Contentious Questions and Religious Dimensions in International Intervention

By Abdi O. Shuriye

International Islamic University, Jalan

Abstract - Since the beginning of the last decade, there is a renewed attention and interest in the relationship between religion and international intervention. Religion is a belief system, faith and cultural orientation; it is a system of symbols which acts to establish powerful moods and motivations in men by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and it has direct relation to international intervention. The core objective of this research emanates from the conviction that international intervention has yet to produce sustainable results and role of religion in the process has been marginal. The research therefore, investigates the meagerness, methodologies and the nature of international intervention, as well as the role of religion in its diverse aspects. The central argument of the research leads to the fact that current humanitarian crisis of the world has resulted from the dreadful failure to employ better mechanisms in the implementation levels of any form of intervention.

CONTENTIOUS QUESTIONS AND RELIGIOUS DIMENSIONS IN INTERNATIONAL INTERVENTION

Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

Contentious Questions and Religious Dimensions in International Intervention

Abdi O. Shuriye

Abstract - Since the beginning of the last decade, there is a renewed attention and interest in the relationship between religion and international intervention. Religion is a belief system, faith and cultural orientation; it is a system of symbols which acts to establish powerful moods and motivations in men by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and it has direct relation to international intervention. The core objective of this research emanates from the conviction that international intervention has yet to produce sustainable results and role of religion in the process has been marginal. The research therefore, investigates the meagerness, methodologies and the nature of international intervention, as well as the role of religion in its diverse aspects. The central argument of the research leads to the fact that current humanitarian crisis of the world has resulted from the dreadful failure to employ better mechanisms in the implementation levels of any form of intervention. The researcher adopts evaluative method to comprehensively assess the subject matter. The data of the research is mainly collected from the available materials. The significance of this research lies in the fact that it explores the subject matter beyond the conventional apparatus.

Keywords : International intervention, religion, armed conflicts, United Nations, war crimes, international community.

I. INTRODUCTION

This research addresses the new face of international intervention. The aspirations of the research is derived from the United Nations World Summit of 2005, which had explicitly adopted international collective responsibility approach to protect civilians from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity. The summit was of the opinion that this needs willingness to take timely and decisive collective action through the Security Council; provided that peaceful means prove inadequate and national authorities fail to perform the same task. (UN World Summit, 2005) The test of the outcome of the summit is now observed on how the UN tackles the current Middle East and North African apprising.

The argument of this research is that, although the UN and other governmental organizations made repetitive diplomatic attempts through its resolutions in intervening political calamities and sending peacekeeping forces, the mechanisms of these efforts need further scrutiny and simplification. International intervention is part of the mechanisms performed by

the international community through international and regional organizations. This research evaluates some contentious questions surrounding international intervention and further outlines its comprehensive relationship to religion.

II. DELINEATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL INTERVENTION

To begin with, it must be mentioned that in the last few years alone we have witnessed several interventions and there are currently several ongoing conflicts which require intervention. The African Union struggles to concur on schema to maintain African forces in Somalia, and NATO forces, on the other side, are engaged in fierce battles against Taliban fighters in Afghanistan, all under one name: international intervention. Undoubtedly, international interventions are of diverse nature and are associated with political and ethical hallucination. The trend of international intervention to combat genocide is currently on the rise. It seems after painful lessons from history, the international community is ready to take up that mission effectively. Since 2005 the relationship between the international intervention and the state sovereignty go in line and not in conflict and one may predict that we are about to see new international community as far as international intervention is concerned. This is apparent in the Libyan case; what the international community has achieved in one year in the case of Bosnia and Rwanda in the 1990's, the same international community achieved in one week in the case of Libya.

One could argue therefore that international intervention has come to the forefront since the end of cold war with tremendous achievements in protecting and safeguarding civilian rights, establishing order and initiating peacekeeping process. The fundamental aim of intervention is to lessen the consequences of violent and destructive conflicts. Under the normal circumstances international intervention is ingrained on the implementation of appropriate and authoritative mandates. Protection of human rights and military or economic interests are part of the justifications for intervention. The rationale for intervention is to create international society which holds fast to the international law through diplomacy in order to achieve balance of power. However, the idea of international society conflicts with the demand of absolute sovereignty by

Author : Department of Science, International Islamic University, Jalan Gombak 53100 Malaysia. E-mail : shuriye@iium.edu.my

nations who favor complete political autonomy and the power to act or the quality of being an independent self-governing nation. There are two schools of thought in this regard: *Pluralists* who stick onto minimal rules for coexistence with non-interference in the domestic affairs of the state but allows alliance to deter or resist aggression. The other school, the *Solidarists,* advocate the idea that sovereignty depends on the full coexistence of international society.

