

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Striking Delicate Balance between Sovereignty and Interventionism

[Mohammed Saaida](#) *

Posted Date: 23 January 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202401.1657.v1

Keywords: National Sovereignty; International Intervention; Human Rights Abuses; Global Peace; Self-Governance; Moral Imperatives



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

The Striking Delicate Balance between Sovereignty and Interventionism

Mohammed Saaida

Department of International Relations and Diplomacy, Faculty of Administration Sciences and Informatics, Al-Istiqlal University, Jericho – Palestine; Email: confador@gmail.com

Abstract: This article delves into the complex tension between national self-rule and international involvement, in the context of global politics, examining the inherent challenges of upholding both principles when confronted with human rights abuses and the pursuit of global peace. The introduction presents the fundamental dilemma: self-governance versus moral obligations. The problem statement calls for a nuanced approach to address the intricate complexities of sovereignty and intervention, acknowledging the potential misuse by oppressive regimes and the ongoing challenges of determining when and how intervention is warranted. The article advocates for a more responsible and effective approach to global conflicts and human rights violations, balancing national sovereignty with judicious intervention when required. The methodology employs both literature review and case analysis to construct a framework for objectively assessing when international intervention is justified in instances of human rights abuses. The conclusion stresses the criticality of objective intervention criteria, transcending cultural, political, and economic biases, and advocates for a globally accepted approach that celebrates diversity while promoting global stability.

Keywords: national sovereignty; international intervention; human rights abuses; global peace; self-governance; moral imperatives

Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War, the tension between national sovereignty and international intervention has been a source of heated debate in global politics. This friction stems from the bedrock principle of self-rule embedded in sovereignty, frequently clashing with the moral obligation to safeguard individuals and ensure global security. This quandary throws us into a maelstrom of critical questions regarding intervention, especially in the face of human rights atrocities and threats to global peace, like the Syrian Civil War (2011) and the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar (2016) (Sarkin & Capazorio, 2022; Wolfrum, 2022). The recent Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Gaza, erupting after October 7th, 2023, stands as a poignant testament to this persistent struggle.

In Gaza, the urgent need for humanitarian intervention for relief and healthcare, distinct from any military action, directly clashes with Israeli claims of absolute sovereignty over the land, sky, and sea, allowing it to keep bombarding civilians. This intransigence effectively denies the Palestinian people their basic rights under international humanitarian law, leading to immense suffering. The failure of alternative UN-led intervention initiatives underscores the limitations of existing approaches to navigating this complex and tragic conflict (Humanitarian Practice Network, 2023).

Steeped in the legacy of colonialism and imperialism, sovereignty remains a foundational pillar of the nation-state system. Sovereignty declares a state's unyielding sway over its resources, citizenry, and territorial boundaries. This principle enshrines the ideal of self-rule for every nation, shielded from outside meddling (Volk, 2022). But the inexorable rise of globalization and our entwined world have thrust to the fore instances where a state's internal deeds ripple beyond its borders (Kyril, 2022). Human rights abuses, genocide, terrorism, and transnational criminal activities are some examples that challenge the notion of absolute sovereignty.

In the face of abused or compromised sovereignty, interventionism arises as a potential remedy, positing a responsibility for states or international organizations to step in (Dada & Uwa, 2023). The

spectrum of intervention spans from diplomatic whispers and economic censures to armed actions, venturing beyond state actors to encompass humanitarian groups and even corporations. Yet, the quandary of when and how to intervene persists, necessitating meticulous evaluation of legality, legitimacy, proportionality, and the specter of unforeseen repercussions.

This article unveils a groundbreaking approach: a holistic and layered framework to navigate the intricate tension between national autonomy and international intervention. This framework pinpoints a crucial blind spot in the global response to conflicts and human rights violations. This framework champions cultural cognizance, sets forth transparent protocols for engagement, and embeds objective standards for assessing the legitimacy and proportionality of intervention. It discards the fallacy of blind non-intervention and promotes tailored responses that respect the intricate tapestry of cultural, political, and economic realities in each scenario.

The subsequent sections embark on a nuanced exploration of the challenges entwined within sovereignty and interventionism. Through an examination of real-world cases, ethical complexities, and viable remedies, the article strives to illuminate this multifaceted issue and offer perspectives on the intricacies interwoven with this persistent tension.

Literature Review

The literature reviewed emphasizes the complexity of the delicate balance between sovereignty and interventionism. The challenges and dilemmas presented underscore the need for thoughtful consideration and a potential reevaluation of existing international norms to navigate this intricate terrain successfully.

National sovereignty, a foundational principle of international relations, remains a critical element in the discourse surrounding global politics. Sarkin and Capazorio (2022) assert that the Syrian conflict serves as a litmus test for the limits of the international community and international law, highlighting the profound importance placed on state sovereignty. The examination of state sovereignty becomes imperative in understanding the challenges and implications associated with external interventions.

