prominent dissidents and key NMDC organizers.


onlookers reportedly cheered the protesters.\textsuperscript{70} By the evening, neither side could claim victory. The police cleared the streets, but the protesters displayed their strength and the degree to which a large portion of the population despised the regime.

As police dispersed demonstrations late on June 10\textsuperscript{th}, several hundred protesters sought refuge at Myongdong Cathedral in central Seoul and promptly decided to hold a sit-in at the Cathedral.\textsuperscript{71} This liberated zone functioned as a rallying point for demonstrations. For the next two days, sympathizers brought supplies to these besieged protesters, while thousands of others confronted police nearby with cobble stones and Molotov cocktails. During this crucial period, the regime's narrative that protesters were radicals agitating for violent revolution began to collapse. The Myongdong Cathedral is located in the heart of Seoul near businesses and popular shopping areas. Frustrated with the government's intransigence and ubiquitous clouds of tear gas, more affluent members of society began to express their support for the protesters by openly cheering on acts of defiance or joining them.\textsuperscript{72} In particular, Roh's claim that "the majority of people are turning their backs against the demonstrators" was most clearly contradicted on June 13th, when tens of thousands of demonstrators including many middle class citizens peacefully marched on police lines to break the barricade to Myongdong Cathedral.\textsuperscript{73} Although the police repulsed this particular effort, the pro-democracy campaign appeared to be slowly gaining an important ally – the silent majority – for whom the regime claimed to speak.

Perceptions that victory was obtainable increased when police withdrew and the regime allowed the Myongdong demonstrators to leave without facing any charges on June 15\textsuperscript{th}. In the following days, protest actions continued on campuses and in the streets throughout the country,

\textsuperscript{71} Katsiaficas, \textit{South Korean Social Movements}, 289-290.
\textsuperscript{73} Peter Hartcher, "In Seoul, the enemy is suddenly everywhere," \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, June 13, 1987.
while the opposition planned for the next nationwide demonstrations. On June 18th, the "Anti-
Tear Gas Day" commenced with hundreds of thousands of protesters battling police to a
standstill across Korea. The largest demonstrations took place in Pusan, where a crowd estimated
at 80,000 chanted "Down with Military Dictatorship."\(^{74}\) Protesters in Seoul briefly seized the city
center and on a few occasions overpowered policemen and stripped them of their riot gear, which
they subsequently burned.\(^{75}\) Perhaps the most notorious incident, however, occurred in Taegu,
where a protester hijacked a bus and drove it into police lines.\(^{76}\) This action killed a police
officer, the first reported death since the uprising began.\(^{77}\)

Beginning on June 13th, the government hinted at tough emergency measures, including
the possibility of martial law, if protests persisted. Typical government statements at this time
noted that the government did "not wish to declare martial law," but "similar actions cannot be
ruled out if the situation deteriorates."\(^{78}\) The national police's inability to control the crowds on
June 18th forced the regime to make a critical decision. Yet, the regime was split on the wisdom
of declaring martial law. Many members in the ruling regime appeared vexed by the lack of
consultation on important decisions, like the April 13th announcement.\(^{79}\) Immediately following
the June 18th protests, one leading member of the DJP stated the regime has "to ponder over
whether or not we neglected reading the peoples' minds."\(^{80}\) Open discontent within DJP ranks
became increasingly evident following a cantankerous six hour caucus on June 21st, where

\(^{74}\) Barry Renfrew, "Students Seize City Center in Massive Street Battles," \textit{Associated Press}, June 18, 1987.
\(^{75}\) Paul Shin, "Students take control of city square," \textit{Associated Press}, June 18, 1987. As is common with mass
uprising, differences exist in estimations of protest size. Katsiaficas (\textit{South Korean Social Movements}, 287-299)
offers higher estimates for protest size because he uses the records of movement groups.
\(^{77}\) A student would die in a coma days later after being hit on the head by a gas canister on June 9th.
\(^{80}\) Barry Renfrew, "Growing Numbers of Koreans Back Anti-Government Protests," \textit{Associated Press}, June 18,
1987.
national assemblymen indirectly criticized Chun's leadership and discussed the need to resume
dialogue with the opposition.\textsuperscript{81} More importantly, the top brass informed Roh that the younger
officers expressed serious concerns over preparations for blanket repression. Roh relayed this
information to Chun and urged him against deploying the military to resolve the crisis.\textsuperscript{82} Still, the
death of the officer in Taegu provided regime hardliners with a vivid example that the situation
was rapidly deteriorating and martial law was the surest, most familiar way to restore order.

At a meeting on the morning of June 19\textsuperscript{th}, Chun made the decision to declare garrison
law, an action that involved deploying troops, arresting demonstrators, dissolving political
parties, and creating military courts to sentence dissidents.\textsuperscript{83} Shortly after making this decision,
Chun met with US Ambassador Lilley, who presented a letter from President Reagan. The US
president urged his counterpart to exercise restraint and avoid violence. Within a couple of hours,
aides received word that preparations for emergency measures were suspended. Although Chun
decided against using the military on June 19\textsuperscript{th}, the regime publicly maintained its readiness to
make an "extraordinary decision" to restore order as it reopened direct negotiations with the
political opposition.\textsuperscript{84} By June 22\textsuperscript{nd}, Roh convinced Chun to meet YS and discuss ways to end
the political impasse. During the June 24\textsuperscript{th} meeting with YS, Chun was still unprepared to accept
all NKDP demands, particularly constitutional reforms that allowed direct presidential elections.
Opposition leaders declared a third mass rally to force the regime to accept its central demand.

On June 26\textsuperscript{th}, the largest demonstration of the June uprising occurred. Over one million
demonstrators participated in "The Grand March for Democracy," a significant proportion of

\textsuperscript{82} William Stueck, "Democratization in Korea: The United States Role, 1980 and 1987," \textit{International Journal of
\textsuperscript{83} Oberdorfer, \textit{The Two Koreas}, 170.
whom were not students. Overstretched and exhausted, the police could no longer prevent citizens from controlling the streets. As the street demonstrations persisted the following day, opposition leaders demanded the government make more concessions. In an unexpected announcement on June 29th, Roh declared his unconditional acceptance of all opposition demands including direct presidential elections. YS described Roh's statement as "quite a step forward," but it meant little without Chun's confirmation. After meeting with Roh, Chun announced on June 31st that he fully supported Roh's proposals. This marked the beginning of the presidential campaign. As Roh hoped, the opposition could not agree on a unity candidate. Both Kims ran for president, which split the opposition vote and allowed Roh to win with only 36.6% of the popular vote in December 1987. Thus, the national struggle for procedural democracy succeeded, but Roh still succeeded Chun.

III. US Actions: 02/06/87 - 06/31/87

The primary national interest for US policymakers in early 1987 remained stability on the Korean peninsula. Even if it had the power to do so, Washington had no interest in playing kingmaker. Any political developments would come from the Koreans' own initiative. Still, American policymakers grew increasingly exasperated with the brinksmanship adopted by both the opposition and the regime. Each side's zero-sum position increased the likelihood that the political conflict would end in a battle of wills on the street. As in 1980, this was the exact scenario Washington wanted to avoid. Thus, the US strategy before June 10th 1987 was to encourage both sides to remain at the bargaining table until they reached a "grand bargain" that would likely resemble Lee Min Woo's seven-point program. In contrast to 1980, however, the

---
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US provided early public and private signals of its support for a political transition and strong opposition to severe repression.

The first signs of a more proactive US policy toward political developments in Korea occurred with the appointment of US Ambassador James Lilley. Unlike his predecessor, Lilley, his embassy, and the State Department actively sought out meetings with high-level opposition figures. Lilley met frequently with YS beginning in early February 1987. Although he avoided direct meetings with DJ, he always kept the possibility open. Moreover, despite government attempts to prevent any US official from meeting DJ, who was under indefinite house arrest from April 8th to late June, Lilley insisted on sending other American officials at critical junctures to signal US support to the opposition's cause. This active diplomacy lent credibility to the US public and private message that the opposition was a legitimate actor and harsh repression of this necessary stakeholder harmed Korea's future and endangered the security alliance.

As the DJP and NKDP jockeyed for a superior bargaining position on constitutional reform, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Gaston Sigur, delivered a major speech on February 6th. In front of the US-Korean Society, he expressed frustration that ongoing talks "have been more argument than real discussion ... more rhetoric than results" and noted that "innovative ideas" were required. Besides this general rebuke, however, he called for the need to "civilianize" Korean politics and noted a new constitution that created a "more open

86 Lilley's predecessor, Ambassador Walker, only met YS once and never had any substantive meeting with DJ over his five year tenure as ambassador to Korea. As a result, he appeared overly supportive of Chun's regime and was highly unpopular with human rights and democracy advocates in the US and Korea.
87 The most important episode of a US official insisting on meeting with DJ occurred when Sigur visited Korea in late June to help bridge the differences between the regime and opposition. In addition to holding talks with opposition and regime leaders, Sigur sought a meeting with DJ. Foreign Minister Choi informed Sigur that ROK police may "intercept" him if he approached DJ's house. Ambassador Lilley warned that Sigur would visit DJ and such an intervention by ROK police would provide US critics of the Korean regime "fresh ammunition." Eventually, Choi acquiesced. Cable, Lilley to Shultz, "ASEC Sigur's Meeting with KDJ: Current Status," June 24, 1987, DNSA.
and legitimate political system" was essential for future US-ROK relations.88 This was a major shift in tone compared to Schultz's comments in May 1986 that described the political situation in South Korea as "moving impressively in the right direction."89 Sigur's remarks publicly clarified the US position on domestic political developments in Korea and received significant coverage in the Korean press. While the US insisted the details of the transition remained an internal issue, its preference for removing the military from politics was evident.

Secretary of State Shultz reinforced this message a month later during a brief layover in Seoul. In private, Shultz left no doubt of his support for Sigur's statement by telling Korean officials that "every sentence, every word, every comma is the policy of our government."90 Publicly, his message was more conservative. He praised Chun's existing promise to leave office and expressed support to "all those who are urging moderation and nonviolent political change."91 Despite these words of encouragement, US officials did nothing more than express serious reservations when informed on short notice that Chun planned to cancel debate on constitutional reform until after the 1988 Olympics. A month later, the Reagan administration wanted both sides to return to the bargaining table, but refused to entertain suggestions made in Congress to adopt measures that would attempt to compel both sides to negotiate. While noting that the US considered "a popularly-based political system" as necessary for stability, Sigur publicly maintained a generic, non-interventionist stance: "Koreans, not outsiders, must develop their own political institutions. We can only offer friendly advice."92 Thus, the US preferred a grand compromise. If relatively low-grade repression preserved a sufficiently stable

---
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environment, then the US could live with the regime's version of a political transition. From the American perspective, the worst case scenario remained a large-scale confrontation on the streets and all its associated risks. Yet, the regime would not return to the table and the opposition would not accept the regime's solution. So, the impetus for real change fell once again on the opposition to force the US into the uncomfortable position of choosing a side.

After the regime's crackdown on the opposition rally on June 10th, the State Department began publicly denouncing violent suppression of peaceful opposition rallies. Phyllis Oakley, the Department's spokeswoman, stated: "We abhor such acts [of violence]. Our support for the right of peaceful assembly remains firm."93 As Oakley and others continued to make similar public statements, the US embassy in Korea reinforced this message for moderation within the regime through the less glamorous path of quiet diplomacy. After June 10th, US embassy officials delivered a consistent, simple message: avoid excessive violence and reopen negotiations over constitutional reform.

To the dismay of the Reagan administration, Congressional activity increased as the crisis worsened. Considered an expert on Korean affairs in Congress, Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-NY) described the cancellation of constitutional debate "a deeply disturbing development" in mid-April.94 Shortly thereafter, he met with Chun to discuss Korea's future. During this meeting, Solarz expressed particular concern over the violence and torture perpetrated by the security
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93 "Huge anti-government protests sweep South Korea," Associated Press, June 10, 1987. Some scholars intimate that US policy toward Korea remained indecisive during the crucial stages of the June Uprising. In response to a question about why the US was not sending a special envoy to Korea, Richard Armitage, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security, said: "Frankly we're really busy. I'm up to my ears in Kuwait and contras and the normal press stuff." Yet, this colorful comment does not validate the contention that the US remained aloof in June. During this period, the Korean crisis received more media attention than the Iran-contra scandal for a reason. The overall U.S. policy was clear, proactive, public, and consistent, even though it lacked flashy threats or statements.

forces and observed the negative impact these actions have on US-ROK relations. A month later, Solarz wrote a New York Times op-ed that placed the lion's share of blame for stalled political development on the regime. To help break this deadlock, he urged to supplement "private persuasion" with "public diplomacy." Although the Reagan administration was not prepared to take such steps in late May, some democratic Congressmen were.

Congressional hearings concerning developments in Korea proliferated in late May and early June. By June 18th, the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific passed a non-binding resolution for Chun to resume talks with the opposition, which the State Department firmly supported. In a much more provocative step, however, a few senators proposed legislation that would place sanctions on South Korea until sufficient democratic progress was evident. Such extreme measures did not serve the US national interest in Korea, but the mere existence of such rhetoric likely provided greater credibility to warnings over the potentially devastating effect the use of deadly force could have on US-ROK relations.

In a series of serendipitous events, US pressure peaked at a critical juncture in the crisis. In the days preceding the second mass rally on June 18th, Chun was in a distraught mental state. He informed subordinates of his reluctance to deploy the army and declare garrison law. These worries appeared genuine. On several occasions, Chun expressed concerns about his personal legacy. He wanted to set a positive precedent and be the first South Korean leader to leave office peacefully. However, Chun did not trust the Kims, who he saw as motivated by blind ambition.
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and linked in an alliance of convenience with violent, pro-communist elements that could undermine the nation's security.\textsuperscript{100} He determined that if the police could not maintain order, he would be compelled to declare martial law and suppress protest with deadly force. Although he believed this policy would produce "a sad chapter in his story," he saw no alternative.\textsuperscript{101} For Chun, entertaining the possibility of reopening negotiations with the opposition, let alone accepting their demands, was not an option worthy of consideration. On June 18\textsuperscript{th}, the police lost control and Chun was prepared to carry out what he perceived to be his tragic duty.

Meanwhile, the Reagan administration had been calculating the best way to impress on Chun that the US position was to resolve the crisis without deadly force. In an attempt to strike the right balance, US officials decided to respond to a letter Chun sent Reagan in April. Reagan's missive adopted a friendly tone toward Chun, urged the Korean leader to cement his legacy by carrying through on his previous promises, and noted the need for a political solution. The letter arrived in Seoul on June 17\textsuperscript{th}. In an effort to reinforce the message, Lilley acted on the advice of the Korean Ambassador to the US to deliver the letter to Chun personally. Unfortunately, US embassy political counselor Harry Dunlop was finding it difficult to arrange a meeting. Officials at the Foreign Ministry repeatedly evaded US requests until Dunlop lost his temper and screamed: "I don't believe that President Chun has made this decision [not to see the U.S. ambassador]... I don't think that he would be that stupid to make it. He couldn't have made it. Goddamn it, I want to know the name of the person who made that decision right now!"\textsuperscript{102} Shortly afterwards, a meeting between Chun and Lilley was arranged for 2 PM the following day.
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Having studied the events preceding the Kwangju tragedy, Lilley learned that the heads of the US embassy and military had to display a united front. Therefore, when Lilley unintentionally attended the same lunch as General Livesey, head of the UN-CFC, hours before meeting Chun, he took full advantage of the opportunity. After the lunch, Lilley shared his plans to encourage Chun not to adopt a military solution. He took Livesey's silence as concurrence with his position. At the meeting with Chun, Lilley made a strong case for avoiding martial law and conjectured that such an announcement could undermine the US-ROK alliance. He also emphasized that the US military fully agreed with his position. Whether explicitly stated or merely implied, the vocal criticism emanating from certain sections of the American public and government would have strengthened this line of reasoning. Shortly after the meeting, Chun rescinded his orders to prepare for emergency measures early the following morning.

This delay provided the US and regime soft-liners a reprieve, not a solution. With the US, some Korean generals, and close civilian advisors urging restraint, Chun began to soften his position. On June 22nd, Rho convinced Chun to reopen negotiations with opposition leaders and provide several concessions, such as freeing the majority of detained demonstrators and lifting DJ's house arrest. Meanwhile, several US officials publicly encouraged plans to resume dialogue, roundly denounced any considerations by hardline military commanders to launch a coup, and warned against the declaration of martial law. The Reagan administration deployed Gaston Sigur to Korea as a special envoy to convey this message clearly to all parties in the
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regime and opposition. The neutral, friendly presence of Sigur was likely useful as the YS-Chun talks collapsed on June 24th. Chun refused to entertain a referendum on constitutional change, and YS would not countenance the cancellation of mass rallies without this concession. The lack of trust between the leaders prevented a political breakthrough; YS renewed his call for the opposition to prepare for another mass rally on June 26th.

Sigur met Chun under these circumstances. The Korean president insisted that various unsavory elements, including communist "sleeper cells," were attempting to exploit this "lame duck" period. Despite the dangers, he expressed his desire to achieve a peaceful resolution to the crisis and avoid blemishing his legacy by declaring martial law eight months before leaving office. Nevertheless, Chun sought Sigur's assurance that the US would support the government if the "complete disappearance of public safety" occurred. He did not foresee this eventuality, but asked Sigur to convey to his other interlocutors that the US would stand with the government, not the rebels, in such a scenario. Sigur dodged the request in fear of sending a mixed message as Gleysteen had done and instead reiterated the US desire to see an orderly, peaceful transition.

Before departing Korea on June 25th, however, Sigur summarized the US message to journalists in extremely blunt terms: "Our position is crystal clear. We oppose martial law." With mass rallies planned for the following day, plausible options available to Chun diminished further.

Often portrayed as a man motivated by pride as much as rational cost-benefit calculus, Chun's preference structure evolved during this critical week. On July 19th, he would have sacrificed his personal legacy rather than accept the opposition's demands. By late June,
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however, he was less recalcitrant. Thanks to constant, friendly pressure by US officials and close
advisors like Roh, all of whom advocated accommodation, Chun no longer perceived the
opposition's demands as the worst case scenario. He allowed Roh to proceed with the famous
June 29th announcement, subsequently known as the Special Declaration for Grand National
Harmony and Progress toward a Great Nation that, inter alia, recognized the need for
constitutional reforms guaranteeing open and competitive presidential elections.

IV. The US Factor in South Korea's Uprisings and Alternative Explanations

That the political transition occurred in 1987 does not inherently imply US actions
mattered. One of the central pitfalls of a most-similar case design is omitted variable bias.
Indeed, other authors point to several alternative factors to explain the different trajectories of the
1980 and 1987 UI campaigns. This section reviews the three most common alternative causal
accounts to determine whether the US factor was endogenous to these other variables or simply
epiphenomenal. In other words, I seek to answer whether the alternative accounts sufficiently
explain the difference in campaign outcomes.

First, several scholars argue the upcoming 1988 Olympic Games were a key causal factor
for explaining the regime's reticence to use deadly force.\textsuperscript{110} Regardless of partisan affiliation, all
Koreans considered the Olympics a source of national pride that symbolized the significant level
of progress achieved over the past 40 years. From a strategic standpoint, the Games conferred
greater external legitimacy and recognition to the South Korean regime that would translate into
useful propaganda against North Korea. Regime members reportedly feared the International
Olympic Committee (IOC) could change venues if the situation deteriorated. Yet, the statements
made by IOC officials in late June were more reassuring than threatening. For instance, on June
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17th, an IOC spokeswoman stated that barring a civil war, the 1988 Olympics would be held in Seoul. IOC president, Juan Antonio Samaranch, delivered a similarly anodyne statement: "I am sure that the games will be held in Seoul -- not only that but that they will be the best games ever." Days later, IOC Vice President Richard Pound said, "it would be very premature to even consider the possibility of having to move the games." Besides the lack of threatening statements, the IOC did not have a glowing record of punishing authoritarian regimes that employed deadly force to suppress political protest. Ten days preceding the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico, for example, the military dispersed student protesters in an orgy of deadly violence on par with the Kwangju Massacre. Those Olympic Games proceeded as scheduled. Thus, the mere fact that high-level Korean officials cared about holding a successful Olympic Games does not explain the regime's decision to avoid deadly force.

A second set of explanatory factors focuses on the overall strength of the opposition movement. As discussed earlier, the opposition's organizational capacity significantly increased during the 1980s. The links between workers, students, the church and the political opposition were more institutionalized by 1987 and no longer reliant on particular personalities. This maturation made targeted repression practically impossible after Chun's unilateral decision on April 13th. When the regime arrested key leaders, other individuals replaced them. In
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113 This argument is different than saying the upcoming Olympic Games did not matter at all. Kihl (Transforming Korean Politics, 86) is right that this event provided the opposition a window of opportunity to press their demands. Similarly, Cumings (Place in the Sun, 333) correctly observes that the Olympics created a timetable that condensed and probably intensified contestation over constitutional reform.
114 The opposition's unwillingness to reach a grand compromise with the regime in 1987 increases the overall validity of drawing comparisons with the 1980 UI campaign. If the opposition agreed to a negotiated settlement similar to Lee Min Woo's conciliatory approach, a reasonable explanation for the different campaign outcomes would have been the opposition's willingness to compromise. The NAVCO dataset operationalizes base campaign demands, but the measure is too rough. Most unarmed insurrections targeting state institutions are coded as demands for regime change, but the permutations that fall within this category are too broad. Thus, the degree of regime change demanded may be a missing variable in statistical analysis, but is not one for this paired case comparison.
particular, the students' deft ability to organize and mobilize without explicit external directives proved vital for the survival of the campaign during the early days of the June Uprising.\textsuperscript{115}

Of equal importance was the role played by the ambiguous social category of the "silent majority" or "middle class." This social force appeared less willing to accept the old bargain of stability and economic growth for authoritarian rule. Hagen Koo argues this shift occurred because the "anti-hegemonic minjung ideology" nurtured over several years of resistance by students, political dissidents, labor activists, and progressive intellectuals "had penetrated the culture and discourse of the middle class."\textsuperscript{116} In particular, he points to survey data prior to the 1987 crisis where "middle class" respondents identified economic inequality, the authoritarian political structure, and corruption among political leaders as the three most serious problems in Korea. Other surveys during this period indicate greater middle class sympathy and tolerance toward organized labor.\textsuperscript{117} Such evidence suggests the middle class had transformed into a relatively progressive force in Korean politics by 1987.

Several scholars point to the visible encouragement and participation of middle class citizens during the June Uprising as the key factor for changing regime softliner views regarding the etiology of and proper response to the protests. Without a doubt, the "necktie brigades" that began emerging on June 13\textsuperscript{th} undermined the regime's central contention as articulated by Roh earlier in the spring that "the silent but powerful middle class by no means supports such radical changes" to the constitution.\textsuperscript{118} Widespread middle class participation raised the stakes. Harsh repression of the silent majority risked the possibility of mass unrest and undermining the

\textsuperscript{115} Katsiaficas, \textit{South Korean Social Movements}, 284-286.
\textsuperscript{117} Koo, \textit{Korean Workers}, 59-61.
economic miracle. However, the timing for when the preference of the silent majority became known is seldom discussed. On June 10th, the silent majority was only beginning to express open support for the protesters. This often took the form of clapping for and shouting words of encouragement to anti-government demonstrators, which also happened during the 1979-1980 anti-government protests. By the last day of the Myongdong cathedral sit-in, however, middle class support for the movement had increased significantly. Still, the extent of support remained unclear as did the willingness of white collar workers to risk bodily harm or arrest.

By June 18th, Roh and other regime moderates recognized that a significant proportion of the non-student population rejected the political status quo. Given the risks, costs and benefits associated with different options available to disperse anti-government protests, members of this faction concluded that major concessions were preferable to mass repression. Soft-line civilian members of the regime also voiced these concerns. However, as DJP Assemblyman Pong Du Wan lamented after the mass rallies on June 18th, pleas for moderation within the regime were falling on deaf ears: "The wind is blowing the other way now ... we are losing and the hawkish people are winning." In contrast to their moderate counterparts, some advocates of a hardline position had more to lose if a political transition occurred, but base material interest does not seem to have been a central motivating factor behind Chun's initial hardline decision. Instead, a mixture of pride and sense of fear motivated him. Regardless of the exact reason Chun made

119 Brazinsky, Nation Building in South Korea, 247.
120 Cable, Gleysteen to Vance, "Embassy Accounts on Current Mood Following Declaration of Martial Law in Pusan," October 19, 1979, FOIA.
123 Chun did not trust the opposition, but more importantly he worried radical elements could co-opt the movement and push it in a more sinister direction. He appears to have assessed the risks of this extremely unlikely scenario as greater than using the military to suppress the movement, even though the latter option invited the possibility of mass disorder or a military coup. Shifting away from a rational choice framework, Chun also seemed emotionally
preparations to declare garrison law on the morning of June 19th, he made the decision despite the reservations expressed by more moderate elements in the regime, who appeared significantly swayed by the extent of middle class participation in the anti-government rallies.

A final broad set of factors scholars occasionally reference is the deterioration of the regime's cohesion by 1987. Unlike campaign strength that undeniably increased from 1980 to 1987, however, indicators for regime cohesion do not uniformly point in the same direction. In one sense, the regime was stronger in 1987. In comparison to Choi's interim government that was paralyzed by fissiparous tendencies, Chun controlled all facets of the regime and the economy was growing at impressive rates. Moreover, Chun had reasons to worry about his personal security in 1987 that did not exist in 1980. A large segment of society held him responsible for the Kwangju Massacre. Even if opposition promises of clemency had been forthcoming, Chun would still have had a difficult time believing his enemies would disregard popular pressure to put him on trial for those events. Despite these factors, the Fifth Republic was more vulnerable in some ways. The opposition exploited these pressure points and eventually caused several members in Chun's inner circle to advise him against using the military to resolve the political incapable of swallowing his pride and capitulating to the opposition. He viewed the opposition's bargaining position as unreasonable. The regime made several significant concessions, including the possibility of introducing a parliamentary democratic political system before the 1988 elections. From his perspective, opposition leaders were behaving like greedy, petulant children, not statesmen. Such bad behavior should not be rewarded.

As mentioned earlier, one aspect that distinguished Chun's regime from Park's was the high levels of corruption surrounding the president. Clifford (Troubled Tiger, 208-212) explains that the government essentially extorted Korean businesses to pay significant "donations" to various "charitable foundations" controlled by the president and his relatives. Chun's Ilhae Foundation, the most infamous of these organizations, accumulated approximately 60 billion won, around $75 million dollars, before he stepped down. A political opening meant this newly acquired wealth was vulnerable. In 1997, Chun was sentenced to life imprisonment and fined $150 million. Outgoing president YS and incoming president DJ jointly decided to pardon him on the grounds of fostering "national harmony," but he still faced the fines. David Holley, "Jailed S. Korea Ex-Presidents Get Pardons," Los Angeles Times, December 20 1997. Chun repaid only one-fourth of the amount he owed the Korean government, but in 2013 his son announced the family's willingness to pay the government an additional $154 million. Choe Sang-Hun, "Family of Foreign Korean Dictator to Pay His Fines," New York Times, September 10, 2013. Yet, these matters remain unresolved. In March 2015, for instance, the US Department of Justice helped the South Korean government recover an additional $27.5 million attributable to Chun's ill-gotten wealth.
crisis. Although describing the regime as more susceptible to internal division in 1987 may appear as a post-hoc explanation, there are at least three reasons to suspect this was the case.

First, private capital had fewer reasons to oppose greater democratization because the technocrats in Chun's regime had already pushed ahead with significant liberal economic reforms. As discussed previously, this reduced the size and availability of rents available through cozy relations with the regime. Thus, the business interests stance toward democratization had changed. Although the business class did not openly break with the regime, they did not desire a security solution either. Such a response arguably posed the single greatest threat to economic growth. Second, the significant violence needed to suppress the Kwangju uprising left an indelible mark on several career military officers. For instance, Chung Ho-Yong, who played an important role in the Kwangju events as the SWC Commander, ardently advocated against military force in 1987. US Undersecretary of Defense for International Security Armitage avers the military did not have the stomach for another Kwangju. Finally, Roh perceived a personal opportunity in accommodating the opposition. Although guaranteed to succeed Chun, he was uncertain a military solution would work. Even if it did, he would face continued domestic unrest, strained relations with the US, and the same legitimacy dilemma Chun faced. In contrast, "magnanimous" concessions to the opposition could allow him to create an image as a wise leader. He could then hope the Kims would split the opposition vote, thereby enabling him to win in universally accepted, popular elections. Even if he lost the elections, he would remain a

---


powerful and respected political figure. Therefore, Roh's strategic position differed sharply from Chun's and reduced the former's perception of playing a single-play game of prisoner's dilemma.

When confronted by resilient opposition protests, these vulnerabilities in the regime's cohesion created a much larger soft-line coalition that included important military and foreign policy advisors. These advisors' consistent counsel to exercise restraint certainly contributed to the peaceful resolution of the crisis. Overall, Chun's inner circle seemed more receptive to a political transition in 1987 for reasons aside from the size and attributes of the UI campaign. Reducing the causal narrative to a parsimonious movement-centric explanation is misleading.

In short, the campaign's organizational capacity, substantial middle class participation, and vulnerabilities to the regime's cohesion were all critical factors contributing to the successful transition in 1987. However, these explanatory variables still appear inadequate for fully understanding the regime's restraint in dealing with protests and Chun's decision to rescind his order to prepare for garrison law. Thus, these factors were arguably necessary, but jointly insufficient to explain campaign success. US "divide and unite" tactics contributed to this process in three ways that influenced the dynamics and outcome of the 1987 campaign.

First, an early result of combining public and private diplomacy was the regime's decision not to remove protesters forcefully from the Myongdong Cathedral. In particular, worried about the negative international repercussions of such an action, Lilley told the Korean Foreign Minister: "Don't go into the cathedral with troops. It will reverberate all over the world." A high official in the Korean Government later informed Lilley that his plea contributed to the regime's decision to withdraw troops and allow the protesters to leave without

127 Lilley and Lilley, China Hands, 278.
129 Lilley and Lilley, China Hands, 274.
punishment. As mentioned above, this leniency probably increased the willingness of the more risk-averse segments of the population, namely the middle class, to participate in future protest actions.\textsuperscript{130} Importantly, the effect of US intervention regarding campaign dynamics appears indirect. US public statements prior to or during the June Uprising did not appear to galvanize student and middle class participation in the protests. In this case, the effect seems mediated by the regime's reaction to Washington's warnings, which appear to have contributed to stalling harsh repression thereby enabling the opposition to gather momentum.

Such counterfactuals are difficult to prove. For instance, in his seminal study of the Iranian revolution, Kurzman cautions that a correct mix of repression and concession may not exist in truly revolutionary situations.\textsuperscript{131} Indeed, the use of disproportionate force to evict the Myongdong occupiers could have backfired and unintentionally contributed to greater, more determined participation. Whether such repression would have produced sufficient moral outrage among middle class citizens to take to the street in mass numbers, however, is doubtful. Given Korea's unique security situation and the historically conservative disposition of the Korean middle class, a clear demonstration of the regime's limited tolerance of dissent and willingness to use the military would have likely cowed this segment of the population. Without significant middle class participation, further repression would have been less costly as the regime could maintain that it enjoyed the support of the "silent majority." Important to note here is the counterfactual related to the likely trajectory of the 1980 protests had the military not employed force at the early stages of those mass rallies. As discussed in chapter four, all sides except the

\textsuperscript{130} Kuran ("Now out of Never," 16-25) employs the concept of preference falsification as a key mechanism for understanding the dynamics of tipping point models. As punishment for dissent appears less likely, more citizens are willing to express their true preferences. If a tipping point is reached, the preference falsification process reverses. Old supporters of the regime begin to censure their preferences publicly.

\textsuperscript{131} Kurzman, \textit{The Unthinkable Revolution}, 105-11.
military appeared eager to push ahead with a negotiated settlement that allowed for a genuine political transition within weeks. Had Chun stalled a few more days, his window of opportunity to seize power would have sharply diminished. In sum, this early US intervention arguably made an important contribution to the way subsequent events unfolded.

Second, the US sought to form a coalition with regime moderates to augment its ability to encourage Chun against a military solution. Those observers sympathetic to the UI campaign's cause lambasted Lilley's controversial decision to attend the DJP ceremony on June 10\textsuperscript{th} that nominated Roh as Chun's successor. This approach could have easily backfired, but Lilley correctly perceived Roh as "the type of leader who could be influenced if we supported him at crucial times."\textsuperscript{132} The US ambassador gained Roh's gratitude and fortified a mutually beneficial alliance. During the crisis, Roh understood his actions would affect the country's future and his ability to become president, but acknowledged he was in "a very difficult position" when urging moderation.\textsuperscript{133} Lilley realized Roh and other softliners could get cold feet and so consistently kept lines of communication open to such key interlocutors to reassure them of US support. Without a doubt, pressures for group think and considerations of personal security ran high during this three week period.\textsuperscript{134} A retrospective survey reveals that approximately half of the regime elites believed the status quo was strong enough to survive for a long time and forceful suppression would have worked on June 19\textsuperscript{th}.\textsuperscript{135} Moreover, Roh reportedly considered asking the US embassy for asylum on June 25\textsuperscript{th} in fear that he was pushing Chun too hard for a democratic opening. Yet, throughout the crisis, Roh persisted in supplying Chun with updated assessments

\textsuperscript{132} Lilley and Lilley, \textit{China Hands}, 271.  
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 280; cable, Lilley to Shultz, "Assistant Secretary Sigur's Meeting with DJP Chairman Roh Tae Woo." June 23, 1987, FOIA.  
\textsuperscript{134} This was important because he kept in touch with all groups during the crisis, while Chun remained largely isolated at the Blue House. Lilley and Lilley, \textit{China Hands}, 279-280.  
\textsuperscript{135} Cho, "Vehicle of Democratization," 74-75.
of the situation. This friendly advice helped inform Chun's final calculations on how to cope with the crisis.\textsuperscript{136} Starting with Sigur's February address, the consistent message from Washington to resume dialogue and avoid the use of deadly force likely strengthened the resolve of regime soft-liners to voice dissent despite the dangers of challenging Chun's apparent preference to deploy the military to reinstate order.

Finally, Lilley's delivery of Reagan's message hours before Chun cancelled his orders to deploy the armed forces against the opposition suggests this additional information tipped the balance in favor of a conciliatory policy. However, Don Oberdorfer, an long-time student of Korean politics, raises the possibility that Chun had already made up his mind before meeting Lilley. In particular, the recently resigned Interior Minister, Chung Ho Yong, a close confidante to Roh and Chun, informed the former that junior officers expressed concern over preparations to mobilize the army against demonstrators.\textsuperscript{137} For Roh, this emerging view in the military that the army should not be mobilized confirmed his own belief that such a solution was inappropriate and dangerous. He immediately relayed this message to Chun and implored the president to avoid deploying the military. However, such apparent smoking gun evidence does not imply that Lilley's meeting was relatively unimportant for understanding Chun's decision-making process.

When recounting the details of Chung's recollections, Oberdorfer only insinuates that Roh provided Chun this information after the final decision to deploy troops was made, but before the meeting with Lilley. Knowing the exact timing of these events is crucial. If Roh told Chun about Chung's message before the mobilization orders, then Chun would have already

\textsuperscript{136} Katsiaficas (\textit{South Korean Social Movements}, 299-303) laments the myth that Korea's democratic transition was elite-led. In particular, he strongly disagrees with accounts that ascribe causal importance to Roh's role thereby portraying his actions as heroic. While appropriate to take issue with such portrayals, it is misleading to claim that Roh had no other palatable choice.

\textsuperscript{137} Oberdorfer, \textit{The Two Koreas}, 171.
incorporated these associated risks, which remained insufficient to deter him from adopting a hardline solution. Even if Roh relayed Chung's message to Chun after the morning meeting, this fact alone does not indicate that this had a greater impact on changing Chun's mind than Lilley's meeting. What matters most is how much new information each conversation revealed. While the US officials urged a peaceful resolution to the crisis for months, Lilley's message was the first direct appeal from Reagan himself. Additionally, Lilley assured Chun this was the position of the entire administration and convincingly issued a strong warning that the use of force could irreparably harm the alliance. Roh's meeting also seems to have conveyed a more stern message about the potentially dire consequences of deploying the military; however, these dangers were well known to Chun as moderates raised such concerns in the days preceding June 19th.138

Ultimately, as had been the case throughout the crisis, the dual pressure from regime moderates and the US were mutually reinforcing. Both appeared necessary conditions to prevent hardliners from adopting a more draconian policy.

Despite the apparent positive role played by the US during the 1987 UI campaign, some still maintain that the US policy was endogenous to movement strength. Sam Kisop, an exiled Korean human rights activist, makes this case most strongly: "The Reagan administration is always on the strong side... If Chun is strong enough to control the demonstrations, then they will support Chun. But if things begin to change, and the opposition is getting stronger, then they will switch. I learned that watching the Philippine situation."139 Evaluating the balance of domestic forces argument is difficult because one must pinpoint when the timing of patron policy and the perceptions of key decision-makers changed and whether this change preceded or followed

138 Lilley and Lilley, China Hands, 278.
events on the ground. In this case, Sigur outlined the US position months before the major street battles and public warnings against state violence from US officials became stronger after the first mass demonstration on June 10th.

The fact that several unrelated factors contributed to the way US decision-makers perceived and reacted to the situation further suggests that movement strength was not the only motivating force responsible for the different US reactions in 1980 and 1987. The Carter and Reagan administrations faced different international and domestic political environments with a unique set of calculations. While members of the Carter administration viewed the Korean situation in terms of Nicaragua and Iran, Reagan officials saw the Philippines and Haiti.140 Further, the upcoming presidential election loomed over the Carter administration. The botched April 1980 rescue mission to save American hostages in Iran and the newly released National Intelligence Estimate revealing North Korea's military capabilities augmented this tendency toward a risk-averse foreign policy. Under such circumstances, public pressure on an ally appeared contradictory to the US national interest, especially when detente with the Soviet Union collapsed due to the the Afghanistan invasion. Reagan did not face these issues. If anything, Congress was pushing him toward a more proactive policy and the president began to understand Soviet intentions as less aggressive after his 1986 meeting with Gorbachev in Reykjavik. Thus, the different US policies cannot be reduced to any one factor, including movement strength.

Overall, US foreign policy appears a necessary, but insufficient condition to explain the different outcomes in this paired comparison. To evaluate whether a different US position would

---

have altered the probability of a democratic breakthrough in 1980, analysts should pay more attention to the factors that made the 1987 campaign appear jointly sufficient. If one accepts that the domestic balance of forces – opposition strength vs. regime strength – cannot fully explain these outcomes, then two important differences arise that caution against overly bold claims concerning the US unilateral ability to determine the outcome of the 1980 UI campaign.

First, the US maintained key civilian allies in the "regime" during both crises, but lacked a clear ally within Chun's inner military circle in 1980. Coupled with US pressure, the strong advice by trusted military insiders helped sway Chun's decision to allow the messy political process of democratization to proceed in 1987. As evidenced by the aborted coup planning in early 1980, at least some Korean officers disagreed with Chun's concentration of power. Encouragement of a countercoup contradicted US national interest, but Washington failed to adopt less risky gambits to stymie Chun's creeping coup by sending public and private signals to strengthen the voices of moderation in the military and interim government. US leverage to strengthen the center shrank the longer it prevaricated. The purge of 40 high-ranking moderate officers after the 12/12 Incident was the first shot across the bow, but the US declined to comment in fear of unduly interfering in domestic military affairs.141

Throughout the spring, Chun continued to consolidate power. After Chun's appointment as KCIA director, significant censure was required to signal US resolve for a democratic breakthrough. Such actions were not forthcoming. Short of drastic measures such as refusing the release of Korean military brigades, the range of options available to the US in May were likely too weak to alter the decisions reached by the small military cabal surrounding Chun. The lack of US penetration into this decision-making circle likely contributed to an environment susceptible

141 Young, *Eye on Korea*, 80-82.
to groupthink, further sidelining any residual dissent about the wisdom of a military solution. Thus, a key difference was the presence of a moderate faction like the one Lilley intuited and fostered in 1987. Whether moderate voices within Chun's inner military circle existed following the December 1980 purges remains unclear partly because Gleysteen and Wickham purposely avoided discussions about the political situation with members of the armed forces.142 If such voices were absent in Chun's clique, Washington's policy would have needed to be quite forceful and may still have failed to sway the hardline faction to keep the military quartered.

The ability of the Carter administration to maintain such a unified, strong position raises the second caveat regarding the unilateral ability of the US to alter the outcome in 1980. As will be discussed in the following chapter, inter-departmental and inter-branch consensus over proper US foreign policy is essential to send unambiguous signals, which is an important aspect of effective coercive diplomacy. Importantly, Carter's troop withdrawal orders caused acute bureaucratic maneuvering until 1979.143 Wickham notes that coordination between the different agencies was strong during the 1979-1980 transition; however, proactive diplomacy could have reopened these recently healed scars.144 Indeed, in late April and early May 1980, Chun attempted to sow inter-departmental discord and gain reassurances from current and former US military and Defense Department officials following the mild US actions adopted after his ascension as KCIA director. General Johnny Sohn and Former General Choi Kyong-Nok contacted US commanders in Korea and officials at the Pentagon in an effort to undermine the postponement of the SCM and persuade themselves "that the compatible responses" they

142 Ibid., 91.
143 Ibid., 39-50.
144 Wickham, Korea on the Brink, 34-36. In contrast, Young (Eye on Korea, 84) contends that natural frictions between the US embassy and US military command persisted during this period.
hear from active and retired US military "represent the 'real' US policy." In contrast to Carter's earlier withdrawal plan, the bureaucracy presented a unified front and actively tried to thwart such self-deception. If the US adopted a more aggressive path, however, the ability to present a single voice would have diminished. Depending on the degree of open dissension, US efforts to apply more pressure to signal resolve for democratic progress could have been significantly undermined. Thus, Gleysteen's argument that US influence was minimal may be true, but for reasons beyond material interdependence and an acute information deficit.

* * * * *

This chapter first discussed important ways in which the ROK regime, opposition and US-Korean relationship evolved between 1980 and 1987. After providing a brief narrative of key events associated with the 1987 UI campaign, I discussed the actions Washington adopted during this critical period. The final section presented evidence supporting the contention that the US factor mattered in crucial ways for guiding the 1987 campaign toward a peaceful conclusion. Through a mixture of public warnings, private threats and personal pleas, the US increased the strength, willingness, and ability of regime moderates to advocate for a conciliatory policy.

Whether a different US approach in 1980 would have yielded a similar result is difficult to ascertain. The predicted probabilities derived using the quantitative data suggest substantively significant differences in the chance that these campaigns would have reached a successful conclusion had Washington reacted differently. In 1980, for instance, the probability of campaign success would have increased from 35% to 58% if the US had sided with the campaign
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145 Holbrooke to Gleysteen, "Self-Deception by the ROK Military," May 3, 1980. Young (Eye on Korea, 93) notes that few in the military supported this decision. This became known to the ROK military command within days.
rather than remained neutral. From a qualitative perspective, the similarities between these two cases are striking, but some potentially important differences in the domestic political environment did exist that may have affected the way these UI campaigns would have unfolded had the US acted differently. These factors may have hampered the Carter administration's ability to pressure Chun to remain neutral during the messy political transition.

This chapter argued that one key difference often overlooked is the balance of forces between regime moderates and hardliners who enjoyed direct access to and influence over the decision-making process that inevitably went through Chun. By May 1980, this circle around Chun seems to have included only officers encouraging a hardline solution. In such a scenario, late changes to US policy would have had a minimal impact save for drastic measures that were never considered realistic options. Even if Chun's inner-circle was in fact composed only of hardliners in May, this was not the case in the preceding months. The early use of "divide and unite" tactics may have prevented the final composition of this decision-making cabal of military hardliners or softened some of their positions. Recognizing that the balance between regime hardliners and soft-liners affects the patron's ability to influence UI campaign outcomes is an important corollary to the limits of patron intervention. This is especially the case when patrons only feel comfortable employing relatively weak "divide and unite" tactics. There is little doubt that US efforts to support the UI campaign would have been much less likely to succeed had Roh Tae Woo and Chung Ho-Yong steadfastly backed Chun's inclination to crack down in 1987.

The full model in Table 2.1 is used to derive these predicted probabilities, but the joint ideology and democratic patron variables are dropped. The 1980 model categorizes patron status as neutral, while the counterfactual 1980 model shifts patron intervention on the side of the campaign. The values for the other variables are as follows: CINC = .013822, Polity IV = -8, regime age = 6, and campaign size = 4, repression=3, and executive exclusivity = 0.
Thus, a balanced assessment of Washington's ability to influence the dynamics and outcomes of these two UI campaigns requires a qualified probabilistic conclusion. While some domestic factors may have been necessary conditions for UI campaign success in 1987, no combination of these variables adequately provide a jointly sufficient explanation for the final outcome without including the US factor. A similar US policy in 1980 would have increased the chance of success, but the scenarios were slightly different in possibly important ways. Whether US support for the 1980 campaign would have guaranteed its success remains an open question.
Chapter 6: 
Feast or Famine: Panama 1988

Manuel Antonio Noriega never formally held Panama's top office. When he became *comandante* of the Panamanian Defense Forces (PDF) in 1983, he controlled the political process behind the scenes. Unfortunately for General Noriega, he inherited an unwieldy political coalition composed of collective actors with vastly disparate interests held together by access to easy credit and highly profitable illicit activities. As credit sources dried up and international financial institutions began to demand payment on Panama's ballooning debt, the regime faced tough economic and political decisions bound to alter the status-quo political arrangement.

Noriega refused to countenance a partial political opening that would provide real autonomy to traditional business interests and the political technocrats. Instead, he chose retrenchment. The extant system of privileges that guaranteed the loyalty of his close associates and PDF officers continued. The fractious political opposition had proved vulnerable to divide and rule tactics in the past; there was little reason to assume cooptation would be less successful in the future. Yet, high-level defections began in 1985 culminating into a national campaign seeking Noriega's removal by the summer of 1987. Parts of the US bureaucracy pounced on the opportunity and openly sided with the opposition. The general's days seemed numbered.

To the surprise of Noriega's detractors, however, he weathered thirty months of domestic and external efforts to remove him from power. His exit came only after US forces invaded with overwhelming military force. This act was an admission that other forms of coercive diplomacy had failed. Several factors contributed to making Noriega a hard target to overthrow through civil resistance. In particular, he was in charge of a military deeply entrenched in licit and illicit economic activities. Loyal officers profited handsomely from the arrangement and feared losing
the institution's privileged position in any political transition. Moreover, the regime's revenue streams were embedded in the country's financial and trade sectors, which were largely autonomous from Panama's productive forces. This insulation made inciting mass military defections, starving the regime of resources, or strengthening soft-liners a difficult task.

As argued below, the regime's strong position to survive short-term challenges did not mean domestic and external pressures were doomed to fail. In fact, Noriega's exit appeared imminent on several occasions during this prolonged contest of wills. Yet, his adversaries failed to muster their full leverage, let alone joint capacity. The opposition's National Civic Crusade (NCC) proved vulnerable on several fronts. Repression that was severe but seldom deadly tended to cow, not galvanize, dissent. The civil disobedience campaign only partly succeeded in forming a broad cross-cutting coalition of discontented collective actors. The movement's hierarchical structure was also susceptible to targeted repression. When the majority of opposition leaders were in hiding, jail or exile, the movement's ability to maintain substantial pressure greatly decreased. Even at its peak, the Crusade never forced the security forces into the position of shooting or defecting. The regime's enforcers appeared comfortable administering a moderate level of repression that became the new status quo.

For its part, US coercive diplomacy was characterized by a series of piecemeal tactical measures. Until April 1988, the Panama "crisis" remained at the working group level. The lack of executive attention gave way to acute bureaucratic infighting over the appropriate policy toward Panama. As principal-agent theory would predict, these clashes, in contrast to the unity within Noriega's security services, stymied the formation of a coherent strategy to realize the ambitious policy goal of regime change. Instead, foreign policy based on the lowest common denominator prevailed. Once bureaucratic battles subsided in mid-1988, electoral politics pushed
the Panama issue into policy limbo. Noriega had become a black eye for Vice President Bush's presidential bid. As US pressure peaked in the summer of 1989, the Crusade had lost the ability to employ civil resistance effectively. The incremental, ad hoc approach provided enough space for the resourceful General to find ways to survive each period of the crisis.

Overall, these efforts to oust Noriega offer an opportunity to explore why and how patron interventions during UI campaigns sometimes fail. The next two chapters analyze specific episodes of US intervention that failed to effect irregular regime change in Panama. This chapter explores the limits of "feast or famine" tactics while chapter seven investigates the complexities of negotiating a "golden parachute." Before turning to Panama as a deviant case of "feast or famine," I offer two analytic narratives on Haiti in 1985-86 and Cameroon in 1991 where patron states employed this mechanism with success. I then describe key features of Noriega's regime, Panama's political opposition, and the US-Panamanian relationship. The third section provides a narrative of key events from June 1987 to April 1988 and details the US policy pursued at this time. I conclude by explaining Noriega's ability to survive as a byproduct of the PDF's privileged institutional role combined with the patron's inability to place optimal pressure on the general.

I. Two Analytic Narratives on the Successful Use of "Feast or Famine" Tactics

The logic of the "feast or famine" mechanism is straightforward. Patrons support the campaign through economic sanctions or withholding aid (famine), and support the regime through increased aid or easy access to preferential loans (feast). This mechanism influences UI campaign outcomes in two ways. Materially, these tactics change a regime's access to economic resources thereby altering the effectiveness of certain forms of civil disobedience. For regimes that face an acute economic crisis, such shifts can affect its ability to buy continued support. Symbolically, such actions signal the patron's preferences and provide information to the regime
elite regarding the likely trajectory the relationship will follow depending on how the crisis is resolved. In this regard, "feast or famine" is an extension of "isolate and unite." This section presents two cases that illustrate the successful application of "feast or famine" tactics to provide a point of comparison for understanding why the US and domestic opposition's joint efforts to compel Noriega's departure in 1988 proved insufficient.

I.a. Cameroon 1991

The failed 1991 Operation Ville Morte (ghost town) in Cameroon offers insight into how patrons help regimes outlast a UI campaign through the provision of resources. In the early 1980s, Cameroon experienced significant economic growth due to the discovery of offshore oil reserves. This influx of revenue led to increases in government expenditures without a significant accumulation of foreign debt. The sharp decline in oil prices in 1986 undermined Cameroon's economy as crude petroleum accounted for 55% of its total export earnings in 1985. Annual economic growth precipitously dropped to -7.8% in 1988 and remained negative until 1994. This decline increased the need for foreign borrowing. To access IMF loans and reschedule the external debt, the government introduced austerity measures in 1989.

This economic reversal occurred while Paul Biya was in the process of consolidating his power after succeeding Ahmadou Ahidjo as Cameroon's second president in 1982. Tension between these former allies quickly surfaced as Biya set off on his own course. After rumblings of a coup plot in 1983, the new president dismissed the prime minister and the minister of the armed forces. Like Ahidjo, both these men were northern Muslims. Shortly thereafter, Biya ended any semblance of dual power by replacing Ahidjo as chairman of the Union Nationale

---

Camerounaise (UNC), Cameroon's only political party.\(^2\) As Biya took steps to secure his regime, the northern-dominated elite Republican Guard unsuccessfully mounted a coup in April 1984.\(^3\) Thereafter, Biya increasingly relied on members of his co-ethnic Beti tribe to fill key civilian and security positions. The onset of the economic crisis exacerbated regional and ethnic tensions within Cameroon. State revenue declined from 800 billion to 550 billion CFA Francs, which compelled the regime to prioritize its allocation of patronage.\(^4\) What was once an inclusive authoritarian model under Ahidjo narrowed considerably.\(^5\)

In an effort to distance his regime from Ahidjo's legacy of ubiquitous repression, Biya launched a political liberalization program in 1982. Known as the "New Deal," this approach resembled what Gorbachev later coined as glasnost and demokratizatsiya. The regime loosened restrictions on the freedom of speech and enabled competitive elections within a one-party system. Cameroonian's appeared to welcome such reforms, but by the late 1980s a large segment of the population grew disillusioned.\(^6\) Biya's rhetorical appeals seemed nothing more than window-dressing as repression against regime critics resurfaced.\(^7\) This pillar of legitimacy crumbled alongside the one-party regimes in Eastern Europe and the rest of Francophone Africa.

---

5 Milton Krieger, "Cameroon's Democratic Crossroads, 1990-4," The Journal of Modern African Studies 32, No. 4 (1994): 607. The Beti constituted less than 10% of Cameroon's population. While Ahidjo was known for spreading the spoils among elites from all major constituencies, Cameroon's first president did favor two particular groups: 1) "the Muslim Fulbe elite, especially those originating from Garoua, the home town of Ahidjo, the so-called Garoua barons;" and 2) "the Bamileke elite, renowned in Cameroon for their 'spirit of capitalism'." These two groups lost their preferential status due to the transfer of power to Biya. Piet Konings, "The Post-Colonial State and Economic and Political Reforms in Cameroon," in Liberalization in the Developing World: Institutional and Economic Changes in Latin America, Africa and Asia, eds. Alex Fernandez Jilberto and Andre Mommen (New York: Routledge, 1996), 248-49.
7 Englebert, "Cameroon: Recent History," 208.
Heightened expectations transformed into open agitation for multiparty elections. Biya resorted to repression to resist such demands. In February 1990, the regime arrested ten dissidents including Yondo Black, a former president of the National Bar Association, for attempting to form a political party. In May, six civilians died during a raid by security forces on a rally celebrating the formation of the unauthorized political party, the Social Democratic Front (SDF), in the Anglophone North-West Province of Bamenda. After this bloody episode, Biya employed a different approach throughout the remainder of the year. He introduced modest reforms designed to release mounting pressure without ceding real power. These efforts culminated in the establishment of a multiparty political system in December 1990, but failed to appease the opposition who thought genuine political change required more constitutional reform. A political standoff ensued when Biya refused demands for a sovereign national conference (SNC).

Frustration over Biya's obduracy contributed to demonstrations and riots across several cities and towns throughout Cameroon in early 1991. Security forces violently dispersed these events contributing to more than 300 protest related deaths by the end of the year. Biya made more concessions in late April partly because Paris revealed plans to link aid and democracy. The regime released all political prisoners and reintroduced the post of Prime Minister, which Sadou Hayatou, a Biya ally, filled. Meanwhile, 11 leading political parties coalesced around the National Co-ordination Committee of Opposition Parties (NCCOP). This umbrella organization launched a UI campaign including a country-wide general strike that would persist until an SNC was held. The goal was to paralyze Cameroon's economy and dislocate Biya from revenue sources required to buy loyalty from the military and bloated civil service sector concentrated in

the country's capital Yaoundé. Operation *Ville Morte* presented a formidable challenge. Up to two million people out of a total population of twelve million participated Monday to Friday from May to August 1991 in this general strike. The government had expected up to 120,000 million CFA in tax revenue by late October, but had only received 19 million CFA.