The common terms for international intervention are mostly employed to include conflict management and military intervention, peace operation and peacekeeping process, humanitarian intervention and good governance. Without the involvement of international and regional organizations international intervention bears not tangible fruits.

a) Conflict Management and Military Intervention

The contention of Kenneth Thomas on the subject could be compelling. He sees conflict management as "the process which begins when one party perceives that another has frustrated, or is about to frustrate, some concern of his." (Kenneth W. Thomas, 1992). It is conventional that conflicts arise naturally in every aspect of human life, at the same time, conflict management is acclaimed as a key skill for all successful long-term relationships and in political framework, it is an effort and initiative to interfere and address the escalating conflict of foreign countries, by regulating and addressing adequately the crisis and effectively solving the conflict. On the global scale, interpersonal conflicts have been intensifying from earliest history to current moments, and for this reason, armed intervention in another satate has been advanced with such regularity since the end of post-Cold War to promote democracy and safeguard national interest and security. The framework for military intervention is grounded in seven categories familiar to strategists and policy makers "national interests, threats, political-military objectives, policy guidance, planning options, resources, and public opinion." (John M. Collins, 1995).

These insights help to underpin decisions to intervene or abstain and to ascertain whether ongoing military operations seem warranted on the targeted regime. According to James Meernik (1996), the readiness of states to wage war and use force against the others is to compel it to become democratic. Although they declare democracy as a goal of the intervention, in majority cases, it does not appear to effectively promote democracy, instead to become a means to attain their political objectives. Key considerations in the use of combat forces abroad as prescribed by Weinberger recognize the unique and universally applicable rules for decisions about interventions. Weinberger outlined six key considerations in the armed intervention: "the vital US or allied interests; clear intent to win; precise objectives and ways to accomplish them; "reasonable" assurance of public support; military action as a last resort; continual reassessment and adjustments as events unfold." (James Meernik, 1996).

b) Peace Operation and Peacekeeping Process

Peace operation and peacekeeping process are comprehensive terms which cover a wide range of activities, whose primary objective is to create and sustain the conditions necessary for peace to flourish. Peace operations comprise three types of activities: *support to diplomacy* (peacemaking, peace building, and preventive diplomacy), *peacekeeping,* and *peace enforcement.* It includes "traditional peacekeeping as well as peace enforcement activities such as protection of humanitarian assistance, establishment of order and stability, enforcement of sanctions, guarantee and denial of movement, establishment of protected zones, and forcible separation of belligerents."(Field Manual 100-23, 1994)

In the post-Cold War strategic security environment, peace operations have dramatically increased and intensified. In its first 40 years, the United Nations (UN) has conducted 13 operations, including the great operations in the Congo during the 1960s. Since 1988, and the succeeding years, the number of peace operations has doubly increase into complex operation. The UN's peacekeeping operation in Cambodia in 1993, marshaled about 22,000 military, police, and civilian personnel from 32 contributing nations, which cost the world community well over $2 billion. The UN-sanctioned peace operation in Somalia, lead by the US special task force (UNITAF), amassed about 27,000 personnel from 23 contributing nations, which cost $750 million are not new to the Army. Since 1948, peace operations spearheaded by the US have served in many countries, which include the mission of United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization in the Middle East, Lebanon (1958), the Dominican Republic (1965), and the Sinai (1982) that successfully geared many members of a multinational force and observers (MFO). (Field Manual 100-23, 1994)

Peacekeeping, on the other hand, is defined by the United Nations as "a unique and dynamic instruments developed by the organization as a way to help countries torn by conflict create the conditions for lasting peace". (United Nations, 2005). Peacekeeping is distinguished from both peace building and peacemaking. The mechanism of peacekeeping helps countries worldwide to maintain peace and order. It has proven to be one of the most effective tools of the UN to assist countries navigate the difficult path from conflict to peace.