Wolfrum (2022) delves into the complex concept of proportionality in international law, offering insights into the justifications for intervention. Reconsidering this established principle, the author sheds light on the nuanced application of proportionality, suggesting that intervention can be justified within certain boundaries. The study contributes to the understanding of when and how the international community may ethically and legally intervene without compromising the principles of sovereignty.

Dada and Uwa (2023) explore the impact of humanitarian intervention on war, specifically reflecting on the Russo-Ukrainian conflict. The research provides valuable insights into the justifications behind interventions, emphasizing the role of humanitarian imperatives in balancing national sovereignty with the responsibility to protect populations facing atrocities.

Lessing's (2023) exploration of bringing the uncooperative North Korean regime to justice for crimes against humanity underscores the challenges associated with intervention. The case exemplifies the difficulties in reconciling the pursuit of justice with the autonomy of a nation resistant to external scrutiny.

Dahl-Eriksen's (2022) research on the controversial implementation of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) further highlights the dilemmas faced when attempting to enforce international norms within the framework of state sovereignty. The study elucidates the challenges of navigating the contested terrain of interventionism while respecting the sovereignty of nations.

Kyris's (2022) exploration of dynamic sovereignty suggests that adapting the conceptualization of sovereignty to accommodate the evolving nature of international relations could contribute to finding common ground. The potential for solutions lies in striking a balance that recognizes the importance of national autonomy while addressing the imperative to protect human rights in the face of egregious violations.

Problem of statement

The potential misuse by oppressive regimes compounds the global challenge of balancing national sovereignty with intervening to address human rights abuses. The central problem is how to achieve this delicate balance while safeguarding cultural identity and autonomy. The absence of universally accepted guidelines for morally, ethically, or legally justifiable intervention further complicates the quest for equilibrium. Navigating these complexities necessitates exploring standards to establish principled decisions guiding the international community while respecting national sovereignty. The ethical and legal justifications for interventions introduce additional layers of complexity, raising questions about how actions can genuinely contribute to global stability without succumbing to the influence of powerful nations.

Highlighting the need for a nuanced approach to global peace and security, interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq underscore the challenges associated with determining when intervention is necessary. The subjective nature of this determination, coupled with conflicting state interests, initiates a critical inquiry. To ensure transparency and universal acceptance, it becomes imperative to establish objective criteria for intervention, addressing biases and skepticism. In essence, the international community faces a multifaceted problem that demands thoughtful consideration. Finding universally accepted approaches is crucial for fostering a just and effective international system.

The gap addressed in this article pertains to the shortcomings of current methodologies in handling global conflicts and human rights violations, specifically in reconciling national sovereignty with intervention. The article advocates for an intricate framework incorporating transparent and objective criteria, surpassing simplistic non-interference approaches. Recognizing the intricate nature of conflicts and human rights crises, the article calls for adaptive strategies and promotes a universally accepted approach that values diversity. The overarching aim is to boost the effectiveness of international efforts dedicated to advancing global peace, security, and human rights.

1. Importance of National Sovereignty

National sovereignty remains a cornerstone of the modern international system, enabling states to govern independently and free from external interference. Its crucial role is evident in shaping cultural identity, self-determination, and domestic autonomy while fostering peaceful relations and preserving territorial integrity. Upholding sovereignty safeguards the international order, preventing unwarranted meddling in independent nations' affairs (Ikenberry, 2020).

One of the primary reasons why national sovereignty is important lies in its ability to preserve cultural identity. Each nation possesses unique customs, traditions, and values that shape their identity. For example, the Maasai people in Kenya and Tanzania are grappling with the unauthorized commercial use of their traditional symbols, attire, and designs by corporations without proper acknowledgment or compensation (Were & Okoth, 2023). This raises questions about the need for legal frameworks and international cooperation to protect indigenous cultural rights. Another example is the South China Sea dispute, which involves territorial claims by China, Vietnam, and the Philippines over the Paracel and Spratly Islands. China's claims and artificial islands have raised tensions and concerns about military confrontations, highlighting the complexity of geopolitical issues (Kausar, 2023).

Another critical aspect is self-determination. National sovereignty empowers countries to exercise their right to self-governance, enabling citizens to determine their own political, economic, and social systems. This freedom allows nations to shape their own destiny, pursue policies that reflect the will of their people, and strive for national goals and aspirations. An example of a state that emphasizes the right to self-governance while acknowledging the need for balance with global responsibility, including respecting international human rights norms, is Switzerland (Calo et al., 2023). Without sovereignty, a nation's ability to decide its own path and future is severely constrained.

