

# Humanitarian intervention

Business



Humanitarian intervention is the entry of another country's armed force into a different country with the objective of protecting the people of that country by preventing violation of human rights.

The citizens of that country are protected against any acts of inhumanity. A good example is the humanitarian interventions in Somalia. After Somalia was submerged in a civil war the United Nation being led by the US intervened. The intervention was necessary in order to prevent the loss of many civilian lives from rival groups which were fighting. The nation of Somalia was hit by some drought at the time of the civil war and it was very necessary for an intervention to be effected at least to provide relief food the civilians (Talentino 85).

Despite the benefits that are gained from interventions there have been many dilemmas and challenges surrounding humanitarian intervention. For instance, there have been arguments from many countries receiving humanitarian intervention arguing that powerful nations use this strategy to justify their armed incursions in their homeland (Weiss 2). This paper explores the idea that humanitarian intervention works in some cases but fails to accomplish its objective in others. Humanitarian interventions are governed by United Nations in pursuit of maintaining peace in all nations. The United Nations policy warns its members from using their international relational powers for activities that do not lead to territorial integrity and other activities which go against political sovereignty of other nations. Some of the dilemmas that have been raised include inappropriate time for intervention.

Despite the fact that humanitarian intervention is mainly aimed at protecting the rights and lives of the minority, it is still not clear about the right time when other nations should come in to help. Some of the other issues include the balancing of the majority and minority rights and the acceptable amount of damage and death during the operations conducted by the humanitarian military. In addition to that, it still remains unclear on the interventions that should be employed during the community reconstructing exercise. When did humanitarian intervention begun? This relief process has been in existence for several years. Humanitarian operations can only be deployed because of national issues like human compounded disasters like war and famine.

Other occurrences that have long lead to such interventions include but not limited to natural disasters like hurricanes and floods. The reason why the international community feels obliged to send help is because of the great damage that innocent citizens encounter. Natural and human compounded disasters are usually characterized by great damage and pain. Citizens of the affected nation greatly suffer during these incidences forcing the international community to intervene and restore peace and offer humanitarian aid. Help is usually given in form of food, clothing and shelter.

Besides this, military forces are supposed to ensure the security of the minority but humanitarian intervention solely focuses on protecting citizens of the affected nation (Weiss 2). Intervention with an aim of caring for victims of natural disasters and wars is a practice with a long history. The US has shown exceptional attitude towards carrying out humanitarian interventions. Change has been effected because of the institutionalized <https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

structures which have been developed to offer relief to victims of human and natural misfortunes. The trend of people and states to responding to calamity victims has greatly changed. For instance during the Second World War many intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations provided humanitarian assistance to the war victims in numerous ways.

This trend has led to an increased number of institutionalized organizations which have been developed to offer the needed help during such difficult times. It should be noted that carrying out humanitarian intervention is not generally accepted as there are schools of thought who view it as a waste of time. This mostly occurs in the developed countries which are mostly responsible for offering humanitarian interventions. Many a times the practice has been viewed as a waste of the tax payers' money. Others have questioned the authority and legality of eliminating and ending human distress in countries where there are wars. Another contentious issue is whether employment of forcible interventions like the use of military to end human suffering and distress by protecting their human rights is acceptable.

These interventions have been made in order to change the underlying situations which create a lot of distress. The employed interventions do not usually indicate whether force will be applied in calming or changing the underlying situation though in the recent past, usage of force has been indicated (Jokic 49). The use of force in carrying out humanitarian intervention has been hotly debated. Since the intervention is aimed at restoring peace, this approach remains controversial. Many nations and people have been left to wonder if these interventions are really working in

protecting humanity or not. Additionally, the interventions are meant to be short term and not long term as many may perceive.

The humanitarian interventions that were used after the Second World War turned out to be long term interventions since these nations continued in their support by promoting national development. For instance, the civilians received long term protection as opposed to short term protection. Some of the activities which were used in form of humanitarian intervention included long term promotion of social and economic development besides peace keeping. Consequently, many people feel that promotion of activities like development and social wellbeing has made the humanitarian interventions to lose its direction. One of the major discussions in public international law is humanitarian interventions. The American government has been inspired by self interest and humanitarianism in reaching out to other nations during times of disaster.