In most cases, UN Peacekeeping is guided by three basic principles: Consent of the parties; impartiality; non-use of force except in self-defense and defense of the mandate. The aim of peacekeeping is to

reconcile between two conflicting states and to reach final settlement by signing a cease fire. In doing so, peace building can be worked out and the danger of renewed war can be reduced. (Ferdinando R Teson, 2003) Similarly, the rules of peacekeeping is to maintain and monitor the cease fire, to have a mechanism for resolving violation, to secure an invitation from all parties to put peacekeeping force in place, to provide administrative assistance in humanitarian relief, governance reformation, conduct of election, and economic recovery, to support the resolution for peace and to strengthen the relations and interest of all parties. (Michael C. Davis, 2004)

The strength of peacekeeping includes the power of legitimacy, burden sharing, and an ability to deploy and sustain troops and police from around the globe, integrating them with civilian peacekeepers to advance multidimensional mandates. Since the past two decades the UN Peacekeepers have provided security, the political and peace building support to help countries transformed, in an early transition from conflict to peace. (Michael C. Davis, 2004) Peacekeeping mission has been deployed in many configurations. There are currently seventeen UN peace operations deployed on four continents. The multidimensional peacekeeping operations not only struggle to maintain peace and security, but help to "facilitate the political process, protect civilians, assist in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; support the organization of elections, protect and promote human rights and assist in restoring the rule of law." (Michael C. Davis, 2004) According to the UN, its peacekeeping missions have built up a demonstrable record of success over the 60 years of its existence, and have pioneered the establishment of the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) in the Middle East since 1948. There have been 67 peacekeeping operations worldwide since that time. Peacekeeping continues to adapt to new challenges and political realities and working toward a comprehensive peacekeeping reform, following an increasing demand for complex peace operations worldwide. (Michael C. Davis, 2004)

c) Humanitarian Intervention

The complex human crises brought along after the end of World War II and during the bitter struggle between the Soviet Union and industrial democratic nations saw a sharp increase in humanitarian relief operations. In addition, the number of violent intrastate clashes in developing nations escalated, steadily increasing the demand for humanitarian aid. This demand, in turn, transformed voluntary organizations and multilateral institutions into influential development players. The Cold War marked the bitter clash between East and West, constantly locked in an ideological battle. Thus, humanitarian aid was also used as an

ideological weapon. A large amount of the assistance was used to fuel corruption, contributed to coercion on the domestic front, and brought about mismanagement of funds. On the positive side, relief operations gave an opportunity for the citizens of affluent nations to learn about the reality of conflict and deprivation in poor nations. To the dismay of many, the end of the Cold War did not bring about swift improvement towards peace and democracy. Instead, it further intensified the existing political instability and public discord, causing violent civil war especially in countries ruled by authoritarian regimes. These violent clashes resulted in large numbers of civilian casualties and refugee flows necessitating intervention by the UN and other voluntary organizations. Away from the warring regions, humanitarian aid was used as an instrument to encourage support for market-based policies and global economic integration. The practice of offering aid with conditions attached soon was later contended by various development groups which later teamed up in support of debt reduction and poverty reduction. At the turn of the century, the agenda forwarded by these organizations was adopted by the member countries of the UN.

Humanitarian intervention is primarily about protecting entire populations of people, against ethnic cleansing and holding individual elites accountable for such crimes (Michael C. Davis, 2004). J. L. Holzgrefe contends that humanitarian intervention is "the threat or use of force across state borders by a state (or group of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied." (L. Holzgrefe, 2003) Ferdinand R. Teson, a well-known supporter of intervention policy, defines humanitarian intervention "as the proportionate international use or threat of military force, undertaken in principle by a liberal government or alliance, aimed at ending tyranny or anarchy, welcomed by the victims, and consistent with the doctrine of double effect." (Ferdinando R Teson, 2003)

Anthony Arend and Robert Beck argued that for an action to count as forcible humanitarian intervention, it must be constrained to 'protecting fundamental rights' and should neither have the blessing of the United Nations (UN) nor the consent of the targeted government."(Arend and Beck, 1996) The fundamental principle of humanitarian act thus should take into account humane military operation which is responsible to protect basic humanitarian right of the civilian. Daniel Rice defined armed humanitarian intervention as "the use of military force by a nation or nations to stop or prevent widespread, systematic human-rights abuses within the sovereign territory of another nation." (Daniel Rice, 2007) He defended armed humanitarian intervention as morally justified to maintain political

