

A.Yu. Zamula, PhD, D.I. Tkachenko  
(National Aviation University, Ukraine)

### **The role of humanitarian interventions in modern international relations**

*In this work, the most controversial issues in international practice regarding the admissibility of humanitarian intervention are analyzed. The results of current practice on the regulation of the procedure for the implementation of humanitarian intervention were also researched. In this observation, the legal nature of humanitarian interventions is analyzed, the distinction is made between the protection of fundamental human rights in the use of armed intervention by states for humanitarian reasons and the inviolability of state sovereignty.*

One of the most controversial and debatable issues in the international arena is the admissibility of humanitarian intervention. Information revolutions and processes of globalization, which made it much more difficult to hide widespread violations of human rights and citizenship in any state, and public organizations are putting pressure on their own governments with a complaint of immorality about non-interference in humanitarian crises in other states.

The priority regarding the sovereignty of the state is the recognition of human rights in the present, taking into account the set of objections of certain scholars and a number of states. However, given that the right of States to one-sided invasion at their discretion is contrary to the totality of principles of international law and is likely to cause indignation by powerful states than to ensure respect for fundamental human and civil rights. Consequently, the issue of the admissibility of humanitarian intervention today is very relevant, especially in the field of UN activities.

Humanitarian intervention is defined as the threat of the using of force or its use outside the borders of its own state by a state (or group of states) aimed at ending massive and terrible violations of basic human rights in respect of persons who are not nationals of that State without the permission of the state on whose territory force applied [2. p. 7].

Given international humanitarian law, humanitarian intervention is unlawful, of course, there are exceptions: self-defense in the event of an armed conflict between States and the use of force on the basis of a relevant Security Council resolution.

The Security Council is the only UN body authorized to use armed force. This institution has the right to veto, loses the ability to respond objectively and effectively to certain challenges that require intervention and represent the political interests of powerful states.

Creating approaches to humanitarian interventions is quite real, but a significant impetus is to ensure the effectiveness of the mechanism. The current point is that if the Security Council does not exercise its powers, it should be given the right to issue resolutions on the use of force by the UN General Assembly, as this significantly affects the authority of the United Nations.

Due to the concept of humanitarian intervention, modern political thought has come close to the idea that violations of human rights can raise questions about the legitimacy of state sovereignty. In situations when violence against local people, religious and ethnic cleansing threatens their right to life, participating countries of humanitarian intervention become guarantors of the rights of a person in a foreign country. The purpose of such intervention is not the military victory, but the creation of the foundations of legal order.

According to the results of modern practice, the impression is that the detailed regulation of the procedure for implementing humanitarian intervention is unprofitable today for key world states. The countries that could be the object of humanitarian intervention (and their regimes) are concerned about the potential threat of such a prospect. Countries that can embody humanitarian intervention do not want to limit their geopolitical possibilities to the regulatory framework, and often commit themselves, in certain specific cases, to interfere with the internal conflict of a particular country, a situation that fully corresponds to a certain formal framework that determines the need for humanitarian interventions (genocide, ethnic cleansing, etc.).

Concerning the essence and position of humanitarian intervention in the international sphere, it is necessary to clearly state the level of ensuring the guarantee of observance of fundamental human rights and citizen, to apply all means to solve the problem of internationalization of the institutionalization of mechanisms for their protection: in what cases, by what and by what methods and means, the basic rights and freedoms of people are protected. Solving this problem is very important in considering a large number of contemporary international and political problems and depends, first of all, on the subsequent role of state sovereignty in it.

Nowadays, the results of these disputes are reduced to the fact that, as a rule, intervention is legitimate only if it is used to stop genocide, religious or ethnic cleansing, as well as to prevent situations the development of which is threatened with crimes against humanity [3, p. 24].

In this case, any interference must be approved by the relevant UN bodies or regional international organizations. It should be noted that this is not enough to create the comprehensive and consistent approach to the definition of humanitarian intervention and the formation of mechanisms for its implementation. Already during the formation of this concept a very important task is to resolve the main differences between the two provisions of international law: the sovereignty of the state, the principle of non-interference in its internal affairs and human rights, and control over their compliance with the international community.

The leading view of sovereignty proclaims the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and defines interference as an act of aggression. Nowadays, it is very relevant that sovereignty has both an external and an internal component, and that the significance of sovereignty does not seem to be complete unless it is perceived as a blessing, that is, as a means to achieve specific goals, and therefore a widespread human rights violation is not only the obvious humiliation of human dignity, but also the neglect of the very principle of sovereignty. In addition, helping to solve humanitarian problems becomes necessary only when governments are not able to carry on their direct responsibilities [1, p. 13].

The most important problem, from this point of view, is the practical impossibility of reconciling contemporary international law with the practice of humanitarian intervention, finding the optimal balance between the eligibility and the validity of such interference. To date, there is no controversy between the legal principles of sovereignty of states and the moral imperative of human rights protection. Without going into the details of the discussions that unfold around it, it can be noted that supporters of humanitarian intervention use two basic methods to justify it: they try, firstly, to determine as fully as possible the list of violations of fundamental human rights, the response of which is the intervention; and secondly, to specify which institution is authorized to initiate international intervention [1, p. 14].

Analyzing all aspects of this issue, one can conclude that the results of some disputes lead to the fact that sometimes the intervention is legitimate only if it is used to prevent genocide, ethnic and religious cleansing, as well as to prevent certain cases, development which can cause terrible consequences in the form of crimes against humanity.

#### References

1. Oreshkin R.V. «Humanitarian intervention» in the common foreign policy and security policy of the European Union in the 90's XX century: author's abstract. diss ... Candidate yes Sciences / R.V. Oreshkin - Volgograd, 2005. - 26 p.
2. 2. Protection Responsibility: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. - December, 2001. - p.7. [ электронный ресурс] – [<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law>].
3. Murphy S.D. Humanitarian Intervention: The United Nations in an Evolving World Order / S.D. Murphy. - Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996. – 448 p.