Saving Strangers Humanitarian Intervention In

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is intended to provide an effective framework for responding to crimes of genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. It is a response to the many conscious-shocking cases where atrocities - on the worst scale - have occurred even during the post 1945 period when the United Nations was built to save us all from the scourge of genocide. The R2P concept accords to sovereign states and international institutions a responsibility to assist peoples who are at risk - or experiencing - the worst atrocities. R2P maintains that collective action should be taken by members of the United Nations to prevent or halt such gross violations of basic human rights. This Handbook, containing contributions from leading theorists, and practitioners (including former foreign ministers and special advisors), examines the progress that has been made in the last 10 years; it also looks forward to likely developments in the next decade.

The topic of humanitarian intervention has become increasingly significant since the end of the Cold War. Despite a substantial body of literature on the subject in the past, recent developments justify a contemporary study of the subject. This book is not only timely, given the crises which have occasioned United Nations interventions over the past several years, but enduring, as international political structures undergo stress and reform, and as international law and international relations theorists grapple with the sovereignty/intervention problem. It defends the emergence of a right of humanitarian intervention and argues that state sovereignty is not incompatible with humanitarian intervention. After a thorough review of historical precedents, the book concludes by assessing contemporary developments in terms of sources of support for intervention on humanitarian grounds.

An examination of the ethical and political issues raised by the responses of Western states to refugees.

Although there is no international government, and no global police agency enforces the rules, nations obey international law. In this provocative study, Franck employs a broad range of historical, legal, sociological, anthropological, political, and philosophical modes of analysis to unravel the mystery of what makes states and people perceive rules as legitimate. Demonstrating that virtually all nations obey most rules nearly all of the time, Franck reveals that the more legitimate laws and institutions appear to be, the greater is their capacity for compliance. Distilling those factors which increase the perception of legitimacy, he shows how a community of rules can be fashioned from a system of sovereign states without creating a global leviathan.

Political Rationale and International Consequences of the War in Libya
The International Isolation of Kampuchea
Humanitarian Interven in Long 19Th C
Ethics and Humanity
Libya, the Responsibility to Protect and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention
Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas

This gripping and important book brings alive over two hundred years of humanitarian interventions. Freedom's Battle illuminates the passionate debates between conscience and imperialism ignited by the first human rights activists in the 19th century, and shows how a newly emergent free press galvanized British, American, and French citizens to action by exposing them to distant atrocities. Wildly romantic and full of bizarre enthusiasms, these activists were pioneers of a new political consciousness. And their legacy has much to teach us about today's human rights crises.

Against Massacre looks at the rise of humanitarian intervention in the nineteenth century, from the fall of Napoleon to the First World War. Examining the concept from a historical perspective, Davide Rodogno explores the understudied cases of European interventions and noninterventions in the Ottoman Empire and brings a new view to this international practice for the contemporary era. While it is commonly believed that humanitarian interventions are a fairly recent development, Rodogno demonstrates that almost two centuries ago an international community, under the aegis of certain European powers, claimed a moral and political right to intervene in other states' affairs to save strangers from massacre, atrocity, or extermination. On some occasions, these powers acted to protect fellow Christians when allegedly "uncivilized" states, like the Ottoman Empire, violated a "right to life." Exploring the political, legal, and moral status, as well as European perceptions, of the Ottoman Empire, Rodogno investigates the reasons that were put forward to exclude the Ottomans from the so-called Family of Nations. He considers the claims and mixed motives of intervening states for aiding humanity, the relationship between public outcry and state action or inaction, and the bias and selectiveness of governments and campaigners. An original account of humanitarian interventions some two centuries ago, Against Massacre investigates the varied consequences of European involvement in the Ottoman Empire and the lessons that can be learned for similar actions today.

This Brief sheds light on the motivation of humanitarian intervention from a theoretical and empirical point of view. An in-depth analysis of the theoretical arguments surrounding the issue of a legitimate motivation for humanitarian intervention demonstrate to what extent either altruism or national/self-interests are considered a righteous stimulus. The question about what constitutes a just intervention has been at the core of debates in Just War Theory for centuries. In particular in regards to humanitarian intervention it is oftentimes difficult to define the criteria for a righteous intervention. More than in conventional military interventions, the motivation and intention behind humanitarian intervention is a crucial factor. Whether the humanitarian intervention cases of the post-Cold War era were driven by altruistic or by self-interested considerations is a question is covered within and enables a comprehensive and holistic evaluation of the question of what motivates Western democracies to intervene or to abstain from intervention in humanitarian crises.

