

Piotr Pietrzak

On the Idea of Humanitarian
Intervention
A New Compartmentalization of
IR Theories



Piotr Pietrzak

On the Idea of Humanitarian Intervention

A New Compartmentalization of IR Theories

Piotr Pietrzak

ON THE IDEA OF HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION

A New Compartmentalization of IR Theories

ibidem
Verlag 

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-7592-4

© *ibidem*-Verlag, Stuttgart 2021

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronical, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

To my lovely wife Delyana, and to my son Victor

They are my two greatest inspirations ever.

Preface to the First Edition

This publication accounts for a result of at least fifteen years of systematic research on the idea of humanitarian intervention. This is combined with scrupulous observations of the way the Syrian conflict has unfolded for the last ten years, collecting, and analyzing information about the principal belligerents involved on the ground, commenting on research on the changing dynamics of the local, regional, and global dimensions, which coincided with intense work aimed at polishing my methods and methodology.

It opens up the discussion related to the nature of the humanitarian intervention, to provide this concept's working definition(s), explains the central controversy around this concept, brings to the fore various concepts related to the way the global architecture of power has been arranged in the UN-based security system, and finally touches upon several critical socio-political dimensions that affect the deliberations on the way the international community can be led to a decision to intervene on humanitarian grounds in any given conflict zone, or not.

The critical component that empowers the research in question is applying a strengthened ontological method to help us examine how the idea of humanitarian intervention is coming into being, into existence, and how it transforms into reality. A new conclusion that will be reached will arrive only after a careful merger of selected IR traditions with various philosophical approaches, through investigations and broader debate by borrowing the brains of some of the most recognizable IR thinkers and many philosophers in the field. This will allow us to appeal to various scholars from all schools of thought within IR theory and philosophy to come up with a new political ontology that offers a new contemplative horizon of investigations that requires a full commitment to a systematic, relentless, and genuine pursuit of truth regarding the idea of humanitarian intervention in general and the inquiry into the main reasons why this idea was not tried during the various stages of the Syrian conflict in particular.

This text is designed for use in a wide variety of courses: international relations theory, international political theory, applied ethics, moral philosophy, and experimental philosophy. It aspires to provide a valuable new contribution to these rapidly developing fields of research. Subsequently, this project is also dedicated to everyone interested in expanding their explanatory horizons and challenging their preconceived notions of truth in the realm of international relations.

Sofia, Bulgaria Piotr Pietrzak April 2021

Acknowledgments

Before I introduce my long list of people whom I want to thank, I want to show my gratitude to my intellectual home and the place where I was lucky to pursue my research—Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”—for the last four years here have been truly tremendous. In this respect, I would like to thank all faculty and administrative staff members for their hospitality, kindness, and professionalism that has surpassed my wildest expectations. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to all those who inspired me and provided me with useful guidance, essential support, and all words of encouragement for the last two decades at the University of Manchester, Cyprus University, and my first alma mater, University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn. The list of the people I want to thank the most begins with my Ph.D. supervisor Prof. Veselin Hristov Dafov from Sofia University, for his time, guidance, valuable suggestions, and of course, his infinite patience in seeing this project through. Prof. Dafov has been a constant source of encouragement to me. He pointed me in the right direction around several major issues encountered while preparing this dissertation. Thank you to my previous MA supervisors Prof. Yoram Gorlizki from Manchester University, Prof. Inderjeet Parmar from the City University of London, and Prof. Stefan Opara from University of Warmia and Mazury, for thanks to their assistance and useful tips and recommendations I have managed to develop my style of writing that made it easier to convey the main message of this study in a much more approachable manner. I would like to thank Jerzy Sidwa, M.A.†, Prof. Arkadiusz Żukowski, and Przemysław Piotrowski, Ph.D. for being my role models whom I always admired, and I tried to follow their examples. I thank them today for their wisdom, valuable guidance, and patience that have contributed to my ever-increasing brighter set of horizons. Thank you to Prof. Giorgios Kentas from Nicosia University for pointing me in the right direction in selecting the best possible academic texts that have opened my eyes to many pressing issues in some of the most up-to-date IR-related deliberations. My next compliments go to Prof. Maria Dimitrova, Prof. Emmanuel-Pierre Guittet, Prof. Aleksander Gungov, Prof. Plamen Makariev, Prof. Veronique Pin-Fat for making me aware that the literature of the subject is full of deeply hidden meanings, as well as various little traps that are not so visible at first sight. Thanks to their assistance, I have learned that those little intellectual pleasures need to be extracted dug out patiently over time. My next thank you goes to Jolanta Kawalczyńska, M.A.†, Prof. Selim Chazbijewicz, and Prof. Marcin Chelminiak, who have helped me recognize and acknowledge the importance of geopolitics and political geography in the explanations of the

global reality at hand. I will always be grateful for your support in this respect. Also, my special gratitude goes to Prof. Tamara Albertini, Mr. Michael Chernishev Gorbunov, Prof. Shogo Suzuki, for suggesting several useful ways to connect my initial hypothesis to the literature on the subject which allowed me to interlink various empirical and analytical components of this project.