Many people have contested the idea of intervention for enhancement of people's well being because they believe that the essence of intervening is just being humane. Others believe that the interventions which are made are driven by personal interests. Some research that was conducted by biologists indicated that humanitarian intervention is neither entirely selfish nor purely altruistic. In the 20th century many borders were eroded and as a result the old concepts of the international community which were based on self interest became inappropriate. The developed international law gave the international community the chance to intervene in order to end human distress (Jokic 49).

Some experts view humanitarian intervention as the deployment of military force with an aim of protecting human right violation victims. The passion for humanitarian intervention developed because of the peacekeeping mission of the United Nations and numerous movements of human rights. Another important factor that promoted humanitarian intervention is the numerous television images of the suffering people because of the abuse of their rights. Historical occurrences for instance the recent genocide which was about to take place in Rwanda in Africa have made people, states and organizations to realize that something needs to be done in case an explosion of human right crisis occurs. There is much complexity surrounding humanitarian intervention despite the fact that it appears to be a moral necessity. Besides that it's better to intervene than to do nothing when innocent people are being killed.

An implementation of foreign policies which will govern values rather than interests seems to be a good idea though there are many questions to be desired when peacemakers are deployed to protect one group among the two groups involved in war or conflict. Despite the fact that humanitarian intervention is a reasonable resolution, the truth is that it always interferes with the affairs and roles of non governmental humanitarian organizations which are structured to solve such issues. Besides that, coming in as peacemakers to protect the human rights of one group automatically shows that political sides have been taken and political neutrality is no longer in operation. Humanitarian interventions have often led to humanitarian aid militarization this is because the incoming peacemakers usually create conflicts for the humanitarian non governmental organizations. Many times

when the deployed foreign military or peacekeepers stay within the restrained boundaries, they offer little help. For example the United Nations peacekeeping force just watched as violence unfolded in Srebrenica when thousands of Muslims perished.

At the same time some of the attempts to change the restraints in order to save lives failed to work because they were considered as self interest interventions. In other scenarios, humanitarian interventions have been used as a way of avoiding participation in ongoing war therefore the purpose of saving lives or bringing peace are hindered. For example the European and United States used humanitarian intervention to avoid participating in the Rwandan war. In case the deployed military members are killed during the war then many states usually decide to retrieve. A good example is Belgian whose peacekeepers left Rwanda after some of their people were killed.

Therefore the option of using the military as humanitarian intervention is only moral and theoretically prudent because it cannot work in real or practical situations (Barnett par 5). This implies that the intervention does not work in some cases. It is not clear if the United Nation peacekeeping policy gave a way for the massive explosions and killings of the Kosovo Albanians. The incident invited many questions because many experts believed that early military deployment would have reduced the massive killings to a very large extent. This incidence made many critics like David Rieff to disagree about the effectiveness of humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention in protecting human rights and whether it still works.

In his book Rieff says that the world has become violent and too complex therefore the ethnic and ideological conflicts that need humanitarian interventions are types of conflicts which are intractable and brutal. Such conflicts are usually followed by civil wars in addition to political instability therefore even if best humanitarian intervention is deployed they are not able to create peace, political and social stability. In most cases, when the humanitarian interventions succeed at their objectives they usually use this opportunity to create structures for nation building and other far reaching policies. Most of the times humanitarian interventions are used to prevent blood shed by maintaining peace and this can only work as long as peacekeepers are around. At times the deployed military acting at the capacity of peacekeepers stay until peace negotiations start. It is important to realize that the humanitarian aid does not usually resolve the issues which led to the conflict.

The only thing they usually do is to buy time because this strategy helps to save lives. Some experts and scholars think that religions can offer best resources which can be used to solve issues that make the people engage in conflict. Though this idea is still under discussion, experts who have studied traditions and religious communities think that the two are important sources of conflict resolution (Barnett par 5). The proponents of humanitarian intervention think that incorporation of some ethical and religious principles in the principles governing the humanitarian bodies will yield much fruit in protecting human rights. Religion is seen as an instrumental factor because most of its value advocates for charity, compassion and love among everybody. It promotes reconciliation and



justice and therefore it can be used to promote ways that benefits human community.

Some scholars think that establishment of religious teachings which are universal to major traditions followed by incorporation into the legality of human rights makes internal human rights law universal and humanitarian interventions beneficial. Such an initiative will eliminate the allegations that the human rights laws are biased culturally. The world's religion core values are responsibility for neighbors and believe in the integrity of every person. These religious values and many others can be used to resolve war in a better way if they can be incorporated into international human right laws. Some scholars think that a combination of cultural practices and core religious teaching can help solve the issues which make many nations start conflicts. These aspects can be used to create humanitarian morality in nations where conflict and war is looming.

