Journal of Human Rights and Refugee Studies
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537

Humanitarian Intervention in Practice: A Comparative Study of Kosovo, East Timor, and Libya

Jessica Turf, MA student
Webster's University Georgia
Department of International Relations

Abstract

This article examines the effectiveness of coercive diplomacy in humanitarian interventions in the post–Cold War international system. As intra-state conflicts increasingly involve systematic violence against civilian populations, the international community has turned to coercive strategies—such as air campaigns, no-fly zones, and peace enforcement missions—to compel actors to halt atrocities without engaging in full-scale war. However, the use of coercive diplomacy raises significant legal, political, and ethical debates regarding sovereignty, legitimacy, and selectivity in intervention decisions. Using a comparative case-study approach, this study analyzes three prominent humanitarian interventions: Kosovo (1999), East Timor (1999), and Libya (2011). Through qualitative process tracing supported by selected quantitative indicators, including civilian casualty trends, displacement patterns, and post-conflict stability measures, the research evaluates both immediate humanitarian outcomes and long-term political consequences. The findings suggest that coercive diplomacy can effectively compel short-term behavioral change and reduce immediate violence against civilians. However, its long-term success depends heavily on institutional factors, particularly multilateral legal authorization, credible enforcement capacity, and sustained post-conflict governance engagement. Cases where coercive intervention was integrated with long-term international administration and reconstruction efforts produced more stable outcomes, while interventions lacking robust post-conflict planning resulted in prolonged instability. The study concludes that coercive diplomacy is most effective when embedded within a broader multilateral framework linking civilian protection, legal legitimacy, and post-conflict state-building.

Keywords: humanitarian Intervention, coercive diplomacy, civilian protection, responsibility to protect (R2P), post–cold war conflict

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537

Introduction

The end of the Cold War reshaped the character of armed conflict. While inter-state wars declined in frequency, intra-state conflicts became the dominant form of organized violence. From the Balkans to Central Africa and Southeast Asia, many of these conflicts were characterized not only by contestation over political authority but also by systematic violence against civilian populations. Ethnic cleansing, mass displacement, siege warfare, and deliberate targeting of non-combatants increasingly became tools of war. Civilians were no longer collateral victims but strategic objectives, as armed actors sought demographic engineering, territorial consolidation, or political leverage.

This transformation generated mounting pressure on the international community to reconsider the principle of non-intervention. Traditional diplomacy, such as negotiation, mediation, and economic sanctions, often proved insufficient in halting mass atrocities once violence escalated. As a result, humanitarian intervention emerged as a policy instrument aimed at protecting civilian populations when sovereign authorities failed to do so. The 1990's saw a series of interventions framed in humanitarian terms, including in Libya, Kosovo, and East Timor, signaling a shift in how sovereignty was understood and executed. Along with this, there is a strategic shift from conventional diplomacy to coercive diplomacy. Rather than relying solely on dialogue or economic leverage, states and multilateral organizations increasingly employed threats of force, limited air campaigns, no-fly zones, and peace enforcement missions to compel compliance. Coercive diplomacy sought to raise the costs of continued violence while avoiding full-scale war or occupation. In humanitarian contexts, this approach aimed to halt atrocities through calibrated military pressure, blending diplomatic signaling with credible enforcement mechanisms. The post–Cold War era thus witnessed the institutionalization of tools within humanitarian policy frameworks.

Despite its growing prominence, humanitarian intervention through coercive diplomacy remains conceptually and politically contested. At the core of the debate lies a base tension between state sovereignty and the protection of human rights. The traditional Westphalian order privileges non-intervention and territorial integrity, yet mass atrocities challenge the moral legitimacy of absolute sovereignty. When a state is unwilling or unable to protect its population, does the international community possess not only a right but a responsibility to intervene?

