ZAC Conference Series: Social Sciences and Humanities
(ZACCS: SSH)
https://conf.zenithacademic.co.uk/index.php/zacsssh
ISSN (Print): 3049-7760 ISSN (Online): 3049-7779
3rd International Humanitarian Conference, Baghdad 2024
Volume 001, Issue 01, 2024, pp. 001-212
https://doi.org/10.70516/zaccsssh.v1i1.41

National sovereignty in light of international intervention

Saleh Hussein Ali [1, a)] and Sahar Salah Al-Khuzaie [2, b)]

[1] Law Department, Al-Noor University College, Baghdad, Iraq.

[2] FRIHET for KVINNER- Norway.

[a)] Corresponding author: saleh.hussain@alnoor.edu.iq

[b)] jonesalexandra822@gmail.com

Abstract. The Charter of the United Nations prohibits the use of force and stipulates two principles in international relations, namely the sovereignty of States and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Intervention is illegal. In fact, the principle of non-intervention poses problems, especially when it comes to human rights, intervention in order to spread or protect democracy, intervention to confront the spread of weapons of mass destruction and international terrorism, or in order to change political regimes or liberate peoples and others. Accordingly, the sovereignty of states under international intervention is threatened by a number of dangers, and it is feared for the future of national sovereignty, especially after being overruled by the international institutions that sponsor international legitimacy. Sovereignty is the legal basis of the state, which by violating it, the role of the nation-state dissolves, and national loyalty to other concepts is affected, as well as its inability to control its economic resources and the decline of social justice.

Keywords: International Intervention, State Sovereignty, National Sovereignty, Forms of Intervention, and Similar Concepts of Sovereignty.

INTRODUCTION

First: The research topic

Research on this topic needs an exceptional effort because of the large number of researches that dealt with international intervention, so we had to follow a different method in this research in terms of the plan and method of presentation of this problem. The Charter of the United Nations did not provide for international intervention, as a principle of the United Nations, because it is one of the topics on which the applicable rules contradict, as well as being one of the topics in which politics are mixed with law, so it becomes difficult to define an absolute and certain concept for it, as the positions of countries varied between supporters of the idea calling for making it part of international legitimacy, and those who reject the idea by calling for their opposition to the principles of international humanitarian law and the principles of human rights law, and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

The idea of international intervention was not easily welcomed by the international community, but he considered it as an intervention in the internal affairs of the state. Rather, the events of September 11 were a gesture in America's interventionist policy, by declaring war on terrorism and acts of intervention on a scale that was not used in the confrontation in the Cold War with the Soviet Union. This rapid military intervention of the

United States in Afghanistan was followed by intervention in Iraq and its occupation in defiance of the United Nations Security Council.

Sovereignty is still necessary and necessary to limit the abuse and abuse of power, and the policy of the hegemonic power in the new world order needs a strong deterrent to control it, namely absolute sovereignty, which clings to non-interference.

Second: The importance of the research

The importance of this research comes by describing the act of international humanitarian intervention in the beginning as a duty in the sense that it is the duty of the international community to intervene in situations that threaten humanity from natural disasters and similar urgent situations. However, after the development of things and the adoption of the Security Council of the act of humanitarian intervention in several resolutions starting in 1990 and starting from giving the green light from the International Court of Justice in 1968 and the General Assembly, the term changed from" duty to intervene" to" right to intervene". The right to intervene is a modern term, characterized by ambiguity because of its contradictions in its essence.

This research increases the importance of the methods of international intervention and its risks , the most prominent of which are the violation of state sovereignty, the transfer of sovereignty, the attack on sovereignty, the usurpation of sovereignty, the waiver and loss of sovereignty, and perhaps the clash of sovereignty within one fragmented nation such as the Arab nation.

Third: The problem of research

The problem of research is defined in the methods and forms of interventions that claim that their goal is to achieve lofty humanitarian principles, although they threaten the contents of the sovereignty of States at the internal and external levels, and that most humanitarian interventions have not taken place in countries that know an acute humanitarian crisis, but on the contrary, international humanitarian intervention has changed towards deviant practices and methods that threaten national sovereignty.

The problem of international intervention lies in the decline of sovereignty, which has become relative and does not mean absolute control by the state over its entire territory and people. These changes in the international arena require us to raise the following questions: Are the new concepts that have been put forward as the humanization of international intervention or other concepts developed by the major powers to pass these principles under names and justifications that serve their interests? Does sovereignty still have a role to play in reducing the arbitrariness and abuse of power of major powers? Is it necessary to regulate international intervention because new global challenges impose this?

Fourth: Research Methodology

The analytical descriptive approach was relied on to show the real role of international intervention that threatens sovereignty and the clear disunity in the use of states, especially the United States of America of military force against weak and fragile states under various pretexts, presenting different arguments and grounds.