I am forever indebted to all members and readers of the *In Statu Nascendi* Journal of Political Philosophy and International Relations that I have had the privilege and honor of editing since 2017, especially to Koubaroudis Evangelos, Ph.D., Stavros Panagiotou Ph.D., Hristiana Stoyanova, Prof. Marcin Grabowski, Galina Raykova, Sami Mohameti Ph.D., Joseph Milburn, Krzysztof Zegota, Ph.D., Zoran Kojcic Ph.D., Venera Russo, Abiola Bami-joko-Okangbaye, Ph.D., Eliza Emily Campbell, Prof. Sophie Grace Chappell, Dimitris M. Moschos Ph.D., Nieves Turégano Muñoz, Prof. Malgorzata Tomala, Bálint László Tóth, and Matthew Gill. Thanks to your support and useful guidance, I have explored a completely new uncharted territory of social science. I would also like to thank Christian Schön from ibidem-Verlag, and the unyielding support of his team, especially to Malisa Mahler and Valerie Lange, for thanks to their kindness, patience, and professionalism, I can reach out to so many readers in so many remote places all over the world.

My special thank you goes to my parents Waldemar and Jolanta Pietrzak, my in-laws Nikolay and Violetta Boyadziev, my sister Anna, my two brothers Michał and Manol, my aunt Stanisława Patorska † (14/11/2020), and my uncle Stanisław Pietrzak who played a massive supportive role in finding countless words of encouragement when I needed them the most throughout the work on this project. This project would have never materialized without my beautiful, intelligent, and thoughtful wife, who also happens to be my best friend—Delyana. Honey, thanks to your unending hope, constructive criticism, never-ending encouragements, and unbending patience, I have managed to connect all of the dots and finish this project. Thank you for believing in me no matter what. Finally, I would like to dedicate this publication to my son Victor, a new addition to our family. Our little Victor loves playing with trains and observing planes and is a very privileged young man, for he grows up in a relatively stable country where the prospects of war are close to zero, and I hope that it will continue this way, so he will be able to grow into an assertive, self-confident, and strong man. I also strongly hope that one day the Middle East will also turn into a place that is inhabited by happy children who will have a chance to live in a much more stable, peaceful, and prosperous environment, in which they will all be able to forget the dreadfulness of times of war; in order to achieve that, however, the adults from this region need to stop killing one another with such passion.

Table of Contents

Preface to the First Edition	7
Acknowledgments.....	9
 Introduction	 17
On the structure of the publication	20
 Chapter One	
On the Main Motivation behind this Project, its Main Hypothesis, its Feasibility, and its Methodology	23
Chapter 1 Short synopsis	23
On the Main Motivation behind this Project	23
The Project's Main Hypotheses	30
Feasibility of this Project.....	32
On Methodology Used.....	33
Chapter 1 Short conclusion.....	42
 Chapter Two	
Adopting an Ontological Mode of Thinking in IR theory	43
Chapter 2 Short synopsis	43
Adopting an Ontological Mode of Thinking	43
Who can be an Ontologist?	45
Responsibility of Ontologist.....	46
What Type of Ontological Thinker do I Consider Myself to Be?	47
What is Unique about this Particular Ontological Inquiry?	50
Explaining the Main Difference between Ontology and Epistemology ..	52
A Brief Manual on How to Perform an Ontological Inquiry	53
The Use of Ontology in the Modern World	56
Constraining IR Theory within a Strong Ontological Framework or treating it as Ontology Itself?	58
Introduction to the New Way of Looking at IR Theory.....	61

On the Emergence of In-Statu-Nascendi-Type Ontology in IR Theory....	65
Towards Much Deeper Ontological Rigor of Thinking.....	69
Brief Reflections before Taking a Road Less Travelled.....	73
Chapter 2 Short conclusion.....	75

Chapter Three

A Brief Introduction to the “Typical” IR Debate on the Idea of Humanitarian Intervention.....	77
---	----

Chapter 3 Short synopsis.....	77
The Predefined Background Debate.....	77
What is Genocide?.....	79
The NATO-led Military Intervention against the Former Yugoslavia..	87
The Responsibility to Protect as a New Humanitarian Standard?.....	92
The Idea of Pragmatic Humanitarian Intervention (PHI).....	94
The Proponents and the Opponents of the Idea of Humanitarian Intervention	94
The UN-Based Security System and its Role in Dealing with Humanitarian Emergencies—Further Discussion	96
Chapter 3 Short conclusion.....	98

Chapter Four

On the idea of Humanitarian Intervention seen through the prism of the International Relations (IR) theory	101
--	-----

Chapter 3 Short synopsis.....	101
How IR Scholars Try to Approach the Idea of HI thus far.....	102
“The Principality of Realism”.....	106
“The Principality of Liberalism”	108
The Principality of the English School of IR theory.....	110
“The Postcolonial Palatinate”	112
“The Duchy of Feminism”.....	113
“The House of neo-Marxism”	115
“The City-States of Constructivism and Rationalism”	119
“The Forbidden Gardens of Poststructuralist IR Theory”	121
Quo Vadis IR Theory?—Ahead of the Long Discussions Ahead	123
Chapter 4 Short conclusion.....	127

Chapter Five

The IR-Related Scientific Ontology of <i>In Statu Nascendi</i> and the Challenge in the General Understanding the Idea of Humanitarian Intervention	129
---	-----

