



AMERICAN POLICY OF INTERVENTIONISM: AN OVERVIEW

Amin Abdus Samad

Ph.D. Scholar

Department of Politics & International Relations

University of Sargodha

Sargodha – Pakistan

assarmalik@gmail.com

Dr. Ashfaq Ahmad

Assistant Professor

Department of Politics & International Relations

University of Sargodha

Sargodha – Pakistan

arashfaqs@hotmail.com

Mehreen Yaseen

Lecturer

Department of Politics & International Relations

University of Sargodha

Sargodha – Pakistan

mehreenyaseen87@gmail.com

Abstract:

Interventionism lacks any proper definition. It is a broad term used for non-defensive proactive policy undertaken by any nation-state to manipulate an economy or society. The most common applications of the term are for economic intervention when a state intervenes in its own economy, or for foreign intervention when a state intervenes in the affairs of another nation as part of its foreign policy. Ever since the Westphalian order of 1644, which accepted the concept of the sovereignty of nation-states on their territory, with no role for external agents in domestic structures, sovereignty has never truly been violable, but in early 20th century the social purpose of the use of force began to expand and marked a new idealism in the use of war. It produced mixed opinions of critics and generated a wide discourse on whether it is a 'mask' to some surreptitious motives, or is a 'Just Intent' in real world terms.

Introduction

Intervention is considered a new development in international relations, although it was used in the



past. After the end of the Cold War it is most frequently used by the powerful states. Sometime in a rightful manner to protect the people of a state to save them from an oppressive Government but mostly in order to full fill the hidden objectives of their foreign policy. Still the definition of Intervention has no universally accepted definition and every one justifies it according to his own demands and needs. This also created many complications. One major hurdle that affects its legitimacy is as to who is responsible to take action against the suppressive regime: the UNO or the major power to take actions in order to protect the world and establish peace.

The modern international system is founded on the premise that a sovereign state has a right to non-intervention, to be free from unwanted external involvement in their internal affairs (Seybolt 2007). At the same time under the UN charter, states enjoy the exclusive right on the territory under their control. The United Nations charter prevents the powerful states not to intervene in the internal matters under the Article 2 (4) of the UN charter and forbids the use of force as an instrument of state policy with only two exceptions - each state's inherent right to self- defence under the Article (51) and enforcement measures authorized by the UN Security Council (Intervention 2010). It is also a fact that the principle of non- intervention and non-interference reduced the inter-state wars and conflicts dramatically.

But the policy followed by the big powers to intervene in a country against the wish of the established government in order to protect the people of that country and to establish the so called world peace even ignore the UN Security Council.(Ahmed, et al. 2021) On some occasions questions about the policy of intervention under the UN charter have been raised. Who has the authority to punish states that are involved in the crime against their own population? Weather humanitarian intervention under International law is legitimate?

What is Interventionism Actually?

Interventionism does not have a definite definition and every state defines it according to its own interests and beliefs. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, interventionism is a government policy or practice of doing things that directly influence the country's economy or the political affairs of another country. Another definition given by Jennings and Watts is “the forcible or dictatorial interference of a state in the affairs of another state, calculated to impose certain conduct or consequences on that other state” (Sir R.Jenning and Sir A.Watts 1996). Saban Kardas, a scholar in his own right, defines the term “as a forcible action by a state, a group of states or international organizations to prevent or end gross violations of human rights on behalf of the nationals of the target state, through the use or threat of armed force without the consent of the target government, with or without UN Security Council authorization” (Kardas 2003).

It is obvious from the above definitions that the interference of an external state in the internal matters of another state against the will of that state is Intervention. And it is also achieved through force and may also involve armed forces to achieve the stated objectives.



Theoretical Framework

We will test the policy of Interventionism under the theoretical structure of Just War theory and test that it fulfills demands of the theory. Just War theory deals with the explanation of how and why wars are fought. The justification can be either theoretical or historical. The theoretical feature is concerned with morally justifying war and the forms that conflicts may or may not take. The war may be divided in to three phases and each phase may be dealt separately.