Fifth: Research Plan

We will address this research through an introduction, two researches and a conclusion as follows:

The first topic: Definition of sovereignty and the like.

The first requirement: The concept of sovereignty.

The second requirement: Concepts similar to sovereignty.

The second topic: means of international intervention and its legal nature.

The first requirement: The legal nature of international intervention.

The second requirement: Intervention methods that threaten national sovereignty.

First Section:

Definition of sovereignty and the like

Sovereignty is one of the foundations of the modern state, and it is a concept that is studied and analyzed by international jurists and constitutional law, despite its exposure to challenges and confusion at times, due to current developments, but sovereignty is still of great importance and is essential to the existence of the state, and sovereignty is constantly studied, and it is of great importance in the practical understanding of the state, and in the organization of international relations as well. The concept of sovereignty is characterized by a set of specific characteristics and forms that differ from one state to another, and this concept has gone through successive stages of development that accompany the development of the life of states [5], and there are concepts of sovereignty, and this is what we will address in two demands:

The first requirement: The concept of sovereignty.

The second requirement: Sovereignty and what is suspected.

The First Section

The concept of sovereignty

The concept of sovereignty has evolved, defined and changed over different eras, and different concepts of authority and sovereignty have been derived. Forms of sovereignty have varied between monarchy, capitalism, socialism and communism, which contributed to the development of concepts of authority and sovereignty. Sovereignty also has a fundamental position that enables it to stabilize the power of the ruler who owns it, and power is strengthened by the power of the state, by possessing sovereignty that distinguishes it from other groups.

In Western thought, the concept of sovereignty came to the supreme authority and independence that the state enjoys in organizing its internal and external affairs. Sovereignty is the essence of the state in order to be able to achieve its national interests, security and stability. The state is independent, under the concept of sovereignty in political, legislative and legal decision-making without being constrained by external authority.

Concepts related to sovereignty have evolved to include the ability to exercise control over lands, resources and internal institutions, and to determine foreign policies and how to deal with other forces, in the international system and the multiplicity of intellectual schools and philosophers' views on the concept of sovereignty. Each of them has contributed to the development of different definitions and interpretations, but the common element between them is the recognition of the importance of sovereignty as a basis for the state, and because it exercises governance and makes decisions freely and independently [18].

The ideas of sovereignty have evolved. The French philosopher Jean Bodin presented the idea of sovereignty as a supreme authority in the state, unconstrained by other laws. In his book "The General Concept of Politics" 1576, Bodin talked about the importance of sovereignty and its delegation by the people.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau also argued that sovereignty is manifested in the will of the people and their need for political representation, and it is noticeable that the general outlook tends to focus on the role of the people in the development of the concept of sovereignty throughout the ages.

Sovereignty was also linked to the establishment of national states and the strengthening of their identity and independence. On this subject, Emmanuel Kant, a German philosopher, wrote his book "Political Sovereignty" in 1762AD, in which he dealt with sovereignty as one of the pillars of the sovereign state. He also talked about the right of the state to regulate its internal and external affairs.

There is no doubt that sovereignty in Arab jurisprudence means the right of the state to make sovereign decisions and control its internal and external affairs. It constitutes an absolute right, unless there is evidence that restricts this right. It also includes the right to defend the national entity and preserve the independence of the state.

Sovereignty is defined as the supreme authority of the state in its territory and over its nationals, and that it is independent of any foreign authority, and this gives the state complete freedom to organize its legislative, administrative and judicial powers, and to exchange relations with other countries with equality and respect [4].

Sovereignty is also described as "the art of balancing unequal forces. This indicates that international sovereignty is necessary to maintain international cooperation, and that international regulation depends on the existence of sovereign states and an active force that contribute to security and progress at the international level. Without sovereignty, the tools of international cooperation deteriorate, and it may become impossible to achieve optimal international regulation" [19].

It also defines sovereignty as "the right of the state to make sovereign decisions and exercise authority over its territory and nationals." It also affirms that sovereignty means the possession of a state free to self-determination, and the protection of its sovereignty and independence. International law also grants the state the freedom to defend itself and achieve its national interests [16].

The previous definitions highlight the importance of sovereignty in preserving the independence of the state, its right to self-determination, achieving its national interests, and providing freedom and development for its

people. They also emphasize giving sovereignty the authority to regulate its internal and external affairs, and enabling it to defend itself and its interests in the international arena on an equal footing with other countries.

Second Topic

Concepts Similar to Sovereignty

We will address the difference between the concept of sovereignty and similar concepts, in addition to presenting different points of view, and explaining the confusion that occurs between sovereignty and authority, as some opinions believe that sovereignty and authority are interrelated as well as with regard to independence, as some researchers believe that sovereignty and independence are identical concepts, and therefore it is necessary to research to differentiate between these concepts, and therefore we will study this in two sections:

Section I: Sovereignty and Authority:

There is a difference between the concepts of sovereignty and authority. Authority refers to the exercise of sovereignty or the application of decisions by the ruling authorities within the framework of the state. It can also be said that authority is a result of the exercise of sovereignty. As for the concept of sovereignty, it is more comprehensive because it refers to the political and legal authority of the sovereign entity. It also expresses the capacity of an entity that exercises its authority independently and does not derive its authority from others, and no one shares it. The term sovereignty also expresses a legal concept that reflects the independence and political power of the state.

