

Part I Introducing the Concept of Humanitarian Countermeasures

1	Origin of the Concept	3
2	Course of Investigation	13
2.1	Approach to the Analysis	13
2.2	Structure	14
3	Need for a New Concept to Fill the Ever-Present Normative Gap	17
3.1	Proactively Developing Humanitarian Countermeasures amid Russia's Aggression against Ukraine	18
3.2	The Unsuitability of International Criminal Law as a Protective Mechanism for Civilians in Mass Atrocities	19
3.2.1	Procedural Barriers to an Effective Enforcement of International Criminal Law	20
3.2.2	A Comparison of the Scope of Protection: Objectives of International Criminal Law and Jus ad Bellum	22
3.2.3	Conclusion	24
3.3	Deficiency of the 'Per Se Illegal' Approach	25
3.3.1	The Unfulfilled Hope for a Stronger Allegiance to Art. 2.4 UN Charter	25

3.3.2	The Unfounded Fear of a Subversion of the UN Charter	29
3.3.3	Slim Prospects of Security Council Reform	31
3.3.4	The Growing Urgency of a New Concept in light of the Changing Nature of Conflicts	31
3.4	The Insufficiency of the 'Illegal But Legitimate' Label	33
3.4.1	Origin of this Approach	33
3.4.2	Arguments in Favor of the Resort to Morality	34
3.4.3	Critique	36
3.5	Taking the Bull by the Horns: The Establishment of a Legal Framework	45
3.6	Conclusion	47
4	Role of Countermeasures in this Context	49
4.1	Sources	49
4.2	Functionality of Countermeasures in the context of Humanitarian Military Action	50
4.2.1	Future-Oriented of Countermeasures	51
4.2.2	Restricting Framework	52
4.2.3	The Targeted Nature of Countermeasures as Differentiation from other Concepts	53
 Part II Opening the Concept of Countermeasures for Humanitarian Military Action		
5	Trends and Developments in International Law and Politics Relevant for Humanitarian Countermeasures	59
5.1	Object and Purpose of Art. 2.4 UN Charter	60
5.2	Tracing State Sovereignty—a Gradual Development towards an Increased Emphasis on Human Rights	62
5.2.1	The Westphalian Sovereignty	63
5.2.2	Status of the 1945 State Sovereignty	65
5.2.3	The Gradual Perforation of Absolute State Sovereignty through Human Rights	68
5.2.4	Humanitarian Intervention	74
5.2.5	Art. 4(h) of the Constitutive Act of the AU	79
5.2.6	The Responsibility to Protect	81
5.2.7	The Consistent as well as Contemporary Backlash Against Human Rights	92

5.2.8	Interim Conclusion—the Current Status of State Sovereignty	98
5.3	Forceful Responses to Previous Wrongful Conduct in International Law and Practice	101
5.3.1	Historical Roots	102
5.3.2	Contemporary Examples	105
5.3.3	Interim Conclusion	116
5.4	The Willingness of States to Act in Spite of a Blocked Security Council	117
5.4.1	Uniting for Peace Resolution	118
5.4.2	Peacekeeping Operations	121
5.4.3	<i>Ex post</i> Authorizations	122
5.5	Conclusion	122
6	The Traditionally Non-Forceful Nature of Countermeasures as Conceived in Art. 50.1 lit. a) DARS	125
6.1	The Difference between Forcible Countermeasures and Reprisals	126
6.1.1	The ‘Across-the-Board’ Prohibition of Reprisals in International Jus ad Bellum	127
6.1.2	Linguistic Analysis of the Notion of Countermeasures and Reprisals	128
6.1.3	Analysis of the References Contained in the ILC Commentaries	131
6.1.4	Conclusion	139
6.2	Art. 50.1 lit. a) DARS as a Dynamic Reference to the UN Charter	140
6.2.1	The ILC’s Reticence to Determine the Scope of the Prohibition of the Use of Force	140
6.2.2	Relevant Provisions of the UN Charter	142
6.2.3	Textual and Historical Interpretation of Art. 2.4 UN Charter as the Codified Prohibition of the Use of Force	143
6.2.4	Changes to the Prohibition of the Use of Force or Art. 2.4 UN Charter through Customary International Law	146