Chapter 5 Short synopsis	129
Building upon the IR theory we know and moving beyond it.....	129
The Ontological Debate on the Idea of Humanitarian Intervention and its (elusive) <i>In-Statu-Nascendi</i> character	141
Comparative ad hoc study between Bhaskar's scientific realism, aka his realist ontology (1979) vs. Wendt's Structuration theory (1987) vs. Pietrzak's ontology of in statu nascendi.....	147
Further reading	151
Chapter 5 Short conclusion.....	153

Chapter Six

The Global Pleas for Humanitarian Intervention in Syria	155
---	-----

Chapter 6 Short synopsis	155
Approaching the Syrian conflict (2011–present)	156
Selected events that have changed the nature of the Syrian conflict ...	159
Towards the end of the Syrian conflict.....	166
The ethical dimension of the debate on the idea of HI in Syria.....	168
Responsibilities before the intervention	172
Responsibilities after any eventual intervention.....	173
Further Discussion.....	174
Chapter 6 Short conclusion.....	177

Chapter Seven

Addressing the Need for a Deeper Philosophical Turn in Future IR theory-related Investigations	179
--	-----

Chapter 7 Short synopsis	179
Philosophical Ontology in the Ancient World.....	181
Ontological Thinking in the Middle Ages and in Early Modernity.....	183
Ontological Mode of Thinking in the 20th century	194
Chapter 7 Short conclusion.....	215

Chapter Eight

SWOT Analysis of <i>In Statu Nascendi</i> type of Ontology, the Idea of Humanitarian Intervention <i>In Statu Nascendi</i> , & the New Experimental Phase of Further Debates on Selected Humanitarian Emergencies.	217
Chapter 8 Short synopsis	217
Part I. Ad hoc SWOT analysis of Ontology <i>In Statu Nascendi</i>	218
Part II. What makes the Syrian crisis the epitome of a case study for exploring a new ontological discussion/re-conceptualization of humanitarian intervention?	224
Part III. The main results of the research after testing the initial hypothesis.	224
Part IV. The Idea of Humanitarian Intervention <i>in statu nascendi</i>	225
Part V. Hinc lucem et pocula sacra—From this place, we gain enlightenment and precious knowledge	225
Exercise No. 1. A classic interdepartmental Realist-Liberal debate on the concept of humanitarian intervention.....	226
Exercise No. 2. Liberal School of IR in Further Debate on Values and Human Rights	229
Exercise No. 3. On “Kantian” Liberalism.....	230
Exercise No. 4. The Middle East of 2050—Semi Constructivist Semi Hegelian topsy-turvy (inverted) world outlook.....	232
Exercise No. 5. First world problems vs. Third World Problems: Jackie Kennedy’s post-JFK assassination moment—Feminist perspective ...	232
Exercise No. 6. Why wasn’t Auschwitz bombed?	233
Exercise No. 7. Postcolonialist outlook.....	235
Exercise No. 8. The idea of humanitarian intervention seen through the theories of project and projectivity.	236
Exercise No. 9. The role of the philosophy of relativity in untangling the philosophical aspect of the debate in question.....	237
Chapter 8 Short conclusion.....	242
Further reading	243
Conclusion	245

Glossary of Latin phrases	253
Bibliography.....	255
On political ontology & methodology	255
On the Syrian Uprising.....	256
On the Syrian conflict, conflict resolution strategies & UN-based security system.....	258
On the Syrian regime.....	260
On the Moderate Members of the Syrian Opposition.....	261
On the Kurds' role in the Syrian and Iraqi conflicts	262
On Islamic State (ISIS) and Jabhat al-Nusra's actions in Syria & Iraq ...	263
On Hezbollah's involvement in Syria.....	265
On Terrorism.....	266
On Genocide & the Genocide Conventions.....	266
On the Ghouta Chemical Attack	268
On Khan Sheikhoun Chemical Attacks	269
On Russia's involvement in the Syrian Conflict	269
On the U.S. involvement in the Syrian Conflict	271
On Turkey's involvement in Syria's internal affairs	271
The IR theory: Classical Approaches	272
The IR theory: Non-Classical Approaches.....	275
On philosophical ontology and philosophical method— in preparations for further more contemplative deliberations.....	279
Other helpful methodological literature used during the work on this project	284
Selected Work of the Author	287

Introduction

The world will always remember the situation in which the peacekeepers from the Netherlands stood idle and watched the cruelties against the Tutsi population during the Rwandan genocide (1994), but this is not an anomaly. It is an example exposing a much broader problem. There is already a hefty list of the UN-based contemporary security system's failures to act to prevent such humanitarian emergencies. For my generation, the Syrian humanitarian emergency is more familiar and will constitute a primary example of such failure, for despite the fact that throughout various stages of this conflict, many political commentators, activists, and decision-makers have called for a humanitarian reaction to put an end to the increased brutality of all sides involved, the international community has shown a far-reaching restraint in this respect (maybe with the exception of the anti-ISIS US-led intervention of 2014, but even this intervention was predominantly designed to deal with this organization's brutalities in neighboring Iraq, and largely ignored Bashar al-Assad crimes against his own citizens in Syria committed in the initial part of the Syrian Arab Spring).

