

### Chapter 30: Humanitarian intervention in world politics

- Counter-restrictionists argue in favour of a legal right of humanitarian intervention based on interpretations of the UN Charter and customary international law.
- The claims for a moral duty of humanitarian intervention stem from the basic proposition that all individuals are entitled to a minimum level of protection from harm by virtue of their common humanity.
- States will not intervene for primarily humanitarian purposes.
- States should not place their citizens in harm's way in order to protect foreigners.
- A legal right of humanitarian intervention would be vulnerable to abuse as states employ humanitarian claims to cloak the pursuit of self-interest.
- States will apply principles of humanitarian intervention selectively.
- In the absence of consensus about what principles should guide humanitarian intervention, a right of humanitarian intervention would undermine international order.
- Humanitarian intervention will always be based on the cultural preferences of the powerful.
- The 1990s were described as a golden era of humanitarian activism because of a dramatic increase in the number of humanitarian interventions.
- Although some interventions were motivated by humanitarian concerns, others were not. Most interventions were prompted by mixed motives.
- The legality and legitimacy of humanitarian intervention remains hotly contested but a norm of intervention authorized by the Security Council emerged in the 1990s.
- Interventions tended to be more successful in stopping immediate killing and less successful in building long-term peace.
- Optimists argued that 9/11 injected self-interest into humanitarian endeavours, making states more likely to intervene to halt human suffering.
- Sceptics worried that the war on terror would 'crowd out' humanitarianism and encourage powerful states to cloak self interest in the veneer of humanitarian concern.
- There was a major debate about whether or not the war in Iraq could be justified as a legitimate humanitarian intervention.
- Iraq has made many states more wary of embracing a humanitarian exception to the rule of non-intervention.

- A combination of prudence and statism has contributed towards inactivity in the face of the humanitarian catastrophe in Darfur.
- The 'responsibility to protect' switches the focus from a debate about sovereignty versus human rights to a discussion of how best to protect endangered peoples.
- The ICISS report attempted to move the norm of humanitarian intervention forward by forging a new consensus around the criteria for judging when armed intervention for humanitarian purposes was justifiable.
- There are good reasons to think that criteria alone will not galvanize action or consensus in difficult cases.
- The responsibility to protect was adopted by states at the 2005 World Summit, but in a significantly revised form.