Despite this impressive display of civil disobedience, the opposition was an alliance of convenience prone to fracturing along regional and ethnic lines. The longer Biya managed to resist the calls for a SNC, the more likely he could exhaust the campaign, sow division within its ranks, and co-opt factions to accept a compromise solution. By mid-July the general strike lost momentum everywhere but Douala, a major port city, and the Anglophone dominant West and North-West provinces. During the fall, recalcitrant members of the opposition recognized the futility of continuing the general strikes. By late October, the opposition accepted Biya's initiative of a "Tripartite Conference." Representatives of the government, opposition parties, and civil society met to resolve the political deadlock. After threatening to withdraw on several occasions, the NCCOP managed to extract some constitutional reforms, but these concessions fell far short of aspirations for a SNC. A final report was signed by 40 out of the 47 political parties that participated in the conference, but a few major opposition leaders refused to sign at the last minute, equating the agreement to a farce. Biya succeeded in his chief aims. He avoided serious reforms that endangered his control over the levers of power and fostered

---

11 Unemployment became a major grievance in Cameroon during the late 1980s. According to Takougang ("Biya and incremental Reforms," 167-68), Biya used rents derived from high oil prices for his social and economic programs, which provided an important source of patronage. Konings ("The Post-Colonial State," 251) observes that the civil service sector grew from 80,000 in 1982 to 180,000 in 1988. Not coincidently, the Beti disproportionately benefited from this artificial job creation.


divisions among the opposition. Following seriously flawed legislative and presidential elections in 1992, Biya officially survived the transition to a multi-party system.

A major reason the general strike proved futile was the regime's ability to gain financial support from its primary patron. While Paris sent mixed public signals in 1990-91 regarding its expectations for political reform in Cameroon, its economic policy clearly favored the incumbent regime. The annual average amount of ODA increased from $94.5 million in 1987-1989, or 30% of all foreign assistance, to $251.6 million in 1990-1992, or 45% of all foreign assistance. Two installments of French aid enabled the regime to pay the salaries for soldiers and civil servants on time and helped Biya avoid fiscal ruin by meeting IMF obligations. Without this additional liquidity, unrest was much more likely to engulf Yaoundé and parts of the south, which remained bastions of relative tranquility. French support also may have influenced the decision of a significant portion of powerful elites to seek a compromise solution with Biya. As it stood, only some civilian elites defected. Many others remained loyal especially in the security forces. The small circle of hardline advisors surrounding Biya could also point to French support as evidence that the president need not and should not accept demands for a SNC. In sum, the regime did not rely on the short-term consent of the domestic population for its livelihood due to French support. In contrast, the average citizen and businessman lacked the means to strike

---

16 Many French representatives contradicted Mitterand's declaration at La Baule. For instance, at the height of the protests in late June 1991, former French Interior Minister Charles Pasqua said on his trip to Cameroon that a SNC was equivalent to the desire of obtaining power before elections. Mentan, "A Flawed Transition," 44. French foreign policy seemed particularly driven by its distrust of the opposition, a large portion of which belonged to Cameroon's Anglophone population. According to Konings ("The Post-Colonial State," 255), "French government circles" seemed to strongly believe "that the shadow of Washington is behind the IMF, the World Bank, and the Cameroonian opposition." Such infringement on France's privileged sphere of influence was unwelcomed.

17 Levitsky and Way, Competitive Authoritarianism, 260.

18 "Cameroon: Paris and the rest of them," Africa Confidential 33, No. 24, December 4, 1992

indefinitely. Without the threat of large-scale elite defection, Biya could wait for the internally fractured opposition to collapse and negotiate the first multiparty elections on his terms.

I.b. Haiti 1985-86

Upon winning the 1957 presidential elections, François "Papa Doc" Duvalier worked tirelessly to consolidate his power. A coup attempt in 1958 convinced him that the military's traditional rule as an independent arbiter posed a grave threat. Consequently, he dismissed the entire general staff replacing them with black junior officers, refashioned the Presidential Guard into a personal security unit, and institutionalized a paramilitary force called the Tonton Macoutes. Later renamed the National Security Volunteer Militia (VSN), this institution counterbalanced the military, intimidated regime opponents, and terrorized the population. During Papa Doc's twelve year reign, an estimated 50,000 people were killed due to state sponsored violence. Despite widespread fear of Cuba exporting its revolution, such extreme repression contributed to the Kennedy administration's decision to cut aid that was being used to finance the Macoutes in 1962. By this time, however, the regime had emasculated the remaining autonomous power centers, including the Roman Catholic church, the business elite, political

20 The Tonton Macoute was a sprawling network, whose ranks grew to twice that of the military. Michel S. Laguerre, "The Tontons Macoutes," in The Haiti Files: Decoding the Crisis, ed. James Ridgeway (Washington, DC: Essential Books, 1994), 48-50. Macoute headquarters were located in every military district, but housed different and sometimes competing local units. The lack of administrative oversight created severe principal-agent problems, but decreased the ability to coordinate efforts to topple the center. Also, the regime was not directly responsible for many rank-and-file members and thus did not need to provide a regular salary it could ill-afford. This was a cheap and effective arrangement for Papa Doc to obtain information about and maintain control over the countryside, where approximately 75 percent of the population lived. Over time, membership in the military and VSN overlapped. This further subverted the military's professionalism and increased opportunities to extract wealth from the countryside. For instance, the military officer in charge of sub-districts appointed local section chiefs, who basically served as the government for the local populace. The local section chief had every incentive to squeeze as much wealth as possible from local residents after bribing the officer to obtain this privileged position because they could be replaced at any time. Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, "Paper Laws, Steel Bayonets," in The Haiti Files: Decoding the Crisis, ed. James Ridgeway, (Washington, DC: Essential Books, 1994), 45. Rank and file members of the Macoutes mirrored this pathological behavior. These individuals often paid to join the organization in order to obtain the privilege to plunder the countryside. Josh DeWind and David H. Kinley, Aiding Migration: The Impact of International Development Assistance on Haiti (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988), 20-22. In sum, the Duvalier system created a fierce and arbitrary security apparatus which fed on corruption and extortion.

parties and trade unions. Possession over the state's coercive apparatus and the complete
demobilization of society enabled Papa Doc to form an acceptable coalition with a small number
of mulatto families that constituted Haiti's traditional economic elite class.\(^{22}\) Meanwhile, his
populist rhetoric combining nationalism with \textit{noirisme} – a political ideology that celebrated
Haiti's African heritage and cultural practices associated with the indigenous black population –
initially proved attractive to the black middle class and impoverished masses. Upon his death in
1971, Papa Doc managed to bestow on his 19-year-old son Jean-Claude "Baby Doc" Duvalier a
predatory state that faced no immediate external or internal threat.

Baby Doc provided the regime a partial facelift. He embarked on a liberalization program
replacing old-guard stalwarts with mulatto businessmen and technocrats.\(^{23}\) While the worst
abuses of the political system diminished significantly under the younger Duvalier, the regime's
kleptocratic tendencies metastasized. Yet, in recognition of the regime's apparent reformist
intentions, total international aid increased from $6 million in 1971 to $149 million in 1985,
roughly 40 percent of Haiti's national budget.\(^{24}\) The US was the largest bilateral foreign donor
averaging an aid package of $44.2 million between 1981-1985.\(^{25}\) By the early 1980s,

\(^{22}\) Prince, \textit{Family Business}, 25-6; James Ridgeway, "Haiti's Family Affairs," in \textit{The Haiti Files: Decoding the Crisis},
\(^{23}\) This realignment culminated in Baby Doc's marriage in 1980 to Michelle Bennett. Her father, Ernest Bennett, was
a rich mulatto businessman who was later involved in several high profile corruption scandals. This strategic shift in
the ruling coalition weakened Duvalier's power base by completely subverting his father's \textit{noirist} ideology. David
Nicholls, "Haiti: The Rise and Fall of Duvalierism," \textit{Third World Quarterly} 8, No. 4 (1986): 1248. Moreover,
hardline regime stalwarts who lost their positions had less incentive to stand by Baby Doc, while Haiti's economic
barons' support for the regime was conditional. This marriage of convenience was easily abandoned if Duvalier
proved incapable of upholding his end of the bargain, i.e. political stability.
\(^{25}\) The regime siphoned off some aid, but its ability to benefit shrank as multinational lending institutions and donor
states increasingly directed aid through Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) thereby circumventing the Haitian
government. According to Elliott Abrams, then Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, the US government
filtered half of its aid through PVOs by 1985 and closely monitored the portion provided to the government \textit{Human
Rights in Haiti, Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Human Rights and International Organizations}, 99th Cong., 67-
68 (1985) (statement Elliott Abrams, Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian
international donor efforts to shape Haitian policy became more pronounced. The World Bank encouraged the regime to initiate reforms meant to foster export-led economic development that exploited Haiti's comparative advantage, cheap labor.\textsuperscript{26} Through structural adjustment programs, the IMF required fiscally responsible budgets and investigations into corruption allegations.\textsuperscript{27}

At the behest of the US Congress, the Regan administration began to encourage political reform. The 1981 amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act made the release of US aid contingent on an annual certification by the President that Haiti was making progress on human rights. The State Department's annual human rights reports continued to certify Haiti's progress, but an outspoken minority spearheaded by the Congressional Black Caucus challenged these assessments. Jean-Claude responded to external pressure with nominal reforms partly because donor conditionality appeared weak. Nonetheless, after apparent backsliding in 1984, he seemed to feel compelled to alleviate some donor concerns. Relative toleration of opposition views in the press existed throughout most of 1985.\textsuperscript{28} The international and domestic opposition condemned Baby Doc's constitutional referendum in July, which enabled independent political parties to function under a multi-party political system with the caveat that these new parties recognize him

\textsuperscript{26}DeWind, \textit{Aiding Migration}, 34-36. This policy aligned with the Caribbean Basin Initiative that envisioned US consumers as the terminal market for increases in Caribbean and Central American exports.

\textsuperscript{27}Haiti failed to meet the fiscal requirements set by the IMF in 1984 and faced additional austerity measures the next year. Significant alterations to the fiscal system or reductions in government spending were innately political and risked upsetting the status-quo. In regard to the distorted fiscal system, the World Bank estimated that 1% of Haiti's population received 44% of the national income, but paid only 3.5% in taxes. Most tax revenue was generated indirectly, which effectively created a regressive tax regime. Thus, striking the right balance between donor expectations and internal exigencies was nearly impossible. For instance, Marc Bazin lasted only five months as Haiti's Finance Minister in 1982 because his campaign against corruption infringed on profitable smuggling activities associated with Ernest Bennett. Bazin's replacement, Frantz Merceron, had more success walking this tightrope. To meet IMF demands, he cautiously increased the value added tax and cut the share of government expenditures on development projects. The goals of technocrats would continue to clash with Duvalier's regime. See Prince, \textit{Family Business}, 51-52; DeWind, \textit{Aiding Migration}, 65-68.

as "President-for-Life." The regime was clearly uninterested in real liberalization, but its
dependence on foreign aid trapped Baby Doc into keeping up appearances.

The most pressing problem facing the regime was the dismal economic situation. Annual
average economic growth increased 5% throughout the 1970s due to propitious conditions
unrelated to Baby Doc's liberalization program, but shrank 2.5% on average from 1980-1985.29
During the first half of the 1980s, unemployment was estimated around 50%, while the annual
percent change in the cost of living increased 9% from 1982-1985. This deterioration in living
standards acutely affected Haiti's vulnerable population, where annual per capita income was
estimated at $270 and one-third of the population suffered from malnutrition.30 The first sign of
potential unrest erupted during the May 1984 food riots in the northwest city of Gonaïves, where
the unemployment rate had reached 80%.31 Days later, riots occurred in Cap Haitien, Haiti's
second largest city, because food aid was being sold rather than distributed to the poor as
intended. On both occasions, the police and military beat protesters into submission killing a
pregnant woman in Gonaïves and three others in Cap Haitien.32 Violence quelled the unrest, but
these short-lived rebellions were a harbinger of events to come.

29 High commodity prices during the 1970s plummeted the following decade, which affected economic growth and
the balance of payments because agricultural products accounted for over 30% of Haiti's GDP. Tourism also
decayed due to negative press reports on HIV/AIDS and the massive influx of illegal Haitian migrants fleeing to the
US on unsafe rafts.
02/17/86. The discovery of the African swine fever virus exacerbated rural poverty further. Perceived as a threat
to the US pig industry, a program known as PEPPADEP (Programme pour l'Eradication de la Peste Porcine Africaine
et pour le Développement de l'Elevage Porcine) successfully exterminated 1.3 million creole pigs between May 1982
to August 1984. The program replaced the slaughtered pigs with commercialized ones, but the latter required special
feed and medical attention Haitians could not afford. Thus, the Haitian peasants were deprived of another key source
32 "3 killed in Haiti riot as food aid is sold," Reuters, May 28, 1984. Following these food riots, coordinated
opposition rallies were attempted on only two occasions before the fall of 1985. Led by the church, a crowd of
80,000 peacefully gathered in February ostensibly for the purpose of celebrating International Youth Year. Given
the tense church-state relationship, the protest action had political overtones. The purpose of the second planned
rally squarely targeted the political and economic situation in Haiti. Opposition leader Hubert DeRonceray and a
Baby Doc's immediate troubles began on November 28th 1985 when police shot on a crowd of 3,000 demonstrators chanting anti-government slogans in Gonaïves, leaving four youths dead. Unlike 1984, these deaths caused significant blowback. Unrest spread rapidly to several other provincial cities, but the capital would remain relatively calm until late January 1986. On December 4th, the US State Department denounced violence against peaceful demonstrators and five days later emphasized that the likely repercussions of adopting a martial solution included the cessation of aid.33 Private US pressure also increased. US ambassador to Haiti Clayton McManaway informed Haitian Foreign Minister Jean-Robert Estimé on December 6th that US certification for aid depended on the government's reaction to the crisis. Aside from avoiding further harsh repression, the ambassador revealed US expectations that the recently shuttered Radio Soliel – a Catholic radio station and the only independent news source reporting on the protests – be reopened, and the recently arrested opposition leader Hubert DeRonceray be released.34 On December 17th, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights Elliott Abrams reiterated McManaway's message to Estimé. As protests subsided in late December, Duvalier reopened Radio Soliel, released DeRonceray, radically restructured his cabinet, removed police leaders, and announced a 10% price reduction in basic commodities. Hoping to ride out the domestic crisis, he attempted to curry favor with the US to obtain the release of aid and adopted modest conciliatory steps to appease protesters.

loose opposition network called "Youth of Haiti" were suspected of making preparations for a mass demonstration against Jean-Claude's constitutional referendum in June. The regime adopted a preemptive strategy by declaring the gathering illegal thereby deterring those opposed to the regime from taking to the streets. "Haitians renew protests," The Guardian, June 17, 1985.
33 Ferguson, Papa Doc, Baby Doc, 99.
34 Cable, McManaway to Shultz, "Suggested Talking Points -- Estime/Abrams," December 12, 1985, Doc # C05662927. Although the Catholic Church's influence over the Haitian population was less encompassing compared to other Caribbean nations, the Church played an important role in encouraging political reforms. During a visit to Haiti in 1983, Pope John Paul II declared that "something must change here" to rectify the injustices of the Haitian political system. Subsequently, Catholic bishops began openly campaigning for political reform that would protect basic civil liberties and political rights. The independent Radio Soliere was a mouthpiece for this cause.
With the rumor of a possible coup circulating, demonstrations re-emerged after the holidays. On January 6\textsuperscript{th}, protests broke out in seven provincial cities, but a tenuous calm was re-established days later. In a third wave of unrest, thousands of protesters openly challenged the army and police in Cap-Haïtien on January 25\textsuperscript{th}. Despite orders to crush the demonstrations, only some units attempted to disperse the crowds violently.\textsuperscript{35} By January 30\textsuperscript{th}, with protests now reaching the capital, Port-au-Prince, the army substituted half-hearted repression with open neutrality. Equally devastating, the US blocked $26 million in aid until further progress in human rights occurred. Early on January 31\textsuperscript{st}, White House spokesmen Larry Speakes incorrectly announced that Haiti's president was in exile. Duvalier denied this claim over the radio and declared a state of siege. As the situation deteriorated around him, Baby Doc reviewed his options. By February 7\textsuperscript{th}, he accepted a temporary "golden parachute" to France arranged with the assistance of the US embassy. Along with 24 of his closest accomplices, Baby Doc left for Paris with his wealth intact. This ushered in the Transitional Military Council. While some downplay US actions as jumping "out of the way of a speeding train," the early public and private warnings deterred the regime from adopting a draconian response likely sufficient to suppress the fragile opposition movement at least in the short term.\textsuperscript{36} The US application of the "feast or famine" mechanism helped prevent this eventuality and provided the protesters enough breathing space to effect the necessary defections from the civilian and security elite.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35} Abbott, \textit{The Duvaliers}, 306.

\textsuperscript{36} Brenda Gayle Plummer, \textit{Haiti and the United States: The Psychological Moment} (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 208. Duvalier was concerned about remaining in the good graces of the US because he wanted to maintain access to loans from the IMF and other multinational financial institutions. A growing consensus among diplomats began to emerge just before Thanksgiving in 1985 that Duvalier's regime was not sustainable. Georges Fauriol, "The Duvaliers and Haiti," \textit{Orbis: A Journal of World Affairs} 32, No. 4 (1988): 601. However, this recognition was not equivalent to a belief that his regime could not survive immediate challenges, like the subsequent food riots in Gonaïves.

\textsuperscript{37} According to some accounts, US actions went far beyond aid conditionality. High ranking military officers and some civilian elites saw these protests as an opportunity to rid themselves of the young president-for-life. Abbott,
The Cameroon and Haiti cases offer some insight into when and how "feast or famine" tactics contribute to UI campaign outcomes. First, a patron must possess substantial economic leverage over the embattled regime that it can quickly adjust to influence the rapidly unfolding situation. Additionally, to play a decisive role, a readily available substitute for the patron's aid cannot exist. For instance, the US provided a substantial amount of aid to Haiti, which the latter required and could not access from alternative channels. Second, domestic movements carry out general strikes either to signal potential future costs if demands are not met or to starve the regime of short-term resources required to maintain the status quo. When a UI campaign seeks to realize the latter goal, it cannot sustain such acute pressure indefinitely. Such efforts to starve regimes are a transitory threat that offer only a brief window of opportunity. In cases like Cameroon, the patron can provide the regime enough breathing space to expose the opposition's internal fissures through a mixture of carrots and sticks. If the patron supports the campaign, efforts to complement this pressure must occur before the regime succeeds in significantly weakening the opposition. Finally, dictators do not cede power voluntarily. They often fight until the impossibility of victory is evident. Thus, Baby Doc did not appear amenable to the golden parachute option until the US officially withdrew its financial aid and the army proved unwilling.

(The Duvaliers, 301-305) claims the plan to remove Jean-Claude via popular protest moved forward partly due to the secret blessing of Ambassador McManaway. The linchpin for success depended on recruiting the VSN leadership, namely Madame Max, to remain as neutral as possible. Acquiring her complicity would prove challenging because the VSN was fully implicated in the brutality of the Papa Doc and Baby Doc regimes. Murderous retribution would inevitably follow any transition. During discussions in mid-January, VSN leader Madame Max allegedly refused the military's offer to oust Duvalier until the interlocutor revealed American willingness to provide "basic concessions to those parties who provided valuable help in the complicated ouster." In exchange for safe passage, she contacted key Macoutes officials to ensure that Baby Doc could safely flee. Therefore, the golden parachute to Madame Max was as important as the one provided to Duvalier and his closest corrupt cronies in the final stages of the crisis. The Tonton Macoutes leadership did not interfere in Baby Doc's decision-making process. This allowed the military to smoothly nudge Duvalier from power as planned. None of the 45 State Department cables released in my FOIA request fully confirm this version. However, one cable (dated around the time Abbott suggested this meeting occurred) mentions that "the Central Command of the VSN had telephoned its commandants around the country to instruct them to stay put and not become involved in suppressing popular expressions of discontent... If the President tried to countermand the order... the Head of the VSN would go on the radio to urge the VSN to stay put." McManaway to Shultz, January 8, 1986, Doc. # C05662888.
to carry out orders to use deadly force. While the golden parachute appeared useful to ease
Duvalier from office through means other than a traditional military coup, the "feast or famine"
tactics appeared necessary to make Duvalier accept such a deal.

II. The Political Environment

As illustrated in the cases above, "feast or famine" tactics can tip the domestic balance in
favor of the regime or the UI campaign. However, as the Panamanian case reveals, principal-
agent coordination problems between the patron and opposition, insulated revenue streams
available to the regime, and ruthless coup-proofing measures enabled Noriega to survive. Before
detailing how these mediating factors reduced the US ability to intervene successfully on the side
of the campaign, this section details the key features of Noriega's regime, the Panamanian
opposition, US-Panama relations, and key events leading to the 1987 June crisis.

2.a. Noriega's regime

When Noriega became PDF comandante in 1983, he took a calculated risk. Instead of
proceeding with political liberalization, he abandoned the extant inclusive authoritarian model in
favor of a coalition between the military and a narrowed circle of co-opted civilian elite. This
decision had important implications. The redistribution of private goods increased the number of
dissatisfied elites and collective actors, but enhanced the loyalty of the winners. In other words,
the choice to retrench provided the opposition potential allies, but bolstered the regime's ability
to survive crises. To contextualize this decision and its repercussions on Noriega's ability to
maintain power during the mid-1980s, it is instructive to outline the political and economic
system he inherited from his predecessor and former patron, General Omar Torrijos.

In October 1968, a group of officers in the National Guard (NG) overthrew the newly
elected president, Arnulfo Arias, before he could retire or reassign them to less influential
Unlike previous interventions into civilian politics, however, the NG did not return to the barracks. Rather, coup leaders formed a provisional junta, announced a broad reformist agenda, abolished political parties, and began a campaign to censor the press. Omar Torrijos nudged his main rival for junta leadership into retirement and survived a countercoup in December 1969 with the help of Major Noriega. Demetrio Basilio Lakas became Panama's president, but real power always lay in the hands of Torrijos. To manufacture ideological and popular support for the so-called "revolutionary process," the regime employed two broad tactics.

First, Torrijos adopted a series of populist policies that benefited a large portion of the population long marginalized by the traditional ruling elite's grip over the political process. The working class, peasants, and urban poor gained most from these early reforms. Torrijos solidified working class support with the progressive 1972 Labor Code that made "collective bargaining obligatory for most private companies, payroll deduction of union dues automatic, wage reductions illegal, and worker dismissals extremely costly." To gain support from the

---

38 Arias was no newcomer to Panamanian national politics. This was the third time he was elected Panama's president, and the third time he was removed from office by extra-constitutional means. He was an effective orator who mixed nationalist, xenophobic, and populist rhetoric to challenge the commercial oligarchic class that dominated Panamanian politics since independence in 1903. See Sharon Phillips Collazos, Labor and Politics in Panama: The Torrijos Years (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991), 23-26.

39 Before the 1968 election, the Liberal Party (LP) controlled the political scene; however, a rift between traditional oligarchic and technocratic reformist interests split the party prior to the elections. A coalition of odd-bedfellows developed between the conservative faction of the old LP and Arnulfo's populist Partido Panamáísta (PP). The technocratic faction of the LP subsequently sided with the coup leaders in an alliance of convenience that would advance their national economic agenda and increase their access to lucrative business ventures. With their interest threatened, the National Council of Private Enterprise (CONEP), a civil society organization dominated by the conservative commercial oligarchy, supported the countercoup effort in December 1969. While articulating a genuine desire to return the country to a civilian-controlled, democratic government, raw economic calculus played a decisive role for understanding why conservative business interests were often arrayed against the military dictatorship during the early period of Torrijos's rule. Steve C. Ropp, Panamanian Politics: From Guarded Nation to National Guard (New York: Praeger, 1982), 62.

40 In devising a formula to win over the previously neglected sectors of Panamanian society, Torrijos selectively emulated the Cuban Revolution, Argentina's Peronist era, and General Valasco's military regime in Peru. Michael L. Conniff, Panama and the United States: The Forced Alliance (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 147.

countryside, the regime pushed agrarian reform in a land redistribution program. Benefitting only 4% of the rural population, this program achieved limited success, but burnished the general's image as a leader concerned with societal inequality. Other populist policies to generate support from poorer segments of society included the implementation of price and rent controls, significant investments in health care and education, and increased social security payments. Overall, this approach was a clear break from the politics of Panama's traditional oligarchy, and lent legitimacy for the nascent military dictatorship. Yet, such efforts to justify the "revolutionary process" depended on the availability of sufficient funds to cover these expensive policies.

Unfortunately, the global recession in the mid-1970s exacerbated the fiscal imbalance. The regime countered economic stagnation by substituting the drop in private investment with an

helped increase "the number of organized workers as a percentage of all workers in Panama... from an estimated 7.2 in the 1960s to 13.9 percent by 1978." It is important to note that the regime's control over labor was far from hegemonic. In fact, the US-dominated labor confederation affiliated with the AFL-CIO, Confederación de Trabajadores de la República de Panamá (CTRP), still had more members in 1978 than the pro-government confederation, Central Nacional de Trabajadores de Panamá (CNTP).

Robert C. Harding, *Military Foundations of Panamanian Politics* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001), 103. These land reforms were much less contentious than those in other Central American countries. The main source of profit for Panama's oligarchic class was based in commerce, and therefore detached from any need to exploit cheap sources of rural labor. Additionally, the government owned significant tracts of land that minimized the need to seize private property. Later on, support from the countryside was important. Whereas the commercial oligarchy gerrymandered electoral districts to favor the urban centers before 1968, Torrijos did the opposite. Thus, this population provided a useful counterweight to the opposition's strongholds in Panama City and Colon. Richard M. Koster and Guillermo Sánchez Borbón, *In the Time of Tyrants: Panama, 1968-1990* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1990), 153, 214; Ropp, *Panamanian Politics*, 78.

Although Panama's population is often cited as enjoying a relatively high per capita income compared to its Central American neighbors, the incidence of poverty in Panama was quite high, especially outside its cities. Panama's GINI coefficient, a measure that compares economic inequality, was larger than every Central American country except El Salvador. Moreover, one report cites that the basic needs for 67.3% of the rural population and 42.9% of the urban population were not satisfied. Although smaller than Nicaragua and El Salvador, these figures are much higher than Costa Rica, where the basic needs for 34.2% of the rural population and 13.6% of the urban population were not satisfied. Zimbalist and Weeks, *Panama at the Crossroads*, 122-127.

Torrijos also manufactured support among the student population. His political alliance with respected leftist intellectuals and the small communist party, the People's Party of Panama (PPP), lent his "ongoing revolution" a modicum of credibility. The PPP also furnished the regime relatively strong institutional connections to student and labor groups. See Koster and Sanchez, *Time of Tyrants*, 140-144; 219. As with labor, Torrijos was unable to co-opt the entire student body, which was split between Social Christians and Marxists. Brittmare Janson Pérez, *The Process of Political Protest in Panama, 1968-1989* (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1994), 60-62.

To cover these public expenditures, the regime attempted to establish a stronger financial base. The 1970 tax reforms raised the rates on income, dividends, property, and excise taxes, but failed to substantially increase the national budget. These reforms should have raised the tax base by 50%, but much of this expected revenue never materialized due to widespread tax evasion. Zimbalist and Weeks, *Panama at the Crossroads*, 34.
increase in public investment. This approach included the nationalization of large companies and provision of significant support to a faltering construction industry. By the end of the 1970s, the government employed 25% of the workforce, which constituted another segment of society – a bureaucratic "lower middle class" – sympathetic to its rule.\textsuperscript{45} However, the external debt soared from $145 million in 1970 to $2.2 billion in 1980. The regime's ability to spend well beyond its means emerged from a unique set of circumstances that enabled Torrijos to gain preferential access to international loan capital. Most importantly, the regime passed two banking laws in 1970 that "provided for numbered bank accounts, secrecy, tax exemptions, and revoked reserve regulations and exchange restrictions for offshore banking."\textsuperscript{46} Panama wanted to become the Switzerland of the Americas. Offering a prime location, political stability, and a dollarized economy, it largely succeeded. Within twelve years, Panama's banking sector grew from 23 banks with $1 billion in deposits to around 120 banks with $50 billion in deposits.\textsuperscript{47} Despite access to easy credit, the regime searched for a more sustainable strategy of economic development, which prompted a period of rapprochement with the traditional ruling elite.

Panama's business community voiced concern over how the socio-economic reforms affected firm competitiveness.\textsuperscript{48} As the state of the economy declined, these arguments gained traction. A group of young economic technocrats in the regime initiated a series of minor reforms


\textsuperscript{46} Harding, \textit{Military Foundations}, 106.

\textsuperscript{47} Zimbalist and Weeks, \textit{Panama at the Crossroads}, 33.

\textsuperscript{48} Collazos, \textit{Labor and Politics}, 105-13.
in 1975 and 1976 to resuscitate the sharp decline in private-sector investment.\textsuperscript{49} The recalibration in economic policy culminated in the adoption of Law 95 in December 1976, which retracted many benefits specified in the 1972 Labor Laws. By the end of the decade, the business community established various semi-institutionalized means to articulate its interests to the regime.\textsuperscript{50} The extent of this reconciliation was significant. If its interests remained protected, the business community seemed just as satisfied with the current political arrangement as a transition back to democracy.\textsuperscript{51} Yet, Torrijos refused to jettison his populist agenda completely. This led to an ambivalent economic policy that left all sides unsatisfied.\textsuperscript{52} By the end of the 1970s, the sustainability of the inclusive authoritarian arrangement began unraveling.

The second way Torrijos rallied support for the regime was with nationalist rhetoric directed at continued US control over the Canal Zone. This issue, unlike any other, resonated with Panama's population. From a material perspective, Panama enjoyed only a minor fraction of the revenue generated within the Canal Zone and had little say over the number, size, and purpose of US military installations. More importantly, the canal's presence through the center of the country was an affront to national dignity. According to the 1903 Hay-Bunau Varilla treaty, Panama's government would never possess legal jurisdiction over the Canal Zone or its residents, known as Zonians, who enjoyed countless privileges unavailable to average Panamanians. Panama's identity as a sovereign nation required a resolution to this issue.

\textsuperscript{49} Zimbalist and Weeks, \textit{Panama at a Crossroads}, 37.
\textsuperscript{50} Organized labor was able to regain some of these lost privileges in 1981. In particular, the passage of Law 8 provided safeguards for job stability. See Collazos, \textit{Labor and Politics}, 117-25.
\textsuperscript{51} Ropp, \textit{Panamanian Politics}, 65.
Resentment toward the US intensified after the deaths of 21 Panamanians during the January 1964 riots that began as a symbolic dispute over raising the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. This episode increased concerns among US policymakers of growing anti-American sentiment. The Johnson administration agreed to initiate negotiations that would gradually transfer sovereignty of the Canal Zone and eventually the Canal itself to Panama. When details of the Robles-Johnson proposal were revealed in 1967, the tentative "three-in-one" treaties fell short of popular expectations. President Robles did not incite popular discontent to press the US for more favorable terms. Neither country ratified the proposal. By 1969, the Nixon administration was content to let the issue idle, but Torrijos was not. He adroitly fomented Panamanian nationalism by standing up to the Colossus of the North, which generated much support for the regime and proved effective at compelling the Americans to negotiate in earnest.

To press the US, Torrijos railed against American imperialism and rallied world opinion behind Panama. In a bold diplomatic move, Panama's UN ambassador managed to introduce a Security Council resolution sympathetic to its cause in March 1973. This forced the US into the awkward position of being the sole dissenting vote. The ability to challenge the US at the world stage and win produced broad domestic support for the regime. Despite significant resistance from various quarters in Panama and the US, the Panama Canal Treaties were signed five years later. Ironically, the strategy to compel the US to negotiate may have worked too well. Torrijos

---

53 President Robles did seek Panamanian sovereignty over the canal and appeared to obtain such a promise from the Johnson administration in 1967. Yet, the Panamanian public considered the details of the agreement inadequate, especially US majority control over a nine member panel of governors and the maintenance of US military installations until 2004. Walter LaFeber, *The Panama Canal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 147-8.

54 This episode grabbed the attention of Henry Kissinger, who previously paid little attention to the canal issue. Concerned over broader strategic implications with Latin America, the Nixon and Ford administrations proceeded with negotiations as an important foreign policy objective. Tom Long, "Putting the Canal on the Map: Panamanian Agenda-Setting and the 1973 Security Council Meetings," *Diplomatic History* 0, No. 0 (2013): 15-16.

55 The Canal Treaties passed by popular referendum in Panama in March 1979, but many prominent opposition figures opposed the treaties partly because they were negotiated by an illegitimate government lacking a popular
secured his legacy, but undermined the utility of a powerful control mechanism. Channeling popular frustrations away from the regime and toward the US would prove difficult with this principle grievance resolved. In sum, the two tactics used to generate support for the regime – the creation of an inclusive authoritarian model and redirection of popular frustration toward the US – became less stable pillars by the late 1970s.

To ensure the ratification of the canal treaties, Torrijos promised congressmen that the National Guard would return to the barracks and the regime would "civilianize" politics. This led to a controlled political opening. In December 1977, the regime announced its intentions to lift Decree 343 that restricted the freedom of expression in the media.\(^5\) In the spring of 1978, exiles could return to Panama; large crowds gathered to celebrate the return of Arnulfo Arias. In October 1978, Torrijos allowed Article 277 of the 1972 Constitution that granted him special powers as "maximum leader" to expire, and promulgated Law No. 81 that legalized political parties. Competitive elections for 19 seats on the National Council were scheduled for 1980, and direct presidential elections for 1984. Despite these positive signs, Torrijos was unlikely to cede real power. He wanted to construct an authoritarian system that possessed the trappings of mandate. Panamanian opposition grew with the inclusion of the DeConcini Reservation added after the referendum. By effectively granting the US the right to intervene militarily when deemed necessary to keep the canal open, this modification to the neutrality treaty helped garner necessary votes in the US Senate. Protests against the amendment accentuated a growing rift between the students and Torrijos. In one infamous episode, thugs from the pro-government student federation assaulted a large number of university students planning to demonstrate against an upcoming visit by President Carter, leaving two dead and 300 injured. Thereafter, students often participated in anti-government protests and would prove one of the most difficult segments of the population to intimidate during the civic campaign to remove Noriega after June 1987. See Koster and Sanchez, *Time of Tyrants*, 204-210.

In the US, a group of conservative Republican senators sought to derail the negotiations. One tactic used was portraying Torrijos's regime as an untrustworthy authoritarian state deeply implicated in drug-trafficking and other unsavory ventures. The Carter administration largely ignored these accusations and sought to bury any details that could affect treaty negotiations, especially those related to the Singing Sergeant's scandal and drug trafficking. See Murillo, *The Noriega Mess*, 230-41.

\(^5\) Perez, *Political Protest in Panama*, 82. Opposition newspapers and radio channels constantly faced forced closures, destruction of property, and intimidation of opposition commentators, such as Guillermo Bourbon Sanchez, a popular columnist for *La Prensa*, and Miguel Antonio Bernal, an outspoken radio host at Radio Mundial. Despite such harassment, the opposition gained privileges it never enjoyed during the first decade of Torrijos's rule.
democracy. In particular, he sought to institutionalize indirect military rule by constructing a broad-based political party modeled after the Mexican Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). However, translating this plan to action proved difficult. Despite significant advantages as the de facto incumbent party, the Democratic Revolutionary Party (PRD) did not perform well in the 1980 legislative elections. Torrijos's party won 11 out of 19 open seats, but only managed to obtain 40% of the total vote. The PRD could not even muster a majority vote in the countryside, where it hoped to dominate. Moreover, 40% of registered voters did not participate, which some observers interpreted as an indication of even greater support for the opposition.

The degree to which Torrijos was prepared to liberalize the political system remains unclear due to his sudden death in a plane accident on July 31st 1981, an event that triggered a succession crisis. To attenuate acute competition among the top officers, a small cabal of four Colonels devised "Plan Torrijos" that set a secret timetable for the dates each officer would become the National Guard's commander-in-chief. This plan quickly unraveled. At each step Noriega outmaneuvered his rivals. He orchestrated a series of quiet coups that propelled him to the position of comandante in August 1983. By this time, the military had become the most powerful institution in Panama.

Throughout his tenure, Torrijos sought to foster a large, well-funded and loyal National Guard as the institutional backbone of the regime. He increased the number of servicemen from 5,500 to 8,700 and the budget from $10 million to $100 million between 1968 and 1978. With

59 The conspirators would force Torrijos's successor to retire and replace him with Ruben Dario Paredes, who would retire in 1983 and run as the PRD's presidential candidate the following year. Armando Contreras would then lead the National Guard until 1984, when Noriega would succeed him, followed by Roberto Diaz-Herrera in July 1987.
this large influx in money and personnel, the institution gradually expanded its reach to a wide variety of activities beyond its original function as a police force. Thus, the Guard became better positioned to profit from a variety of legal and illegal activities.\textsuperscript{61} The unregulated nature of the banking system also attracted vast sums of illicit money that needed to be laundered.\textsuperscript{62} One particularly profitable activity, drug trafficking, started to mushroom in 1982. The Medellin cartel actively sought out Noriega's services that included "an established and protected network for clandestine transport, supply and finance."\textsuperscript{63} Although involvement in drug trafficking significantly diminished after 1984, Panama would gain notoriety within a few year as the first "narco-military" regime. Yet, the foundation for such activity had been set years earlier. Torrijos never discouraged such nefarious schemes and corrupt practices in the National Guard.

Aside from lucrative deals to ensure the loyalty of high-ranking military officers, Torrijos achieved greater institutional cohesion by appointing many non-whites from disadvantaged backgrounds to important posts in the officer corps.\textsuperscript{64} This policy dovetailed with Torrijos's image as a reformer and champion of the underprivileged class, who would enter the National

\textsuperscript{61} Illegal ventures included, \textit{inter alia}, gunrunning, passport-selling, moving contraband in and out of the Colon Free Trade Zone, repackaging Cuban products for the American market, as well as exporting high technology American products to Cuba and Eastern European countries. In testimony to the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Richard Millett noted that the signing of the canal treaties contributed to this expansion as the National Guard began to take over responsibilities in the canal zone. \textit{Situation in Panama: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Comm. on Foreign Affairs}, 99th Cong., 31 (1986), HRG-1986-FOR-0013.

\textsuperscript{62} In exchange for bank account anonymity, the Panamanian authorities charged $1,200 for opening a shell corporation. As "businesses" opened an estimated 150,000 paper companies, regime insiders made around $180 million before Noriega's downfall. For additional services, Noriega's charge was steep, but he often delivered. Steven Kalish, a major marijuana magnate in the US, gave Noriega $300,000 just to indicate his seriousness about laundering large amounts of money through Panama. \textit{Drugs and Money Laundering in Panama: Hearing Before the Permanent Subcomm. on Investigations of the Comm. on Governmental Affairs}, 100th Cong., 13 (1988) (Steven Kalish, convicted narcotics smuggler), HRG-1988-SGA-0011. The Medillin cartel reportedly paid Noriega $200,000 for every transshipment of cocaine through Panama. Kempe, \textit{Divorcing the Dictator}, 195. Drug smugglers who failed to pay Noriega often got nabbed by DEA agents tipped off by Panama's investigative police (DENI). In regard to the amount of money flowing through Panama's banking system, the Banco Nacional began sending US dollars to the Federal Reserve in large quantities beginning in 1980. This ran counter to previous years when the Federal Reserve would send money to Panama, which had a dollarized economy. By 1987, the Federal Reserve had received around $4.2 trillion since 1980. HRG-1988-SGA-0011, at 57 (1988) (Currency Flow Between U.S. and Panama).

\textsuperscript{63} Dinges, \textit{Our Man in Panama}, 124.

\textsuperscript{64} Murillo, \textit{The Noriega Mess}, 886; Ropp, \textit{Panamanian Politics}, 45-52.
Guard as a means to achieve upward mobility. As opposition to the regime emerged, civic leaders tended to arise from Panama's traditional political and business elites, known as *rabiblancos* (white tails). Noriega would attempt to exploit this fact through the indoctrination of junior officers "with the view that their future depended on absolute loyalty to their superiors and that the civilian opposition would betray Panamanian nationalism and destroy the political and economic power of the military." Due to the demographic composition of the junior officer corps, such appeals provided an additional layer of cohesion beyond material gain or the personal risks associated with open defection.

As *comandante*, Noriega strove to concentrate more power under the military, which was renamed the Panamanian Defense Forces (PDF). Specifically, Law 20 was promulgated in October 1983 under the pretext that strengthening the armed forces was necessary to safeguard Panama from the pervasive social unrest and armed conflict in Central America. This justified the expansion of the armed forces to 15,000 members by 1987 and the restructuring of civil-military relations to ensure the PDF's privileged status. This law retracted the president's right to dismiss Noriega as incumbent *comandante* and promoted the PDF's administrative autonomy over its internal affairs, including "personnel policies, disciplinary sanctions against PDF members, organizations created to further the social welfare of members, and recommendations for the defense budgets." This law also formalized the PDF's grip over ports, airports, railroads, immigration and custom services, all potential means to create economic rents. Finally, the passage of Law 20 positioned the PDF as the sole arbiter of political decisions and completed the

---

65 Millett, "Panama's Internal Opposition," 22.
66 Perez (*Political Protest in Panama*, 218) correctly points out that these appeals remained effective if the poorer neighborhoods remained docile. Harsh repression of unarmed protesters from the same socioeconomic background could quickly erode such appeals. As discussed below, the regime provided financial and logistical support to paramilitary groups often present in such neighborhoods in order to avoid the demoralization of PDF soldiers.
transformation of the PRD into "an opportunistic, corrupt body covering a range of ideologies but incapable of mustering majority support and increasingly dependent on the military for access to power and government positions." This outcome ran counter to Torrijos's plans to "civilianize" politics, but suited Noriega's preference to concentrate rather than delegate power.

On the eve of the 1984 elections, Noriega was the dominant personality in Panamanian politics. As one US official would later observe, "Nothing moves in Panama without the instructions, order and consent of Noriega." Yet, prior to the mass protests seeking his removal in 1987, the regime was simultaneously fragile and robust. On one hand, it was vulnerable to high-level civilian defection, especially as Noriega eliminated all remaining vestiges of civilian political autonomy and narrowed access to profitable ventures. On the other, the PDF had several reasons to remain loyal to Noriega. First, the revenue generated from licit and illicit activities enriched the officer corps. Equally important, the rents were mainly derived from sources detached from the local population and the US, which helped insulate the PDF from societal or external pressure. Second, PDF officers considered the political opposition a threat

---

69 While Torrijos sought to maintain indirect military control over the political process, he wanted to prevent military officers from meddling in the daily administration of the country. Scranton, *The Noriega Years*, 59.
70 Seymour Hersh, "Panama Strongman Said to Trade in Drugs, Arms and Illicit Money," *New York Times*, June 12, 1986.
71 Gabriel Lewis, a key opposition leader against Noriega, provides a cogent example of the way the general handled the spoil system. Lewis was a highly successful entrepreneur who benefitted from a close relationship with General Torrijos. Once in power, however, Noriega attacked Lewis's assets and prevented Lewis from obtaining lucrative business opportunities. Lewis defected from the regime in July 1987 for several reasons, but encroachment on his economic interests undoubtedly played a role. This disillusionment with the redistribution of spoils to Noriega's close cronies was not unique to Lewis, who warned fellow civilian businessmen that Noriega was determined to fashion a new business class bound to the general's largesse. Kempe, *Divorcing the Dictator*, 214-16.

This tendency to award loyalty over merit created significant tension within the PDF officer corps as well. Those officers seeking to professionalize the forces came into conflict with Noriega's proclivity to make loyalty and venality the sole criteria for promotion. HRG-1986-FOR-0013, at 32 (1986). This policy unnecessarily fomented dissent within the officer corps and undermined professionalism; however, it also placed key allies in powerful positions. This proved a useful coup-proofing strategy that logically followed from the retrenchment policy of shrinking the size of "winning coalition" and concentrating the spoils.
72 Steve C. Ropp, "Explaining the Long-Term Maintenance of a Military Regime: Panama Before the US Invasion," *World Politics* 44, No. 2 (1992): 215-216. Noriega often entrusted the most corrupt officers with important posts
to their new-found prerogatives in the country's economic and political affairs. Finally, Noriega espoused several coup-proofing tactics. This task was relatively straightforward due to an existing command structure that concentrated the lion share of power in the hands of about twenty officers with a rank higher than lieutenant colonel. Noriega prized blackmail and these officers were compromised due to involvement in the regime's worst abuses. Their fates were intertwined with his own. In sum, Noriega possessed a firm base to fight for survival even if the broad coalition that initially formed around the regime in 1984 disintegrated.

2.b. The Opposition

Public opposition to the regime was minimal until political liberalization commenced in 1978. Open frustration mounted quickly. Expectations of an economic boom due to the transfer of several Canal Zone assets never materialized; instead, real wages fell by 1.6% in 1979, 2.3% in 1980, and 3.0% in 1981. In 1979, citizens across professional and class boundaries supported a prolonged teacher strike. These protests demonstrated the extent of discontent and the ability of an opposition coalition to gain substantial concessions from the regime. When the opposition press revealed a major embezzlement scandal involving the Social Security Administration, tens

because these individuals had a greater incentive to perpetuate the status-quo. In particular, the 19-member General Staff handsomely profited from military-owned businesses and lucrative licit and illicit ventures. Lower tier officers could also multiply their salaries by partaking in small scale extortion and corruption with little fear of reprisal as the judicial system increasingly became packed with Noriega sympathizers.

The two coup attempts against Noriega in March 1988 and October 1989 were led by officers who sought Noriega's ouster to protect the prerogatives of the institution, not to cede complete control to a civilian government. Once mass protests against the regime began, for instance, Noriega assigned body guards to shadow top officers at all times. Most high-ranking officers by the end of Noriega's reign included individuals who worked with him since 1971 in the intelligence service. These include Nivaldo Madrinan, Luis Del Cid, Luis Cordoba, Hilario Trujillo, Luis Quiel, and Clito Hernandez, who all were involved in money laundering and drug-trafficking. Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy Part 2: Panama: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Communications of the Comm. of Foreign Relations, 100th Cong., 91 (1988) (statement Jose Blandón, former Consul General of Panama), HRG-1988-FOR-0012.

Zimbalist and Weeks, Panama at a Crossroads, 122. Collazos, Labor and Politics, 121; Koster and Sanchez, Time of Tyrants, 233-235. In her study of Panamanian protest actions between 1968-1989, Perez (Political Protest in Panama, 115-126) notes that these teacher strikes exemplified the ad hoc nature of opposition coalitions in Panama during this period. Temporary support between these potential opposition centers failed to translate into deepening ties over time.
of thousands poured into the streets in July 1982 to push overtly political demands. The crowds called for the ouster of President Royo and significant reforms to improve the management of public funds. The military readily accepted the first demand. Royo resigned citing a sore throat and Vice President Ricardo de la Espriella succeeded him. Having a civilian leader to blame for unpopular legislation and embarrassing scandals helped deflect attention away from the National Guard. Yet, high ranking military officers had no intention of promoting good governance. The underlying issues that contributed to these grievances remained unaddressed.

The next encouraging development arose when the opposition political parties formed the Democratic Opposition Alliance (ADO) and chose Arnulfo Arias as the presidential candidate. In turn, Noriega rallied pro-government parties behind Nicholas Ardito Barletta, who ran under the banner of the National Democratic Union (UNADE). Whereas Barletta lacked charisma, Arias energized large crowds with promises to root out corruption, re-establish the rule of law, adopt measures to jumpstart the economy, and investigate accusations of PDF involvement in drug trafficking. On May 6th, Noriega's candidate was losing despite enjoying every possible advantage; the regime proceeded to steal the election. The next day, a crowd of ADO supporters gathered at the legislative palace where the vote count was supposed to occur. By evening,

---

77 Murillo, *The Noriega Mess*, 326-333. IFI demands for austerity measures in 1982 and 1983 contributed to unpopular economic policies. This inherent tension in demands between external donors and Panama's large public sector contributed to half-measures and ineffective quick fixes. Lacking its own central bank, Panama could not adopt an expansionary monetary policy. This protected it from rampant inflation common across Latin America during this period, but harmed its ability to cover debt repayments and address short term societal grievances.

78 De la Espriella would "resign" after displaying some defiance. He indicated a desire to run for president, but Noriega feared splitting the pro-government vote and pushed the puppet president out of office. Jorge Illueca became interim president until the 1984 elections.

79 The parties that joined ADO included the Authentic Panameñista Party (PPA), the Christian Democratic Party (CDP), and Nationalist Republican Liberal Movement (MOLIRENA). Arias's close advisor, Carlos Rodriguez, and the CDP leader, Ricardo Arias Calderón, ran as first and second Vice Presidential Candidates on ADO's ticket. The major parties running under UNADE's banner included the PRD, Labor and Agrarian Party (PALA), the Republican Party (PR), and the Liberal Party (PL). Eric Ardito Delvalle, a PR member, and Roderick Esquivel, a PL member, ran as Barletta's first and second Vice President. Ramon Sieiro, Noriega's brother-in-law, led PALA.

members of a clandestine paramilitary group surrounded the square and fired into the crowd, killing three and wounding 80 others.\textsuperscript{81} While both sides claimed victory, the opposition was not prepared to challenge the final results on May 16\textsuperscript{th} that showed Barletta winning the election by 1,716 votes.\textsuperscript{82} Despite the opposition's inability to change the status-quo, the stolen election created a sense of injustice useful for rallying subsequent support and raised greater awareness that institutional channels may not provide sufficient means to address grievances.

Barletta's presidency was fraught with tension. He tried to bridge the differences between irreconcilable political camps, lacked an independent base of support, and faced a economic situation that required drastic and unpopular reforms. These tasks were particularly daunting because many Panamanians considered his presidency illegitimate. True to his background, Barletta approached these challenges as a technocrat, not politician. To reign in the fiscal deficit and improve Panama's international competitiveness in the industrial sector, he increased tax rates, revised the labor code, froze wages for government employees, reduced the number of "ghost" employees on the state payroll, and eliminated protective tariffs. In short, he managed to aggravate every constituency across the political spectrum that could have provided him some popular base.\textsuperscript{83} These reforms incited protests as official unemployment reached historic levels at 12.3\% in 1985 and real GDP in 1984 fell for the first time in over 30 years.\textsuperscript{84} Composed of a large coalition of trade guilds, the newly formed National Civic Coordinating Council (COCINA) led several large protest marches against Barletta's austerity program embodied by Law No. 46. By December 1984, Barletta yielded. The law was revoked without any

\textsuperscript{81} Koster and Sanchez, Time of Tyrants, 307.
\textsuperscript{82} The opposition challenge faded because it did not possess the necessary organizational infrastructure to run an independent vote count and rally support in case of electoral fraud. Also significant was the US unwillingness to question the integrity of the elections.
\textsuperscript{83} Scranton, The Noriega Years, 79.
\textsuperscript{84} Zimbalist and Weeks, Panama at a Crossroads, 134.
replacement suggested. COCINA realized its central goal, but did not make progress on its other stated objectives: "2) a cleanup of public administration; 3) recovery of embezzled funds; 4) publication of the military's budget and its property, an immediate reduction of both, and an audit of the PDF." Noriega allowed Panamanians to vent their frustration toward Barletta's embrace of IMF austerity, but would severely repress efforts to address these other issues.

The discovery of a prominent dissident's corpse in September 1985 precipitated the opposition's next foray into advancing political demands. Hugo Spadafora was a revolutionary, doctor, former minister in Torrijos's cabinet, and one of the few individuals not intimidated by Noriega. In late 1981, Spadafora began a public campaign denouncing the regime's repressive practices and accusing it of drug trafficking. He initially lacked details to corroborate these claims, but began to compile large volumes of suggestive evidence in the following three years. By the fall of 1985, Noriega concluded that this critic was a greater threat alive than dead. The paramilitary group F-8 abducted, tortured, and decapitated Spadafora. His headless body was dumped across the border in Costa Rica in a US postal bag. After a perfunctory investigation, Panama's Attorney General Alberto Calvo concluded that the regime was not involved in the murder even though Spadafora was last seen being escorted off a bus by PDF officers. Shocked by the gruesome details, Barletta called for an independent commission to investigate the murder before departing for a UN conference in New York. The weak president overplayed his hand. When he returned, Noriega forced him to resign and named the more compliant Eric Ardito Delvalle Panama's next "kleenex president," which the PDF would discard after using.

---

85 Perez, *Political Protest in Panama*, 178.
86 Dinges, *Our Man in Panama*, 181-84. By September 1984, he even raised the possibility of leading an armed insurrection to remove the PDF from Panamanian politics if necessary. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 201 (1988) (Floyd Carlton, Federal Prisoner).
Immediately following Spadafora's murder, his family and COCINA spearheaded the so-called "decency campaign" that called for an exhaustive, independent investigation into the crime. Because few doubted Noriega's culpability, calls for his resignation began to emerge. The decency campaign deployed many nonviolent tactics, including large street demonstrations, work strikes, hunger strikes, and the formation of a three-mile long human chain in Panama City, but failed to realize its immediate goal of an independent investigation commission. The stolen elections and Spadafora's death served as salient injustice frames throughout the next two years, but the political opposition could not capitalize on growing societal disillusionment. In March 1986, large demonstrations resurfaced when Delvalle renewed austerity measures required by international financial institutions (IFIs). Importantly, the political opposition failed to court rank-and-file public sector employees and pro-government unions who appeared tolerant of the current political arrangement, but decried the deteriorating state of the economy. As in the past, the regime diluted economic reforms to maintain support of these key constituencies after receiving IMF and World Bank loans. This non-compliance led to the suspension of loan disbursements by the end of 1986, but the regime succeeded in preventing the formation of an opposition coalition cutting across class, occupational, and racial cleavages.

In conclusion, the regime and the opposition appeared vulnerable prior to the onset of large-scale protests in June 1987. Upon assuming control of the PDF, Noriega had three broad policy alternatives: 1) withdraw the military from civilian politics; 2) reformulate an autocratic pact that shared the spoils of the system more broadly and delegated some real autonomy to civilian leaders; or 3) circle the wagons to safeguard PDF prerogatives. He chose the final option. This retrenchment strategy increased the likelihood of high-level civilian defections, but

---

88 Murillo, The Noriega Mess, 461-463. Through a network of informants, Bourbon Sanchez released a vivid account of the murder five days after Spadafora's death in La Prensa.
shored up support among PDF officers. Noriega attempted to augment his base by co-opting opportunistic businessmen, labor leaders, community leaders in impoverished communities, and large number of public sector employees. The sputtering economy and ballooning national debt made this patronage tightrope act more precarious over time. Meanwhile, various groups began to coalesce into a political opposition bound by their mutual disdain for Noriega. However, the opposition failed to offer a vision of Panamanian politics that could mobilize active support from public sector employees, key labor union confederations, and large portions of the indigent population. This inability to form meaningful links with these increasingly disaffected groups would undermine the opposition's capacity to assemble large numbers of protesters for sustained periods of time in the face of significant repression.

2.c. US-Panama Relations

Torrijos and Noriega managed to maintain a cordial relationship with the US for over fifteen years across four different administrations. These strongmen avoided public censure and consolidated power by providing sufficient assistance to US strategic objectives in the region. When the Reagan administration began to recalibrate its strategy in dealing with Noriega in late 1985, it faced several bureaucratic hurdles that undermined its ability to formulate an effective policy toward the intransigent dictator. To understand the foreign policy process from 1987-89 and determine whether US support to the civic resistance campaign was bound to fail, a brief description of the evolution in US-Panamanian relations is useful.