There are different views, on the one hand, of the confusion that occurs between sovereignty and power. Some views see sovereignty and power as interrelated, and that sovereignty is political power itself, while other views believe that sovereignty is a property of political power, and not limited to it only [21].

It is important to clarify the differences between these two concepts, to avoid confusion and confusion in use, and therefore we will present two views on this:

The first opinion: The jurist Doge believes that "sovereignty is the full authority of the state, and he believes that it expresses the will of the nation. When the nation organizes itself into a state, sovereignty becomes the full authority of the state, including the right to issue orders to individuals residing in the territory of the state." This opinion is supported by the jurist Eisman, who promotes the idea that the state legally embodies the nation and represents the seat of public authority. He also believes that sovereignty is the supreme authority that exceeds the will of individuals in society.

As for the second opinion, the jurist Carrie de Millerage says: "Sovereignty is one of the attributes of international authority, that is, the authority of command, restraint, and prohibition. However, they do not overlap. International authority carries a positive meaning that includes the exercise of rights and authority, while states carry a negative meaning related to not being subject to the authority of another state, and the absence of an authority similar to the state internally." [21].

Based on the above, the idea of sovereignty is an advantage of power commensurate with this situation, and there can be a state consisting of three elements: people, territory, and political power, but it does not enjoy sovereignty or enjoy part of it, such as (the State of Palestine) in general. Power means the ability to impose another will. The state represents the repressive authority that surpasses the authority of any group in society. Therefore, authority is achieved through two means: either by means of coercion, violence and force, or by means of free democratic elections, and the strength and stability of authority increases when popular acceptance and satisfaction with it increases optionally [8].

Section Two: Sovereignty and Independence:

Despite the view of some researchers that sovereignty and independence are identical concepts, there is a need to distinguish, semantically, between the legal concept of the international system that expresses the concept of sovereignty, the reality of political relations and the power of the state that must reflect the actual independence of the state [20].

Independence is defined as "the monopoly of the State to exercise its legislative, executive and judicial governmental competences on its territory. No one participates in the exercise of these competences, whether directly or indirectly." Independence also extends to include external competencies related to the conduct of international relations. The State cannot participate in their exercise, except in specific exceptional cases under international legislation, and this is known as joint competencies. [12]

Independence is a concept that reflects the relative ability of a state to manage its own affairs, with the economic, social and strategic challenges posed by the international situation. Independence also reflects the ability of the government to make its own independent decisions in defining and implementing its internal and international political goals, and this is reflected in internal and external independence [12] as follows:

1- Internal independence: means that the state is completely free to manage its public affairs without external interference, as it can choose the system of government it deems appropriate and adopt a constitution that conforms to its nature. It also has the right to determine its relationship and dealings with individuals in its territory, whether they are citizens or foreigners, and no other country can interfere in its internal affairs.

2- External independence: refers to the right of the state to manage its foreign relations freely and equally, in accordance with its public interest and needs, without external interference.

Jurist "Rousseau" also believes that independence reflects the ability of the state to exercise its competences in an inclusive and prohibitive manner, and that the will of the state is free when exercising its competences.

The principle of independence has two content, positive and negative, namely, the positive content of independence, which refers to the singularity of the state in the exercise of its competences, and providing it with full freedom to implement these competencies effectively, while the negative content of independence is to exclude the participation of others in the exercise of the competences of the state.

We conclude that independence is the full and undiminished exercise of the competences of the state. The rights of all life are legitimate before the independent state. Although this nature is not mentioned in international charters and most constitutions, the judicial contribution emerges in matching the concept of sovereignty with independence. We recall what was stated in the advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice, issued by the Permanent Court of Arbitration, on April 2, 1928, in the issue of the island of "Palmas", where he stressed that the sovereignty of the state matures upon completion of its formation, and it has the right to enjoy international legal personality, and here highlights the fundamental difference between sovereignty and the concept of independence. Independence is a direct result of the state's enjoyment of sovereignty [21].

Independence is a condition for sovereignty, and sovereignty is a criterion for independence. Sovereignty guarantees independence, which represents a realistic status enjoyed by the state. Sovereignty accomplishes a legal process to form this status.

As a result of the above, the independent state plays an important role in defining and applying international laws and standards, in addition to participating in international decisions and negotiations. The state is also able to protect its interests by exercising external jurisdiction and enhancing its ability to influence and interact with other states in the international community. External jurisdiction and internal jurisdiction are inseparable. Both overlap and are interrelated within the framework of the national sovereignty of the independent state.

