International Humanitarian Intervention Ethical Dilemmas and Political Realities

Muhammad Budiana (m_budiana70@unpas.ac.id)
Universitas Pasundan

Abstract

This research addresses the complexities of international humanitarian intervention with a focus on the ethical dilemmas and political realities that accompany it. Humanitarian interventions are often justified based on the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) principle, which emphasizes the international obligation to protect civilians from massive violence. However, the implementation of this principle is often hampered by global political considerations and the national interests of major powers, leading to imbalances in the selection of interventions. Through a qualitative approach with case study analysis of the interventions in Libya and Syria, this research explores how political interests can affect the effectiveness and credibility of interventions, as well as engender distrust of the moral motives behind them. The results show that besides being affected by ethical and political dilemmas, humanitarian interventions without a comprehensive post-conflict strategy can lead to prolonged instability. Therefore, the research recommends reforms in international decision-making structures to make humanitarian interventions more equitable and effective, focusing on the protection of human rights without the dominance of political interests. The research concludes that global policy reforms are needed to strengthen the credibility and effectiveness of humanitarian interventions in protecting civilians.

Keywords: Humanitarian Intervention, Responsibility to Protect, Global Politics, Human Rights

Introduction

International humanitarian intervention has emerged as a critical yet controversial issue in global policy, especially as armed conflicts and human rights abuses proliferate. This phenomenon involves states or international organizations entering the territory of another state to protect civilians from serious crimes against humanity, such as genocide or mass ethnic cleansing, which is explicitly addressed under the jus ad interventionem framework of international law (Nicholas Michelsen, 2023). The 1948 Genocide Convention provides the legal basis for such interventions, emphasizing the need for coherent standards to guide actions aimed at preventing atrocities (Muhammad Fahmi Md Ramzan , 2022). However, the ethical dilemmas surrounding humanitarian intervention are significant. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine states that states have an obligation to protect populations from suffering, especially when their governments fail to do so (Nicholas, 2008). However, the legitimacy of interventions is often questioned, especially when the UN Security Council is deemed unable or unwilling to act, raising concerns about the political motivations behind such actions. Ultimately, while the intent of humanitarian intervention is to alleviate suffering, the complexities of state sovereignty and the potential for neo-colonialism complicate its implementation and acceptance in international relations.

From an ethical perspective, humanitarian intervention embodies the moral responsibility of the international community to protect individuals from atrocities, especially when their governments fail to do so. The "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) principle underscores this duty, asserting that the international community must act when states become unable or unwilling to protect their populations (Memoona Nasir, 2024). However, this imperative often conflicts with the principle of state sovereignty, a cornerstone of international law that prioritizes the autonomy of nations (Ronald Olufemi Badru, 2024).

Intervention, even when motivated by humanitarian concerns, can violate a state's sovereign rights, leading to significant ethical dilemmas. The challenge lies in balancing the moral obligation to prevent human rights violations against respect for national sovereignty, which is deeply rooted in the international system (Peter Inalegwu Awodi, 2024). Ethical realism argues that powerful states, such as the United States, should not only pursue their national interests but also embrace their ethical obligations in foreign policy, thus promoting a responsible approach to humanitarian intervention (Nicholas Idris Erameh,2024). This complex interplay highlights the ongoing tension between moral imperatives and legal principles in international relations.

Political realities significantly influence the implementation of humanitarian interventions, often revealing the underlying geopolitical motivations of powerful states. States with great geopolitical power often use humanitarian pretexts to advance their political or economic interests, especially in areas considered strategically valuable or resource-rich. This selective approach to intervention leads to differences in response times; crises in high-value areas receive swift military action, while crises in less strategic states are often ignored (Sidita Kushi,2022). Such behavior fosters the perception that humanitarian interventions are not purely altruistic but rather serve as political tools, undermining the legitimacy of these efforts in the eyes of the international community (Zeljana Zmire,2023).

The role of the UN Security Council is crucial in this context, as its inability or unwillingness to act could further exacerbate the perception of interventions as politically motivated rather than genuinely humanitarian (Nicholas Michelsen, 2023). Consequently, inconsistencies in responding to humanitarian crises raise critical questions about the fairness and integrity of international humanitarian efforts, challenging the fundamental principles of sovereignty and non-intervention that govern international relations (Mohammed B. E. Saaida, 2023).