This tension has generated many disputes over legality and legitimacy. Some interventions, such as those authorized by the United Nations Security Council, possess formal legal grounding but may still provoke debate regarding proportionality or intent. Others, undertaken without explicit authorization, may be defended as morally legitimate yet legally ambiguous. The gap between legality and legitimacy complicates assessments of humanitarian coercion and raises broader questions about the authority structures of global governance.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
A further challenge lies in the selectivity of humanitarian interventions. Not all humanitarian crises trigger external action, and decisions to intervene often reflect strategic interests, alliance politics, or geopolitical calculations. This inconsistency undermines claims of universal humanitarian commitment and fuels skepticism regarding the foundations of coercive diplomacy. The conceptual problem, therefore, is not simply whether humanitarian intervention is justified, but under what conditions it is authorized, implemented, and sustained.

Under what conditions does coercive diplomacy in humanitarian interventions effectively protect civilians while contributing to sustainable political stability?

This question seeks to move beyond set judgments of success or failure by examining the mechanisms through which coercive pressure operates and the structural factors that shape its outcomes. It also distinguishes between short-term civilian protection and long-term stabilization, recognizing that these objectives may not always align.

To address this question, the study pursues four primary objectives. First, it seeks to conceptualize and define coercive diplomacy within humanitarian contexts, distinguishing it from traditional military intervention and purely diplomatic engagement. Second, it examines selected case studies—including Kosovo (1999) and Libya (2011) and East Timor (1999)- to analyze how coercive strategies were justified and implemented. Third, it evaluates the effectiveness of these interventions by assessing both immediate humanitarian outcomes and longer-term political consequences. Finally, the study aims to identify patterns of success and failure, highlighting the structural, legal, and strategic conditions under which humanitarian coercive diplomacy is most likely to achieve its intended objectives.

This article proceeds in four analytically connected sections designed to move from research design to theoretical evaluation. The first section outlines the methodology, explaining the comparative case-study approach, the use of qualitative process tracing, and selected quantitative indicators used to measure both immediate civilian protection and long-term political stability. The second section presents the findings, systematically analyzing Kosovo (1999), Libya (2011), and East Timor (1999) through a common framework that evaluates humanitarian justification, coercive instruments, legal authorization, and post-intervention outcomes. The third section develops the results, with cross-case patterns to assess the conditional effectiveness of coercive diplomacy and to determine whether it functions primarily as a short-term compliance mechanism rather than a sustainable peacebuilding strategy. The final section gives a conclusion that sums up the central findings and clarifies the conditions under which coercive diplomacy can contribute to humanitarian protection while minimizing long-term instability.

This study adopts a purposive comparative case selection focused on three post–Cold War interventions—Kosovo (1999), East Timor (1999), and Libya (2011)—to examine variation in the authorization, implementation, and outcomes of humanitarian coercive diplomacy. Kosovo represents a NATO-led intervention conducted without explicit United Nations Security Council

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
authorization, raising questions about legality, legitimacy, and alliance-based coercion through airpower. East Timor provides a contrasting case of clearly authorized intervention under UN Security Council Resolution 1264, combining coercive peace enforcement with sustained post-conflict administration through UNTAET, thereby allowing analysis of how formal authorization and integrated state-building affect long-term stability. Libya occupies an intermediate but analytically distinct position as a UN-authorized intervention under Resolution 1973, widely associated with the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, yet evolving from civilian protection into regime change and prolonged fragmentation. Together, these cases offer structured variation across legal authorization (absent in Kosovo, explicit in East Timor and Libya), operational strategy (primarily airpower in Kosovo and Libya versus ground-based enforcement in East Timor), and post-intervention outcomes (relative institutional stabilization in Kosovo and East Timor versus sustained instability in Libya), thereby enabling controlled comparison of how institutional authorization, coercive design, and post-conflict governance shape both the legitimacy and effectiveness of humanitarian coercive diplomacy.

