

This PDF is auto-generated for reference only. As such, it may contain some conversion errors and/or missing information. For all formal use please refer to the official version on the website, as linked below.

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

<https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/16/walking-a-fine-line-the-pros-and-cons-of-humanitarian-intervention/>

NIALL GRAY, MAR 16 2019

Characterized by Thomas G. Weiss as a “moral minefield”, the concept of humanitarian intervention has remained a topic of great debate among academics and politicians alike.^[1] Traditionally defined as a state’s use of armed force to protect lives from foreign tyranny, the idea has become inextricably linked to a centuries long philosophical struggle, between individual rights and sovereign authority.^[2] This dichotomy can trace its origins to seventeenth century figures such as Hugo Grotius, who deemed any government sanctioned “outrage upon humanity”, as delegitimizing state control.^[3] Such ideas would play an immediate role in the first examples of humanitarian intervention, with European powers appealing to the ‘natural rights’ of Christians, following their ‘ill-treatment’ by Ottoman authorities.^[4]

Despite such history, it is important to remember the relative infancy of the modern understanding of the concept. Fully emerging in the aftermath of the Cold War, humanitarian intervention quickly became a pertinent issue, in relation to attempts to promote a universal concept of human rights.^[5] This ideal was to be articulated by a newly empowered United Nations, which hoped to enforce a combined international will, regarding state treatment of their populations.^[6] Such optimism, however, would prove difficult to marry with global reality, with the “humanitarian decade” of the 1990s, creating as many questions as answers, with regard to the utility of intervention.^[7] This can be seen in NATO’s troubled operations in Kosovo and Bosnia, which would leave indelible legacies on debate, regarding the merits of intervening in more recent conflicts in Libya and Syria.^[8] As a result, many now question the very concept of humanitarian intervention, with even proponents of the idea, such as Stewart and Knaus, supporting the need for re-evaluation.^[9] This essay will investigate such debates surrounding the ideal of intervention, focusing specifically on its theoretical and practical pros and cons. Engaging with a variety of works, including academic literature and first-hand reports, the study will base its discussion on the experiences of numerous operations, with each offering a myriad of examples, concerning good and bad practice.

With regards to the advantages of intervention, it is perhaps paramount to discuss the doctrine’s proven ability to protect citizens from the actions of their respective governments. Classically viewed as the prime goal of humanitarian operations, preserving life has remained an essential part of justifications, with respect to intervention.^[10] Certainly, this belief has built on the aforementioned work of Grotius, whose ‘guardianship theory’ outlined the ‘duty’ of states, to temporarily intercede in the name of oppressed populations.^[11] This ideal has been bolstered in recent decades by the development of ‘human security’ doctrines, which consider the “welfare of ordinary people”, as equal to more traditional defence issues, such as arms and territory.^[12] This growing emphasis on the welfare of populations has naturally impacted various military outlooks, with NATO’s 1999 decision to intervene against Yugoslav authorities in Kosovo, exemplifying the benefits of such thinking. Indeed, in spite of much debate regarding its overall strategy, the alliance’s humanitarian intervention in the region was ultimately responsible for the cessation of widespread human rights abuses by Yugoslav forces and militia.^[13] At the same time, such an operation could also be described as having pre-emptively halted a potential rise in violence, with the Milosevic administration previously failing to act against various ethnic massacres in Bosnia.^[14] It could be said therefore, that the operation was ultimately responsible for ensuring the security of hundreds of thousands of people, with the local Albanian population having lost the ability to fairly appeal to their respective government.^[15]

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

Despite this, it is worth noting that the intervention by no means perfectly achieved its goal of protecting civilian life.^[16] For example, according to one Human Rights Watch report, NATO forces were directly responsible for the accidental death of over five hundred non-combatants during the conflict.^[17] Therefore, this places the principle aim of humanitarian intervention in jeopardy, with Jaime Pinos stating that the continued existence of various 'collateral issues', could result in the concept's abandonment.^[18] However, just war theorist Michael Walzer has noted the dangers of such thinking, claiming that an over-emphasis on 'no risk interventions', may ultimately harm such operations' overall capacity and willingness to protect populations.^[19] It could be argued, then, that whilst the desire to protect life cannot hope to be flawlessly applied within humanitarian interventions, the doctrine overall has shown that it has been successful in providing a final safeguard for persons, whose existence has been endangered by the actions of rogue administrations.

Whilst this protection of populations has been promoted as a universal standard within humanitarian interventions, it is important to remember that the feasibility of such operations, remains reliant on the national circumstances and outlooks of states. This issue has persisted despite the strengthening of the United Nations' global standing, which still only possesses the ability to sanction humanitarian missions on the behalf of the 'international community'.^[20] As a result, state actors remain the key players in actively performing interventions, with Roland Paris noting that administrations will naturally consider their own "material self-interest", alongside more altruistic ideals.^[21] The reality of this situation has even been acknowledged by progressive documents such as the 2001 International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty report. Indeed, whilst the document presented a revolutionary framework regarding the "responsibility to protect", it admits that such responsibility remains dependent on the basis that an operation possesses "a reasonable chance of success".^[22] Whilst this 'chance' could simply be interpreted as an attempt to avoid frivolous deployments of the doctrine, such a statement ultimately poses questions as to the subjective assessments of states, in relation to protecting life.