6.2.5	Results of the Analysis on Trends in International Law and Politics	165
6.3	Conclusion Regarding the Traditionally Non-Forceful Nature of Countermeasures	166
7	Problem of the ‘Injured State’: Third-Party Countermeasures ...	167
7.1	The Existence of Erga Omnes Obligations	168
7.2	Third-Party Countermeasures in the ILC Draft Articles	169
7.3	Third-Party Countermeasures in State Practice	172
7.4	Conclusion	176
8	The Interplay between Security Council Action and Humanitarian Countermeasures	179
8.1	Relationship between DARS and UN Charter Generally	180
8.2	Relationship of Non-Forceful Third-Party Countermeasures to UN Charter	181
8.2.1	First Approach: Autonomy of Security Council Action and Third-Party Countermeasures	182
8.2.2	Second Approach: Immediate Cessation of Third-Party Countermeasures as soon as Security Council Issues Chapter VII Resolution	182
8.2.3	Practice of Parallel Security Council Action and Third-Party Countermeasures	184
8.3	Specificity of Humanitarian Countermeasures	185
8.4	Determination of Threshold: ‘Blocked’ Security Council	186
8.5	Conclusion	190
9	Risks of Humanitarian Countermeasures	191
9.1	Auto-Interpretation and the Risk of Pretextual Use for Unrelated National Interests	192
9.1.1	Auto-Interpretation and Due Process	192
9.1.2	Instrumentalization as Pretext for Unrelated National Interests	193
9.1.3	The Ubiquity of the Auto-Interpretation Risk in International Law	193
9.1.4	State Practice	195
9.2	Selectivity	197
9.2.1	The Risk of Perpetuating Hegemonic Power Ambitions through Selective Action	199

9.2.2	The Partial Inevitability of Selective Foreign Policy	200
9.2.3	The ‘Illegal, But Legitimate’ Approach as Breeding Ground for Selectivity	205
9.2.4	The Relative Unimportance of Selectivity for Future Actions	206
9.3	Cultural Relativity Critique	207
9.3.1	Problem Outline	207
9.3.2	The Non-Opposability of Cultural Relativity to Humanitarian Countermeasures	208
9.4	Risk of Introducing a Threshold-Based Response Mechanism	212
9.4.1	Purpose of a Red Line Mechanism in the Context of Humanitarian Countermeasures ...	212
9.4.2	Conditions of a Successful Deterrence by a Red Line	213
9.4.3	Risks of Setting Out a Red Line	214
9.4.4	Balance of Risks and Benefits of Thresholds for Humanitarian Countermeasures	217
9.5	Floodgate Argument	219
9.5.1	Concern for Multiplication of Interventions	219
9.5.2	Restrictiveness of Humanitarian Countermeasures as a Remedy	220
9.5.3	Factual Remedy: Unwillingness of States to Get Involved	221
9.6	Risk of Escalating Conflicts due to the Forceful Nature of the Countermeasures	221
9.6.1	Potential Causes of an Escalation	222
9.6.2	Civilian Lives	225
9.6.3	Hardships of Non-Forceful Countermeasures and Sanctions	226
9.6.4	Legal Framework for Humanitarian Military Action as a De-Escalating Factor	228
9.6.5	Conclusion	229

Part III Concrete Design of Humanitarian Countermeasures

10 (Adapted) Conditions According to Art. 49 et seq. DARS	233
10.1 Continuing Internationally Wrongful Act	233
10.1.1 Threshold for Humanitarian Countermeasures	233
10.1.2 “Continuing” Wrongful Act	238
10.1.3 Evidence	239
10.1.4 Assessing Authority	240
10.1.5 Conclusion	250
10.2 Attribution of Conduct	251
10.3 Objective of the Countermeasure: Return to Lawful Behavior	252
10.4 Reversibility	254
10.4.1 Reversibility as a Safeguard for the Future-Orientation of Countermeasures	254
10.4.2 Reversibility in the Context of Military Measures	255
10.5 Subsidiarity of Humanitarian Countermeasures: The Criterion of Non-Preclusion	259
10.5.1 Pending Dispute, Art. 52.3 DARS	259
10.5.2 Deadlock in the Security Council	260
10.5.3 Call upon General Assembly’s Uniting for Peace Competences	261
10.6 Obligation to Call on the Wrongdoing State and Obligation to Notify	263
10.6.1 Art. 52.1 lit. a) DARS	264
10.6.2 Art. 52.1 lit. b) DARS	264
10.6.3 Urgency, Art. 52.2 DARS	267
10.7 No Violation of Art. 50.1 lit. b)—d) and Art. 50.2 DARS	268
10.8 Proportionality	269
10.8.1 Suitability of the Measure to Achieve its Objective	270
10.8.2 Residual Safeguard to Ensure the Precedence of Non-Forceful Measures	273
10.8.3 Proportionality as a Safeguard to Ensure the Selection of the Least Infringing Military Action	275
11 Further Requirements	279
11.1 Consistency	279
11.2 Multilateralizing Humanitarian Countermeasures	281

11.2.1	Advantages of Multilateral Action and Decision-Making	281
11.2.2	Options to Ensure Multilateral Decision-Making	283
11.3	Notification to the Security Council	288
11.4	Acceptance by the Affected Population	289
11.5	Modification of Jus in Bello Norms	290
11.5.1	Jus ad Bellum as Modification of Jus in Bello?	290
11.5.2	Compliance with Jus in Bello as Part of a Stricter Proportionality Assessment	294
11.5.3	Conclusion	295
12	Consolidated List of Requirements	297
	Conclusion	301
	List of Cases	307
	List of Documents	309
	Bibliography	315