Therefore greater specificity and ethical clarity can only occur when moral principles and religious core values are incorporated in the legislation of international war crimes and United Nations charter laws. A coherent humanitarian intervention policy can be created when legal understanding of morality and religion is reinforced. Therefore religion-ethical legal structures can successfully be used by the international community to provide the needed humanitarian interventions. If such amendments are made there will be no need for new laws because restructuring of the existing laws will be enough (Barnett par 7). There are a number of theories which are used to solve the issue of whether the international body ought to carry out

humanitarian intervention. For instance the naturalist theories explain that international norms which are morally binding are a natural world feature.

This characteristic was discovered through experience and reasoning.

Naturalist theories explain that some natural features have a moral significance which cannot be altered easily. On the contrary the consensualist theories guiding international justice argue that moral authority as a result of a given international norm is powered by tacit or explicit consent of the people that are under that norm. Therefore just norms are usually created and not discovered and for this reason they are supposed to be fruitful or product of consent. Just norms should be binding on the agreement made between the involved parties.

Another major concern is about the rightful objects of attention. International justice individualist theories are only concerned with the well being of individual human beings. Despite the fact that the international community is entirely associated with the well being of individuals, this law contradicts itself through another law. The international justice collectivist theories maintain that states, races, and ethnic groups are the correct objects of moral concern. It is important to note that collectivist theory focus on groups in non aggregative conditions for instance they don't consider their rights, preferences or even interests. This further means that groups worth protection may have independent interests which may be conflicting with those of other members.

Another ethical concern about humanitarian intervention is the appropriate moral concern weight and this is defined by egalitarian theories which insist

that objects of moral concern are entitled and subject to equal treatment. Therefore no unequal treatment should be allowed to happen. Despite the emphasis in egalitarian theory for equal treatment, the inegalitarian theories give space for unequally treatment of the object of moral concern. About the issue of moral concern breadth, the Universalist theory responds to it by arguing that proper moral concern objects are all relevant agents. On the contrary to the given provision the particularist theories hold that moral concern should be on a few or some human beings as opposed to all. For instance, some states, nations and races qualify while others do not qualify.

Therefore not everyone can be a proper moral concern object. Some of the principle justice theories of humanitarian interventions include natural law, communitarianism, utilitarianism, social contractarianism and legal positivism. One of the naturalistic doctrines is utilitarianism which holds that a just action is the one as opposed to negative to all the concerned parties (Barnett par 5). Basing on utilitarian the consequences of the taken action is quite fundamental. Therefore whether conduct is good or bad remains neutral because the most important thing is the impact of the action on the well being of the people. Consequently, the effects are what make it to be rated as bad or good.

Utilitarianism is considered naturalist because of its standing on human well being as an action that is intrinsic good. This theory is considered by many scholars and analysts as individualist, Universalist and egalitarian because it only cares and counts for one and not more than one. Issues that have been raised about utilitarianism are mainly because of the unspecified well being. Many scholars think that it is too general therefore for it to be considered

<https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

effective it has to be specified. Most of the utilitarians of the last century argue that good acts are those which satisfy the preferences of individuals. Some supporters of utilitarianism argue that people usually want things that are realistically attainable as opposed to what they really desire.

Therefore in their opinion what should be maximized is human welfare as opposed to subjective preferences. On addition to that analyst and scholars insist that the specification of the object to be used for moral evaluation is very important. This is because the utilitarian act indicates that each human action can be used as a moral evaluation object. This is because by just saying that each human object can be used for moral evaluation they are not considering the fact that the direct and immediate outcome can be more favorable to all concerned parties than unfavorable. On the other hand this provision is contradicted by the utilitarians' rule which identify specific class of actions as the best moral evaluation objects (Meggle 189). Utilitarians rule therefore indicate that an act is considered to be just as long as it follows the set rules which when adopted human well being aggregately increases greatly than the adoption of any other available sets of rules.

For example the utilitarian act is fully contended with the result of a given moral action while the utilitarian rule argues that adoption and faithful adherence to the given provision or act advances human well being. Therefore utilitarian act justifies any humanitarian intervention if its consequences or results promote human well being. For this reason any humanitarian intervention that reduces or diminishes human well being is considered unjust while interventions promoting the people's well being are considered just. This plainly means that a humanitarian intervention that

<https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

saves more lives than those lost is just while that which costs more lives than it saves is considered unjust. In other words the humanitarian interventions which are usually employed usually costs some lives therefore they are only justified when the lives that have been lost are less than those which have been saved. Basing on the utilitarian act the Tanzanian intervention in Uganda was rated just because there were many lives that were saved by overthrowing Idi Amin.

