

Explaining G7/8 Effectiveness with Sanctions and Force

John Kirton and Julia Kulik
G8 Research Group, University of Toronto

Paper prepared for an international conference on “Strengthening Global Summitry: Accountability for Effectiveness and Legitimacy in the G8 and G20,” National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, May 19, 2014. The authors gratefully acknowledge the research assistance of Olga Milkina and Aurora Hudson. This paper builds on an earlier version by Julia Kulik titled “Explaining G7/8 Success with Sanctions and Military Force: The Role of Space and Place in Informal Security Arrangements.” Version of May 25, 2014.

Abstract

Why do the Group of Seven (G7) and Group of Eight (G8) members reliably and effectively use material sanctions in some regional conflicts but military force in others to secure their goals? As an informal security institution composed of major democratic powers from North America, Europe and Asia, the G7/8 has often employed sanctions, notably on Iran in 1980, Afghanistan in 1980, Sudan in 2004, North Korea in 2006, and Syria in 2011. It has increasingly used military force, notably in Iraq in 1990, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan in 2001, Libya in 2011, and Mali in 2013. Yet the G7/8’s choice, initiation, commitment, compliance, implementation and effectiveness has varied, with force being chosen and used effectively only in the post cold war period, primarily where the target is close to southern Europe. Of the three realist and four liberal-institutionalist causes examined to explain this pattern, a high relative-capability predominance of members over the target country strongly produces the G8’s use of force, but a high, direct, deadly threat from the target state to G8 countries does not. Geographic proximity and the connectivity coming from the former colonial relationship between G7/8 members and the target country only weakly cause the G7/8’s use of force. Support from the most relevant regional organization — the North Atlantic Treaty Organization — and support from the United Nations in the form of an authorizing UN Security Council or General Assembly resolution have a strong, positive effect on the G7/8’s use of force. Accompanying accountability mechanisms from the G7/8 itself have a variable impact, as leaders’ iteration of the issue at subsequent summits does not appear to increase compliance, but their foreign ministers’ follow up does to a substantial degree.

Introduction

Significance

Why do the Group of Seven (G7) and Group of Eight (G8) major market democracies reliably and effectively use material sanctions in some regional conflicts but military force in others? The G7/8 is an informal plurilateral summit institution (PSI), with seven/eight country members from Europe, North America and Asia. Since its start in 1975 the G7/8 has often approved its members use of sanctions, most notably in the five major cases of Iran in 1980, Afghanistan in 1980, Sudan in 2004, North Korea in 2006 and Syria in 2011 (Kirton 2011). Moreover, in the post–Cold War period the G7/8 has increasingly chosen military intervention, doing so in the five cases of Iraq in 1991, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan in 2001, Libya in 2011 and Mali in 2013. The G7/8’s choice of where to approve military force has varied substantially, with conflicts close to southern Europe high, on

the list and those in distant Asia rare, with Afghanistan in 2001 being the only leaders-authorized Asian one.

In intervening in regional conflicts through economic sanctions or military force, the G7/8 has been seeking to fulfill its distinctive foundational missions in a materially coercive form. In the 1975 Rambouillet Summit Declaration, G7 leaders identified that mission with the words “We came together because of shared beliefs and shared responsibilities. We are each responsible for the government of an open, democratic society, dedicated to individual liberty and social advancement. Our success will strengthen, indeed is essential to, democratic societies everywhere” (G7 1975). With this statement, the G7 affirmed one of its central principles, the promotion and protection of democracy everywhere in the world. It made clear its concern with the internal political character of its own members and its willingness to intervene in the internal affairs of those beyond. This interventionist dedication to democracy has been maintained for 40 years. Unlike the UN and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), G7/8 members are united by common political principles and priorities of open democracy, human rights, the rule of law and social advance. This was reinforced by the G7’s addition of the newly democratically committed and democratizing Russia in 1998, thus making the old G7 collectively more powerful and geographically global (Kirton 2002).

In the name of these shared principles, the G7 acted as a global security governor from its start, dealing with the democratic transition in Spain in 1975 and the democratic defence of Italy in 1976, the transformation of the authoritarian Soviet Union into a democratizing Russia, the campaign against apartheid in South Africa and the response to the Chinese government’s massacre of unarmed students in Tiananmen Square in June 1989. G7/8 action has increasingly gone beyond deliberation in private conversations and public conclusions, and beyond setting general principles and normative consensus, to include firm commitments that members have complied with and implemented in a concerted way. After the end of the Cold War there had been hope that deadly regional conflicts would diminish, along with the superpower rivalry that had fuelled them and that those which remained could be safely left to a UN now able to work effectively in the way its founders had designed. However, those hopes were soon dashed by the harsh reality of new conflicts arising from Iraq in 1990, the Balkans in 1992, Somalia in 1993 and the genocide in Rwanda in 1994. After September 11, 2001, more conflicts erupted from Afghanistan in 2001, on Israel’s borders in 2006, in Georgia in 2008 and in Libya in 2011. Thus, since 1990 the G7/8 has been increasingly called on to end these deadly conflicts, and has responded, often by approving its members’ use of economic sanctions or military force.

Schools of Thought

How and why the G7/8 has done so is the subject of a debate among several competing schools of thought.

The first sees the G8 as an illegitimate substitute for the UN in governing international peace and security through either sanctions or force (Kühne 2000, Félix-Paganon 2000). This school credits the G8’s prominent role in ending the crisis in Kosovo in 1999. However, it does not view the G8 as having the kind of unrivalled legalized authority and multilateral legitimacy that the UN has. To be sure, serious weakness within the UN system has made room for other players to act and the G8 has become more willing to do so. This poses a serious threat to the credibility of the UNSC. However, the G8’s action in Kosovo was a one-off event and very little should be expected from it in the future. This school implies that the G8 will be more willing to choose force when it has been authorized in advance by the UNSC.

The second school views the G8 as a global security director rather than front-line provider (Penttilä 2005, Fowler 2004). It argues that the G8 is not and should not become a conflict manager or conflict preventer. The G8 works best as an institution that directs the work of other international

organizations by mobilizing political will and resources and contributing to setting the agenda of the broader international community. Risto Penttilä (2005) argues that the G8's role will depend on the willingness of its members, above all the United States, to use to the forum for policy coordination and crisis management. It implies that US initiation, compliance and implementation is necessarily high in cases where force is chosen and ends in success.

The third school views the G8 as a potentially positive alternative to the UN. Gunter Pleuger (2000), inspired by the case of Kosovo, argues that the G8 has grasped the opportunity to take action when the UNSC has been unable or unwilling to act. Compared to the UNSC, the G8 has more flexibility due to the absence of a fixed structure or rules of procedure and is thus able to work with greater effectiveness. The G8 has a more modern concept of conflict resolution than the UN and adapts better to the changing nature of international security threats. While the German government will do everything possible to prevent a decrease in authority of the UN, a lack of necessary change and reform at the UN will inevitably lead to its insignificance. This implies that the G8 with German support will choose force, and use it faithfully and successfully when the UNSC fails to authorize its use.

The fourth school views the G8 as an effective global security governor, due to its fundamental structure as a modern international concert and the massive failures of the UN-centred system (Kirton 2000, 2002). It notes that the G8 has been successful in its use of sanctions, achieving the globally desired outcomes that the leaders sought (Kirton 2011). The recurrent, successful use of sanctions by the G8 is in part due to the shared shock-activated vulnerability among its members and its structure as a compact, cohesive, cherished club.

Puzzles

None of these schools comprehensively and systematically identifies when and why the G7/8 chooses, implements and succeeds with economic sanctions in some cases but military force in others. Nor do they carefully chart the pattern of choice and result over the G7/8's full 40-year life and draw explicitly on core realist and liberal-institutionalist concepts and the literature on sanctions or force to explain the pattern thus observed. This study is the first to do so, by developing and applying a mixed realist-liberal institutionalist model to all cases where the G7/8 summit has endorsed its members' use of military force and to the major cases where it has relied on sanctions alone.

The Argument

It first carefully charts the G7/8 members' choice of sanctions or force, members' initiation, commitment and compliance related to these choices, their implementation of the approved measures, and the effectiveness of the intervention in achieving the intended result. To explain the patterns it then examines the relative salience of seven key causes. The first three causes, drawn from the core of realist theories, are the relative capability ratio between the G7/8 and the target country, the deadly threat from the target country to G7/8 members, and the geographic proximity of the closest member to the target country. The next four causes, drawn from liberal-institutionalist theories, are the connectivity arising from the former colonial relationship between G7/8 members and the target; support for the G7/8 approved action from global multilateral organizations, notably the UN's Security Council and General Assembly (UNGA); support from proximate regional organizations, above all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); and the accompanying accountability mechanisms for compliance within the G7/8.

This analysis finds that a high relative-capability ratio between G7/8 members and the target state strongly predicts the G7/8's choice, compliance, implementation and effectiveness of force, while a high, direct, deadly threat from the target state to G7/8 countries does not. Geographic proximity produces the use of force and compliance with the relevant commitments by G7/8 members. The

connectivity coming from the former colonial relationship between G7/8 members and the target country only weakly causes the G7/8's use of force. Support from the UN in the form of a UNSC resolution coming in advance or afterwards had a strong, positive effect on the G8's use of force. Support from NATO had a strong, positive effect on G8 members' use of force. Accompanying accountability mechanisms from the G7/8 have a variable effect, as leaders' iteration of the issue at subsequent summits does not appear to increase compliance, but their foreign ministers' follow up does to a substantial degree.

Taken together, when G7/8 members are collectively much more powerful than and proximate to the target and have the support of both the UN and NATO, then the G7/8 is far more likely to approve and deliver force and secure the results it wants. Thus the role of some core realist and liberal-institutionalist variables are confirmed. Yet the G7/8 can still improve its accountability mechanisms to increase the compliance, implementation and results it gets.