Asymmetric interdependence between Panama and the US is vast. In 1985, the US had a population 110 times larger and a GDP 550 times greater than Panama's. The US maintained a permanent presence of 10,000 servicemen who manned 14 military bases in the canal zone that

---

89 On co-optation of the lower class, see Perez, Political Protest in Panama, 215-221.
constituted the US base for regional operations, known as the Southern Command (Southcom). In 1985, 60.5% of Panama's total exports, approximately 6% of its GDP, went to the US, and one-third of its imports, approximately 10% of its GDP, came from the US.\textsuperscript{90} The dollarized economy further increased Panama's reliance on the US by foregoing an independent monetary policy. Finally, as Panama's banking sector flourished, its economy became increasingly service oriented and acutely dependent on investor confidence.\textsuperscript{91} Panama's large debt burden did not frighten foreign investors as long as the IMF, World Bank, and other IFIs continued to provide loans and develop strategies to help Panama overcome this challenge. Since the US maintained significant leverage within these IFIs, Panama's ability to borrow funds depended once again on its northern neighbor. This vulnerability was no secret to Torrijos and Noriega. Both generals realized US support was a \textit{sine qua non} for their long-term survival.

In 1968, Arias's overthrow made the US anxious. Panama's oligarchy had been a steadfast ally in safeguarding US economic and security interests, but Torrijos was a leftist sympathizer and possible communist. He was also a pragmatist. Torrijos reassured the US that his populist rhetoric was for domestic consumption; he did not intend to change the strategic relationship. As fear over his political orientation subsided, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD), the predecessor to the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), reported that Torrijos and his close associates were connected to drug trafficking activity. Torrijos balked when confronted with this evidence, but ultimately increased the level of bilateral cooperation to retard the flow of drugs through Panama.\textsuperscript{92} Amicable relations resumed despite Torrijos's obstreperous rhetoric

\textsuperscript{90} Tollefson, "The Economy," 167.
\textsuperscript{91} The service sector in Panama was always quite large. In 1950, the service sector made up 59.6% of the economy, but it grew to 77.4% in 1985 and 80.1% by 1987. Zimbalist and Weeks, \textit{Panama at a Crossroads}, 27.
\textsuperscript{92} This was a salient issue because Nixon delivered a major speech in the summer of 1971 describing drugs as a national security issue. The classified findings of the "DeFoe Report" drafted by the Department of Justice in 1975
over the canal. Ironically, the canal negotiations proved to be an asset for the Torrijos regime because Carter considered its resolution a top priority. Unlike other Latin American dictatorships, the US applied little pressure on Panama to improve its human rights record. Although some Congressional members pushed Torrijos to introduce a program of political liberalization after signing the canal treaties, the executive branch and other US agencies soon became preoccupied with regional stability as a global communist threat appeared resurgent. Real pressure for Panama to democratize receded.

Throughout the 1970s, Noriega headed the G-2, the branch of the National Guard responsible for internal and external security and intelligence. He controlled the flow of all important information and became an essential interlocutor for any group that desired a closer relationship with the regime. Despite his official rank and position, he was widely considered the second most powerful person in Panama. For these reasons, Noriega formed close bonds with powerful US agencies. As liaison to the DEA, Noriega helped field agents detain drug smugglers and seize drug shipments. Although he was known to facilitate drug trafficking and money laundering, he would continue to receive personal letters of gratitude from the DEA director as late as May 1987. The CIA also considered the information Noriega provided on emerging...
guerilla movements and Cuba's activities abroad invaluable. The CIA was aware he shared classified information with Castro, but believed the intelligence it received was "more interesting than what the Cubans were getting." Such opportunistic behavior, however, allegedly troubled the new CIA director Stansfield Turner, who reportedly removed him from the agency's payroll in 1977. Noriega continued to cooperate with other US agencies and was reinstated as a spy for the CIA in 1981. His value as a unique asset rose when the Reagan administration entered office with a distinct conception of how to defend the national interest.

When the radical faction of Sandinistas began to dominate post-revolutionary politics and arm FMLN insurgents against the US allied regime in El Salvador, Central America became an ideological battleground in the US struggle against global communism. Jeane Kirkpatrick provided the intellectual edifice to Reagan's foreign policy in the region. Positing that communist "totalitarian" states endangered pro-American "authoritarian" allies by exporting revolution, she contended that staunch US support for authoritarian allies was necessary. Undue pressure to democratize only destabilized friendly regimes and benefitted the Soviet Union and its proxies. Good intentions, according to this perspective, would lead to the worst possible outcome for the US and the societies of erstwhile allies. Carter settled on containing the spread of communism in Central America during his last year; Reagan appeared increasingly intent on a policy of intercepts, and satellite and overflight photography that, taken together, constitute not just a smoking gun but rather a twenty-one cannon barrage of evidence." Jim McGee and David Hoffman, "Rivals Hint Bush Understates Knowledge of Noriega Ties," Washington Post, May 8, 1988. The DEA insisted that Noriega was a useful asset in the war on drugs. In one significant operation in May 1987, Noriega provided assistance in freezing a significant number of bank accounts believed to belong to drug traffickers. This was known as Operation Pisces. In late May, John Lawn sent a letter to Noriega commending him "as being one of the leaders in the antidrug effort ... Your personal commitment to Operation Pisces and competent, professional and tireless efforts of other officials in the Republic of Panama were essential to the final positive outcome of this investigation." Despite the fanfare around this bust, no Panamanian or Colombian was arrested or convicted. This was an ongoing pattern for all major joint operations related to drug trafficking and money laundering. Noriega would provide the DEA just enough assistance to keep the agency content. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 122-123 (1988) (Jose Blandón).

Edward M. Flanagan, Battle for Panama: Inside Operation Just Cause (Washington DC: Brassey's Inc, 1993), 6. Considered the only source of reliable information on such issues, his annual salary from the CIA was $185,000.

rollback. Yet, fearing another Vietnam, Congress sought to stem US involvement in armed conflicts. A series of legislative measures, collectively known as the Boland Amendments, circumscribed and then prohibited any US intelligence agency from assisting the Contras' effort to topple the Sandinista regime. These injunctions compelled the Reagan administration to fight its proxy war through the CIA and the National Security Council (NSC). Although not a central figure in the unfolding Iran-Contra scandal, Noriega repeatedly met US officials and provided his services to help train and arm the Contras. Through the mid-1980s, Noriega maintained close ties with the CIA, NSC, DEA, and elements within the Department of Defense (DoD).

These connections helped stave off significant US pressure. When the vote count stalled after the 1984 elections, US officials were aware that Noriega's candidate lost. US ambassador to Panama Everett Briggs allegedly fired cables to Washington suggesting that the US consider recognizing Arias as the victor. Instead, the US remained silent despite post-electoral paramilitary violence against peaceful demonstrations and was among the first countries to recognize Barletta's victory. The Reagan administration felt this outcome aligned with its...

---

98 The original intent of containing the Sandinistas related to blocking the supply of weapons to FMLN insurgents in El Salvador. Ironically, Noriega ran a profitable gunrunning scheme in the early 1980s that provided weapons to the FMLN. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 139-141, 193-196 (1988) (Jose Blandón and Floyd Carlton)

99 Contrary to provisions in the canal treaties, Noriega allowed the US to use military installations in the canal zone to carry out covert operations and train contras. He even provided G-2 personnel to carry out the 1985 sabotage operation that ended with the explosion of a large munitions depot in Managua. John Lindsay-Poland, Emperors in the Jungle: The Hidden History of the U.S. in Panama (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 109.

100 The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) also maintained Noriega as an informant. In general, the DoD preferred to avoid unnecessary tension with the PDF because of the trouble Noriega could create for US personnel and their families living in Panama. From 1981 to 1987, the former CIA officer Nestor Sanchez, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Latin America and International Security Affairs Bureau, was a significant voice within the DoD for maintaining friendly relations with Noriega partly due to the anti-communist struggle in Central America. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 127 (1988) (Jose Blandón).

101 Koster and Sanchez, Time of Tyrants, 309. According to reports by the US Embassy in Panama at the time, Arias was estimated to have won the elections by over 60,000 votes. Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 125.

102 Barletta was an economist who studied under George Shultz at the University of Chicago. He served as the Director of Economic Planning under Torrijos and was a key proponent of the 1970 banking reforms. He gained further experience in international finance as Vice President of the World Bank. When he returned to Panama, he had all the right credentials. Noriega chose Barletta because he knew the US would support him. "Shultz Explains '84 Panama Visit," New York Times, June 24, 1986.
efforts to ease the military from politics by supporting a civilian reformist, rather than risking a coup and possible reversion to a traditional military regime. To realize this vision, US economic assistance dramatically increased to Panama. Yet, Noriega refused to reduce PDF control over the political process. The Reagan administration faced another critical juncture after Spadafora's death and Barletta's forced resignation. Publicly, Ambassador Briggs delivered a speech criticizing these actions and boycotted the diplomatic reception for incoming president Delvalle. The administration also suspended $5 million in aid. Privately, these events provided an impetus to convene an interagency review on US policy toward Panama. Instead of adopting Ambassador Briggs's initial suggestion to create a constitutional crisis by continuing to recognize Barletta as Panama's president, this group of advisors proposed to modify the extant evolutionary approach. With an eye toward the 1989 elections, the US would seek to bolster the position of President Delvalle, signal it meant what it said about a democratic transition in Panama, and stop consultations with Noriega on issues not strictly involving military affairs.

CIA director William Casey was the first official chosen to reproach Noriega. Due to their close working relationship, State Department officials felt his words would carry significant weight. Noriega received a different message during the November 1985 meeting. In his 1988

---

103 US economic assistance was $7.4 million in 1983, $12.0 million in 1984, and $74 million in 1985.
105 A Regional Interagency Review occurred at this time. After Nicaragua and Iran, senior US officials considered unnecessary provocations with truculent allies counterproductive. The main concern of these officials was stability on the isthmus, not human rights or democracy. Noriega posed a potential threat to US national security only if he managed to disillusion all sectors of society as Somoza did. Yet, opposition to the regime appeared under control. Another concern emerged over the dangers of transferring sovereignty of the canal to a corrupt authoritarian regime. An important step in this process was set to occur on December 31, 1989 when a Panamanian citizen would become the first administrator of the Panama Canal. Overall, however, the immediate services Noriega provided continued to outweigh the less appealing aspects of the regime and these longer-term fears. The Panama issue was to be put on the shelf and remain there until Nicaragua was straightened out. Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy: The Cartel, Haiti and Central America, Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Communications of the Comm. of Foreign Relations, 100th Cong., 324 (1988) (statement Francis J. McNeil, for US Ambassador to Costa Rica), HRG-1988-FOR-0013.
testimony to the Senate, former State Department official Frank McNeil summarized Casey's memorandum of the conversation. Casey "scolded Noriega only for letting the Cuban[s] use Panama to evade the trade embargo, but never mentioned narcotics nor, if I recall correctly, democracy." Noriega was "getting signals from Mr. Casey that he need not pay attention." Two months later, NSC director Adm. John Poindexter met with Noriega in Panama to ensure the intended message was received. According to Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Elliott Abrams, who was present at this brief meeting, Poindexter reprimanded Noriega for PDF involvement in drug trafficking and the recent trend of democratic backsliding. This was a stern message, but the NSC director never delivered an ultimatum, leaving ambiguous what the consequences for non-compliance would be. As subsequent meetings with NSC officials concerned the financing, arming, and training of the Contras, Noriega appeared to consider the reprimand water under the bridge. Even the policy to reflect displeasure by altering aid flows was inconsistent. Around 85% of Panama's economic aid was suspended in 1986, but the DoD announced a planned increase in military aid from $8.4 million in 1986 to $14.6 million in 1987. In sum, mixed signals led Noriega to discount pugnacious statements from State Department officials. He believed that so long as he remained useful to the DEA, NSC, CIA, and DoD, Washington would not turn against him.

---

108 The military aide to the NSC, Oliver North, would continue to meet with Noriega. These meetings, including those documented on October 1985 and September 1986, reinforced the message that relations with the NSC was back to *quid pro quo* business as usual. This generated a false sense of security for Noriega that if he continued to provide services as in the past, the real powers in Washington would not turn against him.
109 Edward Cody, "Military Shadow Fall Overs Panama's Politics," *Washington Post*, April 6, 1986; Buckley, *The Whole Story*, 52. The reduction in economic aid had no direct effect on Noriega's spoils system. Meanwhile, the increase in military aid captured a central conundrum facing US policymakers. There was a need to professionalize PDF servicemen for the canal transfer, which required additional funds. However, US officials also wanted to discourage PDF intervention in political life. Increasing the military aid budget sent a conflicting public message that the regime could manipulate in the state-owned media to its advantage.
The initial shift in US foreign policy toward Panama came from two unlikely sources. First, after Winston Spadafora presented the gruesome details of his brother's murder, Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) promised to seek justice for Hugo and raise awareness about the true nature of the regime. During the spring of 1986, Helms convened three Senate Investigation Hearings on the current state of human rights and democracy in Panama. In retrospect, testimony from these hearings generated sufficient momentum to shift US policy against Noriega, even though the revelations went largely unnoticed by the public at the time. In particular, Norman Bailey, a former NSC aide, related details on the stolen 1984 elections, Barletta's ouster, the close links between Noriega and drug trafficking, and the various ways the PDF threatened the development of democracy in Panama and the region. These hearings helped form an odd alliance between Helms and Senator John Kerry (D-MA), who was investigating drug trafficking allegations by the contras. Such a bipartisan coalition was essential to undercut Helms's detractors who charged the Senator of sour grapes, or even worse, a hidden agenda to violate the 1977 canal treaties.

Second, investigative journalist Seymour Hersh published an article in June 1986 that described Noriega's involvement in Spadafora's murder, money laundering, gunrunning, and drug trafficking. Other news outlets had previously covered many of the same issues, but Hersh's exposé compiled these allegations and published them on the front page of the New York Times. In the following months, countless reports unearthed new details, relayed the earlier

---

110 HRG-1986-FOR-0013, at 16-17 (1986) (Norman Bailey). The administration still presented a united front on Panama policy at this time. Even Elliott Abrams, who later became Noriega's staunchest opponent within the administration, downplayed the extent of the general's involvement in drug trafficking and insinuated Panama had a stable government "transitioning" to civilian rule. In other words, he delivered an anodyne statement reiterating the administration's position while exhibiting some exasperation over recent events, like Barletta's ouster. He urged the US to help Panama complete its democratic transition, discourage military interference in political life, and maintain this stable oasis in an otherwise unstable part of the world. HRG-1986-FOR-0013, at 40-42, (Elliott Abrams).

111 Helms was a prominent critic during the canal treaty negotiations, who along side other conservatives like Ronald Reagan tirelessly waged a battle against transferring sovereignty of the canal to Panama.

112 Other periodicals ran such stories before, including the Miami Herald, La Prensa, and the San Antonio Light.
findings of the Senate Investigation Hearings, and reiterated the growing litany of indiscretions. Noriega's image would never recover from this onslaught of opprobrium. The American public and US Congress increasingly considered him an untrustworthy ally and the embodiment of America's enemy in the war on drugs. This widespread ignominy confounded efforts by his US allies to defend him publicly and contributed to growing opposition in the Senate to the Reagan administration's policy toward Panama.\textsuperscript{113}

A final blow to Noriega's ability to avoid openly antagonistic relations with the US was the unfolding Iran-Contra scandal that broke in November 1986. Public revelations of the Reagan administration's covert war against the Sandinistas limited the types of unique services Noriega could provide. Moreover, Noriega lost key allies within the Reagan administration. NSC director Poindexter was forced to resign and NSC aide Oliver North was fired. Around the same time, CIA director William Casey retired due to the discovery of a brain tumor and the Assistant Secretary of Defense Nestor Sanchez retired.\textsuperscript{114} Without these key allies in office, Noriega was more exposed to his critics. He attempted to prove his usefulness by increasing Panama's level of cooperation with the DEA.\textsuperscript{115} Although appreciated, this assistance failed to rehabilitate his

\textsuperscript{113} In March 1987, the House of Representatives passed a resolution that declared US economic aid would stop if the 1989 elections were not conducted fairly. In early April 1987, the Senate also passed a resolution to "decertify" Panama as fully cooperating in the fight against drug trafficking by 58 votes in favor and 31 against. This was a symbolic vote that did not affect the disbursement of US aid to Panama, but still revealed a shift in the legislative branch. Only fifteen months earlier, Helms's suggestion to cut off financial assistance to Panama was defeated by a 19 to 2 vote. Paul Glickman, "U.S. Senate Criticizes Anti-Drug Efforts," \textit{Inter Press Service}, April 3, 1987.

\textsuperscript{114} Nestor Sanchez appears to have been strongly encouraged to retire because the operations he oversaw at the Defense Department were close to the Iran-Contra scandal. Like Sanchez, Casey continued to lobby against efforts to adopt a more aggressive policy toward Noriega. For instance, he unsuccessfully pushed back against Helms's September 1986 effort to have the CIA director provide a report to the Senate on the extent of PDF involvement in civilian affairs and the state of human rights in Panama. Kempe, \textit{Divorcing the Dictator}, 179. Had he not fallen ill, Casey would have likely faced similar charges in connection to the Iran-Contra scandal.

\textsuperscript{115} In August 1986, Noriega released \textit{Panama: 16 Years of Struggle Against Drug Traffic}, a detailed report that catalogued the ways Panama assisted the US in the war against drugs. "Panama Issues Report About Its Drug Battle," \textit{New York Times}, August 10, 1986. In April 1987, Panamanian police (DENI) confiscated 1,760 pounds of cocaine, which was the largest single amount ever recovered. In May 1987, Operation Pisces froze several bank
reputation. Without a crisis, US policy toward Panama stagnated, no longer because certain agencies and high-level officials considered the general indispensible, but rather because no clear alternative to him existed.  

This policy inertia slowly became unstuck when the second highest-ranking PDF officer disclosed a series of revelations about the regime's most sensitive secrets.

III. Narrative of Events

3.a. 06/06/87 - 02/25/88

The opposition and the Reagan administration focused on the upcoming 1989 elections as the next opportunity to remove Noriega from power and strengthen civilian control over political affairs. The 1986 Filipino revolution that overthrew the Marcos regime provided the template for challenging incumbent efforts to steal elections. The National Democratic Institute (NDI) funded Panama's Chamber of Commerce President Aurelio Barria to travel to the Philippines in February 1987. He was inspired by NAMFREL, a civil society umbrella organization that monitored the 1986 Filipino elections and organized the subsequent unarmed uprising. Upon his return to Panama, Barria held a series of meetings with other civil society representatives and the Catholic Church to establish a similar organization. As these efforts progressed, a significant development was unfolding within the PDF senior ranks.


Many officials in favor of maintaining ties with the general argued that the individuals likely to succeed him would be no better, and potentially worse. In particular, US officials had Col. Roberto Diaz-Herrera in mind, who some considered may establish a leftist regime. Millett, ”Looking Beyond Noriega,” 51.

Dinges, Our Man in Panama, 259-60, 266-67.
decision-making process.\textsuperscript{118} By May 1987, Noriega appeared to have sufficient control over the political situation. The timing seemed right to remove his final rival within the PDF. Originally, Noriega arranged a decent severance package for Diaz Herrera, who would become a general before retirement and receive the lucrative ambassadorial post in Japan. The colonel was set to accept this offer. At the last minute, however, Noriega reneged on these promises and ignored Diaz Herrera's repeated efforts to contact him.\textsuperscript{119} With his pride irreparably harmed, Diaz Herrera used the only means that remained available to him to seek revenge. On June 6\textsuperscript{th}, he began to divulge incriminating details about the regime to the press. These intimate accounts covered the stolen 1984 elections, Spadafora's murder, and PDF involvement in sundry illicit schemes. These revelations triggered a firestorm from which Noriega never fully recovered.

Relayed over Radio Continente throughout the entire day on June 7\textsuperscript{th}, news of Diaz Herrera's allegations provided the necessary spark to mobilize mass demonstrations across Panama City.\textsuperscript{120} The opposition quickly reached a consensus to ally with their former enemy. To protect Diaz Herrera, members of civil society and the church occupied his home, which became a makeshift headquarters for the opposition. Simultaneously, civil society leaders, most of whom were members of the National Council of Free Enterprise (CONEP) and Panama's Chamber of Commerce, announced the formation of the National Civic Crusade (NCC). Encompassing 26 civil society organizations at its launch, this umbrella organization eventually included over 200

\textsuperscript{118} Diaz-Herrera initiated the beginning stages of a coup attempt during the tumultuous period following Spadafora's murder, but he hesitated after sending some troops into the center of Panama City. Uncertain of how the commander of Southcom John Galvin and other high-ranking PDF commanders would react, he called the troops back. Noriega allegedly learned about this half-hearted attempt almost immediately, but decided to keep Diaz Herrera in place. Dismissing the second highest ranking PDF officer appeared risky at the time. Moreover, as the PDF chief of staff, Diaz Herrera never had troops directly under his command. This absence of an independent power base made sideling him within the regime easier. Murillo, \textit{The Noriega Mess}, 409.

\textsuperscript{119} Koster and Sanchez, \textit{Time of Tyrrants}, 324.

\textsuperscript{120} Perez, \textit{Political Protest in Panama}, 226.
civic, business, labor, professional, women's, and students' groups within two months. The NCC called for a civil disobedience campaign seeking to remove Noriega and other officials implicated in serious crimes "until the acts and accusations [were] clarified." During the summer, the NCC combined demonstrations, general strikes, motorcades, and tax resistance, with symbolic protest actions, like waving white hankies, honking car horns, and banging pots.

To derail opposition momentum, Noriega imposed a state of emergency on June 11th, the third consecutive day of demonstrations. This action effectively silenced the opposition media and suspended basic civil rights. The riot police, known as Dobermans, employed harsh tactics to disperse peaceful rallies, including shooting tear gas and buckshot into large crowds and beating protesters with rubber truncheons. Similarly, police remained spectators when paramilitary goons attacked peaceful gatherings. Arrested protesters landed in squalid prison cells, where hardened criminals would strip them of their belongings, physically intimidate them, and threaten to rape them. Noriega placed few restraints on the riot police except deadly force. He told his followers, "They [the opposition] want dead, but we will not give them dead." Noriega also avoided gratuitous violence. The goal was to scare, not create unnecessary rage. General strikes were the other major tactic NCC leaders used to encourage elite defections. These actions alone never acutely threatened the regime's survival because a large portion of revenue generated from PDF economic ventures was largely autonomous from domestic businesses. Noriega also maintained several ways to undermine participation in general strikes. For instance, shop owners

---

121 Millett ("Panama's Internal Opposition," 26) argues that the high number of civil society organizations in the NCC belies its true strength. There was a significant amount of membership overlap between these organizations.
123 Perez (Political Protest in Panama, 239-240) notes that the June 10th demonstrations were widespread in all neighborhoods of Panama City and Colón.
124 Koster and Sanchez (Time of Tyrants, 42-46; 339) describe some of the regime's subtle forms of intimidation like its 1987 disclosure that some inmates in the infamous La Modelo prison in Panama City had AIDS.
faced fines, difficulty obtaining required licenses and permits, potential property damage, and the threat of deportation. Given PDF loyalty to Noriega, the NCC faced an uphill battle.

Even before Diaz Herrera's revelations, the US appeared to side with the opposition. During General Frederick F. Woerner's "change of command" speech on June 5th, 1987, the incoming Southcom General cited the need for a professional army "subordinate to civilian authority as elected by the populace." On June 9th, La Prensa printed "An Open Letter to the People of the Republic of Panama" dated June 5th from a bipartisan group of US Senators. This missive sought to explain recent Congressional hearings about the poor state of political affairs in Panama and the US desire to see Panama achieve a genuine democracy. Although not official US policy, many viewed these statements as a reproach against PDF meddling in Panamanian politics. The state of emergency declared days later elicited further US criticism. On June 11th, the State Department's spokeswoman Phyllis Oakley urged restrictions on civil rights to be "short-lived" and called for "free and untarnished elections and the full development of an apolitical military." That same day US ambassador to Panama Arthur Davis visited the Christian Democrat leader Ricardo Arias Calderon, who was temporarily under house arrest. The US had not disowned Noriega, but was sending encouraging signals to the opposition. A Senate resolution passed on June 26th calling for Noriega to step down pending the results of an


128 Perez, Political Protest in Panama, 236.

129 The following day, Oakley attempted to downplay her previous statements by noting that they should not "be interpreted as slaps" at Noriega. "U.S. Tries to Soothe Noriega," Inter-Press Service, June 12, 1987.
"impartial and independent investigation" of Diaz-Herrera's accusations partly clarified the US position. Although a State Department official expressed disappointment in specifically naming Noriega in the resolution, he stated that the administration was in agreement with the call for free and fair elections and the immediate lifting of Panama's state of emergency. In turn, Noriega used the resolution to substantiate the regime's narrative about an insidious plot between the former Panamanian oligarchy and the imperialist US hegemon.

Public accusations of US meddling in domestic affairs began in 1985 when Ambassador Briggs criticized the irregular ouster of President Barletta. After Diaz Herrera's confessions, the regime cast the opposition as an elite movement allied with certain "external factors" that sought to undermine Panamanian sovereignty and dignity. Noriega made appeals based on class, nationalist, and leftist themes. According to the regime-controlled media, which was the only domestic source of information for much of the summer, the NCC was waging a struggle against the poor and blacks. Noriega ascribed various motives to explain why certain elements in the US seemed intent on helping the opposition topple the regime. These included the complete emasculation of the PDF, punishment for pursuing the Contadora initiative to resolve

---

130 Steve Gerstel, "Senate Urges Panama to Oust Noriega," United Press International, June 26, 1987. Days after the crisis began, Gabriel Lewis attempted to mediate between the opposition and the military. In effect, Lewis pushed for a palace coup. He insisted that Noriega's retirement was essential for any deal. These efforts quickly deteriorated and Lewis fled to the US in self-exile. He subsequently began to drum up support against Noriega among old allies in Congress who he knew from his days as Panama's ambassador to the US. This personal diplomacy accelerated the fallout between Noriega and the US. Dinges, Our Man in Panama, 269-70.

131 Steve Gerstel, "Senate Urges Panama to Oust Noriega," United Press International, June 26, 1987. The Reagan administration worked hard to ensure that the Senate did not also name the PDF as a source of the problem because it did not want to rally the institution behind Noriega.

132 High-level regime officials, such as President Delvalle, denounced such US statements as a plot by certain domestic and foreign elements to undermine the Panamanian government. Thomas H. Brown, "Military Leader Says 'Long Live the Dictatorship,'" Associated Press, October 11, 1985. Before the summer of 1987, such rhetoric waxed and waned according to public criticism by US officials and the sudden wave of negative publicity against Noriega caused by Seymour Hersh's article.


the Nicaraguan civil war through peaceful means, and the intent to renege on the 1977 canal
treaties. Through this propaganda, the regime sought continued support from the military, the
leftist faction of the PRD, and the poor.\footnote{Silvio Hernandez, "Government Waffles on Dealings with U.S. and Opposition," \textit{Inter Press Service}, July 15, 1987. In an effort to win over conservative allies and IFIs, the regime moved to the right during the 1984 elections. With the leftist rhetorical reframing, Noriega hoped to resurrect old alliances.} In late June, Noriega gambled and escalated the
confrontation with the US to demonstrate how much trouble he could create if he so desired.

Panama's National Assembly symbolically declared Ambassador Davis \textit{persona non
grata} and lifted the state of emergency on June 29\textsuperscript{th}. A large pro-government rally condemning
US intervention was then held. As the demonstration concluded, pro-regime cabinet members led
thousands of protesters toward the US embassy. Panamanian police conspicuously withdrew as
pro-government protesters stoned the embassy and smashed ten cars in the parking lot. Formally,
the Panamanian government owed the US $106,000 for damaged property. The actual
repercussions were far greater. The attack precipitated a series of restricted intelligence group
(RIG) meetings in July and early August that included high-level State Department, NSC,
Pentagon, and CIA officials. This group eventually reached a consensus. Noriega had to go.\footnote{Cable, Shultz to Davis, "Official/Informal," August 21, 1987, FOIA.}

The first clear articulation of this developing position occurred on June 30\textsuperscript{th}, when Elliott
Abrams called on PDF military leaders to "remove their institution from politics, end any
appearance of corruption and modernize their forces ... in defense of the canal."\footnote{John M. Goshko, "U.S. Partially Closes Mission to Panama," \textit{Washington Post}, July 2, 1987.} Ambassador
Davis relayed a message to President Delvalle and Foreign Minister Jorge Abadia from US
Secretary of State Shultz that such an attack on a US embassy had only occurred in Iran, posing
the question of whether that was the type of relationship the Panamanian government desired.\footnote{Kempe, \textit{Divorcing the Dictator}, 223.} In mid-July, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs William Walker conducted a
fact finding mission to Panama where he held well publicized meetings with opposition leaders, but not Noriega. Besides such public and private warnings, the Reagan administration espoused several relatively low-cost signals to reinforce the message. The CIA stopped paying Noriega. The Pentagon downgraded its military to military contacts with the PDF "to the lowest level of contact possible" and stopped providing free maintenance of PDF equipment. Finally, around $26 million dollars of economic and military aid was frozen even though many assumed the US would restore aid once Panama repaid the $106,000 dollars. The intended effect of these measures were two-fold: first, to encourage the opposition to continue its struggle against Noriega; second, to signal to regime elite that they may be better off dumping the general. To a limited extent, both these objectives were achieved.

After a state of emergency was declared on June 11th, dispersed actions like banging pots, car honking, and waving white hankies replaced mass demonstrations. Although the direct effect on the opposition is difficult to assess, the Senate resolution preceded renewed confrontational protest actions. The largest demonstrations in three weeks occurred on July 1st when 3,000 students unsuccessfully marched on the presidential palace. Three days later, 10,000 women clad in white peacefully marched through downtown Panama City without incident. The NCC prepared for a massive demonstration on July 10th seeking to build momentum. Although 100,000 protesters took to the streets on "Black Friday," riot police and paramilitary groups used enough violence to prevent a critical mass from forming. The next major protest action – the "Second Great White Concentration" – managed to attract only 5,000 participants a week later.

139 Scranton, The Noriega Years, 114.
141 Other reasons for renewed demonstrations include the de jure cancellation of the "state of emergency" and the brief reopening of the opposition press.
142 Buckley, The Whole Story, 94-96.
Crusade leaders were forced to re-evaluate the situation. Overall, the campaign produced some discord among the civilian elite, but the loyalty of the PDF to its commander appeared secure.143

As the NCC prepared for a general strike in late July, Noriega launched a surprise attack on Diaz Herrera's residence and launched an undeclared state of emergency to silence the opposition media. Despite efforts to intimidate business-owners, the two-day general strike was successful. Compliance rates were approximately 80% in Panama City, and 95% in Colon, Panama's second largest city. This action gained support in the countryside and poorer outskirts of the capital as well.144 Thousands of protesters rallied daily to demand Noriega's departure. As the NCC prepared for a mass gathering on August 6th, Noriega targeted opposition leaders. On August 4th, the PDF raided NCC headquarters, announced the discovery of a plot to overthrow the government, and issued arrest warrants for six Crusade leaders, all of whom immediately went into hiding and eventually exile. However, the regime's use of repression was not uniform at this critical juncture. Unlike the July 10th demonstration, the police presence during protests on August 6th was minimal. Estimates for the number of participants range from tens of thousands up to 500,000.145 Yet, no plan existed or spontaneously emerged once the crowd congregated near El Carmen Church. The mass gathering dispersed peacefully by evening. In general, the

143 Most prominently, Roderick Esquivel, the First Vice President of the UNADE faction and LP leader, openly challenged President Delvalle to adhere to the constitution, hold Cabinet meetings without the presence of Noriega's representatives, and condemn paramilitary violence against protesters and the destruction of private property. "Panamanians Protest, Defy Presidential Decree," The Washington Post, July 9, 1987. Although LP members were conservative businessmen involved in the NCC, such strong public criticism was surprising. Noriega isolated Esquivel, who eventually withdrew the Liberal Party from the ruling coalition in late October. Jim Mannion, "In Panama, Bully Tactics Aren't Reserved for the Little People," St. Petersburg Times, November 4, 1987. Other relatively high ranking civilian officials quit due to disgust with the regime's willingness to cause significant long-term harm to the nation for its short-term survival. In July, the general manager of Panama's national bank and one of his chief deputies resigned. Scranton, The Noriega Years, 120. Tragically, Doctor Camilio Octavio Pérez Hernández, a justice on the regime's Supreme Court and columnist for a government-controlled newspaper was mysteriously shot on October 31st, 1988. Hours before, he criticized the regime on national television for the "lack of civil liberties and constant abuse of human rights." This is widely accepted as a politically motivated murder. Murillo, The Noriega Mess, 612-14; Larry Rohter, "A Justice is Slain," New York Times, November 25, 1988.
144 Millett, "Panama's Internal Opposition," 30.
145 Buckley, The Whole Story, 99; Perez, Political Protest in Panama, 302.
NCC appeared to approach the civil disobedience campaign as a popular referendum rather than a coercive strategy. The movement revealed widespread discontent with Noriega and the PDF, but this fact was insufficient to compel him to leave. Noriega hoped to wait out the storm. Throughout the summer, the PDF and many co-opted civilian allies remained loyal. The central pillars to Noriega's power were still intact and he quickly regained the initiative.

For the next six months, opposition mobilization efforts stagnated. The general strike called on August 17th failed to attract widespread participation. Protests continued throughout August and September, but seldom attracted more than a couple thousand participants. Many opposition leaders were in hiding, exile, or prison. The crackdown even made symbolic acts like honking car horns dangerous. The opposition's demoralized state was evident on October 22nd, when plans for a mass protest and general strike failed to materialize due to the pre-emptive positioning of riot police and fully armed troops along main avenues and strategic landmarks in Panama City. The NCC no longer posed an immediate existential threat to the regime.

Several domestic factors help explain Noriega's ability to survive the first wave of this UI campaign. Most accounts of the NCC emphasize the striking feature that its leadership was composed of mostly white-collar businessmen. This did not imply opposition to Noriega was mainly a middle-class phenomenon. Many demonstrations occurred in Panama's affluent downtown banking district, but some of the fiercest opposition clashes with the military and paramilitary took place in poor neighborhoods and persisted into the fall. Released in early

---

147 Murillo (*The Noriega Mess*, 540; 584-85) presents compelling reasons to discount popular journalistic accounts that describe Panama's unarmed insurrection as solely or primarily a "white-collar" revolution. Many demonstrations took place in poor urban neighborhoods and regional cities. These events went underreported partly because these protest actions failed to reach a critical mass, sustain momentum, or possess the same ebullient carnival-like atmosphere as the protests in Panama City's affluent neighborhoods. Perez (*Political Protest in Panama*, 213-214; 218) points to several reasons that explain what foreign journalists judged as general apathy in poorer communities. For instance, paramilitary bands unleashed harsher repressive measures in these areas that received less international
August, a Gallup poll showed that 75% of the population in Panama City and Colon wanted Noriega to resign. Such evidence is indicative of the regime's dearth of popular support. The struggle to remove him transcended issues related to class and race. Thus, the formation of a coalition cutting across these salient societal fissures was formidable, but not impossible.

During the summer crisis, some observers noted that the NCC's central problem was its lack of a coherent strategy to remove Noriega. This is not convincing. The strategy of a civil disobedience campaign was sound. The issue was that the movement failed to undermine the central pillars holding up the regime, namely PDF loyalty and co-opted leaders benefitting from the corrupt system. Opposition rallies occasionally attracted tens of thousands of participants, but these gatherings never lasted longer than one day and never attempted to occupy a public space. When large crowds assembled as on August 6th, leaders refused to take advantage of the numbers and confront the regime by marching on some symbol of power. Such behavior was equated to leading the people to the slaughterhouse. Without such actions, however, PDF officers and soldiers never faced the critical decision to shoot or defect. Similarly, the general strikes demonstrated solidarity, but were an insufficient means to compel Noriega's departure. Since a

150 One Chamber of Commerce member attempted to contextualize the significance of these protests by noting that "For us, picking up a rock is like Central Americans picking up a gun," but when the regime used force "[p]eople got scared and [the first wave of protests] started to unravel." Tracy Wilkinson, "Panama Military Strongman Noriega Still Faces Popular Discontent," United Press International, June 20, 1987. Opposition leader Arias Calderon similarly described Panama as "a transactional, not confrontational society." Richard L. Millett, "No Good Options for US," Journal of Commerce, July 10, 1987. Two years later, the NCC leadership remained cautious. The head of the MOLIRENA party and second Vice Presidential candidate for the 1989 elections, Guillermo Ford, explained that he and his running mates were unwilling to take the people "to the butcher shop" and "confront these animals" on the street after the regime's harsh repression following the blatantly stolen 1989 election. William Branigin, "Panamanian Opposition Calls Strike," Washington Post, May 14, 1989.
large portion of the government's revenue was detached from the local economy, the coercive potential of closing local businesses was not decisive.\footnote{To place economic pressure on the regime, the opposition needed to perpetuate instability to undermine investor confidence. Such actions would destroy the international banking system, which was the primary driver to Panama's service oriented economic growth model. In other words, the opposition and the regime were in a game of chicken. Achieving sufficient leverage required the opposition to risk the possibility of irreparably harming Panama's economy and their own economic interests. Jim Mannion, "Panama Banks are Quiet Partner in Push for Democracy," St. Petersburg Times, August 3, 1987.}

Perhaps the most significant barrier to toppling Noriega was the inability of leaders from the NCC and opposition political parties to set forth a vision that appealed to a broader set of societal actors displeased with the status quo. The demands of Crusade leaders centered on abstract ideals, like democracy, liberty, and justice, rather than substantive issues like jobs and the declining standard of living.\footnote{Paul Knox, "Business Leads Opposition to Panama's Regime," \textit{The Globe and Mail}, August 13, 1987; Perez, \textit{Political Protests in Panama}, 244.} This focus on procedural democracy undermined the ability to form alliances with powerful societal actors whose coordinated participation in the struggle would have magnified the coercive potential of civil disobedience. For instance, students proved more resilient than most in the face of harsh repressive measures, but this group was divided over the appropriate role to play with the opposition. The powerful leftist contingent considered the agenda of Crusade leaders inadequate. This partly sabotaged efforts to incorporate sections of the student body into the campaign.\footnote{Millett ("Panama's Internal Opposition," 27) notes that students formed a particularly pugnacious presence on the street. Many students favored the opposition. While 125 student organizations expressed support for the opposition in communiqués during the summer of 1987, only the Panamanian Student Federation (FEP) expressed support for the regime. Yet, the NCC failed to capitalize on this support and dismiss Noriega's claims that the protests were an oligarchic, anti-nationalist, foreign-backed plot. Perez, \textit{Political Protest in Panama}, 244-46; 288-90.} Similarly, the opposition was unable to win over a large portion of government employees, who displayed open discontent with the regime. In early September, for example, the National Federation of Public Employees (FENASEP) carried out a three-day work stoppage with over 100,000 workers demanding greater job security and the right
to organize unions. Finally, the NCC held most rallies in downtown Panama City rather than actively expanding the potential for coordinated civil disobedience to poor urban neighborhoods and rural communities. Whether the inability to form a more inclusive coalition actively opposed to Noriega was due to a lack of charismatic leadership offering an attractive roadmap, a deficit of organizational capacity, or an insurmountable ideological gap is difficult to ascertain. Regardless, the weak connection across potential opposition sites affected the coercive potential of civil disobedience. Noriega exploited these various vulnerabilities for the next two years.

During this initial phase of the confrontation, US officials made public statements and adopted symbolic actions to censure Noriega and lend moral support to the opposition. In a way, the US employed "isolate and unite" tactics, but the ultimate goal remained unclear. The Reagan administration never expressly called on Noriega to step down. Given previous interactions with the US, statements made by US officials appeared as stern warnings, not ultimatums. Noriega's enemies in Congress and the State Department orchestrated these reproaches, not his "friends" in the administration. Thus, Noriega, the PDF, and regime cronies prepared to outlast their domestic and foreign opponents. As discussed in greater detail in chapter seven, the US continued to send mixed messages during the fall despite agreement within the administration that Noriega had to go. Meanwhile, key members of Panama's opposition concentrated on

---

154 The opposition had difficulty providing a credible commitment to pro-government labor groups composed of public employees. Most high-ranking civil and political opposition figures maintained pro-business interests and were part of the former oligarchic elite who dominated the political scene before Torrijos took power. Co-opted labor leaders had no reason to abandon the regime, while politically conscious workers did not perceive a bright future in case the opposition swept aside the current regime. This mistrust did not mean these groups uncritically supported the regime. For instance, after a large labor strike in March 1986, the National Council of Organized Workers (CONATO), a consultative board made up of the heads of all labor organizations, encouraged its members to unregister with political parties associated with the regime. Beginning in the late summer of 1987, large labor groups like and the Federation of Public Employee Associations (FENASEP) expressed discontent with the political stalemate between the regime and opposition civic movement. They encouraged negotiations and reform measures, but never openly broke ranks and called for the regime's ouster. Millett, "Panama's Internal Opposition," 23; Perez, Political Protest in Panama, 245.
convincing the Reagan administration to adopt aggressive measures to ensure Noriega's exit. As efforts to coax the general from office with promises of a "golden parachute" collapsed in January 1988, a series of contingent events combined to push the opposition and US into open confrontation with the regime. The aggressive application of "feast or famine" tactics proved the gravest threat to Noriega's survival during this prolonged 30 month crisis.

3.b. 02/25/88 - 06/03/88

The relative calm during the first weeks of 1988 belied the tumultuous road ahead. The opposition remained largely quiescent in the fall. Its leaders continued to demand Noriega's immediate departure, but were uncertain what measures they could or should adopt given the regime's proven ability to survive and willingness to use repression. In early January, the regime allowed a partial political opening by granting amnesty to most opposition leaders in exile and permitting the opposition media to resume operations with some caveats. The limited restoration of political rights was a gambit to probe the possibility of mending relations with the US to gain some assistance for Panama's rapidly deteriorating economy.

The political turmoil had eroded investor confidence, a necessary condition for Panama's service oriented economy. Originally projected to grow by 2.5% in the beginning of 1987, Panama's GDP actually shrank by 1.8% by the end of the year. Bank deposits dropped by an estimated $10 billion from June to February. Faced with the largest per-capita foreign debt in the world and a $350 million budget deficit, Panama's government stopped paying principal and

---

155 The one major protest action was more a celebration. Rumors circulated on January 9th that Noriega had fled to the Dominican Republic, when in reality he was visiting his daughter. Thousands poured onto the streets, but police easily dispersed the crowd with tear gas, bird shot, and truncheons. Noriega returned the next day. "Thousands Celebrate False Rumors," United Press International, January 9, 1988.

156 Stephen Kinzer, "Noriega Holds onto his Power in Panama," St. Petersburg Times, February 27, 1988. This represented 20% of the total bank deposits in Panama, which was significant because Panama's financial sector constitutes around 10% of the country's GDP. Local deposits also declined by 13%. Panamanians had shipped $500 million abroad since the previous year. Scranton, The Noriega Years, 133.
interest on foreign debts partly because it faced a liquidity problem.\footnote{William Branigin, "Political Turmoil Puts Pressure on Panama's Banks," \textit{Washington Post}, July 30, 1987.} Lacking the capacity to print its own currency due to a dollarized economy, Panama's central bank went from $300 million in reserve in early 1987 to less than $30 million by February 1988. Matters appeared even bleaker as a one-year debt moratorium would end on March 12th, at which point Panama would have to pay $42 million in principal and interest on past debts in addition to the monthly expense of $66 million to cover the salaries for civil servants.\footnote{Larry Rohter, "Economy on Brink in Panama," \textit{New York Times}, February 22, 1988.} Continued defaults on loans harmed investor confidence, which further undermined Panama's economic model.\footnote{Clyde H. Farnsworth, "Panama's Financial Ills Grow Worse," \textit{New York Times}, February 8, 1988. The World Bank cut off a $50 million structural adjustment loan. The IMF did not accept Panama's request for an additional $80 million loan. Both institutions actions were due to Panama's failure to follow through on recommended austerity measures. One Panamanian economist estimated that the regime would need to cut over 30,000 government jobs to balance the current budget. Larry Rohter, "Economy on Brink in Panama," \textit{New York Times}, February 22, 1988.} Requests for patience and additional loans fell on deaf ears as the regime desperately searched for help.\footnote{Noriega reportedly sent an envoy to ask Libya's leader Muammar Gaddafi for $200 million in emergency economic aid and $100 million more to deal with the liquidity issues. Don Oberdorfer, "U.S.-Panama Struggle Intensifies," \textit{Washington Post}, December 16, 1987.}

The US would not throw Noriega a lifeline. Instead, US attorneys were preparing to indict him on drug trafficking charges. In a series of briefings in early February, a handful of high-ranking US officials expressed reservations against indicting a foreign leader. Yet, nobody was prepared to publicly oppose this action on the grounds of national security in the aftermath of the Iran-Contra scandal and the growing prominence of the war on drugs.\footnote{Kempe, \textit{Divorcing the Dictator}, 247.} On February 4th, Noriega was indicted on 13 counts of drug trafficking and racketeering. This action precipitated a rapid succession of events. During an interview six months earlier, President Delvalle asserted that if Noriega was indicted for drug trafficking in the US, he would have no other option than to fire him.\footnote{"Delvalle Distances Himself from Noriega," \textit{Inter Press Services}, August 11, 1987. Although not as vocal as Vice President Esquivel, Delvalle occasionally expressed frustration with the regime's harsh response to peaceful
Panamanian president a visit on February 3rd. Two weeks later, Delvalle travelled to Florida under the pretense of a doctor's visit. In reality, he was devising a plan with Assistant Secretary of State Elliott Abrams. With the economy rapidly deteriorating and the US behind the opposition, they believed the moment was ripe for a Philippine-style people power revolution. Delvalle would relieve Noriega of his duties; people would come to the streets; and, elites still loyal to Noriega would begin abandoning ship. This did not happen.

In the late afternoon of February 25th, a small TV station owned by Delvalle broadcasted a pre-recorded message from the president announcing Noriega's retirement and the appointment of Colonel Justine as the new comandante. Hours later, Justine reaffirmed his loyalty to Noriega and Delvalle went into hiding. In the middle of the night, a slim majority of legislators in the National Assembly dismissed Delvalle and appointed Education Minister Solis Di Palma as his replacement. Meanwhile, Noriega adopted several preventive measures. He clamped down on the opposition media, purged some potentially disloyal PDF officers, increased the presence of riot police on the streets, and attempted to detain Crusade leaders. As Delvalle was widely disliked, his actions did not elicit a popular uprising. Sporadic demonstrations occurred, but were easily controlled by the Dobermans. However, the Reagan administration quickly recognized Delvalle as the legitimate head of the civilian government, thereby ensuring a prolonged constitutional crisis. Of the Latin American nations, only Nicaragua and Cuba expressed protests, such as the attack on the upscale department store owned by his brother-in-law, Roberto Eisenmann. Shaming tactics also appeared to affect Delvalle's willingness to accept the PDF agenda completely. For instance, fellow businessmen booed and threw ice cubes at the President when he attempted to dine at the exclusive Union Club in August 1987. Murillo, The Noriega Mess, 614-15. Delvalle continued to serve the regime during the fall, but he also began taking more "doctor visits" to the US.

unreserved support for Noriega. The other countries disliked the general, but were reluctant to appear subservient to US meddling in Panamanian affairs. For its part, the opposition sided with Delvalle, encouraged citizens not to pay taxes, and prepared for a general strike the following week. They hoped to starve the regime of economic resources.

A cabal of schemers advanced a similar plan in the US as the Reagan administration appeared uncertain on how to proceed. Two former regime insiders, Gabriel Lewis and Jose Blandón, devised a plan with Joel McCleary and former Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs William Rogers to freeze all Panamanian assets held in the US. With the State Department's certification of Delvalle as Panama's legitimate president, US courts ordered American banks to withhold around $50 million from the Solis regime in early March. On March 11th, the administration declared that all future payments to Panama from US government agencies be placed in an escrow account designated for Delvalle's government. Fees for the Panama Canal Commission and a trans-isthmian oil pipeline – approximately $12 million a month – were channeled into this account. Given the current liquidity crisis in Panama, these relatively small amounts were significant. Yet, the Reagan administration was hesitant to adopt a harsher sanctions regime. Some State Department officials and a bipartisan group in Congress

---

166 This created an immediate crisis in the OAS over which Panamanian representative to recognize, Delvalle's or Noriega's. Indicative of OAS hesitation to take a strong position in favor of the opposition, Noriega's candidate was recognized. In an early positive step, the "Group of Eight" Latin American democracies made an important symbolic gesture by suspending Panama's membership. Still, Latin American countries slowly normalized relations as Noriega's likelihood of survival increased, and some Latin American leaders like Mexican President de la Madrid began to criticize the US for meddling in other countries internal affairs in late March. Neil A. Lewis, "U.S. Effort to Remove Noriega Begins to I rk Latins," New York Times, April 6, 1988.

167 Dinges (Our Man in Panama, 288) claims that in February 1988 officers in the US Embassy in Panama were under the working assumption that the next opportunity for change was the 1989 elections.

clamored to enact the International Economic Emergency Powers Act (IEEPA). Senator D'Amato (R - NY) expressed a widely-held, bipartisan sentiment that the president should "go for the jugular" and adopt measures that have an "immediate, dramatic and devastating" effect on "Noriega and his cohorts." On March 4th, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed a resolution calling for further economic sanctions and the termination of all ties with Noriega.

During a series of Panama Review Group meetings, some officials argued against all-out economic war. Given the indiscriminate nature of such sanctions, the Treasury Department (DOT) raised concerns about punishing a friendly population. Implementation and enforcement would also prove exceedingly difficult due to the high number of bilateral business and security ties, which was not a concern when the IEEPA was applied to Iran and Libya. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci and the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Crowe expressed fears over shifting popular anger toward the US. Lacking a clear presidential order, the departments split the difference and adopted a wait-and-see approach. The hope was that incremental pressure from moderate sanctions would prove sufficient to ease Noriega from office.

As the Reagan administration debated what set of policies to pursue after recognizing Delvalle as Panama's legitimate leader, the NCC reinvigorated its civil disobedience campaign.

---

170 One week later, a House resolution passed 367 to 2 expressing support for current efforts to remove Noriega and encouraging consideration of more sanctions. The Senate would continue to push for more aggressive measures by passing another resolution 92 to 1 in late March that urged the president to adopt measures that would place more diplomatic, economic, and political pressure on Noriega.
171 Asset freezes were impossible without more knowledge of where Noriega's wealth was located. William Branigin, "U.S. Pressured to Soften Panama Policy," Washington Post, August 14, 1988.
172 Baker, Politics of Diplomacy, 178. Treasury Secretary James Baker publicly summarized his doubts regarding the effectiveness of such sanctions, "General Noriega no doubt has money squirreled away who knows where... I doubt very much that we have done much to interrupt his life style or to diminish his assets. And it does hurt the people of Panama." David E. Pitt, "Sanction Worry Foes of Noriega," New York Times, April 10, 1988.
In addition to the call for a general strike in early March, Crusade leaders urged Panamanians to delay payments on taxes and utility bills, refuse to buy government lottery tickets, and boycott state-run casinos.\footnote{The overall tax revenue never rose above 15\% of GNP. Thus, the coercive potential of a boycott on paying taxes was never great. Harding, \textit{Military Foundations}, 97.} External and internal pressure on the regime finally aligned. Despite familiar threats to seize stores and revoke the citizenship of foreign born shopkeepers, the general strike mustered a 80\% rate of adherence during the first four days in March. Combined with US court actions, Panama's National Bank could not perform its clearing house functions properly. The regime closed all banks to stem capital flight. In turn, citizens began hoarding cash, which intensified the liquidity crisis.\footnote{Zimbalist and Weeks, \textit{Panama at a Crossroads}, 82, 146.} This sequence of events provided the opposition and the US a brief window of opportunity before the economy adjusted and money began to flow back into the system. Yet, Noriega's adversaries hesitated in adopting an aggressive, coordinated approach.

On March 6\textsuperscript{th}, opposition forces unified around a common platform, the principle objective of which was "to establish jointly a government of national reconciliation capable of providing justice, due process of law, liberty, reconstruction of democratic institutions, fiscal order and economic development."\footnote{Scranton, \textit{The Noriega Years}, 141-42. A significant hurdle to opposition unity was how to proceed with the political transition. Several parties did not believe Delvalle had a rightful claim to the presidency. In particular, Arias's PPA did not want to endorse Delvalle as the legal president of the republic. Significant tensions persisted as different groups continued to jockey for influential positions in a hypothetical transition government. Cable, Davis to Shultz, "PPA Supports Ouster of Noriega -- But Not a Subsequent Delvalle Government," March 23, 1988, FOIA.} Although this statement signaled a willingness to work toward a common goal, actual civil disobedience dissipated. After the banks closed on March 4\textsuperscript{th}, NCC leaders ended the general strike in fear of creating "irreversible and devastating damage" to the economy.\footnote{Larry Rohter, "Panama Runs into a Cash Crisis," \textit{Associated Press}, March 4, 1988.} A tactical shift toward street demonstrations occurred, but a heavy police presence deterred protesters from gathering \textit{en masse}. For example, efforts to organize a rally at El Carmen Church on March 8\textsuperscript{th} caused minor disturbances, but failed to draw large numbers. A
few NCC leaders were arrested, but many others did not attend. They were across town at the large trade fair that generated over $100 million in transactions per year. One foreign journalist queried NCC leaders over such incongruities between their goals and actions. In response to their general absence at the planned El Carmen Church demonstration, one Crusade leader responded "too many Guardia." Similarly, while attending the trade fair, the Chamber of Commerce president Aurelio Barria explained, "life must go on." Such callous statements reinforced the image that the NCC was predominantly a middle class movement. It demonstrated an apparent willingness among its leadership to let less fortunate Panamanians bear the brunt of repression so that the affluent population could reap the fruit of Noriega's overthrow. Equally disconcerting, the NCC was slow in devising a coherent plan to compel Noriega to step down.

As the civic campaign stalled, so did the economy. The cash shortage slowed economic activity to a trickle even after the general strike was lifted. Stores demanded payment for all transactions in cash, and an informal barter system between firms emerged. The inability to cash government issued checks increased popular frustration toward Noriega, not the US. Compared to 1987, pro-government demonstrations were poorly attended. As the government began missing payments to its core constituencies, anti-government protests mounted. On March 7th, thousands of angry retirees protested that they could not cash their social security checks. When confronted by riot police, they co-opted Noriega's aphorism and yelled "not one step back" at the Dobermans, who they mocked as "Murderers! Stooges! Thieves! Liars! Puppets!". Panama's Central Bank only had an estimated $5 million in reserves, when the upcoming PDF payroll

178 William Branigin, "Panama Protesters Take Work Break," Washington Post, March 13, 1988. Branigan encountered other farcical situations during his reporting on the crisis. For instance, a woman rolled down the window in an air-conditioned BMW just enough to implore him to tell the world that Panamanians were "living through hell here." He also witnessed well-heeled dissidents tell their maids to turn on a tape recording of them banging pots while they relaxed on their porch.
179 Cable, Davis to Shultz, "Panama Sitrep," March 10, 1988, FOIA.
alone required $8 million.\textsuperscript{181} On March 15\textsuperscript{th}, government employees launched protests and prepared for strikes the following day. Similar to previous protests by government workers, the central demands were full payment on their paychecks and job security. This time, however, the regime lacked the resources to appease these groups. Ironically, the regime's grip on power grew more tenuous due to actions by collective actors not actively seeking its overthrow.\textsuperscript{182}

At this juncture, a group of officers previously considered Noriega loyalists attempted a coup on March 16\textsuperscript{th}. The US had actively encouraged such actions since Noriega's indictment. Secretary Shultz publicly urged the PDF to remove Noriega and "resume an honorable and proper role in the constitutional system." Privately, he ordered US embassies throughout Latin America to inform Panamanian officers of the "US desire to work with the PDF, but inability to do so while Noriega remained" in power.\textsuperscript{183} Several motives existed among these officers, but US rhetorical and economic pressures appeared to matter.\textsuperscript{184} A group of majors in the PDF began to view a US invasion that would lead to the dismantlement of the PDF more likely the longer Noriega remained comandante. The conspirators advanced the coup date when mass unrest


\textsuperscript{182} Zimbalist and Weeks (\textit{Panama at a Crossroads}, 147) draw a similar conclusion over the aims of government workers and absence of coordination with the NCC.