This study employs qualitative process tracing as its primary methodological tool in order to reconstruct the sequence of decision-making, escalation, and intervention within each case. Process tracing allows for identification of causal mechanisms linking humanitarian crisis, diplomatic signaling, military coercion, and political outcome. Rather than treating intervention as a single event, the analysis disaggregates stages: crisis emergence, international deliberation, coercive signaling, operational deployment, and post-intervention governance. This approach helps clarify whether coercive diplomacy functioned as deterrence, compellence, or regime-change facilitation.

Policy analysis further complements process tracing by examining official documents and institutional outputs. The study systematically reviews United Nations Security Council resolutions, NATO operational communiqués, government statements, and diplomatic correspondence where available. These sources provide insight into how intervention was publicly justified and internally rationalized. Comparing official narratives with scholarly interpretations enables critical assessment of whether humanitarian motives aligned with strategic calculations.

Methodology

Although the study is primarily qualitative, it incorporates quantitative indicators to assess measurable humanitarian and stability outcomes. Civilian casualty trends before and after intervention serve as one key metric for evaluating immediate protective effectiveness. Refugee and internally displaced person (IDP) statistics provide additional insight into humanitarian impact. The duration of active conflict following intervention is used to assess whether coercive diplomacy shortened or prolonged violence. Post-intervention stability indicators—including recurrence of

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
armed conflict, governance capacity measures, and levels of political fragmentation—offer longer-term evaluative benchmarks.

These quantitative indicators are not treated as definitive proof of success or failure but as complementary evidence that strengthens causal inference. For example, a decline in civilian casualties following intervention may indicate effective protection, but it may also reflect conflict exhaustion or shifts in tactics. Similarly, refugee returns may signal stabilization but can mask underlying political fragility. The study acknowledges several limitations in quantitative assessment. First, the attribution problem complicates causal claims: isolating the independent effect of coercive diplomacy from broader military, political, or regional dynamics is inherently difficult. Second, data reliability in conflict zones is often inconsistent, with casualty figures and displacement numbers subject to revision or politicization. Third, long-term stability indicators may be influenced by external economic conditions or regional spillover effects unrelated to the intervention itself. For these reasons, quantitative findings are interpreted cautiously and integrated with qualitative evidence. This research faces several structural limitations. First, the relatively small number of in-depth case studies constrains the generalizability of findings. While the selected cases provide meaningful variation, they cannot capture the full spectrum of humanitarian interventions globally. The study therefore advances conditional rather than universal conclusions. Second, humanitarian narratives themselves may contain embedded bias. Official justifications often emphasize civilian protection, yet retrospective analysis may reveal strategic motivations. Distinguishing genuine normative commitment from instrumental rhetoric remains analytically challenging. This difficulty is compounded by the politicized nature of intervention debates, where competing actors frame events to support divergent interpretations.

Third, isolating coercive diplomacy from broader military strategy poses conceptual challenges. In several cases, limited coercion evolved into broader campaigns with regime-change implications. Determining where coercive diplomacy ends and conventional military intervention begins is not always clear-cut. Finally, normative evaluation inevitably shapes interpretation: assessments of “success” depend partly on ethical frameworks regarding sovereignty, legitimacy, and the acceptable costs of intervention.

Recognizing these limitations does not invalidate the analysis but situates its conclusions within a careful methodological framework. By combining comparative case analysis, qualitative process tracing, and cautious use of quantitative indicators, the study seeks to produce a balanced and analytical evaluation of humanitarian intervention through coercive diplomacy.

Result

Kosovo (1999)

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537

The conflict in Kosovo in 1998–1999 between Yugoslav and Serbian forces against ethnic Albanian separatists, resulting in widespread violence, forced displacement, and reports of ethnic cleansing. Diplomatic efforts, including the Rambouillet negotiations, failed to produce a settlement acceptable to both sides (Hehir, 2008). In response to escalating civilian harm and the breakdown of negotiations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) launched Operation Allied Force on March 24, 1999, conducting a 78-day air campaign aimed at compelling Serbian forces to withdraw from Kosovo. This intervention became one of the most significant and controversial applications of humanitarian coercive diplomacy in the post–Cold War era (Hehir, 2008; Newman & Visoka, 2024).