The Analytic Model

The model created to conduct this study identifies six effects of seven causes (three realist, four liberal-institutionalist) that are tested over ten major regional security cases, five using sanctions only, five using force (Appendix A).

The six effects, or dependent variables, are as follows.

1. Choice. The first effect is the G7/8's choice to approve economic sanctions only or military force, as distinct from using non-coercive instruments such as diplomatic suasion, institutional socialization and material support for the victim country or group. Here the G7/8's approval of the instrument of choice is contained in a public, collective leaders' communiqué, if in general terms.

2. Initiation. The second effect is the initiation of the diplomacy within the G7/8 that leads to the choice of sanctions or force. The initial candidates from the competing schools of thought on the G8 security governance and more general models of G8 governance are the most powerful member, the US, or the most powerful European member of Germany (Putnam and Bayne 1987, Kirton 1999). Determining the initiator, resisters and supporters requires a detailed process-tracing knowledge of the preparations and negotiations by which the communiqué encoded choice was reached.

3. Commitment. The third effect is the commitment of the G7/8 to the case in which sanctions or force was used. This is measured by the number of precise, politically obligatory, future-oriented public commitments made by the leaders on the case, both before and after their choice of instrument was made.

4. Compliance. The fourth effect is the compliance of G7/8 members with the commitments made on the case, including those commitments that do not contain references to the instrument of choice.

5. Implementation. The fifth effect is the specific implementation by members of sanctions or force. It is narrower than the actions that count as compliance, as implementation encompasses only the actual invocation of sanctions or the contribution of military forces to the collective combat mission in which at least half of G7/8 countries are involved.

5. Effectiveness. The sixth effect is the effectiveness of the chosen instrument in securing the intended result, as that result was initially specified in the G7/8 communiqué that first approved the instrument of choice used. In some cases earlier communiqués may be used to identify the intended result or goal, where they provide the specificity that the contemporary authorizing passage lacks.

The outcomes of these six effects are hypothesized to depend on the value of seven causes or independent variables, as follows:

1. Power. The first cause is the key realist concept of power, specifically the relative capability ratio between the G7/8 member countries and the target state, as measured by the relevant countries' gross domestic product in US dollars at market exchange rates at the time when sanctions or force was first used. The model hypothesize that a high predominance of relative capability of G7/8 members over the target country is more likely to lead the G7/8 to choose and reliable, effectively use force. This is based on a rational calculation that with high predominance in relative capability the G7/8 is thus more likely easily and quickly to prevail and secure its intended aims.

2. Threat. The second cause is the realist concept of the threat posed by the target country to the members of the G7/8. It is measured in the first instance by the number of deaths of G7/8 citizens within G7/8 countries from acts initiated or supported by the target state. The second hypothesis is thus that a high degree of threat, defined as an actual or anticipated attack by the target country on a G8 member's territory resulting in the loss of life, is more likely to result in the choice and reliable, effective use of force by the G7/8.

3. Proximity. The third cause, drawn from the geopolitical variant of realism, is proximity, or the geographic distance between the nearest G7/8 member and the target country. The third hypothesis is that closer proximity is more likely to induce the G7/8 to choose military force, induce high commitment and compliance from its members and secure a successful result. Although G7/8 members are all global powers, the effective use of force is more likely if the target is geographically closer to the member using force. This is due not only to the greater potential threat coming from the country in conflict in generating a demand for G7/8 action but also the likelihood of having existing military infrastructure, such as military bases, necessary to sustain an effective military campaign. It further hypothesizes that those G7/8 members geographically closest to the conflict will be the ones initiating the demand and diplomatic coalition building within the G7/8 for the use of force.

4. Connectivity. The fourth cause, now drawn from liberal institutionalist theory in its "interdependence" version, is global connectivity flowing from a former colonial relationship between G8 members and the target country (Keohane and Nye 1977). The fourth hypothesis is that greater connectivity is likely to lead to sanctions only. High political, economic and functional global connectivity among countries, intensified by globalization, should make such sanctions effective, and thus the rational choice, in producing the G8-intended results, without the need to escalate to the use of military force. This connectivity flows from higher rates of trade and investment, stronger diasporic communities with linguistic and cultural ties, and more similar political and legal structures. The greater connectivity with the target state, wherever it may geographically lie, is more likely to generate the use of sanctions.

5. Multilateral Organizational Support. The fifth cause, from the legalizational variant of liberal institutionalism, is support from the dominant multilateral organization, namely the UN, especially the UNSC as the relevant component of the UN, but secondarily the UNGA should the veto power immobilize the UNSC. The fifth hypothesis is that UN support leads to the G7/8's choice and faithful, effective use of force. UN support in the form of a UNSC resolution either before or after the use of force indicates that the use of force is within the limits of either codified hard-law legality or normative soft-law legitimacy. The virtually universal multilateral membership of the UN increases the salience of both.

6. Regional Organizational Support. The sixth cause, from the regional variant of liberal institutionalism, is support from the most relevant regional organization, namely NATO in the five

cases of the use of force. The sixth hypothesis is that NATO support is more likely to produce the G7/8's selection and faithful, effective use of force. The use of force is more likely if a regional organization, to which many or most G7/8 members belong, exists and has the capacity to coordinate such use. It also assumes that the regional organization is close to the target country, making it more likely that military infrastructure is in place to help coordinate and deliver the forceful response.

7. Accompanying Accountability Mechanisms. The seventh cause, arising from newer liberal institutionalist theory, is accompanying accountability mechanisms. These can take the form of issue-specific accountability mechanisms invoked at the initial time; iterated treatment by leaders of the issue at subsequent summits, and follow up by relevant G7/8 ministerial forums and official working groups. The seventh hypothesis is that such accompanying accountability mechanisms increase compliance, implementation and effectiveness.

These hypotheses are empirically assessed against ten major cases of G7/8 governance of regional security from 1980 to 2013. Five cases involve the approval of sanctions only: Iran 1980, Afghanistan 1980, Sudan 2004, North Korea 2006 and Syria 2011. Five cases involve the approval of force: Iraq 1990, Kosovo 1999, Afghanistan 2001, Libya 2011 and Mali 2013. These latter five cases are the only ones in 40 years in which the G7/8 summit endorsed the use of force. All these cases are from the post-Cold War years after 1989. Yet the full 10 cases together span a full 35 years of the G7/8's 40-year life. They include cases arising from military aggression and invasion (Afghanistan 1980, Iraq 1990), ethnic cleansing/genocide (Kosovo 1999, Libya 2011), and terrorism (Iran 1980 Afghanistan 2001, Mali 2013). They are also some of the major causes the G7/8 addressed and the major regional security conflicts in the world during these forty years. The analysis selectively draws on the much larger number of cases involving G7/8 sanctions from 1976 to 2009, as analyzed by John Kirton (2011). In these ways, selection bias of various kinds is minimized.

These cases are of particular contemporary relevance. In the communiqué sections on counter-terrorism and foreign policy released at the most recent G8 summit at Lough Erne in June 2013, the G8 referred by name to seven of these 10 cases: Mali, Syria, Libya, Afghanistan, Iran, Sudan and North Korea (in addition to Somalia, Tunisia, and Palestine and Israel).

Dependent Variables: Effects

Choice of Instrument, Approval and Diplomatic Initiator within the G7/8

Sanctions Cases

Iran 1980. On November 4, 1979, 52 American diplomats and citizens were seized from the US embassy in Tehran and taken hostage by a group of Iranian students (Putnam and Bayne 1984: 98-116, 130-1). The US immediately banned oil imports from Iran. On November 6, the Canadian House of Commons condemned Iran's actions. On November 14, the US froze all Iranian assets in the US and those controlled by US banks, companies and individuals abroad. On December 12, 1979, 183 Iranian diplomats were expelled from the US. In December 1979 the G7 was first mobilized, as high-level US officials visited the UK, France, Germany, Italy and Japan to discuss their possible use of sanctions. On January 13, 1980, the UNSC prepared to vote for sanctions but was stopped by a veto by the Soviet Union. On January 28, Canada suspended the operations of its embassy in Iran to facilitate the escape of six US diplomats who had taken shelter there. On April 7, the US suspended diplomatic relations with Iran and imposed trade sanctions. On April 17, it imposed additional sanctions and threatened military action. On April 23, Canada announced mild initial sanctions with a promise to consider further trade sanctions if the crisis was not resolved by May 17. The US carried out a unilateral but unsuccessful military rescue mission on April 25. The

other major allies of the US introduced sanctions just days before the American rescue mission was launched. On May 22, during its promised second stage of sanctions, Canada placed controls on the export of goods to Iran, making exemptions only for food, medical supplies and other humanitarian products. On June 22, during the Venice Summit (the first G7 summit after the hostage taking), the G7 (1980) issued the “Statement on the Taking of Diplomatic Hostages.” It expressed grave concern about the recent incidents of terrorism and encouraged heads of state and government to “take appropriate measures to deny terrorists any benefits from such criminal acts. The G7 thereby endorsed the use of sanctions.

Afghanistan 1980. On December 27, 1979 the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan (Appendix C-1) (Kirton 1987, Falkenheim 1987, Paarlberg 1987). On December 27, US undersecretary of state Warren Christopher flew to London and Brussels to inform his allies of the intended US response. After a six-hour meeting with his G7 counterparts (minus Japan) on December 31, Christopher announced an allied review of relations with the Soviet Union and an approach to the UN. At NATO the following day, an agreement came to take steps to show western disapproval of Soviet actions. On January 3, 43 countries called for a UN meeting. A UNSC resolution condemning the invasion on January 7, 1980 was vetoed by Russia, with only East Germany on Russia’s side. Then, under the “Uniting for Peace” procedure from the Korean War, UN members in the General Assembly voted on another resolution on January 14, deplored the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, and called for the “immediate, unconditional and total withdrawal of the foreign troops from Afghanistan.” It passed, with 104 for and 18 against, for a winning margin of 85%. The non-aligned and Third World countries voted 78 to 9 for the resolution, overwhelmingly backing the West. On January 4, US president Jimmy Carter announced an embargo of grain sales to the Soviet Union, which all other allies would join. These actions were endorsed at the G7 Venice Summit in June (Kirton 1987: 285).