3

stability and world order. Michael Walzer, a just-war theorist, in his broad interpretation of legal and political ramifications of military intervention and the legitimacy of violating borders and sovereignty, argues that armed humanitarian intervention is morally justified, perhaps even required, in response to "massacre, rape, ethnic cleansing, state terrorism" (Michael Walzer, 2004). He principally defends that it is "morally necessary whenever cruelty and suffering are extreme and no local forces seem capable of putting an end to them." (Michael Walzer, 2004). Walzer further points out that armed intervention cannot be morally justified to promote "democracy ... or economic justice or ... other social practices and arrangements" that exist in other countries. In his view, it must be limited to ending conduct that "shocks the conscience of humankind." (Michael Walzer, 2004)

d) Regional Players and Development

Regional players are vital in ensuring the success of international intervention for a number of reasons. First, they are situated very close to the crises area and are therefore more responsive to calls for early action. Second, their close relation to the local population gives them a better understanding of the socio-political context of the unfolding crisis. Third, their experience in dealing with violent and difficult conflicts in the immediate areas gave regional players the ability to adapt the usual norms and standards for managing and preventing conflicts to give greater impact on local crises. This is particularly true for African regional organizations such as African Union and other sub-regional organizations such as ECOWAS and SADC which maintain in their treaties, the right to intervene in a member state when crisis or humanitarian tragedy is at hand. Some regional players have undertaken bold measures towards preventing conflict thus halting the situation from further deterioration that could have spiraled beyond control (e.g. Nigerian in Sao Tome and Principice; ECOWAS in Guinea-Bissau and Togo). Fourth, some regional organizations have further enhanced their collaboration efforts with local players, particularly civil society groups. This is the case with ECOWAS which has formalized its involvement with West Africa civil society. However, regional organizations have weaknesses which may be rectified by the UN and other development agencies. Successful intervention denotes sharing responsibilities between regional, national and global players.

The UN Secretary-General's report, *In Larger Freedom* (United Nations, 2005) stressed the responsibility of rich countries in developing and ensuring the continuous process of attaining security and development mechanisms in weak states. He further warned that "ignoring failed states creates problems hat sometimes come back to bite us". (Report of the Secretary-General, 2005) The UN High-level Panel oh Threats, Challenges and Change also concurs that "development and security are inextricably linked. A more secure world is only possible if poor countries are given a real chance to develop." (Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, 2004)

The vital link between development and security has been observed since the late 1940s where global poverty and the threat of insurrection have always been closely linked. (Mark Duffield, 2001) During the Cold War, humanitarian aid was used as a tool for developing newly independent states and concurrently preventing them from becoming security threats to the Western world. The evolution of intellectual studies on security and development, however, took on opposing approach where each progressed independently of the other. Traditionally, studies on security involved the study of the phenomena of war, threats to peace, and the use and control of military forces. (Joseph S. Nye, Jr. and Sean M. Lynn-Jones, 1998) While security studies dealt mainly with inter-state war and international relations, development on the other hand focused mainly on the domestic front by encouraging economic growth.

e) Good Governance Democracy and Human Rights

The concept of good governance became well-known around 1989 and 1990 (Martin Doornbos, 2003) when the international donor community began attaching certain conditions prior to granting development aid. Good governance simply refers to judgment on how a particular nation is run. (Martin Doornbos, 1995) The former World Bank President, Barber Conable, explained that development can only be realized when continuous growth is guaranteed irrespective of the process of "imperfect governance". (World Bank, 1992) One of the key aims of international intervention is to create a platform for good governance, democracy and human dignity.

III. Contentious Questions Surrounding International Intervention

There is no globally accepted specific theory for international intervention available in the literature or among academics and policy makers. Nonetheless, some scholars on the subject study vulnerability and ethnic ties as emerging theories of intervention the proposition of these two ideas is itself old as it was customarily used to explain third state intervention in ethnic and secessionist conflicts. (Mueller John, 2000) Vulnerability theory therefore attempts to explain why states should observe international standard of non-intervention, non-irredentism and internal affairs of each other. It is about the principle of cooperation to discourage secessionist movements and ethnic tension. The counter argument to this vulnerability scheme is not supported by politically pragmatic facts; for instance, vulnerable states are not necessarily dissuaded from supporting secessionist groups in another state. This

position shed staid doubt on the soundness and strength of the vulnerability theory. (Pearson, 2004) Ethnic tie as a theory of motive for third state intervention is also seen as paramount mechanism to the development of international intervention. (Pearson, 2004) The argument of ethnic tie theory is based on the fact that states support the side of an ethnic divergence that shares ethnic ties. (Mueller John, 2000) Hence, the ground for its motive is that when an ethnic variance appears the third state would support actors with which it shares an ethnic affinity or empathy.

