



Conceptualizing Liberal Interventionism: Theory and Practice

Munazza Khan

PhD Scholar, Department of History, University of Karachi, Pakistan
malikmunazzakhan@gmail.com

Dr. Muhammad Moiz Khan

Chairperson, Department of History, University of Karachi, Pakistan
moizkhan.edu.pk@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

A paradigm for foreign policy known as liberal interventionism combines liberal ideas with a readiness to use force or other forms of intervention to protect human rights and promote democracy across the globe. The theoretical foundations of liberal interventionism are examined in this article, with particular attention paid to its central tenets: multilateralism, humanitarianism, cosmopolitan ideals, adherence to international law, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine, and the promotion of liberal democracy. Proponents contend that these actions can stop egregious violations of human rights and promote long-term stability on a worldwide scale. Critics, however, raise concerns about the interventions' consistency, their possible exploitation for geopolitical ends, and the difficulty of imposing liberal values in a variety of cultural contexts. This article looks at the theoretical underpinnings and objections in an effort to provide a more complex understanding of liberal interventionism.

Keywords: Liberalism, Realism, Interventionism, Humanitarian Aid, Democracy, Responsibility to Protect

INTRODUCTION

This article explores the intricate relationship between ideologies and pragmatics in international relations, particularly emphasizing the divergent viewpoints of liberal interventionism and realism concerning foreign policy and interventions. Liberal interventionism, rooted in liberal international relations, promotes human rights, democracy, and international collaboration. Interventions are frequently justified as morally necessary to safeguard vulnerable populations. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a cornerstone of the concept, emphasizing the international community's duty to step in when states cannot protect their citizens from mass atrocities. Conversely, realism opposes liberal interventionism by asserting

that operations are frequently strategically oriented and driven by geopolitical goals instead of only humanitarian ones. The following discussions and analyses clarify the nuances of interventions by looking at historical precedents, legal frameworks, and the continuous conflict between the need to uphold human rights and state sovereignty. The article navigates the complex terrain of international politics through case studies and analyses, illuminating the subtle processes that influence foreign policy choices and the ongoing debate between realist and liberal viewpoints.

Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

Liberal interventionism is a foreign policy concept that gained pace throughout the second half of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century. This ideology is also known as the liberal interventionist approach. It advocates using military force or intervention in hazardous governments to protect and enhance liberal ideals such as individual liberties, democracy, and human rights. This is done within the context of protecting and strengthening liberal principles (Quinton-Brown, 2023). This approach was developed as a response to the challenges that have been brought about by worldwide conflicts and disasters that have an impact on the humanitarian sector.

Furthermore, liberal interventionism is built on the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) notion, which serves as its cornerstone. According to this view, the international community is required to intervene in the affairs of sovereign governments that are either aggressive or incompetent in order to protect their populations from being subjected to mass atrocities (Scherzinger, 2023). The following are some instances of crimes that fall under this category: genocide, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. On the other hand, this list does not include everything. For the reason that it lays a focus on the need of the international community to prioritize the well-being of persons above the autonomy of the state in its totality, the notion of the obligation to protect (R2P) is a departure from the usual conceptions of state sovereignty (Mengistu & Adamu, 2023).

After the end of the Cold War, liberal democracies were confronted with the moral conundrum of whether or not to meddle in the internal affairs of sovereign nations. This conundrum culminated in the development of liberal interventionism, a response to the changing dynamics of international relations. Those who advocate for intervening in times of crisis claim that doing so is not only the moral thing to do but is also necessary for maintaining peace and averting other acts of extremism and massacres (Bahmani, 2023). Similarly, R2P and liberal interventionism are closely related to one another because both of these ideologies are dedicated to the protection of fundamental human rights. The rule of law R2P is a normative framework that provides direction and reasons for actions to be taken when severe human rights violations occur. Regarding safeguarding persons from severe injury, the idea recognizes that the sovereignty of states is not an absolute right (Yasmeen, Khan, & Imran, 2024; Quinton-Brown, 2023).

Despite this, there are obstacles and critiques to contend with when implementing these concepts. Critics have argued that even initiatives with the best

of intentions may result in allegations of neocolonialism, exacerbate geopolitical tensions, and have effects that were not expected. A divisive and challenging problem is the maintenance of national sovereignty while simultaneously defending human rights (Scherzinger, 2023). To summarize, liberal interventionism and the R2P are two interconnected theoretical frameworks that aim to address the ethical need to react to mass crimes from a moral standpoint. The ability to effectively navigate through the complexity of international relations while simultaneously coming up with solutions to humanitarian issues that are morally sound is an essential skill to possess (Mengistu & Adamu, 2023).

