

Paradigms of Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Support Operation in War Zone: A Reflection of Russo-Ukrainian War

Osimen Goddy Uwa, Ph.D

Department of Political Science and International Relations, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria
goddy.osimen@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

Moyosoluwa Dele-Dada

Department of Political Science and International Relations, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria
moyosoluwa.dele-dadapgs@stu.cu.edu.ng

Abstract

Humanitarian intervention and Peace support operation has become an increasingly important and as well as turning into controversial topic over time. The Russian-Ukrainian War, which began in 2014, serves as a relevant case study for the discussion of humanitarian intervention and Peace support operation. The Russia-Ukraine war is a complex and politically sensitive matter involving several parties with competing interests. The violence within the region has resulted in a substantial amount of human suffering, including displacement, injuries, and deaths; as a result, there is an immediate need for humanitarian relief to assist those who have been affected. However, before taking any action, especially one with military repercussions, there is a need to weigh the political ramifications and ensure that doing so will not only make things worse but also violate international norms. Thus, the difficulty lies in bringing about a permanent and peaceful conclusion to the conflict while also providing adequate humanitarian aid in various forms. Therefore, this paper examines the impact of humanitarian intervention and Peace support operation in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian War. From the findings of the paper, it was revealed that the war has had a huge humanitarian impact on both Russia and Ukraine. While allies of either side could not officially participate in the war, they provided each side with various supports ranging from military assistance, financial aid, healthcare services to diplomatic support, to bring the woes of the war to an end. This paper concludes that the Russian-Ukrainian War serves as a key example of the complexities and challenges of humanitarian intervention in situations of war. It highlights the importance of finding new and innovative approaches to address mass atrocities, while also emphasizing the need for the international community to find a way to address the humanitarian crisis in conflict-affected regions.

Keywords: Conflict, Humanitarian intervention, peace support operation, Russia-Ukraine, war.

DOI: 10.7176/IAGS/99-02

Publication date: April 30th 2023

Introduction

Within the context of the global community, the question of whether or not to engage in humanitarian intervention and peace support operation is one that is becoming increasingly contentious. According to Finnermore (2015), it refers to the use of military force by one or more states to alleviate human suffering in another state. This could occur in a single state or across multiple states. According to Weiss (2016), the idea of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation has developed over the course of time, and the obligation to protect principle has gained growing support as a rationale for intervention as a result of this development. Nonetheless, the concept is subject to a great deal of criticism, the most prominent of which are worries regarding sovereignty and the possibility of abuse.

It is essential to keep in mind that the question of whether or not to engage in humanitarian intervention as well as Peace support operation is a nuanced and contentious one, with a variety of viewpoints and arguments surrounding it (Klose, 2016). The conflict between Russia and Ukraine, which started in 2014, is a good illustration of a situation that could benefit from the application of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation. According to Lava, de Luca, Milani, Leroy, Ritz, and de Winter (2020), the conflict that erupted as a result of Russia's annexation of Crimea and the subsequent uprising in eastern Ukraine has resulted in a significant number of civilian casualties and displacement. This conflict began as a result of Russia's annexation of Crimea and the subsequent uprising in eastern Ukraine. The current crisis in Ukraine has spurred debate across the globe over the right response, including the potential use of military force for humanitarian reasons (Catoire, 2022). According to Welt (2019), the problem with the involvement of humanitarian organisations in the conflict between Russia and Ukraine is that it is a complicated and politically delicate matter that involves multiple parties with competing interests. These parties include Russia, Ukraine, other bordering nations, and the international community. Lava et al., (2020) observed that the violence has resulted in a substantial amount of human suffering, including displacement, injuries, and deaths. As a direct consequence of this, there is an immediate need for humanitarian relief in order to assist those who have been impacted. The political

consequences must be carefully considered before any action is taken, especially one having military repercussions, to ensure that it would not make matters worse and would not be in violation of international conventions. The challenge is in bringing about a permanent and peaceful resolution to the war while simultaneously giving enough assistance to those in need of it on the humanitarian front. In the context of the Russian-Ukrainian War, this paper will investigate the history of the conflict, the reaction of the international community to the war, the ethics of humanitarian intervention and Peace support operation, and the constraints of such involvement. In addition to that, it will investigate the idea of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation, including its origins, its development through history, the basis for its application, and the effects it has during times of conflict. The purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive and well-rounded analysis of the influence that humanitarian intervention and Peace support operation during war can have by evaluating a variety of perspectives, including those presented here.

Conceptualization of Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Support Operation

The use of military action or the threat of military action by a state (or states) across borders to stop egregious and widespread human rights violations in a state that has not provided permission for the use of force is an illustration of humanitarian intervention (Finnermore, 2013). According to Reychler (2006), humanitarian interventions are only considered to be those that aim to alleviate the most extreme forms of suffering. As a result, activities such as maintaining peace, building peace, and providing aid for development do not fall under the category of humanitarian interventions. According to Finnermore (2015), the term "humanitarian intervention" does not have a universally accepted or legally recognised definition. Stahn (2017) argued that the distinctions in definition include whether or not humanitarian intervention is restricted to circumstances where the host state does not consent, whether or not humanitarian intervention is limited to punishing acts, and whether or not humanitarian intervention is limited to cases where the United Nations Security Council has explicitly authorised action. The threat and use of military force is crucial in the context of humanitarian intervention; it is an intervention in the sense that it comprises interfering in a state's internal affairs by deploying military troops into the territory or airspace of a sovereign state that has not committed an act of aggression against another state; and it is an intervention in response to situations that do not necessarily pose direct threats to a state's strategic interests (Menon, 2016; Stahn 2017).

In a further explanation, Pringle and Hunt (2015) stated that the goal of humanitarian assistance in times of war is to reduce the amount of human suffering that is occurring and to safeguard the lives and well-being of civilians. The international community may take action to prevent mass atrocities, such as the killing of innocent people, forced displacement, and human rights violations, in conflict zones where the government is either unable or unwilling to provide its citizens with basic security and protection. This action may take place in areas where the government is either unable or unwilling to provide basic security and protection (Gomez, Newell & Vannini, 2020). Thus, Menon (2016) came to the conclusion that the purpose of humanitarian interventions is to put an end to human rights violations committed against individuals who are not citizens of the state that is carrying out the intervention. In the same vein, Wallings (2016) stated that the sole purpose of humanitarian interventions is to alleviate the most extreme forms of human suffering. As a result, humanitarian intervention is a reaction to circumstances that do not necessarily pose direct threats to the strategic interests of states; rather, humanitarian intervention is driven by the desire to achieve certain humanitarian goals. To prevent its misuse by hegemony and aggressors and to allay fears that this is a licence to use force, it must be constrained in terms of its objectives, scope, and methods (Bellamy, 2015). In other words, in the context of these studies, peace support operation is the overall strategic impact of promoting peace in war zone; it can be understood as a process of reducing conflict dynamics in the area of operation over a particular period of time, in the context of its mandate and resources (UNGA, 2005).