The main debate in question is already far broader than just a case study deliberation on the consequences of inaction (in the respect of this or any other conflict), for we are likely to see many similar man-made humanitarian emergencies in the future, and we need to be ready to face such problems as they emerge, preferably in the early stages, so they are more controllable.

This is why, the publication begins with a systematic ontological inquiry into the research on the idea of humanitarian intervention that seeks a credible explanation of what this concept accounts for and under what circumstances it could be implemented in the similar conflict zones in the foreseeable future to protect the civilian populations exposed to various brutalities in any given domestic conflict. This research hopes to look at this concept with a fresher and clearer outlook that befriends wisdom and shows a much stronger commitment to launching much stronger truth-searching initiatives in the realm of IR theory to equip policymakers, decision-makers, field practitioners, philosophers, and politicians with a practical, tangible, and clear manual on the policy options in various unfolding humanitarian emergencies.

It advocates in favor of a new opening in the ontological thinking in our discipline and suggests that there is a considerable need for more frequent use of such a mode of thinking in various ad hoc investigations. Unfor-

tunately, the problems that we face today are rather serious, for our discipline exhibits the lack of the broader consensus about the systematic application of the IR theory as a consistent unit of in-depth analysis of various conflict-based situations. Not to mention the nature of the disagreements over the way in which we verify the tangibility and truthfulness of our findings. For instance, according to Robert O. Keohane “scientific success (by extension in IR theory) is not the attainment of an objective truth, but the attainment of a wider agreement on descriptive facts and causal relationships, based on transparent and replicable methods” (Keohane, 1998). This is not particularly characteristic to Keohane, for this type of thinking seems to be very characteristic of many IR scholars; Keohane has just chosen to be very transparent and straightforward in exposing the current mood and the prevailing opinion regarding what objectivity, clarity, and ideal truth account for in IR theory.

The difference in attitudes to a constant pursuit of objective truth in the philosophical realm and settling for the prevailing opinion is more than evident here. As much as overcoming the current status quo may not be easy, this idea is worth pursuing for such democratization of the scientific criteria of truth is unacceptable (and the 2016 presidential election in the US clearly illustrates that it simply does not make sense to accept any idea as truthful only because a large proportion of some members of the academic or any broader community agrees with it. This idea is worth pursuing in an evolutionary manner, step by step, for the IR theory, along with its respectable branches, approaches, theories, and paradigms would really benefit out of a new synthesis that would find a better way to coordinate our most recent discoveries and compartmentalize them in much more approachable manner. There is a sense in distilling this know-how from philosophy to apply it to IR theory, for to paraphrase Karl Theodor Jaspers, IR theory must seek better inquiry and verification paths that lie within global reality as it is conceived today in all of its representations. Nevertheless, this is impossible without particular attention to clarity, truth, transparency, respect, and broader attention towards various ontological matters at hand. Naturally, inviting some of the sharpest philosophical minds to our IR-related investigations is not a new idea, for there are several preexistent philosophy-based ontological debates present in the IR-related deliberations.

In general the IR theory should be seen as a scientific ontology, but it is infused with various philosophical deliberations, that date back to antiquity. We just need to recall the work of Hans Morgenthau (1948), Roy Bhaskar (1979), Alexander Wendt (1999), and many others, to clearly point out the scope of our influence to the vast collection of philosophical ontologies that

have been influencing our way of thinking for decades in not centuries (The first Department of International Politics in the world was founded at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth in 1919). But as much as it is my strong conviction that the main elements of these debates remain pertinent to the way our discipline operates today, I am certain that the contemporary IR theory can really benefit out of more coordinated, frequent and devoted exposure to the leading philosophical debates of today.

This research postulates to start treating IR theory not as a useful catalog always available for the cherry-picking of the most popular ideas, theories, paradigms, and approaches but in a much more contemplative manner that includes the element of constant change in the circular stream of becoming. In this respect, it is essential to emphasize that it is not a stream of becoming that resists human attempts to impose meaningful order on it. On the contrary, it is a stream that compartmentalizes various new ideas, theories, paradigms, branches of science, approaches, and traditions. A stream that can offer us a certain level of temporary certainty during the uncertain times of fragmented or even liquid reality. This study accounts for a genuine attempt to adopt a far more diverse portfolio of existing interdisciplinary work, approaches, methods, debates, and deliberations, boosted by the resilience of a new political ontology and a hybrid-type study that merges and blends several leading philosophical, political, and IR-related paradigms and approaches into an easily approachable ontology that provides the broader public with the tools to engage in much deeper ontological inquiry into the nature, origin, and genesis of any given concept.

The critical component that empowers the research in question is applying a strengthened ontological method to help us examine (in this instance) how the idea of humanitarian intervention is coming into being, into existence, and transforms into reality. It takes good care of existing theories but distinguishes them well from dysfunctional theories. It applies specific patterns of thinking to the ontological deliberations at hand, but on the other hand, it shows their biased prejudice and disingenuous form by merely opening up this discourse to more interdisciplinary modes of investigations. It further outlines multiple examples of competing concepts of humanitarian intervention in the debate related to the conflict that changes its nature, scope, and direction in the same manner as a chameleon changes its skin coloration to supplement the already existing debate with a completely different mode of deliberations.