This issue can be seen clearly with regards to the failure to act before and during the Rwandan Genocide in 1994. Possessing many similarities to the aforementioned situation in Kosovo, such as rapidly deteriorating administrative control, the event still failed to inspire substantial humanitarian action from states.^[23] Certainly, whilst a force of five thousand peacekeepers had been assembled by the United Nations, the operation was hampered by long-running commitment issues that inhibited its ability to accomplish its mandate.^[24] These problems have been discussed at length by mission commander Romeo Dallaire, who particularly noted key contributor Belgium's unwillingness to commit to a conflict, largely irrelevant to its national interests.^[25] Due to this, it could be said that a sheer lack of funding directly contributed to the deterioration of a humanitarian situation, which ultimately resulted in genocide. It appears important to remember, therefore, that humanitarian interventions remain largely subjective affairs. Whilst missions have undoubtedly saved lives, state peculiarities continue to influence ultimately where such interventions occur, thereby challenging the supposed legal universality of human rights.^[26] Such concerns have often proven to have long-term consequences, with the 'Black Hawk Down' legacy of America's failed intervention in Somalia, still employed as a 'rhetorical lense', when discussing potential action in Syria today.^[27]

Despite such problems, it is worth discussing the role humanitarian intervention has played in actively promoting various international norms. Tied closely to the evolution of international law, the doctrine has seemingly played a dual legal role in recent decades, with it acting as an enforcer of existing rules, as well as a precedent setter.^[28] Whilst the former may appear straight forward in application, with operations such as that in Haiti intervening against undemocratic governments, the latter of such roles has been particularly revolutionary.^[29] Indeed, this process of re-assessing legal norms after operations has aided in the formation of an intricate, rule-based environment, markedly different to the more anarchic visions of intervention, promoted by older thinkers, such as John Stuart Mill.^[30] This development is perhaps exemplified by the aforementioned "responsibility to protect", which has outlined various actions from which states must protect their populations, such as genocide and war crimes.^[31] This ideal has been instrumental in promoting the conditionality of sovereignty, with traditional military intervention embedded within a series of prior protocols, when dealing with troubled states.^[32] This saw particular success following Kenya's 2007 elections, where local governments pressured Nairobi to calm ethnic tensions, before the need to physically intervene.^[33] As such, it could be said that intervention has played a decisive role in fostering a more robust international system, with its multiple deployments helping to redefine ideals of universal rights and duties.

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

Furthermore, it is worth noting that humanitarian intervention's ability to bolster international norms, has also aided the rise of 'middle powers', as global players. Described by Beeson and Higgott as possessing a unique level of diplomatic freedom, middle powers are said to simultaneously wield international clout, whilst lacking the suspicion that is commonly directed towards more powerful states.^[34] These characteristics have subsequently empowered such countries to tie their own interests to the pursuit of innovative solutions to multilateral issues, such as intervention.^[35] This can be seen with regards to Canada's role in the aforementioned ICISS document, which favours unified humanitarian action, in contrast to traditional realist dichotomies.^[36] Simultaneously, however, it is perhaps Australia's actions in East Timor that exemplify this mutually reinforcing position, with humanitarian intervention effectively acting as a stage for the promotion of such powers' internationalist outlooks. Certainly, Canberra's close cooperation with the UN and NGOs appears to have resulted in a rare example of a completely successful intervention, thereby hinting at these operations' ability to encourage cross-body connections.^[37] It seems, then, that humanitarian intervention has played a key role in bolstering global society, with it giving voice to a raft of non-traditional state actors. Whilst these developments may not fully embody Fukuyama's "end of history", such actions have ultimately helped to provide an environment for global debate, outside great power struggles.^[38]

It ought to be remembered, however, that whilst humanitarian intervention has certainly strengthened the letter of international law, it does not necessarily follow that the spirit of such rules, has been fully respected by states. This issue has been raised by various scholars, who have particularly criticized intervention's sovereignty-challenging aspects.^[39] For instance, Adekeye Adebajo has argued that this questioning of governmental authority will only affect weaker, smaller states, that rely most on established ideals of sovereignty.^[40] It could be said, therefore, that these emerging 'cosmopolitan' outlooks regarding state authority, which are encouraged by events such as intervention, may ultimately act as a rhetorical smokescreen, for reinforcing animosity.^[41] This can be seen regarding Russia's 2008 conflict with Georgia. Assisting the breakaway republics of Abkhazia and South Ossetia following Tbilisi's operations against the latter, Moscow has claimed that its intervention was necessary in order to halt a 'genocide' of around two thousand civilians by Georgian forces.^[42] Despite this, Russian authorities quietly rounded down this figure following the conflict, thereby suggesting that such language was ultimately used to facilitate less altruistic aims in Moscow's 'near abroad'.^[43] It could be said, then, that the development of intervention norms has not necessarily led to a change in state attitudes. Indeed, in many ways the doctrine's challenge to established 'Westphalian' ideals seems to have led to the furtherance of much of the instability, that it is meant to solve.

