

Paradox of humanitarian intervention: A critical analysis of theory and practice

Paradoks intervensi kemanusiaan: Analisis kritis teori dan praktik

Tadelech Bubamo Welde^{1,2*} & Baiq L. S. W. Wardhani¹

¹Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Airlangga

²Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Social Science and Humanity, Wollega University Gimbi Campus

Address: ¹Jalan Dharmawangsa Dalam, Airlangga, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia 60286

²Oromia West Wollega Zone, Gimbi, Ethiopia

E-mail: luckypetiros@gmail.com

Article History: Received 10 October 2019; Accepted 7 July 2020; Published Online 31 August 2020

Abstract

Since the end of the Cold War, thoughtlessness act in conducting 'humanitarian interventions' has posed analytical challenges for international relations academicians. Traditional security advocates have tried to distinguished implications of 'humanitarianism' based on their interest and how it helps state in regaining the outcome. This research identified motivation of state in conducting humanitarian intervention. There are growing studies, as expressed by the constructivist, that humanitarianism is states' political weapon that shifted the involvement patterns of policymakers and actors in humanitarian interventions. On the other hand, primary criticism from realism stressed economic and political ambition behind humanitarian interventions and makes it impossible to be moral, ethical, and cosmopolitan. The objective of this study is to examine the practices, motives, and challenges of humanitarian interventions. Data gathered from published books and journals selected through rigorous analysis. The research finds that the failure of humanitarian interventions indicates the following: First, humanitarian interventions requires expensive cost in people's life and other resources. Moreover, there is a moral obligation to save the victims. Second, actors are engaged to operate the mission and has limited right to demonstrate their self-interest to protect the victims. Third is the issue of sovereignty and the subjected state's willingness to integrate. To overcome the problem, government should promote global governance transformation and the cosmopolitanism nature between actors.

Keywords: humanitarian intervention; controversy; practices; critical analysis

Abstrak

Akhir perang dingin menjadi momentum ketika intervensi kemanusiaan tanpa persiapan matang membuka ruang diskusi bagi akademisi hubungan internasional mengenai analisis kritis tindakan tersebut. Para pendukung perspektif keamanan tradisional telah membedakan implikasi dari humanitarianisme berdasarkan kepentingan negara dan bagaimana tindakan tersebut mengembalikan keuntungan bagi actor yang mengusungnya. Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi motivasi negara dalam melakukan intervensi kemanusiaan. Para konstruktivis percaya bahwa humanitarianisme telah menjadi alat politik negara dan merubah pola keterlibatan para aktor dan pemangku kepentingan dalam intervensi kemanusiaan. Di sisi lain, para pemikir realis menggarisbawahi ambisi ekonomi dan politik dibalik intervensi kemanusiaan yang menjadikannya tidak bersinggungan dengan nilai moral, etika, dan kosmopolitanisme. Riset ini bertujuan untuk menelaah praktik, motif, dan tantangan intervensi kemanusiaan. Studi literatur digunakan untuk mengabil data melalui buku dan jurnal ilmiah yang dipilih melalui analisis mendalam. Studi ini menemukan bahwa kegagalan intervensi kemanusiaan dilatarbelakangi hal-hal berikut: Pertama, intervensi kemanusiaan membutuhkan biaya yang besar baik dari sisi manusia maupun sumber-sumber lainnya. Kedua, aktor yang terlibat dalam melaksanakan misi memiliki kewenangan terbatas untuk melakukan aksi self-interest guna melindungi korban. Ketiga mengenai persoalan kedaulatan dan kesediaan negara subjek untuk berintegrasi dalam intervensi kemanusiaan. Untuk menanggulangi persoalan ini, perlu penekanan pad apentingnya transformasi pemerintahan global dan perspektif kosmopolitanisme bagi para aktor.

Kata kunci: intervensi kemanusiaan; kontroversi; praktik; analisis kritis

Introduction

What makes humanitarian interventions complicated are the associated principles and approaches. An intervention involves the use of coercive power, either that of another state's military forces or that of international organizations like the United Nations (UN), to enforce a sovereign country when it is unable to safeguard its citizens' fundamental rights. Scholars and lawyers have failed to underline the exact border between the politics, norms, and legal principles of this entry, determining that humanitarian interventions tend to be obscured. Not only their confusion, however, the term 'right to intervene' ratified as part of international law, is also questionable given the past and present humanitarian crises worldwide. Due to the progress in the academic discourse on human rights, the context of state sovereignty is changing. Recently, sovereignty details more of a responsibility to protect the universal human rights of individuals. Broadly, global nations and the sovereignty of different states include human rights values (Zia 2016).

According to Boutilier (2018) discourse, on 29th September 1991 at Sandiford University, the Prime Minister of Canada, Brian Mulroney, delineated his illusion of the post-Cold War world order by saying we advocate re-thinking, the restraints of state sovereignty in a world where trouble has no geographical limits. Additionally, Brian Mulroney labeled the outermost devotion to non-intervention by considering it a violation of a states' freedom, however, Boutilier said that less than two years later, both Brian Mulroney and his successor Kim Campbell's foreign policy interest faced severe censure (Boutilier 2018). For example, the Toronto Star made the accusation that Ottawa's 1994 mismanaged humanitarianism in Bosnia had conciliated the Serbian Military and prohibited decisive European intervention (Boutilier 2018). Mulroney's administration was chosen to be the main actor in the international humanitarian intervention in Yugoslavia, hence, both permitted the administration to amend its goal of a post-Cold War world order aligned with the comprehension of the Canadian appeal and satisfied the desires and inclination of Canadian society. Mulroney's administration stumbled into unexpected conditions in Yugoslavia, and it was unsuccessful at reacting to them efficiently, heading to the inauguration of a review of the peacekeeping and intervention that might not be vital to implement.

The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) contemplated that the ongoing debate on humanitarian military interventions was recognized previously as a 'right to intervene' as a barrier in looking forward. The prospect of development needed a change of sympathies; the commission advanced the rule of non-intervention to universal responsibility to protect sovereignty indicates the duty (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty 2001). The shift in terminology from the right to intervene to the duty to save voiced so that states feel compelled to protect twenty-one states from mass outrage (Evans 2015). This rehabilitated insight exposes the safeguard of an individuals' well-being as being of global concern as well. The states must warrant the security of their citizens. The duty to protect approach has brought to the forefront of the significance of preventive strategies.

On the other hand, in 2005 during the World Summit, the leaders of the UN member countries agree with the phrasing of the ICISS in that it is a universal responsibility to protect individuals from cruel assaults to their human rights when the states themselves fail to protect their citizens (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty 2001). Concerning that, they determined that their alertness to launch humanitarian interventions diplomatically is defective. The national authorities are conspicuously failing to safeguard their citizens from war crimes, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and genocide (UN General Assembly 2005). Regardless of this treaty, the international community has limitations in relation to the initiatives in a manner that is vital to discharge the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) efficiently, that is, the recent representatives of the humanitarian intervention have several remarkable flaws (Pattison 2008).