Humanitarian Intervention

An essential component of liberal interventionism, humanitarian intervention is a controversial and intricate ideology that argues for the use of military action to put an end to or prevent significant violations of human rights. The primary objective of this philosophy is to save civilian populations from being subjected to oppression and threatened with harm (Chu et al., 2023). Based on this concept, interventions, especially military ones, are ethically permissible if they reduce the amount of human suffering they cause. Under the umbrella of liberal interventionism, humanitarian intervention is a subcategory that puts into question long-held assumptions about the appropriate involvement of the international community in the internal affairs of sovereign states. It also draws attention to the urgent necessity to protect civilians from severe breaches of human rights (Ter Hofstede et al., 2023).

Humanitarian intervention first came to light in the era after the Cold War's conclusion, when there was a notable change in global politics. A reevaluation of global power dynamics followed the Cold War's end, and liberal countries grappled with the moral dilemma of intervening in the domestic affairs of independent states to alleviate humanitarian crises. Support for the idea has grown in response to growing concerns about the morality of protecting society's most vulnerable members in the wake of horrific acts like genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes (Azhar, 2024; Kushi & Toft, 2023). In contrast to the conventional Western view of state sovereignty, which holds that national governments have unconstrained power inside their boundaries, liberal interventionism increasingly supports humanitarian intervention. This is a divergence from the classic definition of state sovereignty (Hoque et al., 2023). This is something that is fought against by liberal interventionism, which holds that the protection of human rights should take precedence over the state's sovereignty in situations when there has been a significant violation of human rights. It is symptomatic of the rising understanding that, when faced with mass crimes, the global community as a whole must react. The idea's ascent to popularity indicates this growing consensus (Chu et al., 2023).

Additionally, the international community's moral obligation to react strongly to mass crimes underpins humanitarian intervention. Even when utilizing force, Werntz et al. (2023) argued that human rights and eliminating suffering should come first. This ethical position challenges the idea that sovereignty shields nations from prominent human rights breaches (Azhar, 2024; Ahmad, & Imran, 2024). However,

the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) comes with humanitarian assistance. According to R2P, the international community must intervene to prevent mass crimes such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity when a sovereign state fails to protect its population (Ter Hofstede et al., 2023). R2P's normative theory may underpin liberal interventionist interventions. However, the need to prevent or put an end to genocide is a powerful argument in favor of humanitarian action. The failure of the international community to take action during genocides, such as the one that occurred in Rwanda in 1994, demonstrates how important it is to adopt prompt preventive actions in order to make sure that atrocities of this kind do not occur. Regarding crimes committed by large groups of people, liberal interventionism contends that the costs of doing nothing are still far higher than the dangers and difficulties of intervening (Scherzinger, 2023).

In addition, when a sovereign nation fails or refuses to fulfill its responsibilities to protect its inhabitants, the humanitarian intervention argument contends that the international community should intervene to relieve the suffering that has been caused. From this perspective, sovereignty is recast as a worldwide obligation to safeguard human rights, extending beyond individual nations' boundaries (Wan & Leirimo, 2023). Also, people who support humanitarian missions say they stop violent extremism and stabilize the world. They argue that a more secure and fair international order requires addressing conflict and human rights violations. In contrast, humanitarian action opponents warn of unintended effects. Interventions, however well-intentioned, may worsen wars, increase civilian losses, and generate persistent instability. In geopolitically unpredictable situations when involvement is impossible, it is crucial to consider the risks and implications (Karakaya Koca, 2024).

Some believe strong states may use humanitarian intervention to advance geopolitical interests (Fatima, Khan, & Kousar, 2024). This emphasizes the necessity for international responsibility and monitoring in decision-making and challenges their morality (Hoque et al., 2023). Additionally, humanitarian intervention challenges notions of state sovereignty and whether defending human rights and sovereign autonomy are compatible (Fatima, Khan, & Kousar, 2024). The balance between these factors is complex and challenging. An intellectual approach is needed to protect human rights while managing international politics. Ethics must guide decisions prioritizing community well-being and minimizing damage (Wan & Leirimo, 2023; Phulpoto, Oad, & Imran, 2024). International collaboration is needed for humanitarian help to work. Resolving conflicts requires multilateral efforts guided by common ethical values to identify and address core causes, coordinate solutions, and ensure a collective commitment to impacted communities (Hoque et al., 2023; Imran, & Akhtar, 2023).

Taking humanitarian action under liberal interventionism to address significant human rights violations is ethical. The growing agreement that the global community must safeguard vulnerable people may explain the idea's development. Stopping genocide is a significant motive to engage in humanitarian crises. Another is to fulfill sovereign responsibilities when governments cannot safeguard people. The ultimate objective is global peace and security (Kushi & Toft, 2023). The justifications

against humanitarian action emphasize the significance of moral judgments and careful consideration of unintended effects. International collaboration and shared ethical values may help balance human rights and state sovereignty. Understand and enhance humanitarian action within liberal interventionism to achieve a more equal and compassionate global society while humanitarian crises persist (Werntz et al., 2023).