This pessimistic view of humanitarian intervention's increasing presence in international debate, has been particularly voiced by nations of the 'Global South'. Characterized by their status as developing economies, these states have often claimed that intervention exacerbates historical inequalities, that they have sought to overcome.^[44] Certainly, whilst intervention has seen the emergence of aforementioned 'middle powers' as active players, the ideal has continued to exclude poorer countries, which have often found themselves subject to outside interference.^[45] In spite of the rise of humanitarianism in the 1990s, this disparity has only increased, as India and Vietnam's operations of the late Cold War era, remain rare examples of Southern leadership. As a result, this continued role of wealthier states as the key actors within intervention has attracted growing criticism. For example, Anne Orford has argued that recent Western humanitarian incursions into the Third World, amount to neo-colonialism.^[46] These views have become particularly widespread in light of NATO's controversial justifications for deposing Muammar Gaddafi, with many Southern nations viewing the intervention as an existential challenge to their sovereign rights.^[47] As such, it appears that these issues surrounding humanitarian intervention are indicative of disparities between its theory and application. Whilst the doctrine professes a universalist, liberal outlook, its use by powerful states, particularly the West, appears at times to simply legitimize old hierarchies, under a new guise.

Whilst such issues persist, it should not be forgotten that humanitarian intervention has shown great success in halting the evolution of smaller issues, into larger crises. Commonly rooted in deep-seated social and economic problems, local conflicts have often been shown to cause 'domino effects', within and outside state borders.^[48] International recognition of such difficulties has risen in tandem with discussions on intervention in recent decades, with the latter now often viewed as a means of stopping the spread of long-lasting human issues, such as forced displacement.^[49] These problems have been described by Mary Kaldor as evidence of growing global awareness of "new wars", asymmetrical conflicts which require non-traditional military responses.^[50] Such a concept is particularly relevant for states in Africa, which, in light of aforementioned issues of historical imperialism, have inherited frontiers

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

with little respect for on-the-ground realities.^[51] Due to this, countries of the region have at times seemingly benefited from calculated humanitarian interventions, with the potential escalation of various societal issues stopped by well-timed operations. This capability of the doctrine was particularly evident during the United Kingdom's 2000 intervention in the Sierra Leonean civil war, which has been well noted for its unique circumstances.^[52]

Certainly, the operation has become known for its key break from traditional humanitarian intervention norms, namely the absence of a tyrannical government. Actively requesting assistance from outside forces, Sierra Leone's administration had found itself increasingly pressured by an amorphous rebel army, known as the 'Revolutionary United Front'.^[53] This group's spread across the country had brought on many problems, akin to a humanitarian crisis, as its brutality deliberately exacerbated a variety of societal issues, most notably blood diamond trading.^[54] This challenge to the established social order ultimately threatened to further destabilize neighbouring states, with intervention able to halt the creation of widespread regional anarchy.^[55] Indeed, whilst the operation by no means single-handedly defeated the rebels, British forces aided a return to social normality through a simultaneous focus on disarmament, as well as a variety of civil society issues, aggravated by the RUF's activities.^[56] It seems, therefore, that humanitarian intervention has proven to be a highly versatile concept. Whilst its traditional ideal of protecting life has remained its central aim, its mandate has evolved to recognize the need to simultaneously tackle wider connected issues. This has strengthened the doctrine's use in helping achieve sustainable peace, with the intervention itself seeming to bring greater attention to Liberia's destabilizing role in the region.^[57] Overall, this crucial ability of the concept has even been noted by war refugees, such as Marie Beatrice Umutesi, who has stated that effective intervention in her native Rwanda, could have saved the surrounding region from long-term societal collapse.^[58]

At the same time, however, it appears that this widening of understanding regarding the utilities of intervention, can ultimately bring about its downfall. Now more than ever tied to issues outside simply "delivering foreign nationals from tyranny", questions must be asked as to when a humanitarian intervention, can ever truly be said to have accomplished its goals.^[59] This issue has been popularized through the idea of "mission creep", a term originally coined in the 1990s to describe the internal ideological weaknesses of the doctrine.^[60] Indeed, the term challenges the amorphous nature of an altruistic use of force, stating that whilst operations may simply set out to protect a population, such motives may encourage an increasing acceptance of responsibilities, until such tasks ultimately cause the intervention to fail.^[61] As a result, a new focus on "exit strategies" has arisen within governmental and academic circles.^[62] Despite this, such studies remain largely inconclusive as to when any single humanitarian intervention can be described as finished, with Michael Walzer admitting that his own thinking on the subject has tended to wander.^[63] It seems logical then that operations decades apart have continued to suffer from inherent on-the-ground difficulties, as can be seen with regard to operations in Somalia and Libya.