Shortly after, the G7 followed with further sanctions against the Soviet Union for its actions in Poland in 1980 (Kirton 1987, Marantz 1987). However the US failed to secure G7 consent for the further sanctions it imposed unilaterally, starting in December 1981, on the re-export of US-originated goods designed to cripple the Soviet gas pipeline to Europe (Wolf 1987, Putnam and Bayne 1984, 1987). Strong European resistance, including at the divisive G7 summit in Versailles in 1982, led the US to lift its embargo in November 1982.

Sudan 2004. In early 2003 non-governmental organizations reported widespread ethnic cleansing. At the 2004 Sea Island Summit, G8 leaders called for the government of Sudan to respect UNSC Resolution 1593. By then G8 members were supporting the African Union (AU) peacekeeping mission in Sudan, by working together through the European Union and NATO, providing \$370 million and promising \$2.5 billion in humanitarian relief over the following three years. The UN followed with UNSC Resolution 1564, invoking Chapter 7, on September 18, 2004. On March 29, 2005, the UN (2005) passed Resolution 1591, which imposed a travel ban and asset freeze on individuals “impeding the peace process” in Darfur. The G8 (2005) leaders did not authorize the use of force, nor did they participate in the UN-approved AU peacekeeping force. In February 2010 a ceasefire agreement was signed between the warring factions, after an estimated several hundred thousand people had died.

North Korea 2006. The G7 leaders first dealt with North Korea in 1990 and addressed it themselves or through their foreign ministers continually since that time. They first approved sanctions directly in 2006 when they expressed support for UNSC Resolution 1695 of July 15, 2006, which condemned North Korea’s launches of ballistic missiles on July 5 (G8 2006). That resolution represented a compromise between the US, Japan and France, which sought stronger sanctions, and the Peoples’ Republic of China and Russia, which stood opposed. The resolution banned all UN members from selling material or technology for missiles or weapons of mass destruction to North Korea or

receiving from North Korea any missiles, banned weapons or technology (UNSC 2006). However, in deference to China and Russia, the resolution did not invoke Chapter 11 of the UN Charter, which authorizes the use of force.

Syria 2011. The G8 first addressed Syria at its Halifax Summit in 1995, when it encouraged the conclusion of peace treaties among Israel, Lebanon and Syria (Appendix C-2). The topic of Syria stayed on the summit agenda until the end of the 20th century. It reappeared following the events of the Arab Spring of 2011. At its summit in Deauville, France, in 2011, the G8 called on Syria's leaders to stop using force and intimidation against its own people, to respect their demands for freedom of expression and universal rights and to release all political prisoners. The G8 (2011) went on to say, "should the Syrian authorities not heed this call, we will consider further measures," thereby endorsing sanctions. The UNSC was unable to pass a resolution on Syria due to vetoes by both China and Russia. However, Canada, Japan, the US, the UK and the EU have imposed sanctions on Syria.

Military Force Cases

Iraq 1990. After the invasion and annexation of Kuwait by Iraq in August 1990, the UNSC imposed an embargo and sanctions on Iraq. Subsequently, on November 29, 1990, the UNSC (1990) issued Resolution 678, which authorized member states to "use all necessary means" to bring Iraq into compliance with all previous resolutions. On January 16, 1991, US-led coalition forces began an air campaign, followed by a ground campaign to liberate Kuwait. G8 members Canada, France and the UK joined the US in using force. The G7 first approved the use of force at its subsequent summit in London, in 1991. The diplomatic initiator of the use of force both before and at the summit, was the UK, led by Margaret Thatcher.

Kosovo 1999. In 1998, after years of instability in the Balkans, war erupted in Kosovo between the Kosovo Liberation Army and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. After a series of mass killings, forced expulsions and major human rights abuses led by Serbian president Slobodan Milosevic, the UNSC passed Resolution 1199 in September 1998. It recognized the war in Kosovo as "a threat to international peace and security," but it failed to recommend the use of force (UNSC 1998). Lack of UN authorized support, widespread media coverage of the conflict and the massacre of 45 Kosovo Albanian civilians in the village of Racak prompted NATO to activate Operation Allied Force on March 24, 1999. Under the umbrella of NATO, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the UK and the US bombed the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, leading to the withdrawal of Yugoslav forces from Kosovo (Manulak 2011). The diplomatic initiators of the move to use force were France, the UK and Canada.

Afghanistan 2001. Following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, NATO and its allied members declared war on Taliban-led Afghanistan the following day. Canadian prime minister Jean Chrétien stated that Canada was the first to suggest invoking Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty (Kirton 2006, 170). That article reads: "the Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them ... will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking ... such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area" (NATO 1949). On September 12, 2001, Chrétien along with Italian prime minister Silvio Berlusconi and Russian president Vladimir Putin looked to the G8 to define the American and allied response. G8 members Canada, France, Germany, Italy, France, the US and the UK invaded Afghanistan to remove the Taliban from power (Kirton 2007). At Kananaskis in 2002, the first summit after the 911 attacks, the G8 stated: "We support the transitional authority of Afghanistan. We will fulfill our Tokyo conference commitments and will work to eradicate opium production and

trafficking” (Appendix C-1). The move to use force, from the start, was initiated by Canada, France, the UK and the US.

Libya 2011. After the uprisings of civilians in Libya against the oppressive regime of Muammar al-Qaddafi in February 2011, the international community responded to protect those citizens and allow local forces to overthrow Qaddafi. After a violent crackdown by the Qaddafi government and massive civilian casualties, the UNSC imposed sanctions, an arms embargo and an asset freeze on Libya. On March 17, 2011, Resolution 1973 authorized member states to “take all necessary measures ... to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack” (UNSC 2011). On March 19, NATO forces, including those of Canada, France, Italy, the UK and the US, began a military intervention in Libya. The diplomatic initiator was France, led by president Nicholas Sarkozy (Appendix C-3).

Mali 2013. In January 2013, French troops intervened in Northern Mali to fight armed groups with links to al-Qaeda, which had taken control of Northern Mali in April 2012. The intervention was quickly supported by NATO and by the UNSC (2012) through Resolution 2085. The US, Canada, UK and Germany supported the French intervention. Within months, the rebels were defeated. On June 18, 2013, at the subsequent Lough Erne Summit G8 leaders declared: “we support efforts to dismantle the terrorist safe haven in northern Mali. We welcome France’s important contribution in this regard ... we support the swift deployment of a UN stabilization force in Mali, and encourage the Government of Mali energetically to pursue a political process which can build long-term stability” (G8 2013). The diplomatic initiator was France, led by president Hollande.

Commitment

The number of decisional commitments the G7/8 has made on each of the sanctions and force cases has varied widely, as Appendix D shows. On the sanctions case of Afghanistan 1980, from 1980-1983, the G7 made only five commitments, four of which came in the first year. In the force case of Kosovo 1999 and the broader case of the Balkans, from 1996 to 2005 the G7/8 made 19 commitments, with a full 10 coming in 1996. This tentative evidence suggests that the force cases receive more G7/8 commitments on the case, over a longer time span, than the sanctions only ones do.

Compliance

Compliance with these commitments is assessed over the year following the summit where the commitment was made, up until the next summit takes place. It is measured on a three-point scale where each member is awarded -1, 0 or +1 for each commitment (Appendix E-1). A score of -1 indicates a failure to comply or actions taken that are opposite to the commitment’s stated goal. A score of 0 indicates partial compliance or a work in progress. A score of +1 indicates full compliance with the commitment’s stated goal.

In the overall field of regional security, G7/8 members have an average compliance of +0.57 on the 16 assessed commitments from 1996 to 2011 (see Appendix E-2). Overall, compliance on regional security has been led by the US at +0.81 followed in turn by Italy at +0.64, Canada and Japan at +0.63 each, the EU at +0.62, the UK at +0.56, Germany at +0.44 and Russia at +0.29. What is notable is the high compliance of the United States but also Italy, whose compliance with G7/8 commitments across all issue areas is very low.

On Iraq 1990, compliance with the two assessed commitments averaged a solid +0.48 (Appendix E-1). The first commitment, from the 1996 Lyon Summit, was: “we reaffirm our determination to enforce full implementation of all UN Security Council resolutions concerning Iraq and Libya, only full compliance with which could result in the lifting of sanctions” (G7 1996a). It had an overall G7/8 compliance average of -0.50, with full compliance from the US alone, partial compliance from

Japan, and no compliance from Germany, UK, France, and Canada (with the other members not assessed). The second commitment, from 2004, had an overall compliance score of +0.89, with all G7 members fully complying and Russia complying partially.

On Kosovo 1999, compliance with the two assessed commitments averaged a high +0.84. The first assessed commitment, from 1996 in the cognate area of conflict prevention focused on Bosnia and Herzegovina and received complete compliance. The commitment stated: “We support the High Representative in his work of preparation with the Parties of the establishment of the new institutions: the collective Presidency, the Council of Ministers, the Parliament, the Constitutional Court and the Central Bank. We shall provide the future authorities with the necessary constitutional and legal assistance” (G7 1996b). The second assessed commitment (1999-45), which dealt with financial assistance, was complied with an average of +0.55, with full compliance coming from the US, Japan, France, Canada and the EU, partial compliance from Germany and the UK, and no compliance from Russia.

On Afghanistan 2001, the three assessed commitments had an overall average compliance of +0.42. It was led by the US, the UK and Canada, which fully complied. The first commitment had an overall compliance score of 0, with full compliance by the US, UK and Canada, partial compliance by Germany, France and Russia, and no compliance by Japan, Italy and the EU. The second commitment had average compliance of +0.25, with full compliance by all G7 members and partial compliance by Russia. The third commitment had complete compliance overall and by all members.