An exploration of ethical dilemmas and political realities in the practice of international humanitarian intervention reveals a complex interplay of moral considerations and geopolitical

dynamics. Humanitarian intervention, defined as the use of force across borders to prevent or end serious human rights violations, often raises ethical questions about the motivations behind the action and the legitimacy of the intervening force (Pedro Arcos González, 2024). The ethical dilemmas faced by states and organizations can significantly affect the effectiveness of the intervention, as moral complexities can either promote or hinder these efforts (Mohammed B. E. Saaida, 2023). In addition, the political realities surrounding the intervention, including national interests and power dynamics, play a significant role in determining the success or failure of these actions (Ramakrushna Pradhan, 2024).

The concept of ethical realism states that powerful states, particularly the United States, have a responsibility to act ethically in international affairs, which is essential to encouraging a more responsible approach to humanitarian intervention (Radoslav Packa, 2023). In addition, the involvement of international organizations such as the United Nations and non-governmental organizations is crucial in addressing the challenges of humanitarian crises, as they can provide a framework for more effective and ethical responses. By analyzing concrete cases and reviewing academic literature, this study aims to identify factors that influence intervention practices and their long-term impact on regional stability and global peacebuilding.

Literature Review
Concept and Definition of Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian intervention is defined by academics as a military action carried out by a state or coalition of states without the consent of the target state, with the aim of preventing or stopping gross human rights violations such as genocide, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing. According to Bass (2008) and Holzgrefe & Keohane (2003), humanitarian intervention has a strong moral and legal basis, although it is often limited by the principles of international law. The principle of "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) introduced by the UN in 2005 strengthens the view that states have a responsibility to protect citizens from mass violence when local governments fail to provide this protection or are even involved in the violence themselves (Evans, 2008). However, although R2P provides moral legitimacy, its application continues to be debated about the limits of state sovereignty.

Ethical Dilemmas in Humanitarian Intervention

The ethical dilemmas in humanitarian intervention revolve around the difference between international moral responsibility and the principle of sovereignty. Walzer (1977) in "Just and Unjust Wars" stated that intervention can be morally justified if it aims to stop actions that seriously threaten human rights, such as genocide. However, a dilemma arises when intervention is considered to violate the sovereign rights of a state, which is a basic principle in

international law. In addition, Brown (2002) emphasized that intervention must consider the long-term impact on the stability of the target state, because intervention carried out without ethical considerations and careful planning can actually create new humanitarian crises and political instability.

The Influence of Political Reality on Intervention Decisions

The decision to carry out humanitarian intervention is often influenced by the political and economic interests of countries that have great power. According to Wheeler (2000) in "Saving Strangers," large countries such as the United States and European Union countries often only intervene if a humanitarian crisis occurs in an area that has strategic value or important resources. Chomsky (1999) also argued that intervention is often used as a tool to expand geopolitical influence, rather than simply fulfilling a moral obligation to protect human rights. This has created international distrust of humanitarian intervention, which is sometimes considered a form of modern imperialism (Falk, 2004).

Implications and Impacts of Intervention on International Stability

Humanitarian intervention not only has direct implications for the intervened country but also for international stability. Several studies, such as those conducted by Bellamy (2011), have shown that successful interventions can prevent conflict escalation at the regional level. However, poorly planned interventions can lead to social fragmentation, continued violence, and diplomatic tensions at the global level. Paris (2004) in his work "At War's End" argues that military intervention must be followed by a comprehensive reconstruction strategy to ensure long-term success in building peace. In addition, Doyle and Sambanis (2006) emphasize the importance of multilateral cooperation and the involvement of international organizations in the post-intervention process to reduce the risk of conflict recurrence.