Second Section

Means and legal nature of international intervention

The rules of international law, represented by the charters and decisions of international and regional organizations, emphasize the principle of non-intervention in accordance with legal bases, which stipulate the illegality of any intervention. However, it must be recognized that this principle is general, but it faces exceptions that are considered cases in which intervention may be legitimate and acceptable. Therefore, there must be a careful evaluation and analysis of any intervention to ensure its compatibility with legal and ethical standards and international foundations. We find diversity in the forms of international intervention that threaten the sovereignty of the state. This diversity is represented in the methods used, as intervention is generally considered an illegal act in international relations. This is what we will address in two demands:

The first requirement: The legal nature of international intervention.

The second requirement: Intervention methods that threaten national sovereignty.

Second Topic

The legal nature of humanitarian intervention

International intervention raises many theoretical and practical problems in the field of international, political and legal studies, as it relates to the most important pillars and pillars of the international system and its protection from chaos, which is mainly the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. On the other hand, we find that the principle of humanitarian intervention has a background in international legislation, and this has led to the creation of a paradox, and the difficulty of reconciling the two principles in the absence of consensus

between scholars of international law and theorists in the field of international relations about the legitimacy of this principle.

Whatever the case, the theoretical and legal positions were divided between a direction that supports and rejects the principle of humanitarian intervention. The following is a presentation of the content of the two directions, and the most important arguments and justifications on which each direction was based:

The first trend: Supportive attitudes: Liberals are considered one of the most prominent defenders of the right and legitimacy of international humanitarian intervention to protect and preserve human rights from the oppression and deprivation practiced by the state or certain groups against others. Therefore, we find that the most important basic pillars from which liberals proceed in their perception of international relations and the nature of the interactions in them are human rights and democracy, as well as the central role of ethics in shaping global politics, so that the supporters of liberalism start their interpretation of the motives of humanitarian intervention and its legitimacy from the premise that states or other actors from organizations and others move with moral humanitarian motives to reduce violations of individuals' rights and freedoms, that is, the behavior of states can be rationalized through values and ethics, and therefore states can equip military armies with several high and expensive capabilities, and fight a war inside another state in which they do not have interests, but rather to preserve these human values [17].

This trend is divided into two positions on the permissibility of international humanitarian intervention:

The first position: Permission for international humanitarian intervention within the framework of the United Nations:

It calls for limiting the scope of humanitarian intervention to collective action within the framework of the United Nations. If the national authority does not respect the rights of its citizens, the international community may take appropriate measures, provided that it obtains authorization from the Security Council. In fact, this trend is embodied in what Kofi Annan called for in the session of the General Assembly, especially after the end of 1999, to study the mechanisms for authorizing intervention and asked countries that strongly oppose this meaning "China, Algeria, and India" to provide a response to what their position would have been if the international community had found a mechanism to intervene in the Great Lakes region in 1994 to stop acts of genocide.

Chapter VII of the same Charter also gave the Security Council the power to take punitive measures if it considers that a situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security [23].

Aspiring to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, it is noted that it did not include a text among its principles and objectives that allows humanitarian intervention. However, through the war on Iraq, this principle was clearly demonstrated by the intervention of the Security Council and its adoption of a resolution on the protection of Kurds in northern Iraq, which set some lines according to which the State of Iraq was obligated not to cross, which is one of the modern principles in international law [6].

This means that the Security Council intervened directly and with a mandate from the United Nations in the internal affairs of the State of Iraq - which is a historical precedent in international law - exceeding the principles of this Charter and the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, which stipulates that "the United Nations is entitled to intervene in the internal affairs of the State..." which referred to non-interference in the internal affairs of states that remain confined to the internal jurisdiction of the state, and at the same time authorized taking the necessary measures in the event of a violation of human rights.

The second position: Permitting international intervention even outside the international legitimacy:

It is led by the pioneers of humanism in international law, such as Hersh Lauterpacht and Oppenheim, who call for the authorization of any collective action even outside the UN umbrella to stop the brutal acts of persecution being committed against individuals and groups.

The case of Kosovo proved difficult to embody such a perception that adheres to international reference. In the summer and fall of 1998 , the Sino-Russian veto prevented the Security Council from issuing a resolution authorizing international intervention in Kosovo, prompting NATO countries to launch a 78-day aerial bombing campaign against Belgrade to force it to stop Serbian abuses against Kosovo Albanians [25].

In fact, this trend calls for considering alternative mechanisms when the Security Council is unable to take appropriate action due to the right of veto.

The second trend: Opposing positions: There are two positions, one represented by some jurists, and the second represented by supporters of the realist school. This is what we will present as follows:

Legal position

This trend proceeds in criticizing the first trend based on legal standards included in the Charter of the United Nations, and calls for the rejection of international intervention on the grounds that it affects the sovereignty and independence of the state, and Ian Brownlie believes in this direction that there is no basis, whether in the Charter of the United Nations or the principles governing relations between States, that provides a legitimate cover for humanitarian intervention [22].