On Libya 2011, the one fully assessed commitment was shared with Iraq. It had an average compliance score of -0.50. A second commitment 2013-186 stated: “we will support the transition of Arab Spring countries across North Africa through the Deauville Partnership working for inclusive growth.” Assessed for interim compliance after six months it had an average compliance of +0.56.

In the cognate issue area of terrorism, all of the 16 assessed commitments from 1996 to 2011 dealt with counter-terrorism in general with no specific country or region singled out. Average compliance for the 16 commitments was +0.64. It was led by the US at +0.88. Tied for second place were Italy and Russia, each with +0.79 — the two countries with the lowest compliance with G8 commitments across all issue areas. They were followed in turn by Canada at +0.75, the EU at +0.64, Germany at +0.60, the UK at +0.56, France at +0.44 and Japan with +0.38 in last place. Across the issue areas of regional security and terrorism, the unusually high compliance of proximate Italy and the unusually low compliance of distant Japan are particularly notable.

In the nine specific assessed commitments on cases where force was used, the G7/8’s average compliance was +0.39. The distant but highly capable US achieved a score of +0.89 and the score of the proximate but less powerful Italy was +0.50.

In the 46 commitments from 1996 to 2008 relating to cases where sanctions were used (including the few that ended up using force) G8 average compliance was +0.51. That of the US was +0.62 and that of Italy was +0.35 (Kirton 2011). However, Italy’s compliance scores on commitments relating to force were higher than on commitments relating only to sanctions.

In the five major cases of sanctions examined in this study, the seven assessed commitments had an average compliance score of +0.50. On Iran with four assessed commitments, compliance averaged +0.56. On Sudan with two assessed commitments, compliance averaged +0.89. On North Korea, the one assessed commitment had compliance of -0.50. Thus G7/8 compliance is higher on major cases relating to sanctions than to those on force.

Contributor of Implementing Actions

The G7/8 members making contributions of military force were highly similar in all five cases where the G7/8 endorsed the use of force. They were the US, UK, France, Italy and Canada. Germany did so in Afghanistan 2001. Japan and Russia never did.

In the sanctions only cases, all members invoked sanctions in almost all cases, if not at the same speed and to the same degree. The greatest divergence came between a sanctioning US and refusing Europe over the Soviet gas pipeline dispute at Versailles in 1982.

Effectiveness

The G8's effectiveness in using military force or sanctions is determined by whether it secured its intended result, as outlined in its official documents (Appendix B). The record for the cases of force is as follows.

Iraq 1990. From 1990 to 1991, G7 members successfully secured their intended result with regard to Iraq. Saddam Hussein's armed forces were completely removed from Kuwait, which was thus restored as a sovereign independent state. It has not been invaded again to this day. Some observers had hoped that the G7-led coalition would continue its military offensive into Iraq to destroy Saddam's armed forces and perhaps even replace his regime in Baghdad. Others had hoped that a liberated Kuwait might, as the post-Cold War years unfolded, become a more open, democratic state. Neither of these two results were realized, but neither were they ever among the goals for which the G7 members used military force to liberate Kuwait.

Kosovo 1999. G8 members' use of force met with great success in Kosovo. A looming genocide was prevented. Slobodan Milosevic removed his troops. His own people subsequently removed him from power and sent him to the Hague to be put on trial for war crimes. Since that time, Kosovo has remained a peaceful polity. In 2008, it declared itself to be a sovereign state and was recognized by all G8 members except Russia. All of these results, save the very last one, were part or a consequence of the G7's use of force.

Afghanistan 2001. In Afghanistan, the G8 members' use of force had mixed results. The invasion of Afghanistan led to the crippling of the al-Qaeda organization. It was successful in preventing any further attacks on American or allied territory originating from Afghanistan and in overthrowing the Taliban and installing a democratic government. However, it has not been successful in bringing peace and stability to the region, which were among the initial goals of the forceful intervention.

Libya 2011. G8 members' use of force in Libya was considered highly successful and argued to be a model of intervention (Daalder and Stavridis 2012). It was quick to fulfill its first two tasks of policing the arms embargo and patrolling the no-fly zone. While it took longer to secure the protection of the Libyan people, by August it had successfully attacked Qaddafi strongholds in Tripoli and Sirte. In a matter of months, without any allied casualties, it had enabled the rebels to overthrow Qaddafi.

Mali 2013. In Mali, the UN- and NATO-supported intervention successfully halted the rebels from advancing in Northern Mali and in dismantling the terrorist safe haven. However, rebel forces backed out of the peace agreement and the conflict resumed.

G8 intervention was thus successful in four of the five cases where force was used, with mixed success only in the case of Afghanistan 2001 to date. In contrast, in the five major sanctions only cases, the G8 was clearly successful in only one, but that one was Afghanistan in 1980, where it faced the most powerful adversary of all.

Independent Variables: Causes

What causes the G8's faithful and effective choice of force as opposed to its reliance on sanctions alone? In particular, what causal role is played by the seven key factors of the realists' relative capability, threat, and geographic proximity, and the liberal institutionalists' political connectivity, multilateral organizational support, regional organizational support, and accompanying accountability mechanisms?

Relative Capability

The first hypothesis is that a high predominance of relative capability of G7/8 members over the target country makes it more likely for the G7/8 to choose and faithfully, effectively use force. Relative capability is determined by comparing the total GDP of all G7/8 members and the GDP of the target country at the time of the conflict (Appendices D-1 and D-2). In the case of Iraq, the relative capability ratio is 2,140:1. In the case of Kosovo, the relative capability ratio is 469:1. In the case of Afghanistan 2001, the relative capability ratio is 6,398:1. In the case of Libya, the relative capability ratio is 898:1. In the case of Mali, the relative capability ratio is 3,633:1.

For comparative purposes, the relative capability ratios in cases of the G7/8 using only sanctions were also calculated. In the case of Iran, the relative capability ratio is 70:1. In the case of Afghanistan 1980, the relative capability ratio is 6.85:1, by far the lowest level of superiority the G7/8 has had over the target country in any of the five sanctions or five force cases. In the case of Sudan, the relative capability ratio is 1,229:1. In the case of North Korea, the relative capability ratio was 2,162:1. And in the case of Syria, the relative capability ratio is 537:1.

Therefore, in the five cases of G8 military force, the G7/8 was on average 2,528 more capable than its target. In the five cases of G8 sanctions, the G8 was on average 1,002 times more capable than its target. Predominant relative capability thus indeed has a positive effect on the G8's use of force.

Threat

The second hypothesis is that a high degree of threat, defined as an attack by the target country on G7/8 member territory resulting in the loss of life, is more likely to result in the use of force by the G8. With regard to Iraq 1990 and Kosovo 1999, the threat level was low as there were no attacks on G7/8 territory or citizens. In the case of Afghanistan 2001, the threat level was high due to the al-Qaeda terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. They originated from Afghanistan and killed almost 3,000 people. In the cases of Libya 2011 and Mali 2013, the threat level was low.

In the sanctions-only case of Iran 1980, the threat was medium. There was an attack on the US embassy (US territory) in Tehran in which 52 hostages were taken; however, no deaths resulted. In the case of Sudan, the threat level was low, as there were no attacks on G8 territory. In the case of North Korea, the threat level was medium due to the earlier abductions of Japanese citizens; the official count was 13 but the actual number is unknown. In the case of Syria, the threat level was low. Thus, the G7/8's use of force does not require a high level of deadly threat to a G7/8 member's territory and citizens.

Geographic Proximity

The third hypothesis is that the geographic proximity of the closest and all G7/8 members to the target causes force to be chosen, initiated, committed to, complied with, implemented and effective. It assumes that if the target is geographically closer to the G7/8 members the G7/8 will intervene because, first, the target represents a higher degree of actual or potential threat due to spillovers from regional instability and second the G8 is more likely to have established military infrastructure in place close to the target (see Appendix C). Proximity is measured by the number of miles between

G7/8 capital cities and the capital city of the conflict-initiating target country. In the case of Iraq, the closest capital city to Baghdad is Rome at 1,835 miles. In the case of Kosovo, the closest capital city to Belgrade is again Rome at 448 miles. In the case of Afghanistan 2001, the closest capital city to Kabul is Moscow at 2,096 miles. In the case of Libya, the closest capital city to Tripoli is Rome at 624 miles. And finally, in the case of Mali, the closest capital city to Bamako is Rome at 2,368 miles.

In the sanctions-only case of Iran, the closest capital city to Tehran is Rome at 2,124 miles. In the case of Afghanistan 1980, the closest capital city is Bonn at 1,298. In the case of Sudan, the closest capital city to Khartoum is Rome at 2,178 miles. In the case of North Korea, the closest capital city to Pyongyang is Tokyo at 799 miles. In the case of Syria, the closest capital city to Damascus is Rome at 1,420 miles.

Therefore, in the five cases of G8 members using military force the closest G8 capital is on average 1,474 miles away from the target. In the five cases of G8 members using sanctions, the closest G8 capital is on average 1,563 miles away. These findings lead to the conclusion that proximity matters only a little. Italy, a high complier with G7/8 commitments in cases using military force, is the closest member to the target four out of five times. It is the closest country in three of the five sanctions-only cases.

Political Connectivity

The fourth hypothesis is that a high degree of political connectivity flowing from a former colonial relationship between G8 members and the target country is more likely to produce the G8's effective use of sanctions only. Among the cases in which only sanctions were used, two targets had a former colonial relationship: Iran, a former colony of the UK, and Syria, a former colony of France. Among the cases in which the use of force was used, three had a former colonial relationship: Iraq, a former colony of the UK, Libya, a former colony of Italy, and Mali, a former colony of France. Thus, political connectivity is not a salient cause of the use of sanctions, but does have a positive effect on the G7/8's use of force.

Multilateral Organizational Support

The fifth hypothesis is that support from the dominant multilateral organization, in the form of a UNSC resolution, is more likely to result in the G8 using force. In all five force cases, the UNSC has passed a resolution authorizing its members to use such force, either before or after the G8's action. This suggests that support from the UN through a Security Council resolution has a very high, positive effect on the G8's use of force.