National sovereignty is also crucial for maintaining domestic autonomy. By having control over their internal affairs, nations can implement policies that address specific challenges and cater to the needs of their citizens. This autonomy extends to economic decision-making, allowing countries to

safeguard their industries, protect national resources (Lessing, 2023), and foster economic growth according to their own priorities. Without sovereignty, countries risk becoming dependent on external powers, eroding their ability to make decisions in the best interest of their people, such as in North Korea.

Furthermore, sovereignty serves as the foundation for peaceful relations between states. Non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations is a fundamental principle of international relations. Respecting national sovereignty reduces the likelihood of conflicts and promotes cooperation between nations. It encourages diplomacy, negotiation, and the establishment of mutually beneficial agreements. By acknowledging each nation's right to govern its own territory, stability and harmony can be achieved in the international arena (Williams & Haynes, 2023).

This is the opposite example of a state where the potential limitations of non-interference as the absolute foundation for peaceful relations are evident, which is Myanmar (Burma). In the case of Myanmar, the government has used the principle of non-interference to resist international intervention in response to alleged human rights abuses, particularly concerning the persecution of the Rohingya Muslim minority (Khen, 2023). The military-led actions, widely criticized as ethnic cleansing and even genocide, prompted calls from the international community for intervention to protect the affected population.

Absolute sovereignty, a key principle in international relations for stability and non-interference, faces criticism from thinkers and scholars who see some interventions, even humanitarian ones, as violations of autonomy. Critics argue that interventions like the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) may be used to pursue strategic interests, pointing to the 2011 intervention in Libya under the R2P banner as an example (Petersson, 2023). Unintended consequences like prolonged conflicts and regional destabilization, along with the selective nature of interventions based on political interests, raise concerns about bias and inequity in applying international norms.

By maintaining sovereignty, states can protect and promote their cultural heritage, traditions, and language without external pressures. This enables the preservation and transmission of cultural diversity, fostering a rich tapestry of civilizations within the global community. Oppressive regimes can unquestionably misuse absolute sovereignty. In some cases, respecting sovereignty can sometimes create challenges in addressing human rights abuses within a nation.

Absolute sovereignty is essential for stability and preventing external interference, while non-interference is a cornerstone of international relations, and China is an excellent example of that (BBC News, 2022). Interventions, even humanitarian ones, can violate a nation's autonomy. The Russian government has consistently expressed a strong stance against what it perceives as external interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, particularly in the context of military interventions or actions taken under the banner of humanitarian concerns (German, 2023).

In brief, national sovereignty is crucial in modern society, allowing nations to govern independently, protect cultural identity, foster self-determination, and maintain domestic autonomy. It safeguards territorial integrity, promotes stability, and fosters peaceful relations between states. It prevents undue interference in independent nations' affairs, contributing to international order. But national sovereignty can also be misused to serve political agendas and interests.

2. Justification for Intervention

The intricacies surrounding the concept of intervention prompt a profound exploration into the nuanced equilibrium between upholding national sovereignty and meeting the collective responsibilities of the international community. In the bedrock of international relations lies the principle of sovereignty, yet within this framework, there emerge occasions when intervention beckons as a morally, ethically, or legally justifiable imperative.

1. Protection of Human Rights

The international community recognizes that every person deserves to live free from persecution and violence. Protection of Human Rights: In cases where human rights abuses, such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, or systematic oppression, threaten the basic dignity and rights of individuals,

intervention can be morally imperative. While the principle of sovereignty remains important, it must yield when confronted with the paramount importance of protecting the inherent rights and dignity of individuals.

The military intervention of NATO in Kosovo (1999) is an example where the justification for intervention was the protection of human rights. In the late 1990s, Slobodan Milosevic's Serbian government engaged in the Kosovo conflict with ethnic Albanians, resulting in widespread human rights abuses, including ethnic cleansing and atrocities against the Albanian population (Mueller, 2023). NATO led the intervention in 1999 to prevent further atrocities and create a safe environment for the Albanian population (Petersson, 2023). By intervening, the global collective aims to safeguard vulnerable populations, prevent further atrocities, and promote a more just and humane world.

2. Preservation of Global Peace and Security

While the principle of sovereignty should be respected, there are compelling justifications for intervention. Protecting human rights and preserving global peace and security are imperative responsibilities of the international community. By striking a balance between sovereignty and collective responsibility, intervention can provide crucial support to vulnerable populations, prevent further atrocities, and maintain a stable and peaceful world.