A singular development of the post Cold-War era is the use of military force to protect human beings. From Rwanda to Kosovo, Sierra Leone to East Timor, and more recently Libya to Côte d'Ivoire, soldiers have rescued some civilians in some of the world's most notorious war zones. Could more be saved? Drawing on over two decades of research, Thomas G. Weiss answers "yes" and provides a persuasive introduction to the theory and practice of humanitarian intervention in the modern world. He examines political, ethical, legal, strategic, economic, and operational dimensions and uses a wide range of cases to highlight key debates and controversies. The updated and expanded second edition of this succinct and highly accessible survey is neither celebratory nor complacent. The author locates the normative evolution of what is increasingly known as "the responsibility to protect" in the context of the global war on terror, UN debates, and such international actions as Libya. The result is an engaging exploration of the current dilemmas and future challenges for robust international humanitarian action in the twenty-first century.

The Power of Legitimacy Among Nations
A Critical Anthology
The Oxford Handbook of the Responsibility to Protect
Trusting Enemies
Violence and Democracy
Security and human rights
Saving StrangersHumanitarian Intervention in International SocietyOUP Oxford
An interdisciplinary approach to humanitarian intervention by experts in law, politics, and ethics.
Responsibility to Protect: Research, bibliography, background. Supplementary volume to the Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty

With some 50 million people living under duress and threatened by wars and disasters in 2012, the demand for relief worldwide has reached unprecedented levels. Humanitarianism is now a multi-billion dollar enterprise, and aid agencies are obliged to respond to a range of economic forces in order to 'stay in business'. In his customarily hard-hitting analysis, Thomas G. Weiss offers penetrating insights into the complexities and challenges of the contemporary humanitarian marketplace. In addition to changing political and military conditions that generate demand for aid, private suppliers have changed too: Today's political economy places aid agencies side-by-side with for-profit businesses, including private military and security companies, in a marketplace that also is linked to global trade networks in illicit arms, natural resources, and drugs. This witch's brew is simmering in the cauldron of wars that are often protracted and always costly to civilians who are the very targets of violence. While belligerents put a price-tag on access to victims, aid agencies pursue branding in a competition for 'scarce' resources relative to the staggering needs. As marketization encroaches on traditional humanitarianism, it seems everything may have a priceÑfrom access and principles, to moral authority and lives.

The Kosovo Report
Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations
Freedom's Battle
Should We Try to Save Strangers?
Humanitarian Interventions in the Ottoman Empire, 1815-1914
Against Massacre

Wayne Sandholtz and Kendall Stiles sketch the primary theoretical perspectives on international norm change, the 'legalisation' and 'transnational activist' approaches, and argue that both are limited by their focus on international rules as outcomes.

The destruction of the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire was an unprecedented tragedy. Even amidst the horrors of the First World War, Theodore Roosevelt insisted that it was the greatest crime of the conflict. The wartime mass killing of approximately one million Armenian Christians was the culmination of a series of massacres that Winston Churchill would later recall had roused publics on both sides of the Atlantic and inspired fervent appeals to save the Armenians. Sharing the Burden explains how the Armenian struggle for survival became so entangled with the debate over the international role of the United States as it rose to world power status in the early twentieth century. In doing so, Charlie Laderman provides a fresh perspective on the role of humanitarian intervention in US foreign policy, Anglo-American relations, and the emergence of a new world order after World War I. The United States' responsibility to protect the Armenians was a central preoccupation of Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. Both American and British leaders proposed an Anglo-American alliance to take joint responsibilities for the Middle East and envisioned a US intervention to secure an independent Armenia as key to the new League of Nations. The Armenian question illustrates how policymakers, missionaries, and the public grappled for the first time with atrocities on this scale. It also reveals the values that animated American society during this pivotal period in the nation's foreign relations. Deepening understanding of the Anglo-American special relationship and its role in reforming global order, Sharing the Burden illuminates the possibilities, limitations, and continued dilemmas of humanitarian intervention in international politics.

