

in Ukraine] / Mazuka Lyudmila Ivanivna // Strategichni prioriteti. – 2014. – № 4. – P. 21–25. – Bibliogr.: P. 24–25 [in Ukrainian]

4. Нарочницкая Н. Европа "Старая" и Европа "Новая" / Н.Нарочницкая // Международная жизнь. 2014. – № 4. – С.45 – 63.

Narochnitskaya N. Yevropa "Staraya" i Yevropa "Novaya" ["Old" and Europe "New"] // Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn. 2014. – № 4. – P.45 – 63. [in Russian]

5. Сорокин К.Э. Геополитика современного мира и Россия / К.Э.Сорокин // Политические исследования. – №1, 2008. – С. 28–30.

Sorokin K.E. Geopolitika sovremennogo mira i Rossiya [Geopolitics of the Modern World and Russia] // Politicheskie issledovaniya. – №1, 2008. P.28–30 [in Russian]

6. Смирнов Е.П. ЦВЕ между США и ЕС / Е.П. Смирнов // Канада – США: политика, культура, идеология. 2014. – № 8. – С.38–54.

Smirnov Y.P. CEE mezhd USA i EU // Kanada – SShA: politika, kultura, ideologiya. [CEE between the USA and the EU // Canada – USA: politics, culture, ideology.] 2014. – № 8. – P.38–54 [in Russian]

7. Цыганков П.А. Политическая социология международных отношений : [монография] / П.А. Цыганков. – М.: Радикс, 2004. – 217 с.

Tsygankov P.A. Politicheskaya sotsiologiya mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy [Political Sociology of International Relations] / P.A. Tsygankov. – M.: Radiks, 2004. – P. 217 [in Russian]

*Daryna Linnyk*

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University*

*Vinnitsia*

*Research Supervisor: I.Y.Chars'kykh, PhD. in History, Ass.Prof.*

*Language Supervisor O.O. Odintsova, Senior Lecturer*

## **HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION**

**Introduction.** Forty million civilians were killed during wars between states and approximately 240 million civilians were murdered by their own governments during the 1900s. More than ever before, civilians are being illegally targeted by governments and rebel groups during armed conflict [6]. So, humanitarian intervention is created and is justified because the international community has a moral duty to protect common humanity and because there is a legal obligation, codified in international law, for states to intervene against large scale human rights abuses.

**The objective of this piece of research** is to discuss and understand the basics of humanitarian intervention.

Humanitarian intervention is a means to prevent or stop a gross violation of human rights in a state, where such state is either incapable or unwilling to protect its own people, or is actively persecuting them. It's not just about using military force but also humanitarian aid and international sanction [6].

The UN has agreed to 3 principles of humanitarian intervention: uses military force, interferes in the target state's internal affairs, and responds crisis where states' interests are not directly threatened. In order to get the green light, The UN looks to the Security Council to authorize military force. Many scholars identify 1990s as a "decade of humanitarian intervention", during which the UN authorized several interventions on humanitarian grounds and the United States and its allies took military actions on at least 3 occasions, for express humanitarian forces, when it wasn't authorized by the Security Council. [2] Basically every use of military force is described as humanitarian intervention at that time.

The fact is that humanitarian intervention is here to stay and instead of trying to get rid of it there is more prudence in allowing the lesser evil of a legally-regulated form of humanitarian intervention. When its practical implementation can be subjected to control it can be streamlined to bring good results. Law cannot guarantee complete success of every endeavour of intervention on humanitarian grounds, though there should be a proper procedural and substantive legal regime to underwrite it [4: 121].

There's a need to mention "Responsibility to protect", which is usually considered to be categorically different from most definitions of humanitarian intervention but it's a Canadian response to unsatisfactory humanitarian intervention. It was produced in 2001 by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty ( ICISS ). This report sought to establish a set of clear guidelines for determining when intervention is appropriate, what appropriate channels for approving an intervention and how the intervention itself should be carried out. The responsibility is said to involve 3 stages: to prevent, to react, to rebuild.

When nations send their military forces into other nations' territory, it is rarely (if ever) for "humanitarian" purposes. They are typically pursuing their narrow national interests – grabbing territory, gaining geo-strategic advantage, or seizing control of precious natural resources. Leaders hope to win public support by describing such actions in terms of high moral purposes – bringing peace, justice, democracy and civilization to the affected area. Today's "humanitarian intervention" is only the latest tool in a long tradition of political obfuscation [3].

Talking about criticism, some scholars and politicians argue that humanitarian intervention is a modern manifestation of the Western colonialism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They say that humanitarian intervention is an illegal violation of sovereignty, that it does more harm than good. Others argue that dominant countries, especially the United States and its coalition partners, are using humanitarian pretexts to pursue otherwise unacceptable geopolitical goals and to evade the non-intervention norm and legal prohibitions on the use of international force. They argue that the United States has continued to act with its own interests in mind, with the only change being that humanitarianism has become a legitimizing ideology for projection of U.S. hegemony in a post-Cold War world.