Democratic Values

Liberal interventionism emphasizes democracy in international affairs. This idea holds that democracies are less violent among their member nations; thus, peace and stability may be established globally as they grow. In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, democratic governance and liberal interventionism have been linked in international affairs, creating conflicts about exporting democratic ideas (Peak, 2023). Similarly, the idea that a democratic government defends its inhabitants against internal and foreign aggression and represents their rights and freedoms is the foundation upon which liberal interventionists draw their support for democratic principles. The proponents of democracy argue that democracies are intrinsically more peaceful, that they are less prone to experience internal struggle, and better suited to maintain peace with their neighbors (Firdos, Khan, & Atta, 2024; Obamamoye, 2023).

The liberal interventionist perspective envisions a more all-encompassing kind of democracy that extends beyond the election process. It is essential that this strategy incorporates the rule of law, safeguards individual rights, and establishes institutions with adequate checks and balances. As part of the political agenda, we want to ensure a peaceful transfer of power, safeguard the rights of oppressed groups, and promote political plurality (Johnson & Heiss, 2023). Another strong argument favoring interfering to increase democracy is the notion of democratic peace. Democracies, according to the point of view of specific individuals, have a decreased incidence of interstate war (Haq, Bilal, & Qureshi, 2020). This argument is based on the concept that democratic leaders are responsible to their people, who often choose peaceful endings of problems. This is the basis of this argument (Deudney & Ikenberry, 2023). In addition, democratic institutions, such as free media and impartial courts, provide channels through which complaints may be resolved and disagreements can be settled peacefully (Yoruk, 2023).

To disseminate democratic principles, liberal interventionism may include undertaking diplomatic endeavors, providing financial support, and even taking military action to overturn dictatorial governments. There is a fundamental belief that establishing a democratic government is the most effective means by which the international community can guarantee peace and security in the long term (Obamamoye, 2023). However, intervention carried out in the name of democracy is not devoid of its detractors and detrimental effects. One of the most severe criticisms that may be leveled against attempting to impose Western democracy on other countries is the impact of cultural relativism. Many believe that attempting to impose a universal democratic model might result in instability and unfavorable consequences

because it could not be appropriate for circumstances in every situation (Kreutz, 2023).

Furthermore, democratization may sometimes be complicated. Building democratic institutions takes time, and power conflicts, political splits, and insufficient institutions are common throughout authoritarian rule transitions. Critics of democratically planned activities with unforeseen results cite extreme organizations, power vacuums, and civil upheaval. This is shown by the 2003 Iraq War (Johnson & Heiss, 2023). The invasion, justified by increasing democracy, caused severe instability and sectarian killing. The intervention showed how hard it is to execute democracy in a divided and complicated society. Also controversial is the geopolitical instrumentalization of democracy promotion. Skeptics believe geopolitical agendas, not democratic beliefs, may motivate democracy-advancing policies. Selective intervention guided by geopolitical agendas doubts the global democracy promotion effort (Kutlay & Öniş, 2023).

Despite these obstacles, liberal interventionists contend that advancing democratic government is a just and acceptable goal. They argue that the efforts to disseminate democratic principles are justified by the possible long-term advantages, which include the preservation of human rights, stable political institutions, and a decreased probability of war. Intervention to promote democracy is not uniform, which is essential to recognize. Intervention success depends on the state's social, cultural, and historical environment (Obamamoye, 2023). Regime change alone will not produce democracy; a complete strategy must promote economic growth, democratic institutions, and law enforcement. However, the debate on this subject has changed recently as more sophisticated and context-dependent techniques are needed to enhance democracy via intervention. Supporting local democracy movements and supporting spontaneous democratization have replaced imported models (Borg, 2023).

Finally, liberal interventionism promotes democracy. The democratic peace theory holds that more democracies promote global stability. Cultural relativism, unforeseen effects, and geopolitical instrumentalization are some objections and obstacles to exporting democratic governance. The international community must constantly explore and create new methods of liberal interventionism inside democratic governance to reconcile democratic principles and cultural diversity (Johnson & Heiss, 2023).

Critiques and Controversies

Many critics of liberal interventionist foreign policy have raised ethical and practical questions regarding intervening with sovereign governments. Interventions are considered morally essential to defend human rights and democracy, while opponents say they might have unexpected effects and violate a state's right to self-determination. The diversity of these views has altered liberal interventionism debates and highlighted the complexity of international politics (Bargués et al., 2023). Similarly, unintended consequences are a significant criticism of liberal interventionism. Even when done to alleviate human suffering or promote democratic government, opponents say interventions may negatively affect the targeted state and area long-term (ul Haq, 2017). In 2003, the invasion of Iraq was meant to oust an

authoritarian state, but it instead caused instability, sectarian conflict, and extremist organizations (Chapman & Li, 2023).