Second: The Realistic School:

Realists respond to the first trend by criticizing the idea of international humanitarian intervention from a perspective. Can human rights and moral values be relied upon to explain the movements of effective international units? In this context, the question arises: Can a country equip armies at a high cost and be ready to fight a war within another country with interests to protect the rights of a particular minority? Is this form suitable for explaining the behavior of states?.

Hence, it seems clear that this perspective is deficient in analysis due to the irrational dimension it contains. Realists believe that the goal must be equal to the cost. Neither human rights nor moral values are the engine of state behavior, but the logic of interest is appropriate to explain it. Therefore, the issue of human rights is considered one of the sources of chaos in international relations, and the first threat to international security. It is considered a serious challenge to international legitimacy and the sovereignty of weak states. States often hide their expansionist and strategic objectives behind the justification for intervention (and the case of Iraq is a good example).

In this direction, Henry Kissinger stated that "working to compensate one government for another in its place will make us responsible for the peace regime that was enacted in 1648 in Westphalia, which is based on not allowing foreign countries to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign countries." [22].

What do the proponents of the first trend explain to us is the duality in the forms of humanitarian interventions, especially in American foreign policy.

On the other hand, there are no clear criteria that allow a distinction between humanitarian and dictatorial intervention. All interventions claim that their goal is to achieve lofty humanitarian principles, although most humanitarian interventions have not taken place in countries that are experiencing an acute humanitarian crisis, such as the Congo, Angola, Zaire, Burundi, West Africa, Chechnya, Kashmir, and Burma, while the United States of America has targeted the State of Iraq.

We believe that the so-called humanitarian intervention is nothing but academic marketing of the American interventionist policy, including how can the intervention in Kosovo be considered a humanitarian intervention? How can American silence be explained by the war of extermination, indiscriminate killing and destruction of stone and human beings in Gaza and Palestinian towns by the Zionist entity, which works to erase the national identity of the Palestinians without regard to the laws of war or the provisions of international humanitarian law?

Second Topic

Methods of Intervention Affecting National Sovereignty

Interference means interference in the affairs of another state or interference in its internal affairs for the purpose of influencing the course of events or changing the political or economic situation and violating national sovereignty. Accordingly, we will address in this request some forms and methods of international intervention that vary in their ways and their impact on national sovereignty, and then we will address some illustrative examples of each form of intervention as follows:

First: Military Intervention:

Military intervention is among the illegal forms of intervention; it includes any use of military force other than the exceptions specified in the Charter of the United Nations [15].

One of the forms of military intervention is the intervention of a state in the affairs of another state by sending units of its national army to that state, and sending irregular military units belonging to one of the conflicting parties in the target state after being trained and equipped. These wars are usually known as "proxy wars [14]", and aim to influence the management of the target state in its affairs. Military use by the intervening party can manifest itself in several forms, such as the assembly of naval fleets off the coast of the target state, the occupation of part of its territory, or the siege of the center of government or the head of state if the intervening party originally had forces on the territory of this state, for various reasons.

Second: Economic Intervention:

The economy is the backbone of the life of countries because it controls their ability to meet the needs of their people and achieve development and prosperity. Accordingly, the economy has become an effective means of

interfering in the affairs of countries. Economic pressure and sanctions may be used as tools to influence the policies and decisions of other countries.

This can include imposing trade sanctions or restrictions on trade, freezing financial assets, suspending economic aid, and other economic interventions aimed at achieving the political or strategic interests and objectives of the intervening countries [7]. However, it must be noted that this type of economic intervention raises many issues and challenges, and may have negative effects on the targeted countries and their peoples.

As an example of economic intervention, in 1962 the United States of America introduced a commercial boycott of Cuba with the aim of hitting and eliminating its economy. Although this economic intervention did not fully achieve its desired goal, due to the support of the former Soviet Union and some other industrialized countries for Cuba, it led to a fundamental impact on the Cuban economy and the daily life of the people.

Third: Media Intervention:

Media intervention is one of the forms of international intervention, and differs from other methods in its impact and method of implementation [26]. This type of intervention also depends on the use of various media, such as newspapers, television, radio and social media, to disseminate ideas and visions that promote the agenda of the intervening state as well. It aims to influence the minds of the public and shape public opinion in the target state, by spreading false news or misinformation, and this can include spreading rumors and lies, or amplifying events, to achieve political or colonial goals [11]. It can be said that states and intervening parties benefit from the power and influence of the media and communication to guide public opinion and achieve their goals.

