

Finnemore:

-Focuses on the new wave of international military interventions, theoretically for humanitarian purposes, focusing on the way that interventions has been differentially justified throughout history and the way international norms impacted the type and frequency of interventions.

-Argues that interests as defined by realism do not fully explain new cases of international intervention such as Somalia and Bosnia. Such actions do not appear to be in the national interests of the intervening nations, whether defined in security or economic terms.

-Could say support for democracy/liberalism motivated intervention, but US disavowal of nation-building in Somalia and refusal to overthrow Hussein in Iraq demonstrates that democracy promotion does not lie at the heart of current interventions.

-Thus, need a different type of approach to understand why intervention occurred: argues that attention to international norms and the way they structure interests in coordinated ways across the international system provides such an approach; a norms approach addresses an issue obscured by approaches that treat interests exogenously; focuses on the way interests change

-Normative context shapes the context of interest and policy actions; it creates broad patterns of actions; norms evolve with changes in social interactions because they are socially constructed.

-Constructivist approach does not deny that power and interest are important, but asks different question: what are interest? What are the ends and means to which power will be used?

-Thesis: norms about who should be protected and the way they should be protected explain changes in international humanitarian intervention

-Could argue that examining justifications for intervention doesn't provide a complete explanation because justifications are disguises for true motivations. However, untangling precise motivations can be hard because motives are also mixed; justification is also important because it relates to the way actions are connected to the international community.

Analysis valuable for 4 reasons:

1. humanitarian justifications for intervention are not new, but the content of those justifications have changed over time.

2. Specifically, interpretations of WHICH human beings merit intervention has changed. In the 19th century, western states only evaluated Christian populations as “worthy” of intervention. Recently, a more expansive definition has taken hold

3. norms evolve in part through challenges to previous consensus. Humanitarian norms have not been fully accepted, but they have risen in prominence

4. in the context of broader norms, intervention is only one manifestation of changes in a larger set of norms that have developed in the last 150 years, specifically norms of decolonization and self-determination.

5. The structuring and organization of the international normative context is important. Examination of humanitarian norms and intervention suggests that norm institutionalization, the way norms are embedded in international organizations and institutions, is critical to patterns of norm evolution; institutionalization further increases the power and elaboration of the normative claims.

Decolonization and self-determination norm change involved a redefinition and universalization of “humanity” for Europeans that changed the evaluation of sovereignty and of humanitarian discourse.

-Norms can be mutually reinforcing; should think of norms as part of a highly structured social context, not individually

-As concept of humanity expanded, humanitarian intervention in a wider variety of circumstances considered more legitimate. Norms now allow intervention in cases of disaster or abuse with 2 limits:

1. permissive norms only, don't require intervention
2. place strict requirements on method of intervention (multilateral, with the UN, intervening powers should not have stake in dispute)

-recent interventions exhibit the qualitative dimension of multilateralism; organized according to and in defense of generalized principles of international responsibility and the use of military force, many of which are codified in the UN charter, declarations, and standard operating procedures.

-contemporary multilateralism is political and normative, not strategic; shaped by shared notions of when the use of force is legitimate and appropriate; contemporary legitimacy criteria for the use of force derive from these shared principles, articulated most often through the UN, about consultation/coordination with other states and about multinational composition of forces.

-Multilateral norms create political benefits for conformance and costs for non-conformance; no necessary benefit to multilateral intervention v. unilateral intervention, meaning norms fill the explanatory void.

-Humanitarian intervention has changed over time in _ ways:

1. definition of who qualifies as human and is deserving of protection has expanded
2. intervention has become necessarily multilateral

-development occurred through continual contestation over norms related to humanitarian intervention.