By supplementing such research with revised interdisciplinary ontological deliberations, it is hoped to enhance the prospects of conveying the full picture of the complexity of all of the issues at hand in a much more

approachable, comprehensive, and accountable manner. For by employing some of the simplest yet compelling questions that others do not even think of, we achieve the desired goals. This starts with raising such questions as: “Why?”, “Are we sure about that?”, “Is there any other explanation for this phenomenon?”, “Is there any other way?”, and “Why did it happen in such a way?”. Adopting such a method would allow us to discover many unintentional errors related to shallow, insufficient, or imperfect explanations.

On the structure of the publication

This book comprises an introductory chapter, the main body (divided into eight chapters), and the concluding paragraph. The introductory chapter situates the main subject area and most of the concepts in question in the broader interdisciplinary debate; it informs the reader what the research is about, it touches upon its main hypotheses, and how it is planned to go about researching the problem in question.

Chapter One offers a brief overview that explains the main reasons behind the idea of adoption of a particular focus on ontology, for as it is argued it puts us on the road to discovery of the truth about any given object, property, process, and relation in every area of social reality.

Chapter Two goes deeper in explanations of the increasing demand for adopting a more systematic ontological mode of thinking in IR theory-related deliberations and more thorough attention to ontological modes of thinking in the fields of political science and IR theory. In this respect, it is maintained that as much as ontology is being used in several contemporary sciences, IR theory (apart from some of its newest approaches) is somehow reluctant to fully embrace this mode of thinking more systemically.

Chapter Three provides us with a typical account of IR theory-related deliberations introducing the idea of humanitarian intervention. It opens up the discussion related to the nature of such an intervention, to provide this concept’s working definition(s), explains the central controversy around this concept, explains the way the global architecture of power has been arranged in the UN-based security system, and finally touches upon several critical socio-political dimensions that affect the deliberations on the way the international community can be led to a decision to intervene on humanitarian grounds in any given conflict zone or not. Finally, this part puts in doubt whether the contemporary IR theory can in fact offer a strong coordinated portfolio of techniques, methods, and methodologies that can be successfully applied in a relatively approachable manner to discussions related to some of the most complex matters and phenomena in the contemporary world of politics.

Chapter Four focuses on the elusiveness, fluidity, and unpredictability of the idea of humanitarian intervention, from the perspective of an in-depth analysis of classical and non-classical approaches within IR theory such as realism, liberalism, constructivism, neo-Marxism, feminism, rationalism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, and others. It suggests approaching this vast pluralized portfolio of approaches within IR theory by embracing and incorporating in our analysis more contemplative, interdisciplinary, and inclusive modes of analysis. As it is argued, embarking upon such journey promises to strengthen several empirical inquiries into the main conceptual, methodological, and analytical differences between different approaches that coexist within IR theory.

Chapter Five is a natural continuation of the previous chapter, for it offers each of the individual IR traditions a unique chance to downplay their dispositions so as to focus on working together towards the common good of our discipline's betterment. Its main strength lies in the more coordinated application of various interdisciplinary approaches and methods, relying on sound methodology, robust epistemology, and much more comprehensive ontological inquiry than similar studies in the past. This part, subsequently, suggests an adoption of the *in statu nascendi* type of ontology, that accounts for an interdisciplinary hybrid-type study and an analytical merger of various old and new analytical horizons that allows much easier blending of useful philosophical, political, and IR-related ideas, paradigms, theories, and approaches. Even though they may be traditionally presumed not to work very well together, *in statu nascendi* type of ontology takes on various innovations within the existing traditions, growing a much stronger ontological root to reinvigorate our pursuit of truth about international relations, and making it easier for IR scholarship to reach traditionally uncharted or neglected territories of science.

Chapter Six engages in a hypothetical deliberation on the potential applicability of the idea of humanitarian intervention during selected phases of the Syrian conflict that broke out in that country in 2011. Despite the fact that we can already make an educated guess that the Syrian conflict does not account for a particularly great example of this idea's actual application, for the likelihood of authorizing any humanitarian intervention in this country is now close to zero, this case study still provides us with an ample material for analysis. Considering that this conflict has changed its nature at least half a dozen times in the last ten years, to the extent that this confrontation could be successfully compared to a resourceful chameleon that changes its skin coloration according to the circumstances of any given moment, that is why analyzing this conflict, and the international reaction to its internal develop-

ments, offers us a chance to rethink whether such a policy indeed could have resulted in improving the situation of non-combatants trapped in the cross-fire between multiple sides involved in the local struggle for power in this Middle Eastern country. It is also worth scrutinizing this issue very carefully, for from the policymaker's perspective, it is essential to provide future decision-makers with much better policy options, for it is inevitable that more Syria-like conflicts will emerge in the future.

Chapter Seven supplements the deliberations on the idea of humanitarian intervention and the emerging *in statu nascendi* type of (a scientific) ontology with a constantly expanding horizon composed of carefully selected collection of philosophical ontologies, that can unexpectedly loom into the picture of any IR theorist. Given that the ontology in question claims to be evolutionary, interdisciplinary, and inclusive (and for this reasons "still" or "always" in the "process of creation"), this ontology has to also find the way to embrace such an interdisciplinary horizon in question, and interrelate any conceptual challenge at hand, to respond to emerging philosophical ontologies, projects, theories, and existent influences in much more contemplative manner, to use its elusiveness and dialectical circularity to its advantage.