At what point can we concede that the realities of world politics require that moral principles be compromised, and how do we know when a real limit has been reached? This volume gathers leading constructivist scholars to explore the issue of moral limit and possibility in global political dilemmas. The contributors examine pressing ethical challenges such as sanctions, humanitarian intervention, torture, the self-determination of indigenous peoples, immigration, and the debate about international criminal tribunals and amnesties in cases of atrocity. Their analyses entail theoretical and empirical claims about the conditions of possibility and limits of moral change in world politics, therefore providing insightful leverage on the ethical question of 'what ought we to do?' This is a valuable contribution to the growing field of normative theory in International Relations and will appeal to scholars and advanced students of international ethics and political theory.

Some view humanitarian intervention as little more than a rationale for Wester neo-imperialism, while others see intervention as a major weapon in the crusade for democracy and individual rights. Michael Newman advances a different position. Through a critique of current international policies and an examination of their impact on developing and transitional countries, Newman argues that military intervention often works against efforts to establish a sustainable peace. While he endorses a "responsibility to protect" those whose rights are compromised by the state, Newman interprets protection much more radically than other theorists, combining policy with a conception of humanitarianism that accounts for poverty and inequality. Humanitarian Intervention will resonate with those who both oppose recent Anglo-American foreign policy and agree that "something must be done" to save victims of atrocity. By bringing together a range of disciplines, Newman provides an invaluable resource for students of international relations, contemporary history, law, politics, and peace and conflict studies, as well as those who work with NGOs.

International Norms and Cycles of Change
Conflict, International Response, Lessons Learned
Moral Imperialism
Theoretical and Empirical Considerations
Sharing the Burden
Humanitarian Military Intervention
Proceedings of a conference sponsored by Procedural Aspects of International Law Institute and Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, held in Charlottesville on March 11-12, 1972.

"There is a veritable cottage industry of books on humanitarian intervention (the use of military force to stop atrocities) and the vast majority favors the project. The Conceit of Humanitarian Intervention challenges this consensus by pointing up the strategic, legal, and ethical problems associated with it. The book also disputes the claim that humanitarian intervention, particularly as manifested in the doctrine of "The Responsibility to Protect," has become a universal norm that offers a comprehensive and effective solution to mass killing"--

An account of the origins of violence, its consequences, its uses, and the relationship between violence and democracy.

When foreign powers attack civilians, other countries face an impossible dilemma. Two courses of action emerge: either to retaliate against an abusive government on behalf of its victims, or to remain spectators. Either course offers its own perils: the former, lost lives and resources without certainty of restoring peace or preventing worse problems from proliferating; the latter, cold spectatorship that leaves a country at the mercy of corrupt rulers or to revolution. Philosophers Fernando Tesón and Bas van der Vossen offer contrasting views of humanitarian intervention, defining it as either war aimed at ending tyranny, or as violence. The authors employ the tools of impartial modern analytic philosophy, particularly just war theory, to substantiate their claims. According to Tesón, a humanitarian intervention has the same just cause as a justified revolution: ending tyranny. He analyzes the different kinds of just cause and whether or not an intervener may pursue other justified causes. For Tesón, the permissibility of humanitarian intervention is almost exclusively determined by the rules of proportionality. Bas van der Vossen, by contrast, holds that military intervention is morally impermissible in almost all cases. Justified interventions, Van der Vossen argues, must have high ex ante chance of success. Analyzing the history and prospects of intervention shows that they almost never do. Tesón and van der Vossen refer to concrete cases, and weigh the consequences of continued or future intervention in Syria, Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia, Iraq, Lybia and Egypt. By placing two philosophers in dialogue, Debating Humanitarian Intervention is not constrained by a single, unifying solution to the exclusion of all others. Rather, it considers many conceivable actions as judged by analytic philosophy, leaving the reader equipped to make her own, informed judgments.