The intervention in Afghanistan following the 9/11 terrorist attacks is an example where the preservation of global peace and security was a primary justification. The United States, supported by NATO allies, intervened to dismantle the Taliban regime and eliminate the haven provided to al-Qaeda, the terrorist group responsible for the attacks (Beaud & Dagorn, 2023). The 2003 intervention in Iraq is another clear example where the justification for intervention was framed in terms of preserving global peace and security. The United States, along with a coalition of allies, argued that Iraq, under Saddam Hussein's regime, possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and posed a significant threat to international peace and security (Rexhepi, 2022).

Intervention can also be justified when there are threats to global peace and security. Acts of terrorism, state-sponsored aggression, or regional conflicts possess the potential to destabilize entire regions and lead to further escalation. By collectively intervening, the international community seeks to deter and contain such threats, maintaining stability and preventing conflicts from spiraling out of control. The principle of collective security acknowledges that the inaction of one state can have dire consequences for the entire world. Therefore, intervention in these circumstances becomes ethically and legally necessary to safeguard international peace and security.

3. Challenges and Dilemmas between National Sovereignty and Intervention

The delicate balance between sovereignty and interventionism presents a landscape fraught with challenges and dilemmas. Determining when to intervene is inherently subjective, leading to divergent interpretations and conflicting interests among states. The task of striking the right balance is amplified when upholding sovereignty clashes with safeguarding human rights. These challenges encompass the subjective nature of intervention timing (Volk, 2022). Varied political ideologies and interests fuel divergent interpretations and conflicting viewpoints, hindering consensus on intervention's justification and extent. The pervasive risk of intervention serving powerful nations' self-interests intensifies skepticism and criticism.

The role of non-state actors in interventions appears in several cases, often counterbalancing the focus on government positions regarding sovereignty and interventionism. In the Syrian conflict (2013–2023), such actors, particularly humanitarian organizations and civil society groups, play a crucial role in advocating for and implementing interventions. NGOs like Médecins Sans Frontières and the White Helmets actively provide humanitarian assistance, medical aid, and rescue operations (Sarkin & Capazorio, 2022; Khaldi, 2020). These actors operate independently or with international bodies, highlighting their significant role in addressing the crisis and advocating for civilian protection. Similar engagement occurs in the ongoing Myanmar conflict.

Balancing national sovereignty and the responsibility to protect (R2P) is a fraught undertaking. The thorny issue arises when these principles clash: nations demand self-governance without

external interference, while moral imperatives like preventing atrocities compel intervention. This delicate dance between safeguarding sovereignty and averting humanitarian crises can be perilous, with intervention seen as both a violation and a necessity. The Sri Lankan civil war (2009) exemplifies this tension. Allegations of war crimes and abuses by both government forces and the LTTE cast a dark shadow, leading human rights organizations and the UN to advocate for investigations and accountability to prevent impunity and foster a just society (Igreja, 2023; Kendall, 2011).

Furthermore, self-interest and the shield of sovereignty drive intervention risks. Skepticism and criticism arise from the risk of powerful nations driving intervention based on their self-interests. Some argue that geopolitical, economic, or strategic considerations, rather than purely humanitarian concerns, sometimes motivate interventions (James, 2021). This perception undermines the credibility and legitimacy of intervention, making it difficult to garner broad support and trust from the international community.

Governments often invoke national sovereignty itself as a shield against intervention, even when clear indications of human rights abuses or threats to global security exist. Governments frequently defend the principle of non-interference in internal affairs as a fundamental right, making it challenging to overcome barriers to intervention, especially in cases where the abuse of sovereignty is evident.

The weaponization of human rights and the complexity of the issue present an argumentative issue. Perpetrators can weaponize the same principle invoked to protect human rights, shielding themselves from accountability and impeding intervention, even in dire situations (Cao, 2022). In Thailand, perpetrators have invoked the principle of human rights to shield themselves from accountability and impede intervention, even in dire situations. The country has witnessed numerous instances of arbitrary arrests, detentions, and violations of the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. Authorities have arrested protesters, arbitrarily detained them, and charged them with terror-related and other offenses (REGILME, 2022).

Navigating the challenges of balancing national sovereignty and interventionism involves grappling with subjectivity in determining intervention, the clash between principles of sovereignty and human rights, self-interest disguised as intervention, and the wielding of sovereignty as a shield. Scholars are actively seeking a path that both respects sovereignty and prevents humanitarian crises amid these complexities.

4. Potential Solutions

Global interventions for conflict and human rights violations require a nuanced approach that balances diverse considerations. Multilateralism offers legitimacy but may be sluggish; diplomatic dialogue prioritizes peaceful resolution but can fail; the R2P principle faces criticism for selective application and political motivations; and respecting cultural sensitivities challenges reconciling them with universal human rights standards (De Coning, 2022).

In examining potential solutions to global issues involving conflicts and human rights violations, it is imperative to employ critical thinking skills to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of each approach. Here, four potential solutions to such challenges will be critically analyzed: multilateral approaches, diplomatic dialogue, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle, and respect for cultural sensitivities.