These three phases are

1. The Jus Ad Bellum Convention
2. The Principles of Jus In Bello
3. Jus post bellum

The Jus Ad Bellum

Howard M. Henselin in his book ‘‘The Legitimate Use of Military Force: the Just War Tradition and the Customary Law of Armed Conflict’’ states has to follow these principles :

1. Ultimate goal
2. Only legitimate authority
3. Right intention
4. Just cause
5. Last resort
6. Principle of proportionality
7. Reasonable prospect of success
8. Declare intentions (Hensel 2008)

It is necessary for a state to execute these principles in order to legitimize its action against another state. For the right to go to war a nation must give the above justification in order to morally justify the use of force and wage a war against another state. However, a war is not waged for a personal motive and all the efforts must be made to solve the problem before going for a war. And the action of a war must always be taken with a good intention that it will bring positive results.

The Principles of Jus in Bello

The second principle of the Just War theory is concerned with the just conduct of war in which rules and regulations should be followed throughout the use of military forces against other states. In this regard two broad principles should be followed. The first is, what the genuine targets in the war are, this is called the principle of discrimination whilst the second principle is concerned with how much force is morally appropriate. A third principle may be incorporated in the traditional two, is the



principle of responsibility. This principle lays stress on an examination of where responsibility lies in war.

The Principle of Jus post bellum

After the termination of a war, three possibilities appear: either the army has been defeated, has been victorious, or it has agreed to a ceasefire (IEP n.d.). Principles of justice may then be applied to each situation. Orend presents a useful summary of the principles of *jus post bellum*: the principle of discrimination should be employed to avoid imposing punishment on innocents or non-combatants; the rights or traditions of the defeated deserve respect; the claims of victory should be proportional to the war's character; compensatory claims should be tempered by the principles of discrimination and proportionality; and, controversially, the need to rehabilitate or re-educate an aggressor should also be considered (Orend 2001).

But when we see the modern trend of intervention, these principles of just war theory are not followed particularly by the big powers after the end of cold war. They use force to enhance their personal objectives in place of working for the wellbeing of humanity. In the case of Iraq intervention they did not bother to take the consent of UN Security Council, which is the legitimate authority in modern times for taking the decision for war or peace. These big powers not only violated the rules of just war theory but also ignored the International Law that prohibits from taking action against a Sovereign state.

Military Industrial Complex (MIC)

During the days of cold war, military industries gained too much importance throughout the world. As the rivalry was going on between the two blocks, both established a large military industrial infrastructure in order to meet the growing demands of their defence forces. But after the end of the Cold War these industries start losing their importance, and put pressure on their respected governments to open new fronts in order to sell their arms. For this purpose these industries put money in the political system in order to buy the loyalties of different politicians in order to put pressure on the government to open new fronts. US President Eisenhower in 1961 was the first to mention a military industrial complex (MIC). He alerted councils of governments, saying that 'we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex [MIC]. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist' (Albertron 1963).

Later, the concept of the war developed by social scientists, MIC was seen as a coalition of vested interests within the state and industry, which could lead to decisions being made which were not in the security interest of the state but these decisions, protected the interests of a particular group. In the words of Andrew G. Marshall, War is the most profitable industry in the world, and when the industries that flourish during war time, predominantly being the arms and oil industries, are so closely aligned and connected with the political and military establishment, the eventual result is to



ultimately lead to a state of constant war, or in the eyes of the war industry, constant profits (Marshall 3 OCT 2007). The recent example is the US intervention in Iraq that was also motivated for this purpose. One explanation for exaggerated spending on arms is provided by the unfair intensification of minor threats into major and imminent ones. For example, the threat posed by Ba'athist Iraq to the United States and Britain was, in reality, approximately zero, but it was imprecise by the executive branch of these two countries to build Iraq and its leader, Saddam Hussein, into a major threat that had to be eliminated by military means. Seven years after the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the director general of Britain's domestic intelligence agency at the time of the invasion, Lady Manningham-Buller, confessed that Iraq had posed little danger, and that the invasion itself created a threat by radicalizing Muslims (Dunne 2011).