The additional point is that the action taken in a humanitarian intervention depends on the United Nations Security Council's (UNSC) agreement, and the five permanent council members can refuse to intervene at any time. When the security council refuses to intervene, the UN has no military

power of its own or troops to carry out a humanitarian intervention. As a result, the UN counts on the ad hoc input of military forces from member countries. The member countries have been highly cautious when it comes to committing their armies. The UN missions mostly lack the military power to fulfill their duties. The military provided by the member countries often experiences a shortage of crucial tools, encounters dilemmas that accommodate the setting, and is deployed very steadily. The UN then runs into severe hardship and is charged with a duty that exceeds traditional international peacekeeping (Sossai 2014).

The universal duty to be involved in the process of humanitarian interventions to provide safeguarding for individuals from numerous crimes against humanity in the presence of the member states UN in 2005 agrees with the responsibility to protect in the condition where the state is unable to protect its citizens from genocide, war and crime that denies and violates fundamental human rights (UN General Assembly 2005). Among North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the UN, regional organizations, single states, or many states are obliged to release this duty; they remain ambiguous. It is crucial to address this confusion promptly, if not, as Zia (2016) affirms, some hazards can be pronounced as the 'responsibility to protect' will dissolve the argument concerning the validity and reliability of this duty.

The adherence to this intervention proves this by narrating, 'we shall not allow people to die,' it tackled this thought in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (Wierzbicki & Welhengama 1994). An intervention might be legitimized and legalized if there is an actual violation of fundamental human rights and initiated by international organizations and especially by the UNSC. Unilateral interventions remain contentious and occasionally get international community recognition. The UN's Chapter VII authorizes its security council to carry out interventions and permits the action to be taken according to Charter 41 and 42 to regulate and maintain international security and peace as well as to respond to the incident of a threat to stability (Shimko 2005). Since the 1990s, the UNSC has broadened the limits associated with authorizing action on a humanitarian basis to encompass interstate hostility and domestic antagonism.

Human rights, humanitarian interventions, obligations, and norms prevised as a convenient state role, and international societies also recognize the obligation to protect human rights. Mostly in a time of war, there are tremendous human rights violations, and the claim to use military force has become debatable. Many states represent global governance when maintaining stability during a humanitarian intervention to protect individuals from a threat in a conflict-prone situation; however, humanitarian intervention may not consistently advocate for legitimate human rights. The main scenario is to protect human rights during a conflict; however, somehow, those involved are becoming ignorant of the humanitarian intervention process. Although the dilemma between humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty is continuing, on the other hand, the state obligation to protect its citizen's fundamental rights still matters. Due to this, some countries are not willing to engage in humanitarian interventions when a conflict starts, however, related to the moral issue and influence that comes from the international community, and sometimes the state must give away its sovereignty to maintain its security and to save lives (Isnarti 2018).

Another challenge pointed out by Kirdim (2017) & Wheeler (2000) was convincing states to deploy their armies to save outsiders or those who are not their citizens. These authors have argued that it is always a severe case for states to deliberate in front of their populations, whether the national capital (taxpayers' money and soldiers) is to be used on saving strangers. A few have addressed this problem by launching a permanent UN military force nearly 5.000-15.000 troops to conduct humanitarian interventions with the legalization of the UNSC. These troops can be equipped to deploy precisely when chaos arises; therefore, this army is made up of volunteers in the spirit of cosmopolitanism regardless of their national loyalty. Justification based on House of Commons shows that France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America in the case of Syria have raised questions about the ethical and legal foundations for intervening through an aggressive approach in sovereign countries without their approval on a humanitarian basis. Whereas the United Kingdom has not validated the use of armies according to humanitarian estates, its implementation has prompted a dispute over

why such an operation is essential and when more can be done to save people before the chaos goes beyond control. The board decided then to evaluate the notion of the R2P and humanitarian interventions starting from the military operation, especially regarding the matter raised by today's humanitarian intervention in Syria (Burelli 2019).

The main objective of this study is to analyze the theoretical and practical controversy of humanitarian interventions rigorously, this study has therefore been guided by the following, what are the terms and conditions that allow for military intervention in a sovereign state and is it possible for a humanitarian military intervention to be moral and effective. The critical controversy between humanitarian military interventions and state sovereignty was once considered an aberration in terms of global concerns. Seybolt (2008) states that humanitarian military interventions have become a convincing issue of foreign policy and the debate is regarding when to use coercive power. First, it tends to be a significant trial for state sovereignty. Second, it profoundly impacts the way that humanitarian aid providers and military groups work. Third, it is a question of life or death to save others. The central pillar is that even though humanitarian military interventions claim to have a universal responsibility to protect the victims, it can be used as a political or economic weapon. For instance, the 2011 UN military intervention led by the Obama administration was mainly intended to accomplish a regime change instead of saving civilians (Pattison 2011).

The controversy over the responsibility to protect aspects and humanitarian military interventions is becoming the concern of the growing debate in the UN among civil society, the member states, and among scholars. Francioni & Bakker (2013) have said that this debate is not new, it has old roots linked with the European powers' humanitarian intervention in the Ottoman Empire period in the second half of the 19th century and at the beginning of the past century. The intervention intended to protect the Christian minority in foreign lands, and the use of military power has been controversial because their lives and economic affairs are at risk (Simms & Trim 2011). The question of humanitarian military interventions has felt more pressure over the last two decades given the massive humanitarian crises of the 1990s, particularly Rwanda's genocide and Yugoslavia's ethnic cleansing (Francioni & Bakker 2013, Bellamy 2010, Amnéus 2012).

According to Hehir (2010) & Fiott (2013), the notion of humanitarian intervention is described as a threat or military invention that is against another sovereign state enhanced by humanitarian sympathies. It is hugely contentious since it can change imperialism (political interests) and humanitarianism (Bellamy & Wheeler 2011). It is *prima facie* impressive if countries cooperatively or independently are willing to protect human rights regardless of their political borders. In conditions where the present international organizations, including the UNSC, prohibited from taking measures, there remains a critical threat that the right to such an intervention mistreated to disguise essential power politics (Massingham 2009). However, stimulated by the increased recall of human rights, specifically the privilege of all individuals even at a deficient level to protection from abuse as a result of shared mortality, humanitarian interventions have advanced into being a durable legal and political notion that is intensely debated by both scholars and among political actors. The aspect of assisting humanitarian interventions enlarged in the age is the 'golden era humanitarian movement in the 1990s. It was proven to question whether the international community is dealing with the establishment of a regime correctly and whether the essential ethics (in the logic of ideas of the act, causation, and integrity) and customs assumed to be the norms of behavior can be determined as rights and duties that have been recently formed (Bellamy & Wheeler 2011).