Multilateral approaches, which encourage collective decision-making through international organizations like the United Nations, have advantages in fostering legitimacy and minimizing the risk of violating sovereignty through unilateral actions (Aggarwal, 2023). By involving multiple stakeholders, these interventions seek consensus and broader support, thereby mitigating accusations of moral relativism or double standards.

Multilateralism's effectiveness can be hampered by divergent interests and agendas within member states, leading to slow, cumbersome decision-making watered down to the lowest common denominator. The Tigray conflict in Ethiopia exemplifies these power dynamics, showcasing the friction between sovereignty and interventionism. Despite Ethiopia's strong attachment to sovereignty, human rights abuses and a humanitarian crisis sparked international concern and calls

for intervention (Caruso & Akamo, 2023). Thus, while multilateral approaches hold promise, their implementation can face practical hurdles.

Diplomatic dialogue is another potential solution that emphasizes peaceful reconciliation and the avoidance of intervention. By prioritizing diplomacy, mediation, and dialogue as initial responses to potential conflicts, it seeks to facilitate understanding and resolution. This approach aims at preventing violence and conserving resources that would otherwise be expended on interventions.

However, diplomatic efforts may encounter difficulties when dealing with authoritarian regimes or deeply entrenched conflicts where one party refuses to engage in peaceful negotiations. It is crucial to recognize that successful diplomatic dialogue relies on the willingness and sincerity of all parties involved. But there is a need for accountability mechanisms alongside diplomatic efforts (Yuan & Lee, 2023). In South Sudan, the ongoing conflict has seen a call for accountability mechanisms alongside diplomatic efforts to find solutions. The civil war, which began in 2013, has been characterized by widespread human rights abuses, including violence against civilians, sexual violence, and displacement. The international community, recognizing the need for accountability, has supported efforts to establish mechanisms to address the atrocities committed during the conflict (Riak, 2022).

The UN-endorsed R2P principle offers a framework for intervening when governments fail to protect their citizens from horrific human rights abuses. It emphasizes preventive measures like political, economic, and humanitarian assistance, seeking a balance between intervention and support (Dahl-Eriksen, 2022). Critics point to selective application and political influence in past R2P interventions. To ensure effectiveness and legitimacy, implementing this principle needs transparent guidelines and robust accountability mechanisms.

On the other hand, recognizing the role of non-state actors, civil society groups, and grassroots movements alongside state actors is crucial for preventing atrocities and shaping R2P interventions. Latin America serves as a prime example, with the Organization of American States (OAS) actively promoting the responsibility to protect. In 2019, the OAS hosted its first R2P dialogue and appointed Monika Le Roy as its inaugural focal point. This engagement extends to regional atrocity prevention, as evidenced by the OAS's role in establishing the Latin American Network for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention (Kolmašová, 2023).

Unbridled good intentions, like seeds tossed on fertile ground, may sprout into promising initiatives. Yet, nurturing those seeds into robust solutions demands a gardener's touch: meticulous analysis to assess the soil, a strategic plan for sowing and tending, and constant vigilance against unforeseen blights. Only through rigorous analysis and strategic action can lasting solutions bloom from the fertile soil of good intentions.

Major findings

1. National sovereignty is an important and essential principle in the modern international system, enabling nation-states to self-govern without external interference. It significantly affects cultural identity, self-determination, and domestic autonomy, being key to maintaining cultural heritage, traditions, and language. The text acknowledges the potential for misuse of absolute sovereignty by oppressive regimes and the challenges it poses in addressing human rights abuses within a nation.

2. The tension between sovereignty and interventionism is explored. The text emphasizes the non-interference principle in international relations, with interventions, even humanitarian ones, potentially violating a nation's autonomy. R2P interventions, for example, raise concerns about prioritizing strategic interests over genuine humanitarian efforts. Libya's 2011 intervention illustrates unintended consequences like regional instability and protracted conflicts, highlighting the selective nature of interventions based on political interests. Myanmar's case underscores the limitations of non-interference as the sole basis for peaceful relations, particularly when human rights abuses are alleged.

3. The essay delves into the justification for intervention, highlighting the intricate balance required to respect national sovereignty while fulfilling the collective responsibilities of the

international community. It argues that while sovereignty is a fundamental principle, there are instances where intervention becomes morally, ethically, or legally justifiable. The exploration of this justification focuses specifically on two key aspects: the protection of human rights and the preservation of global peace and security.

4. The article emphasizes the role of intervention in maintaining global peace and security. It argues that intervention is justifiable when faced with threats of terrorism, state-sponsored aggression, or regional conflicts that could destabilize entire regions. International intervention serves to address and prevent these threats, recognizing that state inaction can have global repercussions. The interventions in Afghanistan post-9/11 and Iraq in 2003 are mentioned as examples where the rationale was framed around preserving global peace and security by addressing terrorist threats and concerns about weapons of mass destruction.