Historical Overview of Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian action as a notion is centuries old, with historic precedents. Nonetheless, it wasn't until the 20th century that the global community started to formalise the idea and develop criteria for how it should be used.

One of the oldest examples of humanitarian intervention was in the 19th century, when European countries interfered in the Ottoman Empire to defend Christians from persecution (Rodogno, 2016). This was followed by a number of interventions in the 20th century, one of which being an intervention in Somalia in 1992 led by the United States of America and a coalition of other countries to alleviate a humanitarian crisis brought on by civil conflict and hunger (Clarke & Herbst, 2018). In 1999, NATO launched military intervention in Kosovo in order to save ethnic Albanians from being persecuted by the government of Serbia (Charney, 2017).

The inability of the international community to stop the genocide that took place in Rwanda in 1994 provided the impetus for a reexamination of the concept of humanitarian intervention. The inaction of the international community in the face of widespread atrocities was the impetus for the formulation of the "responsibility to protect" principle. This principle asserts that states have a responsibility to protect their

populations from widespread atrocities and that the international community has a responsibility to intervene when a state is either unable or unwilling to do so on its own (UNGA, 2005).

In the past, humanitarian efforts were restricted to saving one's own citizens or those in other states that were ethnically or religiously comparable to those in the home country (e.g., Christian countries intervening on behalf of Christians in non-Christian countries). Nonetheless, in reaction to shifts in the structure of the international system, the idea of humanitarian intervention has developed over time. The end of the Cold War and the advent of globalisation have led to an expanded involvement for non-state actors in humanitarian operations. These non-state actors include international organisations and non-governmental organisations (Saifullah, 2018). In addition, the utilisation of developing technologies like drones has ushered in both new obstacles and new chances for intervention. The United Nations Charter, which prohibits the use of force in international relations with two exhaustive exceptions—action taken by the UN Security Council under Chapter VII and self-defense against an armed attack—has supplanted the idea of humanitarian intervention in international customary law, which dates back to Hugo Grotius and 17th-century European politics (Hilpold, 2014). From the 19th century, both the nature and the frequency of humanitarian interventions have undergone considerable shifts, with the latter experiencing a particularly notable increase following the end of the Cold War (Kelsen, 2017).

During the course of the 20th century (and particularly after the end of the Cold War), the categories of people who were seen to be deserving of humanitarian assistance expanded beyond populations that shared a religious or ethnic background with them to encompass all individuals. Since NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999, humanitarian intervention has remained a fascinating foreign policy issue, as it emphasises the contradiction between the principle of state sovereignty – a defining pillar of the United Nations system and international law – and emerging international norms linked to human rights and the use of force. This tension has been highlighted by the fact that humanitarian intervention has remained a compelling foreign policy topic (Booth, 2012). In addition to this, it has sparked normative and empirical debates on its legality, the ethics of using military force in response to violations of human rights, when it should occur, who should intervene, and how effective it is.

The 2011 NATO action in Libya, which was authorised by the UN Security Council to protect people from attacks by the government of Muammar Gaddafi, is one of the most fairly recent cases of humanitarian intervention. The goal of this operation was to protect civilians from attacks. The mission was met with widespread opposition and criticism for going above and beyond its mandate to protect civilians by actively seeking Gaddafi's ouster from power (Terry, 2015). The historical instances of humanitarian intervention that have been offered above are not meant to serve as an entire list; rather, they are meant to highlight the development and shifting nature of the notion. It is crucial to note that these historical examples are not exhaustive. Nevertheless, it is also important to note that not all instances of humanitarian intervention have been effective or well-received by the world community.

The Justification for Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Support Operation in War Zone

During times of conflict, the protection of human rights should be a primary concern for humanitarian organisations, which is one of the primary arguments for intervening in such conflicts (Sandholtz, 2018). Disproportionate civilian deaths, rape, forcible population transfers, and other types of violence are just some of the human rights abuses that can result from a war (Walling, 2015). The international community must step in to preserve human rights and help those impacted by armed violence (Finnermore, 2015).

The obligation to protect principle was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 2005. It serves as a basis for international law regarding humanitarian intervention (Stahn, 2017). This concept asserts that governments have a responsibility to protect their people from mass atrocities and that the international community has a responsibility to intervene when a state is incapable or unwilling to protect its population from mass crimes (Evans, 2015). The idea also acknowledges that the use of force should be a last resort and that all non-military measures, including diplomacy and economic penalties, should be used before resorting to the use of armed conflict (Thakur, 2016).

In the most recent few years, the responsibility to protect principle has been used to legitimise a number of different humanitarian interventions and peace support operation, such as the NATO action that took place in Libya in 2011. On the other hand, the notion has been attacked for neglecting the sovereignty of states and for being exploited as a justification for bringing about changes in governments (Averre & Davies, 2015).

Another controversial topic is to the question of what part the international community should play in humanitarian aid (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020). The United Nations (UN) is the primary international organisation tasked with preserving international peace and security. The UN Security Council is the body within the UN that is vested with the authority to decide whether or not the use of force is justified in the service of protecting civilians (Howard & Dayal, 2018). On the other hand, there is frequently a lack of consensus within the Security Council about the question of whether or not to authorise humanitarian interventions, and certain members have

the power to reject such authorizations (Mingst, Karns & Lyon, 2018).