Imperialism

The powerful states use the forces in order to protect the interest of their businessman in foreign markets. In capitalism the most important thing is the free flow of goods in the markets. For this purpose the powerful states always tries to control the foreign markets and to attain this objective they use the military means like in the recent case of Libya. According to Lenin, 'imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism' (Lenin 1963). Imperialism is a policy, practice, or encouragement of extending the authority and power of a nation, particularly by direct protective acquisitions or by gaining indirect control over the political or economic life of extra areas; *generally* the extension or imposition of control, authority, or power. In the words of Kautsky's "Imperialism is a product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the striving of every industrial capitalist nation to bring under its control or to annex all large areas of agrarian (Kautsky's italics) territory, irrespective of what nations inhabit (Lenin 1963).

After the end of the cold war the most powerful states of West use intervention as a tool to protect the interest of their businessmen in the foreign markets like in the case of the Iraq invasion (2003) the main interest was to overthrow the government of Saddam regime and open huge reserves of Iraqi oil for the US and British companies to take advantage from this.

History of Intervention

The Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which ended Europe's wars of religion and established the principle of the sovereignty of the nation-state that became the basic principle of international relations. Under the so-called Westphalian system, the nation-state emerged as the basic unit of international relations. If one state's sovereignty was violated by another state, then it had the right to self-defence. If security of one's sovereignty necessitated support, then one had the right to appeal to the support of other states to bring about the status quo even if that meant invading and punishing the invader state. Systems of collective security emerged to serve as the vehicle to govern the relations and application of the consistent principles of national sovereignty, self-defence, and collective security.



Though it's really difficult to find out when the first intervention took place but from the very start of the nation state system, powerful states interfered in the internal matters of the weaker states in order to achieve their motives. French Emperor Napoleon III is considered the first to intervene in Mexico in 1862; the purpose was imperialistic, one was the debts payments and other was to establish a client regime in Mexico to protect the interests of the French regime. On the other side, the US has a long history of interventions that started from 1846 and continue till today.

After the end of cold war and with the increasing interdependence of the states on each other, also increased the rate of intervention in the other states. The other important reason behind these interventions was the violation of human rights in many states that also provided an opportunity to the powerful states to intervene in the matters of an external state in order to protect the people of that state. In this era, a new doctrine '**Responsibility to protect**' emerged at the international level that was adopted by the UN General assembly at the 2005 world summit. International Commission on Intervention and on State Sovereignty (ICISS) argued that states have the primary **responsibility to protect** their citizens. When they are unable or unwilling to do so, or when they deliberately terrorize their citizens, "the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect" ((ICISS 2001).

Two critical inspiring factors behind the setting up of ICISS was the ambition to avoid upcoming situations like Kosovo, where the UNSC was paralyzed owing to the differences among the permanent members. And future situations like Rwanda, where the world stood aside as genocide unfolded (Alex J. Bellamy and Nicholas J. Wheeler 2009). Someone describes Responsibility to Protect as a revolution in the field of international relations in order to protect human rights worldwide. The main theme was provided by the British Prime Minister Tony Blair in his speech at Chicago on 22 April 1999, when Europe was in the middle of the Kosovo crisis. He offered a formula to the world community for deciding when and how to intervene militarily in the affairs of another country where the immediate threat was not to the outside world, but to a domestic population (Jhon Slobodha and Chris Abbott 2004). It was known as the 'Blair Doctrine' or the 'doctrine of the international community'. The other person behind these efforts was the United Nation Organization Secretary-General Kofi Annan presented this issue as follows: "if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity?" (Annan 2000). All these things motivated the world major powers to intervene in the matters of sovereign states, the main purpose remains to protect the people from their suppressive regimes. It would be considered the shared responsibility of the international system to protect the human rights everywhere in the world.

The other major issue in the modern times is growing interdependence of the states on each other. If the security situation is not going world, it will also affect the other regions as well because now the states are more interlinked. These things also sometimes force the state to intervene in the matters of other states in order to protect their interests.