Chapter Eight tests the main hypotheses that have arisen in the final stage of the research, it summarizes the discussion and the main arguments around the idea of humanitarian intervention, it introduces the reader with the idea of humanitarian intervention *in statu nascendi*, and provides us with a carefully prepared **SWOT analysis** of the ontology of *in statu nascendi* type to discuss this candidate for ontology from the perspective of its main strengths and limitations to set the ground for a future research agenda. Subsequently, this part brings to the fore a careful selection of experimental case studies on several multidimensional challenges related to various humanitarian emergencies that have add a more analytical dimension to this debate and shows that properly applied this mode of study can be successfully used to investigate other even more pressing challenges. This is achieved by engaging in test-driving the results of this interdisciplinary work by relating this debate to the discussions on the scope and scale of the international community's responsibility to bring peace and security back to the new conflict zones. Its final role is to explains why the Syrian conflict should be seen as an extraordinary example of a modern humanitarian emergency.

The primary function of the **concluding paragraph** is to sum up the vast data provided in the main body of the given research, interlinking it with even broader debate in the IR theory, and to explain to the reader any potential limitations of this research.

Chapter One

On the Main Motivation behind this Project, its Main Hypothesis, its Feasibility, and its Methodology

“Tell them what you are going to tell them, then tell them, and tell them what you told them.”

The phrase associated with **Prof. Inderjeet Parmar**¹

Chapter 1 | Short synopsis

Chapter One contributes to this endeavor by explaining the primary rationale behind this project, focusing on the research area, explaining the central hypothesis, and deliberating on the main difficulties and the limitations encountered in this respect in the literature on the subject. Subsequently, this short chapter concludes by bringing to the fore a discussion on the methods used during the investigation in question.

On the Main Motivation behind this Project

If I was about to explain the nature and the purpose of any ontological inquiry to my two-year-old son, I would probably begin by explaining that it is just like setting off on a fascinating journey. Such a journey leads to the road to discovering the truth about any given object, property, event, process, and

¹ As much as I personally associate the origin of this phrase with **Prof. Inderjeet Parmar**, who suggested that the best way to present the results of one's investigation is to follow three basic principles: “*In the introductory chapter, you tell them what you gonna tell them. In the main body of the dissertation, you tell them, and then in the concluding paragraph, you tell them what you have just told them*”. Parmar, his recommendation originates in a much broader academic tradition, please see Maxine Rodburg, and The Tutors of the Writing Center at Harvard University. 1999. “Developing A Thesis”. Available at: </https://writingcenter.fas.harvard.edu/pages/developing-thesis/> [Accessed on 19/11/2020, at 15:00] & “On Developing Your Thesis.” Available at: </https://depts.washington.edu/owrc/Handouts/Developing%20Your%20Thesis.pdf/> [Accessed on 19/11/2020, at 15:00] & Naydan, Liliana. “How Do I Write an Intro, Conclusion, & Body Paragraph?” Available at: </https://lsa.umich.edu/sweetland/undergraduates/writing-guides/how-do-i-write-an-intro--conclusion---body-paragraph.html/> [Accessed on 19/11/2020, at 15:00]; “Tell ’Em What You’re Going to Tell ’Em; Next, Tell ’Em; Next, Tell ’Em What You Told ’Em”. Available at: </https://quoteinvestigator.com/2017/08/15/tell-em/> [Accessed on 22/11/2020, at 14:00].

relation in every area of social reality, despite the difficulties that one may encounter during the process. In this sense, it is asserted that such an ontologist never settles for the more straightforward or more approachable answer, and he or she is always inclined to be excited about digging deeper and deeper to uncover the hidden truth about the nature of a given phenomenon. “Ontology belongs to the central branch of philosophy known as metaphysics that deals with questions concerning what entities exist, or may be said to exist”² and how they may be grouped or subdivided within such a hierarchy, according to their both their similarities and their differences.

Why would we choose such a complex term to deal with such a political problem as the idea of humanitarian intervention? In order to explain that we would have to use a metaphor from one of my favorite passages in the poem: “The Road Not Taken”, by Robert Frost, who famously claims that (to paraphrase it) when given a choice between the well-traveled and unknown path, it is, at times, better to “take the road that is less traveled by, for it makes all the difference”.³

Indeed, by “outsourcing ontology” from the realm of philosophy and reintroducing it to the field of political science and IR theory, I hope to add a more excellent interdisciplinary value to the forthcoming debate that will attempt to escape the shallowness of ad hoc explanations of this ultimately quite vague concept. A careful ontological thinker would always ask himself a series of some of the simplest yet compelling questions that others simply do not even think of, such as: “Why?”, “Are we sure about that?”, “Is there any other explanation for this phenomenon?”, “Is there any other way?”, and “Why did it happen in such a way?” while others just take what is given for granted.