It is necessary to refer here to international precedents that constitute illegal interference, for example, what happened in the case of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, where Haiti submitted a complaint to the Organization of American States against the Dominican Republic, accusing it of practicing moral aggression, when it allowed exiles to use its radio stations to confront the government and incite the people.

The United Nations General Assembly adopted a unanimous resolution condemning the types of seditious propaganda, but it was limited to propaganda that may pose a threat to peace or an act of aggression... On December 1, 1949, the General Assembly urged all countries to refrain from any threats or actions aimed at provoking a civil war or undermining the will of the people in any other country. This decision was repeated in a tone that was characterized by great concern. On November 17, 1950, propaganda aimed [11] at fueling hatred and hatred between peoples and spoiling relations between countries was considered illegal interference. The harmful and destructive effects of this type of propaganda appeared in more than one place.

Fourth: Political Intervention:

Political intervention refers to the political measures and pressures used by states to influence another state and impose its will or change its policies or decisions. Political intervention can include submitting written or oral requests, issuing political or diplomatic statements, holding conferences to resolve disputes or provide solutions to internal problems in a particular state. This type of political intervention aimed at changing the political and economic system of the state is called "destructive intervention" 9]. The word "destructive" here means the purpose for which political intervention seeks, which is to change the system by force, and does not refer to moral dimensions.

The support of the United States and the expression of President George Bush for the so-called "Cedar Revolution" in Lebanon in 2005, following the assassination of Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, can be considered a kind of political intervention. Political intervention refers to the influence of external forces in the internal affairs of another country, in political or diplomatic ways, and may include support for opposition movements or support for regime change, although political intervention does not necessarily have to be negative or harmful, but it may raise questions about the sovereignty and independence of the state in making its political decisions [14].

Fifth: Diplomatic Intervention:

This type of intervention is manifested by diplomatic interference in the violation of the diplomat [24], whether an ambassador, consul or otherwise, of his obligations under the "Vienna Convention" on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, which includes not interfering in the internal affairs of the host country, not provoking unrest or unrest for any purpose whatsoever, not contributing to a revolutionary movement or encouraging a coup d 'état, and not carrying out a political campaign against the actions of the existing government or criticizing these actions on his part in support of certain parties.

An example of this type of diplomatic intervention can be found in what Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro announced on January 1, 2013, when he accused American diplomats in his country of interfering in the country's

affairs and conspiring with the opposition to destabilize the security of the country, and then issued a decision to expel them, describing them as undesirable people.

Sixth: Cultural Intervention:

Cultural intervention is a method of intervention used by states to spread their culture, language, and values. In other countries, colonial states used cultural intervention as a tool to assert their control over the colonies and impose their culture on occupied peoples. For example, foreign missions, schools, and literacy systems were means used by colonial states to spread their culture and language.

An example of this is the dissemination of the French language in countries that today belong to what are known as francophone countries, where French missions and the French educational system have been used to promote the French language and French culture in those countries. Cultural intervention aims to change the beliefs and cultural perceptions of the target peoples and impose the culture of the intervener on them.

In light of recent developments such as technology, globalization, and modern means of communication, cultural interference has become more visible, widespread, and rapid. Global companies and transnational media can convey and promote the cultural values and products of powerful countries, leading to change and influence in the culture of targeted peoples.

Seventh: Ideological Intervention:

The promotion of political or cultural ideologies and ideas in foreign countries, with the aim of promoting the interests of the promoter state and its national security, may be achieved through the use of various media and communications, including social media and modern technology. This promotion aims to spread a certain vision and attract public opinion in other countries in favor of the promoter state. This is one of the forms of cultural interference, and may have an impact on the political and cultural orientations of the targeted countries. It is worth mentioning that some other countries, such as the United States of America, have adopted the idea of ideological interference in some cases. They intervened in "Grenada" and" Nicaragua" under the pretext of protecting human rights or supporting the opposition. However, the International Court of Justice may reject some of the evidence provided to support ideological disruption, and emphasize the right of the state to choose its political system and the beliefs it adopts [2].

Eighth: Intervention with the aim of spreading democracy:

After the collapse of the former Soviet Union, the idea of intervening in order to impose democracy became a hot topic, whether as a basis or a legal justification for the use of military force against a country, especially after the Cold War that led to the formation of the New World Order.

One of the most important results and developments in this context is the theory of intervention for democracy, which means the protection and imposition of democracy on a state by military force, and one of the necessities of this intervention is interference in the internal affairs of that state.

From the point of view of the majority of jurists, military intervention for democracy is a form of humanitarian intervention, and this type of intervention has been used by the United Nations, regional organizations and States, based on the theories of maintaining international peace and confronting clear violations committed by States.

Based on the above, it is preferable for the United Nations to establish controls for resorting to this type of intervention within the framework of collective security, and any individual intervention of States should be rejected, so as not to be exploited as an excuse when an international intervention threatens international peace and security or the security of another State occurs.