NATO framed its intervention as a humanitarian imperative to prevent further atrocities against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. Reports of mass displacement and rights abuses by Serbian forces were central to Western justifications for action (Hehir, 2008). However, Hehir (2008) argues that the humanitarian rationale was contested; although civilians faced serious harm, the scale and immediacy of the purported humanitarian emergency were politically amplified to justify coercive action. The framing of Kosovo's crisis therefore showcased the tension between humanitarian concern and strategic interest in the conduct of coercive diplomacy.

NATO's strategy in Kosovo reflected a classic model of coercive diplomacy: the calibrated use of limited military force to compel policy change without pursuing territorial conquest or full-scale war. Prior to the use of force, diplomatic pressure was applied through negotiations such as the Rambouillet talks, which attempted to secure Serbian acceptance of international peacekeeping forces and political autonomy for Kosovo. When these negotiations collapsed, NATO shifted from diplomatic signaling to coercive enforcement by initiating Operation Allied Force. The campaign relied primarily on sustained aerial bombardment targeting Serbian military infrastructure, command-and-control systems, air defenses, and logistical networks. By degrading Yugoslav military capabilities and demonstrating NATO's willingness to escalate if necessary, the alliance sought to impose significant costs on Belgrade while still avoiding a risky ground invasion.

Airpower functioned as the central coercive instrument because it allowed NATO to apply sustained pressure while limiting casualties among its own forces and avoiding the political risks associated with large-scale occupation. The strategy aimed to force Serbian leadership to reconsider the costs of continued repression in Kosovo and ultimately withdraw its forces from the region. However, the reliance on air campaigns also exposed the limitations of coercive diplomacy in humanitarian contexts. In the early stages of the bombing campaign, Serbian forces accelerated expulsions of ethnic Albanians, contributing to large-scale displacement and humanitarian suffering. This escalation illustrated a key challenge of coercive diplomacy: while military pressure can eventually compel compliance, it may initially intensify violence as targeted actors attempt to consolidate control before the coercive pressure takes full effect. As a result, the humanitarian effectiveness of coercive strategies may be ambiguous in the short term even when they ultimately succeed in altering political behavior.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
Unlike many later interventions, Kosovo did not have explicit authorization from the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) due to anticipated vetoes from Russia and China. NATO justified its actions as legitimate but not strictly legal under the UN Charter framework (Hehir, 2008). This distinction between legality and legitimacy became central to academic debate: NATO did not violate an explicit UNSC prohibition, but lacked clear Security Council backing (Joyner, 2002). Researchers such as Newman and Visoka (2024) note that this ambiguity did not prevent NATO from establishing long-term institutional roles in Kosovo, highlighting evolving practices in international security and governance despite traditional legal constraints.

Under sustained NATO air pressure and parallel diplomatic engagement, Serbian forces agreed to withdraw from Kosovo in June 1999. The United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1244, authorizing an international civil and security presence (UNMIK and KFOR) to restore order and oversee reconstruction (Newman & Visoka, 2024). In the short term, the removal of Serbian forces immediately reduced large-scale violence against ethnic Albanian civilians and allowed for the return of displaced persons. However, Hehir (2008) emphasizes that the bombing campaign itself contributed to increased displacement during its early phases, illustrating how coercive diplomacy can have ambiguous short-term humanitarian effects.

Following the conflict, Kosovo remained under international administration for nearly a decade before declaring independence in 2008. NATO's presence persisted through KFOR, contributing to a relatively stable security environment compared to other post-intervention contexts (Newman & Visoka, 2024). Newman and Visoka (2024) argue that Kosovo illustrates the development of what they term "security practices", where NATO's engagement extended beyond immediate coercive pressure to longer-term stabilization and governance support. Nonetheless, Kosovo's status remains contested internationally, with Serbia and several states not recognizing its independence. Persistent inter-ethnic tensions also highlight ongoing challenges in achieving enduring societal reconciliation.