\textsuperscript{183} Dinges, \textit{Our Man in Panama}, 299. Yates (\textit{US Military Intervention in Panama}, 53) notes that a SOUTHCOM message on March 15th mentioned "recent actions taken by the US government to encourage the separation of ... Noriega from the ... [PDF]." Some Panamanians within the opposition made similar efforts. Gabriel Lewis praised several mid-ranking officers and two top colonels in mid-February as "untainted by corruption" and therefore acceptable to the opposition. William Branigin, "Panama's Military Feels Strain of Noriega Crisis," \textit{Washington Post}, March 6, 1988. Many opposition leaders, however, disagreed with this tactic. According to them, the goal should address not only the symptom, but also the causes. Removing Noriega would not matter if the PDF maintained its privileged institutional position. To the concern of many opposition leaders, the US position appeared to drift toward a myopic focus on Noriega's removal. Although US rhetoric identified the need for a professional military force under direct control of the civilian government, any transition led by the PDF would result in a significant role for that institution in the new political order. Scranton, \textit{The Noriega Years}, 145.

\textsuperscript{184} Yates (\textit{US Military Intervention in Panama}, 53) suggests several alternative motives: "all had been passed over for promotion; some were uneasy over Noriega's growing ties with Cuba, Nicaragua, and Libya; some had recently returned from studying at military colleges in the US; and some merely wanted to preempt higher-ranking officers from launching their own coup." All these motives likely existed, but none independently explain the timing of the coup aside from increased US and domestic pressure. Anti-communist officers' fear of growing links with leftist regimes and desire to move before senior officers attempted their own coup are directly related to the immediate crisis that began in late February. Importantly, the officers only began planning the coup weeks before March 16\textsuperscript{th}.}
emerged after the regime was unable to meet the mid-March payroll. The timing seemed propitious as broad public sentiment favored change and crowds would block large avenues that military units loyal to Noriega would need clear in order to stage a countercoup.\textsuperscript{185} In the end, none of this mattered. A small group of soldiers protecting PDF headquarters easily put down the ill-planned coup attempt. Hours later, Noriega appeared victorious before the international press and described the shots heard during the morning as "kisses" for reporters.\textsuperscript{186}

The implications of the coup attempt were mixed. US officials were encouraged to see deep ruptures within the military that previously appeared immune to measures meant to create wedges between Noriega and his officers. On the other hand, this event informed Noriega where officer loyalties lay. By this time, loyalty was the sole criterion for advancement in the PDF. The general arrested or dismissed over 40 officers and promoted over 100 others. According to US embassy officials, the coup attempt caused initial disappointment among opposition leaders.\textsuperscript{187} For the short to medium term, they believed the purges of reformist elements within the PDF officer corps reinforced Noriega's grip over society. Although preparations for renewed Crusade activities were in flux, the street demonstrations planned by government workers transformed into a massive display of collective frustration that shook the foundation of the regime. Unpaid public sector workers went on strike. This included electrical workers who shut down the power grid, which affected the transisthmian oil pipeline and major metropolitan areas for two days. Combined with looting and pitched street battles, these actions halted practically all economic activity in Panama City and Colon on March 16\textsuperscript{th}. During the next few days, a large troop presence kept the streets quiet. The regime placed most public services under the new
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National Council of Security and Defense and declared a "state of urgency." Noriega attempted to buy time by paying part of government workers' salaries in cash, but union leaders promised to continue work stoppages until they were paid in full. In response to the suspension of basic constitutional guarantees and the opportunity to exploit the unrest created by organized labor, NCC leaders called for an indefinite strike to begin the following Monday.

The general strike added pressure to the dollar starved economy. Throughout the first week, the strike was quite effective. An estimated 95% of businesses and industries participated in Panama City. Strike adherence was also high in regional cities, including Colon, Santiago, David, and Chorrera.\textsuperscript{188} By March 25\textsuperscript{th}, the NCC seemed to have momentum. The opposition released the "blueprint for progress" that set forth a common political agenda after Noriega's removal, including the formation of a government of national reconciliation under Delvalle.\textsuperscript{189} The Senate passed a resolution 92 to 0 calling for additional economic and diplomatic pressures, Noriega's extradition to the US, and financial aid after his departure. Combined with Reagan's executive order days earlier requiring monthly payments from the Canal Commission into Delvalle's escrow account, US foreign policy finally appeared unified and in sync with NCC activities. Noriega needed to regain the initiative.

On March 26\textsuperscript{th}, the PDF reopened the port of Balboa in Panama City and occupied two large flour mills that refused to sell their inventory in exchange for irredeemable government checks.\textsuperscript{190} These definitive actions affected the calculations of supermarkets and banks that had

\textsuperscript{189} Scranton, \textit{The Noriega Years}, 148.
ignored previous government threats of seizure. Noriega also devised various schemes to ensure that his core constituencies received basic commodities. To combat opposition efforts to distribute food via parishes in poorer neighborhoods, the regime began to provide "dignity bags" full of food staples to government workers. The cost of the bags was deducted from worker paychecks that otherwise were not readily fungible. Similarly, workers could use their paychecks to pay for utilities beginning in early April. By late March, the liquidity crunch began to wane. The regime managed to pay PDF servicemen in full and to cover part of other government employees' payroll. Members of public unions slowly returned to work, and the general strike collapsed in early April.

As US pressure slowly escalated in March, an internal debate raged. State Department officials wanted the administration to adopt more aggressive measures. Abrams and Shultz enumerated several options: immediate implementation of the IEEPA, the deployment of 3,000 troops in a show of force, or the outright kidnapping of Noriega. The Defense Department ridiculed the latter option as a "Rambo operation," and derided significant troop augmentation as "a display of force for force's sake" that "might create a demand that they be used." Defense Secretary Carlucci even rejected suggestions of setting up an anti-Noriega radio station on an American base for fear that such actions would raise concerns over US basing rights in other allied countries. As discussed earlier, the Treasury Department and Pentagon believed the IEEPA was too blunt a instrument to target Noriega's interests effectively. In sum, the NSC,
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195 Donnelly, Roth, and Baker, The Storming of Panama, p. 31. Similarly, the Defense Department quickly rejected suggestions to have Delvalle establish an alternative government on a US military installation in Panama.
DOD, and DOT advocated a gradualist approach and hoped it would prove sufficient to remove Noriega. Thus, an indecisive foreign policy based on the lowest common denominator between rival departments captured the US decision-making process at a time when civil disobedience flourished and the liquidity pinch was most severe.

Yet, Reagan felt compelled to respond strongly after the storming of the Marriott hotel on March 29th that led to the arrest of opposition leaders and manhandling of foreign journalists. White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater noted that US patience is "not unlimited," and the administration would "take a look at all the hard options." In reality, President Reagan adopted a cautious approach. On April 1st, the administration deployed 1,300 US troops to Panama, but countervailing rhetoric reassured Noriega and PDF officers. Reagan had already announced on March 24th that the US would not "be the big Colossus of the North once again" and come "in with our power and muscle and saying this is the way it has to be." Various administration spokesmen representing US departments opposed to hawkish measures reinforced this message. The Southcom spokesmen, for instance, claimed that this action was "not meant to be a statement to General Noriega or Panama," but rather "just a prudent measure to enhance security" for US personnel and facilities. The troop deployment failed to place additional pressure on Noriega. Another option Pentagon officials did not vociferously oppose was economic sanctions. Several opposition leaders expressed serious reservations over broadening and deepening the sanctions regime because the measures would not effectively prolong the liquidity crisis, target

198 George C. Wilson and Joe Pichirallo, "U.S. to Add 1,300 Troops in Panama," Washington Post, April 2, 1988. Admiral Crowe and General Woerner believed the events in Panama did not constitute an immediate threat to US interests. As such, these agencies advocated a calibrated US policy that avoided options it considered unnecessary provocations. For more on this bureaucratic showdown, see Yates, US Military Intervention in Panama, 57-59. The Treasury Department Secretary James Baker made similar reassurances concerning the use of force later in the month. Shultz, Turmoil and Triumph, 1057.
the revenue streams Noriega used to pay the PDF, or endanger the general's personal assets. The Reagan administration nevertheless implemented the IEEPA on April 8th days after the last major protest actions. The executive order prohibited payments of all taxes and fees by US citizens and corporate entities to the Noriega/Solis regime. Crusade leader Eduardo Vallarino summarized his side's frustration with the sanctions strategy, "The dosage will almost kill the patient, before it cures the sickness." Yet, the opposition reluctantly endorsed the sanctions regime after receiving assurances that this was the first step in escalating US pressure to compel Noriega's departure. Such promises never materialized.

Dilemmas with implementation and enforcement rapidly emerged. The Panamanian government stopped providing basic services to US citizens and US controlled facilities that abided by IEEPA provisions. For instance, power was cut to the US embassy when it refused to pay its utility fees. Because the purpose of the sanctions was not meant to unduly burden US citizens, these predictable unintended consequences led the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) to declare exemptions on payments for utility bills and airport fees at the end of April. Actual implementation of IEEPA sanctions remained in abeyance until June 3rd. By this time, Panama's banks were fully operational and Noriega no longer faced an acute liquidity problem. The economy was broken, but this did not affect Noriega's short-term capacity to survive. Cancellation of these sanctions was not a politically viable solution

---


201 Lombard (1989, pp. 288-290) makes a compelling argument that the sanctions regime was never going to succeed once Noriega survived the short-term liquidity crisis. Therefore, subsequent measures to dilute the sanctions was responsible policy. Others suggest that the sanctions may have prevented Noriega from covering his payroll if strictly enforced without any amendments. See Steve C. Ropp, "Military Retrenchment and Decay in Panama," *Current History* 89 (1990): 37-39. However, most agree that such broad sanctions were practically infeasible over an extended period given the extent of US business interests in Panama. The roughly 450 US firms operating in...
especially because US presidential politics would soon take center stage. Thus, the Treasury Department implemented two additional amendments on June 15th and August 24th to minimize the most burdensome aspects of the sanctions for US businesses and Panamanian citizens. Panama's real GDP shrank by 18% in 1988, but Noriega remained in power.

IV. Theory Building from a Deviant Case

In hindsight, the spring of 1988 was the only period during the 30 month crisis when all forces aligned against Noriega applied substantial simultaneous pressure. His ability to survive the joint application of "feast or famine" tactics by the domestic opposition and former patron state was never guaranteed. In one sense, these actions activated the predicted sequence of events that often end in regime change. Previously loyal PDF officers attempted an coup and the general was temporarily unable to meet the government's payroll, which led to conditional mass defections by government workers. Yet, the final domino never fell, which begs the question why. Post-hoc explanations provide a false sense of inevitability that belies the inherent contingency of revolutionary situations. Nevertheless, this deviant case provides some clues into what factors increase the ability of an embattled regime to withstand acute external pressure during UI campaigns. Importantly, this case shares many similarities with the deviant cases discussed in chapter three. This section focuses on the regime's resilience and US foreign policy indecisiveness as key factors that helped Noriega survive the crisis.

Leader ingenuity and the domestic institutional configuration increased the likelihood of regime survival. First, Noriega scrounged up funds from disparate international sources to mitigate the immediate liquidity crisis. Panamanian ambassadors to Japan, the UK, and France cobbled together a few million dollars by selling visas and passports, Panama's flag of Panama cried "bloody murder" over the "broad and vague" sanctions regime that "put them at risk with both US and Panamanian Law." John Goshko, "U.S. Aide Visits Panama to Assess Sanctions," Washington Post, April 20, 1988.
convenience, and end user certificates for sensitive materials.202 Responding to an earlier request, Libya allegedly provided a $20 million emergency loan in the spring of 1988.203 Despite assurances to the US from European allies to withhold funds from the Solis regime, Noriega managed to access some accounts, including $15 million from a West German bank.204 Meanwhile, Taiwan and Japan did not join American sanctions or recognize the Delvalle regime due to the high level of trade and foreign direct investment in Panama. Instead, these countries adopted a wait-and-see approach to gauge US determination to remove Noriega.205 During the liquidity crisis, Japan provided small amounts of cash for humanitarian purposes that Noriega used to lessen fears among fellow officer's that Panama faced broad international isolation. Despite US pressure, Taiwan provided approximately $40 million of loans in 1988 under the assumption that the US would not punish its ally.206 Finally, the Solis regime received $19 million in quarterly tax revenue from foreign companies in late March.

Overall, Noriega hoped the US would adjust its strategic goals after realizing the true costs of toppling his regime. Unlike Burma, a long-term substitute to the current patron was absent. Given the asset specificity of the canal to US national security, the general realized his long-term survival minimally depended on regaining Washington's acquiescence. Still, the small amounts of aid functioned as short-term sanction busters that provided the regime life support.

202 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 272.
206 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 287-88.
Once liquidity returned to the system, the regime's revenue streams were sufficiently insulated from domestic and US pressure to generate enough revenue to cover the government payroll even if the economy was in tatters. Yet, these economic rents paled in comparison to Nigeria. The general's long-term survival depended on better relations with his patron. Unfortunately for Noriega, US officials became rhetorically entrapped in demanding his ouster. Unlike Togo, normalization in the patron-client relation would not occur. As discussed in the following chapter, Noriega only understood this fact in late May 1988. Before then, the strategic goal was to take a beating in the hope of wearing down the enemy's resolve. This approach was not based on wishful thinking; Noriega was in a decent position to stall for survival.

The second essential factor that increased Noriega's ability to outlast short-term "feast or famine" tactics was his tight control over the PDF, which actually increased in the spring of 1988. Following the mid-March coup attempt, Noriega established the Strategic Military Council (CEM), which consisted of twenty officers most of whom were majors or captains. This council emasculated the General Staff by taking over many of its core duties. The institutional division of power and information made coordination among potential conspirators after the March 16th coup attempt even more difficult. Meanwhile, to sow greater fear among the civilian population, Noriega streamlined paramilitary groups into the Dignity Battalions, known as Digbats. The regime provided weapons to this umbrella paramilitary organization composed of convicts, the unemployed, the poor, and young children. This additional layer to the coercive apparatus complemented PDF efforts to silence anti-government protests and offered a veneer of popular support.

207 William Branigin, "Panamanian Military Council Formed," Washington Post, May 29, 1988. A key reason for creating this body derived from Noriega's distrust of the Colonels. This included Col. Marco Justines and Col. Leonides Macias despite their declarations of loyalty. Delvalle appointed the former to succeed Noriega in his attempt to dismiss the general on February 24th. Former Consul General Jose Blandón named the latter as a suitable replacement for Noriega during his efforts to ease the general from command of the PDF in the fall of 1988.
nationalist support for an embattled leader standing up to "American imperialism." Finally, a few dozen Cubans advisors and technicians arrived during this period to help the PDF conduct informational and psychological warfare.\textsuperscript{208} An early example of Cuban support in action was the sophisticated nighttime raid in mid-April 1988 on the Arraiján tank farm that led to the death of an American soldier due to friendly fire.\textsuperscript{209} Noriega escalated covert conflict to remind US officials how many headaches he could create if relations remained fraught. In sum, similar to the other deviant cases, Noriega protected his grip over a military dominant regime through several effective coup-proofing measures during his attempt to wear down regime adversaries.

In a way, Elliott Abram's assessment on March 27\textsuperscript{th} that the general was hanging onto power "by his fingertips" was not an exaggeration. Yet, Noriega proved more resilient than Washington officials expected. The liquidity crisis provided a fleeting opportunity to tip the balance in favor of the NCC, but not all quarters in Washington shared this sense of urgency. Unable to agree on a proper set of policy instruments, the Reagan administration adopted an indecisive, incrementalist approach. Whether the US maintained sufficient leverage through the "feast or famine" mechanism to force Noriega's resignation is difficult to assess. The US had several options available to place additional pressure on the general, but the administration reacted to events and lacked a strategic vision to realize its goal of irregular regime change. In

\textsuperscript{208} Such raids were part of a larger game of brinksmanship. The attacks particularly frustrated Southcom officers and lowered morale among servicemen. US forces were operating in a "doctrinal wasteland." The PDF was not categorized as a hostile force, but peacetime guidelines did not apply either. No clear rules of engagement existed. Occasionally, the raids also provided small propaganda victories for the regime. After one nighttime raid on Halloween, for example, Noriega taunted US soldiers by claiming they must have been shooting at witches on broomsticks. Yates, \textit{US Military Intervention in Panama}, 117-118. Cuban media technicians helped insulate the regime from US attempts to override pro-government media outlets and create a clandestine radio station to give the opposition a voice. Although the US never attempted to launch a comprehensive propaganda campaign, such assets proved useful when the Reagan administration provided Kurt Muse, a US citizen, $10 million to establish an unauthorized radio station before the May 1989 presidential elections. The PDF tracked down Muse and arrested him in early April 1989 for violating state security. Flanagan, \textit{Battle for Panama}, 13.

\textsuperscript{209} Buckley, \textit{The Whole Story}, 140.
particular, the US adoption of a strict sanctions regime came after internal pressure largely subsided. Moreover, the policy appeared as a kneejerk reaction to demonstrate the administration's seriousness about dealing with Noriega once public outrage emerged over US corporations providing a lifeline to an unfriendly dictator.\footnote{Immediately following the US court injunction requiring US banks to transfer Panamanian assets to Delvalle's account, the Reagan administration only encouraged corporations to follow suit. Thus, the payment of $5.5 million to the Solis regime from Texaco and United Brands in late March provided funds to meet Panama's end-of-the-month payroll. US officials knew about this impending transfer of funds, but did not force the companies to pay the fees to Delvalle's account as IEEPA provisions adopted two weeks later would require. Shultz to US Embassy in Tel Aviv, "Official-Informal," March 25, 1988, FOIA.} Materially, halting the few million dollars that Noriega managed to extort from US corporations would have done little more than extend the liquidity crisis. However, earlier application of a firm sanctions regime would have delivered a strong message regarding the strength of US preferences.\footnote{Other tough measures were available to the Reagan administration at this time. For instance, it could have banned Panamanian registered ships in US ports. Noriega's regime reportedly earned $50 million in annual taxes and fees related to its flag of convenience, $40 million of which were channeled to cronies. Such an action would have created tensions with some allies, but would have sent a strong signal. Don A. Schanche, "Rivals to Flag Down Panama Ship Business," \textit{Los Angeles Times}, December 19, 1989.} The inability to send strong consistent signals undermined attempts to influence the calculations of the domestic opposition, international allies, regime insiders, PDF officers, and Noriega himself.

The US also avoided using viable military options to signal resolve. In March and early April, Ambassador Davis and other officials privately told opposition leaders that the US was ready to carry out "tough - even military - actions to unseat Noriega."\footnote{Kempe, \textit{Divorcing the Dictator}, 304-5.} After recognizing Delvalle as Panama's legitimate leader, the Reagan administration ignored General Woerner's advice to avoid severing most military contacts to the PDF. He argued that such actions may unify "the PDF, rather than creating ... critical wedges – which should be our objective."\footnote{Yates, \textit{US Military Intervention in Panama}, 105. Noriega often preyed on the fears of lower ranking officers that US efforts were directed at subverting the institutional foundations of the PDF. John Goshko, "Administration's Failure to Oust Noriega: What Went Wrong?," \textit{Washington Post}, May 28, 1988.} These pleas fell on deaf ears. If the original intent of cutting military-to-military ties was to encourage
defection, the actions and statements that followed did not reinforce the message. In late March, President Reagan hinted that the US would avoid using military force to remove Noriega. The Pentagon leaked State Department proposals to use force and described them as "harebrained" ideas. Such statements undermined the deployment of 1,300 troops to Panama meant to signal resolve. Ironically, General Woerner began to favor increased military pressure by the summer, but the Panama issue was placed on the backburner as US presidential elections neared.

This reactive foreign policy of half measures emerged due to competing bureaucratic agendas. The differences between the State Department and the Pentagon were the most significant fault-line. Pentagon officials held deep reservations about adopting aggressive policies that they believed would disrupt a satisfactory working relationship. They worried that such measures were more likely to provoke Noriega than unseat him. In addition to threatening the ability of Southcom to carry out regional operations, Noriega could target over 50,000 US citizens and servicemen in a standoff between the PDF and the US. Noriega was aware of
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215 In case the Kozak mission to provide Noriega a golden parachute failed, General Woerner began to coordinate with State Department and CIA officials to form a strategic vision to realize Noriega's ouster. This plan was called "Fissures" and explicated on the "Panama Triad" composed of three distinct pressure points. Simultaneous pressure from the domestic opposition, the US, and regional actors would create a synergism sufficient to compel Noriega's departure. In its purpose and spirit, the plan closely resembled the 1987 Blandón Plan. Woerner believed the domestic opposition and vocal support from neighboring countries in regional institutions like the OAS were important to complement and legitimize US escalatory pressures. The Southcom commander was not naïve and understood that coordination between all these actors constituted a herculean effort. In particular, he had little faith that the NCC would prove capable of mobilizing large numbers of citizens for sustained periods of time. Moreover, the plan contained internal tensions. For instance, as the US adopted more aggressive measures, Latin American countries would increasingly feel pressure to shift their criticism away from Noriega and toward US imperialism. Still, few other options were available if Kozak's diplomatic initiative failed. Any US administration was unlikely to normalize relations with Noriega still in power. From Southcom's perspective, the status quo was corrosive. The "fissures" plan only began in earnest over a year later. Donnelly, Roth, and Baker, *The Storming of Panama*, 33; Yates, *US Military Intervention in Panama*, 99-101
216 On a critique of the "rational actor" assumption and alternative models to the formation of foreign policy, see Graham Allison and Phillip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1999).
these fears. Internationally, he signaled a willingness to draw closer to America's enemies, including Nicaragua, Cuba, Libya, and the Soviet Union. At home, the PDF began to harass and arrest Americans. Therefore, the Joint Chiefs considered a policy of distancing the US from Noriega a large enough concession. From their perspective, Noriega was nothing more than a "pimple on the elephant's ass." Given the stakes and associated risks of various options, an active policy to unseat Noriega was considered irresponsible and potentially disastrous. Moreover, there was no guarantee his replacement would be any better. In the military's mind, the situation in Panama was not a crisis – the canal was still operating – and there was no need to make it one in an already unstable region. In contrast, high-ranking State Department officials, including George Shultz and Elliott Abrams, saw Panama as a situation that required a resolution. Noriega's ouster was a necessary first step in easing the PDF out of civilian affairs. With the emergence of the Civic Crusade, the State Department pushed more aggressive initiatives under the impression that the US maintained sufficient leverage to remove Noriega.

This interdepartmental tension persisted into 1988 partly because the NSC was hesitant to break the deadlock. Due to the agency's role in the Iran-Contra scandal, Frank Carlucci and Colin Powell, the respective National Security Advisors from 1987 to 1989, "preferred a more neutral, procedural role as adviser," which meant decision-making on Panama "remained at the working..."
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219 General Woerner began sending messages condemning such intimidation efforts in the fall of 1987, but avoided acknowledging these episodes publicly except when reported by the press. Southcom would be operating in a grey-zone between peace and open hostilities for the next two years. Yates, US Military Intervention in Panama, 24.


221 Shultz, Triumph and Turmoil, 1052.
group level." Since the Reagan Administration did not treat the situation in Panama as a crisis until late March 1988, the absence of strong leadership willing to break the bureaucratic impasse produced two related pathologies. First, US policymakers failed to develop a coherent strategy. General Woerner described the formation of US policy toward Panama as "incrementalism by committee," where "policymakers sought the 'lowest common denominator' - that is, the minimal response to the crisis they could make without any one agency sacrificing critical points on its closely held agenda." The result was the adoption of various tactics that exacerbated bilateral tension without producing sufficient diplomatic coercion to realize Noriega's ouster. Second, the Reagan administration continued sending mixed signals to Noriega. The former US Ambassador to Costa Rica, Francis McNeil, insisted that this was "one of the major problems" of US policy toward Panama. During early 1988, mixed signals likely contributed to the US inability to disabuse Noriega of the faint hope that US-Panamanian relations could improve in the future with him still at the helm.

Noriega's Commerce Minister, Mario Rognoni, later acknowledged that the regime's efforts to survive would likely not have mattered had the US been "determined or consistent in its war against us." The lack of presidential direction to break bureaucratic stalemates diluted US pressure and further confounded already daunting principal-agent coordination problems with the NCC. Ironically, the private initiative to spark a "revolution through litigation" appears
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223 As the policy entrepreneur pushing the more aggressive options to deal with Noriega, Abrams bemoaned that Reagan failed to make a "command decision" during the unfolding crisis in March and April. "You just had endless pulling and hauling and a refusal by the president to settle this dispute." Buckley, The Whole Story, 129.


226 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 305. Rognoni was a key confidante of Noriega, whose responsibility during the liquidity crisis was to find fungible assets abroad.
to have eased the sense of urgency within the Reagan administration.\footnote{Kempe, *Divorcing the Dictator*, 269-270.} The recent overthrows of Marcos and Duvalier also contributed to sanguine assessments among US officials that moderate escalation would succeed.\footnote{Susan Rasky, “U.S. Official Says New Pressures Against Noriega Are Considered,” *New York Times*, March 28, 1988.} The risks and costs associated with more aggressive actions seemed unnecessary. Yet, Noriega found ways to survive every escalatory measure adopted by his opponents during March and April, giving the regime enough time to adjust to the new hostile environment. By the end of April, Noriega's grip on power in the short-term was greater than in mid-February despite the precipitous economic collapse. Whether the US missed a brief window of opportunity to topple Noriega is debatable, but its execution of pressure through "feast or famine" tactics was far from flawless. Similar to the other deviant cases, clashing bureaucratic agendas and business interests limited the patron's ability to apply a clear and consistent policy, which provided an embattled regime a fighting chance at survival.

Finally, Panama's civil disobedience campaign was formidable, but never could marshal prolonged, acute pressure capable of forcing PDF soldiers into the situation of shooting or defecting. As discussed earlier, a variety of structural and strategic deficits hindered the NCC's transformation into a high capacity UI campaign. Regarding the effect US actions had on the opposition, the Reagan administration's gradual turn on Noriega during the crisis seemed to contribute to the opposition's momentum. Panama was a rare case in Latin America where regime efforts to foment anti-Americanism largely fell on deaf ears. Many Panamanians welcomed US signals indicating a withdrawal of support from Noriega.\footnote{Paul Knox, "Under the Thumb Feuding Panamanians Keep an eye on U.S.,” *The Globe and Mail*, August 8, 1987.} Unfortunately, the US policy appeared to contribute to a free rider problem over time. As the NCC began losing
momentum in August 1987, members of the opposition began expressing a greater desire for more forceful US actions. Calls for US intervention increased the longer Noriega clung to power. A common sentiment within the opposition was that "[t]he United States created this monster [Noriega] and now they're telling us we have to get rid of him, and we can't." For its part, certain agencies in the Reagan administration were hesitant to take more drastic measures to compel Noriega's departure. US officials opined that the Civic Crusade lacked the commitment and passion of their Filipino counterparts. These mutual recriminations were indicative of serious coordination and principal-agent problems exacerbated by the fact that the principal and the agent were not unified actors. In contrast, Noriega was in tight control of his allies, which significantly increased his bargaining leverage.

* * * * *

This chapter began by offering two analytic narratives on Haiti in 1985-86 and Cameroon in 1991 to illustrate how patron states can apply a "feast or famine" mechanism to influence UI campaign outcomes as intended. The next section turned to the deviant Panamanian case where substantial internal and external pressure failed to remove General Noriega as PDF comandante. After detailing key aspects pertaining to the regime, political opposition, and US-Panamanian relationship, I presented a narrative of events in the summer of 1987 and spring of 1988. During these two phases of the prolonged crisis, the domestic opposition was especially active. US policy toward Panama also evolved between these two periods. While many key actors in the US
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230 William Branigin, "General Strike Gains Support in Panama," Washington Post, March 2, 1988. Opposition leader and nationalist, Olimpo Saez, noted that he had repeatedly "heard the same terrifying cry that tore my heart: What are the gringos waiting for? When are they going to go into action to free us from Noriega?" William Branigin, "U.S. Policy Seen Headed Toward Military Move in Panama," Washington Post, April 12, 1988. Similarly, after a long meeting on April 17th, 1988 between MOLIRENA leaders and a US interagency delegation, Ambassador Davis commented that "one came away with the impression that MOLIRENA's objections to military intervention were strictly for the record, and that their emphasis on the need for rapid, decisive action were in fact intended to push the U.S. toward the military option." Davis to Shultz, "TFPM01 - U.S. Interagency Delegation Meets with MOLIRENA Leaders, April 17, 1988, Doc # C05669299."
appeared sympathetic to the opposition during the June crisis, the US left no doubt about its desire to oversee Noriega's departure by February 1988. The general's ability to survive the second crisis raises important questions about the limits of patron intervention during UI campaigns. Specifically, this deviant case begs the counterfactual about whether US efforts were doomed to fail or whether the US ineffectively applied coercive diplomacy.

The final section attempted to answer this line of inquiry. I argued that Noriega's tight control over the PDF and access to insulated revenue streams increased the chances of his short-term survival. Yet, this domestic institutional configuration was not impervious. The Reagan administration's failure to adopt a policy that maximized US leverage while the liquidity crunch was still underway permitted Noriega to devise stop-gap measures. Similarly, the NCC campaign was unable to harness the full potential of civil disobedience. Its leadership remained predominantly upper-middle class and encouraged a struggle for abstract adjectives more than bread and butter issues. Given the historical antipathy toward the oligarchy, poorer Panamanians and lower middle class government employees did not fully trust NCC motives. This produced a degree of political apathy, which helped Noriega survive. Finally, the NCC and US failed to maximize their combined coercive potential to alter the calculations of Noriega and PDF officers. Significant principal-agent and coordination problems proved too immense to forge a functional synergy. In fact, patron support may have eventually created a perverse incentive among NCC leaders and followers to take fewer personal and collective risks, which was one of several weaknesses endemic to Panama's UI campaign. In the end, all these factors contributed to Noriega's ability to survive.
Chapter 7:
Decapitation I: Panama 1987-1988

During the prolonged crisis, the US used every potential tactic to oust Noriega. Quiet calls for a military coup began in 1988, but remained implicit until Noriega blatantly stole the May 1989 presidential elections. Independent exit polls conducted by the Roman Catholic Church revealed that opposition candidate Guillermo Endara defeated Noriega's candidate Carlos Duque by a 3 to 1 margin. President Bush quickly enacted a set of aggressive measures prepared during interdepartmental contingency planning earlier that spring. He recalled Ambassador Davis, continued economic sanctions, mentioned plans to relocate American dependents living in Panama to US military bases, approved preparations for US forces to reassert treaty rights including freedom of movement operations, and announced the arrival of 1,900 additional troops to protect American interests.1 Days later, Bush encouraged Panama's citizens and military "to do everything they can to get Mr. Noriega out of there." In a not-so-subtle nod to potential coup plotters, he added "no words of caution" to his statement.2 Privately, American officials reached out to PDF contacts to reinforce the message that the US opposed Noriega, not the PDF, and that the situation between the countries would not improve until Noriega was gone.3 These actions contributed to a second coup attempt that almost succeeded in early October 1989. By this juncture, however, Noriega had cowed the civilian opposition into passivity. The conflict had

1 George Bush, "Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With Reporters on the Situation in Panama," May 11, 1989, http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=17017. Troop augmentation and the reassertion of treaty rights were outlined under the contingency plans called Nimrod Dancer, while the relocation of civilians fell under the contingency plan Blade Jewel. For more information on the preparation and implementation of increased military pressure during the summer of 1989, see Yates, US Military Intervention in Panama, 89-103, 170-231.
2 David Hoffman, Bush Seeks Overthrow of Noriega," Washington Post, May 14, 1989. As with previous troop augmentations, senior administration officials particularly in the Pentagon made abundantly clear that the US was not preparing for an invasion. The Bush administration and Panama's opposition leaders feared such bellicose rhetoric would undermine momentum by shifting attention away from the stolen elections to an imminent US invasion. Unfortunately, regional diplomatic initiatives to end the crisis stalled by late summer.
basically transformed into a US-Noriega affair that ended in the December 1989 invasion of Panama known as Operation Just Cause.

In a seminal article on the rationalist causes of war, Fearon observes that war is always ex-post inefficient. States as rational unitary actors would benefit from a negotiated settlement that divides a larger pie. This logic rang true for the situation in Panama. No party benefited from the bloody denouement of this prolonged conflict. At least 516 Panamanians died and 18,000 lost their homes due to Operation Just Cause. Total economic losses due to sanctions were estimated between $670 million to $1.17 billion. The invasion caused an additional $1 billion in damages not including subsequent looting. Operation Just Cause also left 26 American citizens dead and 324 servicemen wounded. The US subsequently provided about $500 million in aid to help Endara's regime in economic reconstruction, political reconciliation, and democratization. The latter goal led to the dismantlement of the PDF. Two cabinet decrees in 1990 diluted the concentration of power guaranteed by Law 20. The new national police were under the direct command of Panama's civilian president and prohibited from engaging in political activity. The legislative branch determined the size of the Public Force and a civilian comptroller controlled its financial matters. Finally, Noriega was charged on eight counts of drug smuggling and racketeering in the US. The former PDF commander faced a 40 year jail sentence with further charges pending in France and Panama. In sum, businessmen, the working class, the poor, the PDF, the US, and Noriega all suffered due to the inability to reach a negotiated settlement.

---

5 Lindsay-Poland, *Emperors in the Jungle*, 118.
6 Donnelly, Roth, and Baker, *The Storming of Panama*, 389-390. Some critics of the invasion argue that Operation Just Cause helped eliminate the public perception of the "wimp factor" associated with President Bush and provided a test for Operation Desert Storm. Neither of these reasons is fully convincing. Bush was just elected President obviating the need to burnish his reputation for the next election, and Saddam's invasion of Kuwait occurred eight months later.
Several authors identify personal security as an important driver for conflict onset, duration, and termination. Chiozza and Goemans, for instance, argue that domestic political systems lacking institutions for regular, peaceful leadership turnover create incentives for rational leaders to fight for survival by initiating international conflicts. In regard to domestic conflict, Fearon suggests credible commitment problems present a critical barrier to negotiated settlements during civil wars that reach a military stalemate. While revolutionary situations are often resolved quickly through a tipping-point process, some UI campaigns do reach an impasse where neither side appears capable of achieving decisive victory. Yet, both sides are hesitant to negotiate. Similar to the challenges presented by the demobilization and integration process of rebel militaries after civil wars, UI campaign leaders fear that the regime will renege on key political concessions once the power balance shifts back in its favor. Thus, the opposition seeks to remove the extant leadership completely to lock in its gains because future coordination between the disparate opposition groups is far from guaranteed. In turn, regime leaders fear politically motivated persecution if they fully cede power. Due to personal security concerns and the inability of either side to provide a credible commitment, a relatively peaceful resolution to crises precipitated by UI campaigns can prove illusive.

A patron state is well positioned to alleviate mutual suspicion and push both sides toward an overlapping bargaining space that realizes a second-best, compromise solution. One policy

---

12 Several authors have pointed out the ability of third parties to help belligerents in a civil war reach a negotiated peace by monitoring compliance, reducing incentives to cheat, and providing protection. See Michael W. Doyle and
tool is the provision of a golden parachute to specific personalities whose removal is often a base demand of UI campaigns. If these individuals are key veto players preventing the transition, then lowering their perceived exit costs may present an opportunity to achieve a peaceful political opening.  

From a patron's perspective, the golden parachute offers several advantages. First, the political transition appears less imposed and more legitimate than some other options. Second, political transitions through elite pacts should provide incentives for key actors to cooperate in the future and reduce the number of potential spoilers. Third, this option is arguably cheaper and less risky than encouraging a coup that could precipitate a violent escalation between opposing military factions or usher in an equally unpalatable military strongman. The patron's alternative of threatening or actually carrying out a foreign imposed regime change with its own military forces is even less appealing. Aside from incurring reputational costs and breaching international laws, such actions raise questions about costly post-conflict reconstruction obligations. Setting aside normative considerations, the ability to prevent an ex-post inefficient outcome by ensuring the personal security of a few individuals is an appealing policy tool.

Nicholas Sambinas, "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis," American Political Science Review 94, No. 4 (2000); Virginia Page Fortna, Does Peacekeeping Work? Shaping Belligerents' Choices After Civil War (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008). The role played by third-party mediators during UI campaigns, however, has never involved international peacekeepers. Preventive diplomacy by international organizations can help channel acute conflict toward a political transition by providing expert advisors versed in conflict resolution, offering logistical support to foster a conducive atmosphere for negotiations, and creating mechanisms capable of monitoring transitional arrangements. See Call, Transition after Constitutional Crises, 35. While IOs have increasingly played a mediation role during UI campaigns in recent years, the definition of patron state intervention presented in Chapter 2 is preserved. Thus, I code cases involving IO mediation efforts as a form of external intervention only when patron states attempted to effect an outcome that favored a particular side.


Before the summer of 1988, Noriega had such an opportunity to step down with his wealth intact through a golden parachute. High-ranking US officials tended to prefer the golden parachute option to realize Noriega's exit until domestic political considerations related to the upcoming US presidential elections became a pressing issue in the spring of 1988. In regard to the opposition, many leaders viewed the "bribe" option as an unfortunate, but ultimately acceptable means to avert a complete economic collapse and further violence. Noriega also appeared willing to consider an honorable exit if certain conditions were met. Circumstances seemed ripe to resolve this political impasse through a golden parachute, but negotiations failed.

The following three chapters investigate credible offers of golden parachutes during UI campaigns in Panama and Yemen. Unpacking the opportunities, limits, and dilemmas of this policy tool during UI campaigns seems particularly instructive for research more broadly focused on this mechanism. Unlike cases where mass atrocities associated with civil war or genocide have occurred, the opposition has fewer reasons to categorically reject the deal. Moreover, fear of subsequent extradition to international tribunals, like the International Criminal Court, is less severe. In other words, these situations constitute a most-likely case population for golden parachute success. These cases are also appropriate because Noriega and Ali Abdullah Saleh maintained sufficient support to bargain with their adversaries. Unlike the golden parachutes provided to Duvalier and Marcos, Noriega's and Saleh's exits were not imminent.

This chapter focuses on two periods during the Panama crisis when the opposition and US offered Noriega a golden parachute. Despite the apparent presence of a satisfactory solution

---

on all sides, a negotiated settlement that included guarantees to Noriega's personal security never occurred. Thus, the Panama case is pertinent for understanding why golden parachutes fail even when conditions seem right.

I. The Blandón Plan

José Isabel Blandón Castillo was a high-ranking PRD member and political advisor to Torrijos and Noriega. During a reshuffling of President Delvalle's cabinet in 1986, Noriega assigned Blandón to New York City as Panama's Consul General. As a long-time confidante to Noriega, he was well positioned to offer advice on how to defuse the ongoing crisis. Blandón claims to have consulted Noriega in mid-August 1987, at which time the general authorized him to explore the possibility of a negotiated settlement. A few weeks later, Noriega cabled further instructions that discussions must remain secret and Blandón should secure a basic *quid pro quo*. Noriega would agree to resign from the PDF and leave politics if the Reagan administration guaranteed immunity from any future indictments and acknowledged his right to remain in Panama. Noriega reportedly suggested April 1988 was a potentially convenient date to resign. With these proposed guidelines, Blandón sought out members of Panama's opposition and potential gatekeepers in the Reagan administration.

---

16 Blandón was forced into "golden exile" because some high-ranking military officers began to express doubts about his loyalty. Kempe, *Divorcing the Dictator*, 227.

17 Buckley, *The Whole Story*, 101. Blandón claimed to notice a potential opportunity to break the stalemate between the opposition and regime. In essence, he noted that Noriega appeared confounded by the demonstrations. In early February 1988, he argued, "The problem today is that no one has a clear idea of what a meaningful, sensible resolution might be. Noriega has the least idea. He now is resigned to fight because he sees no way out. He has in fact become somewhat schizophrenic in his own analysis. On the one hand he concludes the U.S. cannot be trusted, that they want to put him in jail and then on the other hand he feels the CIA and Pentagon in reality - secretly - support him. 'They have said little during my clamp down.'" HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 284 (1988). It is essential to note that many details about Blandón's private consultations with Noriega are difficult to independently verify. In particular, it remains unclear whether Noriega actually prompted Blandón to initiate talks, what parts of the plan Noriega was really prepared to accept, and how much coordination actually occurred between Noriega and his consul general throughout the fall. Dinges, *Our Man in Panama*, xxx; Scranton, *The Noriega Years*, 118.


While lobbying the Senate to pass the June resolution against Noriega, Gabriel Lewis – a NCC leader and well connected businessman – recognized a lack of policy on Panama inside the Beltway. As the UI campaign began to stall in August, a plan was needed to ease Noriega from power and halt the precipitous collapse of the economy. To jumpstart this process, Lewis gathered a set of powerful American friends to assist in the formulation of a viable strategy. Joel McCleary, a consultant who helped turn Barletta into a credible presidential candidate in 1984, suggested that Lewis join forces with Jose Blandón. Despite personal misgivings between the leftist bureaucrat and the oligarchic businessman, McCleary acted as intermediary and helped bring them together in early October. Blandón claims he told Noriega that the current situation presented an ideal window of opportunity. As opposition momentum waned, Noriega could extract better terms for his departure. This logic resonated with Noriega, who allegedly approved negotiations to move forward. Thus, these three odd bedfellows secretly worked on a "Panamanian" solution. To avoid semantic squabbles and lengthy debate, Blandón and Lewis would formulate the plan before selling it to opposition leaders, who were unaware of their machinations. By October 27th, a working document, known as the Blandón plan, surfaced.

The Blandón Plan was divided into two parts. The first part provided a roadmap for the political transition that required the approval of all major parties. The primary objectives were the removal of Noriega and restructuring of the PDF. The provision of an immunity clause which prevented Noriega from facing future criminal prosecution in exchange for his retirement by February 1988 was the major carrot. The plan also called for temporary exile of six key PDF officers known as the "Gang of Six," the retirement of PDF officers who had served over 25

---

20 Buckley, *The Whole Story*, 104. Dinges (*Our Man in Panama*, 286-7) qualifies this event by noting that records of Noriega providing consent to Blandón only began to emerge later.

years, and consideration of immunity from criminal prosecution for several high-ranking PDF officers. Finally, the plan emphasized the need to make major modifications to Law 20, including the transfer of governmental services back to civilian control. These tangible steps would empower a transitional government to implement further reforms, to conduct free and fair elections in 1989, and to foster the development of a professional, apolitical military force.

The second part of the plan focused on the tactics various parties should employ to create maximum pressure on the general while Blandón sold him the first half of the plan. This section of the blueprint was never meant for Noriega's eyes. The idea was to create pressure "from every direction" around the same time to "remind [Noriega] of his tentative hold on Panama."22 As the

22 HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 282 (1988). The similarities between Blandón's plan and General Woerner's "Panama Triad" – "Fissures" strategy outlined in the Southcom Prayer Book plan are striking. Unfortunately, the first draft of the Prayer Book emerged just before the final golden parachute offer in May 1988. Moreover, the Pentagon's reception of this plan was equivocal. Defense Department officials isolated specific aspects as potentially productive options if the diplomatic route stalled, but the strategic vision of the plan got lost in tactical details. Frustrated by such myopia, Donnelly, Roth, and Baker (The Storming of Panama, 34) note that the Southcom sent a revised version emphasizing that the strategic document "should be treated as a coherent package, a whole." Woerner told officials in Washington not to cherry pick aspects of the plan that appealed to them. Such a piecemeal approach would not constitute a coherent strategy. If some elements appeared flawed, officials were to make concrete suggestions of alternatives. Yet, Washington's response of "[i]mplement paragraph 3A, 4C" was "exactly what [Woerner] said would not work." Yates (US Military Intervention in Panama, 106) cites a sobering Southcom internal assessment of the current political reality in October 1988 that acknowledged the next administration was unlikely to adopt "bold new measures" for another six months.

As an officer who never held a high ranking position in Washington, Woodward (The Commanders, 83) asserts Woerner lacked the necessary backchannels to push his agenda through bureaucratic hurdles. Whatever influence Woerner might have had with the new Bush administration vanished completely after his public comments on February 17th, 1989: "Until we get that position filled [Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs] and the debate can commence, I offer you little hope of an articulated policy." This remark struck a nerve in the Bush administration that was already facing broad criticism over the slow pace of nominating officials to important positions. In the spring of 1989, the Bush team began to recognize the need for a more proactive policy. For instance, the new Secretary of State James Baker (Politics of Diplomacy, 178) vividly recalls the conclusions of a policy assessment he commissioned in early February that the "status quo cannot be sustained" and a "fundamental policy choice can no longer be deferred." Still, the administration hesitated exerting maximum pressure on Noriega prior to following the focal point of the 1989 elections in line with Woerner's "Fissures" approach.

According to Woerner, an important reason the Panama Triad concept failed was that the Reagan and then Bush administrations failed to develop "a coherent and attainable strategic vision ... or the institutional capacity within the structure of government – the decisive authority composed of political will, and consensus and resources – to carry it through." Lawrence Yates, US Military Intervention in Panama, 195. Ironically, several members of the Bush team publicly accused the Southcom General as being overly cautious in his willingness to use force. See Baker, Politics of Diplomacy, 184. For its part, the Joint Chiefs continued to view Woerner's plan with skepticism. General Thurman, who would replace Woerner as Southcom commander in September 1989, called it an "unworkable operation." Yates, US Military Intervention in Panama, 244. The plan left too much to chance, relied
opposition resuscitated the civil disobedience campaign, the US was expected to carry out a series of actions. Ambassador Davis would tell President Delvalle that the US supports Blandón's initiative, while another official close to Noriega, preferably Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Nestor Sanchez, would tell the general it is time to go. Shortly thereafter, General Woerner would bluntly tell Noriega and other high PDF officers that the *entire* Reagan administration is intent on seeing a political transition. Other US officials would repeat this message to lower ranking PDF officers and politicians who were members of the political parties that made up the pro-government UNADE coalition in the National Assembly. The US would also encourage allies across the region to urge Noriega to step down. Finally, Congress would continue to demonstrate its vocal opposition to the status quo. With sufficient resolve and commitment, the Reagan administration would play a critical role in advancing a "Panamanian" solution without appearing to impose its will.

Blandón immediately began selling his plan to the various parties. He returned to Panama in early November to brief Noriega and to discuss the plan with opposition leaders. According to Blandón, Noriega "reacted positively" to the plan and encouraged him to proceed. Similarly, a broad set of opposition leaders from the NCC and Panamanian political parties apparently agreed that the political solution was in the best interest of the country even if Noriega would obtain

---

on capricious regional and Panamanian partners, and did not capitalize on the element of surprise or sudden overwhelming force to deliver a quick death blow. Moreover, a slow build-up increased the ability of the PDF to adopt countermeasures, such as taking US hostages or moving to the jungle to start a guerilla war. Aware of the lingering effects of the Vietnam syndrome, Noriega played up these possibilities throughout 1989. Woodward, *The Commanders*, 83. Yet, Woerner saw these aspects of the plan not as weaknesses, but strengths. He preferred a "Panamanian solution to a Panamanian problem," and strongly believed PDF officers would oust Noriega once American willingness to use military force appeared credible. The option of a golden parachute would have provided additional coherence to Woerner's strategy, but Bush took this option off the table once he became president. Ultimately, Blue Spoon, the offensive operations aspect of the Prayer Book plan meant to neutralize the PDF and other hostile forces, was a measure of last resort, but one US officials had to be willing to use if necessary. Murillo, *The Noriega Mess*, 634-5. Blandón's trip to Panama was unexpectedly pushed forward when he learned that his son was struck by birdshot and arrested during an anti-government demonstration. Blandón sought his son's release before he was to be sent to Coiba, an infamous island prison.
immunity from criminal prosecution. Blandón presented the plan first to Elliott Abrams and then Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Michael Armacost on November 7th. They expressed interest and told Blandón they would raise the issue to higher levels. Yet, they never offered guarantees concerning the issue of immunity.\textsuperscript{24} In reality, the Panama crisis only gained Reagan's full attention in April 1988, which condemned the issue of immunity to bureaucratic limbo. Despite this setback, Blandón believed the plan could still work.

The consul general returned to Panama in mid November for four more days of talks. During his meeting with Noriega, Blandón reiterated the need to advance a political solution in order to gain maximum concessions from his adversaries. He urged Noriega to make a radio address that acknowledged the need for a political solution and that dealt with potential reforms to Law 20. When Noriega asked him to deliver a radio address to PDF officers on November 22\textsuperscript{nd} to inform them that a political solution to the current situation was being explored, Blandón saw this as the general's way to prepare his officers for a transition.\textsuperscript{25} Importantly, a split between the "hardline" faction led by Colonel Purcell and the "reformist" faction coalescing behind Colonel Castillo began to emerged after the summer. This tenuous balance within the PDF's ranks appeared to weigh on Noriega's mind during his meeting with Blandón. The next round of PDF assignments, promotions, and retirements were set for December 16\textsuperscript{th} and Noriega recognized the danger if either faction felt unfairly treated.\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 172 (1988). During an interview with Dinges (\textit{Our Man in Panama}, 287) after the Congressional Hearing, Blandón apparently claimed that Armacost did concede to the immunity issue. However, this contradiction only emerges in Dinges's account of events. Others who interviewed Blandón are explicit that US officials never provided any guarantees on the immunity question.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Buckley, \textit{Politics of Diplomacy}, 108.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Cable, Shultz to Davis, "DAS Walker Meeting with Blandón and Lewis," December 4, 1987, Doc. # C05669296. Given his concerns about disturbing the military balance, Noriega made no announcements of changes in the PDF on December 16\textsuperscript{th}. He had President Delvalle announce a number of measures meant to signal the regime's intention to reduce tensions with the NCC. A general amnesty for most regime critiques and the partial reopening for the opposition media would take place in early January 1988. Parenthetically, this date was known as "Loyalty Day" in
\end{itemize}
parachute in subsequent months, fear of a pre-emptive coup seemed to influence Noriega's calculations and cause hesitance on moving ahead with the plan.

After this meeting, Blandón discussed the need for an honorable exit for Noriega with Colonels Justine, Castillo, and Purcell. Castillo appeared amenable, Justine noncommittal, and Purcell vehemently opposed to the transition plan. If this meeting was an indicator for personal preferences throughout the PDF, then those officers implicated most in the regime's corrupt schemes were opposed to political liberalization and presented a substantial barrier if Noriega were to entertain his extrication from the crisis seriously.\textsuperscript{27} Given that Blandón was unable to deliver the \textit{quid pro quo} for Noriega, the consul general could provide little solace for the personal security concerns of other "hardline" officers. Blandón also met with a group of PDF majors without Noriega's consent to gauge the general sentiment among the lower ranking officer corps. He repeated his message that a political resolution to the crisis was necessary and reassured these officers that the military as an institution was not in danger. The audience appeared receptive to his remarks that the PDF would still be involved in political life, but its role would be "different and circumscribed."\textsuperscript{28} These findings seemed to indicate that room for a negotiated solution was possible, if the US fully backed his plan.

As Blandón pushed ahead, Noriega received a slightly different message regarding his options. At the behest of his business partner, Tongsun Park, retired Admiral Daniel Murphy travelled to Panama on two occasions in the fall of 1987 to pursue potential opportunities for his new firm specializing in risk analysis. Murphy was Vice President Bush's former Chief of Staff,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{27} Purcell was fully implicated in drug trafficking, whereas Dinges (\textit{Our Man in Panama}, 262) describes Castillo as a "tough professional with little appetite for politics."
\textsuperscript{28} Cable, Shultz to Davis, "DAS Walker Meeting with Blandón and Lewis," December 4, 1987, Doc # C05669296. Blandón told US officials after this trip that he believed significant fissures existed in the PDF.
\end{flushright}
Operation Chief of the South Florida Task Force Working Group and Chairman of the National Narcotics Border Interdiction System (1982-1985), the Deputy Secretary for Defense for Policy under Harold Brown, and the Deputy Director of Intelligence under Bush. As such a highly credentialed civilian, Noriega was certain to pay close attention. Murphy's visits were known to high-level officials at the DoS, DoD, CIA, NSC, and White House, who he briefed and debriefed on both occasions. According to Murphy, he never discussed what he would say to Noriega with US officials and was simply thanked after debriefing them. No US official ever discouraged him from going to Panama on a business opportunity closely related to an ongoing and sensitive foreign policy initiative. In fact, Murphy asserts that he was unaware of the Blandón Plan until early 1988. He felt his discussions with General Noriega never conflicted with other US goals, rather he thought he was "sending a corroborating message."

On the first visit to Panama in August, Murphy described to Noriega the widespread antipathy toward him in the US and suggested several steps he needed to take in order to restore economic stability to the isthmus. Once he discovered Noriega and the opposition refused to compromise, Murphy concluded that sufficient bargaining space did not exist. He returned to Panama in November only after he was told that maneuvering room was present. During this meeting, he expounded on Noriega's image problem in the US, but mentioned that there was still "room for some improvement" if the following four steps were adopted: 1) free, fair, and transparent elections, 2) reinstatement of full political rights and civil liberties, 3) a meeting with

---

29 The arrival of these men to Panama left an impression on Noriega. Park managed to persuade Sarkis Soghenalian, who later came under indictment as an arms dealer, to let him and Murphy borrow his personal jets. In August, the pair travelled alone on a private Learjet and in November they were accompanied by two other individuals on a Boeing 707, with an actual capacity of over 100 passengers. Such dramatic arrivals likely reinforced Noriega's view that Murphy carried an important message. *Drugs, Law Enforcement and Foreign Policy Part 4: The Cartel, Haiti, and Central America, Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Communications of the Comm. of Foreign Relations, 100th Cong., 274, 278 (1988) (Sarkis Soghenalian), HRG-1988-FOR-0014.*

30 *HRG-1988-FOR-0014, at 256 (Daniel Murphy, former Chief of Staff to Vice President Bush).*
opposition leaders to find a Panamanian solution, and 4) his retirement before the 1989 elections. Noriega agreed to the first three conditions and told Murphy that he "agreed in principle" to the final step, but had to think about it "carefully." Murphy also met with the opposition, who generally accepted the terms, and mentioned July 1988 as a viable date for Noriega's retirement. Murphy returned to the US encouraged, but never received further information about the situation in Panama until the failure of the Blandón plan became public knowledge in January.

Murphy's proposed steps differed in some significant ways from the Blandón plan. First, Murphy told Noriega that he did not need to resign until early 1989. This additional year likely contributed to Noriega's inclination to stall negotiations and see whether he could survive the crisis by exhausting his enemies. Second, Murphy never expressed the need to force the "Gang of Six" into retirement, which implied that the power structure of the PDF would remain largely intact. With this additional information, Noriega phoned Blandón in late November to inform him that an alternative plan more to his liking existed. The general also told his consul general that Murphy came as a representative of Secretary of State Shultz and National Security Advisor Powell. Although a likely fabrication, such proclamations displayed the necessity of a unified front, which Blandón claims existed prior to Murphy's November visit.