Furthermore, intervention in foreign wars is typically difficult due to the intricacy of sociopolitical processes in the targeted state. Interventions may disrupt power systems and allow other groups to take control. Historical, cultural, and religious elements may exacerbate disagreements, making predicting or controlling results harder (Borg, 2023). Moreover, critiques of liberal interventionism raise sovereignty issues. International relations are based on sovereignty, the belief that nations should be allowed to govern themselves. Critics say these acts violate this essential premise, threatening nations' independence and right to create governments (Burlyuk & Musliu, 2023). Likewise, liberal interventionism opponents often argue that individual liberty and state independence conflict. Interventions aim to stop significant crimes, but others wonder whether the international community may undermine a state's sovereignty. Liberal interventionism's main moral challenge is balancing universal human rights with state sovereignty (Yoruk, 2023).

In addition, liberal interventionism's unequal and prejudiced implementation has also been criticized. Critics believe geopolitics, not humanitarian rules, drive interventions. This selectiveness raises doubts about the legitimacy and authenticity of interventions that occur in certain regions but go unreported in others. Interventions by strong governments complicate ethics. Critics believe such operations are motivated by neocolonial aspirations to impose their beliefs and interests on smaller states (Burlyuk & Musliu, 2023). A nation's geopolitical dominance may increase tensions and hinder humanitarian efforts, adding to the antagonism endured since colonialism and imperialism. However, liberal interventionism critics focus on target population effects. Interventions aim to protect and stabilize, but results may vary. Military actions displace civilians, ruin infrastructure, and kill people. These effects may harm the communities these programs aim to safeguard and make situations more unstable and unpleasant (Stavrevska et al., 2023).

The legitimacy challenge and the lack of an international intervention framework affect liberal interventionism claims. Critics say any action must follow international law and be approved by the UN (Afzal, 2019). An inconsistent and largely acknowledged legal framework for interventions raises questions about accountability and the probability that state interests may drive interventions instead of humanitarian values (Chapman & Li, 2023). Liberal interventionism's ideas and issues indicate that international crises need sensitivity and context. Many declare diplomacy, avoiding disputes, and solving core problems are preferable to war. They explain the various causes of conflict and where foreign influence inhibits sovereign governments' internal operations (Johnson & Heiss, 2023; Farooq, et al., 2021).

Liberal interventionists counter that interventions, however flawed, are necessary to combat mass crimes and grave human rights violations. They say protecting vulnerable groups should trump concerns about unintended repercussions and national sovereignty. Advocates emphasize looking back and improving to guarantee ethical and successful future actions (Lawson & Zarakol, 2023). However,

liberal interventionist arguments emphasize the geopolitical, practical, and moral obstacles of meddling sovereign governments' internal affairs. Human rights and state sovereignty are still at war, and interventions' unintended effects demonstrate how complex international conflict management is (Lemke, 2023). In light of liberal interventionism's ethical consequences, the international community must create a more ethical and effective humanitarian crisis response strategy. This requires openness, communication, and learning from errors (Reus-Smit & Zarakol, 2023).

International Legal Framework

Regarding international relations, the fundamental principle of liberal interventionism, the need for a solid legal foundation, is a constant subject of discussion and study. Even though international law offers some direction on the principles that ought to govern acts, there are substantial issues that arise as a result of the lack of a legal framework that is clearly defined and widely accepted (Reus-Smit & Zarakol, 2023). The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is an important organization to pay attention to when it comes to punishing actions. On the other hand, ongoing conflicts among the council member states often impede the council's capacity to take decisive action. This is a reflection of the complex dynamics that lie behind the legal components of liberal programs (Lemke, 2023).

Establishing a fundamental framework for interactions between nations and defining the boundaries of liberal interventions are equally significant aspects of international law. In international law, the three primary objectives are to maintain global peace and security, protect human rights, and exercise control over the actions of states. Because of the complexity involved, the legal profession has been split about interpreting and applying these principles to interventions (Stavrevska et al., 2023). The international community must act when nations fail to protect their populations from mass crimes, including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, under the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) concept (ul Haq, 2019). R2P supports humanitarian activities legally, but its implementation is debatable. Even with R2P, establishing a common legal framework for interventions is challenging. Limitations, interpretation, and abuse are possible without explicit, legally enforceable intervention. Critics say legal uncertainty makes interventions less predictable and acceptable since actors may use diverse standards depending on national interests rather than humanitarian values (Scherzinger, 2023; Shah et al., 2023).

According to the UN Charter, the Security Council is responsible for international stability. United Nations Security Council authorizes operations and force. Intervention measures may be challenging to agree on due to Security Council dynamics, notably permanent members' veto power. The United States of America, China, France, and Russia are the five countries that have permanent membership in the Security Council (Burlyuk & Musliu, 2023). Any of these states can use their right to veto at anytime, even if a resolution has overwhelming support among other members. This dynamic has emerged as a source of controversy and irritation because disputes among strong nations threaten to limit the capacity of the council to react

quickly to humanitarian emergencies (Lawson & Zarakol, 2023).

