

ferences about who establishes the normative agenda in the first place... Alongside the BRICS and the non-aligned states, Russia has questioned whether the norms and legal claims cited to justify Western-led interventions have been representative of the will of the international community" (p. 209). Allison also attributed this shift to a change of thinking in Moscow, particularly from the beginning of Putin's presidency, and also to regional norm-setting by Russia to resist the use of force by the West in Georgia and Ukraine.

The book blends theoretical perspectives with case studies in a splendid manner. Moscow's thinking about military interventions since the end of the Cold War has been captured and analysed in a structured yet lucid way. However, one minor point of disagreement persists: are military interventions in the post-Cold War period really less dangerous to the present global order than earlier bipolar confrontations, as pointed out by Allison? Only time will tell. But this issue certainly is a minor one in the backdrop of the overall brilliance of the work. Allison deserves credit for bringing out a timely book on a hitherto neglected yet important issue in international politics. ■

STEFANO RECCHIA AND JENNIFER M. WELSH
(EDS.). *JUST AND UNJUST MILITARY
INTERVENTION: EUROPEAN THINKERS FROM VICTORIA
TO MILL*

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, pp. xii+306, ISBN 978-1-107-04202-5 (hbk), Price not stated.

VIKASH CHANDRA (CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS,
ORGANISATION AND DISARMAMENT, SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL
STUDIES, JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY)

The recent intervention in Libya brought the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) to the forefront of public and academic debate. Critics questioned the authority and intentions of the intervening coalition. Some alleged that the intervention carried out in the name of R2P was indeed driven by narrow national interests of regime change, while others argued more generally that R2P has become a tool to legitimize interventions by great powers. In such circumstances, when the legitimacy of existing military intervention doctrines is on the tight rope, by providing

an account of just and unjust military intervention from the perspective of modern European thinkers, the book aims to open the possibility of reconceptualizing and developing more acceptable doctrines of military intervention.

In order to capture the essence of theoretical debates, the book concentrates on three core areas: when, or under what circumstances, can intervention be justified? Who has the authority to intervene? What types of interventions are needed? The thinkers featured in this volume differ significantly in their treatment of these questions. On the question of justification of intervention, Vitoria rejected difference in religion, enlargement of empire, and personal interest as legitimate bases and argued that war can only be justified when “harm has been inflicted” (p. 74). Meanwhile, Wolff and Vattel believed that “shared religion gives a state special license to intervene on behalf of others” (p. 143). Suárez went a step further and accepted the use of force legitimate but only if it has been used “to ward off acts of injustice and to hold enemies in check” (p. 50). However, it was Grotius who added the “humanitarian” aspect in discourse on military intervention. He argued that preventive war can be justified against those who wage war against “imperil women” and “innocents”. Thus, he justified intervention as punishment (p. 137). Pufendorf and Vattel, on the other hand, raised the possibility of enhancing the democratic accountability of military intervention by focusing on the “consent” of those being assisted.

Pertaining to right authority, Vitoria allowed both public and private persons to wage war. However, he imposed substantial limitations on private war, which can be justified only in case of immediate danger to person and property, and should be abandoned as soon as the danger passes. Unlike Vitoria, Gentili believed that the legitimate right to wage war belongs exclusively to states, and that consequently, private individuals do not have that right (p. 103). Both advancing and departing from the idea of Gentili, Wolff rejected the idea of intervention by individual states and instead upheld that “collective intervention by the *civitas maxima* alone...[is] legitimate” (p. 144). His idea of collective intervention is shared by modern thinkers and leaders of the contemporary Global South.

Regarding the nature of intervention and use of force, views of thinkers varied significantly. Some thinkers have accepted the use of military force as legitimate, while others restrict it to “moral and political solidarity from abroad; financial and material assistance; and even the contribution of foreign volunteer militia” (p. 249). To Mazzini, states should intervene “by offering their moral, diplomatic, economic and perhaps even indirect military support...” (p. 252). It is also noticeable

that even those who support military intervention do not seem to support regime change.

Though opinions vary, however; non-intervention seems to be the rule, with exceptional intervention permissible only under specific circumstances. Some thinkers have allowed persons and individuals the right to wage war, but most of the thinkers have granted this right only to states. Though some permitted individual states to intervene, most have preferred the collective use of force. Amidst diverging opinions, what readers miss is a concluding chapter.

Despite its merits, any attempt to reconceptualize R2P or construct another doctrine of intervention to meet the challenges of today's complex world would be incomplete until it takes the Global South's view into account. The editors underline how "classical European thought" has exerted a "unique impact on our contemporary conceptual categories and normative standards" and "fundamentally shaped the parameters of legitimate intervention" (p. 7), however, they do not/fail to mention that this only became possible because of the North's domination of the international system. Now, at a time when international power equilibrium is changing, and the international system is going through a transition, the emerging powers will claim their stake in the conceptualization of any doctrine of military intervention.

Moreover, since intervention doctrines have been implemented primarily in the Global South, the inclusion of the views of the non-Western thinkers will also increase the legitimacy of such doctrines, as so far such doctrines have been considered alien. Therefore, in the light of the editors' claim that the aim of the book is "to open up to critical reflection, and with the help of the classical thinkers, to explore the possibility of reconceptualizing and reappraising contemporary problems" (p. 20), it would have been better to include some non-Western thinkers as well. In the absence of thinkers from the Global South, this volume can only be considered/regarded as representative of the European philosophical tradition, rather than a truly global or international endeavour.

Nevertheless, this volume is published at a crucial juncture when the international community as well as victims of ongoing conflicts need such doctrine. By providing a philosophical account of conceptions/theories of just and unjust military intervention during a time when R2P is gathering momentum, the book undoubtedly serves the cause of normative development in the field of military intervention. It will be a useful guide for negotiators of the new norm as well as for students and scholars. ■