Historically, the ICISS was established in 2000 with the assistance of the Canadian Foreign Minister, Lloyd Axworthy, in order to emphasize on ethics and civilian security, the political affairs to react to when obligatory and the progress of the civilian and military potential (Zia 2016). Previous Australian Foreign Minister, Gareth Evans and previous Algerian diplomat and UN Special Advisor, Mohammed Sahnoun, were the chairpersons of the commission. There were ten commissioners and five western nations' representatives, namely, Switzerland, Germany, Canada, and the United States. The remaining five commissioners were from the Philippines, South Africa, India, Russia and Guatemala (Evans & Sahnoun 2002, Binder 2015).

In December 2001, the ICISS issued its report known as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) which endeavored to advance consistent, trustworthy, and fair values to direct intergovernmental and state perform. As a constituent of the ICISS, explained that the goals of the statement are as follows: 1) to establish credible norms that are not offensive to lawyers or philosophers, 2) to have a norm that is robust enough not to be refused by either developed nation or developing nations, the permanent five members (P5) of the Security Council or any other international community, and 3) the norm must be adequate for mobilizing provision[s] as soon as a condition requiring action arises. The commission also sought to create an applicable norm within political action-taking, however, there would have to be a universal collaboration and accord among the member states in such a way as to avoid future problems (Boutillier 2018).

Research Method

Qualitative research methods are contemporary, and they have begun to be applied in the last few decades in academic fields of study (Reiter 2014). Instead of applying statistics, the qualitative research method mostly applies different research types based on the purpose of the research inquiry, such as descriptive, exploratory, and interpretive in terms of the available approaches. It is in order to create terms and to understand the circumstances and reality that is analyzed. Moreover, qualitative research is broadly inductive because of its validity, realities, and inquiry extracted from the existing theories that support the collected data analysis and its interpretation. This study has applied three dominant theoretical paradigms: realist, liberalist, and cosmopolitanism. The data collection process is mainly based on published academic sources such as books, journals, and any available documents from the websites that have been used. The objectives of this study are to assess and analyze the factors that affect the effectiveness of humanitarian interventions and to evaluate and describe the nature, principles, practices, motives, and challenges of humanitarian interventions in order to see what is detrimental to the dilemma.

This discussion is a work of critical analysis through a theoretical paradigm that will be set based on the search object, namely the inquiry into humanitarian intervention paradoxes in the framework of the normative theories of realists, liberalists, and cosmopolitanism. Traditionally, controversies associated with humanitarian interventions have been approached mostly through the conflict theory framework, although there is a particular weakness in applying a theory that is established on a qualitative bias. The major invalidity of this method is the failure to be concerned about the progress in international older humanitarian intervention crises beyond the question of war and peace that have shifted to the supranational level. For this analysis, realist, liberalist, and cosmopolitan paradigms have been used to assess the issue of humanitarian intervention failures. It questions whether the interventions are based on moral and ethical values or if they are used as a political weapon to endorse self-interests. Moreover, this study aims to determine the ideal platform of modern cosmopolitanism regarding humanitarian interventions and to examine its theoretical reflection on the application of humanitarian interventions as well. This work attempts to differentiate between and highlight the main premises constructing the international perspectives of humanitarian intervention and then analyzing the debates in the context of cosmopolitan, realist, and liberalist theories and it is followed by comparing it with what happened and is happening around the world.

Results and Discussion

Moral and strategic failures

The case for humanitarian interventions is bright for the supporters. When Polpots Khmer Rouge killed 2 million of their fellow Cambodians and 800.000 Rwandans in the span of a few weeks, what possible logic could excuse or condone the inaction of those who had the power to prevent and or end the tragedies yet sat on the sidelines? By some estimates, as few as 5.000 troops deployed to Rwanda in 1994 and more could have saved a few hundred thousand lives. Humanitarian interventions are unwanted interference by a state, states, or IOs in other states' domestic affairs to prevent and/or end

the abuse of human rights without the target state's consent. It is unlike peacekeeping operations that commonly occur with the consent of the relevant parties to preserve a peace that has already been achieved (Shimko 2005).

The treaties and former human rights violations alone cannot account for the increased recognition of human rights and humanitarian interventions' approval. There must be 'most commonly' political riots working on their behalf for notions of having consequences. The UDHR may date back to 1948; however, as recently as 1970, the idea that the human rights of individuals in any country are of concern of international people and governments are universally recognized as radical. It is because of the emergence of various humanitarianism advocates such as the Human Rights Watch (HRW), Amnesty International (AI), feminist advocates, and many others. The rise of non-state actors, namely NGOs and voluntary groups (such as Doctors Without Borders), has contributed to the development of human rights activists and the networks that seek to put pressure on the policies of states and international organizations and non-state actors (global civil society). It is in addition to the multinational corporations' overall socio-economic and socio-political realms. For the last few years, hundreds of university students in Paris and the United States have organized reliable public occasions to increase the level of attention concerning the human tragedy unfolding in the isolated region of Sudan. They have paid money to go to Washington, frequently traveling from very far, to join the demonstration and protest in front of the White House (Jumbret 2010). Hollywood actors (celebrities) have also traveled far to be filmed and photographed in the desert dust while sharing the human misery they have been spectators too. As a result, Western politicians have decided to make a severe and alarming public proclamation on the need for the slaying to discontinue. Western states and humanitarian interventions have spent a remarkable amount of financial and human capital on attempts to save the victims of war, significantly more than on the comparable instability in the Darfur region of South Sudan (Bunch et al. 2014).

The Democratic Republic of the Congo provoked by gradually growing human rights assaults committed by the police and the repeated assertion of the police commander's interventions in the judiciary. The human rights elements of the UN Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) commended the Minister of the Interior when it came to launching cooperative follow-up groups made up of national police commanders, the judiciary, MONUC human rights officers and police officers from the UN at the local level. Once functional, these groups have turned out to be productive. It means that they are not limited to the increasingly common discourse between the four groups. It also keeps up the pressure in the struggle against liberty. These actors aid defeat in the circumstances, yet the police do not collaborate with the judiciary. They support international help for investigations and prosecutions of police commanders in charge of the very severe human rights abuses. Based on multiple document analyses, that four major anticipated factors are attributing to humanitarian interventions being ineffective: 1) putting state sovereignty in the first place or both traditional and modern concepts of state-sovereignty, 2) moral, ethical and strategic failures since humanitarian interventions can be used for political purposes instead of saving victims, 3) controversies in principle that oblige military operations where there is a lack of transparency in international politics, and 4) who intervenes in what circumstances as well as to what extent there are complicated concepts that need to be understood, such as Kosovo, Serbia, and Rwanda (Bertschinger 2016, Faruk 2017).