Additionally, Syria illustrates the difficulties of the Security Council's permission for participation. Internal differences have prevented the Security Council from passing measures to address significant human rights violations and chemical weapon deployment. This case shows the inadequacies of the judicial system and its geopolitical impact on decision-making (Stavrevska et al., 2023).

Critics contend that regional authorities should authorize interventions when the Security Council cannot. Chapter of the UN Charter authorizes regional agreements or organizations to tackle threats to global stability. Regional organizations' engagement raises political and legal issues, such as the legitimacy and efficacy of regional measures adopted without Security Council approval. However, interventions without Security Council authority have prompted international law issues. Some say the UN Charter forbids force, while others say self-defense, human rights, and customary international law may justify involvement (Chapman & Li, 2023).

Moreover, the UN's central court, the International Court of Justice (ICJ), resolves international legal disputes and gives advisory opinions on legal problems presented by other UN agencies. The ICJ has ruled on state sovereignty and force but cannot set legal bounds for liberal interventions. The court cannot create new international law norms or rules; its rulings are solely binding on the parties concerned in a case (Stavrevska et al., 2023).

Intervention consent and behavior are legal issues for liberal interventions. International humanitarian law (IHL), sometimes known as the rules of war, governs civilian treatment in wartime. IHL activities provide challenges in protecting humanitarian workers, deciding whether to use force and distinguishing civilians from combatants (Burlyuk & Musliu, 2023). Interventions may change a targeted state's political environment or depose its government, increasing legal complexity. International law upholds non-interference in state affairs and self-determination. Critics say regime change interventions may violate the law (Borg, 2023). Lastly, liberal interventions and international sovereignty discussions sometimes intersect. Due to human rights concerns, full state sovereignty is being reconsidered. The legal debate over liberal interventionism must balance protecting civilians from mass crimes and safeguarding state sovereignty (Burlyuk & Musliu, 2023).

In conclusion, the legal grounding of liberal interventions is a complicated and contentious international issue. Undefined and widely recognized legal frameworks hinder intervention predictability and legitimacy, even if international law provides certain bounds. Disagreements among UN Security Council members undercut its function as the central sanctioning authority, reflecting international geopolitics. Liberal intervention legal arguments encompass behavior issues like state sovereignty and international humanitarian law. The international community must explore and build legal frameworks to resolve the legal complexities of liberal interventionism (Borg, 2023).

Realism vs. Liberalism

Realism, which emphasizes power dynamics and national interests globally, and liberal interventionism, a prominent international relations theory, dispute each other. Realist opponents say interventions are guided by strategy, not compassion. Debates between liberal and realist ideas on intervention efficacy and legitimacy help explain these foreign policy efforts (Fleury, 2023).

Liberal interventionism is a concept that pertains to foreign policy, and the underpinning of liberal interventionism is the idea of liberal international relations. The liberal position is that strengthening democratic values, human rights, and international institutions that protect the rule of law is the most critical factor in achieving a global order that is more cooperative and peaceful. Within this paradigm, interventions are justified by the concept that the international community must safeguard human rights and avert disasters (Johnson & Heiss, 2023). As far as liberal interventionists are concerned, interventions are founded on a genuine dedication to universal goals such as protecting civilians and promoting democratic governance. The concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a prime example of the liberal viewpoint of the moral need for interventions. According to this point of view, the international community should interfere when a state fails to sufficiently protect its citizens from mass crimes (Rutherford, 2023).

On the other hand, realism provides an alternative point of view on matters that affect the whole world. Realists often claim that strategic concerns rather than altruistic intentions drive interventions. This argument is founded on the notion that governments are inherently motivated by their self-interest. Interventions may be used to project influence and power, according to the beliefs of certain realists who disagree with liberal interventionism. These realistic individuals believe that governments utilize humanitarian concerns as a pretext to accomplish geopolitical aims (Ludwig, 2023). Realism emphasizes understanding global power dynamics. According to realists, strong nations intervene to gain resources, influence global events, or avert dangers to safeguard their interests. Realists say self-interest drives foreign policy more than morality (Johnson & Heiss, 2023).

Realist criticisms often find intervention information in their historical context. Interventions that help the intervening countries acquire resources or deter geopolitical competitors are realistic. Realist concerns that emphasized weapons of mass destruction and regime change above humanitarian concerns led the world astray in the 2003 Iraq War (Mengistu & Adamu, 2023). Additionally, the discussion that surrounds interventions is impacted by the ongoing tension that exists between the concepts of realism and liberalism. Since interventions display traits of both liberalism and realism, it is hard to place them under a single theoretical category in practice cleanly. This is because interventions exhibit characteristics of both. The situation's complexity is highlighted by the fact that interventions are often motivated by opposing incentives, including strategic and humanitarian considerations (Rutherford, 2023).