---

31 HRG-1988-FOR-0014, at 248 (Daniel Murphy).
32 Blandón suggested that the offer for Noriega to remain in office until 1989 had significant implications. Noriega allegedly informed Blandón that Murphy told him "anything could happen" in regard to US policy toward Panama with a new president entering office. Noriega's incorrect assessment that Bush was his "friend" would have contributed to his desire to prevaricate. Additionally, Park highlighted his connections with Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita and implied that he could ask the PM to speak to Reagan about the possibility of providing Panama with economic aid. Given Japan's interest in the stability of the Panamanian economy and security of the canal, this suggestion was not outrageous, especially because Panama's ambassador to Japan Alberto Calvo was seeking such loans at this time. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 173 (Jose Blandón); Murillo, The Noriega Mess, 638.
33 HRG-1988-FOR-0014, at 252 (Daniel Murphy). Aware that the Logan Act prohibited private citizens from negotiating on the behalf of the US, Murphy insisted that he was consulting, not negotiating with Noriega. Blandón admitted that Noriega could have just lied to him about the content of his meeting with Murphy. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 174 (Jose Blandón). On November 25th, Blandón raised the issue of Admiral Murphy's visit with Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Walker. The consul general observed that Murphy's actions undercut former Venezuelan
longer convince Noriega that his plan was the best and only option available. Now, the general
could adroitly bide his time by renegotiating better terms and provide "evidence" to subordinates
that the US was not uniformly opposed to him remaining in power.

Blandón was despondent and infuriated when Noriega informed him about Murphy's
visit, but continued to pursue his plan. In early December, he confronted Abrams and Armacost
to express his disappointment that the US was "playing two different games." 34 They assured
Blandón that Murphy never represented Secretary Shultz, but both recognized the need to correct
the false impression Murphy's trip caused. While the State Department sought an envoy with
enough stature to convince Noriega that the entire administration was against him, Noriega
continued to appear relatively open to Blandón's mission. On December 9th, he sent a cable
praising Blandón's work as "valuable" and advising him to keep discussions "under strict
control." 35 Less than two weeks later, however, Blandón received another disheartening call from
Noriega. The English version of the plan had been leaked. 36 Over the phone, Noriega screamed
at Blandón and demanded he end negotiations immediately. Blandón understood that the general
was putting on a show for high-ranking PDF officers, who likely expressed serious reservations
about the tactical blueprint in the second part of the plan, which had been previously unknown to
them. In particular, the Argentine example likely resonated with these officers. 37 In other words,

---

34 HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 174 (Jose Blandón).
35 HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 430.
36 After Blandón presented the plan to the State Department, the secret document circulated widely across US
agencies. This dismayed Blandón and McCleary who realized the dissemination of such sensitive information
increased the possibility that friendly elements in the US bureaucracy would leak the full plan to the general. The
tone if not spirit of the bluntly phrased second portion of the document likely infuriated Noriega. The general told
Blandón on December 23rd that a source in the Defense Department provided him the English version, but Blandón
questions whether this was just more bluster from his boss. HRG-1988-FOR-0012, at 175 (Jose Blandón).
President Alfonsin began prosecuting high-ranking Argentinian officers involved in the 1970s Dirty War.
Noriega's inner-circle was apt to distrust immunity guarantees, which were not forthcoming from the US anyway. They suspected Noriega may cut and run, leaving them to face the popular backlash. Not wanting the situation to get beyond his control, Noriega was retreating from the arrangement. The plan began to collapse.

As the political solution became an increasingly remote possibility, the US finally selected Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs Richard Armitage to deliver the message to Noriega that all US departments reached a consensus. It was time for him to "step back." On December 30th, Ambassador Davis, a vocal Noriega opponent, eagerly awaited Armitage's arrival. Unfortunately, the Assistant Secretary of Defense was given different instructions from the US ambassador. To make matters worse, Armitage would deliver his message meant to dress down the dictator in the company of Noriega, his translator, Davis, and a bottle of Old Parr whiskey. This environment enabled the general to manipulate the message. Noriega shared the bottle with Armitage as the latter listed US grievances and the desire to see the general retire. However, his message did not include an ultimatum or a clear articulation of the consequences Noriega faced if he refused. In a brilliant act of political theater, Noriega exited the meeting with Davis and Armitage at his side. He showed a large crowd of PDF officers the empty Old Parr whiskey bottle and gave Armitage a few boxes of Cuban cigars, including one for his "friend," Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Nestor Sanchez. This mission was the final bungled attempt to ease Noriega from office in 1987.

---

38 The Panamanian opposition preferred Nestor Sanchez or Vernon Walters, both former CIA men, but neither accepted the request. Armitage was a compromise candidate, "the only one to survive the vetoes of the different departments." Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 233.
40 In mid-January 1988, Secretary Shultz attempted to clarify the US position. He told the press that Armitage insisted Noriega should "step back" and allow "civilian authorities to take charge." On Panamanian radio, however, Noriega refuted these claims. Murillo, The Noriega Mess, 646.
41 Buckley, The Whole Story, 113.
From the beginning, Noriega's willingness to resign depended on a credible commitment from the Reagan administration, likely from the President Reagan himself, to drop the two pending and any future indictments against him in the US court system. The opposition appeared willing to grant Noriega criminal immunity, but US officials never made this concession. State Department officials in contact with Blandón lacked the jurisdiction to quash the indictments. Because the situation in Panama was not considered a real crisis, President Reagan was never consulted. The issue lingered, which meant the prospects of success were highly improbable as the credibility of the golden parachute was circumspect.

The Reagan administration also failed to deliver an unambiguous message to Noriega; several steps envisioned in the second part of Blandón's plan never occurred. First, General Woerner did not tell Noriega that all US departments, including the CIA and Pentagon, wanted him to retire. Nor is there evidence that members of the CIA or Pentagon relayed this message to high-ranking or junior officers. Second, Murphy's visit in November undermined the illusion that the administration was unified behind the Blandón Plan. Noriega could select the most appealing aspects from the various initiatives to stall for time. In hindsight, US officials should have been aware that Murphy's trip could send mixed signals and should have advised him not to go. Yet, US officials never seemed to consider the Blandón Plan a priority. Without a sense of

42 Jack Nelson, "Reagan Not Consulted on Noriega Indictments," Los Angeles Times, May 19, 1988. For this reason, cases where the leader of a foreign country is indicted by a Federal grand jury now require the President's consent.
43 Kempe (Divorcing the Dictator, 232) mentions that General Woerner was going to deliver the message to Noriega in late November, but felt the timing and atmosphere were inappropriate. They were together at a military conference in Argentina, but Noriega was partying. This was unfortunate as the message would have been well-timed. Murphy had just met Noriega, who was thrilled to inform Blandón that another plan existed.
44 While grilling Admiral Murphy about his trips to Panama during a Senate Hearing in July 1988, Senator D'Amato and Senator Kerry vented frustration that US officials like Elliott Abrams did not caution Murphy against embarking on his trip. Moreover, Murphy noted that Jack Lawn, the administrator of the DEA, told him not to be overly concerned with the pending indictments because there was insufficient evidence against Noriega. HRG-1988-FOR-0014, at 251 (Daniel Murphy). Although Noriega may have misinterpreted official US policy, he was not alone. Buckley (The Whole Story, 111) relates McCleary's realization of the Blandón plan's imminent collapse when
urgency and executive attention, overcoming the collective action problems inherent in Blandón's complex plan was unlikely. Finally, the overdue Armitage mission only highlighted Noriega's ability to alter the content of blunt messages to suit his purposes.\textsuperscript{45} This raised a strategic paradox. Noriega asked Blandón to keep details of the plan secret so that potential spoilers did not derail the process; however, relying on Noriega to disseminate information to his subordinates enabled the general to manipulate the negotiations to his advantage.

Practically the only step taken by the US as envisioned by Blandón came from Congress, which passed a resolution that suspended US aid, canceled joint military exercises, eliminated the sugar quota, and instructed US representatives at multilateral lending institutions to vote against all loans to Panama. Yet, these symbolic actions from an institution long hostile to Noriega were easy to discount as a substantive shift in US policy. Noriega could tell his officers that he still maintained influential friends in the Reagan administration.

Whether the Blandón Plan would have succeeded if the US executed its role more efficiently is unclear. Many factors were beyond US control. Some observers note that balking senior PDF officers and alleged assassination threats from the Colombian drug cartels influenced Noriega's decision to remain in power.\textsuperscript{46} In regard to the former concern, Blandón foresaw this barrier and encouraged golden parachute offers for potential veto players in the PDF ranks, namely the "Gang of Six." Such deals were not beyond the means of the Reagan administration if it was truly intent at this time on quickly resolving the Panama issue through a negotiated settlement. Regarding the threats from the drug cartels, the fear was that Noriega would provide

\textsuperscript{45} The Blandón plan was explicit that Woerner should deliver the message to Colonel Justine, Colonel Purcell, and Colonel Castillo to prevent Noriega from altering the content of such messages.

\textsuperscript{46} Blandón mentions both these possibilities. HRG-1988-FOR-0014, at 251 (Daniel Murphy).
sensitive information in exchange for a plea bargain. In the spring of 1988, a senior Panamanian official informed US negotiators that an emissary of the drug cartels told Noriega he could not leave office unless the indictments were dropped.\footnote{Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 322. Ultimately, it remains unclear whether the drug cartels would have accepted a US promise to drop the indictments and whether Noriega could trust that the drug cartels had accepted the US promise. Memo, Shultz to USDEL Sec, "TFPM01 - U.S. Inteeragency Delegation Meets with MOLIRENA Leaders, April 17." April 20, 1988. Doc. # C05669299.}

Finally, the inability to coordinate the anvil (opposition pressure) and hammer (US pressure) to compel Noriega into retirement also contributed to the failure of the Blandón Plan. After four months of constant repression, the opposition was unable to muster significant numbers for public rallies or other forms of large-scale civil disobedience in the fall. Without pressure reminding Noriega and his cronies of the regime's tenuous grip on power, the sense of urgency to negotiate an exit was absent. This lull in opposition activity may have provided Noriega a false impression that he had weathered the storm. For its part, the US was still not ready to treat the Panama "crisis" as a top national security priority that required the president's undivided attention. Therefore, bureaucratic squabbles and benign neglect contributed to the failure to develop and implement a coherent strategy with clear carrots and sticks. In sum, Blandón's hope for significant pressure from all direction never materialized.

After the Blandón Plan collapsed, the bargaining space shrank substantially. A New York Times/CBS News Poll revealed that Americans perceived drug trafficking as the gravest threat facing the country.\footnote{Elaine Sciolino and Stephen Engelberg, "Fighting Narcotics: U.S. Is Urged to Shift Tactics," New York Times, April 10, 1988.} The Reagan administration had less wiggle room to bribe Noriega from office without facing audience costs due to the artificial constraints placed by the upcoming presidential elections. Noriega also grew more defiant after his indictment; he cast the conflict as
a contest between him and the US and packed the PDF officer ranks with corrupt sycophants.\textsuperscript{49} Neither side could easily back down from their positions. The next phase of the struggle to remove Noriega began when Blandón, in a last-ditch effort on January 9\textsuperscript{th}, provided his boss an ultimatum. Either Noriega negotiate, or he would accept the US grand jury subpoena to testify about Noriega's role in drug trafficking and money laundering.\textsuperscript{50} Days later, Noriega fired Blandón, an act that further isolated the general by causing a split in the PRD. Even more devastating, Blandón provided the pending indictments against Noriega a credible voice. He could corroborate testimony of convicted drug traffickers and provide additional details as one of Noriega's closest political advisors. Blandón the witness supplied the trigger to the financial crisis detailed in Chapter six. In the midst of the economic squeeze, the US would attempt to negotiate a second golden parachute with Noriega, which is the subject of the following section.

\textit{II. The Kozak Mission}

As the liquidity crunch rattled the regime, Noriega sent out feelers through roughly a half-dozen channels about reopening negotiations over a political transition. Leaders of the NCC and opposition parties did not reject these advances, but worried that Noriega was buying time in order to reconsolidate control over the PDF. Despite an awareness that such tactical stalling entered into Noriega's strategic calculations, the US actively pursued this possibility. Michael Kozak, the State Department Legal Advisor for Latin American Affairs, and William Walker, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, arrived in Panama days after the mid-March coup attempt.

The initial meeting quickly collapsed because the distance between the bargaining positions was too great. The Reagan administration considered Noriega's grip on power so

\textsuperscript{49} The day following the indictment, Noriega delivered the "Chinese restaurant speech," where he cast the battle in terms of David vs. Goliath. He vowed not to cower before US attempts to bully "nationalistic Latin American leaders who dare to criticize the United States." Buckley, \textit{The Whole Story}, 118-9.

\textsuperscript{50} Blandón conveyed this message via two PRD colleagues visiting the US. Dinges, \textit{Divorcing the Dictator}, 291.
tenuous that it could dictate the terms of his departure. The US refused to quash the indictments, but promised not to pursue his extradition if he sought immediate political asylum in Spain.51 Although Noriega indicated a general willingness to leave office before the 1989 presidential election, he refused to accept such terms. One senior US official described Noriega in a state of denial: "He hasn't come to grips with reality. He still thinks there is some way for him to stay."52 Yet, Noriega apparently possessed more information on his prospects for survival. His purge of the PDF significantly reduced the possibility of another coup attempt in the foreseeable future. Although Shultz, Powell, and Abrams issued ominous warnings on Sunday talk shows that time was running out for him to go into golden exile, Noriega called the bluff.53 He correctly calculated that the US was not prepared to use military force. Negotiations would not progress until more information was revealed about the relative strength and resolve of each side.

A month later, Noriega's ability to survive the immediate crisis was apparent. The opposition had been unable to mount any significant pressure since the crackdown in late March and liquidity slowly returned to the economy. In a mid-April assessment of the situation, the US embassy in Panama acknowledged that pressure on Noriega to step down had diminished.54 Kozak returned to the negotiation table prepared to explore the conditions Noriega would accept in exchange for his retirement. The negotiation sessions bridged a number of contentious issues, but Noriega would not seriously consider stepping down until the US promised to drop the indictments. He told Kozak, "If the day comes for me to step down and those indictments are still

---

51 France was another acceptable choice for the US, but the Reagan administration would not allow Noriega to seek political asylum in the Dominican Republic, where his daughter lived. The request for exile in the Dominican Republic was denied because the Reagan administration believed Noriega could corrupt that country's weak political institutions. It also was simply too close to Panama. Lou Cannon, "Deal Reached for Noriega to Yield Power," Washington Post, April 29, 1988.
in place, I'm not stepping down ... No deal." On multiple occasions in late April, Kozak relayed this information to Shultz. With the threat of military force off the table, he argued that the indictment was the only real bargaining chip the US possessed, "It's a great personal affront to him and he's afraid of it." On May 9th, Reagan informed Attorney General Ed Meese that he would allow Kozak to leverage the indictment in bargaining for Noriega's exit. This decision unleashed a flurry of activity. With the missing piece of the negotiation puzzle in play, Reagan and Noriega approved a provisional plan within days.

Noriega obtained a highly favorable deal with several face saving measures. After the US lifted sanctions and Japan deposited $67 million in the Panama National Bank, Noriega would announce his plans to retire on August 12th, the fifth anniversary of his command. He would appoint the next PDF commander and establish a five-year maximum term for all future commanders. He would then call on the National Assembly to grant amnesty to all members of the opposition, restore the constitutional guarantees suspended in mid-March, and make preparations for establishing a committee of national reconciliation. He would announce his plans to take a "long vacation" after retirement that would last until the presidential elections in May 1989. The US assured him that he could briefly return to Panama during the holidays to visit family. If Noriega carried out his promise to retire and depart on August 12th, the Reagan administration would approve the request of Noriega's lawyers to dismiss the indictments. The US would continue to recognize Delvalle as the legitimate head of the government, but would also cooperate with the Solis regime during an interim nine-month government of national

---

55 Kempe, *Divorcing the Dictator*, 320.
57 Ibid., 1058-59.
58 Kempe, *Divorcing the Dictator*, 322.
59 Noriega's negotiation team insisted the $67 million dollars was needed to inject immediate liquidity into the financial system, but several officials worried Noriega would simply take the money after he retired.
reconciliation. Finally, if the US deemed the 1989 elections free and fair, it would release the funds held in Delvalle's escrow account.\textsuperscript{60}

Although information about the negotiations surfaced in late April and early May, the Reagan administration managed to keep details sufficiently ambiguous to avoid a significant backlash. In part, it also tried to manage expectations. For instance, the White House spokesman, Marlin Fitzwater, stated in late April, "[US] policy is that General Noriega must go, which means leave power... We have said we prefer to see him leave Panama but the policy issue is leave power."\textsuperscript{61} The opposition expressed some fears over the possibility that the US would allow Noriega to remain in Panama after his resignation, but no details emerged that threatened to derail the negotiations until Reagan's decision to drop the indictments. Shultz believes the Department of Justice began to leak details about the \textit{quid pro quo} shortly after Reagan met with Meese.\textsuperscript{62} Regardless of the source, CNN began reporting on May 12\textsuperscript{th} that the administration was willing to drop the indictments. This revelation caused a firestorm.

Frozen out of the negotiation process by the State Department, Panamanian opposition leaders feared the Reagan administration was rushing toward the exit. The concessions made to realize Noriega's departure seemed like a quick fix that would leave the corrupt system largely intact. Given the movement's growing reliance on the US, its leadership possessed few tools to influence the negotiations. Real pressure came from the administration's domestic critics, who pointed out the hypocrisy of lifting indictments against the architect of the world's first narco-military dictatorship, while simultaneously waging a "zero-tolerance" war on drugs. Attorneys general involved in Noriega's drug indictments publicly denounced the decision. The US District

\textsuperscript{60} The description for the terms of this deal borrows heavily from Scranton, \textit{The Noriega Years}, 149-150.
\textsuperscript{62} Shultz, \textit{Turmoil and Triumph}, 1059.
Court Judge assigned Noriega's case noted that he could and perhaps would refuse to "dismiss an indictment on the motion of the government." Senators also joined the fray. The Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole (R-Kan.) argued that the administration was sending "the wrong message at the wrong time to the world's drug kingpins." This public outrage placed greater pressure on members of Reagan's administration, particularly Vice President Bush. Significantly trailing Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis in the presidential polls, candidate Bush's campaign handlers viewed the Panama issue as a golden opportunity to recast their candidate's image. Public opposition to lifting the indictments would help Bush get out from under President Reagan's shadow, dispel nagging rumors about his past dealings with Noriega, and appear tough on an issue considered the greatest threat facing the nation. The overall effect of the leaks was to shorten the timeframe and narrow the political space for an acceptable deal.

On May 13th, a negotiated settlement appeared within reach. An announcement of the bargain was set for the following day, but several top officials urged Reagan to explore other alternatives. According to Shultz, Reagan acquiesced to this pressure and waited until Monday to review the options one final time. Two days later, the president reconvened his top advisors and decided to drop the indictments. Kozak left for Panama to finalize the deal as public pressure escalated at home. On May 17th, the Senate passed a nonbinding resolution condemning any arrangement dropping the indictment charges by a vote of 86 to 10. The next day, Bush publicly

---

65 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 336-337. The Bush-Noriega connection was a significant issue during the presidential primaries. Both Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan) and Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis raised questions about possible deals Bush made with Noriega dating back to his years as CIA director. A New York Times article published on May 8th, 1988 resurrected the issue by exploring what Bush may have known about Noriega's illicit activities and when such information may have been available to him. The Bush-Noriega connection remained in the headlines throughout this entire period.
66 Shultz, Turmoil and Triumph, 1062.
joined the growing list of detractors. In an address to the L.A. police academy, the presidential
hopeful said "won't bargain with drug dealers ... whether they're on U.S. or foreign soil." 67
Privately, only the State Department unambiguously supported Reagan's decision to move
forward with the deal.

The one detail that remained unresolved when Kozak returned to Panama was money. In
early May, Noriega's negotiating team insisted that the regime needed money. The logic ran that
if civil liberties were restored and banks could not cash checks, then unrest would follow. The
US would not release the funds in Delvalle's escrow account until a new president was elected.
Instead of dropping the issue, Undersecretary of State Michael Armacost pursued Colonel
Justine's suggestion to inquire whether Japan or Taiwan would provide a loan. 68 Although Japan
never provided a firm guarantee, a clause in the deal Noriega approved on May 10th read that
Japan would deposit $67 million in the Panama National Bank. On May 13th, the Japanese
ambassador to the US informed Kozak that his government would not provide the loan without
assurances that the Reagan administration would refund Japan's money if the deposit vanished.
The administration was unwilling to expose itself to such a potentially embarrassing scenario. 69

This setback turned into an impasse. On May 17th, Abrams reported to Shultz that "the
money is the last piece." Secretary Shultz found this a moot issue because liquidity would
quickly return once US sanctions were removed. He viewed the money as a bribe that Noriega
and his cronies could use for propaganda purposes and/or steal. Reagan shared these concerns
and wanted Shultz to relay a message to Kozak on May 18th to drop the money component to the

---

68 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 325.
69 Murillo, The Noriega Mess, 700.
bargain. Kozak was to tell Noriega to take the deal or leave it. Before Kozak could deliver this message, however, his Panamanian interlocutors mentioned that a Colombian private bank would deposit the money in $15 million increments with US approval. Shultz called the Colombian Foreign Minister on May 19th and said that the US would not oppose the action, but would not provide confidential guarantees to the bank's board of directors. The following day, Kozak reported that the deal was close at hand. The Colombian government supported the action. Once the bank's board agreed to transfer the money, Noriega would sign the deal in twenty-four hours. Just before receiving this news, however, the CIA director Bill Webster told Shultz that the bank was deeply implicated in the laundering of drug money. This complication caused Reagan to call Kozak back for a weekend consultation about the deal.

As expected, the Saturday and Sunday meetings at the White House were tense. Meese, Baker, and Bush argued the deal was rotten. It sent the wrong message to the American public, the law enforcement community, and drug traffickers. The president should explore other options before committing to this one. In contrast, Shultz defended the plan as the only workable solution with military options off the table. By Sunday evening, Reagan stood firm by his earlier decision. He told Kozak to move forward with the negotiations. According to Kempe, Reagan asked Kozak whether he could finalize the deal by May 25th, the day the president would depart for the Moscow Summit. Kozak replied that this was infeasible. Noriega always said he needed four or five days to get his officers in line. Plus, alterations to the financial package created difficulties. Preparations for the money transfer from the Colombian bank fell apart after Shultz called the Colombian Foreign Minister on May 21st to withdrawal his private statement of

---

70 Shultz, Turmoil and Triumph, 1065.
71 Ibid., 1067-1070.
72 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 323. The following description of the final days of this negotiation process borrows heavily from Kempe's account.
neutrality over the issue. In the end, Reagan never gave Kozak an ultimatum; instead, he told his negotiator to "give it a try."

When Kozak returned to Panama, he told his counterpart, Romulo Escobar Bethancourt, that the president would like a deal by May 25th "if possible." The two sides worked assiduously to finalize the details of the plan. The time factor re-emerged as a potential spoiler the following afternoon when US officials reinterpreted Reagan's words. Armacost told Kozak that Noriega had until the next day to accept the deal. Kozak informed Noriega's negotiators of the ultimatum. Within hours, Noriega agreed to the deal. Unfortunately, public messages from Washington did not reinforce the sense of urgency. On the same day Kozak received word of the ultimatum, one official said, "We'd like it to be settled before [the summit]. But we're prepared to leave it until after the summit if we have to." Reagan echoed this sentiment, "We're not going by time. We're going by quality." These mixed messages only contributed to Noriega's penchant for dragging negotiations and his belief that the take-it-or-leave-it ultimatum was a bluff.

The following morning, Kozak could not find the general to sign the deal and deposit the documents at the nuncio's residence as previously agreed. Local Panamanian media outlets began to report that PDF majors were attempting to convince Noriega to stay. Once Kozak finally convened with Noriega at 11 AM, the US chief negotiator could tell the news of an internal crisis within the PDF was not a ruse. Noriega complained to Kozak that he always said he needed some days to sell the plan, but he was never given proper time. The leaks in the US press on May

73 Shultz, *Turmoil and Triumph*, 1075. Shultz explains that Noriega accepted this fact and agreed to move ahead because Texaco provided assurances to release funds for the purposes of liquidity when the deal was finalized.
74 Kempe, *Divorcing the Dictator*, 316.
75 Ibid., 325.
76 Ibid., 326. Shultz (*Turmoil and Triumph*, 1075-1079) provides a slightly different version of the account. He intimates that an ultimatum was made clear on May 23rd.
12th complicated the negotiations by increasing fears among his officers that he would abandon them. Noriega now worried that the junior officers would attempt a coup if he followed through with the deal. For over two hours, Kozak emphasized that this was Noriega's final chance. Noriega seemed forlorn, but said he could not accept. Kozak shook his hand and went to Bethancourt's office to call Shultz and say the deal was off. During this conversation, however, Noriega called on another line and informed Kozak he would sign the papers today and deposit them at the nuncio's office. He would make his speech when Reagan returned from the Moscow Summit in two weeks. Kozak relayed the message, but was told to leave. Minutes later, Shultz announced that the deal had fallen through and departed for Moscow.

III: Unrealized Golden Parachutes

Many post-mortems followed this abnormally public offer of a golden parachute. Noriega seemed to dangle the possibility of his exit as a distraction to regain control over the PDF, find alternative revenue streams to survive the liquidity crunch, and repress the opposition. This interpretation is valid. He stalled to improve his bargaining position and to ensure a viable alternative in case talks collapsed. However, such actions should not be conflated as evidence that he was unprepared to accept the deal negotiated by Kozak. Divining Noriega's true motives is impossible, but he did begin to fall in line once the Reagan administration basically issued an ultimatum. On May 24th, he accepted the fact that the money was no longer part of the deal. Once he realized Kozak was not bluffing about taking the deal off the table on the 25th, he expressed a readiness to sign the agreement. Therefore, Commerce Minister Rognoni's explanation on May 26th that the "artificial deadline" prevented the resolution of remaining

---

79 Kempe, Divorcing the Dictator, 323, 328-29.
80 Ibid., 329-330.
81 Scranton, The Noriega Years, 43.
barriers that were "differences in form, not substance" appears sincere.\textsuperscript{82} This second case raises two important dilemmas that surface when offering an embattled leader a golden parachute.

First, dictators have an incentive to procrastinate when offered immunity in exchange for retirement unless the regime's collapse is imminent. The leader will bargain hard for better terms while simultaneously evaluating the opposition's strength. In the case of Panama, Noriega's grip was not tenuous in May 1988, but he understood the prospect for long-term was rather bleak. The ultimatum forced a decision point. Noriega could choose long-term personal security or short-term political survival with a faint hope of re-establishing long-term control. The US dilemma was to deliver a clear, credible ultimatum. In a sense, the Reagan administration was well positioned to signal its resolve. Bush and Congress were playing the public role of "bad cops." Unfortunately, the pace at which the US delivered the fait accompli was imperfect. By giving Noriega one day to reach a crucial decision, the US dismissed his legitimate concerns. His personal security was at stake if he was unable to remain PDF \textit{comandante} until his retirement in August. Besides the suddenness of the final offer, Noriega also received mixed messages that led him to view the ultimatum as a bluff until his final session with Kozak. Despite his attempt to backtrack and accept the offer minutes after Kozak left, frustrated US officials in Washington cut off the talks fearing another ruse to buy more time.\textsuperscript{83} However, this refusal to acknowledge Noriega's deal was not based on national security interests. The US did not have any coherent policy alternative to negotiations. Thus, the administration was not losing any leverage if Noriega backtracked upon Reagan's return. The problem was the domestic public pressure and upcoming presidential elections. Individuals in the administration felt compelled to resolve the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{83} One high-level official in the Reagan administration noted that Noriega's motives were unclear, but "the majority view [in the administration] is that he was never serious" about stepping down. Josh Goshko, "Panama Talks to Oust Noriega Fail," \textit{Washington Post}, May 26, 1988.
\end{flushright}
crisis immediately. This created hasty "artificial deadlines" that undermined Kozak's ability to issue an effective ultimatum that truly gauged Noriega's willingness to step aside gracefully.

A second dilemma that appears to surface during discussions over golden parachutes is the degree to apply further pressure on the targeted leaders, who will take actions during this negotiation phase to strengthen their bargaining position and maintain options in case talks fail. This was certainly the case with Noriega. He viewed escalation of pressure on his adversaries as complementary to his own efforts to drive a hard bargain during the spring. Panamanian special operations teams infiltrated Southcom bases on multiple occasions; the PDF arrested over 40 opposition leaders; and, Noriega delivered acerbic speeches, including one infamous occasion when he waved a machete in front of a crowd of Latin American labor leaders and screamed "not one step back" to US pressure.\(^{84}\) In contrast, several US policymakers perceived a tension between the different tactics available to resolve the crisis. Actions meant to foment a coup could breed mistrust and antipathy that would derail negotiations.\(^{85}\) Thus, aside from the bureaucratic struggles that undermined concerted application of diplomatic, economic, and military pressure, the Reagan administration intentionally avoided pressing Noriega too hard in the spring of 1988. For instance, the implementation of the IEEPA was purposely delayed to give the Kozak mission time in April and May.\(^{86}\) This hesitation to pressure Noriega from multiple directions eroded the effectiveness of the "feast or famine," "isolate and unite," and "decapitation" mechanisms. The US appeared to tie one hand behind its back while bargaining with the dictator. For Noriega, the apparent consequences of not accepting the negotiated settlement lessened as negotiations


\(^{85}\) Noriega did not want to leave the impression that he was retiring due to US pressure, which explains the number of face-saving measures outlined in the final deal for his exit.

\(^{86}\) Scranton, \textit{The Noriega Years}, 139. Yates (\textit{US Military Intervention in Panama}, 63) argues the delay was caused by Treasury Department attempts to stall a policy it believed could never succeed.
proceeded. The civil disobedience campaign faded in April, and US actions meant to pressure him were diluted. In short, the task of rightsizing pressure to maximize the attractiveness of the golden parachute offer was difficult.

When the deal collapsed, Noriega had taken steps to prepare for such an outcome. In the short-term, he maintained a firm grip over Panama. This was not the case for his adversaries. As the opposition proved unable to rally large numbers of people to the streets, one NCC leader suggested that their new strategy was "to wear [the regime] out."87 The US approach was essentially the same. As one senior State Department official noted, "the administration had staked its hopes of resolving the Panama situation on the negotiations ... and did not have a fallback position."88 Ultimately, the US never adhered to the promise it made to the opposition that sanctions were the first step in a series of escalating measures to unseat Noriega. Diluted IEEPA sanctions remained in effect. Panama's economy continued to wither.89 The US hoped for change, but was unwilling to press the issue. As one observer trenchantly commented in late July 1988, "What ever happened to Panama? For the American public, it has vanished into journalistic no man's land -- just where the Reagan administration wants it."90 Considered a liability for Vice President Bush's presidential run, further public confrontations with Noriega were held in abeyance until 1989.91

87 Yates, US Military Intervention in Panama, 64.
89 Panama's government released economic figures in early 1989 that gave a sense of the collapse that occurred in 1988. The "economy had plummeted by 20%, unemployment had risen to 23%, and all major sectors of the economy suffered terribly: new construction fell 78%; electrical consumption, 21%; tourism, 35%; imports, 44%; exports, 17%; and industrial production, 23%." Harding, Military Foundations, 173. The revenues for the central government fell from $1 billion in 1987 to around $500 million in 1988, which was just enough to meet Panama's government payroll. Ropp, "Military Retrenchment," 39.
91 Plans actively seeking Noriega's removal ended in late July 1988 when the covert operation known as Panama 3 was made public. This CIA covert operation would seek to encourage a coup by senior PDF officers led by Col. Herrera Hassan, the Panamanian ambassador to Israel at the time. Because the mission required funding, the
This chapter explored the "golden parachute" tactic as a potential solution to stalemated UI campaigns. By alleviating a leader's fear concerning personal security after leaving office, such an offer can help induce a political transition. General Noriega considered such proposals on two occasions. The Blandón Plan collapsed for several reasons. Most importantly, the US would not provide Noriega clear guarantees of immunity from criminal charges in the US in exchange for retirement. Blandón's approach proved too ambitious because it did not have the full support of the patron. The Reagan administration agreed that Noriega should go, but various departments in the government placed different priorities on this goal. This bureaucratic conflict prevented the formulation of coordinated pressure including the clear quid pro quo Noriega required before he retired. The absence of executive direction also contributed to mixed signals from US officials. Meanwhile, the civil disobedience campaign fizzled exactly at the time internal pressure was needed to remind Noriega of his weak grip on power. In sum, collective action problems undermined what appeared a potent plan on paper.

The second attempt in the spring of 1988 appeared more promising. The Reagan administration seemed committed to a peaceful settlement and the offer to drop the indictments against Noriega were credible. The general's ability to survive the acute fiscal crisis enabled him to extract maximum concessions from the US. A deal appeared imminent, but fell through at the last minute. Frustrated US officials tired of the resourceful dictator's cat and mouse games issued a poorly timed fait accompli. As demonstrated during the Blandón negotiations, Noriega administration was required to present the plan to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence for approval. The Senate Committee rejected the plan. due to the fact that the operation could fail or result in Noriega's death, which would be equivalent to leadership assassination. Donnelly, The Storming of Panama, 38-39. Interagency consensus on the wisdom of attempting such a covert operation was also fragile. Details of the plan were leaked to the press after the Senate briefing. The administration attempted to blame Congress for the intelligence breach, but the clumsy leak was the result of bureaucratic infighting. Some administration officials seemed to want to kill the covert plan permanently. Buckley, The Whole Story, 164-166.
appeared more concerned about a coup than the civil disobedience campaign. If he could not convince the colonels and majors that the deal provided them favorable conditions, the personal security guarantee protecting him from US prosecution on drug trafficking and money laundering charges was moot. Although Noriega was a master manipulator and may have continued to fight for political survival after signing the secret bargain, dismissing the regime's claim that "artificial deadlines" set by the US derailed the negotiations is premature. In hindsight, the US attempt to leverage the golden parachute was imperfect.

Ultimately, when the regime's downfall is not imminent, a tension that favors the regime appears to exist when offers of amnesty are part of the bargaining process. The patron's offer of a golden parachute creates moral hazard as the dictator possesses a fail-safe option. The embattled regime has an incentive to stall to extract more favorable terms and potentially to outlast the pressure from a heterogeneous set of adversaries. Begging dictators to accept even very generous severance packages is unlikely to succeed in a stalemated situation. An effective golden parachute requires additional forms of coercive diplomacy that make efforts to stall costly. A clear ultimatum of permanently withdrawing immunity is an extreme option difficult to signal credibly without alternative policy options readily available, such as the threat of further sanctions or the use of force. Yet, patrons are hesitant to escalate on two counts. First, stubborn dictators may force hesitant patrons to carry out the threat. Second, proud leaders often insist on saving face. Negotiators cannot discount such factors, but neither can they allow dictators to abuse this consideration. The Yemen case studies identify similar patterns and reveal that golden parachutes work only when additional pressure removes the option to stall for survival.
Chapter 8
Decapitation II: The Spring of 2011 in Yemen

During his 33 year reign, Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh adroitly counterbalanced potential political rivals against each other, a practice he likened to "dancing on the heads of snakes." However, maintenance of this complex patronage system grew increasingly cumbersome. While Saleh groomed his son as Yemen's future president, economic rents based on oil exports rapidly shrank. The loss of this crucial source of government revenue compelled Saleh to abandon Yemen's inclusive authoritarian model. He increasingly concentrated power and wealth around a narrowing circle of political cronies, thereby increasing the ranks of disillusioned elite more willing to defect during a regime crisis. By 2009, the fragility of the political status quo was evident. Infamously, one outspoken opposition figure discussed plans with the US embassy to launch a popular uprising similar to the one that toppled Suharto's regime in Indonesia if the upcoming 2011 parliamentary elections were unfair. US embassy officers dismissed this tough talk as bluster, but such warnings turned out to be prophetic.

An elite struggle for political reform was underway in Yemen before the Arab Spring. The Joint Meeting Parties (JMP), a political opposition coalition, had threatened to boycott the 2009 parliamentary elections. As a result, the ruling General People's Congress (GPC) postponed the elections until 2011 and launched negotiations over significant constitutional reforms. In late December 2010, however, the GPC unilaterally decided to abandon negotiations altogether and

---

2 Shortly before defecting in 2009, Sheikh Tariq al-Fadhli, a former jihadist turned Saleh supporter from the restive Southern governorate of Abyan, explained, "We came to the voice of the power, and we returned without any snakes even. And those who knew they already had their snakes clasped them closer." Clark, *Heads of Snakes*, 253.
3 Craig Whitlock, "U.S. Was Told of Yemen's Leader's Weakness," *Washington Post*, April 7, 2011. The Yemeni interlocutor, Hamid al-Ahmar, was a billionaire businessman with presidential ambitions and one of sheikh Abdullah al-Ahmar's ten sons, who was the head of the most powerful tribal confederation in Yemen, the Hashid, and considered one of the country's most powerful figures before his death in 2007.
4 Three issues dominated this two-year bargaining period: presidential term limits, the composition of the Special Committee for Elections and Referendums (SCER), and the reallocation of key presidential powers to parliament.
prepare for the upcoming parliamentary elections scheduled for April. Protests initially supporting political reforms transformed into a leaderless popular revolt fashioned after the successful revolutions in Tunisia and Egypt. A turning point in the peaceful struggle for Saleh's overthrow occurred on March 18th when government snipers killed at least 45 peaceful protesters amassed at "Change Square" in Sana. Mass security defections followed. Recognizing Saleh as a source of instability, the US and Saudi Arabia (KSA) began to nudge him toward the exit.

Aptly described as "a warlord with half an army," a gentlemanly exchange of immunity from prosecution for retirement seemed to be in the interests of all parties. Both the US and KSA feared the national security repercussions should the centrifugal forces tear the weak state asunder. Fixated on the threat of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), both patrons sought a rapid, peaceful, and smooth transfer of power. There was no plan B. Unfortunately, Saleh continued to play games. He spurned generous severance packages on three separate occasions in April and May, only to accept the golden parachute in November.

Like the Panama case, the amnesty offer was an insufficient, but necessary condition to resolve the conflict short of a coup, civil war, or foreign imposed regime change. Yet, the golden

---

5 "UK Think Tank Discusses Yemen," Yemen Times, May 16, 2011.
6 The inability to realize Saleh's departure in May ended in a suboptimal outcome for all parties. While death toll figures vary substantially, many innocent protesters lost their lives because Saleh failed to accept the golden parachute in May 2011. Human Rights Watch confirmed that 270 protesters died and over 1,000 were injured in 2011, while Yemen's Ministry of Human Rights estimates around 2,000 protesters died and over 22,000 were injured. "Amnesty for Saleh and Aides Unlawful," Human Rights Watch, January 23, 2012; Ahmed al-Haj, "Yemen Says more than 2,000 Killed in Uprising," Washington Post, March 18, 2012. The Saudi newspaper Asharq al-Awsat estimated 179 protesters were dead in mid-May just before Saleh's third refusal to transfer power. By the end of May, 120 more would die. "Armed Civilians Would 15 Yemen Protesters: Medics," Asharq al-Awsat, May 14, 2011; "Al Qaeda Group Tightens Grip on Yemen Coastal Town," Asharq al-Awsat, May 29, 2011. Although the government did not release official figures, the economy experienced a contraction in real GDP of over 10 percent. Economist Intelligence Unit, Yemen: Country Report (London: June 2012), 8. This situation was particularly devastating in Yemen where the average rural Yemeni household spends about 55 percent of their income on food, water, and energy. World Bank, Household Energy Supply and Use in Yemen (Washington, DC: 2005), 3. Besides significant disruptions in telecommunications, electricity, and access to clean drinking water, fuel scarcity increased the cost of basic food commodities, which increased 43 percent on average by August 2011. "Yemen Humanitarian Emergency - Situation Report No. 5," UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, July 25th, 2011. Despite all this suffering, Saleh did not extract more generous terms for his retirement mainly because the original deal more or less granted his every demand save remaining president.
parachute created moral hazard. As the patrons hesitated to delineate a clear red line, Saleh stalled for time and applied significant deadly force in the hope that the fissiparous opposition would crumble, leaving his erstwhile foreign allies a choice between him and chaos. The odds of success were small, but such a strategy was not a high risk gamble. His patrons never dared to threaten the withdrawal of the immunity clause fearing Saleh might call the bluff. Without a clear and credible threat of negative sanctions, however, Saleh had little reason to end the political stalemate. This heightened the suffering of Yemen's civilian population and arguably increased the chances of civil war. Indeed, a precipitating cause for Saleh's decision to sign the GCC offer was the credible threat from the US and its European allies to consider personal asset freezes on Saleh and his close relatives.

The next two chapters argue that the amnesty guarantee alone provided perverse incentives for strategic stalling. Clear and credible threats from Yemen's patrons were necessary to coax the risk acceptant leader from office. I begin this most similar case design by identifying key features of Saleh's regime, various strands of the Yemeni opposition, and Saleh's relationship with the US and KSA. The next section reviews the watershed moments of Yemen's revolution prior to the first formal golden parachute offer in late April. Finally, I discuss how the patrons' meek response to Saleh's obstinacy in April and May contributed to his calculations to stall for survival. Chapter 9 looks at patron efforts in the fall of 2011 to evaluate the contention that coercive diplomacy was necessary to remove the option of prevarication and compel Saleh to decide between civil war and personal security.
I. The Political Environment

1.a. Saleh's regime

In 1978, Ali Abdullah Saleh rose from relative obscurity as a military governor of Taiz to become the country's third strongman in five years. CIA analysts wagered that Saleh would not last longer than six months. Both his predecessors were assassinated and the untested new leader lacked a natural base of support. Saleh defied these skeptics. After surviving early assassination attempts and coup plots, he managed to consolidate power over the Yemen Arab Republic (YAR). During the 1980s, he masterfully pitted potential rivals against each other and formed critical alliances with Sheikh Abdullah al-Ahmar, the leader of Yemen's most powerful tribal confederation the Hashid, and Ali Mohsin al-Ahmar, a powerful military commander who became the regime's ruthless enforcer of last resort.\(^7\)

In 1990, several factors pushed the YAR and People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY) toward unification within the framework of a parliamentary democracy. First, the bankrupt PDRY no longer received subsidies from Moscow and the YAR sought political legitimacy to preserve access to donor money. Second, newly discovered oil fields on the border risked the possibility of armed conflict. Third, the political leadership of the two Yemeni states perceived an opportunity to "outmaneuver their counterparts" and "expand their own power."\(^8\)

Thus, a zero sum mentality and trust deficit accompanied the rush toward unification. An

---

\(^7\) While the socialist PDRY aggressively pursued a policy aimed at eradicating the tribal order, Saleh embraced this social structure in the YAR. The two most powerful tribal confederations are the Hashid and Bakil, known as the wings of the Imamate. Although smaller in size than the Bakil, the Hashid is hierarchically structured, which makes the latter a more coherent political force. Steven C. Caton ed. *Middle East in Focus: Yemen* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2013), 170-171. Ali Abdullah Saleh and Ali Mohsin al-Ahmar are both from the relatively small Sanhan tribe, which is part of the Hashid confederation. Despite sharing the same last name, General Ali Mohsin was not related to Sheikh Abdullah al-Ahmar; rather, he is a blood relative of Ali Abdullah Saleh.

\(^8\) Sarah Phillips, *Yemen's Democracy Experiment in Regional Perspective* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 48. Although the population of the PDRY was approximately one-fifth that of the YAR, the PDRY leadership seemed convinced that the socialist platform could attract a large number of votes.
especially telling sign was the lack of security sector reform. After unification, both parties maintained independent military forces. With the help of the newly formed Islamist party, al-Islah, Saleh managed to outmaneuver the Yemen Socialist Party (YSP) in the April 1993 parliamentary elections. With only 56 out of 301 parliamentary seats, Yemeni Vice President Ali Salim al-Beidh continued to press core YSP demands, like greater devolution of powers to the governorates. In contrast, Saleh sought to institutionalize his short-term advantage by asserting "political control through a process of bureaucratic centralization." In August 1993, al-Beidh retreated to Aden, the capital of the former PDRY and Yemen's largest port city, citing continued political violence toward YSP members and Saleh's efforts to marginalize the South. Months of political deadlock ended when the respective militaries began clashing in April 1994. In May, the PDRY declared independence. With the help of Afghan Arabs, who recently returned after years of fighting against the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, Aden fell in six weeks and was subsequently ransacked. Despite a veneer of reconciliation by appointing some Southerners to high ranking governmental positions, this brief civil war and its aftermath created deep-seated grievances that would resurface years later.

Saleh's subordination of political rivals from the South granted him sole access to oil revenue that he used to co-opt Yemeni elites and perpetuate his inclusive authoritarian regime centered around the Northern tribal elite network. From $1.75 billion in 1994, Yemen's net oil exports value peaked at $6.2 billion in 2008, which roughly accounted for 90 percent of the

9 The founders of Islah were Sheikh Abdullah al-Ahmar, Ali-Mohsin al-Ahmar, Abdul Majeed al-Zindani, and Mohammed al-Yadoumi. Similar to the GPC, Islah was a broad political coalition loosely organized around Islamic principles that included so many schools of thought as to render its ideological foundation incoherent. In the 1993 parliamentary elections, Islah gained 7 more seats than the YSP, even though the latter obtained 1.5 percent more of the popular vote. This result enabled the GPC to form a coalition government with Islah that lasted until 1997.
country's export revenue and 75 percent of the central government's budget.\textsuperscript{12} The other major change in Yemen's political economy occurred in 1990 when Saudi Arabia expelled around 800,000 Yemeni workers. Aside from the lack of proper infrastructure to absorb this large unemployed population, Yemen's economy lost approximately $1.5 billion in remittances.\textsuperscript{13} These economic developments fundamentally transformed Yemen from a remittance "rich populace, poor state" to an oil "rich state, poor populace."\textsuperscript{14} Instead of investing oil export revenues to diversify the economy and ensure long-term sustainable growth, Saleh exploited this influx in economic rents to manufacture continued political fealty to his personal rule.

While Yemen's democracy provided a vent for popular frustrations and a sounding board for legitimate complaints, the political elite understood that real power existed outside these formal institutional trappings. As one member of parliament noted, "Our institutions are only decoration for the world."\textsuperscript{15} The informal institutions undergirding the political system relied on material incentives. Saleh mixed positive inducements and negative sanctions to obtain loyalty, but developed a preference for "co-option, compromise, and divide and rule tactics over exclusion and direct confrontation."\textsuperscript{16} Known as "the president's cashier," the Ministry of Finance emerged as a critical institution that ceded unofficial control over all financial, customs, administrative, and personnel matters to Saleh.\textsuperscript{17} This enabled him to distribute a wide variety of military-security, public sector, private sector, and political patronage.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{13} Dresch, \textit{Modern Yemen}, 158.
\textsuperscript{14} Clark, \textit{Heads of Snakes}, 139.
\textsuperscript{15} Phillips, \textit{Yemen's Democracy Experiment}, 76.
\textsuperscript{16} April Longley Alley, \textit{Shifting Light in the Qamariyya: The Reinvention of Patronage Networks in Contemporary Yemen} (PhD diss., Georgetown University, 2008), 62.
\textsuperscript{17} Phillips, \textit{Yemen's Democracy Experiment}, 73-75.
\textsuperscript{18} Alley, \textit{Shifting Light}, 26.
One parsimonious way to cut into Yemen's complex patronage networks is to identify four ideal-type elite categories: tribal elites, religious leaders, traditional merchants, and technocrats. Antagonistic symbiosis captured the relationship between the tribal confederations dominant in the North and the central government. Saleh always lacked the necessary coercive capacity to subordinate the tribal confederations. Rather, he encouraged the application of tribal law to alleviate the cost of governing these highly autonomous regions while distributing patronage broadly to purchase loyalty and cultivate peripheral dependence on the central government. The level of patronage depended on a variety of factors, including a tribe's coercive capacity, its proximity to the regime's inner core, its track record of loyalty, and tactical usefulness it served Saleh at any particular moment. This latter variable was part of Saleh's

---

19 As Alley ("Rule of the Game," 390) observes, these categories are not mutually exclusive.
20 Day (Regionalism and Rebellion, 100) perhaps overstates his case about Northern hegemony when he asserts that the "power of the state was the power of President Saleh's Hashid tribe," but he does capture a fundamental truth that the regime's core is centered around the Hashid tribal confederation, especially those hailing from the Sanhan tribe.
21 According to the World Bank's World Development Indicators, 70 percent of Yemen's population lived outside urban centers in 2007. Since the tribal system structures rural life in the country's populous Northern regions, this ratio provides a rough indicator for the continued significance of the tribes. Direct confrontation to subordinate Yemen's tribes to central authority was never an option. Tribal sheikhs possessed a ready made militia at a moment's notice. Yemen only trails the US in gun-to-population ratio; all tribesmen own at least one small firearm. See Derek B. Miller, Demand, Stockpiles, and Social Controls: Small Arms in Yemen (Geneva: Small Arms Survey, 2003).
22 The varieties of patronage to tribal sheikhs were vast. The following provides just a few examples beyond the fact that the national budget included direct tribal subsidies Glenn E. Robinson et al. Yemen Corruption Assessment (Burlington, VT: ARD, 2006), 4. Sheikhs received high-level political appointments in the GPC, lucrative advisory or administrative positions, and ghost positions in the military. One knowledgeable officer noted that sheikhs became "colonels without any training" to such an extent under Saleh that "approximately 14,000 colonels" were "in the army – more than all other officer ranks combined." Crisis Group, Yemen's Military Security Reform: Seeds of New Conflict, April 2013, 30. The government allotted sheikhs subsidies to hire personal security guards. Robinson et al., Corruption Assessment, 5. Tribal leaders participated in tax-farming in the coastal/lower regions of the country. Day, Rebellion and Regionalism, 97. The regime also encouraged sheikhs to become businessmen through private sector patronage. One prominent example of this sheikh-turned-businessman is Hamid al-Ahmar, who became a billionaire by obtaining preferential access to state contracts through his proximity to Saleh. Some analysts note that this policy served as an additional regime control mechanism through "co-optive distancing." Paul K Dresch, "The Tribal Factor in the Yemeni Crisis," in The Yemen War of the 1994: Causes and Consequences, ed. Jamal S. Al-Suwaidi (London: Saqi Books, 1995), 38. As sheikhs spent more time in Sana on business ventures and political activities, they became detached from their base of local power, which increased their dependence on the central government. This approach became a liability when economic rents began to disappear because more young sheikhs expected a share in the shrinking patronage system. Alley, Shifting Light, 152.
23 Alley, "Rules of the Game," 395-99. The amount of patronage extracted from the central government was a fluid process constantly under renegotiation. When tribal leaders believed the extant level of patronage failed to reflect
ever evolving divide-and-rule strategy. Like every political entity in Yemen, the various tribal confederations rarely functioned as a coherent political actor. Rivalries existed within and across tribal confederations. Thus, Saleh employed patronage and fomented internal competition to keep potential power centers preoccupied. Similarly, Saleh employed divide-and-rule techniques to pit elites inhabiting different ideal-type categories. For instance, he coopted tribal sheikhs with Islamist connections, like Tariq al-Fadhli, in the Southern provinces of Shabwa and Abyan after the civil war to deny weakened YSP elements from re-emerging as a real threat.

The alliance of convenience between Sunni religious leaders and Saleh persisted in other ways following the civil war. Saleh tolerated the establishment of Wahhabi religious centers and madrassas with significant support from private Saudi capital, the aggressive proselytization of the Zaydi Shi'a population throughout the northern provinces, and the political activities of the Muslim Brotherhood. In return, Saleh received support from powerful religious clerics, such as Abdul Majeed al-Zindani. This cooperation included the provision of patronage to key members of al-Islah, the largest opposition party. In regard to the merchant and technocratic class, these actors had access to a circumscribed set of patronage opportunities. In general, merchant elites primarily benefitted from private sector patronage, whereas technocrats acquired political

26 Part of the fiver school of Shí’ism, the Zaydi sect was ideologically closer to Yemen's Sunni population than the Iranian twelve school of Shí’ism. Historically, Zaydism was dominant among Yemen's Northern tribes. While Saleh is nominally a Zaydi, he feared this sect could function as a potential fifth column for a return of royalist forces of the Yemeni imamate defeated in 1968. Thus, he cynically viewed the Sunni influx as a useful counterweight.
27 Three key allies of Saleh's regime were associated with the Islah party. Sheikh Abdullah al-Ahmar was the head of Islah and the Speaker of the parliament from 1993 to 2007. Although a Sunni convert, his political pursuits were largely devoid of a religious agenda unlike firebrand cleric Sheikh Zindani and General Ali Mohsin, the other key powerbrokers in Islah. While Sheikh Zindani was the head of the Yemeni Muslim Brotherhood, Ali-Mohsin was associated with Salafi elements in Yemen. His relationship with Sunni fundamentalism allegedly dates back to the role he played as a recruiter of jihadists to send to Afghanistan during the 1980s.
patronage through positions in the government or ruling party. Such delimited patronage was partly due to the reformist current that existed among this class of actors torn between privileged access and the allure of an efficient, transparent, rule-based political system. Aware of the greater potential for defection, Saleh preferred these forms of patronage, which were easier to remove and impossible to turn into real autonomous power.

Saleh retained the most lucrative public sector schemes and security-sector patronage for the regime's inner-circle. Given the precarious way Saleh acquired power in 1978, he placed his relatives and fellow Sanhan tribemen in the most sensitive security positions to minimize the chances of a successful assassination or coup attempt. This tribalization of the military persisted throughout Saleh's reign, but an important generational shift occurred in 2000 when Saleh's son Ahmed Ali became commander of the Republican Guard. With the full financial backing of his father, the Republican Guard was transformed into "eighteen of the nation's best equipped, trained, funded and – arguably – managed brigades." In stark contrast, support for General Ali Mohsin's First Armored Division (the firqa) slowed to a trickle. This process of creating small, efficient, and especially loyal units was repeated in the interior and intelligence services under

---

29 One particularly egregious form of regime corruption was diesel smuggling. In a 2008 study, Sarah Phillips (Yemen's Democracy Experiment, 108) found that 50 percent of subsidized fuel – roughly $3.5 billion, or 12 percent of Yemen's GDP – went to smuggling rings that sold the product at market value. According to a leaked State Department cable, the main beneficiaries of this scheme were General Ali Mohsin, the al-Ahmar family, and Ali Abdullah Saleh. Mark Rice-Oxley, "The Wikileaks View: Feared and Reviled as the Iron Fist," The Guardian, March 21, 2011. Another massive source of patronage was military officers' overestimation of the number of men under their command. A 2009 EU commission report suggests that Yemen could remove up to 1,200,000 double dippers and ghost-workers if the security services and army were properly purged. Clark, Heads of Snakes, 266. With little to no government oversight or budgetary transparency, spending on the Ministry of Defense, other security services, and the presidential office, ranged between 25.4 percent and 40 percent of the central government's budget. Phillips, Yemen's Democracy Experiment, 70. A final major cash cow for military officers was their involvement in the so-called military commercial complex, most prominently embodied by the Yemen Economic Corporation (YECO). One infamous practice involving the military and YECO was the seizure of public lands mostly in the former PDRY that subsequently were sold to developers for private gain. Robinson et al., Corruption Assessment, 4. Southerners viewed this practice as an egregious example of Northern domination.
30 Crisis Group, Military Sector Reform, 7. The 30,000 Republican Guard soldiers enjoyed generous salaries and benefit packages not available to any other member of the military security apparatus.
the supervision of Saleh's nephews. This marked the beginning of Saleh's drive to marginalize his chief Sanhani rival Ali Mohsin. By 2011, Saleh had essentially created a powerful loyal core, an army within the army. This bifurcation decreased the ability of the military to resolve political stalemates and play the role of kingmaker as was the case in Egypt and Tunisia.