According to Zaman (2012) discourse, in the 21st century has become the advent of a new etymological term for humanitarian interventionism that stresses the logic of human rights vs. sovereignty, human rights, and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Theorized by the ICISS in 2001 and recognized in the 2005 World Meeting Consequence Document, R2P, in brief, denotes that each sovereign country should protect its individuals from pain and harm. It is powerless or unwilling to do so, and this obligation transposed to the universal society (Bellamy & Dunne 2016). This global duty entails ending the humanitarian catastrophe, responding to it, and upgrading the society in the aftermath (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty 2001). Through the reunion of the norms of sovereignty with so-called human rights, as claimed by Kofi Annan, the R2P report founded the most complete and cautiously thought-well reaction to the dilemma of the old

humanitarian interventions. The growth of the R2P dogma and its collective ratifications in 2005 has been presented by several of its advocates as an assurance for "new world order" as it will draw us closer to ending mass outrages (Evans 2012, Evans 2015).

Once anticipated in international affairs, military interventions to save people are nowadays becoming an obligation in foreign policy concerns. Humanitarian interventions using military force are among the main topics of debate in the contemporary academic discourse as many states have failed to protect their citizens from mass killings (Gkoutzioulis 2019). R2P advocates' main objection to the use of the word 'humanitarian intervention' is that it is arguably a traditional conception of sovereignty contrary to human rights (Evans 2008). The concept of non-intervention is an old dogma that comes from the 1648 Westphalia Treaty, which was approved based on a state-centric principle to stop the interstate war (Dacyl 1996). The other point is that beyond becoming a challenge to state sovereignty, an intervention can also be used to evaluate the transparency of global governance, whether using the intervention as a political tool or acting within the eclipse of its moral and ethical duties against violent threats to humanity. Humanitarian interventions may cost lives and resources (as a matter of life or death), and it is also influenced by the collective responsibilities and immediate reaction from the global communities.

A humanitarian deal emphasizes if not only the safety of vulnerable people; however, a lesson learned from the United States intervention in Afghanistan and Libya was that it was crystal clear that the United States had a hidden agenda to achieve beyond saving its victims (Blanchard 2018). There was the intention to the point of national interest to attain and advance its political and economic goals (Nardin & Williams 2006, Bertschinger 2016). An unlikely motive is a mindset in which the actors act based on their desires and the other devotions that drive them. It is remarkable for only conflict theory to attempt to encompass the right attention from among a few situations before rebuilding its operations through military force, though this reflects no acknowledgment of any motive. Nevertheless, if a country declares humanitarian limits as its rationale, in reality, initiated by additional factors that delegitimize and involvement, either a cynic or realist can argue that it could happen. There is the absence of a humanitarian mission and objectives in humanitarian intervention, as seen in the past and even today (Pogge 2005, Saba & Akbarzadeh 2018). Humanitarian intervention is just oriented intention, instead of logic to save a life (Nardin & Williams 2006). The description 'cosmopolitan' has emerged recently; however, there is no generally agreed upon denotation. It tends to be helpful to examine the public discourse that has been included in international relations and, more specifically, in the politics of interventions somewhat in part. The user's intent appears to be normative. In general narratives and where there is the authenticity of globalization, sovereign countries still complement the critical components of the platform used in the international system (Farer 2004). Although there are weaknesses in several cases, these are the primary tools to control the private influence over the common-good, facilitating one of the more insignificant situations for the individual's self-realization. There is some demand for the groups' self-realization by considering themselves, nation builders. Countries are a foundation where democratic representation and human rights can be built. At the same time, although states and their population describe their self-aggrandizing and parochial humanitarian intervention as a tag, this has an extensive history in international politics and international law, spanning back to the 19th century (Brownlie 1963).

In terms of the age of progress, especially the rapid usage of the denomination for the last decade, it represents most users in terms of the use of force or attack across the state's geographical borders. As Holzgrefe (2003), the action that evolves into a military intervention leaves the open question of whether it technically fulfills the terms of either legality or illegal. The government of Sweden formed an independent international commission to draw on Kosovo's lesson, albeit it does not illuminate this difference. The members of the commission agreed that accurately or not, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's mediation without the asset of the Security Council's endorsement under the UN Charter VII could not be settled within the legal regime of the Charter (Farer et al. 2005).

The former vs new challenges

The original trials addressed by the academic writing on humanitarian interventions were used first to form a sense of ordinary legitimacy for armed interventions for security matters. The second purpose was to form a sense of legitimacy for such interventions in situations where the UNSC denied the peacekeepers (Bellamy 2017). The first trials arose due to a surge in the number of armed interventions in the post-Cold War period marked by profound normative progress. Bertschinger (2016) refers to [this] as a change of paradigm for world order, during the Cold World War, the use of military power to intervene viewed as illegal. The rule of non-intervention is preserved in an article in the UN charter 2(7). It is revered, and both human rights abuse and civil war are considered the states' responsibility within the UN member countries' internal jurisdiction. The UNSC has been given legal power to dominate this rule and to accredit a military intervention according to chapter VII only in a situation where there is a threat to stability, security, or an act of violence. In the Cold War era, it assumed that this situation was solely achieved by intra-state events instead of events within the member states. Consequently, the UNSC resolved a threat to security only twice in that duration: in the conditions of domestic conflict against the apartheid government of 1960 in South Africa and Rhodesia (1965-66). Following the end of the Cold War in early 1991 when Resolution 688 proclaimed that the case of the Kurds in the northern part of Iraq was a threat to international security, the UNSC started to subject such resolutions as a matter of routine for example related to the situations in Angola, Liberia, and Yugoslavia, allowed military interventions in the most of these situations. Thus academicians saw that it called upon the framing of situations under which the scholarly community saw itself to formulate the conditions under which abusing the sovereignty of the state and the norms of non-intervention would be legitimate as a response to internal hostility (Bertschinger 2016, Bellamy & Dunne 2016).

Instantly, a second trend has broken out, despite the good objectives, many of the former interventions ended in a horrific deterioration, unforgettably so in Bosnia, Somalia, and Rwanda (Krylov 1995, Dallaire 2004). The mission led by the United States in Somalia failed when a terrorist assassinated eighteen United States, peacekeeping soldiers. In the Bosnian city of Srebrenica, where eight thousand Muslim men and boys were killed and in Rwanda, where about one million Tutsi slaughtered, at the same time, UN peacekeepers were there and did nothing (Bajoria & McMahan 2013). The cause of the Rwanda and Bosnia disasters was broadly considered to be the UN Security Council's passivity, particularly the unwillingness of the UNSC to take a vigorous practical approach toward the leaders of Yugoslavia and Rwanda (Berdal & Economides 2007).