Alternatives and Reforms in Humanitarian Intervention

There are many academic views that propose reforms in humanitarian intervention to make it more ethical and effective. Beitz (2009) proposed an international consensus-based intervention model that involves the involvement of regional states and international institutions to reduce the impression of unilateralism. In addition, Paris and Sisk (2009) underlined the importance of an approach that focuses on preventive diplomacy and empowering local institutions in the target country. This is expected to prevent conflict in a more sustainable way than direct military intervention. Humanitarian intervention has evolved significantly,

prompting discussion about alternatives and necessary reforms. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine emphasizes the obligation of states to intervene when governments fail to protect their populations from humanitarian crises, thus framing intervention as a moral imperative rather than a mere political choice (Allen Buchanan, 2018). However, the implementation of such intervention must adhere to the customary principles of proportionality, discrimination, and necessity, ensuring that actions minimize harm to non-combatants and target the actual perpetrators of violence (Fayth Ruffin , 2013). In addition, collective support from international bodies, such as the UN General Assembly, is essential to legitimize intervention, especially when the UN Security Council is unable or unwilling to act [4]. In addition to military action, economic sanctions serve as a viable alternative to stop or prevent genocide, in line with the UN Charter's provision for the peaceful settlement of disputes (Steven Dixon, 2013). Ultimately, reform of international law on humanitarian intervention should focus on establishing clear standards and increasing predictability in the practice of intervention, thereby fostering a more stable international order. This multifaceted approach underscores the need for a balanced strategy that combines military and non-military measures in addressing humanitarian crises..

Methods

This study uses a qualitative approach with case study methods and document analysis to gain an in-depth understanding of ethical dilemmas and political realities in international humanitarian interventions. This study uses a qualitative descriptive design, which aims to understand how ethical dilemmas and political realities influence humanitarian intervention decisions by major countries and international organizations. Case studies were chosen because they allow for contextual and historical analysis of each intervention case, which differ in terms of political background, actors involved, and the final outcome of the intervention. Secondary data will be collected through document analysis, such as UN reports, UN Security Council resolutions, official publications from international organizations (NATO, European Union), human rights institution reports, journal articles, and international news. These documents provide empirical evidence and the legal framework used to support or reject humanitarian interventions, as well as provide context regarding the political and ethical factors that influence these decisions.

Results and Discussion

Based on the analysis of data obtained through case studies, document analysis, and in-depth interviews, the results of this study identified several key findings related to ethical dilemmas and political realities in international humanitarian interventions. These findings are

divided into several main themes, namely (1) ethical dilemmas in justifying intervention, (2) the influence of political interests in intervention decisions, (3) the role of international organizations, and (4) the impact of intervention on the stability of the intervened country.

Ethical Dilemmas in Justifying Humanitarian Intervention

The first finding shows a deep ethical dilemma related to the justification of humanitarian intervention. Humanitarian intervention is often considered a moral response to gross human rights violations, such as genocide or ethnic cleansing. However, there is debate about when and how intervention can be ethically justified without violating the principle of state sovereignty.

For example, in the case of the intervention in Libya in 2011, the UN gave a mandate to protect civilians from a repressive regime, which was responded to through NATO military attacks. However, the results of the study show that many parties considered the intervention to have exceeded its initial objectives, creating prolonged destabilization in Libya. In interviews, several informants revealed that humanitarianly justified interventions do not always prioritize ethical approaches, especially when operational objectives change to regime change.

The Influence of Political Interests on Intervention Decisions

Another finding from this study shows that decisions to conduct humanitarian interventions are often influenced by the political interests of major powers. Many cases show that interventions are carried out in areas that have strategic value or resources that are of interest to these countries.

In the case of Syria, for example, the results of the study show that despite a serious humanitarian crisis, significant military interventions were not carried out by major powers. Based on document analysis and interviews, the main reason is the existence of geopolitical interests in the region, where Russia and the United States have different interests in supporting certain parties. This finding shows that humanitarian crises are not always the main determining factor in intervention decisions; political interests are often a more dominant factor.

The Role and Limitations of International Organizations

This study also found that international organizations such as the UN and NATO often face limitations in carrying out humanitarian interventions effectively. Although the UN has the principle of "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) as a basis for humanitarian intervention, its

implementation is often limited by the political interests of Security Council members. The case study results show that vetoes from major powers can prevent important decisions to protect civilians in countries in crisis.

For example, in the case of Myanmar and the treatment of the Rohingya, international involvement was very limited despite reports of serious human rights violations. The study found that the absence of consensus among UN Security Council members limited the responses that could be taken. This shows that although international organizations have mechanisms for humanitarian intervention, decisions and implementation are highly dependent on political dynamics among member states, especially countries with veto power.