Additionally, the global reaction to interventions is a reflection of the interaction that takes place between realists and liberals. There is a possibility that nations are harboring clandestine geopolitical agendas while actively supporting

humanitarian issues in public. When respectfully addressing interventions, liberal concepts like democracy and human rights are often brought up, yet the core strategic considerations are still in play. This lack of consistency contributes to the ongoing discussion on the sincerity of humanitarian motives and the effectiveness of interventions in achieving their intended goals (Ulaş, 2023). The attitudes of liberals and realists are not identical regarding the efficiency of programs and projects. Interventions, according to liberals, have the potential to contribute to the promotion of global stability, the preservation of human rights, and peace when moral values lead them.

On the other hand, realists often emphasize the possibility of unintended repercussions, such as instability, a rise in violent crime, and long-term damage to the intervening state and its surroundings (Johnson & Heiss, 2023). The discussion between realists and liberals is made more complicated by the subject of state sovereignty. Realists strongly emphasize the significance of nations' sovereignty as a basic concept of international relations. At the same time, liberals advocate for interventions founded on the need to protect. The tension between the two points of view demonstrates how difficult it is to find a compromise between violations of human rights and the concept of non-interference in the internal affairs of a state (Kreutz, 2023).

By looking at individual case studies, one may be able to get a better understanding of the subtle differences that exist between liberal intervention analysis and realist intervention analysis. During the 1990s, the liberal worldview served as the guiding principle for the Balkan operations, which aimed to eradicate violations of human rights and ethnic cleansing. More pragmatic concerns played a role, and the desire to maintain stability in the region and avoid unforeseen repercussions played a role (Ludwig, 2023). For example, the intervention in Kosovo was driven by a set of ideals that included both realist and liberal perspectives. On the other hand, the intervention that took place in Libya in 2011 was criticized for its outcomes even though it was portrayed as a humanitarian effort to save citizens from the Gaddafi regime. Realists believe that the intervention contributed to the worsening of regional instability since it did not consider the feasible outcomes that may result from a regime change. This case highlighted the difficulties associated with striking a balance between the goals of humanitarian help and the reality of participation (Kreutz, 2023).

The tension that exists between realism and liberal ideas on interventions demonstrates the need for a foreign policy approach that is more nuanced and tailored to the specific circumstances of the situation. As a result of the complexity of interventions, it is essential to be aware of the interaction between strategic goals and humanitarian issues. Policymakers are responsible for finding a middle ground between the geopolitical realities that affect international relations and the ethical need to safeguard human rights (Jameel, 2023). It is imperative that the international community work toward strengthening the legal and normative foundations that oversee future interventions in order to ensure their success. It is necessary to maintain open lines of communication and work together to arrive at a compromise that satisfies the need to protect the ideals of national sovereignty. For one to have a

complete understanding of the realist-liberal dynamic, one needs to be able to discern the complex logic that lies behind interventions and see the similarities that exist between strategic aims and ethical issues (Ulaş, 2023).

The tension between geopolitical goals and moral values is reflected in the argument between realism and liberal viewpoints, which impacts intervention rhetoric. Realism criticizes of liberal interventionism put national interests above human rights and democracy. The discussions are revealing global politics and the need to safeguard vulnerable people. Understanding the realist-liberal dynamic is essential for moral, long-term foreign policy as governments prepare for interventions (Johnson & Heiss, 2023).

CONCLUSION

This extensive article thoroughly analyzes the complex dynamics in international relations, focusing on the opposing philosophies of realism and liberal interventionism in the context of foreign policy and interventions. Liberal interventionism, rooted in liberal international relations, promotes human rights, democracy, and international cooperation and views interventions as a moral duty to safeguard disadvantaged communities. A thorough discussion of liberal interventionism's theoretical foundations is covered in this article, with particular emphasis on the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) theory. When sovereign states fail to protect their citizens from mass crimes like genocide and crimes against humanity, the international community must step in to stop the atrocities, according to Responsibility to Protect (R2P). On the other hand, realism contends that geopolitical interests and strategic reasons motivate interventions, undermining the liberal interventionists' selfless façade. The approach explores historical cases where realist critiques emerged, such as the Iraq War, highlighting the importance of interventions in advancing national interests over humanitarian concerns. The continuous conflict between the need to uphold human rights and state sovereignty is carefully examined, illuminating the many legal issues surrounding interventions. A close examination of case studies is conducted to demonstrate the complex reasons for interventions, such as the Balkan operations and the Libyan intervention. These instances highlight the difficulties in striking a careful balance between the demands of humanitarianism and geopolitical ambitions. The article argues for a sophisticated foreign policy approach that considers each action's unique conditions in light of these difficulties. It highlights the importance of strengthening legal frameworks and promoting candid communication to enable successful compromises. The subtle processes that influence foreign policy decisions and feed the continuous debate between realism and liberal viewpoints are revealed as the complex tapestry of world politics is untangled. In order to guarantee morally sound and fruitful interventions in the future, policymakers are asked to negotiate this complicated terrain where strategic objectives and humanitarian principles converge.