In 1999, a new example of paralysis brought in an additional impetus to the discourse that the UN Security Council rejected the legitimization of NATO's involvement in Kosovo, which had been recognized as an objection to applying military force in operation against the situated state. It was challenged by situations where much of the respect for the norms of state sovereignty, from the UNSC side, was undertaken to avoid human suffering. Both professionals and voluntary groups started to find a proper way to reach the victims during a war where there is no assistance and authorization from the UNSC. Although these attempts intuitively deemed to have failed, in 2000, Kofi Annan, the UN's General Secretary, issued the following challenge, stating that humanitarian interventions are easily an unacceptable violation of sovereignty. They might also request a cost in terms of life. How the international community reacted during the Rwanda genocide that killed over 800.000 was one of the most unimaginable moral and ethical failures of humanitarian interventions. As a result of this failure, the Canadian state administration assembled an international commission related to the intervention itself and state sovereignty. It was formed in 2001 to consolidate the responsibility to protect the victims (Glanville 2014). The international community sovereignty report assigned an entirely new system to establish who the authorized actors were under certain conditions. The report described that sovereignty enables the inclusion of the responsibility to safeguard citizens from danger; however, if the state fails to do so, the international community must intervene to replace it.

Butler (2016) & Bertschinger (2016) have argued that the primary objective of the recent academic discourse on humanitarian interventions has tended to be one of the most contested topics in intra-

national politics nowadays. It is among a group of problems: civil wars, conflict resolution, and conflict prevention, which creating the core of security of the post-cold War era, more as the military contest, and demilitarization were until the collapse of Soviet Union (USSR). Human intervention is a broad but not new topic of analysis among international relations academics. It provides, among other factors, an opportunity to rethink a topic that is persistent and doubtfully the hottest theme in international relations theory, particularly between idealism and realism today. Idealism is innate within the grounds of humanitarian intervention, according to Smith. There has also been a lot of discourse on the Canada News Network impact (CNN) (Gow 1997, Holbrooke 1998), which believed to be oriented to the political agenda of both Western Europe and North America regarding the peacekeeping operations in Somalia, Bosnia Rwanda, Iraq, and Haiti. It is a shorthand definition for a process in which the moral reaction to a massive range of violence is first stimulated and then decoded into political deeds. Humanitarian interventions are a collective responsibility and built on collaboration. Meanwhile, realism arises in the recall that the actors have in terms of multilateral actions tied into rules of the states involved that performed in the absence combination of short-term and long-term goals, and due to this, humanitarian interventions cannot be virginally humanitarian (Tesón 2005).

The problem is that international law does not manage the conflict between military force and universal fundamental humanitarian values priority in a comprehensive manner. The hazards of discharged force advocate the presumption that unilateral humanitarian interventions are avoided if the tension is high. The operation is not yet totally omitted if it is perceived that it acquires legal action and personal ethics. Therefore, if other states with international leaders typically find that there is a dependable image for humanitarian interventions, then the reaction might be disregarded as it has been exposed. Among the UN's organs, the General Assembly of the UN can be a tool to assess these impacts by endorsing the member countries to respond when humanitarian crises arise. The intervention is thus lacking any determinately founded legal substance (since there is an assumption of unlawfulness). Its legality endures unresolved, and it has to be determined decisively at the formal level. Perhaps it could be institutionalized post-hoc (or not) based on the response to the reactions of other countries or other actors at the international level. The intervention can be recognized and honored in any situation underlined by the Commission on Intervention and Sovereignty (Wheeler 2000).

Miller (2015) figured there to have been two significant changes in global politics after the end of the Cold War. These changes include the collapse of the USSR and the emergence of humanitarian intervention ideas articulated and dominated by the United States. The fundamental changes from a realist ideology claimed to be the balance of power and, more precisely, an evolution from a bipolar system to a unipolar system. This new formation of supremacy meant that the United States was the only superpower without a countervailing union arrayed contrary to it. This evolution has made the United States a hegemonic power. There is thus a Western power dominance over both international politics and the corresponding economy. Accordingly, humanitarian interventions have been undertaken due to the collapsing external challenges to the United States-dominated or western interventions. The Gulf war in 1991 has revealed the remarkable United States power projection potential to control the world. Realist aspects have paved the way for humanitarian interventions (Erameh 2017).

The change in the balance of power in support of the west attentively linked to the rising dominance of Western liberal notions like democracy and the open door marketing system (free market). An essential significance of liberalism according to Miller (2015) is that in the relative centrality of universal human rights versus state rights (sovereignty), the old rights mostly linked with the Westphalian international structure based on the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of independent states (Alvarez 2007, Greaves 2008).

Liberal argument regarding humanitarian interventions

As Tesón (2011) & Spalding (2013) indicate, the liberal protection of humanitarian interventions depends on the norms of political and ethical philosophy. According to these scholars' arguments, political philosophy implies the validation of political influence, followed by the validation of

the state. Liberal interpretations of the state depend on the theory of social contract to clarify the state itself. States warranted as an institution established by principled representatives, that is, independent people (Walzer 2002). A liberal state mainly includes laws that describe the power of the government in a manner that is constant together with respect for individual independence and well-being. Generally speaking, the liberal argument for humanitarian interventions as described by Tesón (2011) involves two elements: 1) the somewhat clear judgment on the implementation of governmental tyranny and the manners that classically takes place in the condition of outermost anarchy are severe procedures of unfairness toward individual and 2) the judgment that a concentration on crucial restrictions and an outsiders' intervention is somewhat ethically acceptable to bring to justice. Tesón (2011) claims that the first argument for humanitarian intervention is uncontroversial. Most of the critics about humanitarian interventions agree with the judgment that the conditions (regarding interventionists) demand for intervention is ethically detestable. The conditions that cause humanitarian interventions are crimes against humanity, severe mass killings, genocide, widespread torture, war, and a Hobbesian state of nature (civil war) triggered by the social order's failure. The difference between the advocates and antagonists of humanitarian interventions relates to the second part of the debate, where interventionists argue that outsiders can assist in ending mass killings while non-interventionists argue that they should not (Schiller & Çağlar 2013). The associated dues of moral and political philosophy are what Tesón indicates as representing sovereignty, as it is dependent on justice, and people have a right to support the victims of insecurity (Wickramasinghe & Wimalaratana 2016).

Realists such as Smith (1998) & Junk (2016) have provided thoughtful advice on the rules of ethical places associated with humanitarian interventions from the realist and liberalist school of thought. A liberalist framework has a formally shared history, community, and self-determination, so far, a liberal also has a high universalistic perception of human rights though sovereignty is a supplementary and phenomenal value (Smith 1998, Junk 2016). Within this type of formulation, humanitarian interventions can briefly indicate their legal and moral principles. Countries that have committed genocide and other extreme human rights violations virtually all acknowledge forfeit moral codes. On the other hand, realism advocates more non-intervention by claiming the states' right to administrate their people independently in a manner free from external influences. Additionally, Nardin & Williams (2006) and Bellamy (2010) advise that the principle of non-intervention naturally accounts for the exclusions established in it. It is because the state exists to safeguard the fundamental rights of its citizens. If it abuses those rights, then the states fail their ethical rationale, and then there is resistance from the external interference (Tesón 2005).