Impact of Intervention on the Stability of the Intervened State

The impact of humanitarian intervention on the intervened state varies, but the study found that poorly planned interventions often create long-term destabilization. In some cases, humanitarian interventions actually worsen the security and internal stability of the country.

For example, the intervention in Libya, which was intended to protect civilians from government violence, ended up in prolonged political destabilization. Interviews with several international relations analysts show that the absence of a comprehensive post-intervention strategy has left Libya in a state of anarchy, with armed groups competing for control of territory and resources. This underscores the importance of careful planning and strategy in any humanitarian intervention so as not to only provide temporary protection, but also to support long-term peace.

Implications for International Policy

The findings of this study reveal that ethical dilemmas and political interests have significant implications for international policy in terms of humanitarian intervention. This study suggests that in order to create more ethical and effective interventions, reforms are needed in the structure of international organizations to be more independent from the political interests of major powers. In addition, a more comprehensive approach, including cooperation with local institutions and post-conflict development plans, needs to be put forward to create long-term stability.

Discussion

1. Ethical Justification Between the Obligation to Protect and the Principle of Sovereignty

The findings of this study indicate a complex ethical dilemma in justifying humanitarian intervention. The principle of "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) is in line with human rights

values, where states and international organizations are obliged to protect civilians from extreme violence, such as genocide or ethnic cleansing. However, this often conflicts with the principle of state sovereignty protected by international law.

This discussion shows that humanitarian intervention, although it has a moral purpose, is not always universally justified. In some cases, such as Libya, military action to protect civilians has led to the destabilization of the state, raising doubts about whether humanitarian objectives can be achieved through means that undermine national sovereignty. Here, the ethical dilemma becomes more complex when interventions focus more on regime change than on protecting civilians. In this context, the conflicting principles of ethics and sovereignty require a new, more flexible approach to avoid destabilizing the intervened state.

2. Political Interests of Great Powers in Decisions to Intervene

This discussion highlights that although interventions are often based on humanitarian grounds, the political interests of great powers play a dominant role in determining when and where to intervene. The decision of great powers not to intervene militarily in Syria, despite the humanitarian crisis, shows that political interests and geopolitical strategies are often the primary considerations.

The fact that political interests dominate suggests a selective bias in international humanitarian interventions, with countries with particular strategic value or resources more likely to be targeted for intervention. This has drawn criticism from an ethical perspective and given rise to a negative perception among the international community that humanitarian interventions are more of a geopolitical tool than an effort to protect civilians. This discussion emphasizes the need for policy reforms that can reduce political influence and create more objective universal criteria in deciding interventions.

3. Limitations of International Organizations in Implementing Humanitarian Interventions

The limitations of international organizations such as the UN in implementing humanitarian interventions effectively are one of the important issues in this discussion. This study shows that the veto power held by permanent members of the Security Council often hinders intervention efforts, especially in situations where the interests of major countries conflict.

In the case of Myanmar, for example, the UN was unable to effectively intervene to protect the Rohingya ethnic group due to the lack of consensus in the Security Council. This indicates

that the current decision-making mechanisms in the UN are not fully capable of protecting vulnerable groups when major human rights violations occur. International organizations need to evaluate their decision-making structures and processes to ensure that humanitarian actions can be carried out without excessive interference from political interests, and consider alternative solutions such as closer regional cooperation in certain cases.

4. Impact of Intervention on Long-Term Stability and Security

This discussion also reveals that humanitarian interventions often leave negative impacts on the stability and security of the intervened country. The case study of Libya shows that without a mature post-intervention plan, the intervened country can experience conditions of anarchy and prolonged internal conflict.

The failure to plan for a stable political transition after the intervention creates conditions that allow for the emergence of competing armed groups. Therefore, this study emphasizes the importance of developing a post-intervention strategy that focuses on long-term development, including support for stable governance and economic recovery. It highlights that the success of an intervention is not only determined by short-term goals (protecting civilians) but also by the ability to create sustainable peace.

