

## **Notes to Guide Reading**

---

### *Week 5, Section 4: Future of the Responsibility to Protect?*

#### **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.

---

#### **Kuperman, “A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO’s Libya Campaign” (2013)**

- Skip this reading.