REFERENCES

- Azhar, Z. (2024). Blockchain as a Catalyst for Green and Digital HR Transformation: Strategies for Sustainable Workforce Management. *Open Access Library Journal*, 11(9), 1-22
- Afzal, M. L. K. S. R. (2019). Vulnerability to Emotional Problems among the Parents of the Children with life-threatening Illness and Developmental Disabilities. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 3(1), 544-553.
- Ahmad, S., & Imran, M., (2024). Exploring the Drivers of Youth Unemployment in Pakistan: A Comprehensive Review. *Spry Journal of Economics and Management Sciences (SJEMS)*, 2(1),12-21. <https://doi.org/10.62681/sprypublishers.sjems/2/1/2>
- Azhar, Z. (2024). The Role of Chatbots in Enhancing Job Seekers' and Employee Experience: A Case Study on CV Warehouse. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 10(4), 23-35.
- Bahmani, P. (2023). Modern International Responsibility to Protect: A Study of the Cyber International Responsibility to Protect—A Case Study of Iran Central European University.]
- Bargués, P., Martín de Almagro, M., & Travouillon, K. (2023). New Visions, Critiques, and Hope in the Post-Liberal Age? A Call for Rethinking Intervention and Statebuilding. In (Vol. 17, pp. 1-15): Taylor & Francis.
- Borg, S. (2023). In search of the common good: The postliberal project Left and Right. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13684310231163126.
- Burlyuk, O., & Musliu, V. (2023). The responsibility to remain silent? On the politics of knowledge production, expertise and (self-) reflection in Russia's war against Ukraine. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 1-14.
- Chapman, T. L., & Li, H. (2023). Can IOs influence attitudes about regulating “Big Tech”? *The Review of International Organizations*, 1-27.
- Chu, P. C., Wierucka, K., Murphy, D., Tilley, H. B., & Mumby, H. S. (2023). Human interventions in a behavioural experiment for Asian Elephants (*Elephas maximus*). *Animal Cognition*, 26(2), 393-404.
- Deudney, D., & Ikenberry, G. J. (2023). Getting Restraint right: Liberal internationalism and American foreign policy. In *Survival* December 2021-January 2022: Trials of Liberalism (pp. 63-99). Routledge.
- Farooq, S., Khan, M. L., Bhatti, M. I., Afzal, R., & Khan, N. (2021). Peer Tutoring Rather than Traditional Lecture Method: A Phenomenological Study. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(10).
- Firdos, S., Khan, M. L., & Atta, N. (2024). Intrinsic Motivation and Social Emotional Competence and Job Satisfaction Among School. *International Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 58-79.

- Fatima, S., Khan, M. L., & Kousar, R. (2024). Emotional Intelligence, Religiosity and Quality of Life Among University Students. *Journal of Social & Organizational Matters*, 3(2), 455-471.
- Fleury, E. (2023). The theoretical case against offshore balancing: Realism, liberalism, and the limits of rationality in US foreign policy. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 19(1), 49-63.
- Haq, A., Bilal, M., & Qureshi, S. A. (2020). Moderating effect of corruption in relationship of cash holding and corporate governance with firm's performance: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 14(3), 14-26.
- Hoque, R., Chen, L. Y., Sharma, S., Dharmarajan, K., Thananjeyan, B., Abbeel, P., & Goldberg, K. (2023). Fleet-dagger: Interactive robot fleet learning with scalable human supervision. *Conference on Robot Learning*,
- Imran, M., & Akhtar, N. (2023). Impact of Ethical Leadership Practices on Teachers' Psychological Safety and Performance: A Case of Primary School Heads in Karachi-Pakistan. *Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review*, 3(2), 172-181. <https://doi.org/10.48112/aessr.v3i2.505>
- Jameel, N. N. (2023). Realism and Relative Gains in International Relations. *resmilitaris*, 13(1), 1000-1008.
- Johnson, T., & Heiss, A. (2023). Liberal institutionalism. In *International Organization and Global Governance* (pp. 120-132). Routledge.
- Karakaya Koca, P. (2024). Policy Coordination in Neoliberal Migration Governance: The Case of Kilis Municipality and Humanitarian Organizations Middle East Technical University.]
- Kreutz, A. (2023). Moral and Political Foundations: From Political Psychology to Political Realism. *Moral Philosophy and Politics*, 10(1), 139-159.
- Kushi, S., & Toft, M. D. (2023). Introducing the military intervention project: a new dataset on US military interventions, 1776–2019. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 67(4), 752-779.
- Kutlay, M., & Öniş, Z. (2023). Liberal Democracy on the Edge? Anxieties in a Shifting Global (dis) order. *Alternatives*, 48(1), 20-37.
- Lawson, G., & Zarakol, A. (2023). Recognizing injustice: the 'hypocrisy charge' and the future of the liberal international order. *International Affairs*, 99(1), 201-217.
- Lemke, T. (2023). International relations and the 19th century concert system. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*.
- Ludwig, J. (2023). Exploring Realist and Liberal Explanations of Armed Conflict Related to Economic Interdependence The Ohio State University.]