Motives of Intervention

The motives of interventions has always remained much debatable issue in international relations and still it is a big issue that on the basis of which motives intervention is legitimate. Most states intervene on the basis of these three motives:

- Humanitarian
- Political
- Economic

To save the people from oppressive governments always remain one of the most important motives of international system. As the major powers always intervene in the affairs of that state that is involved in genocide or following suppressive policies against its own citizen. Human rights are just as important as peace and security in the UN Charter. The Charter's preamble and Articles 1(3), 55 and 56 all highlight the importance of human rights. Indeed, Article 1(3) identifies the protection of human rights as one of the principle purposes of the UN system (Alex J. Bellamy and Nicholas J. Wheeler 2009).

A number of international scholars argue that irrespective of what the law says, there is a moral duty to intervene to protect civilians from genocide and mass killing. They argue that sovereignty derives from a state's responsibility to protect its citizens and when a state fails in its duty, it loses its sovereign rights" (Tenson 2003). But the new norm that was developed on the basis of humanitarian intervention was weak and UNSC has never authorized intervention against a fully functioning sovereign state. (Abbas, et al. 2022) The problem arises with the intervention that took place without the authority of UNSC and it remains controversial, states continue to worry that the intervention that took place in the name of human rights is a "Trojan horse" and an effort to should be made to legitimize the interference of the strong states in the matters of weak.

The other reason for the states to intervene may be economic, because in this international system, states used all means to protect the interests of their business man in the foreign markets. We can take the example of recent intervention that Western states such as Great Britain and France made in Libya in 2011 in support of the Libyan rebels. The purpose behind this action was the regime change in Libya that would bring a more liberal regime and it was more likely that this new regime align itself politically and economically with the West. However, the bilateral intervention in Iraq in 2003 fostered a worldwide sense of cynicism regarding liberation intervention. The veiled oil agenda attracted negative media attention, and changed the way humanitarian interventions are perceived (Richmond 2013). In case of Iraq the main motive behind the intervention was the free flow of oil for the Western economies.

Another important factor behind the intervention remains the political motives of the intervening state, because the international system is based on the self-help system and states always work for their own interest and state will not intervene for primary humanitarian reasons because they are



always motivated by national self-interest. It's not possible for a state to use its resources and persons without any interests (Wheeler 2000). The importance of national interest in the current foreign affairs has stoked the concerns in some circles that the concept of humanitarian intervention is no more than a means of powerful Western countries to broaden their influence and guarantee their access to the vital resources (Krieg 2013).

It's very difficult for a state to intervene only to protect the citizen of another nation that is not his responsibility. On the other side, the military action that was carried out not only need the military person, but also economic resources like in the case of Afghanistan and Iraq that badly affected the economy of the US. States almost always have mixed motives for intervening and are rarely prepared to sacrifice their own soldiers overseas unless they have self-interested reasons for doing so. These motives may be to increase its sphere of influence or to protect economic interests.

Legal Parameters

The legal parameters that support humanitarian intervention are based on two main points. Firstly, the UN Charter commits the state to protect fundamental rights and second, there is the right of humanitarian intervention in customary international law.

On the other side Article 2(4) of the UN charter directs all the member states to respect the sovereignty of each other. According to Article 2(4)

'All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations' (Cali 2007).

Under article 2 (4) states have the power within the territorial limits to do what they want to do and no state has the right to interfere in their internal matters. And all the member states are bound under this article to respect the territorial boundaries of each other and refrain from taking any military actions against each other.

The other points that the intervening parties used in their favor is the right of self-defence under article 51 of the UN Charter which says:

'Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security' (Cali 2007).

According to the supporters of intervention, it is argued that human rights are as vital as peace and security are important in the UN charter. The Charter's preamble and Articles 1(3), 55 and 56 all



highlight the importance of human rights. But the problem arises with the action taken by the USA and UK in Afghanistan (2001), the US intervention in Iraq (2003) and the EU action in Kosovo (1999), was all these actions under the UN charter. And the article 51 of the UN charter allowed taking preemptive or preventive actions against the independent sovereign states. The answer is very much clear, although chapter VII of the UN Charter allows the use of force only in self-defence. In order to maintain international peace and security UNSC has the power under Article 41 to impose sanctions against a wrong doing state and if the these sanctions proofed unsuccessful, then the UN Security Council has the power to use air, sea or land forces under article 42 of the UN charter and these decisions taken by the UNSC are binding on all member states under article 25 of the charter.