Explicit criticism of this position can come from the realist point of view. What is there to avert intervening countries from discriminatory-based interventions only when it contests its own strategic and political affairs? Schachter (1991) argued the Reagan policy in the 1980s, which has been broadly criticized for being influenced by its imperialistic features. At the same time, upon covertly putting effort into overcoming leftist regimes, it was focused more on the values of internal security and freedom, because they have very different indications. It primarily provides details on the dynamics of realism and liberalism or on the intervention itself since it has been observed to mix the intentions and motives. It is crucial to differentiate them. While covertly attempting to overthrow leftist governments emphasized the 'higher values' of national security and freedom (Schachter 1991).

Besides the moral arguments and discourse on intervention, liberalism can also argue the principles of international law. The foundation of international criminal court brings the executors of vast human rights abuses to due process and justice. Even though its nature is non-military, the allegations and execution of the heads of the state, such as Slobodan Milosevic in an overseas country, might be assumed to be a violation of non-intervention into the internal affairs of an independent country. It is accepted that some countries, including America, are not willing to give up their assistance to such court. The vast majority have accomplished this and perceive it as a positive in safeguarding human rights around the globe. The traditional approaches to sovereignty have progressed to a kind of inclusive sovereignty. State sovereignty is deep-rooted, and it is an essential right of any country, so long as the state has not failed to protect its citizen's rights and security, and it has not violated massive human rights (Chandler 2004).

On the other hand, realists indicate that those traditionally unsympathetic to any intervention are understood to be initiated by moral and ethical inferences. The major realist critics of humanitarian interventions do so due to its repeated self-centered orientation motivated by actual economic and political ambitions; hence it cannot be moral. Some scholars, such as Smith (1998) & Fiott (2013) argue that interventions never act outside of their self-interests to protect the victims. It is an argument that has dominated the critical thinkers of humanitarian interventions; however, it could be possible to construct realist or nominal realist debates for use in an intervention by permitting attention to be paid to some of the ethical values that can appear. In order to do so, academics have to broaden their perspective of what the state interests are. For instance, the statement delivered by the United States National Security Strategy Department in 2002 expressed that as they pursued the terrorist movement in Afghanistan, they agreed to work alongside international alliances and organizations. The alliances consisted of both state actors and NGOs, particularly the UN and volunteers willing to participate in humanitarian interventions to provide and promote humanitarian aid. It was also economical and political security support mainly to reconstruct Afghanistan in a way that avoided the violations and threats within the country and tied into counter-terrorism (Seay 2007). What can be learned from the United States' strategy of entering Afghanistan? It was an effort undertaken to establish a direct network between the United States national interests (army regulation of terrorists to stop them from building a haven in Afghanistan) and the moral obligation to provide humanitarian and further support to the violated individuals. In other words, interventions for self-oriented affairs, in the name of protecting individuals from human rights violations, have become part of the moral and strategic failure assumption.

Realists can argue that the past, namely the state interest, is a particular actual motive to engage in action. It is no matter how a liberalist responds, thus spelling out the further humanitarian motive of improving the intervention. It is inconsiderate whether or not America was legally legitimized in invading Afghanistan in 2001. It demonstrates that the initiation of an intervention that is either declared or implicit is deeply complicated. The link between humanitarian interventions done either for moral matters and hidden political-strategic demand is unclear. As a normative theory, cosmopolitanism searches for how to describe how the global order ought to be. Unlike other paradigms of the theories involved in international studies that have a state-centric tradition emphasized by the sovereign nation, the increase of state affairs and maintaining the balance of power between states or nationality means that cosmopolitanism in the context of politics is based on the recognition of a sense of natural humanity that ethically illustrates the concept of shared moral responsibilities towards other humans through the integrity of humanity (Brown & Held 2013).

There are three collective moral normative commitments derived from cosmopolitanism's ethical considerations: 1) cosmopolitanism is a reflection of the humanitarian spirit that is universal in its spheres, perpetuating inclusive equality for all humans in their moral principality, this moral principality belongs to all regardless of any differences universally since all humans are citizens of the world, 2) cosmopolitanism believes that individual human beings are the fundamental standard of moral concern, instead of states, political associations or forms of community, and 3) cosmopolitans manage the aforementioned moral concern toward individuals in order to impartially devote themselves to treating all human beings regardless of any limits (Pogge 1992b, Brown & Bohm 2016). It allows scholars to prove that cosmopolitanism as a theoretical paradigm can be illustrated as egalitarian, universal, and individualist.

According to Held (2002), there is no single form of theoretical paradigm (liberalism) that has developed the thought of democracy. There is no monolithic or collective comprehension of cosmopolitanism either. Cosmopolitan advocates have contextualized the involved pillar points variously, and this has led to a broad spectrum of various normative concepts and morals within the cosmopolitanism paradigm. In the modern cosmopolitan view, it is viable to differentiate between two explicit versions: cosmopolitanism as a paradigm that advocates justice (Moellendorf 2002) and cosmopolitanism as a theory of institutions and morality (Davidson 2012, Pogge 1992a, Moellendorf 2002). Ethical or moral cosmopolitanism supports the thought that human equality is universal down

to a single community with a moral obligation to all humanity as every person is an absolute unit of equal concern and moral worth (Kleingeld & Brown 2003). McGrew (2004) claims that political cosmopolitanism can be described as institutional cosmopolitanism; his idea is supported by Beitz (1979) & Pogge (1992b). They also claim that global political institutions have an importance which involves exceeding the Westphalian approach to the sovereignty of a country and establishing an institution that governs beyond the geographic limits. These paradigms are critical of the new statist arrangement, and they can be seen as hostile towards the understanding of the normative principle of cosmopolitanism (Caney 2010). They focus on the significance of cooperative global governance and a transformed international political structure based on cosmopolitan perspectives. The cosmopolitan organizations and institutions of global and regional governance are believed to be the crucial right hand of autonomous states (Brown & Held 2013).

The foundation of modern political thinking and political virtue is an autonomous geographically sovereign country as a moral model of the political institution. Sovereignty in the horizontal dimension has been recently classified into several branches, although sovereignty in the vertical dimension is concentrated heavily in the single range that is the state. From the perspective of cosmopolitans, this massively single level of real sovereignty is argued to be indefensible (Pogge 2005). Held (2002) described his argument using the cosmopolitan paradigm in that he agrees that states don't need to be considered as the foundation of legitimate power within its political boundaries. Its role should be settled in the universal cosmopolitan shell (Dahl-Eriksen 2016). The cosmopolitan paradigm provides optional approaches to global governance, where state sovereignty has been classified into vertical and horizontal dimensions, which is convenient in the globalized epoch. It can also counter global problems more effectively (Koolmeester 2014, Rawls 2001).