- Mengistu, A., & Adamu, T. (2023). Responsibility to Protect: Humanitarian Intervention in Ethiopia's Northern Armed Conflict: Nostrum or Venom? *KEPES*, 21(2), 63-72.
- Obamamoye, B. F. (2023). Beyond neo-imperialist intentionality: explaining African agency in liberal peace interventions. *Third World Quarterly*, 44(7), 1380-1397.
- Phulpoto, S. A. J., Oad, L., & Imran, M. (2024). Enhancing Teacher Performance in E-Learning: Addressing Barriers and Promoting Sustainable Education in Public Universities of Pakistan. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 8(1), 418–429. [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024\(8-I\)38](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024(8-I)38)
- Peak, T. (2023). Halting genocide in a post-liberal international order: intervention, institutions and norms. *International Affairs*, 99(2), 787-804.
- Quinton-Brown, P. (2023). Two Responsibilities to Protect. *Millennium*, 03058298221138944.
- Reus-Smit, C., & Zarakol, A. (2023). Polymorphic justice and the crisis of international order. *International Affairs*, 99(1), 1-22.
- Rutherford, N. (2023). Is political realism barren?: normativity and story-telling. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 26(3), 398-417.
- Scherzinger, J. (2023). Unbowed, unbent, unbroken? Examining the validity of the responsibility to protect. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 58(1), 81-101.
- Stavrevska, E. B., Lazic, S., Musliu, V., Karabegović, D., Sardelić, J., & Obradovic-Wochnik, J. (2023). Of Love and Frustration as Post-Yugoslav Women Scholars: Learning and Unlearning the Coloniality of IR in the Context of Global North Academia. *International Political Sociology*, 17(2), olad008.
- Shah, S., Khan, M., Haq, A. U., & Hayat, M. . (2023). COVID-19 Precautions of Pakistani Banks in the Lens of Qualitative Study Approach. *Global Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 2(2), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.59129/gjhssr.v2.i2.2023.15>
- Ter Hofstede, R., Williams, G., & Van Koningsveld, M. (2023). The potential impact of human interventions at different scales in offshore wind farms to promote flat oyster (*Ostrea edulis*) reef development in the southern North Sea. *Aquatic Living Resources*, 36, 4.
- ul Haq, A. (2019). Proposing A Model of Financial Access for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMES) Through Islamic Banking. *City University Research Journal*, 9(4).
- ul Haq, A. (2017). Firm Characteristics and Cash-Cash Flow Sensitivity of the Manufacturing Sector of Pakistan. *Business & Economic Review*, 9(3), 71-103.

- Ulaş, L. (2023). Can political realism be action-guiding? *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 26(4), 528-553.
- Wan, P. K., & Leirimo, T. L. (2023). Human-centric zero-defect manufacturing: State-of-the-art review, perspectives, and challenges. *Computers in Industry*, 144, 103792.
- Werntz, A., Amado, S., Jasman, M., Ervin, A., & Rhodes, J. E. (2023). Providing human support for the use of digital mental health interventions: Systematic meta-review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25, e42864.
- Yoruk, T. B. (2023). Another 'American Exception'? American Order-Building and a Schmittian Analysis of US Foreign Policy vis-à-vis China in the Post-Cold War Era and Beyond Carleton University. Nawaz, H., Maqsood, M., Ghafoor, A. H., Ali, S., Maqsood, A., & Maqsood, A. (2024). Huawei Pakistan Providing Cloud Solutions for Banking Industry: A Data Driven Study. *The Asian Bulletin of Big Data Management*, 4(1), 89-107.
- Nawaz, H., Sethi, M. S., Nazir, S. S., & Jamil, U. (2024). Enhancing national cybersecurity and operational efficiency through legacy IT modernization and cloud migration: A US perspective. *Journal of Computing & Biomedical Informatics*, 7(02).
- Shiddike, Z. (2018). The role of organizational politics in public sector Government hospital. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 42(4), 645-662.
- Tuba, A., & Rana, N. A. (2015). Using social networking site (SNS) in students' learning experiences: An experimental study at higher secondary school Karachi, Pakistan. *Int. J. Engl. Educ*, 4(3), 238-249.
- Yasmeen, K., Khan, M. L., & Imran, H. (2024). Exploring Emotional Intelligence, Remote Work Dynamics, Team Collaboration, and Adaptive Leadership for Enhanced Success in the Digital Workplace. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 8(2), 969-979.
- Yang, J., & Treadway, D. C. (2018). The dark side of workplace relationships: Examining ostracism and its impact on employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(1), 89-100.
- Zhao, H., & Xia, Q. (2017). Social exclusion and employee outcomes: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(6), 749-761.