Ninth: Intervention to Counter the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and International Terrorism:

Many countries adopt a preventive defense strategy as a justification for dealing with these risks resulting from the use of these weapons. Intervention to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that threaten the security of States is essential. The presence of these weapons, which can completely destroy any country, without the need for direct military conflicts, makes it unacceptable for countries to wait for an expected attack from another country.

An example of this is when the United States of America bet on the pretext of disarming Iraq of weapons of mass destruction as a means of intervention, based on Security Council resolution 1441 in November 2002. Prior to the issuance of this resolution, the previous stage witnessed tension and tension between countries, especially the major powers. At this stage, US President George Bush, in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly

in September 2002, strongly affirmed his country's determination to disarm Iraq, even if individually, without the assistance of the United Nations.

Accordingly, the intervention in Iraq took place through the search for legitimate cover embodied in Resolution 1441, but upon reviewing Security Council Resolution 1441, issued on November 8, 2002, we find that it includes directing "Bush" directly to launch an attack on Iraq to disarm weapons of mass destruction. Resolution 1441 called on Iraq to comply with the demands of the international community by removing and dismantling its nuclear, chemical and biological programs, and gave an opportunity to the international inspection team, led by "Hans Blix", to work in Iraq and submit its reports to the Security Council.

There is no specific decision number referring to Bush's attack on Iraq. The launch of the military operation in Iraq, which led to the military occupation of the country in 2003, came sometime after the issuance of Resolution 1441 and other political and military developments [3].

This kind of use of pre-emptive force, under this claim, represents a threat to the collective security system, and undermines the international agreements and guarantees related to this matter. The Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency and other international organizations have condemned such international practices.

As for resorting to preventive legitimate defense, under the pretext of combating international terrorism, international terrorism is a complex and dangerous phenomenon that has been facing the international community for a long time, and there was no need to renew this complexity, after the events of September 11, 2001, which left traces and results that continue to this day, and some believe that what happened on September 11 represents a historical turning point in international law and international relations [1].

At the Security Council meeting held on 14 February 2003, the United States accused Iraq of possessing weapons of mass destruction and having links to Al-Qaeda and Al-Zarqawi. Iraq's representative on the Security Council denied these allegations and proved that they were technically fabricated. President Bush relied on forged documents to bring charges of terrorism and possession of weapons of mass destruction to Iraq. Based on this, the United States launched the war on Iraq on March 19, 2003, without a mandate from the Security Council, which provoked great condemnation around the world, but ultimately led to the occupation of Iraq.

This war launched by the United States against Iraq in 2003 was a violation of the rules and principles of international law. The United States allowed itself to wage a preventive war, which is a precedent in international law. Here, the foundations of the American-British claims appear based on combating terrorism and the idea of preventive legitimate defense, which reflects a traditional doctrine in justifying the legitimacy of resorting to military choice, before the threats become real on the ground, and this constitutes a traditional template for the neoconservative doctrine.

The use of force, in a limited and exceptional manner, in only two cases is the use of force within the framework of the provisions of international collective security in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, or the use of force in the case of individual and collective legitimate defense, in accordance with the limits and controls stipulated in Article 51 of the Charter.

CONCLUSION:

First: Results:

1. There is a variety of methods of international intervention; for example, military, political, diplomatic, cultural and ideological intervention under the banner of human rights or training peoples to govern themselves or under the banner of liberation that violates the sovereignty and independence of States and others. Adhering to national sovereignty and rejecting international interference in the internal affairs of States as stipulated in the Charter of the United Nations, is no longer in line in modern times.
2. The use of force and interference in internal affairs by some countries, such as the United States of America in Iraq and the Zionist entity in Gaza, and without the approval of the Security Council under various pretexts without the consent of the intervening state is itself a violation of international peace and security. Peaceful alternative methods can be used to confront weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, protection of human rights, self-defense, international terrorism and others.
3. Through the practical applications of intervention, it was found that its use by the great powers, especially the United States of America, without necessity calls for these interventions, and these interventions serve their interests and threaten the national sovereignty of countries, which leads to their retreat, and that these countries refrain from international humanitarian intervention in countries that need it.
4. The arbitrariness in the use of proactive and preventive concepts, and the emergence of pretexts for combating terrorism to intervene militarily, politically and culturally and to preempt it without a

mandate from the Security Council, is an erosion of the concept of national sovereignty and a violation of the principle of the prohibition of the use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, which is prohibited in the Charter of the United Nations .

Second, recommendations:

5. The need to commit to enshrine the principle of non-interference in the internal and external affairs of other countries, and this can be strengthened by activating the provisions of the documents establishing international and regional bodies that urge respect for this principle.
6. The need to work to strengthen belonging to the state and respect for its sovereignty by building equal and conscious citizenship, and to spread awareness among citizens about the danger of international intervention and its consequences in striking the sovereignty of the state and looting and destroying its economy.
7. We suggest that the Security Council remain the only authority authorized to use force, provided that it reconsiders the voting mechanisms so that members refrain from using the veto in the event of serious violations of the national sovereignty of States.
8. The scope of international humanitarian intervention should be determined by defining the intervention geographically and temporally, requiring that it does not turn into aggression or occupation, that the intervention is linked to a threat to international peace and security, and that the intervening parties respect Security Council resolutions, without overriding them.