Conclusion

The politics of humanitarian interventions emulate the superpowers' concerns in terms of their moral and legal doctrines. Criticisms are apt to persist based on the realist, liberal, and cosmopolitanism paradigms. Accordingly, functioning policies, minimal principles, and learning from experience are essential to harmonize the two aspects. The state sovereignty, conditions, intentions of the actors, and international commission of the intervention need to address humanitarian crises precisely. Their key solution goes beyond the moral, ethical, theoretical, and practical aspects. On the other hand, some of the significant policies following these aspects cause controversy. Former interventions are held to be hasty due to lacking attributable standards. Maybe future ones can, assuming that the international community prefers to implement 'the Responsibility to Protect' as an unhidden and enforceable precondition for military use, thereby restricting the range of manipulation and violation on behalf of the intervening countries. There rests another challenge apart from any policy aims and the enumeration of measures, namely political affairs being used as a weapon to overthrow regimes and to penetrate sovereign states to maximize either hard or soft power. Only when independent states and the Security Council together have the aligned political interest to insist on and monitor such measures will humanitarian interventions save the victims that they stand for. Moreover, since humanitarian interventions are amoral, ethical, and legal matters, defining them only in terms of military operations indicates that global governance is not transparent and committed. Failures in this manner are still ongoing globally.

Even though the failure-causing factors varied in the process of humanitarian interventions, the most challenging factors are triggered by the nature of global politics and governance. Humanitarian interventions cannot be achieved without collective and collaborative action. First of all, saving victims are supposed to be the concern of global society since it is more ethical and moral than military power. Second, humanitarian interventions should not be authorized just by the UNSC or another state. They must also include any voluntary actors that are willing to save the victims. Finally, to make a humanitarian intervention genial, the humanitarians must change according to the global governance and international community as well as implement the accepted treaty (Responsibility to Protect) for all, regardless of race, religion, and geographical borders.

References

- Alvarez JE (2007) Notes from the president: The schizophrenias of R2P. Newsletter of the American Society of International Law 23 (3):1-15.
- Amnéus D (2012) Has Humanitarian Intervention Become Part of International Law Under the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine? In: Hoffmann J & Nollkaemper A (eds). Responsibility to Protect. From Principle to Practice. Amsterdam: Pallas Publications and Amsterdam University Press. 157-171.
- Bajoria J & McMahon R (2013) The dilemma of humanitarian intervention, Council on Foreign Relations, 12 June, 154-178.
- Beitz CR (1979) Political Theory and International Relations. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bellamy AJ (2010) The responsibility to protect—five years on. Ethics & International Affairs 24 (2):143-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2010.00254.x>.
- Bellamy AJ (2017) Humanitarian Intervention: Critical Concepts in Military, Strategic, and Security Studies. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bellamy AJ & Dunne T (eds) (2016) R2P in Theory and Practice. In: The Oxford Handbook of the Responsibility to Protect. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bellamy AJ & Wheeler NJ (2011) Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics. In: Baylis J, Smith S, & Owens P (eds). The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berdal M & Economides S (2007) United Nations Interventionism 1991-2004. LSE Monograph in international studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bertschinger A (2016) Humanitarian intervention: An inviable concept. Dissertation, King's College London, United Kingdom.
- Binder M (2015) Paths to intervention: What explains the UN's selective response to humanitarian crises? Journal of Peace Research 52 (6):712-726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343315585847>.
- Blanchard CM (2018) Libya: Transition and U.S. Policy. Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Boutilier M (2018) The Mulroney government and humanitarian intervention in the former Yugoslavia. International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis 73 (1):49-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702018754593>.
- Brown GW & Bohm A (2016) Introducing *Jus ante Bellum* as a cosmopolitan approach to humanitarian intervention. European Journal of International Relations 22 (4):897-919. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066115607370>.
- Brown GW & Held D (eds) (2013) The Cosmopolitanism Reader. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brownlie I (1963) International Law and the Use of Force by States. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bunch C, Antrobus P, Frost S & Reilly N (2014) International Networking for Women's Human Rights. In: Global Citizen Action. Oxfordshire: Taylor and Francis.
- Burelli C (2019) A realistic conception of politics: Conflict, order and political realism. Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy. [Accessed 21 November 2019]. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2019.1604045>.
- Butler MJ (2016) Is R2P Failing Humanitarian Intervention? Norm Stagnation and the (de) construction of R2P. In: CEEISA-ISA Joint International Conference, 23-25, Ljubljana. Slovenia: University of Ljubljana.
- Caney S (2010) Cosmopolitanism. In: D Bell (ed). Ethics and World Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chandler D (2004) The responsibility to protect? Imposing the 'liberal peace'. International Peacekeeping 11 (1):59-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1353331042000228454>.

- Dacyl JW (1996) Sovereignty versus human rights: From past discourses to contemporary dilemmas. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 9 (2):136-165. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/9.2.136>.
- Dahl-Eriksen T (2016) R2P and the “Thin Cosmopolitan” imagination. *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 40 (2):2-16.
- Dallaire R (2004) *Shake Hands With Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*. London: Arrow Books.
- Davidson J (2012) Humanitarian intervention as liberal imperialism: A force for good? *POLIS Journal* 7 (1):2-37.
- Erameh NI (2017) Humanitarian intervention, Syria and the politics of human rights protection. *The International Journal of Human Rights* 21 (5):517-530. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2017.1307829>.
- Evans G (2008) *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and for All*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Evans G (2012) Lessons and Challenges. In: J Genser & I Cotler (eds). *The Responsibility to Protect: The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities in Our Time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Evans G (2015) The Evolution of the Responsibility to Protect: From Concept and Principle to Actionable Norm. In: Thakur R & Maley W (eds). *Theorising the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Evans G & Sahnoun M (2002) The Responsibility to Protect. *Foreign Affairs* 81 (6):99-110.
- Farer T (2004) Toward an effective international legal order: From coexistence to concert? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17 (2):219-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0955757042000245861>.
- Farer T, Archibugi D, Brown C, Crawford NC, Weiss TG, & Wheeler NJ (2005) Roundtable: Humanitarian intervention after 9/11. *International Relations* 19 (2):211-250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117805052814>.
- Faruk R (2017) *Humanitarian Military Intervention: A Failed Paradigm*. Graduate Theses and Dissertations, University of South Florida, United States.
- Fiott D (2013) Realist thought and humanitarian intervention. *The International History Review* 35 (4):766-782. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2013.817466>.
- Francioni F & Bakker C (2013) Responsibility to Protect, Humanitarian Intervention and Human Rights: Lessons from Libya to Mali. *Transworld: Transatlantic Relations and the future of Global Governance*, Working Paper 15.
- Gkoutzioulis A (2019) Challenging the association of Hegel with political realism: The contribution of Hegel’s methodological insights to a critique of realism and a richer understanding of war and statehood. *Journal of International Relations and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-019-00177-5>.
- Glanville L (2014) *Sovereignty And The Responsibility To Protect: A New History*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.
- Gow J (1997) *Triumph of the Lack of Will: International Diplomacy and the Yugoslav War*. London: C. Hurst & Co. Publishers.
- Greaves W (2008) The intervention imperative: Contradictions between liberalism, democracy, and humanitarian intervention. *Innovations: A Journal of Politics* 8 (2008):59-72.
- Hehir A (2010) *Humanitarian Intervention: An Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Held D (2002) Law of states, law of peoples: Three models of sovereignty. *Legal Theory* 8 (1):1-44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1352325202081016>.
- Holbrooke R (1998) *To End a War*. New York: Modern Library.
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001). *The responsibility to protect*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre [Accessed 25 January 2020]. <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>.