Regional Organizational Support

The sixth hypothesis is that support from the most relevant regional organization — NATO — is more likely to produce the G7/8's effective use of force. In four out of the five cases in which the G8 used military force, NATO support was present. Only in the case of Iraq was it absent. This suggests that the support of the most relevant regional organization has a high, positive effect on the G7/8's use of force.

Accompanying Accountability Mechanisms

The seventh hypothesis is that accompanying accountability mechanisms cause an increase in the compliance of G7/8 members with their commitments in the same case. The first accountability mechanism assessed is leaders' issue iteration, by having them return repeatedly to discuss at subsequent summits the same issue or case. In the force case of Afghanistan 2001, which averaged moderate compliance of +0.42 on the three assessed commitments, iteration was initially low but subsequently strong. The issue was absent in the communiqué in 2003 and 2006, but robustly present every other year through to 2013 (Appendix C-1). In the force case of Libya 2011, where compliance

was a low +0.03, iteration was high for all of the subsequent two years. Iteration thus does not seem to cause compliance in these two cases where force was endorsed. But in the sanctions case of Syria 2011, where interim compliance was a strong +0.56 in 2013, iteration was strong for the two years after 2011. Thus for the cases endorsing force, the leaders issue iteration hypothesis is disconfirmed. But in sanctions-only cases, iteration may cause compliance to rise.

A second accountability mechanism — ministerial follow up — has G8 foreign ministers meetings that address the same case quickly following the summit where force or sanctions were endorsed. As Appendix G shows, in the case of Kosovo 1999, where compliance with the two assessed commitments averaged a high +0.84, foreign ministers did not discuss Kosovo at their first follow-up meeting three months later (which dealt exclusively with Chechnya), but they did at subsequent ones 12 months and 25 months from the start. In the case of Afghanistan 2001, where average compliance with the three assessed commitments was a moderate +0.42, foreign ministers meetings followed quickly and frequently and discussed Afghanistan each time. In the case of Libya, where compliance was a low +0.03, G8 foreign ministers follow-up was slow and did not address Libya. On the basis of this limited evidence base, this hypothesis about foreign minister follow-up is generally confirmed.

Conclusion

Since the first G7 summit in Rambouillet, the G7/8 has established itself as an institution dedicated to governing regional security around the world based on its members' shared principles and beliefs of open democracy and individual liberty. While the manner in which they choose to address regional conflict has varied, on numerous occasions the G7/8 has moved beyond its reliance on the standard instruments of diplomatic suasion, institutional inclusion, and financial or other material support, to approve the imposition of economic sanctions or intervention with military force.

This study finds that the G7/8 has endorsed the use of sanctions a great deal, almost since its start in 1975 (Kirton 2011). It also began to endorse the use force in the post-Cold War years, doing so on five occasions since 1989. In these choice of force cases, its commitment, compliance, implementation and effectiveness has generally been strong.

Beyond the fact that force seems to work in getting the G7/8 what it wants, this committed, faithful, effective reliance on force is driven by four main factors, coming from the realist and liberal institutionalist traditions alike. A high relative-capability ratio between members and the target state strongly predicts the G7/8's reliance on force while geographic proximity helps a little. In contrast, a high, direct deadly threat from the target state to G8 countries does not, as such threats have been low beyond the great exception of Afghanistan in 2001. Support from the multilateral UN and regional NATO have a strong positive effect on the use of force. Yet political connectivity between G8 members and the target country is a weak cause. Accompanying accountability mechanisms have a mixed effect on compliance with commitments in the same case.

Suggestions for Future Research

This study points to the need for further research in several ways before more robust conclusions can be made. One is to expand the number and range of cases, by adding those where force is endorsed only by G7/8 foreign ministers and all of the many sanctions only cases (Kirton (2011)). A broader definition, not employed here, would be to add such public collective approval by G8 foreign ministers. This would yield the additional case of the use of force in East Timor in 1999, as approved by G8 foreign ministers in Japan in 2000. A second is to render more sensitive the measurement of the variables, for example by determining how much force was used, by how many members for how long, and whether the G8 authorized or approved the use of force before or after the UN, with an examination of the relationship between the two. The level of support from

surrounding summits such as the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie as well as regional organizations such as the AU should be considered. Existing international relations literature on force versus sanctions only should be reviewed. Detailed process tracing would permit a more reliable assessment of which G7/8 member initiated, supported, and initially opposed the G8's approval of the use of force.

References

- Daalder, Ivo H. and James G. Stavridis (2012), "NATO's Victory in Libya," *Foreign Affairs*. March/April 2012. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137073/ivo-h-daalder-and-james-g-stavridis/natos-victory-in-libya>>.
- Falkenheim, Peggy L. (1987), "Post-Afghanistan Sanctions," in David Leyton-Brown, ed., *Economic Sanctions as a Policy Instrument* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), pp. 105-130
- Félix-Paganon, Jean (2000), "The G8: Heading for a Major Role in International Peace and Security," in Winrich Kühne and Jochem Prantl, eds., *The Security Council and the G8 in the New Millennium* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), pp. 87-89.
- Fowler, Robert (2004), "The Intricacies of Summit Preparation and Consensus Building," in John Kirton and Radoslava Stefanova, eds., *The G8, The United Nations and Conflict Prevention* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 39-42.
- G7 (1975), "Declaration of Rambouillet," G8 Information Centre. November 17, 1975. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1975rambouillet/communiqu.html>>.
- G7 (1980), "Statement on the Taking of Diplomatic Hostages," G8 Information Centre. June 22, 1980. Accessed on April 2, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1980venice/hostage.html>>.
- G7 (1996a). "Chairman's Statement [Political Declaration]: Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World," G8 Information Centre. June 29, 1996. Accessed on April 5, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1996lyon/chair.html>>.
- G7 (1996b). "Decisions Concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina," G8 Information Centre. June 29, 1996. Accessed on April 5, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/1996lyon/bosnia.html>>.
- G8 (2005), "Statement by the G8 and AU: Sudan," G8 Information Centre. July 6, 2005. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/index.html>>.
- G8 (2006), "St. Petersburg Summit: Non-Proliferation," G8 Information Centre. July 16, 2006. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2006stpetersburg/nonprolif.html>>.
- G8 (2011), "G8 Declaration: Renewed Commitment for Freedom and Democracy," G8 Information Centre. May 26, 2011. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2011deauville/2011-declaration-en.html>>.
- G8 (2013), "G8 Lough Erne Leaders Communiqué," G8 Information Centre. June 18, 2013. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2013lougherne/lougherne-communiqu.html>>.
- G20 Research Group (2012), "2011 Cannes G20 Summit Final Compliance Report," June 16, 2012. Accessed March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/compliance/2011cannes-final/index.html>>.
- Hufbauer, Gary and Kimberly Elliot
- Keohane, Robert and Joseph Nye, Jr. (1977), *Power and Interdependence*
- Kirton, John (1987), "Economic Sanctions and Alliance Consultation," in David Leyton-Brown, ed., *Economic Sanctions as a Policy Instrument* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), pp. 269-293.
- Kirton, John (2000), "The G8: Heading for Major Role in International Peace and Security," in Winrich Kühne and Jochem Prantl, eds., *The Security Council and the G8 in the New Millennium* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), pp. 73-82.

- Kirton, John (2002), "The G8, the United Nations and Global Security Governance," in John Kirton and Junichi Takese, eds., *New Directions in Global Political Governance* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 190-207.
- Kirton, John (2007), *Canadian Foreign Policy in a Changing World* (Toronto: Thomson-Nelson), pp. 135-36, 170, 198.
- Kirton, John (2011), "G8 Sanctioning Success," in Andreas Freytag, John Kirton, Razeen Sally and Paolo Savona, eds., *Securing the Global Economy: G8 Governance for a Post-Crisis World* (Farnham: Ashgate), pp. 153-176.
- Kühne, Winrich (2000), "Introduction," in Winrich Kühne and Jochem Prantl, eds., *The Security Council and the G8 in the New Millennium* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), pp. 5-6.
- Manulak, Michael (2011), "Forceful Persuasion or Half-Hearted Diplomacy?," *International Journal* 66(2): 351-369.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (1949), "The North Atlantic Treaty. April 4, 1949. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm>.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014). "Gross Domestic Product (GDP)." OECD.StatExtracts. Retrieved on March 27, 2014, at <http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?datasetcode=SNA_TABLE1>.
- Paarlberg, Robert L/ (1987), "The 1980-81 US Grain Embargo: Consequences for the Participants," in David Leyton-Brown, ed., *Economic Sanctions as a Policy Instrument* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), pp. 185-206.
- Penttilä, Risto (2005), "Advancing American Security Interests Through the G8," in Michele Fratianni, John Kirton, Alan Rugman and Paolo Savona, eds., *New Perspectives on Global Governance: Why American Needs the G8* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 83-105.
- Pleuger, Gunter (2000), "The G8: Heading for a Major Role in International Peace and Security," in Winrich Kühne and Jochem Prantl, eds., *The Security Council and the G8 in the New Millennium* (Berlin: Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik), pp. 83-86.
- Putnam, Robert and Nicholas Bayne (1984), *Hanging Together: The Seven-Power Summits* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press).
- Putnam, Robert and Nicholas Bayne (1987), *Hanging Together: Co-operation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summit*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications).
- United Nations Security Council (2005), "Press Release SC/8346," United Nations. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/sc8346.doc.htm>>.
- United Nations Security Council (1990), "Resolution 678 (1990)," United Nations. November 29, 1990. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/678\(1990\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/678(1990))>.
- United Nations Security Council (1998), "Resolution 1199 (1998)," United Nations. September 23, 1998. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1199\(1998\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1199(1998))>.
- United Nations Security Council (2006), "Resolution 1695 (2006)," United Nations. July 15, 2006. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1695\(2006\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1695(2006))>.
- United Nations Security Council (2011), "Resolution 1973 (2011)," United Nations. March 17, 2011. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973\(2011\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973(2011))>.
- United Nations Security Council (2012), "Resolution 2085 (2012)," United Nations. December 20, 2012. Accessed on March 1, 2014, at <[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2085\(2012\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2085(2012))>.
- Wolf, Bernard M. (1987), "Economic Impact on the United States of the Pipeline Sanctions," in David Leyton-Brown, ed., *Economic Sanctions as a Policy Instrument* (London: Croom Helm, 1985), pp. 207-220.
- World Bank (2014), "GDP (Current US\$)," World Bank Open Data. Accessed on March 27, 2014, at <<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>>.