It is imperative to note that state behavior is governed by a government's judgment to be in their interest, they are also selective about when and where to intervene. The problem of selectivity arises when an approved moral principle is at stake in more than one situation, but national interests dictate a divergence of responses. NATO's intervention in Kosovo is a good example of the selectivity of response; the argument that it could not have been driven by humanitarian concerns because it has done nothing to address the very much larger humanitarian catastrophe in Darfur (Alex J. Bellamy and Nicholas J. Wheeler 2009).

But in all cases the authorization of the UN Security Council must be taken prior to any military intervention being decided. Under the charter, those who calling for an intervention must formally request such authorization, or have the Council raise the matter on its own proposal, or have the Secretary-General raise it under Article 99 of the UN. Only the Collective intervention blessed by the UN is considered as legitimate because it is duly authorized by a representative international body. Intervention that is taken unilaterally by a state or a group of states without the approval of UNSC is seen as illegitimate because it is mainly self-interested and challenged the UN charter which is the sole legitimate guardian of international peace and security.

The Case Studies

The doctrine of unilateral humanitarian intervention has given rise to considerable debate among the scholars of international law. Whether the use of force for the protection of human rights, is legitimate without the consent of the UNSC. Same is the case with the intervention that made by NATO in Kosovo in order to protect the people from their oppressive government. The bed rock of the case for the illegality of the NATO intervention in Kosovo is the traditional case against humanitarian intervention. This starts with a reading of Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, which ruled out any use of force other than that permitted by way of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter (Cali 2007). On the other side, the article 5 of the NATO treaty allowed the right of self-defence when a member state is attacked. Even some scholars challenge the justifiability, in terms of any doctrine of humanitarian intervention, on the Kosovo case. They argue that at the time of the intervention, the condition in Kosovo had settled, with the OSCE confirmation mission having provided some security for the Kosovo people. The humanitarian need was merely not there at the time of the intervention, the main



motivation for which NATO had taken the action that had failed to impose its will in not securing Yugoslavia's acceptance of the Rambouillet 'agreement'. On the other side, the action was taken on the name of collective defence under article 5 of the NATO treaty, but as the member of the UN, it was necessary to take the approval from UNSC for any action that would be taken in the name of collective defence. NATO, neither have the authorization and nor have the support of the United Nations Security Council because the military action was opposed by two permanent members, Russia and China who had close ties with Yugoslavia. According to the report of the International Independent Commission for Kosovo "NATO military operation was illegal, but legitimate (Rubin 2001). Also the basic motive behind the Kosovo operation was political and not humanitarian. NATO had to face criticism owing to its charter and its relationship with the UN, which prohibits the use of force without an armed attack on NATO member states. The legal justifications given by the U.S.A allied forces to intervene in Kosovo were very weak and the action seems like to kill the civilian population intentionally if not purposely. The strategy and planning of bombing was never proof successful and hundreds of thousands innocent people were killed in the name of so called humanitarian safeguards.

The other case study that included was the US-led coalition intervention in Afghanistan. The reason presented to UNSC was that the government of the Taliban was supporting the terrorist groups like Al-Qaida. And these groups are a threat to the world peace and security. (Ahmed 2022) At the same time, the action taken by Al-Qaida against US on 9/11 was with the help of the Taliban regime and the Taliban regime was also violating the basic human rights in areas under their control. The military intervention in Afghanistan was unique, in that sense, it was a war by a state, directed mainly against a non-state actor, operating within the territorial boundaries of and supported by a sovereign state.