To sum up, a simplified way to conceive how power was ordered under Saleh is to think of a Russian nested doll. Broadly speaking, the outermost figurine was composed of co-opted merchants and technocrats. The next layer included Islamists and tribal sheikhs. Then came the oligarchical core such as the al-Ahmars and Ali Mohsin. According to one study, "around 10 key families and business groups with close ties to the president control more than 80% of imports, manufacturing, processing, banking, telecommunications and the transport of goods." Saleh's close relatives encased the chief of this plunder system, the president himself. The 2015 UN report estimates that Saleh personally accumulated over $60 billion during his 33 years in power. Those who chose to challenge or defy the doll's game were viciously pursued and punished.

1.b. The Opposition

By 2010, the regime faced several formidable challenges, including socio-economic structural trends. Between 1990 and 2010, Yemen's population grew from roughly 12 to 23 million citizens. This caused a youth bulge where 42 percent of Yemenis were under the age of

31 In 2001, Brigadier General Yahya Saleh became chief of staff of the Central Security Forces (CSF), a paramilitary organization tasked with confronting Yemen's numerous internal security challenges. He also supervised the formation of the Central Security Services' elite CT force. In 2002, Colonel Ammar Saleh became deputy head of a new intelligence service, the National Security Bureau (NSB). This step was encouraged by the US, which distrusted the old intelligence service, the Political Service Organization (PSO), due to its Islamist ties. See Clark, Heads of Snakes, 170-72. The salary, benefits, and rigorous screening process increased the level of NSB intelligence officer professionalism and loyalty. As key American allies in combatting terror in Yemen, both the CSF and NSB received significant levels of US military aid. Saleh's other nephew, Brigadier General Tarik Mohammad Saleh, commanded the Presidential Guard, one of his half-brother, Brigadier General Mohammed Saleh al-Ahmar, commanded the air force that was a useful tool for projecting power in Yemen's vast periphery, and the other half-brother, Brigadier General Ali Saleh al-Ahmar, was the chief of staff of the general command.

15 and 75 percent under the age of 30 in 2010. According to the World Bank, 40 percent of Yemeni children were malnourished, one of the highest rates in the world, and around 47 percent of the population lived under the upper poverty line of US $2 per day. Nearly 35 percent of Yemenis were unemployed, but this rate reached 50 percent among those between the ages of 18 to 28. Yemen was the most destitute country in the region, but in terms of relative deprivation its populace fared better than those living in the world's poorest countries. What made the situation in Yemen disconcerting were expectations about the future of essential resources like water and fossil fuels. Water scarcity was a potential threat to domestic security with warnings that Sana may become the first capital in the world to run out of a viable water supply by 2017. Meanwhile, the World Bank estimated that Yemen would earn no income from oil by 2017 and the dwindling reserves would be exhausted by 2025. With no readily available alternative to oil revenue accounting for 75 percent of the government budget, the regime's ability to maintain the corrupt networks that undergirded the inclusive authoritarian model was no longer viable. Reality required drastic reforms for the transition to a post-oil economy, but political survival proscribed such an approach. While the regime enacted modest reforms in the years leading up to 2011, elite competition for a larger slice of an ever shrinking pie intensified.

35 As Charles Schmitz correctly points out, Yemen's GNI per capita was nearly twice the average of the United Nation's least developed countries. Caton, Yemen, 138.
36 "Capital City Faces 2017 Water Crunch," IRIN News, March 23, 2010. Yemen relies on rainfall to replenish the underground aquifers that traditionally supplied the population with a sustainable source of water. The yearly average of the total renewable water resource is estimated at 2.5 billion cubic meters, while Yemen's population consumes 3.4 billion cubic meters. This leaves a 900 million cubic meter deficit, much of which is covered by an ever declining water table. A.M. Al Abashi and Qahtan Yehya, Water Resources Information in Yemen (Vienna: IWG-Env, International Work Session on Water Statistics, 2005), 1. The cause for this crisis is due to a combination of factors, including a rapidly growing population and the predominant preference among local farmers to cultivate a water-intensive cash crop, qat, a mild stimulant deeply embedded in the cultural fabric of Yemeni society.
The alliance of convenience between the GPC and Islah eroded after the parliamentary election in 1997 when the GPC gained a majority of parliamentary seats. No longer needed as a coalition partner, Islah lost its cabinet positions and became part of the opposition. It began seeking other political partners and eventually formed the Joint Meetings Party (JMP) in 2002 that included a diverse collection of smaller parties, such as socialist, Baathists, and Nasserists. Islah pushed for reform, but remained part of the "loyal opposition" from 1997 to 2005. Party leaders avoided crossing red lines to the informal rules of the game such as Saleh's right to rule.\footnote{In the 1999 presidential election, for instance, Sheikh Abdullah not only refused to nominate a candidate from Islah to contest the elections against Saleh, but also publicly declared that he would vote for Saleh, who ultimately won 96 percent of the popular vote. For a discussion on the degree to which Islah functioned as a real opposition party between 1997 and 2005, see Phillips, \textit{Yemen's Democracy Project}, 141-144.}

The 2006 presidential elections offered a substantial break from politics as usual. The JMP fielded a competitive presidential candidate, Faisal Bin Shamlan, who officially won 22 percent of the popular vote.\footnote{Day (\textit{Rebellion and Regionalism}, 222) suggests that Bin Shamlan likely won between 30-40 percent of the vote given the regime's past practices of vote tampering.} Realizing the elections would be more competitive than desired, the regime employed its full arsenal to defang Bin Shamlan's momentum. Weeks before the elections, Saleh successfully pressured key Islahi allies like Sheikhs al-Zindani and al-Ahmar to encourage their constituents to vote for him. Yet, some opposition figures crossed red lines. Sheikh Abdullah's son, Hamid al-Ahmar, vociferously attacked the incumbent while bankrolling Bin Shamlan.\footnote{For the sake of perpetuating the veneer of legitimacy provided by Yemen's formal democratic institutions, Saleh encouraged Islah leaders to field a proper candidate to avoid repeating the 1999 presidential elections. Yet, Saleh continued to expect a "respectful" opposition. According to Alley (\textit{Shifting Light}, 82-3), "elites who aggressively criticized the President, who actively attempted to crack his tribal base of support in Hashid, or who openly placed their personal wealth and or political clout behind his electoral defeat had clearly crossed the red line." This perfectly captures the role Hamid played in the 2006 elections. His public vitriol toward Saleh continued unabated after the passing of his father in 2007. While few high-ranking officials joined Hamid in open defection, a growing number of young reformist technocrats and politicians began to test the boundaries of the red lines with increasing frequency. See Alley, \textit{Shifting Light}, 83-85, 107-109, 162-178.} Despite the electoral loss, the opposition succeeded in shifting the national discourse to issues related to endemic government corruption. This contributed to
popular expectations for substantial reforms that Saleh refused to tackle in earnest.\textsuperscript{41} The opposition continued to challenge the GPC's grip on power. The JMP announced preparations for a boycott of the 2009 parliamentary elections unless the GPC controlled Supreme Commission of Elections and Referendum (SCER) enacted substantial electoral reforms. After failed attempts to divide the opposition, the ruling party agreed to delay the elections until 2011 and entered negotiations with the JMP over a broad set of divisive issues. While Saleh's political monopoly seemed vulnerable, many key figures in the formal opposition did not necessarily seek a complete overhaul of the corrupt system, but rather a greater share of the spoils.

In contrast to the institutional opposition, fierce regional social movements outwardly rejected the political status quo. Saleh's inclusive authoritarian arrangement centered around the Northern tribes and excluded entire groups in the North and South of the country. The Houthis were the first group to rebel against the regime. From the northern province of Sa'ada, a Zaydi stronghold that borders Saudi Arabia, Hussein al-Houthi launched a religio-cultural revivalist movement meant to counter the spread of Salafism, a puritanical form of Islam that considered the Zaydi Shi'a sect heretics. Prior to 2001, the GPC held an equivocal view of the Salafist encroachment on the Zaydi heartland. In one sense, the Houthis were a natural counterbalance to Islah's growing influence. However, the potential for a strategic alliance vanished after Saleh felt compelled to join the US war on terror in 2001. In addition to condemning Saleh's hypocrisy, Hussein al-Houthi encouraged the local populace to redirect state taxes to his movement. Too many red lines had been crossed.\textsuperscript{42} Local security forces attempted to arrest Hussein in the

\textsuperscript{41} Hill et al., \textit{Global Drivers of Conflict}, 9.
\textsuperscript{42} Day, \textit{Rebellion and Regionalism}, 216-17. As a minority population with limited appeal, the Houthis did not present a fundamental threat. However, their example compromised the underpinnings of the regime. First, the popular slogan – "God is Great! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curse Upon the Jews! Victory to Islam!" – tapped into widespread resentment across Yemen toward Saleh's strategic alliance with the US. Second, the refusal
summer of 2004, but these efforts resulted in clashes with the local militia that left 20 dead. In an effort to make an example of al-Houthi, Saleh deployed the army in September to decimate the movement. Hussein would die, but the intended effect of deploying brutal force backfired and resulted in increasingly bloody rounds of fighting. The sixth ceasefire occurred in February 2010 after Saudi Arabia joined Yemeni forces in "Operation Scorched Earth."\(^43\)

The other non-institutional challenge to the regime arose in the territories of the former PDRY. The Southern Mobilization Movement, or al-Hirak, emerged in early 2007 as a civil disobedience movement of former PDRY military officers who demanded higher pensions and/or reinstatement into the armed forces. Saleh feared the movement's spread, but seemed uncertain on how to respond to peaceful protests. On October 14\(^{th}\) 2007 in the town of al-Habilayn, security forces used disproportionate force by killing four unarmed demonstrators with live bullets during a sit-in.\(^44\) This event launched a broader movement that incorporated civil servants, students, teachers, lawyers, academics, and the unemployed youth. The amorphous demand for "equal citizenship" fit into the broadly shared injustice frame of systematic marginalization under "Northern occupation."\(^45\) More specific grievances touched on issues considered sacrosanct by the regime, including unlawful land seizures and the decentralization of to pay taxes touched on a sensitive issue related to federalism and greater fiscal autonomy for local authorities. While Sa'ada contributed insignificant amounts to the state budget, replication of this practice in the oil rich regions posed an existential threat to the political status quo.

\(^43\) The regime's inability to defeat an outmanned and outgunned rebel force raised questions about whether the Houthi conflict became a means to wage an internal struggle within the regime. By making the poorly equipped and poorly trained First Armored Division the primary force responsible for fighting the insurgency, Saleh could keep General Ali Mohsin occupied as he sought to shore up his own power base in preparation for his son's succession bid. This conjecture gains further credence from a leaked State Department cable that suggests Saleh purposely provided the Saudi air force incorrect bombing coordinates in 2009. Instead of targeting the Houthis, the Saudis would have bombed Mohsin's base of operation. Gerd Nonneman and Ginny Hill, *Yemen, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States: Elite Politics, Street Protests and Regional Diplomacy* (London: Chatham House, 2011), 5.

\(^44\) This event was symbolically charged. The date and place chosen to use deadly force coincided with an incident in 1963 where British soldiers shot and killed seven activists, an event that launched the social movement eventually responsible for toppling British colonial rule. Day, *Rebellion and Regionalism*, 229-230.

power. Saleh provided modest concessions by rehiring some officers and increasing the pension of others, but these actions were insufficient to demobilize al-Hirak. Because major concessions appeared equivalent to political suicide, the regime increasingly resorted to violent repression of peaceful protesters and began a propaganda campaign describing those who joined al-Hirak as secessionists and terrorists. The regime's unwillingness to entertain any real power-sharing agreement led some factions to voice secessionist demands and others to engage in political violence by the end of 2008. Thereafter, al-Hirak became the general term to describe the decentralized social movement that maintained multiple power centers each of which espoused different tactics and issued various demands related to the Southern question.

In addition to these three formidable challenges, al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) re-emerged at the end of the decade. Unlike the earlier AQ network that existed in Yemen until 2002, this group vowed to fight its enemies on the domestic, regional, and international fronts. Despite harsh declarations describing Saleh and other Gulf leaders as "servants of the cross" who were "directed by their [American] masters," the number of attacks in Yemen between 2007 and 2010 remained relatively isolated events directed at the US Embassy in Sana and foreign tourists. During this period, AQAP focused on strengthening its local network across Yemen's central and southern tribal regions. Beginning in the summer of 2010, however, AQAP initiated a campaign that targeted government and military officials and

46 Broadly speaking, the Northern political elite refused to consider the possibility of federalism and greater autonomy over local resources because 80 percent of Yemen's oil is located in the Southern governorates that constitute 20 percent of the country's population. Phillips, *Yemen's Democracy Project*, 42.
49 AQAP considered the Houthis apostates. While AQ members allegedly gained sanctuary with Salafist sympathizers in the North, they appeared most active in the eastern and southern tribal regions. The governorates with the most reported AQAP activity included al Jawf, Mar'ib, Abyan, Shabwa, Lahij, and Hadramawt.
began to "capture, hold, and rule territory."\textsuperscript{50} Thus, on the eve of the uprising, Saleh faced a potential humanitarian crisis, a faltering economy in long-term structural decline, an increasingly vociferous institutional opposition, two insurgencies, and al-Qaeda. Given these challenges, many foreign governments and analysts considered Yemen in danger of sliding toward failed state status. Accustomed to making lemonade out of lemons, Saleh transformed the regime's weaknesses into personal gain. At home, he warned of somaliazation, suggesting that only he could steer Yemen away from chaos. Saleh relied on such negative legitimacy based on the absence of a clear alternative.\textsuperscript{51} In regard to the international community, the risk of state failure became a fungible good due to fears that AQAP would take advantage of ungoverned spaces.

\textit{1.c. US-KSA-Yemeni Relations}

With Yemen seemingly on the brink of collapse, foreign donors sought to provide the necessary assistance to ensure the country's short- and long-term stability. Unfortunately, the tactics of this dual-track approach were not necessarily mutually reinforcing. Long-term solutions were couched within the framework of good governance and sustainable development. Recognizing that Yemen received an amount of international aid per capita far below the average of other countries facing similarly difficult circumstances, a group of international donors from the US, Europe, and the Gulf gathered in London to pledge $5.7 billion in 2006. Due to a lack of transparency, administrative absorptive capacity, and significant security threats, donors managed to disperse only 10 percent of the promised aid. This failure led to the creation of the Friends of Yemen (FoY) in January 2010, an international forum that sought to create a coordination mechanism that generated a synergy between local institutions engaged in

\textsuperscript{50} Andrew W. Terrill, \textit{The Struggle for Yemen and the Challenge of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula} (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2013), 35-39.

development issues, Western and multilateral donor technical expertise, and the wealth of Gulf donors. Yemen's largest donors – the US and Saudi Arabia – professed commitment to the long-term developmental approach, but were more concerned about the regime's capacity to carry out counterterrorism (CT) efforts that disrupted and degraded AQAP's operational capability, which both countries considered a grave national security threat.

Ever since King Abdulaziz's deathbed warning to his sons that the "good or evil for us will come from Yemen," the Saudi monarchy has pursued a Goldilocks foreign policy approach toward its Southern neighbor.\(^5\) Yemen is the only country on the Arabian peninsula with a population roughly equivalent to Saudi Arabia. On one hand, a unified, strong Yemen posed a potential threat to the Saudi monarchy's regional hegemony. On the other, the long porous border between the two countries exposed the Kingdom's soft underbelly. The problems of an overly fractured, weak Yemen would inevitably cross into Saudi Arabia, which explains why KSA officials characterize issues pertaining to Yemen in terms of internal security, not foreign policy. The Saudis used their vast wealth to maintain an extensive transnational patronage network that provided credible sources of information, augmented elite autonomy, and created a means to influence Yemeni politics.\(^5\) Such Riyal-politik perpetuated controlled weakness in Yemen, a state of affairs the royal family considered just right. After the Treaty of Jeddah was signed in 2000, however, Saudi Arabia "largely withdrew from Yemeni affairs and left its Yemen" network of "contacts to wither."\(^4\) Its attention shifted to other pressing matters, such as the


\(^5\) As one of the most important access points, Sheikh Abdullah received a monthly stipend of around $800,000 in 2000. Phillips, *Yemen's Democracy Project*, 100. This represented only the tip of the iceberg. According to Hill and Nonneman (*Elite Politics, Street Protests*, 9) the annual budget to sustain this patronage system during the 1980s and 1990s was approximately $3.5 billion per year.

aftermath of September 11th and the US invasion of Iraq. Meanwhile, the delicate equilibrium in Yemen was breaking down.

Although reluctant to admit the presence of domestic terrorism, Saudi Arabia's hand was finally forced on May 12th 2003 when a coordinated attack at residential compounds housing many foreigners left 26 people dead. Soon-to-be Deputy Minister of the Interior Prince Muhammed bin Nayef subsequently launched a (CT) program that relentlessly pursued, arrested, and attempted to rehabilitate homegrown jihadists. Terrorist attacks on the Kingdom declined dramatically by 2007. As remaining al Qaeda members focused on survival in Saudi Arabia, a jailbreak of 23 hardened terrorists from a Yemeni Political Security Organization (PSO) prison occurred in February 2006. These two groups would formally combine forces in January 2009 to form AQAP's core cadre of leaders. A subsequent assassination attempt on Prince Muhammad bin Nayef by an AQAP member disingenuously seeking to participate in his rehabilitation program coupled with the brief conflict with Houthi forces reawakened Saudi officials to the threats posed by Saleh's weak grip on power. By this time, however, the health of Minister of Defense Prince Sultan, who had managed Saudi policy toward Yemen for decades, was in precipitous decline. Already an opaque and byzantine process, policy formation and coordination toward Yemen diffused across competing princely fiefdoms cum government ministries. Equally troublesome, potential policy entrepreneurs did not share similar strategic visions on the

55 The relationship between certain members of the Saudi royal family with radical Islam created tensions in the US-KSA alliance. The fact that 15 of the 19 hijackers directly involved in the 9/11 attacks were Saudi citizens was sufficient to cause significant public scrutiny of the strategic relationship in the US.
57 No independent analyst believed the claim that these men managed to dig a 100 meter tunnel with spoons and plates without help. Aware that the PSO was a corrupt institution with Islamist sympathies, US officials considered it an inside job. Whether collusion went beyond local PSO officials is unknown. Clark, *Heads of Snakes*, 203-204.
best way to deal with Saleh. For instance, Prince bin Nayef complained to US officials in 2009 that Saudi aid to Yemen tended to end up in "Swiss bank accounts." In 2010, however, King Abdullah decided to give Saleh $700 million despite objections voiced by Minister of the Interior Prince Nayef and other princes. Such internal disarray in Saudi foreign policy toward Yemen increased the likelihood for indecision and mixed signals during a policy crisis. Besides, King Abdullah enjoyed the final say on all key foreign policy decisions, which suggested Saudi Arabia would handle Saleh with kid gloves.

In contrast to Saudi Arabia, US-Yemeni bilateral relations were jumpstarted in October 2000 when the bombing of the USS Cole off the coast of Aden killed 17 American sailors. Saleh felt obliged to offer minimal cooperation during subsequent US investigations, but the aftermath of September 11th left no room for neutrality. Always a political chameleon, Saleh adopted the rhetoric of the global war on terrorism (GWOT) and provided the US assistance in its pursuit of al Qaeda militants in Yemen. In return, he received a generous aid package reportedly worth up to $400 million in technical assistance, equipment and training to develop – \textit{inter alia} – new anti-terrorism units under his nephews' command. These joint efforts

61 Leaked Saudi documents during this period suggest that deference to the king remained a paramount norm even among the most powerful princes, including Saudi foreign minister Prince Saud al-Faisal. Ben Hubbard, "Checkbook Diplomacy of Saudis is Revealed," \textit{New York Times}, June 21, 2015.
62 In late November 1990, Secretary of State James Baker traveled to Sana to ensure that Resolution 678 authorizing the use of force in Iraq passed with an unanimous vote. At the time, Yemen held a rotating seat on the UN Security Council. Baker warned Saleh that Yemen stood to lose $70 million in annual US aid if he voted against the resolution, which he did. Bilateral relations stagnated until the end of the 1990s. Baker, \textit{Politics of Diplomacy}, 278.
63 This point was made abundantly clear by President Bush's declaration on September 20th 2011, "Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, 2001, http://www.prezidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/09.20.01.html.
64 Jeremy Sharp, \textit{Yemen: Background and U.S. Relations} (Washington DC: Congressional Research Service, 2010), 10. One leaked 2009 cable suggests that the US had spent more than $115 million on bolstering these CT forces.
culminated in the first known targeted assassination attack using a US drone on November 3rd 2002 that left six dead, including al Qaeda in Yemen's leader Qa'id al-Harithi. With the November 2003 arrest of al-Harithi's replacement, Muhammad al-Ahdal, al Qaeda's presence in Yemen faded because the structure of the terrorist network had been highly centralized and the main theater for the transnational war had shifted elsewhere, namely Iraq.

With the common enemy removed from the picture, bilateral relations began to sour. In December 2005, Saleh arrived in Washington with hopes of repeating his profitable 2001 visit. Instead, top officials in the Bush administration bluntly explained that US aid depended on substantive political and economic reforms. US military aid for security assistance dropped to $4.3 million in 2006; Yemen was suspended from the Millennium Challenge Corporation, an additional $20 million in aid; and, the World Bank cut aid from $420 to $280 million. Years later, Saleh opined to Daniel Benjamin, the State Department's CT chief, that the Americans are "hot-blooded and hasty when you need us," but "cold-blooded and British when we need you." Undoubtedly, this embarrassing episode stuck in his mind. Never having been truly committed to the war on terror, Saleh's appetite to pursue known terrorists diminished further. For instance, Saleh allowed Sheikh Zindani to operate freely within Yemen despite the 2004 US injunction against the cleric, which placed him on the "Specially Designated Global Terrorist" list. While

---


65 Two days after the successful strike, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz overturned the cover story that Harithi's car was carrying a bomb that exploded upon hitting a ditch. During a Pentagon press conference, he boasted that the drone strike was "a very successful tactical operation, and one hopes each time you get a success like that, not only to have gotten rid of somebody dangerous but to have imposed changes in their tactics and operations and procedures." Aware of the domestic consequences of Wolfowitz's comments, Saleh was said to be "highly pissed." Another drone strike would not occur until 2009. Day, Rebellion and Regionalism, 198-199.

66 Johnsen (Last Refuge, 209) notes that AQAP learned lessons from the fate of al-Qaeda in Yemen version 1.0. Specifically, AQAP espoused a centralization of decision-making, decentralization of execution strategy. Such compartmentalization would foil the US strategy of kill the leader, kill the organization.

67 Johnsen, Last Refuge, 180-185.

such inaction was unsurprising given Zindani's stature and strategic alliance with the regime, Saleh also ignored US pleas to stop sheltering and keep incarcerated known terrorist, such as Jamal al-Badawi, the chief architect of the USS Cole bombings.\(^6^9\) Such a "revolving door" policy of briefly detaining and then releasing terrorists frustrated US officials.\(^7^0\)

The attack on the US embassy in September 2008 and the formation of AQAP in January 2009 drew America's attention back to Yemen. US officials understood Saleh's security priorities lay with the Houthis and Hirak, not AQAP.\(^7^1\) Leaked US government cables revealed an acknowledgement by US officials that Saleh diverted at least some US military aid to combat these insurgencies.\(^7^2\) The Obama administration faced an awkward scenario. It wanted to halt the spread of AQAP, but the assistance required to achieve this goal was channeled through Saleh and his family, thereby bolstering a fragile autocratic regime. Seeing few other options, the administration increased security assistance aid from nothing in 2008 to $67 million in 2009.

Two turning points occurred during 2009 that produced even closer US-Yemeni cooperation. First, AQAP rejected Saleh's attempt to renew a tacit non-aggression pact in early

---

\(^6^9\) Saleh's disdain for US priorities was on full display during a 2007 lunch when he informed White House CT advisor Frances Townsend that he had just met Badawi two weeks earlier, noting the terrorist was "under my microscope." Ellen Knickmeyer, "Yemen's Double Game," *Foreign Policy*, December 7, 2010. He repeated this performance in the spring of 2008 during a meeting concerning CT issues with FBI director John Mueller. The typically unfazed Mueller reportedly left fuming at Saleh's insolence. Michael Isikoff, "A Tense Impasse in Yemen," *Newsweek*, May 5, 2008. Aside from Badawi, Saleh's release of Fahd al-Quso, another suspect in the USS Cole bombing, was another high profile case, especially because he later joined AQAP.

\(^7^0\) Clark, *Heads of Snakes*, 204.

\(^7^1\) In a leaked 2009 cable, Saleh explained to deputy CIA director Stephen Kappes that he considered the Houthis, Hirak, and AQAP as equally dangerous, only "to reverse himself" and place AQAP as the greatest threat to Yemen. US Ambassador Seche noted that Saleh certainly had "his USG interlocutors in mind" when making such assessments. Greg Miller, "Cables Show rising Worry about Al-Qaeda in Yemen," *Washington Post*, April 10, 2011.

\(^7^2\) Laura Kasinof, "Yemen Diverted Counterterrorism Aid Meant to Tackle Al-Qaeda, Wikileaks Reveals," *Christian Science Monitor*, December 16, 2010. Pointing to weak evidence of an Iranian connection to the Houthis, Saleh attempted to draw the Americans formally into these domestic conflicts. In a September 2009 meeting with White House CT chief John Brennan, Saleh claimed, "The Houthis are your enemies too." Brennan responded that the "USG is prohibited by law from providing military support ... against the Houthis since the USG considers the group a domestic insurgency." Ellen Knickmeyer, "Yemen's Double Game," *Foreign Policy*, December 7, 2010. In this way, the US avoided formal entanglement, but still turned a blind eye publicly to Saleh's diversion of CT aid.
February. As a result, he grew more willing to accommodate US preferences to escalate the conflict at a time when the new Obama administration was actively reassessing its Yemen policy. The level of cooperation reached unprecedented levels during a September meeting in Sana, when Saleh pledged to White House CT chief John Brennan "unfettered access to Yemen's national territory for U.S. counterterrorism operation," including "unilateral operations by the U.S." Such open ended access dovetailed with Obama's preference for aggressive covert action and the expansion of drone strikes to deal with the terrorist threat. By the end of September, David Petraeus, the commander of US central command (CENTCOM), issued an order for the creation of a Joint Unconventional Warfare Task Force that provided the US military permission to carry out covert actions without requiring "the president's approval or regular reports to Congress." The second turning point occurred on Christmas Day 2009 when a young Nigerian attempted to blow up a plane over Detroit with an underwear bomb. Tracing the plot back to Yemen, US officials realized AQAP harbored the intent and possessed the ability to harm US and Western interests directly. 2010 would prove to be another watershed year.

With the reassessment of the security threat posed by AQAP, US military aid jumped to $155.3 million in 2010. Drone reconnaissance and cruise missiles became the favored tactic in

---

73 Al Qaeda in Yemen had refused to entertain such an arrangement in 2007 due to Saleh's "treasonous alliance with tyrants." *Confronting Al-Qaeda, Preventing State Failure, Hearings Before the Comm. on Foreign Relations, 111th Cong., 13 (2010)* (statement by Gregory Johnson, Doctoral Candidate), S. Hrg. 111-719. The group apparently felt even less inclined in 2009 as it was already operating in a "permissive security environment." Craig Whitlock, "U.S. Was Told of Yemen Leader's Weakness," *Washington Post*, April 8, 2011.


76 Sharp (*Background 2010*, 14) notes the overall consensus among Western experts for most of 2009 "was that AQAP would concentrate its attacks inside Yemen and ... Saudi Arabia." This assessment began to change with the Fort Hood shootings that left 13 dead and 32 wounded on November 5th 2009. The gunmen, Nidal Malik Hassan, had exchanged 18 emails with ideologue Anwar al-Awlaki, an Yemeni-American cleric and an key spokesman for AQAP. The Christmas Day attack was particularly jarring because it demonstrated that the group's capacity to harm US national security went beyond being a source of inspiration for lone wolf attacks. By August 2010, the CIA reportedly considered AQAP a more dangerous threat to the US homeland than its parent organization, al Qaeda in Pakistan. Greg Miller, "CIA Sees Increased Threat in Yemen," *Washington Post*, August 24, 2010.
the first half of that year. This approach abruptly ended on May 25th when an airstrike accidently targeted and killed the deputy governor of Marib province rather than his brother, who was a local AQAP leader. Before this episode, Saleh accepted responsibility for civilian deaths. In an effort to acquire plausible deniability, Saleh promised CENTCOM commander Petraeus to take credit for all strikes, "We'll continue saying they are our bombs, not yours." With the death of Jabir al-Shabwani, however, the political costs for errant air strikes became too costly. Saleh refused US requests to continue air strikes, but continued his close cooperation on joint covert training and missions. Saleh appeared on track to becoming an invaluable partner in the war on terror. In mid-2010, the US was prepared to allocate up to $1.2 billion of aid to help Yemen build up its security forces over the following five years. AQAP was about to become the cash cow Saleh needed to prop up his faltering regime. The discovery in late October of two parcel bombs stashed in ink cartridges destined for Chicago served as additional evidence to US officials that the CT first approach was proper and correct.

When Saleh announced parliamentary elections would proceed without addressing any of the JMP's core demands, the Obama administration put up little resistance. On her January 11th 2011 visit to Sana, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton noted that the countries shared a common

---

77 David Leigh, "Leaked US Cables Set Off Global Diplomatic Storm," The Guardian Weekly, December 3, 2010. This was not simply an altruistic act. The domestic political backlash would be much greater if Saleh admitted that he compromised the nation's sovereignty by permitting the Americans to kill "suspected terrorists" on Yemeni soil. 78 Marib is home to a substantial portion of the country's oil wealth. In line with the tradition of center-periphery bargaining, the Abeeda tribe attacked the main oil pipeline and the provincial presidential palace. The lingering grievance surrounding Shabwani's death contributed to the tribe's decision to side with the 2011 uprising in March. 79 US drones "had not fired any missile" in Yemen for six months, but "a major buildup of intelligence and lethal assets" continued with "the arrival of additional CIA teams and up to 100 Special Operations force trainers." Greg Jaffe and Karen DeYoung, "U.S. Drones on Hunt in Yemen," The Washington Post, November 7, 2010. 80 Adam Entous, Siobhan Gorman, and Julian E. Barnes, "U.S. Funding Boost is Sought for Yemen's Forces," Wall Street Journal, September 2, 2010. With only $120 million committed to development assistance from the State Department over the following three years, many civilian officials including Ambassador Seche feared the US was sending the wrong message to the Yemeni people about its priorities. 81 Johnsen (Last Refuge, 182-6) compellingly argues that this short-sighted whack-a-mole approach to terrorism incentivized Saleh to use the threat of al Qaeda as a means to extort funds from the US.
threat, but the relationship was not solely defined by terrorism. She observed that the US supported "an inclusive political process that will in turn support a unified, prosperous, stable, democratic Yemen." While US officials quietly encouraged reforms as a means of preventing further radicalization among the multifarious opposition forces, Saleh understood that the Obama administration was unprepared to cut aid as Bush had done before the 2006 elections. Like Saudi Arabia, the US framed all matters related to Yemen in the light of counterterrorism and security. Overly dependent on Saleh and his family as partners in this battle, the patrons ironically became one more co-opted spoke that revolved around Yemen's president. If Saleh could force reform upon the JMP without causing a complete collapse in political order, the US was prepared to embrace him as president-for-life. Unfolding events in Tunisia and Egypt, however, tapped into deep-seated grievances that ultimately derailed Saleh's brilliantly improvised dance for survival.

II. Narrative of Events

2.a. 01/18/11 - 03/21/11

Small, sporadic protests began in Yemen following the peaceful overthrow of Tunisian President Ben Ali, but these demonstrations appeared less spontaneous than their counterparts in other Arab countries. Activists affiliated with the opposition political parties took the lead. JMP leaders began calling for a national uprising on January 25th, but in reality sought to channel the regional unrest to improve their bargaining position over electoral and constitutional reforms. During the first couple of weeks, the opposition and regime elite attempted to gauge the situation and their respective strength. The regime mixed carrots and sticks. Beginning on January 23rd, Saleh began to make concessions. By the time he delivered his preemptive speech to Parliament on February 2nd, the list of promises appeared magnanimous, far exceeding the opposition's

---

wildest dreams just weeks earlier. The most important concession was his pledge for "no extension [of the presidential term limit], no [family] succession of power, and no resetting the [presidential term limit] clock." Only one problem existed. Saleh had no credibility. He reneged on the same promise in 2005 and had just attempted to ram through an amendment to remove presidential term limits. Aware of Saleh's penchant for perfidy, the JMP refused his call to resume the dialogue process and halt demonstrations. Without the protesters, the institutional opposition had no leverage with Saleh. Thus, JMP leaders continued to negotiate with the regime, but encouraged street action as an insurance policy.

During this early stage, the unemployed youth, university students, professionals, NGO activists, and women began coordinating their activities. They emphasized the need to eschew violence and embrace the spirit of inclusion to realize their revolution. Known collectively as the independent youth, this third force played a prominent role in the daily protests following Egyptian President Mubarak's resignation on February 11th. As the JMP vacillated between the street and negotiation table, the youth demanded Saleh's immediate resignation. While

---

83 The regime employed many inducements during this early phase. Military and security personnel would receive a monthly pay raise and gain access to free food and gas. The lowest paid civil servants would receive a monthly pay raise of $47 immediately. A new fund would find employment for 25 percent of university graduates in the class of 2011 and the government would waive 2011 university tuition fees for currently enrolled students. Finally, for the poorest members of society, an existing assistance program would extend financial support to an additional 500,000 individuals. Saleh also promised to maintain certain price controls and reduce income taxes by half.


85 Day (*Rebellion and Regionalism*, 274-75) observes that Sheikh Muhammad Abu Lahoum, a high ranking GPC official and powerful Bakil tribal leader, managed to negotiate a set of reforms to the voting laws that the JMP leadership accepted by January 18th. This elite pact may have been sufficient to resolve what was a political crisis, but Saleh rejected the gambit. At that juncture, he still insisted on the removal of presidential term limits.

86 Ambassador Feierstein urged the independent youth to organize and set forth a list of demands to increase the likelihood of their inclusion in the bargaining process. "If the JMP is not the representative of the people on the street, then the people on the street need to say who are their representatives." "Ambassador Feierstein's Press Conference with English-Speaking Journalists," US Embassy Press Releases, March 13, 2011. To this end, the Coordination Council of the Youth Revolution of Change (CCYRC), an umbrella organization that consisted of 40 different movements and coalitions, provided a list of 13 demands on April 12th after four weeks of consultation. The most controversial demands included the peaceful removal of the current regime including all members of the President's family and the legal prosecution of the parties responsible for killing and injuring peaceful protesters. "Yemeni Youth Movements Consolidate," *Yemen Times*, March 14, 2011. Despite this clear agenda, domestic and
estimates vary, this group never composed the majority of anti-Saleh protesters. Unlike the JMP, the independent youth did not possess large sums of financial resources or extensive patronage networks to mobilize constituents. Yet, their presence legitimated the movement and foiled Saleh's attempts to pigeonhole the uprising as part of an elite putschist agenda.87

When JMP leaders urged their partisans to join the peaceful protesters on February 20th, an awkward alliance to topple Saleh took shape.88 Intrepid protesters erected tents at the gates of Sana University and declared their intention to hold a permanent sit-in until the regime fell. Later called Change Square, this public space served as an "incubator" for civil society and an opportunity to foster an inclusive atmosphere long denied under Saleh's rule.89 This broad coalition was a strength and weakness. Despite herculean efforts by the JMP and independent youth to form bridges across potential fault-lines that could undermine the movement's cohesion, different groups possessed fundamentally different visions about Yemen's future.90 Regardless,

87 The editor-in-chief of the Yemen Times described a situation in early March when many young protesters left the protest camp because Islah partisans had begun to dominate Change Square. When they returned the next day, a power-sharing compromise emerged where the independent youths would gain access for two hours a day to the main stage to voice their positions. Although Islah and the tribes represented the majority on the square, they recognized the need to maintain their alliance with the independent youth. Nadia al-Sakkaf, "The Politicization of Yemen's Youth Revolution," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, April 28, 2011.
88 The JMP supported street protests and urged their own partisans to join them, but never collectively demanded Saleh's immediate departure. They did not close the door on negotiations. Crisis Group, Reform and Revolution, 4.
90 During the spring of 2011, the JMP and independent youth embraced the idea of an inclusive national dialogue. Houthis and conservative Islah members were allies on Change Square, but continued to fight a proxy battle with mounting casualties in the Northern governorate of al Jawf. Fernando Carvajlis, "Politics and Proxy Wars," Yemen Peace Project (blog), August 15, 2011, http://yemenpeaceproject.org/blogpost. Before being pushed aside, liberal female leaders shared the main platform at Change Square with Salafist clerics. The JMP and the independent youth actively sought to include Hirak activists, who in turn avoided demands for secession. In short, the opposition was characterized by countless individual and collective rivalries that Saleh hoped to exploit.
all opposition parties recognized that a political transition must occur without Saleh at the helm. Their mutual disdain for the president and his family proved sufficient to keep them together.

Aside from the early February concessions, Saleh responded with repression and counter-mobilization. The president encouraged loyal tribesmen to occupy Tahrir Square near Sana's Old Town and to attack any anti-regime demonstrations that approached. Eventually, the opposition gravitated toward Sana University, but armed thugs in civilian clothes, known as baltagiya, continued to attack unarmed protesters. The security services either remained neutral onlookers or participated in the repression. In contrast, government forces made no effort to conceal the use of deadly force against unarmed civilians in Taiz and Aden partly because foreign journalists were effectively prevented from covering those events. As the crackdown in the capital grew worse in early March, the regime increasingly attempted to control the narrative by limiting the amount of international coverage.

91 Al Sabeen near the Presidential Residence was another site for pro-regime demonstrations. Several accounts note the regime paid supporters and provided them with ample amounts of qat and food to occupy these spaces. Michelle Shephard, "Hundreds Hit Streets in Yemen," Toronto Star, February 16, 2011. Such inducements were necessary to fill the squares for weekly mass rallies following Friday prayers, but Saleh's regime had genuine partisans, including certain tribes near Sana that risked losing substantial access to patronage. Crisis Group, Reform and Rebellion, 7.
92 The role of counter-demonstrations were two-fold. First, the regime encouraged counter-demonstrations near anti-Saleh protest sites to conceal government repression as violent clashes between two independent forces. The utility of this approach declined by mid-March. With his back to the wall, Saleh became less cautious about hiding state repression. Additionally, the tribal elements and eventually the firqa established checkpoints to protect protesters in Change Square. These boundaries reduced the chance for direct confrontations between dueling demonstrations. The second function was to show domestic and international audiences that Saleh maintained a popular mandate. The size of pro-change protests often dwarfed those supporting Saleh, but he would claim the minority was attempting to establish mob-rule against the silent majority. In one interview to al Arabiya in late March, he claimed the opposition "hardly constitute 2.5 per cent out of 25 million. They seek the support of 4,000 protesters. I have 1 million. If they stage a demonstration of 20,000, I can stage a 3 million-man demonstration." "President Saleh Talks on Yemen Current Crisis in Arabiya TV Interview," Saba News, March 28, 2011.
93 See Human Rights Watch. Days of Bloodshed in Aden (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2011). Another important reason for employing the security services was that the GPC's mobilization capacity in these cities was small compared to the networks maintained by Islah and Hirak. "Sana Bulletin #2," Yemen Peace Project (blog), February 19, 2011, http://yemenpeaceproject.org/blogpost.
94 Saleh's concern over international coverage sympathetic to the protesters was revealed in late January when he called Qatari Emir Hamad bin Khalifa al Thani to request that Al-Jazeera stop inciting violence "by twisting fact and exaggerating events." "Yemen President Slams Al-Jazeera TV by Phone Call with Qatar Emir," Xinhua, January 27, 2011. On March 14th, four Western journalists were deported; the government had stopped issuing visas to foreign journalists weeks earlier. Given that the regime's most violent crackdown on peaceful protesters occurred four days
The other two familiar tactics Saleh used were fear-mongering and divide and rule. Since February 2\textsuperscript{nd}, Saleh insisted on the need for dialogue and compromise. False starts in negotiation efforts persisted through mid-March and Saleh placed blame squarely on the opposition. He described his opponents as preachers of sedition and chaos, criminals, putschists, secessionists, and foreign agents. In contrast, he portrayed the regime's position as based on constitutionalism that safeguarded the nation's security, stability, unity, and development. In short, he embraced his negative legitimacy and preyed on fears that the country would inexorably slide toward civil war without him.\textsuperscript{95} Saleh also sought to transform extant fissures within the opposition into irreparable rifts. To this end, he only negotiated with the JMP to force it into making concessions that could disillusion the revolutionary youth.\textsuperscript{96} Another example of fomenting friction occurred in mid-April when the typically secular Saleh suddenly espoused religious piety by condemning the "mixing of sexes" during protests. This was a pathetic ploy to draw the attention of the Islamist faction in the opposition to their apparent hypocrisy. Although protesters held mass rallies to denounce this transparent act of desperation, some observers noted an uptick in tensions within opposition ranks as Islamists attempted to enforce this norm more strictly.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{95} For instance, in a meeting with religious leaders, Saleh said the opposition "would not be able to rule for even one week ... Yemen would be divided ... into four pieces by those who are riding the wave of stupidity." Mohamed Ghabari and Mohammed Mukhashaf, "Yemen Opposition Spurns Unity Offer," Reuters, 03/01/11.

\textsuperscript{96} Aside from intimidation, the use of deadly force against protesters was used to shift anger toward the JMP for carrying out a dialogue with Saleh. Yet, many leaders of the independent youth proved quite pragmatic. They demanded Saleh's immediate resignation, but several appeared amenable to a negotiated settlement where Saleh remained in office for a short period of time so long as they could maintain their presence on the streets. Even after the March 18\textsuperscript{th} massacre, some youth leaders were publicly willing to accept the GCC initiative to "preserve Yemeni blood." Mohammed Al Qahdi, "GCC Appeals for Yemen's Saleh to 'transfer power,'" The National, April 11, 2011.

\textsuperscript{97} Atiaf Zaid Alwazir, "The Square of Change in Sana: an Incubator for Reform," Arab Reform Initiative, May 9, 2011.
Despite these efforts to intimidate, discredit, and divide his foes, the disparate opposition maintained a largely united front. By late February, the size of peaceful protests had increased significantly. As the repressive apparatus flexed its muscle, strain among regime elite grew more acute and the sons of Abdullah al-Ahmar began to make their move. On February 28th, Hamid publicly demanded Saleh deliver on "his promises," warning that if he "would be crazy enough to use the army against the people, the tribes would move against him." His brother, Hussein al-Ahmar, announced his resignation from the GPC in front of tens of thousands of tribesmen on February 26th. Hussein's defection was particularly significant because he maintained a strong tribal base within the Hashid and had the closest ties to President Saleh among the al-Ahmar brothers. Finally, Sheikh Zindani dramatically joined the ranks of early high-level defectors on March 1st. He declared that Saleh "came to power by force, and stayed in power by force, and the only way to get rid of him is through the force of the people."

As the list of defectors grew, Saleh met with the Yemeni Association of Clerics on February 28th to help him craft a resolution to the crisis. He allegedly told the religious scholars led by al-Zindani, "I'm ready to leave power but not through chaos. I'm fed up now after 32 years, but how to leave peacefully? You scholars ... should say how." Besides the February 2nd

---

98 Tensions gradually re-emerged the longer Saleh held onto power. For an excellent summary on the deterioration of a unified regional front between the opposition in Sana and Hirak, see Crisis Group, "Break Point?," 11-12.
100 Iona Craig, "Rival Says President who Turned State into 'Family Empire' Must Stand Down," The Times, February 28, 2011. Hamid moved quickly to encourage protests after the fall of Tunisian President Ben Ali. As the chairman of Sabafon, Yemen's main cell phone service provider, he sent out text messages to coordinate protest actions. Ginny Hill, The UN Role in Yemen's Political Transition (New York: Social Science Review Council, 2011), 4. He also provided essential financial and logistical support to protesters camped at Change Square.
101 "Yemen: A Revolution in Waiting?," Yemen Times, March 07, 2011. Throughout mid-February, Saleh met influential tribal and religious leaders during the day and security and military officers in the evening. This daily agenda was a clear indication of where Saleh considered his base of real power resided.
103 Nasser Arrabyee, "Intrigue, Political Drama Behind the Scenes in Yemen," Gulf News, March 1, 2011.
concessions, the clerics formulated an eight point plan, where a unity government equally divided between JMP and GPC representatives would govern under Saleh until the 2013 presidential elections. The JMP flatly rejected this initiative as "too late" and "no longer feasible." Two days later, after consultations with tribal and religious leaders, the JMP presented Saleh a five point plan for achieving a peaceful transition that called on him to resign before the end of 2011. Initially, he seemed willing to proceed with the opposition's road map, but ultimately declined the following day. The major barriers to resolution appeared to be the timing of Saleh's departure and the right to continue peaceful protests. Saleh presented a third initiative on March 10 incorporating some new concessions. Most significantly, the government would hold a referendum on a new constitution that would cede more power to the parliament, which had been an important point of contention before the uprising. In response, JMP spokesman Mohammad Qahtan dryly noted that "the demands on the street go beyond that" now. From Saleh's perspective, the opposition continued raising the bar on their demands and he was in no mood to make more concessions.

While backroom negotiations proceeded, the security forces generally adhered to Saleh's order to protect peaceful protesters at least in the capital. The situation changed on March 8th when uniformed officers attacked Change Square with live ammunition and tear gas for the first time since protests began in Sana. One protester died and 80 were injured. The government claimed the opposition was sneaking guns into the protest site, but this was a lie. The action

---

106 After presenting his last initiative, Saleh seemed certain the opposition would refuse the offer and only made it to appear reasonable. According to some observers, he appeared to be offering a fait accompli, not a bargaining position. When the opposition refused his offer, there were no more details to discuss. "Ambassador Feierstein's Press Conference with English-Speaking Journalists," US Embassy Press Releases, March 13, 2011.
seemed a preemptive measure designed to deter the sit-in from spreading. A similar attack by the Central Security Forces happened early on the morning of March 12th. Another two protesters died and hundreds more were wounded.108 In retrospect, these attacks appeared as dress rehearsals meant to gauge the domestic and international reaction to the use of deadly force. With "dialogue" at an impasse, Saleh attempted to break the deadlock through a massacre.

On March 18th, government snipers in civilian clothes shot at unarmed civilians without provocation from rooftops around Change Square. At least 45 protesters were killed, many of them shot in the head and neck, and over 200 were injured. Saleh immediately declared a 30 day state of emergency hoping fair-weather protesters would abandon the streets. To the contrary, the disproportionate use of force backfired. Protesters defiantly participated in a massive funeral procession two days later chanting "the people want to prosecute the killer."109 What had been routinely tens of thousands of anti-government protesters turned into hundreds of thousands over the next two months. Meanwhile, three government ministers as well as significant numbers of civilian diplomats, technocrats, businessmen and lower ranking party members resigned. The two most significant defections occurred on March 21st, Saleh's birthday. Sheikh Sadiq al-Ahmar abandoned his role as mediator and urged the entire Hashid confederation to side with the opposition.110 General Ali Mohsin declared his intention to switch sides and use the firqa to protect peaceful protesters from security forces still loyal to Saleh.111 Sana transformed overnight

108 Similar deadly attacks transpired in Taiz, Aden, and Mukalla between March 8th and March 16th.
110 Sheikh Sinan Abu Lahoum announced his decision to side with the protesters on March 24th, and Sheikh Mohammed Abu Lahoum decided to resign as a senior GPC official not long after the massacre. Both these Sheikhs were powerful leaders of the Bakil tribal confederation. Laura Kasinof and Scott Shane, "Yemen's Leader in Talks on Exit but Still Defiant," New York Times, March 25, 2011.
111 The three other major military defectors were Brigadier General Hameed Al-Qushaibi, commander of Brigade 310 in Amran Province, Brigadier General Mohammad Ali Mohsen, commander of the eastern region, and Brigadier General Saif al-Boqri, commander of the central region in Sana.
from a deadlocked situation between unarmed protesters and the regime to an uneasy armed stand-off. Many believed a tipping point had been reached. Saleh's days appeared numbered.

Concerning the role of external actors during this early phase of the uprising, the US took the lead as King Abdullah recovered from surgery. The Obama administration's primary goal was Yemen's stability and unity. To achieve these aims, it encouraged the regime and JMP to hold a dialogue and negotiate over specific terms of an orderly transition. The US and its European partners encouraged Saleh to address protester demands, commit to credible steps, and avoid violence against unarmed civilians. To this end, Obama called Saleh after the February 2\textsuperscript{nd} concessions speech "to welcome the significant reform measures" and stressed the need "to follow up his pledge with concrete actions."\footnote{Laura Kasinof, "Yemen's Saleh Agrees Not to Run Again," \textit{Christian Science Monitor}, February 2, 2011. During a subsequent press conference on the Middle East, President Obama reiterated this message, "if you are governing these countries, you've got to get out ahead of change. You can't be behind the curve." "Press Conference by the President," White House Office of the Press Secretary, February 15, 2011.} Although not publicly acknowledged until early April, the administration had suspended a record assistance package worth more than $1 billion over the next five years until the crisis was resolved.\footnote{Keith Johnson, Adam Entous, and Margaret Coker, "U.S. Halted Record Aid Deal as Yemen Rose Up," \textit{Wall Street Journal}, April 8, 2011.} In regard to the JMP, the US strongly urged opposition leaders to participate in negotiations without preconditions and in good faith. On February 5\textsuperscript{th}, the US embassy released a statement that encouraged "the opposition parties to avoid provocative actions and respond constructively to Saleh's initiative."\footnote{"President Obama Encourages Political Reconciliation," US Embassy Press Releases, February 5, 2011.} Finally, the US position on the demonstrations was ambivalent. The protesters maintained the right to peaceful assembly and speech, but should avoid demands for the fall of the regime without providing a clear alternative road map. From the US perspective, Saleh still maintained a significant base of
popular support and a seemingly loyal coercive security apparatus. A rejection of dialogue and zero-sum battle of attrition on the streets would push the country closer to civil war and chaos.\textsuperscript{115}

The opposition understood that the Obama administration viewed street demonstrations skeptically and that Saleh would prey on these fears. In an effort to address US Ambassador Feierstein's complaint that the opposition had not provided the US a clear transition plan, JMP leaders delivered an initiative to the US embassy in mid-March.\textsuperscript{116} Among other details, the plan emphasized the opposition's recognition of the al Qaeda threat and readiness to ally with the US in the war on terror.\textsuperscript{117} Upon his defection, Ali Mohsin also signaled a willingness to join the fight against AQAP after Saleh's departure.\textsuperscript{118} Meanwhile, the revolutionary youth implored the Obama administration to abide by its principles and publicly stand on the side of the protesters, who remained committed to peaceful means to realize change despite the regime's constant provocations.\textsuperscript{119} Despite these reassurances, the US national security apparatus that dominated the policymaking process toward Yemen erred on the side of caution.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{115} In a press conference with Yemeni journalists, Feierstein noted, "The concern that we've had from the very beginning and that we've expressed over and over again, is that if there is no dialogue, if there is no negotiation, then the prospect, the possibility of conflict and violence between the two sides grows every day... All we can say is that as the tensions grow, as the positions of the two sides harden, the possibility for conflict grows." "Ambassador Feierstein Press Conference with English-Speaking Journalists," US Embassy Press Releases, March 13, 2011.

\textsuperscript{116} In an early March interview, Ambassador Feierstein clarified the US position, "Our question is always, 'If President Saleh leaves, then what do you do on the next day?'" David Elkins, "Death Toll Rises at Peaceful Protests," \textit{Inter Press Service}, March 10, 2011.

\textsuperscript{117} "Opposition Assures any 'New Regime Will be Strong Ally in War on Terror," \textit{Yemen Post}, April 4, 2011.


\textsuperscript{120} Defense Secretary Gates describes how the Iranian analogy played a role in his own and other top officials' analysis of the Arab Spring. In particular, the progressive elements most palatable to US officials often get pushed aside by the better organized groups, who are often hostile to US national interests in the Middle East. Robert Gates, \textit{Duty: Memoirs of a Secretary at War} (New York: Random House, 2014), 504-505. White House CT chief John Brennan was the highest ranking administration official to maintain frequent contact with Saleh. During the uprising, he took on the role as chief US emissary, which indicates the degree to which US Yemen policy fell into the CT paradigm.
US hesitance to push the cunning dictator toward the exit grew painfully obvious as state
sponsored violence against peaceful protesters worsened. After March 8th, the US embassy in
Sana released a bland statement expressing dismay over the deaths and injuries of peaceful
protesters and encouraged the government to "investigate these incidents and take all necessary
steps to protect the rights of all Yemeni citizens."\textsuperscript{121} The Obama administration did not identify
Saleh as the primary party responsible for the violence and insisted that "representatives of all
sectors of the Yemeni opposition should respond constructively to President Saleh's call to
engage in a serious dialogue."\textsuperscript{122} Quiet diplomacy continued after the March 18\textsuperscript{th} massacre. In a
White House press statement, President Obama "strongly condemn[ed]" the violence and
"call[ed] on President Saleh to adhere to his public pledge to allow demonstrations to take place
peacefully." A press statement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton echoed alarm over the
violence and urged the "Yemeni security forces to exercise maximum restraint."\textsuperscript{123} On March
21\textsuperscript{st}, State Department spokesman Mark Toner unsuccessfully parried questions regarding the
clear double standard. In response to why the administration was avoiding a call for Saleh to step
aside as it had done to Mubarak on February 2\textsuperscript{nd}, Toner denied the administration had been
silent, claiming President Obama's statement was "very forceful."\textsuperscript{124}

Given AQAP's presence, the possibility of the central government's complete collapse
weighed heavily on US policymakers. Defense Secretary Robert Gates repeatedly emphasized

13, 2011.
\textsuperscript{123} "Statement by the President on Violence in Yemen," White House Office of the Press Secretary, March 18, 2011.
\textsuperscript{124} "Daily Press Briefing," Department of State, March 21, 2011. In contrast, Tawakkol Karman, the founder of the
NGO Women Journalists without Chains and subsequent recipient of the Nobel Peace for her political activism in
the Yemeni revolution, bluntly stated in early April, "We are really very, very angry because America until now
didn't help us similar to what Mr. Obama said that Mubarak has to leave now... Obama says he appreciated the
courage and dignity of Tunisian people. He didn't say that for Yemeni people." Laura Kasinof and David E. Sanger,
this point. In late March, he explained on national TV, "We have had a lot of counterterrorism cooperation from President Saleh and Yemeni Security Services. So if that government collapses or is replaced by one that is dramatically weaker, then I think we'll face some additional challenges out of Yemen... There's no question about it. It's a real problem." When asked about an earlier Gates's comment that there had been no "post-Salih planning," Mark Toner sidestepped the question and noted that CT "assistance is going to continue" and that "it's not necessarily tied to one individual." This weak rebuttal contradicted former US Ambassador to Yemen's Thomas Krajeski's observation that "the State Department each year had studied possible successors to Mr. Saleh and 'came up empty'." Thus, the US faced a dilemma after Ali Mohsin's defection. Saleh suddenly seemed a greater liability than asset in combatting AQAP. The US hoped to play the role of honest broker and help midwife a peaceful political transition that quickly de-escalated confrontation and enabled the ongoing CT program to proceed. Somewhat more cynically, some experts noted that Yemen’s allies wanted "the system preserved, even if it costs the president his job." Regardless of the ultimate aim, US policy toward Yemen fell into a national security paradigm that sought to minimize all risks. The tools associated with quiet diplomacy appeared the most suitable for the task at hand.