In the years immediately following the conclusion of the Cold War, the phrase "right of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation" was not utilised until 1990, when a group representing the United Kingdom did so for the very first time (Kabia, 2016). This occurred as a direct result of Russia and China voting against the establishment of a no-fly zone above Iraq. Thus, the concept's dual humanitarian and political purposes include skirting the UN Security Council through the invocation of rights. Critics, on the other hand, point to the Westphalian concept of international law to support their claims that the international community should not interfere with the internal affairs of independent states (Marxsen, 2015). Article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter from 1945 bolsters this idea by making clear that the organisation will not meddle in matters that are properly the purview of individual nations. As a consequence of this, and due to the fact that those who are in favour of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation do not have their separate legal underpinnings in the charter of the United Nations, there is still an ongoing debate on whether or not sovereignty or humanitarian causes need to take precedence. The United Nations has also shown a persistent concern with issues relating to humanitarian intervention. In recent years, the UN has become involved in an increasing number of conflicts that occur within the borders of individual countries (Alston & Mégret, 2013). As a result, new mechanisms for authorising and enforcing intervention have emerged, including coalitions of the willing and the deployment of regional institutions like the African Union. Some have argued that by avoiding the United Nations, these options are less accountable to the global community.

Forms of Humanitarian Intervention in War Zone

In spite of the fact that the vast majority of academics are in agreement that humanitarian interventions have to be carried out on a multilateral scale, there is still some discussion regarding which specific actors — the United Nations, regional organisations, or a group of states — ought to engage in response to widespread breaches of human rights (Recchia, 2017). The choice of actor has repercussions for the problem-solving strategy of collective action, which involves the mobilisation of political will and material resources. Questions surrounding the efficacy, behaviour, and motivations of a possible intervener, as well as the level of both internal and external support, and legal authorization, have been brought up as potential variables that might be used to determine the legitimacy of a potential intervener.

Pragmatic humanitarian intervention: Since the end of World War II, the concept of genocide has been the most well-known benchmark for humanitarian intervention. In accordance with the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, which was signed in 1948, the term "genocide" refers to acts committed with the goal to eliminate, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group (Aydin, 2014). The standard, on the other hand, is being questioned. This is due to the fact that if the international community uses the genocide standard to determine whether or not to engage in humanitarian intervention, it may be too late to make a meaningful intervention that could have prevented widespread mass killing in the country in question.

These well-known guidelines for humanitarian assistance do not resolve the trade-offs that states have to make between their moral responsibilities and the potential costs of their actions (Coyne, 2013). In addition, the commitment that states have to their own citizens could be put in jeopardy if they intervene without first formulating a feasible plan and developing a strategy that can be implemented. It is also important to keep in mind that sometimes the sole effect of humanitarian involvement is unbridled anarchy in the country without any significant advancement (Stanley & Brown, 2012).

Unauthorized interventions: At least in certain cases, individual nations or groups of states have used force to interfere in situations without first receiving authorization from the United Nations Security Council. This has been done at least in part in reaction to allegations of severe abuses of fundamental human rights. Both the protection of the Kurds in northern Iraq following the Gulf War and NATO's involvement in Kosovo are instances of interventions that occurred fairly recently (Valentino, 2011). There are four distinct approaches or perspectives that may be distinguished with regard to the legitimacy of humanitarian action in the absence of authorizations from the Security Council:

- **Status quo:** A military intervention as a response to crimes is only possible if it has been sanctioned by the United Nations Security Council or if it can be justified as an exercise in the right to self-defense. Other than that, the status quo remains in effect. Hence, the NATO involvement in Kosovo was a flagrant disregard for the provisions of Article 2(4) (Valentino, 2011). Many countries, including Russia and the People's Republic of China, are staunch supporters of this view. The proponents of this approach point to the actual text of the United Nations Charter and emphasise that the high threshold for authorising the use of force aims to minimise the use of force, promote consensus as well as stability by ensuring a basic acceptance of military action by key states, and prevent the use of force from being used as a means of settling international disputes (Duggan, 2017). The conflict in Kosovo, on the other hand, brought to light the shortcomings of this strategy. The Kosovo war brought to light the

shortcomings of this method, most notably in situations when effective and consistent humanitarian intervention is made improbable by the geopolitical reality of relations between the Permanent Five members of the Security Council. This results in the use of the veto and inconsistent action in the face of a humanitarian crisis.

- **Excusable breach:** Humanitarian action without a mandate from the United Nations is technically in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, but under certain rare circumstances, it may be ethically and politically justified (Donnelly, 2017). This strategy has a number of advantages, one of which is that it does not consider the creation of any new legal rules governing the use of force. Instead, it creates an "emergency exit" in situations where there is a conflict between the rules that govern the use of force and the rules that protect fundamental human rights. Although it is doubtful that intervening states will be held accountable for breaking the law, they do run the danger of breaking the laws in order to achieve what they perceive to be a more important goal. On the other hand, if this were to be put into effect, it might cause people to question the validity of the legal norms themselves because they would be unable to justify actions.
- **Customary law:** In this strategy, an examination of the development of customary law is carried out in order to find a legal foundation for unauthorised humanitarian action in exceptional circumstances. This strategy investigates the possibility of locating a developing principle of customary law, with the goal of determining whether or not humanitarian intervention can be understood to be not only morally and politically justifiable, but also lawful in accordance with the normative framework that governs the use of force (Hurd, 2011). Yet, there are not very many cases that exist to provide justification for the development of a norm. According to this approach, ambiguities and differences of view regarding the legality of an intervention may discourage states from taking action. Another potential cause for concern is the possibility that laws controlling the use of force could become laxer over time.
- **Codification:** The fourth strategy advocates for the codification of a clear legal theory or right of intervention. This strategy contends that such a doctrine might be developed through some formal or codified mechanism, such as an amendment to the United Nations Charter or a declaration from the United Nations General Assembly (Asamoah, 2012). Although states have been hesitant to advocate for this approach, a number of scholars and the Independent International Commission on Kosovo have made the case for the establishment of such a right or doctrine with specified criteria to guide assessments of legality (Thakur, 2016). One of the most compelling arguments in favour of codifying this right is that it would strengthen the legitimacy of international law and find a solution to the conflict that exists within the United Nations charter between the concepts of human rights and sovereignty. Nonetheless, the historical record on humanitarian intervention is sufficiently murky that it argues for modesty regarding efforts to identify in advance the situations under which nations can use force, without Security Council authorizations, against other states to preserve human rights.

