

Notes to Guide Reading

Week 5, Section 2: Finishing Research Paper, and Justified Humanitarian Intervention

Caney, *Justice Beyond Borders*, Chapter 7: Humanitarian Intervention

- Be able to define what intervention more broadly means, and what “humanitarian” intervention specifically means.
 - This will require you to think through what the purpose of humanitarian intervention is, what kinds of humanitarian intervention exist, and the actors that are involved.
- Also, be prepared to explain what the driving justification is for the international community’s “Responsibility to Protect,” which the U.N. ratified in 2005.
- Caney’s central claim is that humanitarian intervention is *sometimes* justified—or more precisely that a blanket rejection of humanitarian intervention is unjustified, or perhaps *even more* precisely that when honoring principles of just war, humanitarian intervention is justified.
 - Given this central claim, be prepared to answer the following:
 - What are three reasons or pieces of evidence Caney uses to support the truth of his central claim? (You will find these in his discussion/defense of the “egalitarian liberal cosmopolitan” account.)
 - *When* specifically—that is, under what conditions—is humanitarian intervention justified? This is key to understanding Caney’s argument.
 - What might the warrant for his argument be? That is, you should be able to articulate what you think the bedrock justification is for his argument in this section—and this will require you to identify some fundamental value or idea that Caney could rest his argument on.
 - Also, explain one objection that Caney considers to his argument, explain why the objection is plausible, and explain how he refutes the objection. Are you convinced by Caney’s response?
- Finally, referencing components of the rhetorical situation and our working list of principles of good writing, be able to explain two characteristics of good or bad writing you see in Caney’s chapter.

Kuperman, “Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention” (2008)

- Be able to define what Kuperman means by a “moral hazard,” and be prepared to give an example of a real-world moral hazard (and one that Kuperman himself does not mention).
- Kuperman’s central claim is that humanitarian intervention entails a moral hazard—or more precisely that humanitarian intervention can lead to the genocidal violence that it aims to prevent.
 - The argument Kuperman develops is complicated, but given this central claim, be prepared to answer the following:
 - What are three reasons or pieces of evidence Kuperman uses to support the truth of her central claim? In short, be prepared to explain how the promise of intervention counterintuitively incites genocidal violence.
 - This will require you to be able to explain why dissidents view rebellion as a “no-lose proposition” given the international R2P norm (be able to explain both components of this idea).
 - What might the warrant for his argument be? That is, you should be able to articulate what you think the bedrock justification is for his argument in this section—and this will require you to identify some fundamental value or idea that Young could rest his argument on.

- Additionally, how might Caney—who emphasizes that justified humanitarian intervention must satisfy principles of just war—respond to Kuperman?
- Finally, given what you have learned from Caney and Kuperman, be prepared to explain whether the United States should intervene against the Assad regime in Syria.