- Holzgrefe JL (2003) *The Humanitarian Intervention Debate*. In: Holzgrefe J & Keohane R (eds.) *Humanitarian Intervention Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isnarti R (2018) Humanitarian intervention from constructivist perspective: Case study of China peace keeping operation in Darfur. *AEGIS Journal of International Relations* 2 (2):154-165. <https://doi.org/10.33021/aegis.v2i2.425>.
- Jumbret MG (2010) *The internationalization of Sudanese conflict: From South Sudan to Darfur*. Dissertation, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, Paris.
- Junk J (2016) Bringing the non-coercive dimensions of R2P to the fore: The case of Kenya. *Global Society* 30 (1):54-66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2015.1092422>.
- Kirdim ŞE (2017) Failed efforts to reform humanitarian intervention system in the United Nations. *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences* XIX (1):75-85. <https://doi.org/10.5578/jeas.50686>.
- Kleingeld P & Brown E (2003) *Cosmopolitanism*. In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. *International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. [Accessed 25 November 2019]. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/>.
- Koolmeister H (2014) *The question of agency in humanitarian intervention: Cosmopolitan approaches*. Master Thesis, Universitas Tartuensis, Estonia.
- Krylov N (1995) *Humanitarian intervention: Pros and cons*. *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review*.
- Massingham E (2009) Military intervention for humanitarian purposes: Does the Responsibility to Protect doctrine advance the legality of the use of force for humanitarian ends? *International Review of the Red Cross* 91 (876):803-831. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383110000068>.
- McGrew A (2004) *Cosmopolitanism and global justice*. In: *Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies* 3 (1):1-17.
- Miller B (2015) *The Sources and Effects of Humanitarian Interventions: Realism, Liberalism and the State-to-Nation Balance*. In: *R2P at 10*. Massachusetts: Brandeis University Press.
- Moellendorf D (2002) *Cosmopolitan justice*. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory* 104.
- Nardin T & Williams MS (2006) *Humanitarian Intervention*. New York: NYU Press.
- Pattison J (2008) Legitimacy and humanitarian intervention: Who should intervene? *The International Journal of Human Rights* 12 (3):395-413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642980802069658>.
- Pattison J (2011) The ethics of humanitarian intervention in Libya. *Ethics and International Affairs* 25 (3):271-277. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679411000256>.
- Pogge T (1992a) An institutional approach to humanitarian intervention. *Public Affairs Quarterly* 6 (1):89-103.
- Pogge T (1992b) *Cosmopolitanism and sovereignty*. *Ethics* 103 (1):48-75.
- Pogge T (2005) *Humanitarian Intervention*. *Moralizing Humanitarian Intervention: Why Jurying Fails and How Law Can Work*. In: Nardin T & Williams MS (ed). *Moralizing Humanitarian Intervention*. New York: NYU Press.
- Rawls J (2001) *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reiter B (2014) Theory and methodology of exploratory social science research. *International Journal of Science and Research Methodology* 5 (4):129-150.
- Saba A & Akbarzadeh S (2018) The responsibility to protect and the use of force: An assessment of the just cause and last resort criteria in the case of Libya. *International journal of Peacekeeping* 25 (2):242-265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2017.1404908>.
- Schachter O (1991) *International Law in Theory and Practice*. Leiden: Brill Nijhoff.
- Schiller NG & Çağlar A (2013) Locating migrant pathways of economic emplacement: Thinking beyond the ethnic lens. *Ethnicities* 13 (4):494-514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796813483733>.

- Seay M (2007) Realism, Liberalism and Humanitarian Intervention: Is There A Middle Ground? In: Independent Academic Research Studies International Institute, London.
- Seybolt TB (2008) Humanitarian Military Intervention: The Conditions for Success and Failure. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shimko (2005) The United Nation and Humanitarian Intervention. *Controversies*. 241-246.
- Simms B & Trim DJB (eds) (2011) Humanitarian Intervention: A History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith MJ (1998) Humanitarian intervention: An overview of the ethical issues. *Ethics and International Affairs* 12 (1):63-79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.1998.tb00038.x>.
- Sossai M (2014) The privatisation of ‘the core business of UN peacekeeping operations’: Any legal Limit? *International Community Law Review* 16 (4):405-422. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18719732-12341287>.
- Spalding LJ (2013) A critical investigation of their theories that underpin the debate on humanitarian intervention. *International Public Policy Review* 7 (2):2-16.
- Tesón F (2005) Humanitarian Intervention: An Inquiry into Law and Morality. Ardsley Park: Transnational Publishers.
- Tesón F (2011) Humanitarian intervention: Loose ends. *Journal of Military Ethics* 10 (3):192-212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2011.608494>.
- UN General Assembly (2005) Resolution adopted by the General Assembly: 2005 World Summit Outcome. [Accessed 12 April 2014]. <https://www.refworld.org/docid/44168a910.html>.
- Walzer M (2002) Arguing for Humanitarian Intervention. In: Nicolaus M & Kira B (eds). *The New Killing Fields: Massacre and the Politics of Intervention*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wheeler NJ (2000) *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wickramasinghe AAIN & Wimalaratana W (2016) International migration and migration theories. *Social Affairs: A Journal for the Social Sciences* 1 (5):13-32.
- Wierzbicki B & Welhengama G (1994) The problem of humanitarian intervention: Developments and trends. *The Liverpool Law Review* (2):151-165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01079811>.
- Zaman T (2012) Jockeying for position in the humanitarian field: Iraqi refugees and faith-based organisations in Damascus. *Disasters* 36:126-148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2012.01286.x>.
- Zia MH (2016) The dilemma of humanitarian intervention. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 6 (11):64-72.