Humanitarian Business
Iraq, Bosnia and Rwanda
Humanitarian Intervention and Safety Zones
Motivations for Humanitarian intervention
The Evolution of the Doctrine and Practice of Humanitarian Intervention
Ethical Demand and Political Reality

The war in Kosovo was a turning point: NATO deployed its armed forces in war for the first time, and placed the controversial doctrine of 'humanitarian intervention' squarely in the world's eye. It was an armed intervention for the purpose of implementing Security Council resolutions-but without Security Council authorization.This report tries to answer a number of burning questions, such as why the international community was unable to act earlier and prevent the escalation of the conflict, as well as focusing on the capacity of the United Nations to act as global peacekeeper.The Commission recommends a new status for Kosovo, 'conditional independence', with the goal of lasting peace and security for Kosovo-and for the Balkan region in general. But many of the conslusions may be beneficially applied to conflicts the world-over.

The changing legitimacy of humanitarian intervention is examined here, by comparing the international response to cases of humanitarian intervention in the Cold War and post-Cold War periods.

This Oxford Handbook is the definitive volume on the state of international security and the academic field of security studies. It provides a tour of the most innovative and exciting news areas of research as well as major developments in established lines of inquiry. It presents a comprehensive portrait of an exciting field, with a distinctively forward-looking theme, focusing on the question: what does it mean to think about the future of international security? The key assumption underpinning this volume is that all scholarly claims about international security, both normative and positive, have implications for the future. By examining international security to extract implications for the future, the volume provides clarity about the real meaning and practical implications for those involved in this field. Yet, contributions to this volume are not exclusively forecasts or prognostications, and the volume reflects the fact that, within the field of security studies, there are diverse views on how to think about the future. Readers will find in this volume some of the most influential mainstream (positivist) voices in the field of international security as well as some of the best known scholars representing various branches of critical thinking about security. The topics covered in the Handbook range from conventional international security themes such as arms control, alliances and Great Power politics, to "new security" issues such as global health, the roles of non-state actors, cyber-security, and the power of visual representations in international security. The Oxford Handbooks of International Relations is a twelve-volume set of reference books offering authoritative and innovative engagements with the principal sub-fields of International Relations. The series as a whole is under the General Editorship of Christian Reus-Smit of the University of Queensland and Duncan Snidal of the University of Oxford, with each volume edited by a distinguished pair of specialists in their respective fields. The series both surveys the broad terrain of International Relations scholarship and reshapes it, pushing each sub-field in challenging new directions. Following the example of the original Reus-Smit and Snidal The Oxford Handbook of International Relations, each volume is organized around a strong central thematic by a pair of scholars drawn from alternative perspectives, reading its sub-field in an entirely new way, and pushing scholarship in challenging new directions.

A Widow of Babong
Humanitarian Intervention in International Society
Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations

Saving Strangers
Moral Limit and Possibility in World Politics

The Armenian Question, Humanitarian Intervention, and Anglo-American Visions of Global Order

Military intervention in a conflict without a reasonable prospect of success is unjustifiable, especially when it is done in the name of humanity. Couched in the debate on the responsibility to protect civilians from violence and drawing on traditional 'just war' principles, the central premise of this book is that humanitarian military intervention can be justified as a policy option only if decision makers can be reasonably sure that intervention will do more good than harm. This book asks, 'Have past humanitarian military interventions been successful?' It defines success as saving lives and sets out a methodology for estimating the number of lives saved by a particular military intervention. Analysis of 17 military operations in six conflict areas that were the defining cases of the 1990s-northern Iraq after the Gulf War, Somalia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, Kosovo and East Timor-shows that the majority were successful by this measure. In every conflict studied, however, some military interventions succeeded while others failed, raising the question, 'Why have some past interventions been more successful than others?' This book argues that the central factors determining whether a humanitarian intervention succeeds are the objectives of the intervention and the military strategy employed by the intervening states. Four types of humanitarian military intervention are offered: helping to deliver emergency aid, protecting aid operations, saving the victims of violence and defeating the perpetrators of violence. The focus on strategy within these four types allows an exploration of the political and military dimensions of humanitarian intervention and highlights the advantages and disadvantages of each of the four types. Humanitarian military intervention is controversial. Scepticism is always in order about the need to use military force because the consequences can be so dire. Yet it has become equally controversial not to intervene when a governmentsubjects its citizens to massive violation of their basic human rights. This book recognizes the limits of humanitarian intervention but does not shy away from suggesting how military force can save lives in extreme circumstances.