Responsibility to protect: The creation of a "Responsibility to protect" (R2P) is noteworthy, while being generally viewed as radically dissimilar from most notions of humanitarian intervention. The Canadian government established the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in response to Kofi Annan's question of when the international community must act for humanitarian causes; the resulting 2001 report is titled R2P (Badescu, 2014). According to the findings of the research titled "The Duty to Protect," which was commissioned by the Canadian government, sovereignty not only bestowed upon a state the authority to "regulate" its internal operations, but it also bestowed upon the state the primary "responsibility" for safeguarding the safety of its own citizens (VanLandingham, 2012). In addition, the report made the suggestion that when a state fails to safeguard its people, whether due to a lack of capability or a lack of willingness, the responsibility for doing so should be transferred to the larger international community. The purpose of the report was to develop a clear set of principles for establishing when it is right to intervene, what the appropriate channels are for sanctioning such intervention, and how the action itself needs to be carried out.

In addition to promoting a greater dependence on non-military means, the responsibility to protect initiative works towards the establishment of a more transparent code of behaviour for humanitarian interventions (Labonte, 2013). In addition to this, the study offers criticism of the discourse and terminology that surrounds the topic of humanitarian intervention and makes an attempt to alter it. It contends that the concept of a "right to intervene" should be abandoned in favour of the R2P since it creates more problems than it solves (Stahn, 2017). According to the R2P doctrine, rather than having the right to intervene in the actions of other states, states are regarded as having the responsibility to step in and protect the residents of another state in situations in which the first state has failed in its responsibilities to protect its own citizens.

A rapid and effective collective reaction, international assistance and capacity building, and state protection obligations are often cited as the three pillars on which this duty rests. There is widespread support for the idea of R2P in some places, like Canada and a few European and African countries, and among human security advocates, but there is also widespread criticism of the idea from other locations, with a number of Asian

countries being among the most vocal opponents of the concept (Chandler, 2014).

Challenges of Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Support Operation in War Zone

Critiques can be made of humanitarian intervention, despite the fact that its goals are to reduce suffering and safeguard human rights. This section will examine three of the most common arguments against humanitarian intervention: concerns over sovereignty, the possibility for abuse of the notion, and the efficiency of such operations.

- **Sovereignty concerns:** The assertion that humanitarian intervention and peace support operation undermines the sovereignty of governments is among the most significant complaints levelled against it. It is generally agreed upon that the idea of sovereignty, which maintains that states have the right to rule themselves free from intervention from other nations, is an essential component of the system of international relations (Alles & Badie, 2016). Some people believe that humanitarian intervention and peace support operation can serve as a smokescreen for other, more nefarious goals, such as the overthrow of a government or the promotion of particular economic interests (Menon, 2016). For instance, the US-led intervention in Iraq in 2003 was justified on humanitarian grounds; nevertheless, it has been contended that the true reasons were to control Iraq's oil resources and to remove a danger that was considered to be directed towards them United States (Bojang, 2016). Another illustration of this can be seen in the military operation that took place in Libya in 2011, which was sanctioned by the UNSC under the responsibility to protect principle (R2P) in order to protect civilians from the possibility of being subjected to widespread genocide at the hands of the government (Welsh, 2016). On the other hand, the intervention was attacked for exceeding its mission, which led to the overthrow of the government, the murder of thousands of people, and the instability of the country (Brockmeier, Stuenkel & Tourinho, 2016)
- **Potential for abuse of the concept:** Another argument against the practise of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation is that it can serve as a cover for a military operation that is motivated by other considerations, such as the overthrow of an oppressive government or the promotion of certain economic interests (Menon, 2016). Abusing the concept of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation in order to meddle in the internal affairs of other states for one's own nefarious purposes is a straightforwardly possible scenario when powerful governments are involved. For instance, the US-led intervention in Kosovo in 1999 was justified on humanitarian grounds; nevertheless, some have suggested that the underlying reason for it was to strengthen NATO's power in the region (Richmond, 2016). In a similar vein, the intervention that took place in Libya in 2011 was criticised for exceeding its mandate and resulting in the overthrow of the government, the murder of thousands of people, and the instability that spread throughout the country (Welsh, 2016).
- **Effectiveness of humanitarian intervention and Peace Support Operation:** Another argument against humanitarian intervention and peace support operation is that it does not always succeed in attaining the objectives it sets out to accomplish. Some individuals assume that military action in a humanitarian crisis can make things worse rather than improve the situation (Garwood-Gowers, 2016). For instance, the purpose of the US-led intervention in Somalia in 1992 was to restore order and provide assistance to those in need, but instead it led to the murder of thousands of innocent civilians and the withdrawal of US soldiers without accomplishing either of those objectives (Clarke & Herbst, 2018). In a similar vein, the ongoing conflict in Syria, despite numerous attempts at intervention and ceasefires, has resulted in the murder of hundreds of thousands of people and the displacement of millions more (Akbarzada & Mackey, 2018).

The Russia - Ukrainian War: An Overview

Russian and Ukrainian relations throughout history have been fraught (Cheskin & March, 2015). In spite of the fact that the two nations share a lengthy history, language, and culture with one another, they have also been at odds with one another for many centuries. As a result of Ukraine being split and mostly ruled by Russia throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, a strong sense of Ukrainian nationalism emerged in that region (Hahn, 2018). In the years following World War II, Ukraine was annexed by the Soviet Union and converted into a republic; despite this, the country never stopped promoting its distinct cultural and national traditions (Miller, 2022).

Having begun in February of 2014 and continuing to this day, the Russo-Ukrainian War is primarily fought between Russia and pro-Russian soldiers and Ukraine (Angevine, Warden, Keller & Frye, 2019). The status of Crimea and certain parts of the Donbas, both of which are generally acknowledged by the international community as being a component of Ukraine, has been at the centre of the conflict (Petro, 2015). According to Woniak (2016), the crisis in Ukraine was sparked when President Yanukovich of Ukraine made the announcement that he would be withdrawing Ukraine from an agreement with the European Union in favour of

establishing stronger connections with Russia. This move was met with massive demonstrations in the country's capital city of Kiev, which finally led to the ousting of Yanukovich in February of 2014. (Koszel, 2020). In retaliation, Russian military forces occupied and subsequently annexed the Ukrainian territory of Crimea, while pro-Russian separatists in eastern Ukraine declared their country's independence (Bebier, 2015). In April 2014, the government of Ukraine announced that it would launch a military campaign against the separatists, which eventually developed into a full-scale conflict (Katchanovski, 2016).