Appendix A: The Analytical Model

Dependent Variable (Effects)

1. **Instrument:** does G7/8 authorize or approve
a. sanction only, or b. military force?
2. **Initiation:** taken by which G7/8 countries?
3. **Commitment:** how many commitments did the G7/8 make on the case?
4. **Compliance:** how much G7/8 members comply with the commitments relevant to the case, especially those relating to sanctions or force is:
a. high, or b. low?
5. **Implementation:** is G7/8 members' contributions to the sanctions or force
a. high or b. low?
6. **Effectiveness:** does the G7/8 secure its initially intended, communiqué specified result with
a. success, or b. failure (how much, how fast)?

Independent Variable (Causes)

A: Realist Causes:

1. **Power:** Relative capability ratio between target country and G8
2. **Threat:** Deadly threat posed by target country to G7/8 member(s)
3. **Proximity:** Geographic distance of targets country to closest G8 member, initiator, complier

B. Liberal-Institutionalist Causes:

4. **Colonial relationship** between target and G8 member (political connectivity)
5. **Multilateral organizational support** (global institutional connectivity)
6. **Regional organizational support** (geographic place)
7. **Accompanying Accountability Mechanism** in G7/8 (leaders iteration, implementation review, ministerial follow-up, official level follow up)

Appendix B: Summary of Empirical Results

Dependent Variable: Effects (*partial data)

Case	Force	G8 Initiator	Commitments	Compliance	Contributor Effectiveness
FORCE					
Iraq 1991	Yes	United Kingdom		+0.48, N=2	Yes
Kosovo 1999	Yes	United Kingdom, France, Canada	19	+0.84, N=2	Yes
Afghanistan 2001	Yes	Canada, France, United Kingdom, United States		+0.42, N=3	Mixed
Libya 2011	Yes	France, United Kingdom, Canada		+0.03, N=1	Yes
Mali 2013	Yes	France	3		Yes
SANCTIONS ONLY					
Iran 1980	No	United States			Mixed
Afghanistan 1980	No	United States	5		Success by 1987
Sudan 2004	No				Yes
North Korea 2006	No	Japan			No
Syria 2011	No				Mixed

Independent Variable: Causes

Case	Proximity	Colony	Regional	United Nations	Capability	Threat
FORCE						
Iraq 1991	1,835 (Italy)	Yes (United Kingdom)	No	Yes (678)	2,410	Low
Kosovo 1999	448 (Italy)	No	Yes (NATO)	Yes (1244)	469	Low
Afghanistan 2001	2,096 (Russia)	No	Yes (NATO)	Yes (1510)	6,398	High
Libya 2011	624 (Italy)	Yes (Italy)	Yes (NATO)	Yes (1973)	898	Low
Mali 2013	2,368	Yes (France)	Yes (NATO)	Yes (2085)	3,633	Low
SANCTIONS ONLY						
Iran 1980	2,124 (Italy)	Yes (United Kingdom)		No	80	Medium
Afghanistan/USSR 1980	1,298 (Germany)	No			7	
Sudan 2004	2,178 (Italy)	Yes (United Kingdom)		Yes (1591)	1,229	Low
North Korea 2006	799 (Japan)	No		Yes (1718)	2,162	Medium
Syria 2011	1,420 (Italy)	Yes (France)		No	537	Low

Note: NATO = North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Appendix C-1: G8 Conclusions on the Balkans, 1975–2013

Year	Total Words	% of Total Words	# of Paragraphs	% of Total Paragraphs	# of Documents	% of Total Documents	# of Dedicated Documents
1975	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1976	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1977	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1980	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	598	11.8	8	10.9	1	14.2	0
1988	194	4	3	4.6	1	33.3	0
1989	338	4.7	3	2.5	1	9	0
1990	61	0.8	1	0.81	1	25	0
1991	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1992	2,418	32.1	36	21.3	4	100	1
1993	368	11	2	4.7	2	66.6	0
1994	197	4.7	6	8.8	1	50	0
1995	499	6.8	9	69.2	2	66.6	1
1996	1,417	9.2	32	14	2	50	1
1997	781	6	11	7.8	2	40	1
1998	367	6	5	7.8	1	25	0
1999	850	8.4	9	10.4	1	33.3	0
2000	384	2.8	3	2	1	20	0
2001	217	3.5	1	1.3	1	14.2	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	59	.2	1	.36	1	8.3	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	60	0.8	1	1.9	1	50	0
2011	176	0.9	2	0.9	1	20	0
2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8984	113.7	133	169.27	24	625.5	4
Average	230.4	2.9	3.4	4.3	0.6	16	0.1

Notes: Data are drawn from all official English-language documents released by the G8 leaders as a group. Charts are excluded.

“# of Words” is the number of subjects related to the Balkans for the year specified, excluding document titles and references. Words are calculated by paragraph because the paragraph is the unit of analysis.

“% of Total Words” refers to the total number of words in all documents for the year specified.

“# of Paragraphs” is the number of paragraphs containing references to the Balkans for the year specified. Each point is recorded as a separate paragraph.

“% of Total Paragraphs” refers to the total number of paragraphs in all documents for the year specified.

“# of Documents” is the number of documents that contain subjects related to the Balkans and excludes dedicated documents.

“% of Total Documents” refers to the total number of documents for the year specified.

“# of Dedicated Documents” is the number of documents for the year that contain a Balkans-related subject in the title.

Appendix C-1: G8 Conclusions on Afghanistan, 1975–2013

Year	# of Words	% of Total Words	# of Paragraphs	% of Totals Paragraphs	# of Documents	% of Total Documents	# of Dedicated Documents
1975	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1976	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1977	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1980	254	0	3	0	1	0	0
1981	137	0	1	0	1	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	58	0	1	0	1	0	0
1988	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1993	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1994	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1995	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1996	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1997	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	24	0	1	0	1	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	15	0	1	0	1	0	0
2005	132	0	2	0	2	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	268	0	1	0	1	0	0
2008	273	0	1	0	1	0	0
2009	507	0	4	0	2	0	0
2010	322	0	3	0	2	0	0
2011	439	0	6	0	1	0	0
2012	269	0	5	0	1	0	0
2013	185	0	1	0	1	0	0
Average							

Note: Compiled by Julia Kulik, G8 Research Group, May 7, 2014.

Appendix C-2: G8 Conclusions on Syria, 1975–2013

Year	# of Words	% of Total Words	# of Paragraphs	% of Total Paragraphs	# of Documents	% of Total Documents	# of Dedicated Documents
1975	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1976	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1977	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1980	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1993	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1994	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1995	112	0	1	0	1	0	0
1996	164	0	2	0	1	0	0
1997	156	0	1	0	1	0	0
1998	166	0	1	0	1	0	0
1999	54	0	1	0	1	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	226	0	1	0	1	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	88	0	1	0	1	0	0
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	90	0	1	0	1	0	0
2010	323	0	1	0	1	0	0
2011	381	0	4	0	2	0	0
2012	224	0	2	0	2	0	0
2013	771	0	7	0	1	0	0
Average							

Notes:

Data are drawn from all official English-language documents released by the G8 leaders as a group. Charts are excluded.

“# of Words” is the number of Syria-related subjects for the year specified, excluding document titles and references. Words are calculated by paragraph because the paragraph is the unit of analysis.

“% of Total Words” refers to the total number of words in all documents for the year specified.

“# of Paragraphs” is the number of paragraphs containing references to the Syria for the year specified. Each point is recorded as a separate paragraph.

“% of Total Paragraphs” refers to the total number of paragraphs in all documents for the year specified.

“# of Documents” is the number of documents that contain Syria subjects and excludes dedicated documents.

“% of Total Documents” refers to the total number of documents for the year specified.

“# of Dedicated Documents” is the number of documents for the year that contain a Syria-related subject in the title.

Appendix C-3: G8 Conclusions on Libya, 1975–2013

Year	# of Words	% of Total Words	# of Paragraphs	% of Total Paragraphs	# of Documents	% of Total Documents	# of Dedicated Documents
1975	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1976	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1977	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1980	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1981	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1983	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1984	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1985	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1986	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1987	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1988	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1990	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1991	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1993	113		2		1		0
1994	37		1		1		0
1995	63		1		1		0
1996	59		1		1		0
1997	57		1		1		0
1998	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	385		3		1		0
2012	307		5		2		0
2013	217		2		1		0
Average							0

Notes: Data are drawn from all official English-language documents released by the G8 leaders as a group. Charts are excluded.

“# of Words” is the number of Libya-related subjects for the year specified, excluding document titles and references. Words are calculated by paragraph because the paragraph is the unit of analysis. “% of Total Words” refers to the total number of words in all documents for the year specified.

“# of Paragraphs” is the number of paragraphs containing references to the Libya for the year specified. Each point is recorded as a separate paragraph.

“% of Total Paragraphs” refers to the total number of paragraphs in all documents for the year specified.

“# of Documents” is the number of documents that contain Libya subjects and excludes dedicated documents.

“% of Total Documents” refers to the total number of documents for the year specified.