On the other hand, the Indian intervention in Bangladesh would be rated unjust because they are many lives that were lost during the time that the Indian military was in Bangladesh than those who were saved. The utilitarianism act has been criticized because of the generalization of very few and very many people. Despite of the lack of specificity utilitarianism acts obliges people to help those who are bound to gain more from the assistance given compared to what the providers would loose. Additionally, this act urges people to help others until the one offering help and the one receiving it reaches the same level. This is the reason why some analysts emphasize that it will be so unfair for the international community to refuse to offer assistance to another nation when the services they will be offering will yield more positive deeds than the losses which they will incur by helping.

The extreme consequences of utilitarianism act are altruism as result of Universalist premises, egalitarian and individualist. For this reason what is needed most is moral obligation because it is considered to be more important than women and men moral capacities. On the contrary, the humanitarian intervention principle of utilitarianism act asks very little

<https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

because it fails to ban some actions and interventions which are intuitively wrong. Any kind of military action is allowed as long as many lives are saved than lost. For example the murder of ten civilian radio television Serbia employees by NATO during the operation allied force in Belgrade is justifiable under the utilitarian act because many lives were saved at Kosovo as opposed to ten lost lives (Meggle 190). Natural law sharply contradicts with the utilitarianism act because it emphasizes that some damages and harm are not acceptable unless they are exceptional or they qualify.

On the other hand, the utilitarian rule chooses rules as proper moral evaluation objects. This is because significant human well being is achieved through coordinated actions of great agents of many people. The maximization of the utility generated from the act only results when one determines what is most likely to be done by many people. Though it is not very easy to determine the choice of many people because of the many act utilitarian agents, this can only be achieved when rules are enforced and people have to agree to adhere to those rules. One of the many challenges of the utilitarian rule is that trust is eroded when people fail to adhere to set rules. Consequently, the well being of the people diminishes with the eroding trust.

Basing on the utilitarian rule the well being of the people will keep improving as long as the people adhere to the set rule as the moral evaluation object. If the moral evaluation object is not strictly followed things like declination of economic activity will occur and as a result the well being of the people will greatly reduce or diminish. The successful moral evaluation all the people have to adhere to the same moral rules and as a result trust between the

<https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

people will take roots. Therefore utilitarianism act is detrimental to the rule of law or the utilitarianism rule. Despite the benefits of the law which includes cost benefit analysis, the most important thing is the fundamental level. Some of the questions which arise with such intervention are the failures brought in by employed legal systems because such legal systems remove predictability from law (Janzekovic 2).

Case to case approach on the other hand is a clear indication that there is no single reasonable rule which can be designed to handle any foreseeable circumstances that may arise. By the fact that the utilitarian act of humanitarian intervention principle still holds as long as there are many positive consequences than negative the action remains just then the utilitarian rule remains at loss. The utilitarian rule simply means that any humanitarian intervention which is permitted by the law and is adhered to by everyone will always result to the best consequences for the concerned parties. Despite the fact that rule of utilitarian seems to be the best option for humanitarian intervention problems may emerge because it does not specify the rule which satisfies this description. Scholars and analysts argue that humanitarian interventions usually fail because they never achieve the balance which is needed to satisfy or secure best outcomes for all the involved parties. Some analysts assert that the employment of military force usually leads to loss of more lives the opposite of what it was supposed to achieve.

Therefore humanitarian intervention are more self defeating than edifying because of the loss of lives and human misery that they cause. Because of this accusation some analysts decided to defend the United States and the <https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

republic of Tanzania for their interventions during Ugandan massive violation of human rights by Idi Amin and the Dominican Republic interventions. This is because of the positive results which were realized compared to their negative from the humanitarian intervention was much more than the negative impacts that resulted (Janzekovic 2). There are mixed reactions about the usefulness of humanitarian interventions. There are people who are for it because they think that it really helps in saving lives and ending human misery while others insist that humanitarian intervention diminishes the well being of the conflict victims because it increases the chances of the intervening nation collapsing in the nation where they are deployed. Some authors argues that human right violation has become a more common thing therefore if deployment of external force is allowed then it will not be easy to prevent any nation from using force against the other.