In the year 2021, things began to spiral out of control. President Vladimir Putin of Russia began an all-out invasion of Ukraine on February 24th, 2022. Since Ukraine gained its independence in 1991, Russia and Ukraine have had a hostile relationship with one another (Fedorenko & Fedorenko, 2022). Russia has maintained that it did not initiate the conflict in Ukraine, despite the fact that Russian forces have crossed into Ukrainian territory and Russian missiles have struck both military and civilian targets across the country (Kryrydon, 2022). The battle has resulted in a significant amount of human suffering, with tens of thousands of people having either lost their lives, been injured, or been forced to flee their homes as a direct consequence of its impacts. Not only has it had huge political and economic ramifications for Russia and Ukraine, but it has also had these repercussions for the wider area and the rest of the world community as a whole (Charap & Colton, 2016; Welt, 2019; Ben Hassen & Bilali, 2022).

In connection with this conflict, allegations of human rights abuses, including but not limited to torture, enforced disappearances, and arbitrary detention, as well as violations of international humanitarian law, have been brought up (Henrikson, 2022). The issue has become even more complicated as a result of the involvement of foreign powers, such as Russia, which is being blamed for providing the separatists with both military and financial means of assistance (Feklyunina, 2016). The efforts that have been made to find a resolution to the dispute have been fruitless up to this point despite the fact that there have been multiple rounds of diplomacy and international sanctions levelled against Russia. The disagreement has not yet been resolved, and it continues to be a key contributor to the tension and instability that characterises the region (Welt, 2019).

Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Support Operation in the Russo-Ukrainian War

The current crisis between Russia and Ukraine has prompted questions regarding the viability of a humanitarian intervention and peace support operation by the international community. Most notably, there is continued debate about whether or not humanitarian organisations should get involved in the Russia-Ukraine conflict. While some people believe that such an intervention would assist to stabilise the situation and protect civilians from damage, others argue that it would only make things worse if it were to take place. According to proponents of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation, the violence has resulted in a significant amount of human suffering, as evidenced by the fact that over two million people have been forced to evacuate their homes and thousands of lives have been lost (Welt, 2019). An intervention for the sake of humanitarianism has the capacity to protect civilians and deliver relief and support to those whose lives have been upended by the conflict. Yet, many who disagree with this course of action refer to Russia's involvement in the conflict as evidence that the situation is only going to become worse. Furthermore, they highlight how military actions have been criticised for having unintended negative consequences (Garwood-Gowers, 2016).

The ultimate impact of a humanitarian intervention and peace support operation in the conflict between Russia and Ukraine would depend on a variety of factors. These factors include the nature of the specific intervention that will be carried out as well as the reactions of the parties that are at odds with one another. Yet, it cannot be denied that the war has resulted in a significant increase in the suffering of civilians, and that additional steps need to be taken to protect the rights of these people while also providing them with assistance and support (Henrikson, 2022).

Humanitarian relief supplies have been delivered in large numbers to those in Russia and Ukraine who have been affected by the hostilities between their countries. Nonetheless, efforts have been made to assist individuals who have been impacted by the fighting (Ociepa-Kiciska & Gorzaczyska-Koczkodaj, 2022). The conflict has had a significant impact on the humanitarian situation in both Russia and Ukraine as a whole. These relief efforts, which have provided essentials such as food, clothing, and medical attention to individuals who were in need, have been spearheaded by the governments of the two nations, in addition to organisations from other countries (Bilali, 2022).

Those who were forced to flee their homes as a result of the violence have received assistance in the form of food, shelter, medical care, and other essentials from both the Ukrainian government and international organisations. As a direct result of the conflict in Ukraine, the United Nations and other humanitarian organisations have been active across the entirety of the country. These organisations are providing assistance to those who have been uprooted from their homes and bolstering efforts to restore essential services to those who continue to make their homes there (Jain, Prasad, Bordeniuc, Tanasov, Shirinskaya, Béla,... & Reinis, 2022).

Those in Russia and Ukraine who have been harmed by the conflict have received assistance in the form of humanitarian aid from organisations based elsewhere. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has

been engaged in the region, providing assistance to people who have been forcibly displaced, injured, or imprisoned as a result of the conflict. During this time of need, a number of other organisations, such as Save the Children and Doctors Without Borders, have also provided assistance to individuals who are in need (Guenette, Kenworthy, & Wheeler, 2022). Other types of assistance include the following:

Provision of Military and Political Support: Military aid has been offered to Ukraine by a number of countries in reaction to the crisis with Russia. The form and scope of this assistance have changed throughout time, but it has always included training, advice, and hardware for the military (Karolewski & Cross, 2017).

The United States has provided significant aid to the Ukrainian armed forces, primarily in the form of nonlethal military aid such as armoured vehicles, radar technology, and communication equipment. In an effort to bolster Ukraine's armed forces and enable the country to better defend itself against Russian aggression, military units in Ukraine have received training and advice from the United States (Mills & Curtis, 2022). According to Antezza, Frank, Frank, Franz, Kharitonov, Kumar,... & Trebesch, (2022), Canada has provided Ukraine with non-lethal military support in the form of training, advisers, and equipment such as helmets, vests, and first-aid kits. There have been a number of additional countries, including Poland, Lithuania, and the United Kingdom, that have extended an offer of military assistance to Ukraine. This assistance has been provided in the form of both material donations, such as the provision of military equipment and training, as well as in-kind contributions, such as the deployment of military personnel to assist in the capacity of advising and training (Mills & Curtis, 2022).

Although though some countries have provided Ukraine with military assistance, others, such as Russia, have supported separatist rebels in the war zone, which has contributed to the continued carnage and contributed to the instability in the region (Nicholson, 2020). The providing of military support has been a contentious issue during the entirety of the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. While some countries have supported Ukraine in its efforts to defend itself against Russian aggression, others have urged for a peaceful resolution of the crisis through diplomatic means (Welt, 2019).

Provision of Economic and Financial Aid: The United States has provided assistance to Ukraine in various different ways during the conflict with Russia. This support has been provided in the form of both economic and military assistance, in addition to diplomatic backing (Mills & Curtis, 2022). The United States of America has extended financial assistance to Ukraine in the form of economic aid in order to support the country in its efforts to implement economic reforms and to achieve economic stability. Support in the form of financial aid, assistance in the form of technical support, and loan guarantees have all been provided to assist in reorganising the energy industry (Pronko, Furman, Kucher & Gontaruk, 2022).