Why international community must intervene in internal conflicts? This is a relevant question and the direct answer to this question is to stop perpetrator. In fact, it was a malfunction of history and letdown on the part of the international community to allow high-profile atrocities in Bosnia, Rwanda, Somalia, Afghanistan, Kosovo, Ogadenya, East Timor, and others including Darfur and more currently Syria. It is a simple fact that, placing a well-resourced substantial force that are consciously prepared to protect the victims would have prevented the bloodshed or at least minimized the escalation of violence. Scholars talk of timely intervention, which denotes quick response to violence and atrocities. (Feil, 1998)

Likewise, these genocides should be blocked at its initial stage at the expense of so-called state sovereignty. Besides, intervention comes in the form of expected economic gains, military power, natural resources, regional stability or national security. Another reason for intervention could be common identity including shared culture, language, religion or ethnic ties. Hitherto, there are interventions done under the motive of past injustices, sympathy, or common ideologies and principles. Other related reasons for intervention could be based on security threat and maximization of power particularly international security. Whatever the reasons might be, the ensuing conflicts of ethnic clash, tyrannical rule and repressive governance in the world warrant an instant interference from collective powers to impose certain sanctions and find solutions to the subsequent political and humanitarian predicaments (Pearson, 2004)

Based on this viewpoint, international intervention occupies an important role to bring changes to the old approach. Therefore, the currently formulated approach of intervention is largely an ideal approach to face the challenges detrimental to human right and global institutions, as outlined by Kofi Annan: "if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity?" (Kofi Annan, 2000). Nonetheless, contentions and questions surrounding intervention are plenteous and found in diverse aspects of international intervention. International law is the guiding mechanism for international intervention. The most difficult question in international law and its relation to international intervention is whether armed humanitarian intervention is morally justified. It is an established tradition of international norm that fundamentally recognize all nations to have rights of sovereign power, which traditionally denotes that they exercise exclusive political control within their borders. (Jerome Slater and Terry Nardin, 1986)

Thus, intervention, by force against the political sovereignty or territorial integrity of another nation, has traditionally been considered aggression in international relations, which clearly breach foreign land and has its bearing on moral, political, and legal ramifications. However, as contended by Jerome Slater and Terry Nardin, "intervention is justified, at least in principle, in many cases where governments are responsible for substantial and systematic violations of human rights, even when such violations fall short of genocidal proportions."(Jerome Slater and Terry Nardin, 1986) The same authorities on the subject maintain that it is morally appropriate to intervene into other nation's territory, and they recognize non-aggression approach, peaceful political coercion which can occur through armed force or other coercive but peaceful instruments of political power. Jerome Slater and Terry Nardin, claim that the seriousness of the human rights violation determines the degree of protection against intervention, arguing that: "the grosser the violation, the weaker the claim to such protection" (Jerome Slater, 1986) This approach contends that it is morally appropriate to demand foreign intervention and impose comprehensive sanctions on the purported regime, and battling growing violence and crisis.

Besides, Thomas M. Frank, an expert on international law, insists that such intervention may be morally justified "if the wrong perpetrated within a state against a part of its own population is of a kind specifically prohibited by an international agreement (e.g., the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; treaties regarding racial discrimination, torture, the rights of women and children; the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); and agreements on humanitarian law applicable in civil conflict.)" (Thomas M. Franck, 2002) This position implies legalistic justification for intervention, based on generally accepted concepts of morality and fundamental human rights. With its reference to international legal instruments in a wide variety of circumstances, such as the principle embodied in ICCPR relating to the rights of women and children, it demonstrates the principal terms to justify armed intervention. (Thomas M. Franck, 2002)

Be that as it may, the intervention of a nation in another's internal affairs must abide to the rules of international law and objectives set out in the UN Charter against the use of force by states except in self-

defense against an armed attack (UN Charter article 2 (4), and must reflect two important objectives of international law: principle of peace and justice. (Thomas M. Franck and Nigel S. Rodley, 1973) Nevertheless, it is a complex conception to justify the use of military force, as the only way to address all sorts of racial, gender, or ethnic discrimination. The primary target of international intervention is to plot a course for the solution between the warring parties and "to find out a peaceful solution to the crisis" (Thomas M. Franck and Nigel S. Rodley, 1973) this is in fact the underlying objective of international intervention. When armed, intervention aims to lessen the consequences of conflict, protect self-autonomy and human rights and establish order and political stability. (Thomas M. Franck and Nigel S. Rodley, 1973)

So far one thing is clear that, international intervention created both legal and political predicaments and dilemmas for the world communities, political leaders and decision makers. The moral questions and contentions surrounding international intervention, the evolving political, economic, and the debate over the justification and legality of international intervention under the current international legal framework or the issue territorial integrity are all part and parcel of these predicaments confronted by the international community. There are those who argue international intervention is justified on humanitarian grounds, particularly when there are coarse instances of human rights abuses occurring. It is the current conscience of international community that classical notion of state sovereignty must be revisited and reevaluated, more so, for the failed states. Nonetheless, since the horrible disasters that took place in Bosnia and subsequently in Rwanda the international community came to agree on the conviction that international norms must advance to a level of acceptance to intervene a crisis at the expense of state sovereignty.