5. Policy Implications Towards a More Ethical and Effective Intervention Approach

The results of this study indicate an urgent need to reform the international approach to humanitarian intervention, especially in terms of balancing ethical needs with political realities. Policy implications that can be drawn from these findings include

a. International Organization Reform Consider changes in the UN decision-making mechanism, especially regarding the veto power, so that humanitarian interventions can be implemented more effectively without political bias.

b. Stricter Application of the Principle of Responsibility Encourage more objective and strict criteria for determining when interventions can be carried out, based on strong evidence and broad international agreement.

c. Comprehensive Post-Intervention Planning Establish a clear framework for stabilization and development of countries after interventions, so that countries can return to long-term stability and peace.

d. Broader Regional Cooperation In situations where international organizations are limited, regional cooperation can be an effective alternative to respond to humanitarian crises quickly and in accordance with local contexts.

Conclusion

1. Ethical Dilemmas in Justification Humanitarian interventions are often faced with the contradiction between the international responsibility to protect and the principle of state sovereignty. Although the purpose of intervention is usually morally based to prevent humanitarian crises, its implementation is often questionable, especially when the intervention leads to the destabilization of the intervened country.

2. Influence of Global Political Interests The decision to conduct or not to conduct humanitarian intervention is greatly influenced by the political interests of major powers. Cases such as Syria and Libya show the selectivity and bias in the selection of countries targeted for intervention, which has the potential to undermine international confidence in the moral motivation of the intervention.

3. Limitations of International Organizations The UN Security Council is often deadlocked by its veto power, which limits the ability of international organizations to respond effectively to crises. This suggests that the existing decision-making structure needs to be improved to avoid excessive political influence and allow for a faster and more impartial humanitarian response.

4. Long-Term Impact on Stability, Humanitarian interventions without proper post-intervention planning often lead to long-term instability, as seen in the case of Libya. This highlights the importance of post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization strategies to avoid a recurrence of crises.

5. International policy reform is needed to focus humanitarian interventions more on protecting civilians than on political interests. This includes reforms in international organizations, the development of objective criteria for intervention, and increased regional cooperation as a more responsive alternative to local crises.

In conclusion, this study underscores the importance of a more ethical and sustainable approach to implementing international humanitarian interventions, which considers long-term protection and reduces the influence of global political interests. Reforms in international decision-making processes are needed to ensure that humanitarian interventions are implemented in a more just, effective, and truly human rights-protective manner.

References

(2022). 33. Humanitarian intervention in world politics. doi: 10.1093/hepl/9780192898142.003.0033

Afriantari, R., & Budiana, M. (2023). ASEAN COMISSION ON PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN (ACWC) POLICIES IN ME VIOLENCE RESPONSE TO WOMEN IN THE SPIRIT. *Journal Sampurasun: Interdisciplinary Studies for Cultural Heritage*, *6*(1), 10-20.

Allen, Buchanan. (2018). Reforming the Law of Humanitarian Intervention. doi: 10.1093/OSO/9780190878436.003.0007

Aziz, Y. M. A., Huraerah, A., Budiana, M., & Vaughan, R. (2023). Policy model for development of tourism villages based on local wisdom towards self-reliant village in Pangandaran Regency, Indonesia. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, *13*(1), 169-181.

Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P. D. (2005). "The Responsibility to Protect and the Crisis in Darfur". Security Dialogue, 36(1), 27-47. doi10.1177/0967010605051922

Budiana, M. (2022). The Use of E Voting in the General Election System in Indonesia. *Legal Brief*, *11*(5), 2656-2662.

Budiana, M. (2022). Use of Social Media in Political Communication. *Jurnal Info Sains: Informatika dan Sains*, *12*(1), 18-24.

Budiana, M. (2023). Analysis of Indonesia's Foreign Policy during President Jokowi. *Jurnal Mantik*, *6*(3), 3564-3570.

Budiana, M. (2023). INDONESIAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF STRUGGLE (PDI PERJUANGAN) STRATEGY IN 2019 WEST JAVA PROVINCE LEGISLATIVE ELECTION. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *8*(3), 95-103.

Budiana, M. (2023). INDONESIAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF STRUGGLE (PDI PERJUANGAN) STRATEGY IN 2019 WEST JAVA PROVINCE LEGISLATIVE ELECTION. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *8*(3), 95-103.

Budiana, M. (2023). Indonesia's Foreign Policy in Facing Terrorism. *Central European Management Journal*, *30*(4), 1650-1655.