In addition to this, Canada has offered financial assistance to Ukraine in order to help economic reforms, and it has implemented economic sanctions against Russia as a response to Russia's actions in Ukraine (Guenette, 2022). Additionally, Australia has offered financial assistance to Ukraine in the form of aid to support the country's ongoing economic reforms. Besides this, Australia has offered assistance in the form of humanitarian assistance to people who have been negatively impacted by the conflict (El-Badawy, Munasinghe, Bukarti, & Bianchi, 2022). Australia, much like Canada, has retaliated against Russia with economic penalties in reaction to Moscow's activities in Ukraine and has also been an outspoken supporter of Ukraine's right to self-determination and territorial integrity in the context of the international community (Welt, 2020).

Diplomatic Support: The United States has been supporting Ukraine diplomatically by engaging in political and diplomatic dialogue with Ukrainian officials and participating in international efforts to mediate the conflict. The United States, along with other nations and international organisations, has exerted diplomatic pressure on Russia to cease its aggression against Ukraine and work towards a peaceful resolution to the crisis (Carment, Nikolko & Belo, 2019). In an effort to find a diplomatic solution, Chinese diplomats have been meeting with their Normandy Format allies. The government of China has made it clear that it backs the Normandy Format and other diplomatic initiatives aimed at bringing an end to the conflict, and it has urged all parties involved to demonstrate the same level of commitment (Zachau, 2021). China has not openly interfered in the conflict between Russia and Ukraine; nonetheless, it has maintained its position as a neutral party while emphasising the importance of a peaceful resolution to the conflict and respecting Ukraine's constitutionally guaranteed right to self-determination (Cafruny, Fouskas, Mallinson, & Voynitsky, 2023). Both Canada and Australia have been active participants in international measures aimed at bringing about a peaceful resolution to the war, including taking part in the Normandy Format and various other diplomatic endeavours. They have urged all parties to preserve Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity and have highlighted the need for a peaceful conclusion to the crisis (Welt, 2020).

Healthcare Services and Medical Assistance: Several different nations have provided victims of the conflict between Russia and Ukraine with medical aid and other forms of health care. The healthcare system in Ukraine has been improved with assistance from the United States, which has provided the country with medical equipment, funded the development of infrastructure, educated and supported healthcare personnel, and helped educate future healthcare professionals. In addition to providing financial assistance, the United States has also

supplied Ukraine with mobile medical units as part of an effort to offer much-needed medical attention to people who require it, irrespective of where in Ukraine they may be located, as a direct result of the war (Awuah, Mehta, Kalmanovich, Yarlagadda, Nasato, Kundu, ... & Sikora, 2022).

Additionally, Canada has assisted Ukraine in a variety of different ways, the most notable of which are the provision of medical equipment to Ukraine as well as the provision of resources for the practitioners working in the country's healthcare system. In addition, Canada has made a contribution to the reconstruction of hospitals and other medical facilities that were damaged or destroyed as a direct result of the conflict (Awuah et al., 2022). In addition, international organisations such as WHO and the ICRC have provided assistance to the people of both Russia and Ukraine. In areas of Ukraine that have been affected by the conflict, the World Health Organization has worked to ensure that essential medicines and medical supplies are readily available. Moreover, the organisation has provided Ukraine's healthcare professionals with technical assistance and training (World Health Organization, 2022). The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has been particularly active in bringing medical aid to individuals who have been hurt or are in need of medical treatment as a consequence of the violence (Awuah et al., 2022). Overall, the accessibility of health care and medical aid has substantially benefited the humanitarian response to the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. Several nations and international organisations have contributed medical aid and support in order to assist with the fulfilment of the needs of people whose health has been negatively impacted as a result of the conflict (WHO, 2022).

The limitations of Humanitarian Intervention and Peace Support Operation in Russo-Ukrainian War

The crisis in Ukraine has persisted, and there is currently little indication that it will ever be resolved, despite the efforts of the international community. Due to the fact that political and strategic factors are the primary drivers of the war, the impact of humanitarian intervention on the war has been relatively minimal. The war has continued to take a toll on the civilian population, despite the efforts of foreign assistance groups, which have provided some relief to those who have been impacted by it through their efforts (Davis, 2016). The absence of international consensus has been one of the most significant barriers to effective humanitarian intervention in the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. It has been difficult to adequately handle the violence and give enough assistance to those who are in need since there has not been a cohesive reaction from the international community (Perepelytsia, 2022). In addition, the violence has persisted despite the efforts of international organisations, which exemplifies the constraints that are placed on humanitarian intervention in settings where there is armed conflict.

Moreover, access restrictions have hampered humanitarian efforts during the Russian-Ukrainian conflict (Karakiewicz-Krawczyk et al., 2022). It has been challenging for humanitarian agencies to work efficiently on the ground due to the conflict's impact on transportation and security. As a direct consequence of this, a significant number of individuals have been denied access to critical forms of assistance and services.

Conclusion

In summary, the idea of humanitarian intervention and peace support operation continues to be a very useful instrument for the purpose of shielding civilians during times of armed conflict. The international community should proceed with prudence and make sure that any interventions and support are well-planned, well-coordinated and well-executed, taking into account the opinions of the affected population and working with regional organisations and other actors to find a political solution to the situation. The Russian-Ukrainian War is a strong illustration of the complexities and difficulties associated with intervening on behalf of humanitarian causes in times of war. It emphasises the necessity for the international community to find a solution to address the humanitarian crises in conflict-affected regions while also highlighting the importance of discovering new and innovative approaches to address mass atrocities.

References

- Akbarzada, S., & Mackey, T. K. (2018). The Syrian public health and humanitarian crisis: a 'displacement' in global governance?. *Global Public Health*, 13(7), 914-930.
- Alles, D., & Badie, B. (2016). Sovereignism in the international system: from change to split. *European Review of International Studies*, 3(2), 5-19.
- Alston, P., & Mégret, F. (Eds.). (2013). *The United Nations and human rights: a critical appraisal*. OUP Oxford.
- Angevine, R., Warden, J. K., Keller, R., & Frye, C. (2019). *Learning lessons from the Ukraine conflict*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Defense Analyses, document NS D-10367, May, 1, 1.
- Antezza, A., Frank, A., Frank, P., Franz, L., Kharitonov, I., Kumar, B., ... & Trebesch, C. (2022). *The Ukraine Support Tracker: Which Countries Help Ukraine and How?* (No. 2218). KIEL working paper.
- Asamoah, O. Y. (2012). *The legal significance of the declarations of the General Assembly of the United Nations*. Springer.
- Awuah, W. A., Mehta, A., Kalmanovich, J., Yarlagadda, R., Nasato, M., Kundu, M., ... & Sikora, V. (2022).