On 12 September 2001, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution 1368, in which it condemned the terrorist attacks on the US and uttered its willingness to take necessary measures to respond to the attacks of 11 September and to combat all forms of terrorism in accordance with its Charter responsibilities (Khalid 2011). But the UN resolution did not authorize the use of force against any sovereign state. On the same day, The United Nations Security Council passed another resolution 1373 which freeze financial and economic assets of all suspects who were involved or attempted to commit the terrorist acts. On Oct 7, 2001, The US government informed the UNSC that they were the victim of a brutal attack and had the inherent right under Article 51 of charter to use force in self-defence, which they are going to use against Afghanistan. And on the same day, both the US and the UK started operation against the Taliban and Al-Qaida.

Here the question comes that whether the US and its allies taken all the necessary measures to solve the problem through peaceful means before the attack. Under the article 2 (3) of the UN charter "All Member States shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, is not endangered" (UNO n.d.). On the other side, the Taliban regime was asking for the peaceful solution of the problem, but these offers were rejected by the Bush administration. This also shows the clear violation of the article of 2 (3). According to the



international court of Justice, the right of self-defence applies in the response of sending by or on behalf of a state of armed bands, groups, irregulars or mercenaries, which carry out acts of armed forces against other states of such gravity as to amount to an actual armed attack conducted by regular armed forces, or its substantial involvements therein. In other words the armed attack exists in when the link between the state and the non-states actor is very close. It is important to mention that the armed attack considered to be launched by one state against the other state (Stanimir 1996). On the basics of the above argument, the use of force in Afghanistan was problematic and can't be called legitimate. In the words of Afghan president Karzai the main purpose behind the intervention in Afghanistan was to dominate and American are "here for their own purposes, for their own goals, and they're using our soil for that," (Ray Rivera and Ginger Thompson 2011).

The third case is the American led action in Iraq in 2003. The Bush government was eager to use force in order to over through the Sadaam regime in Iraq. The main reason that was provided by the U.S and the UK to the world and also to their on people that Sadaam regime had the Weapons of Mass destruction (WMD) and they want (Abbas, et al. 2022) ed to disarm Iraq. These weapons were a threat to the world peace and security. Saddam regime is also violating the human rights of its people and America wanted to liberate them. The legality of the Iraqi invasion is again a complex question and a matter of great debate. A new term "pre-emptive self-defence" was first time used by the U.S government.

The term "pre-emptive self-defence" is not mentioned in Article 51 of the United Nations charter so any self made term cannot be a base to use force against any state. According to international law, it is illegal (Khalid 2011). Here also comes the same problem that whether the UN Security Council had taken all the necessary steps to maintain international peace and security. And the WMD in Iraq was a real threat for the U.S and its allies, but the answer is of course no. Under the article 51 of the UN charter right of self-defence can only be used when a state attack on you, but the Iraq did not attack on any other state. So U.S and its allies have no right to attack on a sovereign and independent state. The other reason for which the attack was carried out against Iraq was WMD, but after 2 years of invasion the top CIA's weapons inspector reported that 'they could not find a single weapon of mass destruction from Iraq' (CIA's final report: No WMD found in Iraq 2005). The Secretary General of United Nations has told to the BBC in an interview that the US-led invasion of Iraq was an illegal act that contradicted the UN charter. I have indicated that it was not in conformity with the UN charter as from the charter point of view, it was illegal." (Iraq war illegal, says Annan 2004). The U.S also added to the UN resolution that Iraq is not following the security council resolutions, so a military action is necessary against Saddam regime, but it is not the duty of individual state to take action against a state who is not following the UNSC resolutions because UNO is an international institution and its decisions are taken with mutual consensuses and no individual state has the right to use international law for its own interests.



Conclusion

Interventionism, a strategic need or a taboo? One must have to decide it before adding more colours to the military history of the world. Validity of any phenomenon or strategy arises from its contemporary need, when there comes no other way out to avoid it. In case of 'interventionism' we have a multi layered opinion, intermingled and complexed. On one side, we have the major powers, driven by their explicit and inexplicit motives and they have the potential to move the strings in their favour. They strongly support the policy of interventionism as a protective shield to their vested interests.