This book critically analyses the 2011 intervention in Libya arguing that the manner in which the intervention was sanctioned, prosecuted and justified has a number of troubling implications for the both the future of humanitarian intervention and international peace and security.

"The book offers contrasting views of humanitarian intervention - a war aimed at ending tyranny. Fernando Tesaon

Should states use military force for humanitarian purposes? What are the challenges to international society posed by humanitarian intervention in a post-September 11th world? This path-breaking work brings together well-known scholars of law, philosophy, and international relations, together with practitioners who have been actively engaged in intervention during the past decade. Together, this team provides practical and theoretical answers to one of the most burning issues of our day. Case studies include Somalia, Rwanda, the Balkans, and East Timor, as well as the recent US intervention in Afghanistan. The book demonstrates why humanitarian intervention continues to be a controversial issue not only for the United Nations but also for Western states and humanitarian organizations.

Who Should Intervene?

Challenges for Humanitarian Intervention

Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty

The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention

The Ethics and Politics of Asylum

Punishing the Poor

"How can two enemies, locked into a spiral of fear and insecurity, transform their relationship into a trusting one? Trusting Enemies argues that the field of International Relations has not done a good job of answering this question. This is because it has been looking in the wrong place. Where trust-building has been theorized by the discipline of International Relations, the focus has been on the state and the individual. This book argues that there is a need to appreciate the importance of a new level of analysis in trust research-the interpersonal. In its development of a theory of interpersonal trust between state leaders in adversarial relationships, this book argues that the obstacles to leaders sincerely signalling their peaceful intent can be overcome and that trust-based relationships provide the greatest assurance of accurate signal interpretation. This book examines three cases: the interaction between US and Soviet leaders Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev and its role in ending the cold war; the interaction between Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and its role in the Lahore peace process of 1998-9; and the interactions across 2009-10 between Barack Obama and Ayatollah Ali Khamenei that did not lead to a breakthrough in the US-Iranian nuclear relationship"(ed.)

This book explores attempts to develop a more acceptable account of the principles and mechanisms associated with humanitarian intervention, which has become known as the 'Responsibility to Protect' (R2P). Cases of genocide and mass violence have raised endless debates about the theory and practice of humanitarian intervention to save innocent lives. Since the humanitarian tragedies in Rwanda, Burundi, Bosnia, Kosovo and elsewhere, states have begun advocating a right to undertake interventions to stop mass violations of human rights from occurring. Their central concern rests with whether the UN's current regulations on the use of force meet the challenges of the post-Cold War world, and in particular the demands of addressing humanitarian emergencies. International actors tend to agree that killing civilians as a necessary part of state formation is no longer acceptable, nor is standing by idly in the face of massive violations of human rights. And yet, respect for the sovereign rights of states remains central among the ordering principles of the international community. How can populations affected by egregious human rights violations be protected? How can the legal constraints on the use of force and respect for state sovereignty be reconciled with the international community's willingness and readiness to take action in such instances? And more importantly, how can protection be offered when the Security Council, which is responsible for authorizing the use of force when threats to international peace and security occur, is paralyzed? The author addresses these issues, arguing that R2P is the best framework available at present to move the humanitarian intervention debate forward. This book will be of interest to students of the responsibility to protect, war and conflict studies, human security, international organisations, security studies and IR in general. Violence or the potential for violence is a fact of human existence. Many societies, including our own, reward martial success or skill at arms. The ways in which members of a particular society use force reveal a great deal about the nature of authority within the group and about its members' priorities. Martha Finnemore uses one type of force, military intervention, as a window onto the shifting character of international society. She examines the changes, over the past 400 years, in why countries intervene militarily as well as in the ways they have intervened. It is not the fact of intervention that has altered, she says, but rather the reasons for and meaning behind intervention-the conventional understanding of the purposes for which states can and should use force. Finnemore looks at three types of intervention: collecting debts, addressing humanitarian crises, and acting against states perceived as threats to international peace. In all three, she finds that what is now considered "obvious" was vigorously contested or even rejected by people in earlier periods for well-articulated and logical reasons. A broad historical perspective allows her to explicate long-term trends: the steady erosion of force's normative value in international politics, the growing influence of equality norms in many aspects of global political life, and the increasing importance of law in intervention practices.