5. The article highlights the subjectivity of determining when intervention is necessary, creating a landscape rife with conflicting interpretations and interests among states. Complex challenges complicate reaching consensus on the intervention's justification. The risk of powerful nations wielding intervention for their own interests raises skepticism and criticism of interventionism. This sparks concerns about interventions' credibility and legitimacy, given the potential for ulterior motives to influence international actions.

6. A key clash explored is between national rights and the moral duty to protect human rights from atrocities like genocide and ethnic cleansing. The essay balances this tension, navigating the challenge of preventing violations without infringing on national sovereignty. The Sri Lankan civil war shows this struggle: human rights groups and the UN sought investigations, while the government invoked non-interference. It also shows how invoking human rights can be used to shield perpetrators, as in Thailand's arbitrary arrests and rights violations, hindering intervention even in dire situations.

7. Multilateralism involving collective UN decisions is recognized for its potential to boost legitimacy and minimize sovereignty violations from unilateral actions. Conflicting member states' interests can hinder its effectiveness, leading to slow decisions and watered-down interventions acceptable to all, e.g., the Tigray conflict. This clash, illustrated by human rights concerns clashing with a humanitarian crisis and Ethiopia's focus on sovereignty, highlights the challenges and power dynamics within multilateral institutions.

8. Peaceful reconciliation through diplomatic dialogue is another potential solution, prioritizing understanding and resolution while avoiding costly interventions. Its success hinges on genuine willingness from all parties, posing challenges with authoritarian regimes or intractable conflicts. The text emphasizes the importance of accountability alongside diplomacy, citing instances like South Sudan. Here, widespread human rights abuses have led to calls for accountability mechanisms alongside diplomatic efforts to address the conflict's atrocities.

Discussion

The major findings regarding the delicate balance between sovereignty and interventionism paint a complex picture of the challenges faced by the international community in addressing conflicts and human rights violations. Let's delve into a discussion on some key themes derived from these findings.

1. Importance of National Sovereignty: The recognition of national sovereignty as a pivotal principle is foundational to the international system. While it allows nations to govern independently, the text acknowledges the potential for misuse by oppressive regimes. This raises questions about how the international community can address human rights abuses within a nation without compromising its sovereignty. How can a balance be struck between respecting national sovereignty and intervening to protect fundamental human rights?

2. Delicate Balance and Unintended Consequences: The delicate balance between sovereignty and interventionism is evident, with non-interference being a fundamental principle. The unintended consequences of interventions, as seen in the case of Libya in 2011, raise concerns about the selective nature of interventions based on political interests. How can the international community navigate

these challenges to ensure that interventions are guided by humanitarian concerns rather than strategic interests?

3. Justification for Intervention: The essay explores the justification for intervention, emphasizing the delicate balance required to respect national sovereignty while fulfilling collective responsibilities. This justification focuses on the protection of human rights and the preservation of global peace and security. How can the international community determine when intervention is morally, ethically, or legally justifiable, and what criteria should be established to guide these decisions?

4. Preservation of Global Peace and Security: Interventions are argued to be ethically and legally justified when threats to global peace and security exist. Though, the examples of Afghanistan and Iraq raise questions about the effectiveness and legitimacy of such interventions. How can the international community ensure that interventions are not driven by self-interests and that they genuinely contribute to global peace and security?

5. Subjective Nature of Intervention: The subjective nature of determining when intervention becomes necessary is a significant challenge. Divergent interpretations and conflicting interests among states contribute to skepticism and criticism of interventionism. How can the international community establish objective criteria for intervention to avoid biases and ensure a more transparent and universally accepted approach?

6. Clash between Sovereignty and Human Rights Protection: The clash between national sovereignty and the responsibility to protect human rights poses a central dilemma. Balancing the inherent right of nations to govern themselves against the moral imperative to prevent atrocities is challenging. How can the international community navigate this delicate task, especially when powerful nations invoke sovereignty to shield perpetrators from accountability?

7. Challenges of Multilateral Approaches: Multilateral approaches are recognized for their potential advantages, yet their effectiveness is hindered by divergent interests among member states. The ongoing Tigray conflict illustrates the challenges within multilateral institutions. How can the international community address these challenges to ensure that multilateral approaches are more efficient and responsive to crises?

8. Diplomatic Dialogue as a Solution: Diplomatic dialogue is presented as a potential solution, prioritizing peaceful reconciliation. But, success is contingent on the willingness of all parties involved. How can diplomatic efforts be strengthened, especially in dealing with authoritarian regimes or deeply entrenched conflicts? What role do accountability mechanisms play in enhancing the effectiveness of diplomatic solutions?