Therefore if humanitarian intervention were legalized, then powerful nations will use this opportunity to overthrow unresponsive governments (Walzer 59). There are people who think that the humanitarian intervention principle of utilitarian rule contracts itself. The only problem is that those who are against humanitarian intervention have failed to show how humanitarian intervention practice which is well regulated can create a more violent world than the one we occupy. Some allowed humanitarian intervention may yield the desired goals and lead to overall well being though the same consequentialist reason will not allow it to happen. An annoying aspect of the ongoing debate about the act and rule of utilitarianism is that there is no side that has been able to back its claims with satisfactory evidence because whatever they are presenting is anecdotal evidence.



In addition, systematic analysis of the impacts of humanitarian interventions on the well being of the people is still missing from both the sides. The important missing information has made it difficult to determine if humanitarian intervention should stop or continue. Substantial evidence is necessary for any useful judgments to be done. How is natural law related to Humanitarian interventions? This is a naturalist doctrine which explains that human beings have natural moral duties and virtues. The precepts of this law solely depends on reasoning therefore anyone who can rationally think can have them.

These virtues and moral duties are likened to the human nature making them immutable and universal. To the naturalists moral duties result from the human nature therefore humanitarian intervention is a natural thing. This is a clear explanation of our moral obligation as human beings towards other people. One important aspect about the natural law is that one is not restricted to whom they should help therefore aspects like contract, common locale or political ties does not tie one to whom they should help or not because anyone can be helped (Nardin 59). Our moral obligation as human beings is to form healthy relations and promote decent relations. The important role for the naturalist is to offer assistance to anyone who may be in need of it and is the common natural morality.

Therefore interference with another nation's internal affairs by international bodies, outsiders and other nation is the sense of this moral obligation. Some of the implications of the moral duty in form of given support is dependant on a number of factors. These important factors include awareness of the existing boundaries for the outside aid and general respect for the

<https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

sovereignty of the nation in question. There are normal allowed grounds for the naturalist though application of force which can occur if things are in bad shape. The naturalist law has its supporters who feel that infliction of ones subjects or citizens without warrant calls for humanitarian intervention because other states have a moral obligation to offer assistance where it is due.

Humanitarian intervention is justified by the naturalists because it is their moral responsibility to ensure the safety and well being of other people. Some analysts emphasize that those who possess the powers that are equal to those of kings are allowed to demand punishment on account of damages caused to their subjects themselves and other injuries which affect them indirectly if law of nature has been violated. Naturalists therefore agree that states have the right to intervene for those people that have been oppressed by their leaders or some injustices. Despite the fact that states are allowed to offer humanitarian intervention they are allowed not to do so if their citizens are not justified. The proponents of natural theories view humanitarian intervention as an imperfect duty because it is not different from duties like beneficence and charity. On the other hand, humanitarian intervention puts the safety of other nation's citizens before its own citizens.

Deadly damages may result if a state gives priority to its citizen when other people are suffering in another country (Walzer 60). Some analysts explain that even though intervention may be justified, even when it helps to stop terrible crimes, humanitarian intervention remains imperfect duty and therefore it is not meant for a specific nation or agent. Intervention is necessary although there is no specific nation that is obliged to do so or <https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

morally bound to help. By the fact that no specific nation has been assigned to intervene in case of inhumane actions most of the times there is no nation which voluntarily offers itself to help. Despite the fact that we are morally required to be each others keeper, we often seat back and watch as people die without offering any assistance.

Costs of humanitarian interventions are usually very high and that is the reason why massacres may be going on when every nation with the capacity to help is doing nothing. Therefore there is usually nothing to stop a nation that has decided that it will not tolerate mass murder and things like genocides. Naturalists claim that people are not only supposed to respect human rights but should also help in creating environments or making arrangements which prevent violation of human rights. In addition, one can only say that they respect others when they do something to ensure that others are treated with ultimate respect. Therefore a country refraining from abusing human rights is not satisfactory if they don't join hands with other nations or organizations seeking to prevent and stop violation of human rights.

For this reason the duties of humanitarian intervention perfectly suit with provisions of natural law. Despite this evidence practically there are no natural theorists that recommend or advocate humanitarian intervention. Many naturalists emphasize that states have a right to refuse to intervene despite the fact that humanitarian intervention is an imperfect obligation (Buchan 84). Some naturalists strongly argue that nations have an obligation of refraining from mingling with affairs of other states just they way individuals are supposed to have respect for one another. Interference with <https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

the state affairs of another nation is illegal because it is against the states natural liberty since every nation is independent of the wishes and will of other countries as far as action is concerned.