In the past the international community has failed in this regard but these failures must not be taken as an excuse. Javier Perez de Cuellar (1991) the former Secretary General of the UN, acknowledges that "the fact that in diverse situations the United Nations has not been able to prevent atrocities cannot be accepted as an argument, legal or moral, against the necessary corrective action, especially when peace is threatened". Similar arguments are seen in Boutros-Ghali. In his mission statement "An Agenda for Peace", (1995) he ricocheted the same sentiments. Kofi Annan's (1998) pragmatic convictions are that: ''state frontiers should no longer be seen as watertight protection for war criminals or mass murderers.''. However, the international community is aware of the fact that state sovereignty may not be easily defeated without structural political and legal transformation. Others raise contentions on the method used to apply international intervention. One method is economic and trade related sanctions, this could be through decisions based on international cooperation in view of international law and global justice. (Evan Mawdsley, 2007) Other imperative methods employed are nation-building, occupation, and national security approaches. Although sometimes these methods raise contentious concern as they are seen mere pretext to fulfill national or personal interest. In this respect, the intervention could be in a form of policy, military, corporate, or religious (Evan Mawdsley, 2007) Intervention could be non-hostile. The non-aggressive or non-hostile intervention make use of soft approaches through diplomatic resolutions, humanitarian delegation, and humanitarian aid, as well as through consultation. This approach is of the conviction that belligerence is inherently illegitimate, but does not preclude defense against aggression.

IV. Religious Dimension in the Study of International Intervention

Studies on religion and its relation to international intervention present not so convincing or straightforward recommendations. This is due to the fact that there exists extreme disparity between various forms of religion as well as between ranges of international intervention. One of the authorities on the subject, Marc Gopin, deliberated, in his book *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking,* the complex character of religion. (Marc Gopin, 2000) Gopin also pointed out the necessity of religious and cultural sensitivity in international interventions, at the same time; he contended that religion has taken the central dimension of statecraft with the new tendency on the part of international community's recognition of the importance of religion in peacemaking, diplomacy, and conflict management.

On that line, religion is always part of a bigger collective and cooperative societal framework. It effects not only on the political, cultural and economic processes, rather it influences the future of governance for the state and election outcomes. However, when it comes to peacemaking and conflict management religion must be accompanied with other elements of social cohesiveness as it cannot be the main cause factor of any armed conflict. That is to say, other transformations and resolutions including diplomacy have to go along with religious dimensions in the context of successful international intervention. With its normative flavor and transcendent nature, religion provides identity. This form of identity is stronger when it compared to ethnic, economic or geographic. I have the propensity to believe that one of the raison d'être on whey the international interventions failed to bring lasting peace for Somalia is the religious factor. In conflicts, like that of Afghanistan and Somalia where religion plays an

6

imperative part the international community have failed to understand the main issues to identify common ground and diagnose the infection. Religious issues are more complex, and to the downbeat, religion has been a major source of ethnic conflicts. In fact religious conflicts attract political intervention by foreign states.

Religion motivates peace and in some ways directly or indirectly stimulates conflict. At the same time, other contentions expose that, religious sentiments have been perversely distorted by humans for egotistic goals; issues of religious terrorism and religious-based conflicts cannot be directly found in the teachings of major religions including Christianity, Islam and Judaism. In spite of the quasi-paradigmatic (José Casanova,1994) situation of marginalizing the role of religion in peace and security initiatives in the world and creation of false assumptions that modernity has made religion irrelevant in the public sphere and in the political life, relevant empirical research and data in the last decades reveal that instead of declining and eventually disappearing, religion persists both in the individual conscience and in the public sphere, continuing to shape the political beliefs and practices of a great number of people and institutions throughout the world. On balance, the relationship between religion and peace or security is therefore, relevant to our study. No religion is inherently vicious or peaceful it is us, the humans, who determine the position of religion in each intervention. Besides, for the past two decades, religion has been politicized and unfortunately used as a tool by warring violent parties. In its organic understanding however, religion remains momentous element in conflict management, peacekeeping, humanitarian aid and in international intervention as a whole.