We are anyway prone to ask ourselves a very similar questions when we are faced with the international community’s lack of adequate response to some of the most recent humanitarian disasters in such places like Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, Iraq, Mali, Myanmar, South Sudan (and many any other historical places that have faced an inferno of some of the most deadly armed

2 For more information on the relation between ontology and metaphysics please see: Quine, Willard V. “On What There Is.” *The Review of Metaphysics* 2, no. 5 (1948): 21–38. Available at: </http://www.jstor.org/stable/20123117/> [Accessed on 24.11.2018, at 15:00]. Alternatively, please also see: Allen, Sophie “Properties”, Sub-chapter on “What Are Properties? Ontological Questions.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at <https://iep.utm.edu/properties/> [Accessed on 01.02.2020, at 15:00]. & Allen, S. R. 2016. *A Critical Introduction to Properties*. London: Bloomsbury.

3 Frost, Robert. “The Road Not Taken,” Poetry Foundation, <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/44272/the-road-not-taken>. Accessed 24 November 2020.

conflicts in the world). In such places, the value of human life seems to be so low that it makes us wonder whether these atrocities' perpetrators have realized that the Middle Ages' barbarity has already ended. Faced with pictures of atrocities committed on innocent civilians en masse, the increasingly conscious global observer starts to wonder whether the international community should intervene on a humanitarian basis to prevent any further crimes from happening. But there are no readily available solutions, such as the idea of humanitarian intervention, that could just be executed at once, for they need to be authorized by a UNSC decision in the first place. Even though the "justifying reasons" for any potential humanitarian intervention have a very strong underpinning in the Augustinian concept of *Jus Ad Bellum*, a long-established tradition in moral philosophy, its practical application is often seen as a very controversial idea. Robert O. Keohane once famously stated that saying "humanitarian intervention" in a room full of philosophers, legal scholars, and political scientists may be very dangerous and may be seen as crying "fire" in a crowded theater, for it can create a clear and present danger to everyone within earshot. The main reason for this state of affairs is the fact that the concept in question has traditionally been used and abused concerning both historical and still-unfolding humanitarian emergencies in the world. In such situations, the intervening parties very often choose to pursue their particular agendas and use their humanitarian pretenses only as a smokescreen. Still, this problem is more multidimensional than it is commonly understood, and it relates to how the entire concept is approached in the literature on the subject, which will be discussed in this research.

We must realize that the underlining causes of the difficulties in defining the concept of humanitarian intervention also relate to the fact that the discipline of social science that traditionally concerns itself with such complex but inherently vague concepts has outsourced the dealing with this problem to the field of International Relations (IR) theory, which happens to be increasingly pluralistic. As much as scholastic pluralism per se is one of our discipline's most inspiring features, it may also cause some conceptual issues in general, affecting each branch of this discipline's representatives. The individual members of a selected tradition tend to find it challenging to agree on how to constrain the idea of humanitarian intervention within much tighter and more universally recognized conceptual boundaries, or they are prone to dispute the way other branches within this tradition are presenting the main characteristics, nature, and the possible conditions for the implementation of the idea of humanitarian intervention.

It is not helping to overcome this difficulty given that specific individual approaches within IR tradition are much more closely interlinked (like, for instance, realism and liberalism) while others may appear as relatively unrelated or even primarily ignored by other scholars from more unorthodox approaches, such as postcolonialism, feminism, poststructuralism, and the IR school of Marxism. Furthermore, at times IR theory itself shows a particular propensity to be prone to be politicized, opinionated, or even biased. Nevertheless, in IR theory's defense, if we compare it with philosophy, it is still a relatively new discipline,⁴ so it is normal to expect that its ontological framework would need more revision than, for instance, philosophy, the discipline that has been with us for centuries. It is already an unwritten tradition that faced with significant conceptual difficulties, IR theorists would knock at philosophy's door to reach for the work of some reliable thinkers such as Immanuel Kant, Niccolò Machiavelli, David Hume, Thomas Hobbes, and John Stuart Mill, and there are many references to these philosophers in IR literature. Naturally, in similar debates in the past, various social scientists have made several justifiable and far less justifiable attempts to produce more tangible justifications (either in favor of or against a given humanitarian intervention, under given circumstances). At times, they may have also chosen to utilize various philosophical discoveries to strengthen the claim in a rather instrumental manner that a given philosopher would have chosen such a path. There is ample evidence proving many similar attempts in favor of or against any given intervention in the literature on the subject. However, this research will not follow such a suit. On the contrary, this study's main strength lies in the more coordinated application of various interdisciplinary approaches and methods, relying on sound methodology, robust epistemology, and much more comprehensive ontological inquiry than similar studies in the past.

4 Naturally comparing apples or oranges may be counterproductive, for it can be also effectively argued (and there is an ample evidence) that confirms that the IR theory has already matured as a new discipline both in Kuhnian and Lakatosian sense: "In his 1962 publication, *the Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Thomas Kuhn suggested that mature sciences were characterized by dominant paradigms, which determined both the trajectory of puzzle-solving "normal science" and provided paradigm-specific criteria for deciding whether such activity is successful or not. In contrast to normal science, said Kuhn, "revolutionary science" occurs when scientific communities switch between paradigms (Kuhn 1962, p. 94)." **For more details in this respect please see:** Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman "Lessons from Lakatos" p. 23 & p. 21–70 & Andrew Moravcsik "Liberal International Relations Theory: A Scientific Assessment" p. 159–204 & Jonathan M. DiCicco and Jack S. Levy "The Power Transition. Research Program. A Lakatosian Analysis" in Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (eds), *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press 2003).