Kosovo occupies a complex place in the literature on humanitarian intervention and coercive diplomacy. Hehir (2008) critiques the idea that Kosovo represented a breakthrough in humanitarian intervention, instead framing it as a politically contingent operation where strategic and alliance interests shaped both justification and execution. Joyner (2002) similarly highlights legal debates about the intervention's legitimacy in the absence of UNSC authorization. , Opposingly, Newman and Visoka's (2024) analysis of NATO's extended role underscores the case's importance in evolving international security practices. In coercive diplomacy terms, Kosovo demonstrates that credible threats backed by alliance capacity can compel compliance even when legal authority is politically constrained. However, the case also illustrates how framing and implementation can complicate the humanitarian narrative.

Compared to later interventions like Libya (2011), Kosovo achieved greater post-conflict stability, partly because sustained international engagement helped build governance and security structures. Unlike East Timor (1999), which had clear UNSC backing for force deployment, Kosovo lacked

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
explicit legal authorization yet still succeeded in coercing compliance. This contrast highlights how coercive diplomacy operates across differing legal and institutional contexts and underscores the need to examine both effectiveness and legitimacy in humanitarian intervention scholarship.

Libya (2011)

In February 2011, uprisings against the regime of Muammar Gaddafi erupted as part of the wider Arab Spring movement. Protests quickly escalated into armed conflict between Gaddafi's forces and various rebel groups. Reports of brutal repression, including indiscriminate attacks on civilians, raised international concern (Bello, 2017). In response, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1973, authorizing "all necessary measures" to protect civilians and establish a no-fly zone over Libya. NATO subsequently assumed command of the operation, conducting an air campaign from March to October 2011 aimed at degrading Gaddafi's military capacity and preventing further civilian harm (NATO, 2011).

Supporters of intervention justified the operation on humanitarian grounds, framing it as an urgent effort to prevent mass atrocities. With Gaddafi's forces advancing toward rebel-held cities such as Benghazi, Western states argued that decisive international action was required to shield civilians from large-scale violence (Bello, 2017). The invocation of UNSC Resolution 1973 reflected a collective determination to translate the emerging principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) into practice. However, scholars and critics have noted that motivations extended beyond pure humanitarian concern to include political, strategic, and economic interests among coalition members, complicating the moral clarity of the justification (Bello, 2017).

NATO's intervention in Libya exemplified coercive diplomacy using limited military force under a humanitarian mandate. The air campaign involved precision strikes on Libyan air defenses, command and control infrastructure, tanks, and armored units, with the declared aim of impeding Gaddafi's capability to attack civilian populations (NATO, 2011). The imposition of a no-fly zone and targeted bombardments were intended to raise the costs of continued repression for Gaddafi's regime, compelling behavioral change without committing ground troops.

Nevertheless, Human Rights Watch (2012) documented civilian casualties from NATO air strikes, estimating that the coalition's operations caused multiple unacknowledged deaths. While NATO denied responsibility for many of these incidents, the evidence of civilian harm highlights the inherent risks in coercive military diplomacy: even carefully executed air operations can produce unintended humanitarian consequences, undermining the very goals they seek to achieve.

Libya's intervention possessed explicit United Nations authorization, a distinguishing legal feature compared to earlier cases such as Kosovo. UNSC Resolution 1973 provided the legal basis for NATO's actions, giving the mission legitimacy in international law. As NATO's own documents

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
emphasize, the operation was framed as a collective effort to protect civilians consistent with international obligations derived from the UN Charter and the emerging doctrine of R2P (NATO, 2011). However, scholarly literature questions whether NATO adhered strictly to the limits of that mandate. As Bellamy and Williams (2013) note, intervention quickly expanded in scope, with coalition forces targeting regime forces more broadly than necessary strictly for civilian protection. This has led to debates about the scope and limits of coercive diplomacy under humanitarian mandates, especially when strategic goals overlap with tactical objectives.