This is due to the fact that religion offers distinctive sets of morals, values and beliefs which in turn motivate quick resolutions and reconciliations among the conflicting parties. Religion employs spiritual elements in the process of peace making initiatives. There are numerous examples of conflicts throughout the world that were transformed through religious basis. The Holy See, for instance, has effectively arbitrated the conflicts in Argentina and Chile, due to some exclusive assets of moral authenticity and impartiality. St. Egidio Community was actively involved in the peace process in Mozambique, Burundi, Congo and Kosovo, using a Catholic-inspired approach. This is normally termed the principle of faith-based diplomacy. (Malcolm B. Hamilton, 1995)

Islam for instance, teaches pragmatic and resilient ways of conflict resolution. There are various incidents in the Qur'an in which it is evidently clear that the process of conflict resolution is addressed. Instance of this is Sura Yusuf which signifies the process of conflict resolution. Elsewhere, in the Qur'an Muslims are exhorted to safeguard against the malevolencies which fraudulently distorts collective life and ruins communal relationships in the society. For this the Qur'an is against mocking each other, calling names, creating suspicions and spying into other people's affairs; all these attitudes cause and instigate conflict. In fact, racial intolerance and other forms of prejudices as well as iniquitous treatments are all condemned by the Qur'an.

Meanwhile Islamic history and civilization depict political compromise and coexistence among Muslims and people of other faiths. The illustrious treaty of Hudaibiya neutralized the disagreement between the Quraish, the Muslims and the Jews. During the lifetime of Prophet Mohamed followers of major religions including Christians, Jews and Muslims lived in harmony under one leadership. In fact the understanding was that the common values shared by these religions applied in a comprehensive worldview of common consciousness. These aspects of religious teachings have not been employed to find solutions on the current religious and ethnic conflicts in the world. Similarly despite the increase in the attention to the religious facet of conflicts, it remains an under-researched area of study, at the same time, religion is a party in violent conflicts, and simultaneously it could be engaged as an active peace-maker and peace-builder. One of the fundamental principles of Islam is humanitarianism. Helping others who are in distress is part of Islamic faith and it is seen as indispensable element of religious practice for a Muslim.

V. CONCLUSION

Religion has inspired diverse conflicts in the past both in the regional levels and at the world stage and remains a major source of internal and international conflicts, at the same time, its role in humanitarianism, peacekeeping and military intervention could not be denied. In fact, in recent years its role has intensified and as such attracted huge attention. Those who oppose religion as a mechanism for peace argue that religion is responsible for the most of the world conflicts and on the contrary, those who see religion as an instrument of peace opine that religion is a peace builder and it could help the international community to find solutions to internal and international conflicts through religious orientations on the ground. The contention of this study has consistently been that unlike those who disregard the role of religion in international intervention, the values and the ethos of religion remain and will continue to hang about in any internal or international conflict in the world. During the course of modern human history we have witnessed ideologies and epistemic systems which have emerged to subtract religion of its powers; these include modernity, secularization and empiricism. But the social and spiritual relevance of religion repudiated to cease existence. On balance, more than two thirds of the world population belongs to a religion and religious oriented

