

## **Notes to Guide Reading**

---

### *Week 5, Section 2: Justified Humanitarian Intervention*

#### **Caney, *Justice Beyond Borders*, Chapter 7: Humanitarian Intervention (2005)**

- Only read sections 1, 2, and 7.
- 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.

---

#### **UN General Assembly, “Implementing the Responsibility to Protect” (2009)**

- Closely skim pages 4-10.
- Know the specific responsibilities that the international community has according to this mandate (detailed in pillars 1-3).
- Know the reason why the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) does *not* violate international law.
- Be able to recite some of the specific instances that the international community failed to prevent the forms of violence that this convention is intended to prevent.
- Know what we mean by “sovereignty as obligation” or “sovereignty as responsibility,” and be able to explain how this notion could be an alternative to external intervention.
  - In other words, why might the R2P seem to contradict the sovereignty of states? And how can we understand the R2P as *strengthening* state sovereignty?
    - [https://levszentkiralyi.files.wordpress.com/2017/05/shrader-frechette\\_developing-nations-equal-protection-and-limits-of-moral-heroism-2002.pdf](https://levszentkiralyi.files.wordpress.com/2017/05/shrader-frechette_developing-nations-equal-protection-and-limits-of-moral-heroism-2002.pdf)