- Inside the Ukraine war: health and humanity. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 98(1160), 408-410.
- Aydin, D. (2014). The interpretation of genocidal intent under the genocide convention and the jurisprudence of international courts. *The Journal of Criminal Law*, 78(5), 423-441.
- Badescu, C. G. (2014). The evolution of international responsibility: From responsibility to protect the responsibility while protecting. *Int'l Stud. J.*, 11, 45.
- BBC News. (n.d.). Ukraine crisis in maps. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-26248275>
- Bebier, A. (2015). Crimea and the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. *Romanian J. Eur. Aff.*, 15, 35.
- Bellamy, A. J. (2015). Humanitarian intervention. In *The Routledge Handbook of Global Ethics* (pp. 139-152). Routledge.
- Bojang, M. B. (2016). The hidden agenda behind the invasion of Iraq: The unjust war over Iraq in 2003. *Central European Journal of Politics*, 2(2), 1-14.
- Booth, K. (2012). *The Kosovo tragedy: The human rights dimensions*. Routledge.
- Brockmeier, S., Stuenkel, O., & Tourinho, M. (2016). The impact of the Libya intervention debates on norms of protection. *Global Society*, 30(1), 113-133.
- Cafruny, A., Fouskas, V. K., Mallinson, W. D., & Voynitsky, A. (2023). Ukraine, Multipolarity and the Crisis of Grand Strategies. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 25(1), 1-21.
- Carment, D., Nikolko, M., & Belo, D. (2019). Gray zone mediation in the Ukraine crisis: comparing Crimea and Donbas. In *Research Handbook on Mediating International Crises* (pp. 124-140). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2019, June 27). The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention in the Ukrainian War. <https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/06/27/limits-of-humanitarian-intervention-in-ukrainian-war-pub-79077>
- Chandler, D. (2014). The Responsibility to Protect? Imposing the 'Liberal Peace'. In *Peace operations and global order* (pp. 59-81). Routledge.
- Cheskin, A., & March, L. (2015). State–society relations in contemporary Russia: New forms of political and social contention. *East European Politics*, 31(3), 261-273.
- Council on Foreign Relations. (n.d.). International Response to the War in Ukraine. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/international-response-war-ukraine>
- Council on Foreign Relations. (n.d.). The War in Eastern Ukraine. <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/war-eastern-ukraine>
- Coyne, C. J. (2013). *Doing bad by doing good: Why humanitarian action fails*. Stanford University Press.
- Davis, C. M. (2016). The Ukraine conflict, economic–military power balances and economic sanctions. *Post-Communist Economies*, 28(2), 167-198.
- Donnelly, J. (2017). Genocide and humanitarian intervention. In *Genocide and Human Rights* (pp. 385-401). Routledge.
- Donnelly, J., & Whelan, D. J. (2020). *International human rights*. Routledge.
- Duggan, N. (2017). The People's Republic of China and European Union security cooperation in Africa: Sino-EU security cooperation in Mali and the Gulf of Aden. *International Journal of China Studies*, 8(1), 1-23.
- El-Badawy, E., Munasinghe, S., Bukarti, A. B., & Bianchi, B. (2022). Security, Soft Power and Regime Support: Spheres of Russian Influence in Africa. *Tony Blair Institute for Global Changes*, 23.
- Fedorenko, V., & Fedorenko, M. (2022). Russia's Military Invasion of Ukraine in 2022: Aim, Reasons, and Implications. *Krytyka Prawa. Niezależne studia nad prawem*, 14(1), 7-42.
- Ferris, E., & Kirisci, K. (2016). *The consequences of chaos: Syria's humanitarian crisis and the failure to protect*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Finnemore, M. (2013). The purpose of intervention. In *The Purpose of Intervention*. Cornell University Press.
- Finnemore, M. (2015). Constructing norms of humanitarian intervention. In *Conflict After the Cold War* (pp. 272-289). Routledge.
- Fournier, A. (2018). From frozen conflict to mobile boundary: Youth perceptions of territoriality in war-time Ukraine. *East European Politics and Societies*, 32(01), 23-55.
- Garwood-Gowers, A. (2016). China's "Responsible Protection" concept: Reinterpreting the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and military intervention for humanitarian purposes. *Asian Journal of International Law*, 6(1), 89-118.
- Gomez, R., Newell, B. C., & Vannini, S. (2020). Empathic humanitarianism: Understanding the motivations behind humanitarian work with migrants at the US–Mexico border. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 8(1), 1-13.
- Guenette, J. D., Kenworthy, P. G., & Wheeler, C. M. (2022). Implications of the War in Ukraine for the Global Economy.
- Hehir, A. (2013). *Humanitarian intervention: an introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hilpold, P. (2014). R2P and Humanitarian Intervention in a Historical Perspective. *Responsibility to Protect (R2P): A new paradigm of international law*.