The NATO air campaign succeeded in significantly degrading Gaddafi's military capabilities. Rebel forces regained territory because of coalition support, and by August 2011, major regime strongholds had fallen. The ultimate collapse and death of Muammar Gaddafi in October 2011 signaled an end to organized resistance by the regime and a nominal humanitarian success: the immediate mass killing of civilians by Gaddafi's forces was averted (Bello, 2017).

Nonetheless, Human Rights Watch's report (2012) highlights that civilian casualties occurred because of NATO strikes. The presence of unacknowledged deaths suggests that even with precision targeting, the complexity of aerial coercive strategies can produce contradictory humanitarian effects in the short term. In the long term, Libya's post-Gaddafi trajectory revealed significant instability. The absence of a strong post-conflict governance framework and effective institutions contributed to power vacuums, proliferation of armed militias, and extended conflict between rival factions. Rather than consolidating a stable humanitarian peace, Libya entered a prolonged period of political fragmentation and violence.

Scholars argue that NATO's success in compelling regime change did not translate into effective stabilization or reconstruction. Bello (2017) emphasizes that without a coherent post-intervention plan, the humanitarian gains achieved through coercive diplomacy were undermined by subsequent insecurity, displacement, and chronic humanitarian need. The Libyan case illustrates both the possibilities and limitations of humanitarian coercive diplomacy. On the one hand, NATO's intervention under UNSC authorization prevented what many feared would-be large-scale massacres in besieged cities and demonstrated international willingness to act under the R2P framework (NATO, 2011). On the other hand, the extension of the campaign beyond narrow protective measures toward broader regime degradation raises questions about mission creep and the alignment of military action with humanitarian objectives (Bellamy & Williams, 2013).

In addition, civilian casualties resulting from coalition air strikes underscore that coercive force, even with legal mandate and precision munitions, can have direct humanitarian costs (Human Rights Watch, 2012). The long-term instability that followed further complicates assessments of success: while coercive diplomacy compelled regime change, it failed to ensure a stable humanitarian environment in its aftermath. Compared with Kosovo (1999) and East Timor (1999), Libya stands out for its clear UN legal authorization, but also for the difficulty of translating military success into lasting humanitarian outcomes. Kosovo, despite legal ambiguity, achieved a relatively stable post-conflict environment under continued international administration. East

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
Timor, with explicit backing, moved more swiftly toward institutional rebuilding. Libya's instability suggests that coercive diplomacy can compel short-term compliance but may not guarantee sustainable humanitarian or political reconstruction without post-conflict planning.

East Timor (1999)

In August 1999, the people of East Timor voted overwhelmingly for independence from Indonesia in a United Nations–administered referendum. In the aftermath of the vote, pro-Indonesian militias, often supported or tolerated by elements within the Indonesian security forces, launched a campaign of violence that included killings, forced displacement, and the systematic destruction of infrastructure. Nearly a quarter of the population was displaced, and much of the territory's basic infrastructure was destroyed (Southgate, 2019). The scale and organization of the violence exposed the fragility of Indonesia's security guarantees and quickly escalated into a humanitarian emergency. As diplomatic efforts failed to halt the attacks, international pressure intensified, culminating in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1264, which authorized a multinational force to restore peace and security.

The intervention in East Timor was framed as a direct response to mass atrocity and humanitarian breakdown. Unlike more ambiguous crises, the violence followed a clearly expressed act of self-determination and involved widespread targeting of civilians. Wheeler and Dunne (2001) argue that East Timor became symbolic of a shift toward "new humanitarian interventionism," in which sovereignty was increasingly conditional upon a state's responsibility to protect its population. The international community's eventual willingness to override Indonesia's resistance reflected the growing normative weight attached to civilian protection.