On the other hand, we have the burden sharing class of the states, sharing the burden of the self stated morality (interventionism) of key global actors. Restlessness among the suppressed or would be suppressed states is not highly pitched. Their voices don't reach up to the standards to be echoed on an international level. A more transparent system, more scientific study and more unanimously agreed method is required to address their grievances keeping in view their very sacred sovereignty.

At the international level, state followed a duel stander of morality. On the one hand, they rise voice to protect human rights and also for the rule of law, but at the same time, they themselves suppress the rights of their people and violate international rules. As the states are rational actors in the international system and always work for their own interests. Like in the 1990's the European powers intervene in Kosovo to protect the human right, but pay no intention to the genocide that occurred in Rwanda. On the other side, the world powers took action in Libya and again ignored the Dafur. These cases show that always took those actions which are in their interest and all others are left for UNO to decide.

In a nutshell, the only balancing factor among the both sided is international regimes and organizations. They have the power of 'collectivity' and 'consensus' to save the human beings from the clutches of unwanted wars. These institutions are backed by the international law and the UN charter. They have to take the charge because in case of delay this world can be perished within an eye blink in this highly tactical nuclear environment. Last but not least they must give a second thought to the idea that 'war is a necessary evil'.



References

Abbas, Rashida, Adeela Ahmed, and Muhammad Tabish, Mediation In Armed Conflict: A Case Of Kashmir. *Pakistan Journal of International Affairs* 5(2), 2021.

Ahmed, Adeela, The Contours of Pakistan's Relations with Russia. *In Pakistan's Foreign Policy*. Pp. 181-192: Routledge, 2022

Ahmed, Adeela, Arsim Tariq, and Rashida Abbas, Demographic Changes in Indian Occupied Jammu and Kashmir (IOJK) and the Future of UN Resolutions. *International Journal of Kashmir Studies* 3(2).2022

Alex J. Bellamy and Nicholas J. Wheeler. "Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics." 2009: 1-41.

Albertrou, Dean. *Eisenhowe as presiident* . New York: Hill and Wang, 1963.

Annan, Kafi. *We the people: the role of UN in 21st century*. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information, 2000.

Dunne, J. Paul. "The Changing Military Industrial Complex." *SIPRII*, 2011: 1-9.

Just war theory. IEP.

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/justwar> acceded on 25 April, 2014.

ICISS, International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. "The Responsibility to ProtectICISS." Ottawa, 2001.

<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf> acceded 29 April, 2014.

Hensel, Howard M. *The Legitimate Use of Military Force: the just tradition and the customary law of armed conflict*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2008.

Jhon slobodha and Chris abbott. "the 'Blair Doctrins' and after: five years of humantrian intervention." *Open Democracy*, 2004.

http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-institutions_government/article_1857.jsp accded on April, 2014.

Kardas, Saban. "Humanitarian Intervention: A Conceptual Analysis." *Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 2003: 21-49.

Krieg, Andreas. "National Interest and Altrusim in Humanitarian Intervention." *In Humanitarian Intervention and The National Interest*, 46-58. London: Routledge Publisher, 2013.



Lenin, V. I. *Imperialism , the highest stage of capitalism*. Moscow: Progress Publishers , 1963.

Marshall, Andrew G. "Financing Fascism: the Military Industrial Complex and the Rise of Neo-Conservatism." *Journal of 9/11 studies*, 3 OCT 2007.

Orend, Brian. *War and International justics*. Wilfrid Laurier Press., 2001.

Ricmond, Matthew. *Are Economic Motives Relevant to Military Intervention in Africa*. E-International Relations students, 2013.

Seybolt, Taylor B. *Humanitarian Military Intervention, the condition for success and failure*. New York: Oxford University press, 2007.

Sir R. Jennings and sir. A. Watts. *Oppenheim's International Law volume one: Peace (Introduction and part1)*. London: Longman, 1996.

Tenson, F. "The Liberal Case of Humanitarian Intervention." In *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas*, by Holzgrefe and R.O. Keohane, 93-129. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Wheeler. *Saving Strangers: humanitarian intervention in international society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.