In conclusion, the major findings highlight the intricacies of the delicate balance between sovereignty and interventionism, necessitating thoughtful discussions on establishing clear criteria for intervention, addressing the challenges of multilateral approaches, and strengthening diplomatic efforts to achieve lasting solutions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the delicate tapestry of sovereignty and interventionism reveals a multitude of threads, each demanding careful attention from the international community. The fundamental principle of national sovereignty, cornerstone of self-determination and cultural identity, is acknowledged. Yet, within its folds lurk shadows of misused autonomy, where human rights are trampled under the banner of absolute rule. Striking a balance requires a nuanced approach, navigating the treacherous terrain where internal atrocities clash with the right to self-governance.

Examples like Libya and Myanmar serve as stark reminders of the pitfalls of simplistic interventions. Guided by self-interested motives or ill-defined principles, they can leave scars even deeper than the conflicts they sought to heal. Only through navigating with the compass of principle and the map of defined intervention criteria can the path ahead be safely traversed. These criteria, forged in the fires of transparency and objectivity, must prioritize genuine concerns for human rights over the whispers of political maneuvering.

The actual fabric of global peace and security hangs in the balance and is inextricably linked to the justification for intervention. Afghanistan and Iraq stand as cautionary tales; their wounds are a testament to interventions perceived as self-serving rather than humanitarian. Toward a global future, a standardized approach must emerge, one that prioritizes sustainable stability and eschews intervention driven by power dynamics.

Determining when such an intervention is necessary remains a Gordian knot of subjectivity. Yet, amidst the tangled threads, the imperative for objective criteria shines brightly. This demands a collective effort, weaving a transparent framework that transcends biases and prejudices, ultimately leading to a universally understood language of when and how intervention may unfold.

The clash between sovereignty and the responsibility to protect remains a central, thorny issue. Sri Lanka stands as a tragic illustration, where the shield of sovereignty masks unspeakable atrocities. Navigating this delicate path requires an unwavering commitment to accountability, holding violators accountable while simultaneously seeking genuine dialogue and diplomatic solutions. Even in the face of entrenched conflicts or the intransigence of authoritarian regimes, diplomatic efforts must be tirelessly pursued, wielding the tools of negotiation and pressure alongside robust accountability mechanisms.

Multilateral approaches, though brimming with potential, are susceptible to unraveling under the weight of divergent interests. Strengthening these institutions, fostering their efficiency, and upholding shared values is crucial for ensuring a collective and effective response to global crises. This demands not just a commitment to action but also a willingness to confront and overcome internal discord, ensuring collective action truly serves the cause of a just and peaceful world.

Therefore, the identified gaps in existing approaches serve as a rallying cry for the international community. Let us collectively break free from the restrictive confines of simplistic solutions and embrace a paradigm shift. Let us weave a new tapestry, one where diversity is respected, interventions are guided by ethical considerations, and global peace and human rights stand interwoven forevermore. Finally, the researcher proposes three concrete recommendations:

1. Creating clear and widely accepted criteria for intervention: these criteria should be straightforward, objective, and transparent, helping to decide when intervention is justified for addressing human rights abuses or threats to global peace and security; prioritizing humanitarian concerns over political interests; ensuring proportionality; and safeguarding national sovereignty; promoting international consensus on these criteria through open dialogue, multilateral forums, and legal frameworks.
2. Strengthening multilateral approaches for effective intervention: addressing internal discord within multilateral institutions like the UN by focusing on shared values and collective action; increasing transparency in decision-making processes and holding individual states accountable for upholding shared commitments; and implementing robust accountability mechanisms to deter human rights violations and ensure consequences for breaches of international law.
3. Prioritizing diplomatic dialogue and accountability for peaceful solutions: strengthening diplomatic efforts, especially with authoritarian regimes, through negotiation, mediation, and incentives for compliance; practicing strong accountability mechanisms to hold violators responsible for human rights abuses and deter future atrocities; and focusing on fostering lasting peace and reconciliation through dialogue, addressing root causes of conflict, and supporting post-conflict reconstruction.