“# of Dedicated Documents” is the number of documents for the year that contain a Libya-related subject in the title

Appendix D: G8 Commitments on Regional Security

Year	Afghanistan	Iran	Sudan	North Korea	Syria	Iraq	Kosovo	Afghanistan	Libya	Mali
1980										
1981	4									
1982	1									
1983	0									
1984	0									
1985										
1986										
1987										
1988										
1989										
1990										
1991										
1992										
1993										
1994										
1995										
1996							10			
1997							7			
1998							0			
1999							1			
2000							0			
2001							1			
2002							0			
2003							0			
2004							0			
2005							0			
2006										
2007										
2008										
2009										
2010										
2011										
2012										
2013										3

Appendix E-1: Compliance Case-Specific Commitments

Commitment	Average	United States	Japan	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Canada	Russia	European Union
Iraq 1990	+0.48	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5
1996-114	-0.50	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
2004-C2	+0.89	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
Kosovo 1999	+0.84	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	-1	1
1996-120	+1.00	1	1	1	1	1		1		
1999-45	+0.67	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	-1	1
Afghan 2001	+0.42	0.67	0	0.33	0.67	0.67	0	1	0.33	0.42
2002-15	+0.25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0.25
2008-248	0	1	-1	0	1	0	-1	1	0	-1
2010-51	+1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Libya 2011	+0.03	1	0	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0
1996-114	-0.50	1	0	-1	-1	-1		-1		
2013-186*	+0.56	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Mali 2013	TBD									
2013-172	TBD									
2013-178	TBD									
Overall Average	+0.39	+0.89	+0.33	+0.33	+0.56	+0.67	+0.29	+0.78	+0.00	+0.32

Notes: TBD = to be determined. * indicates interim score (first six month).

		United States	Japan	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Canada	Russia	European Union	Total
	three years. Domestic and international investors should be full partners to this process. We are mobilising practical support for Mr Wolfensohn's efforts and look forward to further development of his plans and their presentation to the Quartet and the international community in September." [MEPP]										
2005-C2	"We commend and will continue to support the African Union's Mission in Sudan (Darfur) , just as we are contributing to UNMIS's operation in southern Sudan."	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.89
2006-288	"In order to facilitate the UN's rapid and efficient response to crises, G8 states commit to pursuing reforms in the United Nations to ensure that resources are available in advance to the UN as it works to establish new peacekeeping and peace support operations: pre-positioning equipment in Brindisi, an increase in pre-authorization funds to support DPKO's planning, and the authority to identify personnel in advance of a UNSC resolution mandating a new PKO;"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2006-307	"We will support the economic and humanitarian needs of the Lebanese people, including the convening at the right time of a donors conference." [MEPP]	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
2007-295	"We reiterate our commitment to continue to provide humanitarian assistance and will undertake, in coordination with the African Union and the United Nations, to identify options for improving humanitarian access."	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0.78
2008-203	"[We will, in particular] build capacity for peace support operations including providing quality training to and equipping troops by 2010, with focus on Africa, as well as enhance logistics and transportation support for deployment"	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0.67
2008-248	"We reaffirm the importance of economic and social	1	-1	0	1	0	-1	1	0	-1	0

		United States	Japan	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Canada	Russia	European Union	Total
	development along with counter-terrorism measures in the Afghanistan -Pakistan border region, which can play a critical role in bringing lasting peace, stability and security to this region. To this end, we are committed to further strengthening the coordination of our efforts in the border region in cooperation with the respective countries, international organizations, and other donors.”										
2009-186	“We reaffirm our commitment to promoting stability and development in both countries and the wider region, also by strengthening their capacity to counter terrorism, illicit trafficking and crime.”	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.89
2010-51	“we fully support the transition strategy adopted by International Security Assistance Force contributors in April, as well as the on-going efforts to establish an Afghan -led national reconciliation and reintegration process.”	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
2010-59	“To this end, we commit to strengthening: the international availability of civilian experts to support rule of law and security institutions; the capacities of key littoral states and regional organizations for maritime security; and international peace operations.”	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.89
2011-120	“For our part, we stand ready to offer additional support through, inter alia, improved mutual market access opportunities to encourage integration into the global economy through increased trade and inward investment in the region, for countries undertaking reforms to open their economies and create competitive conditions.”	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.22
2013-186	Deauville Partnership [Libya] (Interim)	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	.56
2013-198	Syria (Interim)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	.56
Conflict Prevention N=8		0.88	0	0.75	0.63	0.88	0	0.88	-0.29	0.80	0.51

		United States	Japan	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Canada	Russia	European Union	Total
1996-120	"We support the High Representative in his work of preparation with the Parties of the establishment of the new institutions: the collective Presidency, the Council of Ministers, the Parliament, the Constitutional Court and the Central Bank. We shall provide the future authorities with the necessary constitutional and legal assistance." [Balkans-Kosovo]	1	1	1	1	1		1			1.00
Terrorism N=16		0.88	0.38	0.60	0.56	0.44	0.79	0.75	0.79	0.64	0.64
1996-63	"We rededicate ourselves and invite others to associate our efforts in order to thwart the activities of terrorists and their supporters, including fund-raising, the planning of terrorist acts, procurement of weapons, calling for violence, and incitement to commit terrorist acts."	1	1	1	0	1		1			0.83
2000-103	"We call for all states to become parties to the twelve international counter-terrorism conventions to enhance international cooperation against terrorism."	1	0		1	0		0			0.40
2001-xx	We have asked our foreign, finance, justice, and other relevant ministers, as appropriate, to draw up a list of specific measures to enhance our counter terrorism cooperation, including: Expanded use of financial measures and sanctions to stop the flow of funds to terrorists, aviation security, the control of arms exports, security and other services cooperation, the denial of all means of support to terrorism and the identification and removal of terrorist threats.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1.00
2002-4	We are committed to sustained and comprehensive actions to deny support or sanctuary to terrorists, to bring terrorists to justice, and to reduce the threat of terrorist attacks.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1.00
2003-150	"the G8 will create a Counter-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00

		United States	Japan	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Canada	Russia	European Union	Total
	Terrorism Action Group (CTAG), to focus on building political will, co-ordinating capacity building assistance when necessary. CTAG will provide funding, expertise or training facilities."										
2003-168	"Given the increasing number of MANPADS (Man-Portable Air Defense Systems) in world-wide circulation, we commit ourselves to reducing their proliferation and call upon all countries to strengthen control of their MANPADS stockpiles".	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1		0.63
2004-F10	"Accelerate development of international standards for the interoperability of government-issued smart chip passports and other government-issued identity documents. We will work for implementation by the 2005 Summit."	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
2005-N1	"We have carried forward initiatives to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction to terrorists and other criminals, reinforce international political will to combat terrorism, secure radioactive sources and — as announced at Sea Island — ensure secure and facilitated travel. Today we commit ourselves to new joint efforts. We will work to improve the sharing of information on the movement of terrorists across international borders."	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00
2007-314	"Furthermore, we aim to improve passenger screening programs and techniques, port facility security audits, security management systems and transportation security clearance programs."	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.22
2007-318	"We commend the efforts of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) and reaffirm our commitment to implement and promote internationally its 40 Recommendations on Money Laundering and nine Special Recommendations on Terror Finance."	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.78

	United States	Japan	Germany	United Kingdom	France	Italy	Canada	Russia	European Union	Total	
2008-246	"We stress the urgent need for full implementation of existing standards, including Financial Action Task Force (FATF) Special Recommendations VIII and IX, and ask our experts to take steps to share information, evaluate threats, assess new trends and promote implementation and review these efforts next year."	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	0	-1	1	-0.22
2009-202	"We will intensify our efforts in tackling the widest variety of threats, such as chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear terrorism (CBRN), and attacks on critical infrastructure (including critical information infrastructure), sensitive sites, and transportation systems."	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.78
2010-65	"We are committed to further enhancing international cooperation, by strengthening old partnerships and building new ones with governments, multilateral organizations and the private sector."	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0.67
2010-68	"We underscore our determination to work cooperatively on key challenges, including transportation security, border security and identity integrity, preventing chemical, biological, nuclear and radiological terrorism, combating terrorism financing, countering violent extremism, radicalization leading to violence, and recruitment."	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.89
2010-70	"We will seek to build closer cooperation among relevant G8 partner programs to make our effort to address terrorism and related security threats more coherent and effective."	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.78
2011-145	"We stand ready to assist the countries affected by this scourge in building their own capacities to fight terrorism and terrorist groups."	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0.56

Appendix F-1: Capability of G8 Members

	Canada	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	United Kingdom	United States	Russia	Total
1980	278,368	526,685	777,221	524,846	1,004,592	467,306	2,862,500	N/A	6,441,518
1990	552,217	1,002,531	1,472,120	1,001,122	2,377,973	919,323	5,979,600	568,900	13,878,786
1991	559,117	1,046,643	1,598,785	1,050,335	2,538,749	937,624	6,174,000	559,600	14,464,853
1999	841,313	1,424,154	2,051,700	1,385,611	3,115,999	1,437,816	9,665,700	869,766	20,792,059
2001	932,845	1,629,631	2,201,804	1,556,071	3,377,139	1,637,784	10,625,300	1,074,407	23,034,981
2004	1,076,117	1,760,498	2,447,878	1,600,738	3,753,389	1,916,836	12,277,000	1,474,055	26,306,511
2006	1,233,200	1,993,970	2,765,956	1,793,350	4,064,908	2,155,593	13,857,900	2,133,935	29,845,087
2011	1,419,474	2,369,589	3,352,099	2,056,688	4,386,151	2,201,439	15,533,800	3,216,934	34,536,174
2013	1,800,000	2,734,000	3,635,000	2,100,000	4,900,000	2,476,000	17,100,000	2,014,000	36,700,000

Note: All figures from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development database on gross domestic product. Figures are listed US dollars, current prices, current purchasing power parity, millions.

Source: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2014).