Certainly, despite the missions taking place at either end of the contemporary 'liberal era', both seem to exhibit classic issues regarding "mission creep". This can be most vividly seen in the way in which the two missions quickly concluded that there was a pressing need to focus on removing local and national leaders (Mohamed Farrah Aidid and Muammar Gaddafi), despite their original intention to simply end internal hostilities.^[64] Such thinking has been criticized for causing a range of 'cascade effects', with both states' contemporary status as 'administrative black holes', contrasting completely with the operations' original intentions.^[65] It could be argued, then, that the internal logic of humanitarian intervention may need to be subject to renegotiation, as its objectives often remain amorphous and malleable, despite the common presence of UN mandates. This need appears all the more urgent in light of growing unease in intervening countries regarding the utility of such missions, with many now viewing such aforementioned failures, as indicative of the concept's irreparably flawed nature.^[66] Due to this, intervention has become part of a wider, existential debate, regarding liberal ideals of sovereignty and their supposed benefits.^[67] It seems, therefore, that such flaws, if unaddressed, could aid a shift in the very order that fostered the concept, with Trump stressing with regards to Libya, "What do we get out of this?"^[68]

In conclusion, it appears that humanitarian intervention could be described as a troubled, yet necessary concept. Whilst the doctrine has been shown to possess a number of positive moral and practical qualities, most notably its ability to protect populations, its overall utility remains hampered by a variety of difficulties. This issue reflects a continuing schism regarding the inherently legal nature of humanitarian intervention and its connection with actual on-

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

the-ground applications. This can be seen clearly with regards to the points raised in this study, with each of the concept's beneficial aspects, ultimately possessing characteristics which can be manipulated, intentionally or not, by those who decide to employ the doctrine. For example, while it is clear that intervention has played a key role in promoting a more robust system of international norms, it remains evident that state bodies will decide whether such operations, are truly employed for these higher ideals. This decisive role of national administrations also plays a part in other issues, with a growing humanitarian understanding of the need to adapt to new aspects of conflict, oftentimes resulting in counter-productive outlooks. It could be said, then, that the problems surrounding the effectiveness of humanitarian intervention, remain part of a larger philosophical discussion, regarding the relationship between states and their 'international obligations'. Such a dichotomy has naturally generated diverse views, as ongoing debate over Syria, has showcased the continued role of states' unique peculiarities, regarding their perceptions of 'rights'. As long as such issues persist, therefore, it is likely that interventions will continue to produce mixed results, with Nicholas Rengger noting that attempts to objectively define the phenomenon, are likely to remain reminiscent of a "rush for fool's gold".^[69]

Bibliography

Adebajo, Adekeye, *The revolt against the West: intervention and sovereignty*, Third World Quarterly, Vol. 37, Issue 7 (2016)

Alkopher, Tal Dingott, *From Kosovo to Syria: the transformation of NATO Secretaries General's discourse on military humanitarian intervention*, European Security, Vol. 25, Issue 1 (2015)

An Introduction to the Responsibility to Protect, International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect – <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop/learn-about-rtop> [accessed 24th December 2018]

Bacevich, Andrew J., *The Forgotten Lessons of Black Hawk Down*, The New York Times, 3rd October 2018 – <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/03/opinion/the-forgotten-lessons-of-black-hawk-down.html> [accessed 23rd December 2018]

Beeson, Mark & Higgott, Richard, *The changing architecture of politics in the Asia-Pacific: Australia's middle power moment?*, International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, Vol. 14 (2014)

Bellamy, Alex J., *Kosovo and the Advent of Sovereignty as Responsibility*, Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, Vol. 3, Issue 2 (2009)

Bolivian president blasts the UN and the "Insecurity Council" on Libya, MercoPress, 19th September 2011 – <http://en.mercopress.com/2011/09/19/bolivian-president-blasts-the-un-and-the-insecurity-council-on-libya> [accessed 27th December 2018]

Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Serbia and Montenegro), International Court of Justice, 26th February 2007

Civilian Deaths in the NATO Air Campaign, Human Rights Watch (2000) – <https://www.hrw.org/reports/2000/nato/Natbm200.htm> [accessed 22nd December 2018]

Criddle, Evan J., *Three Grotian Theories of Humanitarian Intervention*, Theoretical Inquiries in Law, Vol. 16, No. 2 (2015)

Crossley, Noele, *A Model Case of R2P Prevention: Mediation in the Aftermath of Kenya's 2007 Presidential Elections*, Global Responsibility to Protect, Vol. 5, Issue 2 (2013)

Dallaire, Romeo, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (Arrow Books, 2005)

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

de Wet, Erika, *The Modern Practice of Intervention by Invitation in Africa and its Implications for the Prohibition of the Use of Force*, *The European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (2016)

Eaton, Jonah, *An Emerging Norm – Determining the Meaning and Legal Status of the Responsibility to Protect*, *Michigan Journal of International Law*, Vol. 32, Issue 4 (2011)

Gashaw, Tasew, *Colonial Borders in Africa: Improper Design and its Impact on African Border Communities*, Africa Up Close, Wilson Center, 17th November 2017 – <https://africaupclose.wilsoncenter.org/colonial-borders-in-africa-improper-design-and-its-impact-on-african-borderland-communities/> [accessed 29th December 2018]

Gberie, Lansana, *A Dirty War in West Africa: the RUF and the destruction of Sierra Leone* (Indiana University Press, 2005)

Gberie, Lansana, *An Interview with Peter Penfold*, *African Affairs*, Vol. 104, Issue 414 (2005)

Gladstone, William Ewart, *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (New York: Lovell, 1876)

Hehir, Aidan, *Humanitarian Intervention: An Introduction* (MacMillan Education, 2013)

Heinze, Eric A., *Humanitarian Intervention: Morality and International Law on Intolerable Violations of Human Rights*, *International Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (2004)