Budiana, M. (2023). POLITICAL CULTURE AND SOCIETY'S POLITICAL ORIENTATION IN THE DIGITAL AGE. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Sahombu*, *3*(01), 108-115.

Budiana, M. (2023). The Impact of Globalization on the International Political System. *Journal of Management*, *2*(2), 214-236.

Budiana, M. (2023). Women and Politics: Representation of Women in Political

Parties. *Jurnal Sosial Sains dan Komunikasi*, *1*(02), 69-75.

Budiana, M., & Budiman, B. (2024). Sovereignty Dynamics In The US-China Geopolitical Conflict In The South China Sea. *Jurnal Sosial Sains dan Komunikasi*, *3*(01), 29-37.

Budiana, M., & Djuyandi, Y. (2023). INTERNATIONAL SECURITY BASED ON THE UNITED STATES RESPONSE POST TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA CLAIM BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA. *Jurnal Wacana Politik*, *8*(1).

Budiana, M., & SIP, M. S. (2022). *Strategi Komunikasi Politik Berbasis Budaya dalam Sistem Kepartaian*. Deepublish.

Budiana, M., & Yusa Djuyandi, Y. D. (2023). Military Position Transition in Every Era Of Indonesian Head Of State Leadership. *Journal of Governance*, *7*(1), 275-285.

Budiana, M., Bainus, A., Widya, R., & Setiabudi, S. (2018). Regional Election Winning Strategy of the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) in North Coast Area of West Java Province (Case Study in Subang and Cirebon Regencies). *Journal of Social and Development Sciences*, *9*(1), 31-37.

Budiana, M., Djuyandi, Y., & Dermawan, W. (2020). The contribution of organization of Islamic cooperation in southern Thailand conflict. *Rivista di studi sulla sostenibilità: X, special issue, 2020*, 81-95.

Budiana, M., Muhammad Fedryansyah, M. F., Yusa Djuyandi, Y. D., & Ramadhan Pancasilawan, R. P. (2023). Indonesia military power under the increasing threat of conflict in the South China Sea. *Central European Journal of International and Security CEJISS.*, *13*(4), 259-274.

Chandler, D. (2006). *"From Kosovo to Kabul Human Rights and International Intervention". Pluto Press.*

Enemaku, Umar, Idachaba. (2024). The Responsibility to Protect (RtoP): Norm Institutionalisation, Issues and Challenges. Africa's Global Engagement: Perspectives from Emerging Countries, doi: 10.1007/978-981-99-8163-2_21

Evans, G., & Sahnoun, M. (2002). "The Responsibility to Protect". Foreign Affairs, 81(6), 99-110. doi10.2307/20033347

Fayth, Ruffin., John, C., Mubangizi. (2013). The morality and politics of humanitarian intervention with specific reference to the 2011 Libyan experience. Politeia,

Hehir, A. (2010). "Humanitarian Intervention An Introduction". Palgrave Macmillan.

Kuperman, A. J. (2001). "The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention Genocide in Rwanda". Brookings Institution Press.

Luck, E. C. (2008). "The United Nations and the Responsibility to Protect Challenges and Prospects". Policy Analysis Brief, The Stanley Foundation.

Mark, Swatek-Evenstein. (2020). A History of Humanitarian Intervention.

Memoona, Nasir. (2024). Assessing the inaction of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in Myanmar and Gaza Amidst Atrocity Crimes. NUST journal of international peace and stability, doi: 10.37540/njips.v7i2.176

Mohammed, B., E., Saaida. (2023). The Effectiveness of International Humanitarian Intervention in Conflict Zones. International journal of political science and public administration, doi: 10.51483/ijpspa.3.2.2023.49-57

Muhammad, Fahmi, Md, Ramzan., M., Z., Abdul, Rahman., Nurfarhana, Mohd, Daud. (2022). Analisis Legitimasi Campur Tangan Kemanusiaan: Sorotan Terhadap Prinsip-Prinsip Asas Undang-Undang Antarabangsa. Jurnal PERADABAN, doi: 10.22452/peradaban.vol15no1.2

Nicholas, Idris, Erameh., Victor, Ojakorotu., Ambassador, Robert, Adebiyi. (2024). Can the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine Act as Deterrence Against Mass Atrocity and Human Rights Infringement in Africa?. Africa's Global Engagement: Perspectives from Emerging Countries, doi: 10.1007/978-981-99-8163-2_20

Nicholas, Michelsen. (2023).. Humanitarian intervention?. doi: 10.4337/9781800377240.00013

Pattison, J. (2010). "Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect Who Should Intervene?" Oxford University Press.