REFERENCES

1. Ibrahim Al-Daraji, The Crime of Aggression and the Extent of International Legal Responsibility, Al-Halabi Human Rights Publications, Lebanon, 2005.
2. Ismail Al-Ghazal, Terrorism and International Law, Majd of the University Foundation for Studies, Publishing and Distribution, Beirut, 1990.
3. Bassem Karim Suwaidan Al-Janabi, Security Council and the War on Iraq 2003 , A Study on the Reality of the Conflict and the Legality of the War , Zahran Publishing and Distribution House, Amman, 2006.
4. Hamid Hanoun Khaled, Principles of Constitutional Law and the Development of the Political System in Iraq, Al-Sanhouri Library, Baghdad, 2012.
5. Hussein Abdullah Al-Ayed, The Implications of Globalization on National Sovereignty, Kunooz Al-Maarifa Publishing House, Jordan, 2009.
6. Suhail Hassan Al-Fatlawi, The Objectives and Principles of the United Nations, Hamid Publishing House, Jordan, 2010.
7. Sameh Abdulqawi Al-Sayed, International Intervention between Legitimacy and Illegality and its Implications for the International arena, New University House, Alexandria, 2012.
8. Saleh Hussein Ali Al-Abdullah, Authority and Popular Satisfaction, Modern University Office, Alexandria, 2015 .
9. Atef Ali Al-Salhi, The Legality of International Intervention in Accordance with the Rules of Public International Law, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo , 2009.
10. Abdel Fattah Abdel Razzaq Mohamed, General Theory of Intervention in Public International Law, Jordan, Dar Degla, undated.
11. Abdul Karim Alwan Khudair, Mediator in Public International Law - General Principles, Amman, Dar Al-Thaqafa Library for Publishing and Distribution, 1998.
12. Abdulaziz Ramadan Ali Al-Khattabi, Preventive Defense in Public International Law, New University House, Alexandria, 2011.
13. Abdulaziz Ramadan Ali Al-Khattabi, Theory of Competence in Contemporary International Law, New University House, Alexandria, 2012.
14. Leila Nakoula Al-Rahbani, International intervention is understood in the process of change, Al-Halabi Human Rights Publications, Lebanon, 2011.
15. Mohammed bin Al-Sheikh, Intervention in International Relations between Theory and Practice, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, undated.
16. Musaad Abdel Rahman Zaidan, United Nations Intervention in Armed Conflicts of a Non-International Character, Legal Books House, Egypt, undated .
17. Anas Akram Al-Azzawi, International Humanitarian Intervention between the Charter of the United Nations and Practical Application, PhD thesis submitted to the Faculty of Political Science, University of Baghdad, 2005.

18. Bosbia Saleh Al-Ayyash, Theory of Sovereignty in Islamic and Western Thought, A Comparative Analytical Study between the Thought of Abi Al-Ala Al-Mawdudi and the Thought of Jean Rousseau, Master Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Algiers, 2009 .
19. Soleimani Siham, The Impact of the Right of Humanitarian Intervention on National Sovereignty, Case Study of Iraq 1991 ", Master Thesis in Political Science and International Relations, Introduction of the Faculty of Political Science and Media, Algeria, 2005.
20. Talal Yassin Al-Issa, Sovereignty between its Traditional and Contemporary Concept, Journal of the University of Economic and Legal Sciences, Volume 26, Issue 1, Damascus, 2010.
21. Ali Abu Hani, The Decline of the Principle of State Sovereignty under the New International Order, Journal of Scientific Research and Studies, No. 60 , Dr. Yahya Fares University, 2012.
22. Hassan Nafaa, Sovereignty of States in light of the shifts in the balance of power in the international system, published on the website http://www.afkaronline.org
23. Stephen Walt, International Relations, One World, Multiple Theories, translated by: Zagagag Adel and Zaidan Zayani, published on the website httpm//www.geocities.com/adel zeggagh/polreview.html
24. Abdelfattah Ismail Arab, an article entitled "Military Intervention in Accordance with a Thought that Supports Human Rights, Counterterrorism, and Preventive Legitimate Defense, Iraq as a Model. Published at: 21http://abedasal.blogspot.com/2023/01/blog-post-2.htm
25. Imad Gad, International Intervention between Humanitarian Considerations and Political Dimensions, published on the website http://www.ahram.org.eg/acpss/ahram
26. François Rubio, la question le droi d 'ingérence est-illégistry, Paris: éditionsdel 'hébe, p19.