The extent to which humanitarian intervention has become a legitimate practice in post-cold war international society is the subject of this book. It maps the changing legitimacy of humanitarian intervention by comparing the international response to cases of humanitarian intervention in the cold war and post-cold war periods. Crucially, the book examines how far international society has recognised humanitarian intervention as a legitimate exception to the rules of sovereignty and non-intervention and non-use of force. While there are studies of each case of intervention-in East Pakistan, Cambodia, Uganda, Iraq, Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Kosovo-there is no single work that examines them comprehensively in a comparative framework. Each chapter tells a story of intervention that weaves together a study of motives, justifications and outcomes. The legitimacy of humanitarian intervention is contested by the 'pluralist' and 'solidarist' wings of the English school, and the book charts the stamp of these conceptions on state practice. Solidarism lacks a full-blown theory of humanitarian intervention and the book supplies one. This theory is employed to assess the humanitarian qualifications of the cases of intervention analysed in the book, and this normative assessment is then compared to the moral practices of states. A key focus is to examine how far humanitarian intervention as a legitimate practice is present in the diplomatic dialogue of states. In exploring how far there has been a change of norm in the society of states in the 1990s, the book defends the broad based constructivist claim that state actions will be constrained if they cannot be legitimated, and that new norms enable new practices but do not determine these. The book concludes by considering how far contemporary practices of humanitarian intervention support a new solidarism, and how far this resolves the traditional conflict between order and justice in international society.

The Purpose of Intervention

Confronting the Contradictions

The Conceit of Humanitarian Intervention

The Oxford Handbook of International Security

Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect

Debating Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility To Protect considers who should undertake humanitarian intervention in response to an ongoing or impending humanitarian crisis, such as found in Rwanda in early 1994, Kosovo in 1999, and Darfur more recently. The doctrine of the responsibility to protect asserts that when a state is failing to uphold its citizens' human rights, the international community has a responsibility to protect these citizens, including by undertaking humanitarian intervention. It is unclear, however, which particular agent should be tasked with this responsibility. Should we prefer intervention by the UN, NATO, a regional or subregional organization (such as the African Union), a state, a group of states, or someone else? This book answers this question by, first, determining which qualities of interveners are morally significant and, second, assessing the relative importance of these qualities. For instance, is it important that an intervener have a humanitarian motive? Should an intervener be welcomed by those it is trying to save? How important is it that an intervener will be effective and what does this mean in practice? The book then considers the more empirical question of whether (and to what extent) the current interveners actually possess these qualities, and therefore should intervene. For instance, how effective can we expect UN action to be in the future? Is NATO likely to use humanitarian means? Overall, it develops a particular normative conception of legitimacy for humanitarian intervention. It uses this conception of legitimacy to assess not only current interveners, but also the desirability of potential reforms to the mechanisms and agents of humanitarian intervention.

The extent to which humanitarian intervention has become a legitimate practice in post-cold war international society is the subject of this book. It maps the changing legitimacy of humanitarian intervention by comparing the international response to cases of humanitarian intervention in the cold war and post-cold war periods. Crucially, the book examines how far international society has recognised humanitarian intervention as a legitimate exception to the rules of sovereignty and non-intervention and non-use of force. While there are studies of each case of intervention-in East Pakistan, Cambodia, Uganda, Iraq, Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Kosovo-there is no single work that examines them comprehensively in a comparative framework. Each chapter tells a story of intervention that weaves together a study of motives, justifications and outcomes. The legitimacy of humanitarian intervention is contested by the 'pluralist' and 'solidarist' wings of the English school, and the bookcharts the stamp of these conceptions on state practice. Solidarism lacks a full-blown theory of humanitarian intervention and the book supplies one. This theory is employed to assess the humanitarian qualifications of the cases of intervention analysed in the book, and this normative assessment is then compared to the moral practices of states. A key focus is to examine how far humanitarian intervention as a legitimate practice is present in the diplomatic dialogue of states. In exploringhow far there has been a change of norm in the society of states in the 1990s, the book defends the broad based constructivist claim that state actions will be constrained if they cannot be legitimated, and that new norms enable new practices but do not determine these. The book concludes by considering how far contemporary practices of humanitarian intervention support a new solidarism, and how far this resolves the traditional conflict between order and justice in international society.