Heraclides, Alexis & Dialla, Ada, *Humanitarian Intervention in the Long Nineteenth Century: Setting the Precedent* (Manchester University Press, 2015)

Hildebrandt, Timothy, Hillebrecht, Courtney, Holm, Peter M. & Pevehouse, Jon, *The Domestic Politics of Humanitarian Intervention: Public Opinion, Partisanship and Ideology*, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, No. 9 (2013)

Hoag, Jim, *Beware Mission Creep in Somalia*, *The Washington Post*, 20th July 1993 – https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1993/07/20/beware-mission-creep-in-somalia/fe98b9e2-9ceb-45c3-babf-844a8a2671e9/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d33b4997411c [accessed 29th December 2018]

Intervention: When, Why and How? Written evidence from the Humanitarian Intervention Centre, UK Parliamentary Records, Session 2013-2014 – <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmdfence/writev/intervention/int10.htm> [accessed 30th December 2018]

Interview: General Romeo Dallaire, PBS Frontline, 1st April 2004 – <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/ghosts/interviews/dallaire.html> [accessed 23rd December 2018]

Interview: Jonathan Powell, Civil Service World, 5th January 2015 – <https://www.civilserviceworld.com/articles/interview/interview-jonathan-powell> [accessed 30th December 2018]

Kaldor, Mary, *A Decade of Humanitarian Intervention in Global Civil Society 2001* eds. Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius & Mary Kaldor (Oxford University Press, 2001)

Knight, Andy & Murray, Robert, *The responsibility to protect in a Trump world*, *Folio*, 21st December 2016 – <https://www.folio.ca/opinion-the-responsibility-to-protect-in-a-trump-world/> [accessed 30th December 2018]

Kreps, Sarah A., *The 1994 Haiti intervention: A unilateral operation in multilateral clothes*, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 30, Issue 3 (2007)

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

Kuperus, Tracy, *Kosovo and Rwanda: Selective Interventionism*, The Center for Public Justice (1999) – https://www.cpjjustice.org/public/page/content/kosovo_and_rwanda [accessed 23rd December 2018]

Libya – *Joint Letter from Nicholas Sarkozy, President of the Republic, and David Cameron, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, to Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council*, Embassy of France in London, 10th March 2011 – <https://uk.ambafrance.org/Libya-France-and-UK-s-joint-letter> [accessed 30th December 2018]

MacQueen, Norrie, *Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011)

Majumdar, David, *Are U.S. Special Forces facing a Syrian 'Black Hawk Down'?*, National Interest, 22nd January 2016 – <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/are-us-special-forces-facing-syrian-black-hawk-down-14995> [accessed 23rd December 2018]

Malone, Barry, *Uganda's Museveni says West bombing Libya for oil*, Reuters, 21st March 2011 – <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-uganda-libya-oil-idUSTRE72K4V420110321> [accessed 27th December 2018]

McDougall, Derek, *"Intervening" in the neighbourhood: Comparing Australia's role in East Timor and the southwest Pacific*, International Journal, Autumn 2007

Mill, John Stuart, *A Few Words on Non-Intervention* (1859), Foreign Policy Perspectives, No. 8, Libertarian Alliance

Ntinda, Asser, *Attack on Libya "crime against humanity"* – Nujoma, SWAPO Website – http://www.swapoparty.org/attack_on_libya.html [accessed 27th December]

Orford, Anne, *Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law* (Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Orford, Anne, *The Politics of Anti-Legalism in the Intervention Debate*, Global Policy, 30th May 2014 – <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/30/05/2014/politics-anti-legalism-intervention-debate> [accessed 27th December 2018]

Paris, Roland, *The 'Responsibility to Protect' and the Structural Problems of Preventive Humanitarian Intervention*, International Peacekeeping, Vol. 21, Issue 3 (2014)

Pashakanlou, Arash Heydarian, *Air power in humanitarian intervention: Kosovo and Libya in comparative perspective*, Defence Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1 (2018)

Pinos, Jaume, *Kosovo and the Collateral Effects of Humanitarian Intervention* (Routledge, 2019), Forthcoming

Proukaki, Elena Katselli, *The right not to be displaced by armed conflict under international law in Armed Conflict and Forcible Displacement: Individual Rights under International Law* ed. Elena Katselli Proukaki (Routledge, 2018)

Rengger, Nicholas, *Just War and International Order: The Uncivil Condition in World Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Riley, Major Jonathon P., *The U.K. in Sierra Leone: A Post-Conflict Operation Success?*, The Heritage Foundation, 10th August 2006 – <https://www.heritage.org/africa/report/the-uk-sierra-leone-post-conflict-operation-success> [accessed 29th December 2018]

Roberts, Adam, *NATO's 'Humanitarian War' over Kosovo*, Survival, Vol. 41, Issue 3 (1999)

Roberts, Sir Adam, *The United Nations and Humanitarian Intervention* in *Humanitarian Intervention and*

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

International Relations ed. Jennifer Walsh (Oxford University Press, 2004)

Rodogno, Davide, *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire 1815-1914* (Princeton University Press, 2011)

Seybolt, Taylor B., *Humanitarian Military Intervention: The Conditions for Success and Failure* (Oxford University Press, 2008)