127 Similarly, the Pentagon's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Combating Terrorism said in early March, "In my view, it's [Saleh's regime] the best partner we'll have, and hopefully it will survive." Laura Kasinof and Scott Shane, "Radical Cleric Demands Ouster of Yemen Leaders," New York Times, March 2, 2011. A leaked 2005 diplomatic cable offers one such assessment about Ali Mohsen's ability to replace Saleh. Mohamed Sudam and Mohammed Ghobari, "Yemen Accepts Call for Talks, Opposition Silent," Reuters, April 5, 2011.
128 Besides the increased possibility of civil war due to divided military loyalties, Saleh had to draw effective CT units away from the frontline in the war on terror to protect his tenuous grip on power in large urban centers.
As Gregory Johnsen remarked, US officials obsessed over "what comes after Saleh" rather than "what does Yemen look like if Salih stays?" In other words, the danger of civil war and an accompanying power vacuum for al Qaeda was equally high if Saleh negotiated in bad faith and refused to accept a generous offer. Given his history, this was not beyond the realm of possibility. Yet, US officials seemed convinced that this time was different. If they begged hard enough and stroked his ego long enough, Saleh would leave. Unfortunately, there was no plan B in case Saleh did not want to play his part. A master of manipulation, Saleh adroitly exploited this extreme risk-aversion in a high stakes game of brinksmanship.

2.b. 03/22/11 - 04/25/11

After this initial wave of regime defection, Saleh scrambled to reassess his options. He immediately held several high profile meetings to gauge the reservoir of remaining support among military leaders, sheikhs, and GPC officials, who still professed loyalty to the regime.

Regime envoys simultaneously re-initiated power transfer talks with the opposition to ensure a...
relatively soft landing in case high-level defections persisted. As these backroom negotiations proceeded, both groups engaged in public posturing to strengthen their bargaining positions.

On March 22nd, Saleh announced his acceptance of the opposition's five point plan that stipulated he leave office by the end of 2011. He ominously warned that military defections and street protests were part of a coup plot that would push the country toward civil war if continued. In response, the opposition said its offer no longer stood. Saleh had to resign immediately. JMP spokesman Qahtan threatened to escalate the peaceful protests by marching on the presidential palace that Friday.\textsuperscript{133} Behind closed doors, lead opposition negotiator Ali Mohsin bargained with Saleh on Wednesday and Thursday over the timing and conditions of the President's exit as US and UK ambassadors closely monitored the developments. The broad contours of the plan called for the formation of a civilian transitional government to replace Saleh, who would resign alongside Ali Mohsin within 60 days.\textsuperscript{134} The deal collapsed Thursday evening with government officials suggesting the date of Saleh's departure was the biggest obstacle.\textsuperscript{135}

As private talks appeared to stall, public maneuvering intensified. Large pro- and anti-government crowds assembled for dueling Friday demonstrations. At Sabeen Square, Saleh struck a defiant tone declaring his intention to hand power to "safe hands," not to "malicious forces who conspire against the homeland."\textsuperscript{136} As sudden proponents of constitutional legalism, regime representatives explained that the President would leave office after elections were held later that year. On March 27\textsuperscript{th}, the regime reneged even on this promise. In a speech to an

\textsuperscript{133} Qahtan overstepped acceptable boundaries by threatening to march on Saleh's bedroom, which is a deeply offensive comment in Yemeni culture. Saleh reportedly gained additional support for this transgression. Nasser Arrabyee, "President Saleh Willing to Hand Over to Opposition-Led Government," \textit{Gulf News}, March 30, 2011.

\textsuperscript{134} Some initial reports stated that both men would resign within days. Regardless of the exact date, the opposition demanded Saleh step down no later than sixty days after he agreed to the deal.

\textsuperscript{135} Foreign Minister al-Qirbi also observed that the time frame of the transition appeared a critical barrier to the negotiations. Cynthia Johnston and Mohammed Ghobari, "Yemen Close to Transition of Power Deal," \textit{Mail and Guardian}, March 27, 2011.

exceptional GPC meeting, Saleh announced that there would be "no more concessions from now on," while the ruling party insisted he remain president until the end of his constitutional term in 2013.\textsuperscript{137} In turn, Ali Mohsin publicly vowed to overthrow the regime.

The precipitant for this public drama was the breakdown of the negotiated settlement behind closed doors. After accommodating many of Saleh's demands, a five point plan emerged early on Saturday morning.\textsuperscript{138} Ali Mohsin and Saleh would resign from their posts; a civilian caretaker government headed by the current prime minister would assume power; Saleh's close family members would receive immunity guarantees from prosecution; and, Saleh's son and nephews would retain their current positions in the security sector for at least five months.\textsuperscript{139} The deal seemed to be in the final stages when Ali Mohsin included one final opposition demand. Saleh had to go into exile once he resigned.\textsuperscript{140} Saleh responded by calling the General to threaten him and his soldiers. One Yemeni official suggested Saleh's reaction was "understandable" from a cultural perspective, but Saleh's regained sense of confidence also played a key role.\textsuperscript{141}

As one of Saleh's presidential aides observed, "The past week has been a winning week for Saleh." Regime defections mostly stopped. Saleh realized the inner core of his regime

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{137}] "President Saleh: No More Concessions from Now On," \textit{Saba News}, March 27, 2011.
\item[\textsuperscript{138}] Saleh accepted and then refused two earlier deals that involved him handing power to a presidency council or his vice president before stepping down. Hakim Almasmari, "Yemen's Lying President," \textit{Yemen Post}, March 28, 2011.
\item[\textsuperscript{139}] Aside from the timing of his resignation, the fate of Saleh, his son, and nephews was another major obstacle. First, Mubarak's fall from grace reportedly had a significant impact on Saleh's calculations. As former US Ambassador to Yemen Barbara Bodine explained, "What had become a negotiating point, became a very real point. This [immunity] is very important to him." "Upheaval, Uncertainty in Yemen as Saleh Weighs Exit," \textit{PBS NewsHour}, April 25, 2011. Despite an initial unwillingness to sign the immunity clause, foreign mediators persuaded JMP leaders to promise passing a decree into law that would forgive Saleh and his relatives for any past mistakes in exchange for his resignation. Second, the opposition wanted to remove Saleh's relatives immediately from their positions in the security services. Naturally, Saleh considered these family members "safe hands" and wanted them to retain their positions as a means of retaining power and influence. A security official mentioned that the son and nephews would stay at their current posts for at least five months partly because US officials wanted to ensure continuity in the war against terror. This fact partly explained Qahtan's exasperation, "The reason for the delay of Saleh's fall was the ambassadors of the US and UK. They bought him negotiating time and this is hurting the revolution." "Saleh's Survival Skills Keep Him in Power Still," \textit{Yemen Post}, March 29, 2011.
\item[\textsuperscript{140}] Saleh still had apparent aspirations to remain active in politics after his resignation. During a March 28 interview with al Arabiya TV, Saleh indicated that he would remain head of the GPC.
\item[\textsuperscript{141}] Hakim Almasmari, "Death Toll From Yemen Blast Rises to 150," \textit{Wall Street Journal}, March 29, 2011.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
remained intact and he could still mobilize large crowds of supporters. Finally, a senior official noted that the opposition's willingness to accept practically any demand in exchange for his resignation "proved to him that the opposition was not as strong as he thought." With this updated information, Saleh arrived at the conclusion that political survival was not impossible. Efforts to rescue the domestic initiative to find a dignified exit for Saleh ended on March 29th. Publicly, JMP spokesmen Qahtan blamed Saleh's endless "maneuvers" for the failure. After another round of dueling Friday demonstrations, Saleh ignored the opposition's "last, last chance" power-transfer deal offered on April 2nd. With negotiations moving toward external mediation, Saleh now pursued a dual track domestic strategy. First, he would draw out the negotiation process as long as possible and encourage splits within the tenuous opposition coalition. Second, he would secure a generous severance package for him and his family. This immunity clause in the exit deal would create moral hazard, allowing him to pursue his primary

143 Ambassador Feierstein met with Assistant Secretary General of the GPC Sultan al-Barakani after the breakdown in negotiations to discuss ways to resolve the crisis. The US reportedly gave Saleh an ultimatum in late March that either he agree to a deal or the US will publicly call for his resignation. Samia Nakhoul and Amena Bakr, "Saudi and Allies Focus on Yemen's Saleh Exit," Reuters, April 6, 2011. A deal still appeared imminent on Tuesday with either the chairman of Islah, Mohammad al Yadoumi, or the Secretary General of Islah, Abdul Wahab al Ansi, accepting the position of Prime Minister in a caretaker government that would split key government posts equally between the GPC and JMP. Yadoumi reportedly met twice with Saleh on Tuesday, but to no avail. According to Abdul-Ghani al-Iryani, the Islah chairman appeared to get cold feet at the last moment. Not trusting Saleh to hold up his end of the bargain, Yadoumi requested foreign mediation. Author's interview, June 4, 2011.
144 The JMP proposal included five points: "1) Saleh steps down and transfers all powers to vice president Abdu Rabu Hadi; 2) Hadi announces as he takes office the restructuring of the national security, the central security and the republican guard systems to ensure they do their duties according to the Yemeni constitution and law under competent and patriot commanders and under the supervision of the Interior and Defense Ministries; 3) Agreement with the new president, Hadi, on an interim government based on national reconciliation...; 4) Forming the supreme commission for referendum and elections to be responsible for the vote on the constitutional reforms and holding presidential and parliamentary elections according to the new constitution; 5) Ensuring freedom of expression, freedom of peaceful protests and sit-in and investigating the attacks on the killings of the protesters calling for the ouster of the current regime." "Opposition Reveals Five-Point Vision for Power Transfer," Yemen Post, April 2, 2011. Italics are added for emphasis to identify points that subsequently became contentious issues. JMP spokesmen Qahtan clarified that this was the opposition's final offer, whereas Yasser al Awadh, a senior GPC official, said, "if this plan is for discussing, it has what deserves discussions, but [if] it is not for discussing, then I think nobody can dictate [to] others only what he wants." Nasser Arrabyee, "Who Misses the Last Chance in Yemen?," (blog), April 5, 2011, http://narrabyee-e.blogspot.com
objective with even fewer inhibitions. The killing of seventeen unarmed protesters in Taiz and Hudeidah as well as the alleged assassination attempt on Ali Mohsin marked an inauspicious beginning to the external mediation efforts under the auspices of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), a loosely bound international organization of six Arab monarchies.¹⁴⁵

During an interview in late March, Saleh made two statements intended for internal and external consumption. First, he described Yemen as a "time bomb." Two days later, over 150 civilians died after a munitions factory exploded in the small town of Jaar located in the southern Abyan governorate, a province known for significant AQAP activity. Civilians apparently went to loot the factory after army and security forces disappeared. Unsurprisingly, AQAP militants took advantage of this strategic retreat by elite CT units and occupied the town.¹⁴⁶ In the capital, the government and opposition blamed each other for the terrorist advance.¹⁴⁷ Some in the opposition even believed AQAP was a regime creation.¹⁴⁸ The US position on this matter seemed more neutral. Saleh's redeployment of loyal military units to urban centers was necessary to prevent total regime collapse, but it had the unintended consequence of ceding ground to

---

¹⁴⁵ The uptick in violence corresponded with frustrated protesters who escalated their struggle against the regime by conducting large marches throughout major cities sometimes with the aim of occupying government buildings.

¹⁴⁶ The extent of this withdraw was unclear until late July when Brigadier General Mohammed al-Sawmali discussed the travails of the 25th Mechanized Brigade's efforts to stop AQAP's advances in the Abyan province. "General Al-Sawmali: I am a Military Commander and Do Not Have Anything...," Asharq al-Awsat, July 30, 2011.

¹⁴⁷ "There is Terrorism Practiced by Some Political Forces," Saba News, March 31, 2011; "Opposition Assures Any 'New Regime Will Be Strong Ally in War on Terror,'" Yemen Post, April 04, 2011.

¹⁴⁸ The degree to which the regime colluded with AQAP remains an unresolved, highly contentious issue. In recent revelations, al Jazeera debriefed a former Yemeni NSB informant who claims Colonel Ammar Saleh not only colluded with al Qaeda, but maintained a close relationship with many of the group's top leaders, including Qasim al-Raymi, and supplied the group with weapons and money. Such accusations align closely with the narrative offered by Saleh's political opponents and raise serious concerns about the degree to which Saleh and his family played the US before, during, and potentially after the uprising. Will Jordan, "Informant Says Yemen's Saleh Helped Direct Al-Qaeda," Al Jazeera, June 4, 2015.
terrorists on the periphery. Regardless of the reason, the uprising was creating space for AQAP's territorial expansion and safe havens for operational planning.

Second, Saleh mentioned during the interview, "I will leave with my head high, not humiliated." He wanted to convince his interlocutors that he would not respond to public pressure or threats. Saleh reinforced this message at the start of the external mediation efforts.

On April 7th, the Qatari Foreign Minister said he "hopes to conclude an agreement with the Yemeni president to step down." The next day, Saleh indignantly announced to his supporters, "We don't get our legitimacy from Qatar or from anyone else ... We reject this belligerent intervention." This reinforced the GCC desire "not to be seen forcing a solution on the parties involved." Other GCC member states let Saleh humiliate Qatar without any repercussion. US officials seemed to share the view that public pressure could harm negotiations for a peaceful transfer of power. Therefore, the Obama administration supported King Abdullah's approach over the preferences of Qatar and possibly other high ranking members of the Saudi royal family. Thus, Saleh successfully thwarted the possibility that external mediation would deliver

---

149 The State Department's top CT official Daniel Benjamin explained, "It certainly is not helping out counter-terrorism efforts that we have seen the kind of political impasse that we've had in Yemen and that there have been so many demonstrations. Obviously there is going to be concern about security services being distracted by internal issues." Daniel Dombey, "Al-Qaeda 'Still a Formidable Network,'" Financial Times, May 9, 2011.
150 Mohamed Sudam and Mohammed Ghobari, "Yemen's Saleh Again Rejects Move to Replace Him," Reuters, April 8, 2011. Yemen's ambassador was withdrawn from Doha the following day. Three days after Foreign Minister al Thani's comment, GCC Secretary General al Zayani publicly stated that the GCC urged Saleh to proceed with the "transfer of his powers to the vice president." Mohammed Al Qahdi, "GCC Appeals for Yemen's Saleh to Transfer Power," The National, April 11, 2011. Saleh's double standard on what constituted interference is revealing. Saleh seemed to apply divide and rule tactics to exacerbate the fraught relationship between Qatar and Saudi Arabia.
151 "Gulf States Expect Saleh to Quit, Qatar PM Says," Gulf News, April 7, 2011.
152 After Saleh refused to sign the generous offer for a third time on May 22nd, former US Ambassador to Yemen, Barbara Bodine, registered her skepticism for a more aggressive approach, "I don't really think sanctions are really going to bring this to closure ... Certainly not threats." Phil Steward, "For U.S., No Good Options to Nudge Yemen Leader Out," Reuters, May 26, 2011.
153 As one US expert on Yemen observed, "there is not one Saudi policy toward Yemen. I think the Saudis are trying to figure all of this out right now, just as many others are." U.S. Policy in Yemen, Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Near Eastern and South and Central Asian Affairs of the Comm. of Foreign Relations, 112th Cong., 29 (2011) (Statement by Christopher Boucek, Associate at Carnegie Middle East Program) S. Hrg. 112-364. Given these internal divides in Saudi Arabia and the GCC on the appropriate strategy to pursue in Yemen at the time, the US
effective pressure that forced him to make a decision between war or resignation. At this critical juncture, he gained additional time to stall for survival. He would drag out negotiations until the opposition split and foment controlled chaos in the periphery to regain the lost support from his external patrons for the devil they knew and to whom they were awkwardly bound.

By early April, the US preference for dialogue and negotiation shifted decisively toward a policy to push Saleh quietly to the exit. On April 5th, the White House Press Secretary commented that "Saleh needs to resolve the political impasse with the opposition so that meaningful political change can take place in the near term," while Department of State spokesman remarked that a transition "should be done quickly." Publicly, the Obama administration evaded questions regarding its position on the need for Saleh to step down. US officials instead anonymously leaked details to news agencies revealing private efforts to accelerate the process of Saleh handing over power. Although US Ambassador Feierstein would play an important facilitative role during the following two months of negotiations, the administration embraced its newfangled "lead from behind" strategy.

The US encouraged a Saudi-led GCC mediation effort for several reasons. First, the US and GCC states shared the same primary objective – an orderly, peaceful transition that promoted a stable, unified, and secure Yemen. Second, the US wanted the Saudis to assume more responsibility in addressing regional security matters. Yemen also appeared a good crisis to promote the institutionalization of the GCC. Third, the US foreign policy apparatus was arguably possessed the means to help these countries calibrate the diplomatic tone to adopt toward Saleh. Even if they had wanted to adopt an assertive policy, however, US officials may have hesitated to lean on King Abdullah due to the diplomatic tensions with the Sunni monarchs caused by Obama's decision to pressure Mubarak to leave office. Gate, Duty, 506-507.

overstretched due to the fast paced developments related to the Arab Spring, such as the NATO-led intervention in Libya and dramatic escalation in the Syria crisis. Finally, Saudi Arabia had greater familiarity with and possessed much more material leverage over the key figures involved in negotiations.\textsuperscript{156} Thus, the Obama administration immediately announced its full support of the Gulf initiative on April 8\textsuperscript{th} after GCC General Secretary Abdul Latif al Zayani presented a draft plan to representatives of the JMP and Saleh. The GCC initiative closely resembled the opposition's April 2\textsuperscript{nd} five-point plan with the important addition that Saleh and his family would receive immunity from prosecution.\textsuperscript{157} US officials remained largely silent about Yemen's uprising until negotiations collapsed on May 22\textsuperscript{nd}.\textsuperscript{158} They hoped the US-backed, Saudi-led GCC initiative could quietly coax the wily dictator to resign.

After setting the tone by lambasting Qatar's supposed interference, Saleh quickly mended fences by calling the leaders of the other GCC countries to inform them that he still welcomed the initiative. By April 11\textsuperscript{th}, Saleh's office announced that the President had "no reservation about transferring power peacefully and smoothly within the framework of the constitution," an indication of tentative acceptance.\textsuperscript{159} Saleh's mercurial nature and unpredictability led external mediators to pressure the opposition to make all major concessions to close the bargaining gap

\textsuperscript{156} In a seemingly unrelated development, Saudi Arabia terminated all payments to the thousands of Yemeni who had previously received Saudi stipends in April 2011. Hill and Nonneman, \textit{Elite Politics, Street Protesters}, 9.

\textsuperscript{157} "GCC Initiative in Yemen," Department of State Press Release, April 8, 2011. Three days later, the Secretary of State reiterated support for the GCC initiative. "Remarks with Finnish Foreign Minister Dr. Cai-Goran Alexander Stubb After Their Meeting," Department of State, April 11, 2011.

\textsuperscript{158} Yemen was not mentioned once during the twenty one Daily Press Briefings held at the Department of State between April 9\textsuperscript{th} and May 20\textsuperscript{th}. In contrast, Syria and Bahrain were respectively topics of discussion at seventeen and seven Daily Press Briefings during the same period. The US bureaucracy released two statements condemning ongoing violence during this period, but these statements remained vague and never placed blame on Saleh. In contrast, a press statement from President Obama poignantly condemned "in the strongest possible terms the use of force by the Syrian government against demonstrators." "United States Condemns Syria's Violence Against Demonstrators," White House Office of the Press Secretary, April 22, 2011.

\textsuperscript{159} "Yemen's Saleh Ready for Peaceful Power-Transfer," \textit{Agence France Presse}, April 12, 2011.
between the parties.\textsuperscript{160} This pattern became immediately apparent. The opposition accepted the plan on April 8\textsuperscript{th} after submitting suggestions for a few minor alterations, but declined the deal on April 10\textsuperscript{th} claiming the GCC altered the original initiative to please Saleh. Opposition leaders were specifically wary of the imprecise language surrounding the phrase "transfer of power." They wanted to know when, how, and how much power Saleh would transfer.\textsuperscript{161} To resolve the deadlocked process, EU and US officials suggested Saleh transfer all power to a deputy of his choosing within 30 days of signing the GCC initiative.\textsuperscript{162} After further consultations with representatives of the opposition and Yemen's President, the GCC produced the so-called 30-60 compromise plan. Saleh would immediately transfer power and then formally resign in 30 days, with presidential elections held 60 days later under an interim unity government.

While Saleh responded positively to the plan, the opposition conditionally accepted the deal. Among a few other valid concerns, the JMP balked at the clause demanding all protest activity end before the transfer of power.\textsuperscript{163} The JMP correctly pointed out that "no one has

\textsuperscript{160} During this period, the opposition conceded much more than Saleh. In particular, the opposition wanted to remove Saleh from all positions of power immediately, to force Saleh into exile during the entire transition period, and to remove his family members from the security sector immediately. "Gulf States Expect Saleh to Quit, Qatar PM Says," \textit{Gulf News}, April 7, 2011. These demands were considered important for increasing the likelihood that the political transition would produce a stable political order. The external mediators exercised considerable pressure that led the opposition to drop or modify all of these demands. The deeply flawed GCC initiative would not only allow Saleh to stay in Yemen after his resignation, but also left open the possibility that he remain the head of the ruling party. Meanwhile, the family members would stay at their current posts for at least five months. In a rush to end the immediate crisis, external mediators would unintentionally create an extremely powerful spoiler during the transition period. Saleh never hid these intentions. In mid-May, he told the Saudi Okaz daily newspaper that he would "bring down the government again" after any transfer of power. Mohamed Sudam, "Plain-Clothed Men Fire on Yemen Protesters, Wound 15," \textit{Reuters}, May 14, 2011.

\textsuperscript{161} "Yemen Opposition Needs Some Details on GCC Initiative," \textit{Yemen Post}, April 12, 2011.

\textsuperscript{162} Qahtan explained that another obstacle to concluding negotiations concerned whether Saleh's family would keep their military and security positions. Reportedly, this US-EU initiative suggested that Ahmar, Yahya, Ammar, Saleh, and Ali Mobshef all resign and leave the country in exchange for immunity from prosecution. Defining the terms of exile seems to disappear from negotiation talks around this time. Nasser Arrabyee, "Saleh to Exit Within Month," \textit{Gulf News}, April 17, 2011.

\textsuperscript{163} JMP officials resisted two other aspects of the initiative. First, they wanted the national unity government to be formed after Saleh left power rather than in seven days because this would require them to swear loyalty to Saleh. Second, they objected to the fact that Yemen's current parliament possessed the power to approve or reject Saleh's resignation. "Yemeni President Agrees to Step Down in 30 Days," \textit{Asharq Al-Awsat}, April 24, 2011.
power over the young protesters.\textsuperscript{164} Even if the JMP had sufficient trust that Saleh would abide with the terms of the agreement, acceptance of this clause would completely alienate the JMP from the independent youth, which had been a central aspect of Saleh's strategy since the protests began. Saleh and his allies pounced on the opposition's legitimate reservations to the GCC initiative. As one presidential adviser noted, "This will be good for the president, because now it's clear that the opposition has refused everything."\textsuperscript{165} Meanwhile, Saleh equivocated about his own intentions of accepting the deal. Officials close to the President indicated his willingness to sign it on April 23\textsuperscript{rd} apparently under the impression that the opposition could not possibly accept the initiative in its current form. Yet, in an interview with the BBC the following day, Saleh defiantly offered his support for change "through ballot boxes and referendums."\textsuperscript{166} By April 25\textsuperscript{th}, however, the US ambassador had convinced the opposition to announce their acceptance of the offer with the addendum that peaceful protests may continue.\textsuperscript{167} Saleh appeared cornered into accepting an incredibly generous severance package.

III. The Failed GCC Initiative

Frustrated by the continued attacks on unarmed civilians and disappointed with the GCC initiative, peaceful protesters escalated pressure in late April by leaving their encampments and marching through urban centers.\textsuperscript{168} On the worst day of violence since March 18\textsuperscript{th}, the security

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{164} Nasser Arrabyee, "Saleh Agrees to Step Down," \textit{Gulf News}, April 24, 2011. Although the independent youth rejected the initiative, this collective actor was not considered a spoiler to the deal. Their presence placed some limits on what the JMP would accept, but the JMP generally used the crowds as a bargaining chip.
\textsuperscript{166} "Yemen President Ali Abudllah Saleh Defiant Over Exit," \textit{BBC News}, April 24, 2011.
\textsuperscript{167} The US ambassador reportedly employed strong-arm tactics and provided assurances to convince the opposition to accept the deal. "Yemen's Opposition 'Agrees to Gulf Plan,'" \textit{Al Jazeera}, April 26, 2011. In regard to external persuasion, one JMP leader opined, "We grudgingly accepted the terms of the agreement. As a political opposition, we had no alternative." Shatha Al-Harazi, "JMP Says GCC Initiative is Dead," \textit{Yemen Times}, May 5, 2011.
\textsuperscript{168} Some local branches of the national uprising successfully implemented other forms of civil disobedience. For instance, the southern cities of Aden, Lahj, Taiz, and Ibb called for a partial general strike in late April for Wednesdays and Saturdays. By early May, Aden and Lahj achieved a nearly 100 percent adherence rate among
\end{flushleft}
forces killed 12 unarmed protesters and injured approximately 200 more in Sana on April 27th. The US Embassy released a statement registering "distress" over the violence, but sent the wrong message by urging unarmed civilians to avoid "all provocative demonstrations, marches, and speeches" rather than singling out Yemen's President for the disproportionate use of force.\textsuperscript{169} Saleh continued to stall the next day by expressing reluctance to sign if Qatar's representative attended the ceremony. GCC members rallied around Qatar this time and flatly rejected Saleh's excuse. Searching for any way to derail the initiative, Saleh then refused to travel to Riyadh in fear that a coup would occur during his absence. He was accommodated and the ceremony was made into a two day affair. Finally, Saleh refused to sign in his capacity as president. He would sign as the head of the GPC because the plan "was a political party deal from the beginning."

This was a bridge too far for the opposition. As one JMP leader explained, "Our opponent is not the ruling party... We don't demand the ruling party to leave. We demand Saleh as the president of the country leave."\textsuperscript{170} Saleh managed to manufacture another excuse to buy more time.

Rather than dismiss this issue as frivolous and demand Saleh sign in his capacity as president, the international community appeared deferential.\textsuperscript{171} After a failed attempt by King Abdullah to salvage the deal by calling his Yemeni counterpart on May 1st, the GCC spokesmen merely insinuated that Saleh was the cause of the deadlock and noted plans to proceed with the

\textsuperscript{170} Shatha Al-Harazi, "JMP Says GCC Initiative is Dead," \textit{Yemen Times}, May 5, 2011.
\textsuperscript{171} Abdul Ghani al-Iryani blamed both sides for stubbornness, "We shouldn't care how Saleh signs the agreements. It's not a document that will be used in court. Instead of wasting time the JMP should have told the GCC how they want the agreement to be, and the GCC would put it in mind." Shatha al-Harazi, "JMP Says GCC initiative is dead," \textit{Yemen Times}, May 5, 2011.
mediation effort. Such international pusillanimity confirmed Saleh's hunch that he could continue to play games. Moreover, he had a "get out of jail free" card with the immunity offer that allowed him to take significant risks without facing serious repercussions. The lack of a strong response to Saleh's continued intransigence proved to be a second critical juncture in the international mediation process. Without public condemnation or credible private threats, Saleh felt at ease ignoring subsequent pleas for him to sign the deal.

As negotiations proceeded, Saleh attempted to prove his continued utility by allowing the US to carry out its first drone strike in just under a year, which almost killed Anwar al-Awlaki, a US citizen on top of the secretive "kill list." US and EU representatives reportedly pressured opposition leaders to accommodate Saleh's request, while the GCC provided them a revised version of the plan that made the accord binding only between the political parties. The JMP spokesman refused the GCC's revision and openly called on external states to "put pressure on the president to take all necessary measures to force him to sign the agreement." Giving into Saleh's demand would not close the bargaining gap; GPC officials were resurrecting the demand that street protests cease once more. Meanwhile, massive nationwide protests continued as did efforts to occupy regional government buildings. The revolutionary youth seriously considered a decisive march on the Presidential Palace and released a statement on May 10th declaring their intention to carry out this final strategy the following week.

172 Saleh reportedly told the King that he welcomed continued mediation efforts, but believed the "initiative's articles should be carried out completely as a whole, indivisible and non-selective system." In other words, protests should stop. "GCC Initiative Should be Carried Out as a Whole, Saleh Says," Saba News, May 1, 2011.
175 The US killed Osama bin Laden on May 2nd and some believed al-Awlaki would replace him.
177 "Two Qaeda Leaders Killed in Yemen," Reuters, May 6, 2011.
and 12th when security forces killed at least 15 anti-regime protesters and injured hundreds more in Sana, Taiz, Hodeida, and Ibb. This escalation in violence and Saleh's veiled threat for the opposition to "stop playing with fire" appeared to rekindle some sense of urgency. The Department of State encouraged the security services "to exercise maximum restraint," expressed support for the GCC proposal, and urged the political transition to "begin immediately." The Department of State encouraged the security services "to exercise maximum restraint," expressed support for the GCC proposal, and urged the political transition to "begin immediately."

As tensions rose, GCC Secretary General al Zayani tried revive the deal. The JMP rejected a fourth version that demanded they end street protests and provide a clear time frame for settling the Houthi and Hirak movements before Saleh resigned. US and European diplomats eventually pressured both sides into verbally committing to a modified version of the initiative that would have Saleh sign as both president and GPC head. The US ambassador reportedly met with Saleh on May 17th to inform him that this would be his "last chance" for an "honorable exit." Yemen's president tentatively committed to the plan. The following morning, Saleh received a call from White House CT chief John Brennan, who reiterated "that this transfer of power represents the best path forward for Yemen." Brennan also told Saleh that President Obama would single him out as a positive example of enlightened leadership in his landmark speech on the Arab Spring. Saleh confirmed his intention to resign, but reneged hours later.

---

180 "Violence in Yemen," Department of State Press Statement, May 12, 2011.
181 After Qatar backed out of the initiative on May 12th due to violence and strategic stalling, the JMP began calling the GCC initiative dead, but still welcomed Zayani's efforts and were willing to meet with him if he had "anything new" to discuss. "Gulf Mediator to Meet Yemen's Saleh as Violence Rages," Agence France Presse, May 15, 2011.
183 "JMP 'Optimistic' That Saleh Will Sign GCC Power Transfer Deal," Yemen Times, May 19, 2011. It remains unclear whether this message left no room for interpretation and clearly delineated the consequences Saleh would face if he did not sign the deal. In coordination with US efforts, Zayani also reportedly gave a 24 hour deadline on May 17th for Saleh to accept the initiative. Hakim Almasmari, "Yemen Stalemate Continues as Both Sides Fail to Sign Agreement," The National, May 18, 2011.
184 "Yemen Rivals Fail to Sign Power Transfer Deal," Agence France Presse, May 18, 2011.
185 Robert F. Worth and Laura Kasinof, "Evasions by Leader Add Chaos in Yemen," New York Times, May 26, 2011. After Saleh refused to sign the plan, Obama cursorily addressed the Yemen issue in his speech by noting that Saleh needed "to follow through on his commitment to transfer power." Obama had not publicly commented on the
when the opposition chose Mohammad Basindwa, a political independent, as one of their five representatives to sign the initiative.\textsuperscript{186} Reports began surfacing shortly thereafter that even the GCC chief mediator al Zayani considered Saleh the sole reason for the current impasse.\textsuperscript{187}

On May 19\textsuperscript{th}, the US and EU reportedly placed "intense [private] pressure" sufficient to extract another promise that Saleh would now sign the initiative on May 22\textsuperscript{nd}, Yemen's national unity holiday.\textsuperscript{188} Yet, Yemen's president issued warning that if the internationally sponsored "coup scheme" went forward, then "Al-Qaeda will succeed and control the situation here, and [the West] will then realize that is worse."\textsuperscript{189} Opposition leaders signed the initiative on May 21\textsuperscript{st}. Saleh was expected to follow suit the next day. The West continued to apply "significant pressure." In a phone conversation, John Brennan reportedly told Saleh "that if he doesn't sign, we're going to have to consider possible other steps."\textsuperscript{190} Having exhausted every excuse, Saleh resorted to controlled chaos. On the morning of May 22\textsuperscript{nd}, thousands of pro-regime, armed thugs held diplomats from the US, UK, EU, and GCC hostage at the UAE embassy. Saleh sent a helicopter to rescue the diplomats and bring them to the signing ceremony. The five designated GPC officials signed the GCC plan, but Saleh refused to sign the document "behind closed doors" without the presence of the opposition leaders who signed the initiative, as previously

\textsuperscript{186} Mohammad Basindwa was the chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the National Dialogue formed following the aborted 2009 parliamentary elections. The opposition wanted him to sign the initiative because he was a potential candidate for the interim prime minister position.

\textsuperscript{187} Hakim Almasmari, "President of Yemen Again Stalls on Deal to Seal His Resignation," The National, May 19, 2011.

\textsuperscript{188} "Gulf Accord on Yemen to be Inked Sunday," Agence France Presse, May 19, 2011.

\textsuperscript{189} "Al Qaeda Could be Worse Successor in Yemen," Yemen Post, May 21, 2011.

agreed, the day before. The plan collapsed again. The opposition and regime exchanged blame, while the international community hoped the country would not implode.

On May 23rd, a localized armed conflict in Sana began between tribes aligned with the al-Ahmar family and government security forces. This intermittent battle lasted into early June and left at least 140 dead. On May 29th, Al-Qaeda managed to consolidate control over Zinjibar, the Abyan governorate capital, which lay less than 40 miles away from Aden. Also beginning on May 29th, government forces attacked the main protest camp in Taiz, which left at least 19 unarmed protesters dead within three days. Saleh engaged in brinksmanship to test the mettle and cohesion of his internal and external foes. Before he took his next step, however, an assassination attempt nearly killed him. Due to the extent of his injuries, he had to seek treatment in Riyadh. In line with the constitution, de jure powers were transferred to Vice President Hadi, but de facto power remained divided.

Following the failed negotiation effort on May 22nd, multiple leaks from anonymous US officials about the significant pressure placed on Saleh surfaced in media reports. This was a clear effort by the Obama administration to save face. In essence, they attempted to construct a narrative that their strategy was sound. It only failed because Saleh was "not being rational."

---

192 Skirmishes between the tribes and government forces began on May 23rd. Saleh escalated the crisis by crossing a cultural red line the following day, when pro-regime forces mortared Sadiq al-Ahmar's residence where tribal mediation efforts were underway. King Abdullah reportedly called Saleh shortly afterwards in an unsuccessful attempt to exhort him to quite immediately. "GCC to Take Yemeni File to UN Security Council," Yemen Post, May 28, 2011. The Saudi King subsequently helped broker a tenuous ceasefire after the assassination attempt on Saleh.
193 Echoing the JMP, the former Ministers of Defense and Interior accused Saleh of ordering his forces "to hand over Zinjibar." Whether Saleh manipulated the situation in such fine detail seems doubtful, but the mass withdraw of forces created the permissive environment al Qaeda required to capture and control such provincial centers. Nasser Arrabyee and Laura Kasinof, "Islamists Seize a Yemeni City, Stoking Fears," New York Times, May 30, 2011.
Yet, not all was lost. The deal was still on the table and Saleh just needed to sign it. The day before the assassination attempt, reporters asked State Department spokesmen Mark Toner whether the US was calling on Saleh to step down or was planning to apply sanctions against him and his family. His response was guarded, "I think as this wears on, we need to look at ways to convince him. But at this point, we continue to work closely with the Yemeni Government in trying to urge that he sign it. He has committed to signing this agreement, and again, we urge him to sign it."\textsuperscript{195} This was the international community's response to Saleh's obduracy.

What exactly constituted "intense pressure" remains unclear, but Saleh clearly considered these private threats a bluff. Given the US response after May 22\textsuperscript{nd}, there was no contingency plan. The GCC initiative assumed Yemen's president had no other viable options. In contrast Saleh believed his regime was badly broken, but not beyond repair. Already in late March, Saleh recognized that he maintained a large number of partisans and a formidable degree of coercive capacity. Of equal importance, he perceived the disparate opposition coalition to be much more vulnerable to internal strife than his own base. If he could prevent the international community from adopting a firm stance against him, he could regain the domestic initiative. After March 18\textsuperscript{th}, Saleh tested the resolve of his external mediators and found them eager to accommodate his demands. In particular, he exploited the ubiquitous fear of terrorism to deflect serious pressure. Coupled with the feeble reaction to his rejection of the GCC initiative in late April, the external mediators could not or would not credibly threaten Yemen's president in mid-May.\textsuperscript{196} The golden parachute appeared necessary to avoid a civil war or foreign imposed regime change, but it was

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{195}] "Daily Press Briefing," Department of State, June 2, 2011.
\item[\textsuperscript{196}] Even if Saleh had signed the agreement, questions over the ability of external mediators to enforce the terms of the plan remained. Essentially, the deal exchanged one waiting period for another with several opportunities for Saleh to renege on his promise. Even if Saleh did resign after thirty days, the interim government would only have 60 days to agree on a framework for elections, a feat that had proven elusive since 2009.
\end{itemize}
not a sufficient measure to get Saleh to leave. In sum, Yemen's president took a calculated, not irrational risk on May 22nd. Unfortunately, the unconditional nature of the immunity clause made his strategy of escalating the crisis to gamble for resurrection that much more rational.

* * * * *

This chapter explored the US-GCC failed attempt to coax Saleh from office in the spring of 2011. Saleh seemed ready to accept the golden parachute after the March 18th massacre precipitated a significant wave of elite defections. After a few days, however, it became clear that most of the regime's inner core remained loyal to the president. With his departure no longer appearing imminent, Saleh bargained from a position of strength. His tight control over remaining allies allowed him to extract maximum concessions and to bide his time in the hope that the temporary coalition of internal and external opposition forces would crumble. Like Noriega, the provision of a generous severance package did not deter Saleh from brinksmanship. The golden parachute provided him a perverse incentive to stall and incite managed chaos. Threats by US and GCC representatives for him to resign were ineffective. There was never a resign or else face the following set of consequences and the vague threats that were issued remained private. In effect, the patron begged the dictator to leave and never formulated a coherent alternative in case he refused. Saleh rationally chose to stall for survival.

The logic for avoiding bellicose rhetoric had merit. First, the patrons did not want to provide the opposition an excuse to escalate the conflict. Second, they wanted to avoid cornering Saleh fearing that the prideful man would react emotionally rather than logically. Nevertheless, his refusal to accept an honorable exit equally risked a slide into civil war. The patrons basically needed to remove the palatability of the stalling option and force the regime toward a decision point. To achieve this, they needed to send unambiguous signals about the consequences spoilers
to the deal would face if they refused to sign and abide by the terms of the transition accord.

While it is impossible to know what would have happened had the assassination attempt not occurred, the events in the fall of 2011 provide a means to evaluate the above hypothesis.
Chapter 9:
Decapitation III: The Summer and Fall of 2011 in Yemen

The previous chapter examined the pitfalls of offering a golden parachute without applying simultaneous pressure through credible signals that increase the cost of prevarication. Offers of amnesty often present a necessary condition to avoid violent escalation, but are insufficient means to ease an embattled dictator from office. Since amnesty offers often coincide with the imminent collapse of a regime, ascertaining the independent causal effect of golden parachutes from over-determined cases is difficult. Thus, the Panama and Yemen cases are useful to evaluate this hypothesis because both UI campaigns entered a stalemate. Yet, a cross-country comparison between these vastly different regimes is fraught with analytic challenges because the underlying conditions, unfolding processes, and key personalities substantially varied. While repeated patterns surface through close analysis of these golden parachute offers, a comparative framework between these cases does little to address alternative explanations for the short-term outcomes respectively. Fortunately, the UI campaign in Yemen experienced two distinct periods where patron behavior and campaign outcome corresponded to the theoretical expectations. Saleh received amnesty guarantees in the spring and fall, but only signed the GCC initiative once external pressure mounted making further attempts to stall costly. Thus, this most similar case design offers a means to gauge the utility of golden parachutes during UI campaigns.

This chapter begins by detailing the domestic and international effort to ease Saleh and his family from office during the summer and fall of 2011. I then explore potential alternative explanations to evaluate whether patron actions independently affected these outcomes or whether the end results were over-determined by other factors. I contend that external pressure was necessary to realize Saleh's departure. The chapter concludes by summarizing the findings.
from the four amnesty cases during stalemated UI campaigns in Panama and Yemen. Ultimately, lowering leadership exit costs through immunity guarantees appears a weak mechanism to induce a political breakthrough unless credible domestic and external threats loom.

I. 06/04/11 - 11/23/11

After the assassination attempt, large crowds celebrated the news of Saleh's departure in public squares throughout the country as analysts began to write his political obituary.¹ Behind closed doors, Western diplomats tried to make this development permanent by urging Vice President Abdu Rabu Mansur Hadi to take control of the situation, declare himself acting president, embrace the full competencies of that position, and sign the GCC initiative.² Yet, Hadi refused to accept the responsibilities of acting president and announced Saleh's imminent return on June 6th. The JMP and demonstrators encouraged Hadi to reconsider this decision, but he would or could not adopt a more proactive approach.³ As chief GCC mediator al-Zayani explained in September, Hadi had "no real powers in Yemen."⁴ Saleh's family maintained control of the better equipped and trained portion of the military. Officials still loyal to the convalescing president insisted that no transfer of power occur until his return. Finally, Ahmed Saleh symbolically occupied the presidential palace after his father's departure. Whatever guarantees

---

² Article 115 of Yemen's 1994 constitution states, "If the post of the President of the Republic becomes vacant or should the President become permanently disabled, the Vice President temporarily takes over the presidential functions for a period that does not exceed sixty days, during which new elections for the President of the Republic shall take place." On June 5th, Hadi received a call from Vice President Biden and John Brennan. The US, UK, and EU ambassadors also met Hadi and told him that Saleh would not be returning soon and that there was no longer a need for his signature so long as power was transferred. Ambassador Feierstein also told the opposition to work with Hadi on the transfer of power. Mohammed al-Qahdi, "Diplomats, Opposition and Yemen's Acting Leader Debate Post-Saleh Rule," *The National*, June 7, 2011.
³ The JMP was prepared to work with Hadi as acting president as was Sadiq al-Ahmar, who assured Hadi tribal support if he decided to lead Yemen. Mohammed al-Qahdi, "Vice-President Hadi Battles Against Saleh's Son for Control in Yemen," *The National*, June 23, 2011. Similarly, the revolutionary youth marched and carried out peaceful sit-ins near Hadi's residence to pressure him to announce the formation of a transitional presidential council. The JMP and revolutionary youth began to intimate the possibility of forming their own national councils if Hadi refused their demands.
the West offered Hadi were insufficient to counteract the threats emanating from Saleh's inner circle.5 Although Western officials described Hadi as the acting president, he functioned as a placeholder. Saleh's family remained veto players to any political transition and Saleh refused to act according to the constitution by transferring real power to the vice president.

Western diplomats succeeded in getting JMP and GPC officials to hold their first known meeting since the beginning of the protests, but Hadi refused to discuss the transfer of power. He focused on reducing the areas of tensions that threatened public order and restoring basic services to prevent a humanitarian crisis. Further discussion on the transfer of power would occur once the situation settled.6 Other GPC officials were less conciliatory. On June 12th, a government spokesman announced that Saleh's first surgery was a success and no transfer of power would happen until he returned. This news resulted in six hours of non-stop celebratory gunfire in the capital. As one senior GPC official observed, "The Americans and Europeans

---

5 Saleh selected Hadi, a Southerner, as his Vice President after the 1994 civil war in an attempt to provide a façade of reconciliation. A leaked State Department cable described Hadi as a "putative reformer" who did not maintain any independent base of power. Tom Finn, "New President Steps Out of Shadows," The Guardian, February 21, 2012. US, European, and GCC ambassadors pressured Hadi and the JMP to agree on a joint transitional council over a short period of time where each political party would receive a 50% stake in the interim government. The opposition faced a formidable hurdle. Some members believed the GPC's share was too large; others disagreed over how to divide their 50% share. Hadi faced the daunting task of convincing the ruling party, which was divided between those who supported a transition and those who backed Saleh. According to a senior officer in the Republican Guard, Ahmed let it be known that he would use all necessary means if the opposition tried to take over power while his father was in Riyadh. Hakim Almasmari, "Chaos in Yemen Grows as Stalemate Continues," The National, June 11, 2011.

6 Hardline regime members reportedly balked even at these tentative measures because the regime used collective punishment as a means to increase pressure on average citizens. Hadi's cautious approach threatened to dilute the effectiveness of this cynical calculation. The logic behind this tactic was that citizens facing extreme hardship would turn on the opposition and call for a restoration of the status quo ex-ante. Regime officials blamed opposition elements for sabotaging electricity lines and oil pipelines as a means to discredit the regime. The people on the street explicitly rejected this accusation on July 22nd, the "Friday of Refusing Collective Punishment by the Regime." Regardless of which side deserved the most blame, the deteriorating economic situation severely affected Yemen's vulnerable population. The shortage of gasoline and diesel caused price spikes of up to 567% on the black market for these products, which "affected the prices of all commodities and paralysed the function of many economic sectors and some service activities." For instance, basic food staples increased by 43% on average and the price of water rose by 202% as fuel was required for transportation of food and the operation of well pumps. Many civilians also complained that the supply of electricity was erratic and often lasted only one hour a day on average in the capital. "Report to the High Commissioner on OHCHR's Visit to Yemen," Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, September 13, 2011.
wanted to hastily close the Yemeni file ... Our response: 'Not before the president's return,' and we shot millions of bullets in the air to make this message clear. They got the message."\(^7\)

Frustrated by such apparent stalling, the JMP wanted the international community to take a strong stand and break the deadlock. Although Secretary of State Clinton reiterated the need for "an immediate, orderly, and peaceful transition consistent with Yemen's constitution," the West hesitated to threaten regime hardliners.\(^8\)

The US foreign policy priority in Yemen was fighting AQAP. This created a dilemma. Although US officials insisted that the CT program did not depend on any one individual, it disproportionately relied on Saleh's family, especially Ammar Saleh who ran the National Security Bureau. The fall of Zinjibar confirmed the assumption in Washington that AQAP would take advantage of the political crisis.\(^9\) Al Qaeda appeared poised to consolidate control over the entire Abyan governorate with further plans for territorial expansion. On June 9\(^{th}\), the new Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, explained in front of the Senate Armed Services Committee, "we continue to work with elements there to try to develop counterterrorism."\(^10\) Throughout the summer, the US played an integral role in air operations to stem the terrorist advance and placed substantial pressure on Yemen's government to support the besieged 25th mechanized battalion fighting AQAP militants near Zinjibar.\(^11\) By early September, the combined force of US

\(^7\) Abeer Allam, "Saleh Supporters Rally Round President," Financial Times, June 12, 2011. Tragically, up to 16 people died and 230 more were injured as the bullets subsequently rained down on innocent bystanders.

\(^8\) "Press Availability in Abu Dhabi, UAE," Department of State, 06/09/11.

\(^9\) S. Hrg. 112-364, at 7 (2011) (Joint Statement by Daniel Benjamin, US Department of State Coordinator for Counterterrorism, and Janet A. Sanderson, Ambassador). The jailbreak of 62 Al Qaeda prisoners in Mukalla on June 22\(^{nd}\) added to these fears. Absolute worst case scenarios included a strategic alliance between AQAP and the al-Shabaab terrorist network in Somalia that could threaten the three million barrels of oil that transit daily through the Bab-el-Mandeb strait if political order completely collapsed in southern Yemen.


\(^11\) The Obama administration was able to increase the number of drone strikes dramatically during the summer. By mid-June, a Yemeni Defense Ministry official noted that US drone strikes were occurring on a daily basis. Hakim Almasmari, "US Makes a Drone Strike a Day in Yemen, The National, June 15, 2011. Moreover, the US was speeding up construction on a CIA base in the region, which would provide the administration greater latitude for
airstrikes, Yemeni military reinforcements, and local tribes proved sufficient to recapture Abyan's capital. The extent of cooperation between the US and elements of Saleh's regime became apparent when CIA director David Petraeus acknowledged that "counterterrorism cooperation with Yemen has, in fact, improved in the past few months."\(^{12}\) The US depended on the cooperation of Saleh's family to carry out effective CT operations during the summer, which the latter contingently gave to demonstrate its remaining value as a partner in the war on terror. Despite private assurances from the opposition to cooperate with Washington against AQAP, US officials appeared unwilling to issue credible threats to regime hardliners.\(^{13}\) As a result, US officials mechanically condemned violence without explicitly placing blame on the regime and called for an immediate, peaceful, and orderly transition as proposed by the GCC initiative.\(^{14}\)

By early July, the protest camps appeared increasingly "dispirited, depressed, and divided."\(^{15}\) Latent tensions within the formal opposition grew more apparent. The smaller parties in the JMP held private meetings with GPC officials to "keep all options on the table," while the increasing the number of strikes. As Panetta would note in July, Al Qaeda was "on the run" and "close to defeat," adding that "[n]ow is the moment, following what happened with bin Laden, to put maximum pressure on them because I do believe that if we continue this effort that we can really cripple Al Qaeda." He observed that the branch in Yemen constituted one of "the biggest threats in terms of attacks on the United States ... I would say that's one of our top priorities right now." Elisabeth Bumiller, "Panetta Says Defeat of Al Qaeda is 'Within Reach,'" \newyorktimes\, July 9, 2011.

\(^{12}\) Tabassum Zakaria and Susan Cornwell, "CIA Chief: Al Qaeda Affiliate Most Dangerous," \reuters\, September 13, 2011.

\(^{13}\) In an meeting with the opposition in early June, Ambassador Feierstein sought and received guarantees from the JMP that the strategic partnership would continue regardless of who won the power struggle. Mark Mazzetti, "U.S. Is Intensifying a Secret Campaign of Yemen Airstrikes," \newyorktimes\, June 9, 2011.

\(^{14}\) During the summer, two high ranking US officials travelled to Yemen. US Assistant Secretary of State Jeffery Feltman visited in late June and John Brennan in mid-July. Publicly, they reiterated the generic message. Privately, they attempted to persuade Saleh and his family to allow a political opening to occur, but this message was unlikely forceful as these visits also dealt with CT cooperation. The only innovation in the US effort to convince Saleh was a letter hand delivered by John Brennan from President Obama stating that "the only way to get American aid flowing again was to sign" the GCC initiative. David E. Sanger, "Envoy Meets with Leader of Yemen on Accord," \newyorktimes\, July 11, 2011. Yet, Saleh's immediate survival did not depend on this aid thereby undermining the coercive effect of this feast or famine tactic. The Undersecretary of Defense and Intelligence Michael Vickers also visited Sana in early September, but this visit assuredly had little to do with resolving the political crisis.

\(^{15}\) Laura Kasinof, "Yemen's Revolution Bogs Down in Despair," \newyorktimes\, July 9, 2011.
YSP voiced fears of an Islamist takeover. Rifts between the street and formal opposition also emerged. The revolutionary youth believed the formal opposition in collusion with Ali Mohsin was hijacking the revolution. Thus, the stalling for survival strategy appeared to be succeeding. Meanwhile, in a pre-recorded speech on July 7th, Saleh addressed the Yemeni people for the first time since his injuries. Although in a visibly fragile physical state, he remained combative. He talked broadly about the possibility of a unity government, but never indicated a willingness to step down and accused the opposition of an "incorrect understanding of democracy." Coupled with numerous statements from regime spokesmen indicating that the president would only leave through the ballot box, the opposition appeared no closer to achieving its goals.

John Brennan's appeals to the opposition after visiting Saleh in Riyadh on July 10th only served to heighten their sense of isolation and vulnerability. Aside from the bland statement that Saleh should follow through on his pledge to sign the GCC initiative, the US CT chief told the opposition that Saleh would return and the US had little leverage to accelerate the transition. One opposition official present at this meeting noted that Brennan "warned against any political protest escalation ... that would lead to growing unrest and deterioration, which certainly [would] benefit [the] terrorist al-Qaida wing to expand its activities." Essentially, the US considered Saleh's acceptance of any transition a sine qua non, but refused to place additional pressure on

---

17 These strategic allies understood they shared little in common except the ouster of Saleh. The revolutionary youth's reticence toward their purported strategic allies increased during the summer. An early indication of this fraught relationship arose on June 7th when thousands of protesters peacefully gathered at Hadi's residence to push their demands for a transitional council. Although they arrived at an agreement with Ali Mohsin, whose troops were providing protection for the Vice President at that time, to end the peaceful sit-in within 24 hours, the troops violently and unexpectedly dispersed the gathering early. "1st Armored Division Attacks Protesters," Yemen Times, June 8, 2011. Frustrations mounted when firqa troops and pro-opposition tribesmen attempted to control the movements of the youth into and out of Change Square. Moreover, Islamists and tribesmen gradually gained greater control over the square. Thus, the revolutionary youth accused the elite in the formal opposition of coopting the mantle of revolutionary legitimacy to advance their narrow self-interests.
him. Aware that the stalemated situation only served the interest of regime hardliners, the opposition ignored US appeals and escalated pressure to maintain momentum, prevent fragmentation, and shame the international community into taking a stronger stance.

The revolutionary youth moved first. Claiming that the US was "stabbing the youth in the back," they formed a revolutionary council on July 16th. The council was dead upon arrival. Many of those named as council members were unaware of their selection and no opposition party endorsed it. Meanwhile, the UN special envoy, Jamal Benomar, arrived the following day to gather information on ways to alleviate tensions and resolve the crisis. The opposition rejected Benomar's pleas to re-enter into dialogue with the GPC through Hadi's so-called roadmap for peace that sought "to solve all the problems gradually." The central point of contention remained the timeframe of the transition. The opposition demanded an immediate transfer of all Saleh's powers to Hadi. Foreign Minister Al Qirbi outlined the regime's position. The GCC initiative remained acceptable. Saleh would transfer power at the ballot box during early elections in line with the constitution. Yet, Al Qirbi claimed elections in 60 days as outlined by the GCC initiative was an infeasible timetable and warned that the country would descend into civil war if the opposition continued to seek Saleh's ouster through extra-constitutional means.

---

21 Leaders of the revolutionary youth accused the US ambassador of lying to them in April when he allegedly promised the full backing of the US if Saleh did not follow through on a transfer of power within one month. Unlike in Libya, the external actors discouraged the fractured opposition from coalescing around a transitional council. After stating that the UK will not recognize the revolutionary council, UK Ambassador Jonathan Wilkes informed the youth that the divisions in their ranks prevented the formation of such a council and emphasized the need for transferring power to Hadi in accordance with the Yemeni constitution. "Britain Will Not Recognize Transitional Council in Yemen," Yemen Post, July 18, 2011.

22 The idea of a transitional council remained a rather popular option for filling the void created by Hadi's refusal to become acting president and carry out a political transition. Earlier in the month, the JMP revealed its intentions "to form a transitional ruling council as soon as possible ... due to obstructions by Saleh's aides and the lack of seriousness of the Gulf mediators to press Saleh's followers to implement the GCC initiative." "Yemeni Opposition Drafts Transitional Ruling Council," Xinhua, July 5, 2011.