Ethics and Humanity pays to tribute to Jonathan Glover, a pioneering figure whose thought and personal influence have had a significant impact on applied philosophy. In topics that include genetic engineering, abortion, euthanasia, war, and moral responsibility, Glover has made seminal contributions. The papers collected here, written by some of the most distinguished contemporary moral philosophers, address topics to which Glover has contributed, with particular emphasis on problems of conflict discussed in his book, Humanity: A Moral History of the Twentieth Century. There are also moving testaments to the influence Glover has had on colleagues, students, and friends. Glover himself contributes a series of fine replies, which constitute an important addition to his published work.

Ten new essays critique the practice armed humanitarian intervention, and the 'Responsibility to Protect' doctrine that advocates its use under certain circumstances. The contributors investigate the causes and consequences, as well as the uses and abuses, of armed humanitarian intervention. One enduring concern is that such interventions are liable to be employed as a foreign policy instrument by powerful states pursuing geo-political interests. Some of the chapters interrogate how the presence of ulterior motives impact on the moral credentials of armed humanitarian intervention. Others shine a light on the potential adverse effects of such interventions, even where they are motivated primarily by humanitarian concern. The volume also tracks the evolution of the R2P norm, and draws attention to how it has evolved, for better or for worse, since UN member states unanimously accepted it over a decade ago. In some respects the norm has been distorted to yield prescriptions, and to impose constraints, fundamentally at odds with the spirit of the R2P idea. This gives us all the more reason to be cautious of unwarranted optimism about humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect.

Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force

Interpersonal Relationships in International Conflict

Humanitarian Intervention

Themes from the Philosophy of Jonathan Glover

The Conditions for Success and Failure

The Responsibility to Protect

Neither willing to engage in a meaningful way to save targeted civilians in Iraq, Bosnia and Rwanda nor to stand entirely aside as massive violations of humanitarian law occurred, states embraced safety zones as a means to 'do something' whilst avoiding being drawn into open warfare. Humanitarian Intervention and Safety Zones: Iraq, Bosnia and Rwanda explores why and how effectively safety zones were implemented as a way to protect civilians and displaced persons in three of the most important conflicts of the 1990s. It shows how states consistently sought to reconcile their political and humanitarian interests, a process which often led to problematic and ambiguous outcomes, and assesses in fascinating detail the difficulties and controversies surrounding the use of such zones, variously called safe havens, safe areas, secure humanitarian areas, and zones humanitaires sûres . The book also asks whether or not such zones could serve as precedents for possible future attempts to ensure the safety of civilians in complex humanitarian emergencies.

Political Rationale and International Consequences of the War in Libya focuses on the international intervention in Libya in 2011, and tries to answer two broad questions; (1) What was the political rationale for the various actors to proceed as they did in the lead-up and conduct of the military intervention in Libya?, (2) What are the consequences of the UN-authorized military intervention in Libya? R2P was the public raison d'etre of the war, and an important legitimizing factor of the intervention. Still, the humanitarian situation was a necessary, but not in and by itself an adequate precondition for intervention. A number of factors coalesced to enable the intervention. While the humanitarian situation triggered the intervention, in reality a variety of national interests governed the approach by the various international actors, and more often than not, these motives were not rooted in the particular circumstances in Libya. The book offers a combination of unique perspectives. While the perspectives of the US, France, and the UK on the Libyan Crisis/War have been well documented, the Arabic and Scandinavian political and military dynamics have been much less so. While the perspectives of NATO, the UN, and R2P have been debated, the view from the Arab League and African Union (AU) have been less in focus. The volume redresses that imbalance and offers the most broad-ranging analysis yet of a key moment in recent international relations.

Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility To Protect

Liberal Democracy and the Response to Refugees