Statement by the North Atlantic Council on Kosovo, NATO Press Release, 30th January 1999 – <https://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-012e.htm> [accessed 22nd December 2018]

Stewart, Rory & Knaus, Gerald, *Can Intervention Work?* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2012)

The Responsibility to Protect, Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001)

The ripple effect: economic impacts of internal displacement, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (June 2018) – <http://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/20180608-idmc-economic-impacts-intro.pdf> [accessed 29th December 2018]

Tosen, Fernando R., *Kosovo: A Powerful Precedent for the Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention*, Amsterdam Law Forum, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2009) – <http://amsterdamlawforum.org/article/view/62/119> [accessed 24th December 2018]

Trim, D.J.B. & Simms, Brendan, *Towards a history of humanitarian intervention* in *Humanitarian Intervention: A History* eds. D.J.B. Trim & Brendan Simms (Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Trump, Donald, *Why did we spend billions of dollars of our money on Libya if we are not going to get any of the country's oil? What do we get out of this?*, Twitter (@realDonaldTrump), 21st October 2011 – <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/127387237007630337> [accessed 30th December 2018]

Umutesi, Marie Beatrice, *Surviving the Slaughter: The Ordeal of a Rwandan Refugee in Zaire* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2004)

United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) Brief, World Peace Foundation – <https://sites.tufts.edu/wpf/files/2017/07/Sierra-Leone-brief.pdf> [accessed 29th December 2018]

United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 775, United Nations Security Council, 28th August 1992 – [http://undocs.org/S/RES/775\(1992\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/775(1992)) [accessed 30th December 2018]

United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 794, United Nations Security Council, 3rd December 1992 – [http://undocs.org/S/RES/794\(1992\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/794(1992)) [accessed 30th December 2018]

Up in Flames: Humanitarian Law Violations and Civilian Victims in the Conflict over South Ossetia, Human Rights Watch, 23rd January 2009 – <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/01/23/flames/humanitarian-law-violations-and-civilian-victims-conflict-over-south> [accessed 27th December 2018]

Waisova, Sarka, *Human Security – The Contemporary Paradigm?*, Perspectives: Review of Central European Affairs, No. 20 (2003)

Walzer, Michael, *The Argument about Humanitarian Intervention*, Dissent Magazine, Winter 2002

Weiss, Thomas G., *Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas in Action* (John Wiley and Sons, 2016)

Williams, Paul, *Fighting for Freetown: British military intervention in Sierra Leone*, Contemporary Security Policy,

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

Vol. 22, No. 3 (2001)

2018 *Fragile States Index*, Fund for Peace, 2018 – <https://fundforpeace.org/fsi/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/951181805-Fragile-States-Index-Annual-Report-2018.pdf> [accessed 30th December 2018]

Notes

[1] Thomas G. Weiss, *Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas in Action* (John Wiley and Sons, 2016), p. 117

[2] Alexis Heraclides & Ada Dialla, *Humanitarian Intervention in the Long Nineteenth Century: Setting the Precedent* (Manchester University Press, 2015), pp. 14-16

[3] Jonah Eaton, *An Emerging Norm – Determining the Meaning and Legal Status of the Responsibility to Protect*, Michigan Journal of International Law, Vol. 32, Issue 4 (2011), p. 775

[4] Davide Rodogno, *Against Massacre: Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire 1815-1914* (Princeton University Press, 2011), p. 3

William Ewart Gladstone, *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (New York: Lovell, 1876), pp. 13-24

[5] Sir Adam Roberts, *The United Nations and Humanitarian Intervention* in *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations* ed. Jennifer Walsh (Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 71-73

[6] Ibid.

[7] Davide Rodogno, *Against Massacre*, p. 1

[8] Tal Dingott Alkopher, *From Kosovo to Syria: the transformation of NATO Secretaries General's discourse on military humanitarian intervention*, European Security, Vol. 25, Issue 1 (2015), p. 49

[9] Rory Stewart & Gerald Knaus, *Can Intervention Work?* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2012), p. xiii

[10] D.J.B. Trim & Brendan Simms, *Towards a history of humanitarian intervention* in *Humanitarian Intervention: A History* eds. D.J.B. Trim & Brendan Simms (Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 1-2

[11] Evan J. Criddle, *Three Grotian Theories of Humanitarian Intervention*, Theoretical Inquiries in Law, Vol. 16, No. 2 (2015), pp. 475-476

[12] Sarka Waisova, *Human Security – The Contemporary Paradigm?*, Perspectives: Review of Central European Affairs, No. 20 (2003), p. 61

[13] Arash Heydarian Pashakanlou, *Air power in humanitarian intervention: Kosovo and Libya in comparative perspective*, Defence Studies, Vol. 18, No. 1 (2018), pp. 39-40

Adam Roberts, *NATO's 'Humanitarian War' over Kosovo*, Survival, Vol. 41, Issue 3 (1999), p. 120

[14] *Case Concerning Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina vs. Serbia and Montenegro)*, International Court of Justice, 26th February 2007, pp. 224-225

[15] Alex J. Bellamy, *Kosovo and the Advent of Sovereignty as Responsibility*, Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, Vol. 3, Issue 2 (2009), pp. 170-171