A third type of criticism centers on the event-based and inconsistent nature of most policies on humanitarian intervention. These critics argue that there is a tendency for the concept to be invoked in the heat of action, giving the appearance of

propriety for Western television viewers, but that it neglects the conflicts that are forgotten by the media or occur based on chronic distresses rather than sudden crises. Henry Kissinger, for example, finds that Bill Clinton's practice of humanitarian intervention was wildly inconsistent. The US launched two military campaigns against Serbia while ignoring more widespread slaughter in Rwanda, justifying the Russian assault on Chechnya, and welcoming to the United States the second-ranking military official of a widely recognized severe human rights violator - the communist government of North Korea [7 :22-23]. The debate surrounding humanitarian intervention will always be contentious, as the discussion has implications for the value that international community places on human life.

However, genocides are instances in which the international community is justified in intervening. In the event of genocide, the targeted population's capacity for self-determination, or even the most basic measures of resistance to their aggressors, is severely restricted. In such cases, the victimized group is powerless before the apparatus of the state or the rebel group which is victimizing them, while their fellow nationals are either targeted themselves as sympathizers, or they are participating in the murders. An example of that phenomenon is the recent Arab Spring uprising in Libya, in which the rebels were directly threatened with death and seemed certain to be overrun by the former Libyan dictatorship before the arrival of humanitarian intervention in the form of NATO air strikes. In the event of genocide, therefore, the international community is justified in intervening because the state is unwilling or unable to protect its citizens' right to life and the citizens themselves are equally incapable of assuring their own survival [1].

**Conclusion.** International community must intervene with force against all actions of genocide. The universal acceptance of the right to life obliges to do no less. Basically, without intervention and the threat of intervention it is certain that national elites will murder and torture on a massive scale. However, the international community should be working towards the establishment of a standing UN army for the purpose of justifiable act of humanitarian intervention.

### References

- 1.Cox Dodgson T. Criticism of Humanitarian Intervention [Electronic resource] / Theo Cox Dodgson. – Retrieved from: <http://alevelpolitics.com/criticisms-of-humanitarian-intervention/>.
- 2.Golebiewski D. The Humanitarian Interventions of the UN [Electronic resource] / Daniel Golebiewski. – Retrieved from: <http://thepolitic.org/the-security-councils-humanitarian-intervention/>.
- 3.Humanitarian Intervention? [Electronic resource] – Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpolicy.org/qhumanitarianq-intervention.html>.
4. Ignatieff M. Intervention and State Failure / Michael Ignatieff // Dissent. – 2002. – p. 115–123.
- 5.International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. The responsibility to protect / International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. – Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001. – 91 p.

6.Jayakumar K. Humanitarian Intervention: A Legal Analysis [Electronic resource] / Kirthi Jayakumar. – Retrieved from: <http://www.e-ir.info/2012/02/06/humanitarian-intervention-a-legal-analysis/>.

7.Teson F. Liberal Case for Humanitarian Intervention / Fernando R. Teson. // FSU College of Law. – 2001. – 39. – Retrieved from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=291661>

*Anastasiia Matiukha*

*Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University*

*Vinnitsia*

*Research Supervisor: A. M. Karakuts, PhD in History, Ass. Prof.*

*Language Supervisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, PhD in Philology, Ass. Prof.*

## **EXISTING AND POTENTIAL CHALLENGES AND RISKS IN BILATERAL UKRAINE-GERMANY RELATIONS**

**Introduction.** Germany is Ukraine's one of the nearest neighbors belonging to the European Union, and an important and reliable partner on the way to Europe. Ukraine to Germany is the cornerstone of European security architecture. There is a dense network of political, economic, cultural, and private links between the two countries. The Federal Republic is one of the most active partners of Ukraine, its geopolitical role is determined not only by a high and sustainable economic growth, and, above all, a stable financial position. German politicians allocate an important role to our country, taking into account its geo-economic potential and growing foreign policy role as one of the great powers of Europe. However, the relationships cannot be described as ideal and predictable.

**The objective of this paper** is to highlight the existing and potential challenges and risks in bilateral relations between Ukraine and Germany.

The Germany's interest to Ukraine increased because of the aggression of Russia. Therefore, there is a reasonable risk that, in the case of stabilization of the situation the state will disappear from the radar of foreign policy priorities of Berlin. Moreover, the reconciliation between Kiev and Moscow could allow the Germans to return to the traditional "Eastern policy" with an emphasis on the restoration of relations with Russia [2].

However, the chances of such developments are low. At least in the short-term perspective there are no specific prerequisites for the reconciliation between Ukraine and Russia. Ignoring can occur, rather, in terms of the fact that the Berlin has already accustomed to the conflict between Ukraine and Russia, and therefore could not pay attention to other provocations of Moscow. In order to avoid this, Ukraine needs to provide on a regular basis the German party with the evidence of Russian destabilization of the situation in Ukraine within all the directions — military, political, economic, information, etc. [1].