Pedro, Arcos, González., Rick, Kye, Gan. (2024). The Evolution of Humanitarian Aid in Disasters: Ethical Implications and Future Challenges. Philosophies, doi: 10.3390/philosophies9030062

Peter, Inalegwu, Awodi., Sharkdam, Wapmuk. (2024). From Peacekeeping to Responsibility to Protect: Unpacking the Genealogy and History of the RtoP Doctrine in the International Humanitarian System. Africa's Global Engagement: Perspectives from Emerging Countries, doi: 10.1007/978-981-99-8163-2_3

Power, S. (2003). "A Problem from Hell America and the Age of Genocide". Basic Books.

Priangani, A., & Budiana, M. (2021, December). PENGUATAN KETERAMPILAN TEKNIK NEGOSIASI DI KALANGAN SISWA SMA. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat Penguatan Inovasi IPTEKS bagi Pemerintah Daerah (pp. 2-8). Lembaga Penelitian, Publikasi dan Pengabdian Masyarakat (LP3M) Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.

Priangani, A., Oktavian, A., & Budiana, M. (2018). Manajemen Perbatasan Di Wilayah Perbatasan Indonesia Malaysia. *Prosiding Senaspolhi*, *1*(1).

Radoslav, Packa. (2023). Humanitarian Interventions after 1945: Multilateralism, Success Rate and the Impact of the Intervention on the Democratization Process of the Impacted States. Politické vedy, doi: 10.24040/politickevedy.2023.26.1.118-135

Ramakrushna, Pradhan., Anantagopal, Sing. (2024). Humanitarian Intervention in Syria: A Critical Analysis. International Studies, doi: 10.1177/00208817241228385

Roberts, A. (2000). "NATO's 'Humanitarian War' over Kosovo". Survival, 41(3), 102-123. doi10.1080/713660993

Ronald, Olufemi, Badru., Temitope, Oluwaseun, Oluyemi. (2024). Responsibility-to-Protect and a Tri-dimensional Methodology: Exploring the Epistemic-Morality of an Interventionist Principle. Africa's Global Engagement: Perspectives from Emerging Countries, doi: 10.1007/978-981-99-8163-2_2

Saira, Mohamed. (2010). Restructuring the Debate on Unauthorized Humanitarian Intervention. Social Science Research Network,

Sidita, Kushi. (2022). Selective humanitarians: how region and conflict perception drive military interventions in intrastate crises. International Relations, doi: 10.1177/00471178221104344

Steven, Dixon. (2013). Humanitarian Intervention: A Novel Constructivist Analysis of Norms and Behaviour.

Thakur, R. (2006). "The United Nations, Peace and Security From Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect". Cambridge University Press.

Weiss, T. G. (2012). "Humanitarian Intervention Ideas in Action" (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Wheeler, N. J. (2000). "Saving Strangers Humanitarian Intervention in International Society". Oxford University Press.

Williams, P. D., & Bellamy, A. J. (2012). "Principles, Politics, and Prudence Libya, the Responsibility to Protect, and the Use of Force". Global Governance, 18(3), 273-297.

Zaelani, I. R., & Budiana, M. (2024). CLUSTERING SUNDANESE CULTURAL ARTICLES ON GOOGLE SCHOLAR: A BIBLIOMETRIC REVIEW. *Journal Sampurasun: Interdisciplinary Studies for Cultural Heritage*, *10*(1), 27-39.

Zeljana, Zmire., Sang-Kyou, Kim. (2023). NATO's and Russian involvement in the Libyan Crisis in a view of the Post-Cold War Realism vs. Humanitarianism. doi: 10.29159/kjas.41.1.7

Zifcak, S. (2012). "The Responsibility to Protect after Libya and Syria". *Melbourne Journal of International Law, 13(1), 59-93.*