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

- [16] *Statement by the North Atlantic Council on Kosovo*, NATO Press Release, 30th January 1999 – <https://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-012e.htm> [accessed 22nd December 2018]
- [17] *Civilian Deaths in the NATO Air Campaign*, Human Rights Watch (2000) – <https://www.hrw.org/reports/2000/nato/Natbm200.htm> [accessed 22nd December 2018]
- [18] Jaume Pinos, *Kosovo and the Collateral Effects of Humanitarian Intervention* (Routledge, 2019), Forthcoming, pp. 178-182
- [19] Michael Walzer, *The Argument about Humanitarian Intervention*, Dissent Magazine, Winter 2002, pp. 20-21
- [20] Norrie MacQueen, *Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp. 44-45
- [21] Roland Paris, *The 'Responsibility to Protect' and the Structural Problems of Preventive Humanitarian Intervention*, International Peacekeeping, Vol. 21, Issue 3 (2014), p. 573
- [22] *The Responsibility to Protect*, Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001), p. xii
- [23] Tracy Kuperus, *Kosovo and Rwanda: Selective Interventionism*, The Center for Public Justice (1999) – https://www.cpublicjustice.org/public/page/content/kosovo_and_rwanda [accessed 23rd December 2018]
- [24] Romeo Dallaire, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda* (Arrow Books, 2005), p. 131
- [25] *Interview: General Romeo Dallaire*, PBS Frontline, 1st April 2004 – <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/ghosts/interviews/dallaire.html> [accessed 23rd December 2018]
- [26] Eric A. Heinze, *Humanitarian Intervention: Morality and International Law on Intolerable Violations of Human Rights*, International Journal of Human Rights, Vol. 8, No. 4 (2004), p. 471
- [27] David Majumdar, *Are U.S. Special Forces facing a Syrian 'Black Hawk Down'?*, National Interest, 22nd January 2016 – <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/are-us-special-forces-facing-syrian-black-hawk-down-14995> [accessed 23rd December 2018]
- Andrew J. Bacevich, *The Forgotten Lessons of Black Hawk Down*, The New York Times, 3rd October 2018 – <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/03/opinion/the-forgotten-lessons-of-black-hawk-down.html> [accessed 23rd December 2018]
- [28] Fernando R. Tosen, *Kosovo: A Powerful Precedent for the Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention*, Amsterdam Law Forum, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2009) – <http://amsterdamlawforum.org/article/view/62/119> [accessed 24th December 2018]
- [29] Sarah A. Kreps, *The 1994 Haiti intervention: A unilateral operation in multilateral clothes*, Journal of Strategic Studies, Vol. 30, Issue 3 (2007), p. 449
- [30] John Stuart Mill, *A Few Words on Non-Intervention (1859)*, Foreign Policy Perspectives, No. 8, Libertarian Alliance, p. 4
- [31] *An Introduction to the Responsibility to Protect*, International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect – <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop/learn-about-rtop> [accessed 24th December 2018]
- [32] Ibid.

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

[33] Noele Crossley, *A Model Case of R2P Prevention: Mediation in the Aftermath of Kenya's 2007 Presidential Elections*, *Global Responsibility to Protect*, Vol. 5, Issue 2 (2013), p. 192

[34] Mark Beeson & Richard Higgott, *The changing architecture of politics in the Asia-Pacific: Australia's middle power moment?*, *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Vol. 14 (2014), p. 218

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] *The Responsibility to Protect*, p. vii

[37] Derek McDougall, "Intervening" in the neighbourhood: Comparing Australia's role in East Timor and the southwest Pacific, *International Journal*, Autumn 2007, pp. 877-878

Taylor B. Seybolt, *Humanitarian Military Intervention: The Conditions for Success and Failure* (Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 90

[38] Aidan Hehir, *Humanitarian Intervention: An Introduction* (MacMillan Education, 2013), p. 3

[39] Adekeye Adebajo, *The revolt against the West: intervention and sovereignty*, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 37, Issue 7 (2016), pp. 1191-1193

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 1188

[41] Anne Orford, *The Politics of Anti-Legalism in the Intervention Debate*, *Global Policy*, 30th May 2014 – <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/30/05/2014/politics-anti-legalism-intervention-debate> [accessed 27th December 2018]

[42] *Up in Flames: Humanitarian Law Violations and Civilian Victims in the Conflict over South Ossetia*, Human Rights Watch, 23rd January 2009 – <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/01/23/flames/humanitarian-law-violations-and-civilian-victims-conflict-over-south> [accessed 27th December 2018]

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] Adekeye Adebajo, *The revolt against the West*, p. 1189

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] Anne Orford, *Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 172

[47] Barry Malone, *Uganda's Museveni says West bombing Libya for oil*, Reuters, 21st March 2011 – <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-uganda-libya-oil-idUSTRE72K4V420110321> [accessed 27th December 2018]

Asser Ntinda, *Attack on Libya "crime against humanity"* – Nujoma, SWAPO Website – http://www.swapoparty.org/attack_on_libya.html [accessed 27th December]

Bolivian president blasts the UN and the "Insecurity Council" on Libya, MercoPress, 19th September 2011 – <http://en.mercopress.com/2011/09/19/bolivian-president-blasts-the-un-and-the-insecurity-council-on-libya> [accessed 27th December 2018]