Appendix F-2: Capability of Target Countries

Case	Gross Domestic Product (US dollars)
FORCE	
Iraq 1991	\$6 billion
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia 1999*	\$44.3 billion
Afghanistan 2001	\$3.6 billion
Libya 2011	\$38.4 billion
Mali 2013	\$10.1 billion
SANCTIONS ONLY	
Iran 1980	\$92 billion
Soviet Union 1980	\$940 billion
Sudan 2004	\$21.4 billion
North Korea 2006	\$13.8 billion
Syria 2011	\$64.3 billion

Note: * indicates an estimated figure.

Source: World Bank (2014).

Appendix F-3 : Overall Relative Capability

Country	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2012	2013
G7									
United States	2862.48	4346.75	5979.55	7664.05	10289.73	13095.43	14958.30	16244.58	16799.70
Japan	826.14	1384.53	3102.70	5333.93	4731.20	4571.87	5495.39	5937.77	4901.53
Germany	691.26	639.70	1547.03	2525.02	1891.93	2771.06	3310.60	3427.85	3635.96
France	470.04	547.83	1247.35	1573.08	1220.22	2140.27	2569.82	2612.67	2737.36
United Kingdom	1086.99	468.96	1204.59	1181.01	1496.61	2324.18	2296.93	2484.45	2535.76
Italy	542.45	446.03	1140.24	1132.36	1107.25	1789.38	2059.19	2014.38	2071.96
Canada	274.37	362.96	594.61	602.00	729.45	1164.18	1614.07	1821.45	1825.10
Total	6753.73	8196.76	14816.06	20011.45	21466.39	27856.36	32304.30	34543.13	34507.36
BRICS									
China	303.37	307.02	390.28	727.95	1198.48	2256.92	5930.39	8229.38	9181.38
Brazil	148.92	231.76	465.01	769.74	644.73	882.04	2142.91	2247.75	2242.85
Russia	N/A	N/A	N/A	313.45	259.70	763.70	1524.92	2004.25	2118.01
India	181.42	237.62	326.61	366.60	476.64	834.22	1708.54	1858.75	1870.65
South Africa	80.55	57.27	112.00	151.12	132.97	246.95	365.17	382.34	350.78
Total	714.24	833.67	1293.89	2328.86	2712.52	4983.84	11671.92	14722.47	15763.67
Other G20									
India	181.42	237.62	326.61	366.60	476.64	834.22	1780.54	1858.75	1870.65
Australia	163.73	175.24	323.44	379.72	399.47	733.04	1249.25	1555.29	1505.28
Mexico	234.95	223.42	298.46	343.78	683.54	865.85	1050.85	1183.51	1258.54
Korea	64.39	98.50	270.41	531.14	533.39	844.87	1014.89	1129.60	1221.80
Indonesia	86.31	91.53	113.77	202.13	165.02	285.77	709.34	877.80	870.28
Turkey	94.26	90.58	202.25	227.81	266.67	482.74	731.54	788.04	827.21
Saudi Arabia	163.97	103.68	116.69	147.94	194.81	328.46	526.81	733.96	745.27
Argentina	209.03	88.19	141.35	258.22	284.41	181.36	367.56	475.21	488.21
Egypt	22.37	46.45	91.38	60.16	99.62	89.52	218.76	262.26	271.43
Total	1220.41	1155.21	1884.36	2517.50	3103.57	4645.82	7649.55	8864.41	9058.67
Other European Union									
Spain	224.37	176.59	520.42	596.94	582.05	1132.76	1387.43	1323.21	1358.69
Netherlands	177.20	133.17	295.57	419.35	386.20	639.58	778.61	770.49	800.01
Sweden	131.27	105.68	242.88	253.68	247.26	370.58	463.06	523.94	557.94
Poland	56.62	70.78	62.08	139.10	171.26	303.98	469.80	489.78	516.13
Belgium	121.98	83.44	197.71	284.79	233.25	378.01	472.03	483.22	506.56
Austria	80.11	67.93	165.17	238.80	192.63	305.51	378.38	394.68	415.37
Denmark	69.71	61.20	135.84	181.99	160.08	257.68	312.95	315.16	330.96
Finland	53.05	55.29	139.23	130.95	122.15	196.12	237.15	247.28	256.92
Greece	53.64	45.13	92.20	131.82	127.61	240.49	294.77	248.56	241.80
Portugal	32.12	26.82	78.24	116.40	117.64	192.18	229.37	212.26	219.97
Ireland	21.00	20.76	47.25	67.92	97.62	202.93	209.78	210.75	217.88
Czech Republic	N/A	N/A	N/A	57.79	58.80	130.07	198.49	196.45	198.31
Romania	45.59	47.80	38.24	35.48	37.33	99.17	164.78	169.18	189.66
Hungary	22.61	21.04	33.73	45.47	46.39	110.32	127.50	124.59	132.43

Slovakia	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.60	20.48	47.98	87.44	91.40	95.81
Luxembourg	6.47	4.57	12.70	20.69	20.33	37.71	52.15	55.17	59.84
Croatia	N/A	N/A	N/A	22.12	21.49	44.79	58.84	56.16	58.06
Bulgaria	26.68	28.05	21.12	13.42	12.94	28.97	47.84	51.33	53.05
Lithuania	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.73	11.50	26.10	36.71	42.34	47.56
Slovenia	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.97	20.08	35.77	47.08	45.41	46.85
Latvia	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.97	7.78	15.94	24.10	28.38	30.95
Estonia	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.78	5.70	13.93	19.08	22.39	24.48
Cyprus	2.13	2.40	5.52	9.14	9.20	16.92	23.10	23.00	21.83
Malta	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.73	4.04	6.14	8.56	8.85	9.55
Total	1124.54	950.65	2087.90	2825.62	2713.82	4833.61	6128.99	6133.97	6390.58

Notes: N/A=Data not available. Compiled by Julia Kulik, May 16, 2014.

Source: IMF World Economic Outlook Database.

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2014/01/weodata/index.aspx>

Appendix F-4: Relative Military Capability

Country	1990	2000	2005	2010	2013	% of United States
United States	527,174	394,155	579,831	720,282	618,681	100.0
China	19,820	37,040	71,496	136,239	171,381	27.7
Russia/USSR	62,300 ^a	31,100	46,446	65,807	84,864	13.7
France	70,527	61,783	65,123	66,251	62,272	10.1
Japan	47,802	60,388	61,288	59,003	59,431	9.1
United Kingdom	58,824	48,000	58,150	62,942	56,231	9.1
Germany	71,666	50,614	46,983	49,583	49,297	8.0
Italy	36,892	43,063	42,342	38,876	32,663	5.3
Canada	20,582	15,651	17,811	20,684	18,704	3.0
Turkey	13,137	20,601	15,668	16,955	18,682	3.0
Netherlands	13,550	11,267	11,821	12,061	10,258	1.7
Poland	7,417	6,351	7,733	9,326	9,431	1.5
Iraq	N/A	N/A	2,545	3,489	7,251	1.1
Serbia (FYR)	N/A	1,633	976	1,028	919	0.1
Afghanistan	N/A	N/A	183	631	1,333	0.2
Libya	N/A	531	1,069	N/A	2,903 ^b	0.5
Mali	58.5	88.7	116	158	153	0.02
Iran	2,813	9,923	15,128	11,043	9,573 ^b	1.5
Russia/USSR	62,300 ^a	31,100	46,446	65,807	84,864	13.7
North Korea	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sudan	764	1,676	2,166	N/A	N/A	N/A
Syria	1,117	1,856	2,339	2,366	N/A	N/A

Notes: ^a = 2002 figure, ^b = 2012 figure. Compiled by Julia Kulik, May 15, 2014.

Source: SIPRI Military Expenditure Database, 1988–2013, constant 2011 US\$ millions.

Appendix G: Proximity to G8 Members

	Ottawa, Canada	Washington, United States	Rome, Italy	Paris, France	Berlin, Germany	Tokyo, Japan	Moscow, Russia	London, United Kingdom
Baghdad, Iraq	5,840	6,202	1,835	2,402	2,229 ^a	5,190	1,585	2,546
Belgrade, Serbia	4,374	4,712	448	898	620	5,700	1,063	1,049
Kabul, Afghanistan	6,500	6,930	3,067	3,473	2,972	3,902	2,096	3,549
Tripoli, Libya	4,601	4,856	624	1,238	2,184	10,588	3,166	1,451
Bamako, Mali	4,525	4,554	2,368	2,573	3,002	8,495	3,845	2,723
Tehran, Iran	5,942	6,331	2,124	2,620	2,182	4,768	1,534	2,736
Moscow, Russia	4,452	4,865	1,479	1,546	1,298^a	4,651	N/A	1,555
Khartoum, Sudan	6,306	6,553	2,178	2,865	2,763	6,520	2,794	3,070
Pyongyang, North Korea	6,458	6,869	5,459	5,456	4,934	799	3,989	5,388
Damascus, Syria	5,532	5,869	1,420	2,037	1,737	5,570	1,540	2,201

Notes: Distance is calculated by the number of miles between capital cities. All cases listed involved military force. The G8 member closest to the conflict is in bold.

^a = Proximity is measured from Bonn, Germany, the former capital of West Germany.

Appendix H: Accompanying Accountability Mechanisms

H-1: Leaders' Issue Iteration at Subsequent Summits

Force:	Start	Words	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Iraq	1990								
Kosovo	1999	24	0	15	132	0	268	273	507
Afghanistan	2001								
Libya	2011	385	307	217	N/A				
Mali	2013								
Sanctions									
Syria	2011	381	224	771	N/A				

Note: N/A = Not applicable.

H-2: G8 Foreign Ministers' Follow-up

Force	Start	Meeting 1		Meeting 2		Meeting 3	
		Months after event	Issue discussed	Months after event	Issue discussed	Months after event	Issue discussed
Iraq	1990						
Kosovo	1999	5 months	No	12 months	Yes	25 months	Yes
Afghanistan	2001	3 months	Yes	11 months	Yes	20 months	Yes
Libya	2011	11 months	No	23 months	No	N/A	N/A
Mali	2013	N/A					

Notes: Excludes meetings without statements and statements without meeting. N/A = not available.