24 Saleh organized an umbrella committee in late July to formulate the regime's base bargaining position on the necessary amendments to the April GCC Initiative. The main issues to emerge from this working draft document
In an interview days later, Al Qirbi asseverated that nothing prevents Saleh from returning home. The opposition responded to such intransigence by announcing its intention to escalate the struggle. Benomar departed unable to bridge the gap.

On July 30th, Sheikh Sadiq al-Ahmar announced the formation of the Yemen Tribal Coalition, an alliance of tribes that supported the goals of the popular youth-led revolution. A week later, the JMP revealed that it would form a national council on August 17th to coordinate the forces of the revolution since Saleh was no longer president according to Article 116 of the constitution. Deputy Minister of Information Abdul Janadi described this move as "a call for war." Similar to the revolutionary council a month earlier, the National Council of the Peaceful Revolution Forces failed to unite the fragmented opposition. Yet, less than a week later, the fall of Tripoli reenergized the flagging opposition. The regime braced for the opposition's escalation campaign that would gain momentum after Ramadan ended on August 30th.

25 The declaration occurred following indiscriminate airstrikes in Arhab, Al Zindani's home village only 25 miles north of Sana. Intense armed conflict between the Revolutionary Guard and local tribes had begun in mid-July. Ali Mohsin and Al Zindani allegedly hatched a plan for a pincer attack that supported Sheikh Mansour al-Hanaq, a Minister of Parliament from Arhab and cleric in the Muslim Brotherhood with close connections to Al Zindani, to capture the strategic sites of Mount as-Sama and Sana International Airport. Fernando Carvajal, "Politics and Proxy Wars," Yemen Peace Project (blog), August 15, 2011, http://www.yemenpeaceproject.org/blogpost. After Sadiq's announcement in late July, loyal Hashid tribes prepared once more for armed confrontation in Sana's Hasaba district. Another localized armed conflict was underway since late May in Taiz, where Ali Mohsin provided support for local tribes led by Sheikh Mikhlafl, Al Zindani's former bodyguard and Islah member. Government forces fought fiercely to prevent the opposition from gaining complete control over Taiz throughout the summer and fall due to fears that the city could function as Yemen's Benghazi. These armed proxy battles provided some credence to the regime's claim that the revolutionary youth were just a front for an Islamist takeover. In an effort to regain patron support, the regime tirelessly made connections between the strong Islah presence in the opposition to the potential that the next regime may be sympathetic to Al Qaeda.

26 "Yemen Says Opposition National Council is Call to War," Yemen Post, August 11, 2011.

27 In particular, the Houthi and Hirak partisans refused to take the seats designated to their contingents.

28 A chant at this time was, "O Ahmed, Saleh's son, enough illusions. Look [what] Saif Al-Islam, Gaddafi's son, has become."Yemen Demos Continue As Libyans Confirm Victory Against Colonel," Yemen Post, August 24, 2011.
Throughout August and early September, the international community assiduously worked on two fronts to defuse mounting tensions. First, efforts to create a satisfactory implementation mechanism accelerated. In mid-August, some Yemeni diplomats intimated that the UN envoy's proposal suggested in late July, where the transfer of power would take place in two stages, was gaining traction. This modification guaranteed Saleh's exit through elections and addressed some key concerns, but required further refinements. By early September, additional amendments to the implementation mechanism addressed lingering issues related to the GCC initiative. Yet, hardline elements in the GPC continued to frustrate any resolution to the crisis. Second, Western diplomats applied "significant pressure" on Saleh to stay in Saudi Arabia. Saleh's intentions remained unclear, but a breakthrough seemed to occur on September 12th when he granted Hadi some presidential competencies to negotiate a power transfer deal in line with the GCC initiative. State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland described this as one among several "encouraging signs" and voiced hope that "an agreement is reached and the signing of the GCC Initiative takes place within one week." Unfortunately, less than a week

---

29 In the first phase, Saleh would transfer power to Hadi from Saudi Arabia. Hadi would then set up a national unity government and the JMP and GPC would elect Hadi by the end of the year as the constitutionally legitimate president of a transitional government. In the second stage that would last two years, Hadi would oversee debate over constitutional reforms and make preparations for new parliamentary elections. GPC moderates appeared to embrace this approach, but Saleh's faction continued to balk. The opposition also issued reservations including a demand for restructuring the security apparatus before the presidential elections. "GCC Yemen Plan Sees Fresh Amendments," Yemen Post, August 14, 2011.

30 No major innovations to the implementation mechanism occurred after these alterations.

31 Similar to those in May, the type of threats issued at this time remained ambiguous. With momentum slowly building in the UN, Western diplomats may have raised the possibility of a UN Security Council resolution if Saleh refused to empower Hadi to complete negotiations. In an interview in early September, John Brennan explained that Saudi Arabia would allow Saleh to return to Yemen. He added that he could not obstruct his return, but strongly warned Saleh that his return was not "in his interests, Yemen's interests or our interests." Kimberly Dozier, "US Counterterrorism Chief: al Qaeda on 'steady slide,'" Associated Press, September 1, 2011.

32 Saleh and his close advisors regularly issued contradictory statements. For instance, Saleh sent Obama a letter on August 10th informing his counterpart that he approved the transfer of power plan and would not return home during the political transition. Less than a week later, he said on a nationally televised address, "See you soon, in Sana."

33 "Daily Press Briefing," Department of State, September 15, 2011.
after making this bold prediction, more than 130 unarmed protesters were killed and Saleh furtively returned home "carrying the dove of peace and an olive branch."\textsuperscript{34}

Tensions during the first half of September culminated in this paroxysm of violence. The month began with the Friday of Escalation where over two million unarmed anti-government protesters gathered in 16 out of the 21 governorates in Yemen to demand Saleh's immediate resignation. On September 5\textsuperscript{th}, the head of the newly formed National Yemeni Council for the Revolution, Mohammad Basindwa, carried out the opposition's perennial threat to join the youth on the street. He rejected any provision of immunity clauses, announced the beginning of an "escalation campaign," and emphasized that the people "will bring down the regime through peaceful way[s], not violence, no matter what weapons the regime uses against us."\textsuperscript{35} Days earlier, however, Ali Mohsin had raised questions about the opposition's dedication to peaceful change, "We know that the revolution will need military interference, and we will work to make it happen."\textsuperscript{36} Ahmed Saleh reacted to this provocation by recalling Republican Guard units located in Dhamar, cutting off road access to the capital, and storing weapons in strategic locations throughout Sana. In an effort to head off the impending showdown, Western diplomats joined JMP and GPC moderates to find a practical mechanism to break the dangerous stalemate. The outcome was Saleh's reluctant decision to cede some powers to Hadi, but Yemen's president

\textsuperscript{34} "Violence Rocks Yemen After Saleh Peace Vow," \textit{Agence France Presse}, September 24, 2011. How Saleh returned to Yemen remains mysterious especially since he had discussed the transition with King Abdullah only days earlier. Most likely, Saudi Arabia felt compelled to allow the incumbent President to return as it generally avoided setting precedents of external interference in domestic political matters. An alternative account offered by some anonymous US and Saudi officials is that the "clever, canny" dictator tricked his host by asking to see off some Yemeni officials at the airport, but then boarded a plane destined for Sana himself. In still another version, Saleh asked to relocate to Ethiopia to establish permanent residence in exile. According to one airport official in Sana, a plane destined for Addis Ababa asked to stop to refuel. President Saleh unexpectedly walked off this plane. Mohammed Al Qahdi, "Saleh 'duped Saudis' to Fly Home to Yemen, Says US," \textit{The National}, September 29, 2011.

\textsuperscript{35} "Yemen Opposition Rejects GCC Proposal," \textit{Yemen Post}, September 6, 2011.

\textsuperscript{36} Hakim Almasmari, "Yemen Opposition Considers Using Military to Oust President Saleh," \textit{CNN}, September 2, 2011.
did not seem ready to exit quietly. His close associates continued to make demands the opposition would not accept such as the inclusion of his son in the next government.\(^{37}\) Whatever chance there was of a successful negotiated settlement was scuttled by the bloody conflagration that peaked in the capital between September 18\(^{th}\) and the 23\(^{rd}\).\(^{38}\) Arriving in Sana on September 19th to obtain Hadi's signature for the revised UN-backed GCC initiative, Al Zayani left two days later dryly noting that conditions were still not ripe for resolution.

Despite Saleh's clandestine return and the surge in violence, unarmed protesters took to the street in unprecedented fashion on Friday, September 23\(^{rd}\). During the first public address since his return, Saleh reiterated his intention to transfer power according to the GCC initiative, but never revealed a specific timeframe or new concessions. The speech repeated the same old phraseology of "constitutional legitimacy," "dialogue," and "ballot boxes."\(^{39}\) The absence of significant security defections likely strengthened Saleh's conviction that he still possessed substantial support. Yet, international opinion was slowly turning against the regime's stalling tactics. The US, GCC, and UN called for "maximum constraint" and urged all sides to sign the

---

\(^{37}\) The split between GPC moderates and hardliners remained the main obstacle to negotiations. "Fighting Spreads in Sanaa as Division in Saleh Party Holds up Talks," The National, September 23, 2011.

\(^{38}\) Whether one side purposely initiated this bloody conflict remains a source of contention. Some observers suggest that Ali Mohsin and Hamid al-Ahmar provoked violence because they were largely excluded from the ongoing negotiations and could gain bargaining leverage by blaming the regime for killing unarmed civilians. In early September, a pro-Saleh official claimed in an interview that the government possessed a secret document, which revealed a plan between Ali Mohsin and Hamid to derail talks through a violent confrontation. Subsequently leaked to the media, the document revealed alleged machinations whereby Hamid asked Ali Mohsin to arm 3,000 young men to protect the "revolutionary end" protests. Nasser Arrabyee, "War as a Bargaining Chip," Al-Ahram, September 22, 2011. The independent youth protesters set September 18\(^{th}\) as the date to escalate their unarmed campaign by marching on boundary zones separating pro- and anti-Saleh forces. In contrast to months of discouraging such demonstrations, a contingent of armed firqa troops followed unarmed protesters to Kentucky Square. Essentially, these troops used the protesters as a human shield. As the Central Security Forces would not cede strategic ground especially to a gathering of unarmed and armed elements, this episode precipitated the deadly conflict. Government troops also exploited the occasion to target unarmed protesters intentionally for the next five days. Kasinof, Don't Be Afraid, 204-205. Thus, regime hardliners did not appear to avoid or lament the use of violence to derail the unpopular negotiation process either.

\(^{39}\) "President Addresses the Nation on September Revolution," Saba News, September 26, 2011.
GCC initiative "immediately." Most vocally, the spokesmen for the French Foreign Ministry stated that "one could not stand by with its arms folded anymore." Saleh appeared poised to play his trump card. In a Washington Post interview on September 30th, he posed a rhetorical question to the American public, "Are you still keeping your commitment to continue operations against the Taliban and al-Qaeda?" In response, he noted that US pressure to speed up the power transfer process in Yemen was dangerous because "we know where power is going to go. It is going to al-Qaeda, which is directly and completely linked to the Muslim Brotherhood [Islaah party]." The following day, a US drone killed Anwar al-Awlaki.

Given Saleh's previous history of concealing and revealing information to his patrons to suit his agenda, this episode hardly appears coincidental. Yet, the increased level of cooperation in CT operations throughout the summer did not buy the regime a reprieve from international pressure. Immediately following Awlaki's death, State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland confirmed that Saleh still needed to "step aside." US Defense Secretary Panetta strengthened this message when discussing his expectations that CT cooperation would continue "regardless of what ultimately happens with Saleh." External pressure became more acute when UN special envoy Benomar, who had arrived with Zayani on September 19th, left Sana in early October declaring that "Saleh was not serious about stepping down." UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon issued Saleh a three day deadline to accept the GCC proposal before initiating procedures likely to end in a UN resolution. As Saleh ignored this ultimatum, the UK in

41 The interview included trademark Saleh stalling tactics. First, he noted that "we need to sign the GCC initiative as a whole, and we need timelines for the mechanism of executing it." Then, he added new demands that his political rivals should also step down before him, "If we transfer power and they are there, this will mean that we have given into a coup." "We Are Ready to Sign the GCC Initiative as a Whole," Saba News, September 30, 2011.
44 "What Options are Left for Saleh?," Yemen Post, October 16, 2011. Benomar would not countenance Saleh's counterproposal to remain president until the end of his mandate in 2013.
consultation with France and the US began to draft a UN Security Council resolution in early October that would formally call on Saleh to sign and implement the GCC plan.

As street protests and localized armed conflict persisted across Yemen, efforts to sway debate over the UNSC resolution consumed regime and opposition officials. On October 8th, Saleh announced his intention to relinquish power in the coming days on state TV without providing specific details. The following day, Foreign Minister al-Qirbi met with the Russian and Chinese ambassadors hoping to convince these countries to veto any resolution on Yemen. More generally, Saleh and other regime officials lamented the West's incorrect understanding of the crisis and warned of civil war and a "military-Islamic coup." Meanwhile, several high-ranking members of the opposition spent a month touring foreign capitals to make the case for more external pressure. For example, in the week leading up to the vote on the UNSC resolution, three opposition leaders were in Moscow lobbying the Russian government. Western diplomats charged with drafting the resolution were also keenly aware of Russian and Chinese reservations. As a result, UNSCR 2014 passed on October 20th by a vote of 15-0, but retained the controversial immunity clause and failed to mention the possibility of sanctions if Saleh failed to comply. The White House described the resolution as a "united and unambiguous signal to President Saleh that he must respond to the aspirations of the Yemeni people by transferring power immediately." The response to the resolution in Yemen was more varied.

46 The resolution was intentionally contradictory regarding the immunity clause built into the GCC initiative. The resolution's second point stated that "all those responsible for violence, human rights violations and abuses should be held accountable," but the fourth point stated that "all parties in Yemen ... commit themselves to implementation of a political settlement based upon" the GCC initiative. Resolution 2014, UN National Security Council, October 21, 2011, http://www.un.org/press/en/2011/sc10418.doc.htm. Hamid and Ali Mohsin were also threatened with sanctions. Hill et al., Global Drivers of Conflict, 26.
In typical fashion, Saleh "welcomed" the resolution and expressed a "readiness to sit down immediately at the bargaining table ... to reach the final signing of the initiative and its immediate implementation."\(^48\) Only days earlier, however, a government spokesman declared that "nothing and no one, not even a U.N. resolution would make [Saleh] resign."\(^49\) Accustomed to such posturing, opposition leaders remained abroad to push for tougher measures, such as travel bans and asset freezes on Saleh and his close circle of cronies. As for the independent youth protesters, a significant number denounced the weak resolution demanding that Saleh stand trial for the crimes committed during the uprising.\(^50\) Despite this source of frustration, one fact became clear. Time was running out on the strategy of stalling for survival. For the first time since his clandestine return, Ambassador Feierstein met with Yemen's president on October 25th. Saleh informed Feierstein of his intention to sign the initiative. Tired of words, the ambassador urged action noting that "it was time for him to face the fact that no other option was left on the table."\(^51\) As external and internal pressure mounted, Saleh prepared for two eventualities.

First, he allowed the moderate faction in the ruling party to advance negotiations over the GCC deal. The final touches on the UN implementation mechanism incorporated confidence-building measures that addressed remaining reservations to the deal.\(^52\) Given these new

\(^{50}\) Tawakkol Karman, who had just received the Nobel Peace Prize for her role in Yemen's youth revolution, expressed her contempt for the resolution, "Yemenis are ready to pay the ultimate price to take on a brutal dictatorship. Yet the UN can't even bring itself to condemn him." Tawakkol Karman, "The World Must Not Forsake Yemen's Struggle for Freedom," \textit{The Guardian}, November 1, 2011. Importantly, many independent youth protesters did not share Karman's perspective and expressed a willingness to accept the transition agreement. This group noted that some self-serving members within the JMP were encouraging protesters to reject the negotiated settlement in a bid to improve their bargaining position. Crisis Group, \textit{Break Point?}, 10.
\(^{51}\) "American Ambassador to Yemen Denies Yemeni Government Claim," \textit{Yemen Post}, November 1, 2011. Whether Feierstein issued additional threats remains unknown, but European officials began publicly discussing targeted sanctions within two weeks of this meeting. Such action was unlikely taken without the consent of the US due to the close diplomatic coordination between these countries on Yemen.
\(^{52}\) Before Saleh returned in late September, two specific issues remained unresolved. First, Saleh wanted to remain president until early elections, whereas the opposition wanted him to resign beforehand. A solution emerged
parameters, the GPC released a statement that expressed for the first time a clear, unified position on transferring power to Vice President Hadi. The government told US, EU, and Gulf diplomats that Saleh agreed to transfer powers to Hadi who would sign the GCC initiative. Responding to these positive developments, the EU ambassador Michele Cervone d'Urso expressed optimism that a political agreement would soon be reached, but the opposition remained wary correctly observing that "what is happening on the ground" told a different story.\(^{53}\) Foreign negotiators and diplomats assumed that Saleh would not purposely provoke a civil war because he did not possess sufficient power to accomplish a quick, clean victory. Although moderate GPC officials shared this perspective, Saleh had not dismissed the option of a military solution and was actively preparing for this second option.

In mid-October, a high-ranking Yemeni diplomat claimed that plans to wipe out the opposition existed.\(^{54}\) Certain actions appeared to substantiate this accusation. Saleh embarked on a fresh military recruitment campaign and was continuing to transfer heavy weaponry to strategic locations.\(^{55}\) During an October 16\(^{\text{th}}\) meeting with top security and military commanders, Saleh warned of a "military coup by [the] Muslim Brotherhood in collaboration with al-Qaeda" and declared "all-out war" on "the so-called revolution forces."\(^{56}\) Hadi's absence at this meeting suggested that ultimate decision-making power was shifting away from the GPC and toward the

---


\(^{54}\) "What Options are Left for Saleh?,” *Yemen Post*, October 16, 2011.

\(^{55}\) "Rayan Hills are Turned Into a Defense Military Base," *Yemen Post*, November 8, 2011.

military. After the passage of UNSCR 2014, the government escalated its bloody proxy battles, especially in Taiz and Arhab. Since this contradicted the UN resolution that called for an immediate end to politically motivated violence, the French Foreign Minister revealed on November 8th EU plans to discuss asset freezes "as soon as possible."\(^{57}\) Shortly thereafter, the US and UK indicated their intentions to discuss asset freezes within a week. When UN envoy Benomar arrived on November 11th to finalize negotiations, Saleh launched a ferocious attack on Taiz that killed 17 civilians. Two days later, Saleh reportedly refused to sign the initiative again and told Benomar to continue dialogue between Hadi and the opposition over a "practical mechanism and timetable." Just as Ambassador Feierstein had done weeks earlier, Benomar "categorically refused to engage in further talks as he said that enough time had been wasted already."\(^{58}\) With the UN resolution's thirty day deadline and credible threats of asset freezes looming, the international community had finally forced Saleh to decide between civil war and his severance package. Following a series of marathon negotiations over the following week, the foreign mediators managed to close the gap. The international community sighed in collective relief as a smiling Saleh finally signed the GCC initiative in Riyadh on November 23rd.

The manner in which Saleh reached the "rational" decision to resign rather than fight for survival is revealing. In line with his preparations to launch a military solution, the regime continued to issue bellicose statements. After regime violence in Taiz on November 11th, for example, Yemen's defense minister announced that the army was prepared "to defend the country against subversive elements of the opposition and the dissident army."\(^{59}\) In an interview on November 14th, Saleh indirectly threatened that civil war remained a distinct possibility "if

\(^{57}\) "EU to Discuss Sanctions on Yemen's Saleh Next Week," *Reuters*, November 7, 2011.
\(^{58}\) "Yemen: Presidential Refusal," *Yemen Post*, November 15, 2011.
\(^{59}\) "Yemen Defense Minister: "Ready to Defend the County," *Yemen Post*, November 12, 2011.
some provisions are excessive or don't take into account the specific features of the Yemeni people, its customs, its traditions."\textsuperscript{60} Over the following week, Saleh appointed new, loyal officers to key military posts previously held by suspected sympathizers of the uprising and continued transferring military equipment to the capital.\textsuperscript{61} On November 20\textsuperscript{th}, Saleh visited a Republican Guard corps in Sana to praise the soldiers' loyalty, denounce defectors, and promise "painful" punishment for attacks on government forces.\textsuperscript{62} The following day, Saleh assembled all military commanders in the National Defense Council aside from his family members and asked them to explore a military solution to the problem. By evening, his commanders told him that a solution did not exist. Saleh was essentially asking his commanders whether they would fight to preserve the regime and the commanders told him they would not.\textsuperscript{63} Saleh repeated this exercise on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} and the morning of the 23\textsuperscript{rd} just before he boarded the plane to sign the agreement in Riyadh. He received the same answer. Saleh, a risk-acceptant, but rational leader, chose to resign. The additional pressure by the international community proved necessary to force him toward the decision point between civil war and personal security.

\textit{II. The Patron Factor in Yemen's Arab Spring and Alternative Explanations}

The timing of Saleh's decision to sign the GCC initiative indicates that increased pressure by the international community played an integral role in resolving the crisis. Nonetheless, I must rule out the possibility of omitted variables that may independently provide a sufficient account for this political breakthrough. This section examines three such alternative factors to ascertain whether increased patron pressure was a necessary condition to achieve a negotiated settlement to the political stalemate precipitated by a UI campaign.

\textsuperscript{60} "Yemen's Saleh 'to Step Down in 90 Days,'" \textit{France 24}, November 14, 2011.
\textsuperscript{63} Author's interview with Abdul-Ghani Al-Iryani, June 4, 2015.
The most common explanation given for why the crisis ended in Saleh's resignation is that neither side possessed sufficient coercive capacity to bend the other to its will. Yemen's president, his family, and close advisors realized that the stakes of armed conflict were high and victory far from guaranteed. As Saleh poignantly noted in an interview in mid-November, "we do not want a new Gadhafi in the region ... I'm aware that anyone who clings to power is mad." Director of the strategic research center at the Yemeni Ministry of Defense Ali Obeid shared this line of reasoning by characterizing the violence in the fall as a dangerous game of "posturing for political gains" as it was "clear that neither side can actually win this." While this strategic stalemate undeniably constrained the options available to hardliners on both sides of the conflict, it alone was insufficient to understand the timing of the political breakthrough.

A "hurting stalemate" had theoretically existed since the mass security defections occurred on March 21st and yet the conflict stubbornly remained unripe for resolution. If the domestic balance of forces thesis were sufficient to explain the timing of Yemen's political transition, then key strategic shifts should have preceded Saleh's decision to sign the GCC Initiative. While pitched fighting was taking place in Arhab, Taiz, the Hasaba district and some other localized sites during the fall, no military victories occurred that decisively tilted the strategic balance to either side's favor. Moreover, to suggest that civil war was not a serious possibility in the fall due to the coercive strength of the opposition is misleading. In fact, the

---

64 “Yemen's Saleh 'to Step Down in 90 Days,'” France 24, November 14, 2011. The gruesome death of former Libyan strongman Colonel Muammar Gaddafi on October 20th had been recorded for the world to see. Coupled with Saleh's own brush with death, this scene may have instilled a greater sense of caution by clearly demonstrating the threat that gambling for resurrection could have on his legacy and the fate of his family.


67 Author's interview with Western journalist who worked in Yemen during this period, May 26, 2015; author's interview with Western analyst working in Yemen during this period, December 29, 2014.
chances for a slide into civil war seemed to increase the longer Saleh stalled for survival. Ultimately, Yemen's risk-acceptant leader appeared willing to roll the iron dice had his close military advisors not responded with such a clear rejection to a security solution. The proper counterfactual to ask then is whether the members of his inner military circle would have responded differently in May than they did in November had Yemen's patrons made the option of stalling more costly in the spring. While the additional six months provided these advisors some insight into the opposition's resilience and armed capacity, this additional information would not have altered the basic assumption that an armed resolution to the situation would be a prolonged and deadly affair. Therefore, it stands to reason that these officers would have reacted similarly in May if compelled to reach a decision between civil war and a negotiated settlement.

A second argument concerns the refinements to the implementation mechanism that occurred throughout the summer and fall. Both the opposition and Saleh had reservations about the feasibility of the 30-60 plan devised in April. Indeed, only a few paragraphs in length, the GCC Initiative evolved into the nine-page document signed in November that included a number of confidence building measures to help bridge the trust deficit.68 Nevertheless, the major innovations in the implementation mechanism occurred in August and early September before Saleh returned to Sana. He continued to criticize the incomplete nature of the arrangement during the fall, which he eventually signed on November 23rd despite an inability to acquire any new concessions of import.69 In reality, resolution to the crisis was never over the exact details of the accord. No perfect deal existed. Saleh always found some aspect to justify his attempts to stall.

69 "Yemen's Saleh Refuses to Sign GCC Deal Without Implementation Mechanism," Xinhua, November 15, 2011.
The fact that the stalemate persisted two months after his return suggests that the refinements to
the initiative were minor bumps rather than serious barriers to the resolution of the crisis.

Finally, a question arises over what aspect of external intervention nudged Saleh to take
the golden parachute in November. In other words, was the threat of sanctions by the US and its
Western allies sufficient to increase the costs of stalling, or did UNSCR 2014 independently
affect Saleh's decision-calculus? This is potentially important because China and Russia refused
to pass a UN sponsored resolution that would have expressed support for the GCC mediation
effort on April 19th. Yet, Saleh appeared less concerned about the symbolic value behind any
UN resolution. In contrast to Syria, Russia and China had little leverage and no stake in Yemen.
While these countries would have certainly condemned a more proactive GCC approach as
foreign meddling in the spring, as the Russian ambassador to Yemen did on May 16th, there is no
reason to believe they were willing to function as a black knight. Besides the potential material
repercussions of targeted sanctions, the signal of patron intent this threat sent to Saleh was likely
most important. Stalling any longer raised the stakes at home and abroad and perhaps left too
many factors to chance. When push came to shove, he took the golden parachute. He was still
well positioned to play a political role in the transition process. His family members remained in
important governmental posts and nothing formally prohibited him from remaining in politics
due to the ambiguity of the deal, a fact his external interlocutors would subsequently regret.

In sum, a full explanation for the timing and outcome of this UI campaign must recognize
a few causal factors. First, the continued presence of brave peaceful protesters in change squares

70 The threat to veto any resolution on Yemen was inextricably related to residual anger concerning the West's liberal interpretation of UNSCR 1973 that instituted a no-fly zone in Libya weeks earlier.
71 A Western journalist working in Yemen at the time conveyed to me insider observations regarding the level of concern Saleh expressed over the threat of sanctions in the final few weeks of negotiation. Author's interview, May 26, 2015.
across Yemen made a martial solution more difficult to implement. Orders to kill unarmed civilians would have prompted further international condemnation and security defections thereby diminishing the chances of an outright military victory even more.72 While this chapter has taken this fact for granted, it is essential not to forget. Second, the parity in coercive capacity created a strategic environment that further limited Saleh's options once strategic stalling became more costly. Thus, the amnesty offer, even distribution in the domestic balance of forces, and resilience of the unarmed insurrection were necessary conditions to nudge Saleh to the exit, but jointly insufficient. The final extrication of Yemen from political limbo required diplomatic coercion that forced Saleh toward the decision point between civil war and a soft landing.

* * * * *

This chapter examined the successful use of a golden parachute to help defuse the stalemated UI campaign in Yemen and midwife a political breakthrough. In line with the theoretical expectations outlined in chapter two, the amnesty offer lowered the exit costs for Saleh. This provision for personal security was a necessary condition to reduce the likelihood that he gambled for resurrection. As described in chapter seven and eight, however, such guarantees create an incentive to stall for survival. In essence, golden parachute offers to beleaguered leaders is an indicator that the domestic opposition maintains insufficient means to effect irregular regime change through civil resistance. With a narrow, but loyal base of support, leaders draw out negotiations not only to improve the terms of their severance packages, but also to create wedges between their internal and external foes facing severe principal-agent dilemmas. To reduce the moral hazard created by the amnesty offer, it is incumbent upon the patron to raise the costs of strategic stalling as the US and its Western allies did in the fall of 2011 in Yemen.

72 Crisis Group, Military Security Reform, 13.
Although leaders like Saleh and Noriega often threaten patrons that their exit will not occur under duress, they are unlikely to accept a dignified exit through friendly exhortations alone. Herein lies an underappreciated, but important tension related to the effectiveness of this mechanism in general. Undue public pressure may offend the leader's honor, but ambiguous or private attempts to escalate pressure are easier to discount. Finding the right mix is a difficult enterprise, but the Panama and Yemen cases suggest that credible amnesty offers without a clear articulation of the consequences for not accepting the deal are unlikely to succeed.

One final issue beyond the scope of this dissertation concerns the conditions of the severance package. As mentioned above, regime leaders who receive golden parachutes ironically enjoy a strong bargaining position. In both the Panama and Yemen case, the patron formulated highly favorable terms to bribe the leader from power. But, how generous of a severance package is required and at what costs? As one Civic Crusade leader observed while Kozak negotiated with Noriega over his exit, "We felt [US officials] were giving away the store. Unfortunately, they were giving away our store." In that case, the US was willing to allow the PDF to maintain a substantial amount of political clout and allow Noriega to reside in Panama after the 1989 presidential elections. As such, the US was creating powerful spoilers who could derail or significantly constrain the subsequent political transition. Similarly, in a rush to resolve Yemen's "political crisis" so that the focus could return to Al Qaeda, the US and GCC failed to specify key issues over the terms of Saleh's exit. Specifically, the patrons failed to clarify whether Saleh's immunity was contingent on permanent or temporary exile. More alarming, they never mentioned whether he could hold public office after he resigned. Whatever verbal assurances were given were subsequently ignored. Not only did Saleh refuse to go into exile, but

---

he also remained the head of the GPC party. As if Yemen's political transition was not daunting
enough, the former strongman turned vindictive spoiler created even more problems. While the
etiology of the internationalized civil war that began in April 2015 is extremely complex, Saleh's
ability to meddle in the political transition was undoubtedly a contributing factor. Thus, while the
golden parachute is a tool of expedience that sometimes is necessary to avert civil war in the
short term, overly generous severance packages can lower the chances of successful political
transitions, which potentially increase the number of headaches for the patron in the longer term.
Chapter 10: Conclusion

Research on UI campaigns tends to privilege domestic-level factors. Naturally, movement skill, institutional resilience of the regime, and the internal structural environment in which the contest of wills unfolds are essential to understand the dynamics and outcomes of these revolutionary situations. In their seminal study on UI campaigns, Chenoweth and Stephan argue that external factors appear to matter in particular cases, but do not seem to affect the outcomes of these events in any systematic manner.¹ Unfortunately, such a contention implies that a theory-driven effort to locate generalizeable mechanisms based on the international dimension is a misplaced enterprise that will yield uninteresting, idiosyncratic conclusions. This counterintuitive thesis seems to have become accepted wisdom in the field of unarmed resistance as no studies known to this author have challenged it using quantitative or qualitative evidence. Thus, I set out in this dissertation to examine three interrelated questions regarding the short-term effects of patron state interventions on UI campaign dynamics and outcomes.

This dissertation began by asking whether great powers and regional powers alter the probability of UI campaign success in a systematic manner. Since the variables constructed in the NAVCO 2.0 dataset proved inadequate for capturing this particular aspect of the international dimension, I developed a transparent, replicable way to operationalize interstate patron-client relationships. After identifying the population of patron states, a broad review of the secondary literature helped determine whether the patron remained neutral or supported a particular side during the UI campaign. When included in logistic regression models where campaign-year is the unit of analysis, patron state interventions proved statistically and substantively significant across several model specifications that included pertinent control variables. Whereas patron

¹ Chenoweth and Stephan, Why Civil Resistance Works, 59.
neutrality is practically a necessary condition for UI campaign success, a shift from patron neutrality to campaign support increases the probability success approximately twofold in any given year. Patron support for the campaign is also associated with an increased probability of security and civilian defection, but not with campaign size. Thus, in contrast to Chenoweth and Stephan's findings, the results of the quantitative analysis suggest that patron interventions during UI campaigns have a consistent effect across the entire case population.

With this statistical relationship established, the next question logically follows. How do patron states transform latent leverage into real influence during such fast-paced periods of acute contestation over state power? In theory, patron actions could affect the behavior of campaign participants and/or members of the political elite. The plausible working hypothesis that patron support increases the number of active participants was rejected because the data did not reveal any particular association between these variables. This result was not particularly surprising because countervailing trends are associated with the effect of patron interventions on campaign size. While patron support for a UI campaign may galvanize greater societal participation by increasing the collective perception that victory is achievable, it can also exacerbate the free rider problem whereby potential participants avoid risky action because victory seems imminent. Patron support for the UI campaign may also discredit the opposition by substantiating regime efforts aimed at portraying the movement as a pernicious fifth column. Even though patron support for either side does not seem to affect participation in any systematic way, campaign size appears related to a patron's decision to intervene. That is, larger campaigns seem to compel patrons to pick a side. Given these considerations, I concentrated on the means available to patron states that could shape the cost-benefit calculus of individuals belonging to the civilian elite in the regime and the security services.
Instead of focusing on particular tactics that connect external intervention to campaign outcome, I produced a set of causal mechanisms by identifying generalizeable ways patrons manipulate these situations to retard or promote large-scale elite defection and/or a negotiated settlement, which are proximate causes to successful UI campaigns. The observation in the political transitions literature that regime and opposition forces are composed of hardliners and softliners provides a starting point for theory development. An important clarification is to note that many individuals lie in between these two ideal-type personalities. Theoretically, these fencesitters' interests and/or worldview do not lead them to inherently prefer hardline or softline tactics. Thus, they are the group of elites most likely to update their priors based on perceived shifts in the internal and external balance of forces. As such, a patron's actions are most likely to influence the decision-calculus of these elite actors thereby creating a channel to influence elite defection rates or tip the internal balance in favor of those seeking hardline or softline solutions.

The most subtle form of patron intervention is the "divide and unite" mechanism, whereby a patron strengthens hardliner or softliner factions in the regime. Encouragement of regime softliners to reach an elite pact with their counterparts in the opposition or explicit backing of regime hardliners likely influences whether the regime adopts high-intensity repression against the UI campaign. Although such repression sometimes creates blowback that increases the number of participants in a UI campaign, the quantitative analysis reveals that higher levels of repression are associated with a decreased likelihood of UI campaign success. By clearly signaling its preference, the patron can nudge fencesitters toward regime hardliners or softliners, thereby tipping the balance of power toward a negotiated settlement or bloody crackdown. Importantly, a patron that solely relies on this mechanism appears more successful when representatives publicly express this position. As shown in the South Korea cases, regime
hardliners are better equipped to gain the upper hand if the patron appears neutral or detached regarding the manner in which the political impasse is resolved. Aware that other actors often seek a clear indication of where the patron stands, the regime has an incentive to disseminate misinformation. Meanwhile, members in the regime will plead with the patron to avoid public diplomacy as a potentially incendiary action that would further destabilize the situation. Indeed, an utterly hostile public stance could backfire by alienating potential allies within the regime and providing the opposition elite an excuse to adopt unnecessarily provocative actions. Nonetheless, well-timed, calibrated public statements that clearly denounce violence and enunciate the need for a political transition will complement the quiet diplomacy occurring behind closed doors.

Two additional facilitative roles played by patrons during UI campaigns fall under this broad mechanism. First, patrons can function as an information conduit to prevent groupthink and assure the regime leadership that the opposition does not pose a fundamental threat to the country's way of life as the US ambassador to South Korea did during the 1960 revolution against strongman Syngman Rhee. Second, patrons can help mediate the conflict and provide credible guarantees that each side abide by its commitments to alleviate the inherent trust-deficit. In these subtle ways, the "divide and unite" mechanism influences the likelihood that regimes resort to high-intensity repression or negotiate an elite pact.

"Feast or famine" offers an alternative avenue to shape UI campaigns by adjusting the flow of assets made available to the targeted regime from the patron state. The tactics associated with this mechanism include the threat or application of sanction regimes and/or adjustment of developmental and military aid. In some respects, such tactics are a material extension of the "divide and unite" mechanism that alters the cost-benefit calculus of elite actors and provides clear signals to fencesitters about the patron's resolve. In certain scenarios, however, "feast or
famine" tactics operate as a distinct mechanism by affecting a regime's ability to meet payroll obligations to state employees and members of the security sector. In other words, patrons can affect the probability that UI campaigns produce a tipping point by adjusting non-tax sources of income available to the regime or applying sanctions aimed at short-term economic asphyxiation.

While the cases of Cameroon in 1991 and Haiti in 1985-1986 revealed the utility of such tactics, the effectiveness of this mechanism appears contingent on several factors. First, the targeted regime must be near bankruptcy or face some other acute economic vulnerability, such as Panama's liquidity crunch in the spring of 1988. Second, no other external actor can be willing and able to provide the assets removed by the patron. Important to recognize is that targeted regimes are resourceful. As with any form of economic coercive diplomacy, the patron's ability to deter other external actors from diluting these measures is crucial for increasing the likelihood of success. If a long-term substitute patron is available, such measures are unlikely to succeed. Finally, the failed attempt to oust Noriega shows that economic coercion only creates a window of opportunity. Economic strangulation of an entrenched regime is most effective if the patron and UI campaign are able to maximize pressure during this period. Yet, such coordination is difficult due to myriad principal agent problems. If a tipping point is not reached at this critical juncture, the regime may succeed in restoring a sub-optimal, but relatively stable equilibrium.

"Decapitation" is the last mechanism available to a patron short of the explicit threat or actual use of its own military forces. Since UI campaigns incorporate diverse segments of society, the lowest common demand is often the removal of the regime leadership. If a patron can facilitate this eventuality, then it can help create the initial breakthrough necessary for some kind of political transition. To achieve such ends, two tactics exist. First, mass security defections are closely associated with successful UI campaigns. Thus, a patron may encourage a
military coup to resolve the immediate crisis. In a handful of cases, patrons did actively pursue this agenda, but such a form of intervention is often avoided as a risky enterprise that further increases the likelihood of instability, an outcome patrons often seek to minimize.

The second measure available to patrons is offering the members of the embattled leadership a golden parachute. By lowering the potential costs of exit, the patron ameliorates the credible commitment problem thereby decreasing the probability that a leader gambles for resurrection. While detractors condemn such severance packages as a morally corrupt practice that sets a universally deleterious precedent and undermines post-conflict reconciliation efforts, few deny the utility of such bribes to end immediate suffering due to leadership insecurity. As such, this dissertation expected credible golden parachutes to constitute an effective tool available to patrons to resolve deadlocked UI campaigns. Yet, a close analysis of such offers to Noriega and Saleh revealed that amnesty guarantees were far from a panacea for ending the strategic stalemates in Panama and Yemen. In fact, these golden parachutes seemed to create a perverse incentive for these leaders to stall for survival. While such offers were likely a necessary condition to resolve these crises short of armed conflict, this tactic alone was insufficient to nudge the leadership into retirement. Although amnesty guarantees tend to occur in circumstances when other tactics appear overly risky, additional pressure on the leader is often required to end the crisis. Thus, external mediators must recognize that golden parachutes create moral hazard and should be prepared to adopt additional coercive measures. As revealed in the Panama case, however, significant threats such as potentially removing the amnesty offer should be made as clear as possible with sufficient advance warning.

Overall, patron states mix and match these various policy tools to influence UI campaign outcomes according to their perceived interests. Yet, such efforts are not bound to succeed,
which raises the final question addressed in this dissertation. Aside from the presence of a counterbalancing patron state, why do some external interventions fail? Two patterns emerged across the outlier cases, where patron support for UI campaigns proved insufficient to effect irregular regime change.

First, regimes where the fate of the leadership and the military's institutional interests are intimately linked through material or non-material bonds appear particularly resilient in outlasting UI campaigns that manage to gain patron support. One important caveat is that dissatisfied military officers lack the capacity to challenge the status quo. Because political arrangements where the military and regime leadership share the same fate are associated with corrupt personalist or military regimes, such divisions often arise. Either portions of the officer corps desire to professionalize their institution, or certain high-ranking officers hold deep-seated grievances. In other words, such a domestic institutional configuration is robust during UI campaigns that receive patron support only if the regime has sufficiently coup-proofed the military. With the coup threat minimized, the regime can rely on the security sector to employ high intensity repression. If the patron and UI campaign lack the means to bankrupt the regime in the short-term, the repressive measures will force peaceful demonstrators to give up, embrace covert forms of non-violent resistance in preparation for the next opportunity, or resort to armed rebellion. Thus, patron intervention still increases the likelihood of UI campaign success, but this specific type of authoritarian regime is a particularly difficult target to overthrow.

Second, patron efforts to influence UI campaigns are sometimes less than perfectly executed. In hindsight, this raises counterfactuals regarding whether additional measures available to the patron could have changed the outcome. Broaching such a line of inquiry is fraught with several potential pitfalls, but these events do seem to activate some pathologies that
limit a patron's ability to function as a unitary rational actor and maximize its leverage over the client regime. In particular, UI campaigns often catch patron states by surprise and unfold rapidly in an information scarce environment. Since UI campaigns in smaller client regimes are seldom considered crises worthy of executive attention, a permissive environment for acute internal struggles emerges that undermines the formulation of a coherent response to such a foreign policy challenge. If powerful bureaucratic or business interests are opposed to an adversarial position toward the regime, then the patron's intended signals will appear less clear and credible, thereby decreasing the likelihood the policy achieves its intended aim. As revealed in the Yemen and Togo cases, another factor that spurs caution is the possibility that a policy aimed at toppling the regime could unintentionally result in a failed state. Importantly, targeted leaders who always have a much higher stake in the outcome of the crisis than the patron states will adopt countermeasures that exacerbate these extant divisions and concerns to dilute any adversarial measures taken by the patron state. If a patron only manages to muster a halfhearted stance against the client regime, then its tepid support for the campaign is less likely to result in a political transition.

The final subject tackled in this dissertation are issues surrounding the possibility of endogeneity. First, the aforementioned explanations provided for failed patron interventions are partly linked. Suboptimal patron interventions seem more likely to occur against well-insulated regimes because the more aggressive forms of intervention needed to help the UI campaign topple the regime are more likely to impinge on bureaucratic and business interests. Therefore, the UI campaign may be able to "win over" the patron, but the patron's tentative intervention may prove insufficient to topple a deeply entrenched political order. If the regime proves robust enough to survive the short-term dual pressure from the UI campaign and patron, then it has a
chance to gain back the patron. In other words, bold patron support for UI campaigns that marshals the full amount of available coercive leverage appears least likely to materialize when it is most needed against tough and resourceful authoritarian targets.

In a similar vein, the second form of endogeneity concerns the timing of patron interventions. The quantitative analysis suggests that patron states are more likely to intervene in larger UI campaigns, but did not reveal any statistically significant association between patron intervention for UI campaigns and participation rates in such civil resistance movements. Nonetheless, it stands to reason that patron states may act like fencesitters. If the patron believes the UI campaign is bound to overthrow the regime, then it should rationally cast its lot with the imminent winner. If this tendency is a relatively common phenomenon, then campaign size arguably explains both the direction of patron intervention and the outcome. As statistical tools are ill-equipped to address this form of endogeneity properly, the dissertation attempted to speak to such concerns through a qualitative approach. Confirming or rejecting the independent causal effect of patron intervention in specific cases proved a challenging undertaking. Through a most-similar case design approach coupled with process-tracing evidence, however, I illustrated that the outcomes were not over-determined by domestic-level factors. In sum, the dissertation cannot fully dismiss these concerns of endogeneity and recognizes the fact that patrons tend to remain neutral until UI campaigns appear viable. Nevertheless, this is far from conceding that the association between patron intervention and campaign outcomes is mere correlation. The several cases examined in this dissertation reveal that patron interventions do matter and in ways that seldom require the explicit threat or actual use of the patron's military might. Through a combination of three causal mechanisms – "divide and unite," "feast or famine," and "decapitation" – patron states influence the dynamics and short-term outcomes of UI campaigns.
APPENDIX I: Coding Patron Intervention

Bilateral Trade:

Super patron (2) if combined exports and imports exceed 30 percent of target regime's GDP AND targeted regime's GDP is at least 20 times smaller;
Patron (1) if combined exports and imports exceed 10 percent of targeted regime's GDP AND targeted regime's GDP is at least 20 times smaller OR (1) if combined exports and imports exceed 30 percent of targeted regime's GDP AND targeted regime's GDP is at least 10 times smaller;
Collective Patron (2 or 1) if a group of states' combined exports and imports exceed the super patron or patron thresholds AND form a united position on the UI campaign; Otherwise, it is coded as no patron relationship (0).

Super patron intervention (1) if patron publicly expresses support for one side OR adopts symbolic sanctions like travel bans and visa restrictions OR privately threatens a more serious sanctions regime that targets personal assets or sectoral interests;
Patron intervention (1) if patron adopts a more serious sanctions regime;
Otherwise, it is coded as no patron intervention (0).

Foreign Aid:

Super patron (2) if combined developmental and military aid exceed 3 percent of target regime's GDP;
Patron (1) if combined developmental and military aid exceed 1 percent of target regime's GDP;
Collective Patron (2 or 1) if a group of states' combined developmental and military aid exceed the super patron or patron thresholds AND form a united position on the UI campaign; Otherwise, it is coded as no patron relationship (0).

Super patron intervention (1) if patron publicly expresses support for one side OR privately threatens to adjust current and future aid.
Patron intervention (1) if patron withholds or adjusts amount of current and future aid. Otherwise, it is coded as no patron intervention (0).

Military Presence:

Super patron (2) if more than 5,000 troops from the patron state are stationed on the territory of the targeted regime;
Patron (1) if more than 500 troops from the patron state are stationed on the territory of the targeted regime;
Otherwise, it is coded as no patron relationship (0).

Super patron intervention (1) if patron publicly expresses support for one side;
Patron intervention (1) if patron privately threatens military action OR attempts to foment a coup d'etat.
Otherwise, it is coded as no patron intervention (0).

**SOURCE:**

**Bilateral Trade:** Barbieri et al., *COW Trade Data Set*, 2012; World Bank, *WDI*.

**Foreign Aid:** OECD, *QWIDS*; USAID, *Loans and Grants*; World Bank, *WDI*.


* Trade, aid, and GDP figures are in current US dollars. The average value for onset year and two years preceding the UI campaign is used to minimize identification based on sudden fluctuations in the bilateral relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Regime</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Patron?</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Aid</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Intervention?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1989-1991</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1977-1983</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1987-1990</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1977-1982</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Rep</td>
<td>1990-1993</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1983-1989</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1956-1957</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1976-1979</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>1961-1962</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Actor(s)</td>
<td>Regime</td>
<td>Neut to Reg</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1977-1979</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2007-2010</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>1990-1992</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1956-1960</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1997-1997</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1977-1978</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1990-1991</td>
<td>UK-US</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1991-1993</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>UK-US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>2003-2008</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1990-1992</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1987-2000</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1988-1990</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1968-1969</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1987-1989</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1983-1986</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1980-1981</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1982-1989</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>AID 1</td>
<td>AID 2</td>
<td>AID 3</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1973-1974</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1987-1989</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1952-1959</td>
<td>EU-US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1990-1994</td>
<td>EU-US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1979-1980</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>US-EU-Arab L.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1979-1985</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1992-1995</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1991-1993</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Camp to Reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>EU-US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Western donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values missing, but presence of patron extrapolated from secondary literature. Accurate records of aid distribution from non-Western great and regional powers are not easily accessible. The same issue applies to trade flows between countries within the former Soviet Union during the Cold War and cases that occurred before 1960.
APPENDIX II: Codebook for Quantitative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cname</td>
<td>correlates of war</td>
<td>Country name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>Calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowcode</td>
<td>correlates of war</td>
<td>Country code (COW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>Target of the campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camp_id</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>Unique campaign ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_nusco</td>
<td>navco 2.0</td>
<td>Campaign included in NAVCO 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_nusco</td>
<td>navco 2.0, global nonviolent action dataset (GNAD); various encyclopedic entries and scholarly works</td>
<td>Campaign included in my alternative case population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all_nusco</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>All UI campaigns included in cs_nusco and my_nusco plus campaign years originally coded as nonviolent campaign in NAVCO 1.0, namely Guyana 1992.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_succ</td>
<td>navco 2.0</td>
<td>1=campaign outcome reached a progress mark of 4 in given year, 0=otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_succ</td>
<td>navco 2.0 and author's calculation</td>
<td>Change GDR 1989 and Ukraine 2004 from &quot;0&quot; to &quot;1&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partsucc</td>
<td>navco 2.0 and author's calculation</td>
<td>1=campaign outcome reached a progress mark of at least 3 in given year, 0=otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_secondefect</td>
<td>navco 2.0</td>
<td>The regime loses support from the military and/or security forces through major defections or loyalty shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_secondefect</td>
<td>navco 2.0 and author's calculation</td>
<td>Missing data in NAVCO 2.0 and new cases are coded in same fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_statedefect</td>
<td>navco 2.0</td>
<td>The regime loses support from the civilian bureaucrats and/or civilian public officials through major defections or loyalty shifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_statedefect</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>Missing data in NAVCO 2.0 and new cases are coded in same fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_regularsise</td>
<td>navco 2.0</td>
<td>Indicator of the general size of the campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_regularsise</td>
<td>navco 2.0 and author's calculation</td>
<td>Missing data in NAVCO 2.0 and new cases are coded in same fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_repression</td>
<td>navco 2.0</td>
<td>The degree of state repression in response to campaign activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_repression</td>
<td>navco 2.0 and author's calculation</td>
<td>Missing data in NAVCO 2.0 and new cases are coded in same fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patron</td>
<td>author’s calculation</td>
<td>Patron-client relationship absent=0, present=1. Collective patron=1, if acted in together during campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dempatron</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>Form of governance in primary patron where non-democracy=0, democracy=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_regsup</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>1 = patron support for regime; 0=otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_campsup</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>1 = patron support for campaign; 0=otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinatra</td>
<td>author's calculation</td>
<td>Indicator for the Cold War where campaign occurred between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polity2_lag</td>
<td>Polity IV Polity score of target regime lagged one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epr_lrexclpobl</td>
<td>Ethnic Power Relations Logged value for share of excluded population relative to ethno-politically relevant population in regime lagged one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_ldurablel</td>
<td>Polity IV Logged value of regime age at the start of the UI campaign lagged one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cinc</td>
<td>Correlates of War - National Military Capabilities Weighted index of a country's military capabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE VARIABLES AND CONTROLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cs_primmethod</td>
<td>NAVCO 2.0 Denotes primary form of resistance for each country-year of the campaign where violent=0 and nonviolent=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_campgoals</td>
<td>NAVCO 2.0 Stated goals of the campaign. 0=regime change 1=significant institutional reform 2=policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_progress</td>
<td>NAVCO 2.0 0=status quo 1=visible gains short of concessions 2=limited concession achieved 3=significant concessions achieved 4=complete success -99=unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my_progress</td>
<td>Author's calculation Change GDR 1989 and Ukraine 2004 from &quot;3&quot; to &quot;4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_regwdril</td>
<td>NAVCO 2.0 1= regime has formal support from other states 0=otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs_campsup</td>
<td>NAVCO 2.0 1=campaign has formal overt support from other states 0=otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cw</td>
<td>Author's calculation Indicator for the Cold War where campaign occurred between 1948 to 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow_lmilper</td>
<td>COW Logged number of personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow_lsolqual</td>
<td>COW Logged expenditure per soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow_chmilex</td>
<td>COW % change in military expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gle_lgdpc</td>
<td>Gleditsch Logged value of real GDP per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wdi_gdpgrl</td>
<td>World Bank GDP growth (annual %) lagged one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ht_mill</td>
<td>Hadenius and Teorell 1=military regime 0=otherwise lagged one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ht_opl</td>
<td>Hadenius and Teorell 1=one-party regime 0=otherwise lagged one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gle_lpop</td>
<td>Gleditsch Logged value of total population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow_urban</td>
<td>COW Urban population over total population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III: Quantitative Robustness Checks

Table 1.a: UI Campaign as Unit of Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully Successful (All UI Campaigns)</th>
<th>Fully Successful (NAVCO 2.0)</th>
<th>Fully Successful (Alternative NAVCO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Model</td>
<td>Standard Model</td>
<td>Base Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Support</td>
<td>-3.32***</td>
<td>-3.50***</td>
<td>-3.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Support</td>
<td>1.51**</td>
<td>1.38*</td>
<td>1.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.946)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>-31.94*</td>
<td>-28.2*</td>
<td>-171.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.90)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(115.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2 Score (t-1)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Age</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Exclusion</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Size</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression</td>
<td>-0.83***</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-1.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald chi2</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>12.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0012</td>
<td>.0062</td>
<td>.0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>.3436</td>
<td>2124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of countries</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.b: Differences in Datasets Regarding Patron Support Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regime Support</th>
<th>Campaign Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAVCO 2.0</td>
<td>Philippines 1983; Poland 1968; Poland 1970; Poland 1976; Poland 1982-84</td>
<td>Guyana 1990-91; Zambia 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Dataset</td>
<td>Bahrain 2011; Cambodia 1998; Cameroon 1991; Syria 2011; Togo 1993</td>
<td>Central African Republic 1991-93; Cuba 1933; Dominican Republic 1961-62; Guinea 2009-10; Niger 2009-10; Syria 2011; Yemen 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Different Operationalizations for Campaign Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partly Successful UI Campaigns (All UI Campaigns)</th>
<th>NAVCO 2.0 Code for Full Success (All UI Campaigns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Model</td>
<td>Standard Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Support</td>
<td>-1.92***</td>
<td>-1.85***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Support</td>
<td>1.19***</td>
<td>1.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.44)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>-0.86**</td>
<td>-0.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>-7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.21)</td>
<td>(7.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2 Score (t-1)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Age</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Exclusion</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>-0.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Size</td>
<td>0.48****</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron is democratic</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron share ideology</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald chi2</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>22.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>.0888</td>
<td>.1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2335</td>
<td>.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of campaigns</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Delimited Case Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully Successful UI Campaigns (NAVCO 2.0)</th>
<th>Fully Successful UI Campaign (Alternative NAVCO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Model</td>
<td>Standard Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Support</td>
<td>-1.50**</td>
<td>-1.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.695)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Support</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td>(1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>-0.91**</td>
<td>-0.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>-11.74</td>
<td>-14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.34)</td>
<td>(15.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2 Score (1-1)</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Age</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Exclusion</td>
<td>-0.46***</td>
<td>-0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repression</td>
<td>-0.51**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Size</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron is democratic</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron shares ideology</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.97***</td>
<td>1.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald chi2</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>20.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>0.1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of campaigns</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Variable Specific Robustness Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime Support</td>
<td>-1.41*</td>
<td>-2.08*</td>
<td>-1.76**</td>
<td>1.93***</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Support</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>1.02**</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>1.12**</td>
<td>0.927**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.86**</td>
<td>-0.78**</td>
<td>-0.70*</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.43)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td>(0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity2 Score (t-1)</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime Age</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Exclusion</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Military Size</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Soldier Quality</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Military Exp.</td>
<td>-2.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Regime (t-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalist Regime (t-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Urban Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged GDP per capita (t-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth (t-1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged Rent Resources per capita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-1.68***</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald chi2</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>25.47</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; chi2</td>
<td>0.7999</td>
<td>0.1248</td>
<td>0.1503</td>
<td>0.1242</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>0.1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of campaigns</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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