[48] Elena Katselli Proukaki, *The right not to be displaced by armed conflict under international law in Armed Conflict and Forcible Displacement: Individual Rights under International Law* ed. Elena Katselli Proukaki (Routledge, 2018), p. 1

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

[49] *The ripple effect: economic impacts of internal displacement*, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (June 2018), p. 2 – <http://www.internal-displacement.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/20180608-idmc-economic-impacts-intro.pdf> [accessed 29th December 2018]

[50] Mary Kaldor, *A Decade of Humanitarian Intervention in Global Civil Society 2001* eds. Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius & Mary Kaldor (Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 134

[51] Tasew Gashaw, *Colonial Borders in Africa: Improper Design and its Impact on African Border Communities*, Africa Up Close, Wilson Center, 17th November 2017 – <https://africaupclose.wilsoncenter.org/colonial-borders-in-africa-improper-design-and-its-impact-on-african-borderland-communities/> [accessed 29th December 2018]

[52] Michael Walzer, *The Arguement about Humanitarian Intervention*, p. 9

[53] Erika de Wet, *The Modern Practice of Intervention by Invitation in Africa and its Implications for the Prohibition of the Use of Force*, The European Journal of International Law, Vol. 26, No. 4 (2016), p. 985

[54] Paul Williams, *Fighting for Freetown: British military intervention in Sierra Leone*, Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 22, No. 3 (2001), pp. 144-145

[55] *United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) Brief*, World Peace Foundation, p. 1 – <https://sites.tufts.edu/wpf/files/2017/07/Sierra-Leone-brief.pdf> [accessed 29th December 2018]

[56] Major Jonathon P. Riley, *The U.K. in Sierra Leone: A Post-Conflict Operation Success?*, The Heritage Foundation, 10th August 2006 – <https://www.heritage.org/africa/report/the-uk-sierra-leone-post-conflict-operation-success> [accessed 29th December 2018]

Lansana Gberie, *A Dirty War in West Africa: the RUF and the destruction of Sierra Leone* (Indiana University Press, 2005), p. 173

[57] Lansana Gberie, *An Interview with Peter Penfold*, African Affairs, Vol. 104, Issue 414 (2005), p. 124

[58] Marie Beatrice Umutesi, *Surviving the Slaughter: The Ordeal of a Rwandan Refugee in Zaire* (University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), p. 68

[59] Evan J. Criddle, *Three Grotian Theories of Humanitarian Intervention*, p. 482

[60] Jim Hoag, *Beware Mission Creep in Somalia*, The Washington Post, 20th July 1993 – https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1993/07/20/beware-mission-creep-in-somalia/fe98b9e2-9ceb-45c3-babf-844a8a2671e9/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d33b4997411c [accessed 29th December 2018]

[61] Ibid.

[62] *Intervention: When, Why and How? Written evidence from the Humanitarian Intervention Centre*, UK Parliamentary Records, Session 2013-2014 – <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmdfence/writev/intervention/int10.htm> [accessed 30th December 2018]

Michael Walzer, *The Arguement about Humanitarian Intervention*, pp. 22-23

[63] Ibid.

Walking a Fine Line: The Pros and Cons of Humanitarian Intervention

Written by Niall Gray

[64] *United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 775*, United Nations Security Council, 28th August 1992 – [http://undocs.org/S/RES/775\(1992\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/775(1992)) [accessed 30th December 2018]

United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 794, United Nations Security Council, 3rd December 1992 – [http://undocs.org/S/RES/794\(1992\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/794(1992)) [accessed 30th December 2018]

Libya – Joint Letter from Nicholas Sarkozy, President of the Republic, and David Cameron, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, to Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council, Embassy of France in London, 10th March 2011 – <https://uk.ambafrance.org/Libya-France-and-UK-s-joint-letter> [accessed 30th December 2018]

[65] *Interview: Jonathan Powell*, Civil Service World, 5th January 2015 – <https://www.civilserviceworld.com/articles/interview/interview-jonathan-powell> [accessed 30th December 2018]

2018 Fragile States Index, Fund for Peace, 2018, p. 7 – <https://fundforpeace.org/fsi/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/951181805-Fragile-States-Index-Annual-Report-2018.pdf> [accessed 30th December 2018]

[66] Timothy Hildebrandt et al., *The Domestic Politics of Humanitarian Intervention: Public Opinion, Partisanship and Ideology*, Foreign Policy Analysis, No. 9 (2013), p. 250

[67] Andy Knight & Robert Murray, *The responsibility to protect in a Trump world*, Folio, 21st December 2016 – <https://www.folio.ca/opinion-the-responsibility-to-protect-in-a-trump-world/> [accessed 30th December 2018]

[68] Donald Trump, *Why did we spend billions of dollars of our money on Libya if we are not going to get any of the country's oil? What do we get out of this?*, Twitter (@realDonaldTrump), 21st October 2011 – <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/127387237007630337> [accessed 30th December 2018]

[69] Nicholas Rengger, *Just War and International Order: The Uncivil Condition in World Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 132

Written by: Niall Gray
Written at: University of Tartu
Written for: Eva Piirimäe
Date written: December 2018