References

1. Aggarwal, A. (2023). Analysis of Multilateralism in the Light of the Historical Change Towards Bilateralism. Available at SSRN 4529957.
2. BBC News. (2022, June 28). Hong Kong national security law: What is it and is it worrying? BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-52765838>

3. Beaud, G., & Dagorn, R. E. (2023). Afghanistan Since 2001: US Geostrategic Ambitions, a Failed State, and the Return of the Taliban. In *The Post-American Middle East: How the World Changed Where the War on Terror Failed* (pp. 23-59). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
4. Calo, Z., Moloney, K., & Swart, K. (2023). Legal-administrative implications of international sport for public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 1-25.
5. Cao, L. (2022). Weaponizing Culture to Undermine International Women's Rights. *Hastings LJ*, 73, 233.
6. Caruso, F., & Akamo, J. O. (2023). Ethiopia and the Tigray War: Limits and Challenges of EU Policy in a Fragmented and Contested Region. *JOINT Research Papers*, (16).
7. Dada, M., & Uwa, O. G. (2023). The Impact of Humanitarian Intervention on War: The Reflection of Russo-Ukrainian War (2022-2023). *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4407146>
8. Dahl-Eriksen, T. C. (2022, January 19). R2P. The controversial Implementation of The Responsibility to Protect within State Sovereignty. <https://hdl.handle.net/10037/23531>
9. Davids, D. (2021). Problematising sovereignty: Why did humanitarian intervention fail in Libya and Syria? (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University).
10. De Coning, C. (2022). Insights from complexity theory for peace and conflict studies. In *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Peace and Conflict Studies* (pp. 600-610). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
11. German, T. (2023). From cooperation to confrontation: US-Russia relations since 9/11. *International Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-023-00524-x>
12. Humanitarian Practice Network. (2023, December 13). Responses to the humanitarian situation in Gaza and Israel | Humanitarian Practice Network. <https://odihpn.org/publication/responses-to-the-humanitarian-situation-in-gaza-and-israel/#thakkar>
13. Igreja, V. (2023). 12. The politics of accountability. *Handbook on the Politics of Memory*, 176.
14. Ikenberry, G. J. (2020). *A world safe for democracy: Liberal internationalism and the crises of global order*. Yale University Press.
15. Kausar, S. (2023). Charting contested waters: The South China Sea and competing state claims. *International Journal of Law*, 9(5), 14-22.
16. Kendall, S. (2011) Donors' justice: recasting international criminal accountability. *Leiden Journal of International Law* 24(3): 585–606.
17. Khaldi, H. (2020). Humanitarian Field Practices in the Context of the Syrian Conflict from 2011 to 2018. *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*, 2(2), 48-57.
18. Kolmašová, Š. (2023). How do Latin American States Engage with Responsibility to Protect Norms? A Typology of Positions. *Czech Journal of International Relations*, 58(3), 43-72.
19. Kyris, G. (2022). State recognition and dynamic sovereignty. *European journal of international relations*, 28(2), 287-311.
20. Lessing, K. (2023). Starving for Power: Bringing the Uncooperative North Korean Regime to Justice for Crimes Against Humanity. *Creighton International and Comparative Law Journal*, 10(2), 1-25.
21. Moodrick-Even Khen, H. (2023). How to Win a Genocide Case: Analyzing the Triple Strategy of the Advocates of the Rohingya in Myanmar. *Genocide Studies International*, 14(2), 109-132.
22. Mueller, J. A. (2023). Rebel Groups' Adoption of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law Norms: An Analysis of Discourse and Behavior in Kosovo. *Human Rights Review*, 1-34.
23. Petersson, E. (2023). Airpower and territorial control: Unpacking the NATO intervention in Libya. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 07388942231173613.
24. REGILME JR, S. S. F. (2022). The Global Human Rights Regime. *Human rights at risk: global governance, american power, and the future of dignity*, 3.
25. Rexhepi, R. (2022). US Intervention in Iraq. *Traektoriâ Nauki*, 8(02-03), 1010-1016.
26. Riak, G. A. (2022). THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ON PEACE BUILDING IN SOUTH SUDAN A CASE STUDY OF JUBA COUNTY. *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities Researches*, 7(5).
27. Sarkin, J. J., & Capazorio, R. C. (2022). The Syrian Conflict as a Test Case for the Limits of the International Community and International Law: Global Politics and State Sovereignty Versus Human Rights Protection. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 44(3), 476-513.
28. Volk, C. (2022). The problem of sovereignty in globalized times. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, 18(3), 716-738.
29. Were, E. M., & Okoth, P. G. (2023). Visibilizing African Heritage in Diplomatic Thought and Practice. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Diplomatic Thought and Practice in the Digital Age* (pp. 35-64). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
30. Williams, M. S., & Haynes, S. (2023). Canada's Accession to Asean's Treaty of Amity: Cooperation and Diplomatic Presence in Southeast Asia. *Canadian Political Science Review*, 17(1), 77-97.
31. Wolfrum, R. (2022). Proportionality: Reconsidering the Application of an Established Principle in International Law. *International Law Studies*, 99(1), 28.
32. Yuan, C., & Lee, B. T. F. (2023). ASEAN in the Conflict Management of the Rohingya Crisis. *Journal of Autonomy and Security Studies*, 7(1), 39-60.