- Human Rights Watch. (2019, July 18). The Human Cost of the War in Ukraine. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/07/18/human-cost-war-ukraine>
- Hurd, I. (2011). Is humanitarian intervention legal? The rule of law in an incoherent world. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 25(3), 293-313.
- Jain, N., Prasad, S., Bordeniuc, A., Tanasov, A., Shirinskaya, A. V., Béla, B., ... & Reinis, A. (2022). European countries step-up humanitarian and medical assistance to Ukraine as the conflict continues. *Journal of primary care & community health*, 13, 21501319221095358.
- Kabia, J. M. (2016). *Humanitarian intervention and conflict resolution in West Africa: from ECOMOG to ECOMIL*. Routledge.
- Kallenborn, Z. (2022). InfoSwarms: Drone Swarms and Information Warfare. *The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters*, 52(2), 87-102.
- Karakiewicz-Krawczyk, K., Zdziarski, K., Landowski, M., Nieradko-Heluszek, A., Kotwas, A., Szumilas, P., ... & Karakiewicz, B. (2022). The Opinions of Poles about the Need to Provide Humanitarian Aid to Refugees from the Area Covered by the Russian–Ukrainian War. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(20), 13369.
- Karolewski, I. P., & Cross, M. A. K. D. (2017). The EU's Power in the Russia–Ukraine Crisis: Enabled or Constrained?. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55(1), 137-152.
- Katchanovski, I. (2016). The separatist war in Donbas: a violent break-up of Ukraine?. *European Politics and Society*, 17(4), 473-489.
- Kelsen, H. (2017). Collective security and collective self-defense under the Charter of the United Nations. In *The Use of Force in International Law* (pp. 97-110). Routledge.
- Kuzyk, P. (2019). Ukraine's national integration before and after 2014. Shifting 'East–West' polarization line and strengthening political community. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 60(6), 709-735.
- Labonte, M. (2013). *Human rights and humanitarian norms, strategic framing, and intervention: lessons for the responsibility to protect*. Routledge.
- Lava, S. A., de Luca, D., Milani, G. P., Leroy, P., Ritz, N., & de Winter, P. (2022). Please stop the Russian-Ukrainian war—children will be more than grateful. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 181(6), 2183-2185.
- Marxsen, C. (2015). Territorial Integrity in International Law—Its Concept and Implications for Crimea. *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, 75(1), 7-26.
- Menon, R. (2016). *The conceit of humanitarian intervention*. Oxford University Press.
- Menon, R. (2016). *The conceit of humanitarian intervention*. Oxford University Press.
- Miller, A. I. (2022). National identity in Ukraine: history and politics. *Russia in Global Affairs*, (4), 46-65.
- Mills, C., & Curtis, J. (2022). *Military assistance to Ukraine since the Russian invasion*. House of Commons Library.
- Mingst, K. A., Karns, M. P., & Lyon, A. J. (2018). *The United Nations in the 21st century*. Routledge.
- Mohajan, H. K. (2018). The Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar are Victim of Genocide!. *ABC Journal of Advanced Research*, 7(2), 95-108.
- Ociepa-Kicińska, E., & Gorzałczyńska-Koczkodaj, M. (2022). Forms of Aid Provided to Refugees of the 2022 Russia–Ukraine War: The Case of Poland. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(12), 7085.
- Oxford Research Encyclopedias. (n.d.). Humanitarian Intervention: An Overview. <https://oxfordre.com/internationalrelations/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-71>
- Pearson, N. (2015). Private Military Contractors, security Forces, and mercenaries. *Laurier undergraduate Journal of the Arts*, 2(1), 61-72.
- Perepelytsia, H. (2021). The dilemma of war and peace in the trend of the XXI century (Russian–Ukrainian case). *Przegląd Strategiczny*, 11(14), 249-275.
- Petro, N. N. (2015). Understanding the other Ukraine: identity and allegiance in russophone Ukraine. *Ukraine and Russia: People, Politics, Propaganda and Perspectives*, Bristol, United Kingdom: E-International Relations Edited Collections, 19-35.
- Pringle, J., & Hunt, M. (2015). Humanitarian action. *Encyclopedia of Global Bioethics*, 1-10.
- Pronko, L., Furman, I., Kucher, A., & Gontaruk, Y. (2020). Formation of a state support program for agricultural producers in Ukraine considering world experience. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*.-2020.-Vol. 9, № 1.-S. 364-379.
- Recchia, S. (2017). Authorising humanitarian intervention: a five-point defence of existing multilateral procedures. *Review of International Studies*, 43(1), 50-72.
- Richmond, S. (2016). Why is humanitarian intervention so divisive? Revisiting the debate over the 1999 Kosovo intervention. *Journal on the Use of Force and International Law*, 3(2), 234-259.
- Ryan, M. (2011). Bush's "Useful Idiots": 9/11, the Liberal Hawks and the Cooption of the "War on Terror".

- Journal of American Studies, 45(4), 667-693.
- Sehrawat, V. (2017). Legal status of drones under LOAC and international law. *Penn St. JL & Int'l Aff.*, 5, 164.
- Stahn, C. (2017). Responsibility to protect: political rhetoric or emerging legal norm?. In *Globalization and Common Responsibilities of States* (pp. 147-168). Routledge.
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (n.d.). The Ethics of Humanitarian Intervention. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-humanitarian-intervention/>
- Stanley, B., & Brown, G. K. (2012). Safety planning intervention: a brief intervention to mitigate suicide risk. *Cognitive and behavioral practice*, 19(2), 256-264.
- Thakur, R. (2016). Rwanda, Kosovo, and the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Oxford Handbook of the Responsibility to Protect*, 94.
- United Nations. (n.d.). Humanitarian consequences of the conflict in Ukraine. <https://www.un.org/ukraine-humanitarian-update/humanitarian-consequences-conflict-ukraine>
- United Nations. (n.d.). The Responsibility to Protect. <https://www.un.org/en/genocideprevention/about-r2p.shtml>
- Valentino, B. A. (2011). The true costs of humanitarian intervention-the hard truth about a noble notion. *Foreign Aff.*, 90, 60.
- VanLandingham, R. (2012). Politics or Law: The Dual Nature of the Responsibility to Protect. *Denv. J. Int'l L. & Pol'y*, 41, 63.
- Walling, C. B. (2015). Human rights norms, state sovereignty and humanitarian intervention. *Hum. Rts. Q.*, 37, 383.
- Weiss, T. G. (2016). *Humanitarian intervention*. John Wiley & Sons
- Welsh, J. M. (2016). The responsibility to protect after Libya & Syria. *Daedalus*, 145(4), 75-87.
- Witt, T. (2019). Forced Migration: A Syrian Exodus to Germany. *Journal of Undergraduate Research at Minnesota State University, Mankato*, 19(1), 2.
- World Health Organization. (2022). Response to the Ukraine Crisis: interim report, February to June 2022 (No. WHO/EURO: 2022-5897-456620-65580). World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe.
- Woźniak, M. (2016). The Ukraine crisis and shift in US foreign policy. *International Studies: Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal (IS)*, 18(2), 87-102.
- Zachau, J. (2021). Russia's Instrumentalisation of Conflict in Eastern Europe: The Anatomy of the Protracted Conflicts in Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova. *SCEEUS Reports on Human Rights and Security in Eastern Europe*, 6.