individuals and organizations have vast networking facilities. Similarly, religion offers utilities needed in international interventions including forgiveness, spiritual appeasement and voluntarism. Through these means religion could be employed to monitor conflicts and provide peace services.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Ada Huibregtse. 2010. "External Intervention in Ethnic Conflict," International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations, 36:3, 265-293.
2. Annan Kofi. 1998. Thirty-fifth Annual Ditchley Foundation Lecture. UN Doc. SG/SM/6613. New York: United Nations.
3. Arend and Beck, 1996. in Oliver Ramsbotham and Tom Woodhouse, Humanitarian Intervention in Contemporary Conflict: A Reconceptualization. Cambridge: Polity Press.
4. Asad Talal. 1993. Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam. Baltimore, MD.: John Hopkins University Press.
5. Carment, David and Dane Rowlands. 1998. "Three's Company: Evaluating Third Party Intervention in Ethnic Conflict: Theory and Evidence." Nations and Nationalism 6: 173-202.
6. Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley. 2005. Understanding International Relations. 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Clifford Geertz. 1993. "Religion as A Cultural System" in The interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. Waukegan, Illinois: Fontana Press.
8. Cooper, Robert and Mats Berdal. 1993. "Outside Intervention in Ethnic Conflicts." Survival 35: 118-42.
9. Evan Mawdsley. 2007. The Russian Civil War. New York: Pegasus Books.
10. Fabio Petito & Pavlos Hatzopoulos, ed. 2003. Religion in International Relations, The Return from Exile, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
11. Ferdinando R Teson. 2003. 'The Liberal Case for Humanitarian Intervention,' in J. L.
12. Field Manual 100-23, 1994. Peace Operations. Washington, DC: Headquarters Department of the Army.
13. Gaurav Ghose and Patrick James. 2006. "Third-Party Intervention in Ethno-Religious Conflict: Role Theory and the Major Powers in South Asia" in Perspectives on Contemporary Ethnic Conflict: Primal Violence or the Politics of Conviction? Santosh C. Saha (ed.). UK: Lexington Books.
14. Giraldez, Arturo. 2001. "Book Review: The World That Trade Created: Society, Culture, and the World Economy, 1400 to the Present" Journal of World History, vol 12.2, 482-485 (online).
15. Gopin Marc. 2000. Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World religions, Violence and Peacemaking. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
16. Hamilton Malcolm B. 1995. The Sociology of Religion: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives. New York and London: Routledge.
17. Hammond, Kenneth J. 2008. From Yao to Mao: 5000 Years of Chinese History. N.p.: The Teaching Company.
18. Holzgrefe , J. L. and Robert O. Keohane, ed. 2003. Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Holzgrefe and Robert O. Keohane ed., Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas. New York: Cambridge University Press.94
20. James Meernik. 1996. "United States Military Intervention and the Promotion of Democracy", Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Nov.), pp. 391-402.
21. Jerome Slater and Terry Nardin. 1986, "Nonintervention and Human Rights," The Journal of Politics, 48, no. 1 (February): 92.
22. John M. Collins, 1995. "Military Intervention: A Checklist of Key Considerations."Parameters, Winter, pp. 53-58.
23. Jonathan Fox. 2008. A World Survey of Religion and the State. New York: Cambridge University Press.
24. Jonathan Fox, Patrick James and Yitan Li. 2009. "Religious Affinities and International Intervention in Ethnic Conflicts in the Middle East and Beyond," Canadian Journal of Political Science, 42:1, 161-186.
25. Jonathan Fox, Patrick James and Yitan Li (2009), "State Religion and Discrimination Against Ethnic Minorities," Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 15:2, 189-210.
26. Kenneth W. Thomas. 1992. "Conflict and Conflict Management: Reflections and Update", Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 13, issue 3, 265-274.
27. L. Holzgrefe. 2003. 'The Humanitarian Intervention Debate,' in J. L. Holzgrefe and Robert O. Keohane eds., Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas. New York: Cambridge University Press.
28. Mary Kaldor, 2007. Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention. Cambridge University Press.
29. Michael C. Davis, et.al. (eds.) 2004. International Intervention in the Post-Cold War World: Moral Responsibility and Power Politics. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
30. Michael Walzer. 2004. Arguing About War. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

31. Mueller John. 2000. The Banality of ''Ethnic War.'' International Security 25:42–70.
32. Pearce Susanna. 2005. "The Double-Edged Sword: The Impact of Religion on the Intensity of Political Conflict," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Dublin, Trinity College.
33. Pearson Frederic S., Robert A. Baumann, and Jeffrey J. Pickering. 1994. ''Military Intervention and Realpolitik.'' In Reconstructing Realpolitik, edited By Frank W.
34. Perez De Cuellar, Javier. 1991. Secretary General's Report on the Work of the UN. UN Doc. A/46/1. New York: United Nations.
35. Robert O. Keohane, and J.L. Holzgrefe. 2003. ed., Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas. New York: Cambridge University Press.
36. Samuel P. Huntington. 1996. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. New York: Simon and Schuster.
37. Santosh C. Saha (ed.) 2006. Perspectives on Contemporary Ethnic Conflict: Primal Violence or the Politics of Conviction? UK: Lexington Books.
38. José Casanova, 1994. Public Religions in the Modern World. Chicago, University of Chicago.
39. Scott Thomas. 2005. The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relation, the Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century, New York.
40. The UN Charter
41. Thomas M. Franck and Nigel S. Rodley. 1973. "After Bangladesh: The Law of Humanitarian Intervention by Military Force," The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 67, No. 2 (Apr.), pp. 275-305

This page is intentionally left blank