Philosophy will not be used in such an instrumental manner in this respect; for it will be employed during the forthcoming investigation only in order to achieve a far greater clarity, objectivity, and clarity are required. So, we will be able to enter some uncharted territories of science that require far more attention to detail and reconciliation of all of the interdisciplinary aspects of this multidimensional, interconnected, and subtle endeavor. Finally, it is expected that emphasizing the ontological aspects of the research area will help attain far greater cohesion between various seemingly unrelated traditions in inherently politicized and at times biased International Relations theory.

In general, IR scholars, social scientists, and political thinkers may be skeptical about engaging in a truly philosophical debate, for they tend to ask and answer different kind of questions than philosophers, and opening the doors to for instance various transcendental, metaphysical, or universal deliberations may be counterproductive from their perspective. Although a very strong group of the IR scholars may be rather skeptical about the prospects of an extended collaboration between both of these traditions, we have already witnessed rather fruitful debates among the IR scholars on various philosophical matters. These debates date back to the work of Hans Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948)⁵, Kenneth Waltz's structural realism (or neorealism),⁶ and the work of Alexander Wendt (1999) that opened our field to more structured and more comprehensive agent-structure debate that is infused with various ontological deliberations. It has been already established beyond a considerable doubt that as long as both scientific fields keep their distinctive characteristics, there should be no harm in engaging in the interdisciplinary research and analysis. This being said, it has to be admitted that by merely knocking on the philosopher's doors, we should not expect that all of the similarly politicized problems at hand that cripple the integrity of our discipline would be miraculously resolved. Some limits, constraints, and insufficient appetite within our IR theory infuse it with too deep philosophical debates. It is likewise for policymakers who, especially when faced with an unfolding humanitarian emergency, need to come up with an instant response, so dealing with more philosophical

5 Please see: Vasquez, John A. "The Enduring Contributions of Hans J. Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations*." *International Studies Notes* 24, no. 1 (1999): 5–9. Accessed May 8, 2021. Available at: </http://www.jstor.org/stable/44235856/> [Accessed on 09/05/2021].

6 Please see Fischer, Markus. "On the Ontology of Structural Realism". *Open Journal of Political Science*, 9, p. 145–162. Available at: </https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=89895/> [Accessed on 09/05/2021].

matters can be seen as a luxury that one can hardly afford. Philosophical perfectionism could lead our inquiry astray, to some dead end, for what is universal cannot be particular, imperfect, material, subjective, speculative, political, and finally, human.

In essence, this project fulfills multiple functions, for it begins with a systematic ontological inquiry into the research on the idea of humanitarian intervention that seeks a credible explanation of what this concept indeed accounts for and under what circumstances it could be implemented in an unfolding humanitarian emergency in the contemporary world. These theoretical deliberations are followed by a more practical debate on the potential applicability of humanitarian intervention during selected phases of the Syrian conflict that broke out in 2011. As it is well documented in the literature on the subject, the situation in Syrian has deteriorated to (what in humanitarian terms can be clustered as) a Complex Humanitarian Emergency at least half a dozen times ever since 2011;⁷ for the scale of the civilian population's exposure to various atrocities during this conflict has varied significantly over the last ten years.

During this time the ordinary men, women and children in Syria have been exposed to an intentional brutality inflicted upon them from the hands of **the Syrian regime**, the jihadist organizations such as the **Islamic State**, **al-Nusra Front**, as well as occasional and rather accidental **collateral damage** inflicted upon them by other members of the **moderate Syrian opposition** that have fought under various umbrellas: **Free Syrian Army**, **Kurdish Peshmerga**, and other military groups associated with, **Syrian Muslim Brotherhood**, **Syrian National Council**, **National Coalition for Syrian Revolutionary and Opposition Forces**, as well as **other non-Syrian groups** involved in this conflict.⁸ From the perspective of hindsight, we also

7 According to Glossary of Humanitarian Terms, **Complex Emergency** is defined as “a multifaceted humanitarian crisis in a country, region or society where there is a total or considerable breakdown of authority resulting from internal or external conflict and which requires a multi-sectoral, international response that goes beyond the mandate or capacity of any single agency and/or the ongoing UN country programme. Such emergencies tend to have a devastating effect on children and women and call for a complex range of responses”. For more information in this respect, please see: “Glossary of Humanitarian Terms” published by Relief Web (August 2008). Available at: </https://www.who.int/hac/about/reliefweb-aug2008.pdf/> [Accessed on 05.05.2021, at 12:55].

8 The subject of pluralism of involved sides in the Syrian conflict is too important and too complicated to be fully discussed in a parenthesis, and I touch on it only as far as it is necessary for the purpose of illustration. For more information please see: Piotr Pietrzak “The Short, Medium and Long-Term Implications of the Russian Intervention in Syria” *International Scientific Conference “Security, Political and Legal Challenges of the Modern World”*. Conference Paper: ISSN: 9989-870-79-9.