

## **INTERVENTION (I)**

**HOFFMAN, SURVIVAL, 1996**

### CASE AGAINST MILITARY INTERVENTION

◆ STATE SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTS THE STATE'S PEOPLE FROM EXTERNAL CONTROL, BENEVOLENT PERHAPS, BUT ALIEN AND IMPOSED.

◆ THE SOVEREIGN STATE IS THE PROTECTOR OF ITS PEOPLE (LOCKE) AND AN EXPRESSION OF THEIR COLLECTIVE WILL (ROUSSEAU)

◆ EVEN IF THE STATE BEHAVES POORLY, FOREIGN INTRUSION IS A GREATER EVIL

◆ INTERVENTION IN THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF TURMOIL

## **INTERVENTION (II)**

### A CASE FOR MILITARY INTERVENTION

◆ SOVEREIGNTY IS NOT AN ABSOLUTE GOOD. WHEN A STATE VIOLATES THE RIGHTS OF ITS PEOPLE, THE STATE'S CLAIM TO FULL SOVEREIGNTY FAILS.

◆ THE CENTRAL ISSUE IS NOT DEFENSE OF A PEOPLE AGAINST OUTSIDER BUT THE WEIGHING OF MORAL CLAIMS. THE MORAL GOOD OF SOVEREIGNTY AT TIMES MUST YIELD TO SUPERIOR MORAL GOODS. AN APPLICATION OF THE JUST WAR DOCTRINE.

◆ INTERVENTION AT TIMES IS NECESSARY TO KEEP DOMESTIC TURMOIL FROM BECOMING REGIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL TURMOIL.

◆ MILIEU GOALS -- GLOBAL STABILITY AND GLOBAL HUMANITY

## **INTERVENTION (III)**

### WHEN OR WHY TO INTERVENE?

◆ DOMESTIC SITUATIONS THAT ARE DEEMED THREATS TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY.

◆ CASES OF MASSIVE AND SYSTEMIC SUFFERING.

◆ GENOCIDE ONLY?

◆BRUTAL AND LARGE-SCALE REPRESSION, POLICIES OF BARBARISM, MASSIVE BREAKDOWN OF LAW AND ORDER, EPIDEMICS, FLIGHTS OF REFUGEES, FAILED STATES?

## **INTERVENTION (IV)**

### WHO SHOULD INTERVENE?

◆TO AVOID PURELY SELF-INTEREST, UNILATERAL INTERVENTION IF EITHER OF THE TWO CRITERIA AS TO WHY AND:

◆AUTHORIZED BY THE UN OR WITH THE CONSENT OF THE UN

◆WHEN THE UN IS PARALYZED, ACTION IS LESS DAMAGING THAN INACTION, AND THE STATE HAS TRIED TO GET UN ENDORSEMENT

◆TO HELP A DEMOCRATIC STATE FIGHT REBELLION SUPPORTED FROM ABROAD OR TO PREVENT A FOREIGN-BACKED FORCE IMPOSE ITS WILL ON THE STATE

◆OTHERWISE COLLECTIVE INTERVENTION, AUTHORIZED BY THE UN

### INTERVENTION (V)

◆TO ACCOMPLISH WHAT AND WHAT DEGREE OF FORCE?

◆HUMANITARIAN RELIEF?

◆A SECURE ENVIRONMENT?

◆PEACE-ENFORCEMENT?

◆PEACE RESTORATION AND RESOLUTION?

## **INTERVENTION (VI)**

### REALITY

◆PRESUMPTION AGAINST UNILATERAL INTERVENTION WILL HOLD

◆CONTINUING PROBLEMS WITH COLLECTIVE INTERVENTION

◆MOST STATES HAVE NO ENTHUSIASM FOR MILITARY INTERVENTION

◆CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

- ◆ ABYSS BETWEEN DEMANDS AND THE CAPABILITIES OF THE UN
- ◆ GREAT POWERS IMMUNE
- ◆ UN SELECTIVITY
- ◆ SOME NUTS TOO HARD TO CRACK (RESOLVE)
- ◆ REQUIREMENT FOR SUPPORT BY THE US

## 105. THE MORALITY OF INTERVENTION

- ◆ CYNICS -- MORAL JUDGMENTS DO NOT MATTER
- ◆ SKEPTICS -- PRUDENCE : CHOICE BASED ON MOTIVE, MEANS, AND CONCERN FOR CONSEQUENCES
- ◆ REALISTS -- NATIONAL INTERESTS
- ◆ COSMOPOLITANS -- JUSTICE FOR INDIVIDUALS
- ◆ STATE MORALISTS -- STATE SOVEREIGNTY WITH EXCEPTIONS

PREVENTIVE INTERVENTION

SELF-DEFENSE OR DEFENSE OF ANOTHER STATE

MASSIVE VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

ASSIST SECESSION MOVEMENTS BASED ON SELF-DETERMINATION OR

JUST WAR DOCTRINE -- WORTHY GOAL, ACHIEVABLE GOAL, LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY, LAST RESORT, APPROPRIATE MEANS, CONCERN FOR NONCOMBATANTS & VICTIMS