This argument is based on the analogy of states and persons. For example people are independent agents and for this reason, they are allowed to determine or choose their actions freely without any interference as long as their deeds do not go beyond the moral constraints. This implies that states are self governing and autonomous on their own and for this reason this independence needs to be respected. The poorest analogy is the collectivist ideology on addition to that states usually lack unified agents and wills. As a result, things only become clearer when there is gross violation of human rights. On the other hand, Social contractarianism is basically a naturalist doctrine which states that moral norms are bound by the mutual consent of the common people or people that are subject to them.

It is important to note that the mutual consent being talked about is never applicable when it comes to real choice situations and real people.

Therefore, the moral consent is only applicable in situations that deserve ideal choices and this can only be done by ideal agents. Social contractarianism explains that morally obligatory is only allowed when it is equal and free and that rational agents have to agree first. Justice is defined in this way in order to prevent criticism that many people do not usually go for this option freely. Social contractarianism idealizes their choice situation in order to ensure a genuine mutual consent.

Therefore a genuine mutual consent is the one that is not forced. Many analysts do not agree with social contractarianism because of the way contracting parties are identified. Proponents of social contractarianism explain that norms are justified only if the citizens of that particular state consent to them. Other supporters justify norms if the state accepts it. There are many disagreements about the justifiable norms because other people argue that they should only be justified when all human beings approve them. Proper identification of the consenting parties is very important in the entire issue because proper norms can only be obtained when there are correct contracting parties.

Nevertheless, contracting parties greatly determine the morally binding norm that will be selected. For instance if the contracting parties are to be the citizens of the state in question then the maximizing obligation that will be selected is the one that maximizes and expands national interest (Krieger 459). States are therefore the creators of the contracting parties and the agreed contract is only justified when it serves the state interests. For this reason, liberty interference is justified only when the freedom and the well being of the citizen is promoted. Basing on the above statements it is clear that states have no duty or reason for ensuring the justice of the people in the world. Therefore the actions of a government are only justified if they are faithful agents of its people.

This can only be done when all actions which are taken by the government are in the interests of its esteemed people and not other country's citizens. For these reasons any humanitarian intervention is judged on the basis of the benefits or negative effects caused to the interests of the nation. Basing <https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

on Social contractarianism any interventions which are made with the objective of ending gross violation of human rights in other countries are considered unjust and illegal. To the social contractarianism the interventions which are viewed as just are those which are done to meet the interest of its own citizens and not other country's citizens. Some analysts and scholars strongly argue that it is not morally and legally right for the United States military to be killed by the Somalia insurgents because they are protecting citizens of Somalia from being killed by fellow citizens.

Therefore humanitarian interventions for ending major issues like mass murder, genocides, and slavery may only be justifiable to some small extent. Besides that, the interests of the intervening state are justified while those of the nation being protected are not justified (Holzgrefe 19). In general, there are many controversies surrounding the usefulness of humanitarian intervention and if it accomplishes its objectives like maintenance of peace, prevention of massive violation of human rights among others. There are people who believe that humanitarian intervention is justified in their operations and there are those who believe that deployment of military in another country should not be allowed. Basing on the analysts and scholars criticism humanitarian intervention has worked in some circumstances where many lives were saved though in other situations it did not work because of the damages that resulted. There are different humanitarian principles that have been used to analyze the effectiveness and limitations of humanitarian intervention and whether it is illegal or legal.

Many contradicting aspects in almost every theory and for this reason the debates about the same are still ongoing and a final decision cannot be

<https://assignbuster.com/humanitarian-intervention/>

reached until substantial proof has been provided. The nature of humanitarian intervention attracts many responses and criticism. There are people who feel that nations should not interfere with other nations because they are autonomous institutions which deserve equal respect like the respect accorded to individuals. Other people argue that you are not justified to say that you respect every person when you are doing nothing to ensure that they are respected by preventing violation of their human rights. There are methods or means that can be used to prevent violation of human rights for instance enforcement of religious and societal values and principles in the specific countries. Other people feel that humanitarian intervention has failed because it never helps in solving the issues which caused the conflict or the war.

For these reasons universal religious values and acceptable social values and principles can be utilized to solve the underlying issues. It is however clear that humanitarian intervention works in some cases but fails to accomplish its objective in others.