

Ty Gomez

PS3351.254

Interventions in the view of international relations, refers to the deliberate actions of a state or a group of states in the affairs of a sovereign nation. Thus, interventions tend to aim at influencing social, political, or even economic outcomes. Interventions can also manifest in a variety of forms such as military, diplomatic, humanitarian, and economic actions. Justifications for any interventions are often highlighted around national security, protection of basic human rights, or even the nation's interest. Yet, while some may promote democracy and help to stabilize a destabilized region of a sovereign state, others argue and go around sovereignty in order to amplify a conflict.

Nye and Welch's textbook *Understanding Global Conflicts and Cooperation* analyzes in depth military interventions through what they view as the four main criteria which could determine whether any interventions are justifiable or unjustifiable. These four criteria include: (1) self-defense, (2) humanitarian justification, (3) legal authorization, (4) national interest. We can apply these four criteria to Russia's interventions within Ukraine more specifically in Crimea (2014 – present) and the threat of China making military interventions into Taiwan and reclaim it as part of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), when we break down each of the situations and apply Nye and Welch's four criteria it is clear and evident that neither both of these interventions are justifiable but rather are illegal.

Russia's interventions in Ukraine can be analyzed by these four unique criteria. Self-defense, in United Nations Charter Article 51 which essentially gives a legitimate justification for any sort of military intervention when a sovereign state is being attacked with the right to

defend itself from the outside force. Ukraine did not attack Russia, yet it was the complete opposite with Russia moving ground troops into the eastern portion of Ukraine more specifically Crimea in 2014 and in 2022. Russia makes the argument that NATO's continued presence in Eastern Europe is a clear threat to the homeland, but this doesn't qualify as an act of aggression towards Russia. So, since Ukraine did not make a hostile move that would cause Russia to make a retaliatory strike the clause of self-defense does not justify Russia's initial military movement.

The legal aspect (authorization) and Humanitarian justification are both illegal and baseless. For such an intervention to meet any legal standing it must show an authorization from an institution with such authority as the United Nations or even the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), but instead it was renounced illegal. From the humanitarian side of the stage Russia made a statement that Russian ethnic groups and Russian speaking members of Crimea and eastern Ukraine were seeking persecution from the Ukrainian government, which made them have to make military interventions in order to halt any ethnical cleansing or genocide. Ukraine denies any persecution of Russian ethnical groups or Russian speaking individuals, so this would mean that the human rights aspect of intervention would be ruled out as well.

From the aspect of national interest which we are warned by Nye and Welch not to use this alone as the sole justification, due to it leading to unchecked militarism and aggressive takeover of another sovereign state. Russia believes that with NATO moving closer to Eastern Europe to risk of Ukraine joining NATO grow significantly each year which scares Russia because it puts NATO right at Russia's doorstep. Principle sovereignty should take precedence over expansionist ambitions of any other state.

Therefore, with the application of all four criteria that Nye and Welch lay out this is clearly highlighting an unjustifiable and completely illegal intervention of moving into Ukraine.

Potential Chinese presence within Taiwan. China views Taiwan as a breakaway province (a region that has separated from a larger political entity) this means that any military interventions that China makes in Taiwan would be justified due to it being a domestic issue rather than an international issue. Yet, Taiwan operates as a de facto (a political regime existing where one group has all powers and aspects of State sovereignty) having their own economy, military, and established government.

From the standpoint of self-defense even though Taiwan does not pose as a highly credible threat to China with no military aggression being shown towards China. Therefore, China cannot make any claims that there is a high threat of any attack coming to their homeland which rules out the clause of self-defense.

The legal aspect (authorization) and Humanitarian justification are both baseless as well as Russia's argument. The United Nations has a very low probability of letting Chinese military invade Taiwan in order to reclaim it, so this means that this would be a clean-cut violation to international law and even a breach of Taiwanese state sovereignty. From the humanitarian standpoint Taiwan is a democracy with no evident crisis happening on their soil, this means that China can't make the claim that a military invasion is to protect the human rights of the people of Taiwan.

The national interest aspect is more of a scare for China due to the United States and many of its allies helping Taiwan and growing closer to Taiwan. This is not a clear national

security threat to China but instead its more of a strategy in order to retake Taiwan back and make it apart of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).

Thus, Chinas potential invasion into Taiwan is seen as territorial control with military intervention, and it would not be justified based on Nye and Welch's four criteria.

The situations of Russia and China shed light of the dangers of unjustified military interventions in the field of international politics. These interventions only challenge key criteria of international law, which would include sovereignty, non-aggression, and territorial integrity. The international community should and must uphold principles to prevent any forthgoing expansionism and even the global instability that comes with it. The failure to keep states accountable for any sort of unjustifiable interventions could set dangerous precedents. If any actions that Russia takes goes unchecked or without any repercussions could invite any other state to take actions on other sovereign states. Similarly, if China is allowed to make any militarily movement into Taiwanese territory whether that be land, air, or even sea it would cause grave destabilization to the Asia-Pacific region which destroy any successfulness that the United Nations has made in the past and even in the future.

After the application of Nye & Welch's four criteria self-defense, legal authorization, humanitarian grounds, and national interest we can see that Russia and China's interventions in both Ukraine and Taiwan both are not justifiable as we stated above, we can also see analyze that they both make rely more on the national interest side. They rely on strategy rather than any form of legitimacy of humanitarian or defensive grounds. Their actions are clear and evident violations of international law and sovereignty to other states. Nye and Welch criteria provide an essential framework for evaluating interventions, guaranteeing that they are guided by law and any ethical responsibility rather than geopolitical landscape and ambition. Members of the

international community must do their part in upholding state sovereignty, the principles rules based upon orders to prevent conflicts even maintain global peace and security, and finally accountability.