However, Ahmed (2006) notes that the international response was not immediate. Despite early warnings of militia mobilization, decisive action occurred only after large-scale violence had already unfolded. This delay raises questions about the consistency of humanitarian commitment and whether geopolitical calculations influenced the timing of intervention. Southgate (2019) further emphasizes the regional diplomatic tensions within ASEAN, where norms of non-interference complicated collective action, demonstrating the structural barriers to early preventive intervention. The East Timor crisis illustrates a layered model of coercive diplomacy combining diplomatic pressure with credible military enforcement. Initially, international actors applied diplomatic and economic pressure on Indonesia, including suspension of military cooperation and public condemnation. When these measures failed to curb militia violence, the UN authorized the International Force for East Timor (INTERFET), led by Australia, to deploy under Chapter VII authority. The rapid deployment of INTERFET troops signaled a decisive escalation from coercive diplomacy to peace enforcement. The credible presence of multinational ground forces altered the strategic calculus of both militias and Indonesian authorities. Wheeler and Dunne (2001) argue that this credibility was essential: coercion succeeded because Indonesia faced mounting international isolation and the tangible prospect of sustained military engagement. Ahmed (2006) similarly contends that the combination of diplomatic isolation and military pressure compelled

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
Indonesia to accept international intervention, illustrating the effectiveness of coercive leverage when backed by multilateral legitimacy.

The intervention in East Timor was firmly grounded in international legal authorization. Security Council Resolution 1264 authorized the use of “all necessary measures” to restore peace and facilitate humanitarian assistance. This explicit mandate provided legal legitimacy absent in some other humanitarian interventions. Southgate (2019) highlights that despite ASEAN’s traditional adherence to non-interference, Indonesia ultimately acquiesced under intense diplomatic pressure, thereby reducing the risk of interstate escalation.

Following the stabilization phase, the United Nations established the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), which assumed full administrative control over the territory until independence in 2002. Wheeler and Dunne (2001) argue that this institutional commitment to governance and reconstruction distinguished East Timor from more limited enforcement operations. The integration of peace enforcement with transitional administration strengthened the long-term legitimacy of the intervention.

The immediate impact of INTERFET’s deployment was a sharp reduction in violence. Militia activity declined significantly, displaced persons began returning, and humanitarian agencies were able to expand operations. The withdrawal of Indonesian forces further stabilized the security environment. In coercive diplomacy terms, the intervention achieved compliance: Indonesia ceased active obstruction, and militia operations were curtailed (Wheeler & Dunne, 2001). Nevertheless, Ahmed (2006) emphasizes that the intervention occurred only after extensive destruction had already taken place. This underscores a recurring limitation of humanitarian coercive diplomacy: it can often function as a reactive mechanism rather than a preventive one.

In contrast to other humanitarian interventions, East Timor experienced a comparatively structured political transition. Under UNTAET administration, institutions were gradually developed, culminating in formal independence in 2002. Although the new state faced economic fragility and occasional internal unrest, the overall trajectory reflected sustained international commitment to governance and reconstruction. Southgate (2019) notes that the integration of regional diplomacy, UN authorization, and long-term administrative oversight was central to this outcome. Wheeler and Dunne (2001) similarly argue that East Timor became a model of how humanitarian intervention, when embedded within multilateral institutions and followed by state-building efforts, can contribute to relatively durable stability. However, Ahmed (2006) cautions that structural dependency and limited domestic capacity remained enduring challenges.

The East Timor intervention demonstrates that coercive diplomacy can succeed when clear humanitarian justification, multilateral authorization, and sustained institutional engagement converge. The credible threat and deployment of force altered Indonesia’s strategic calculations, while long-term UN administration provided a framework for reconstruction. Compared to more contested interventions, East Timor achieved a closer alignment between humanitarian objectives

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
and political outcomes. Yet, the delayed response and reliance on powerful states for enforcement reveal structural inequalities in the international system. The case suggests that while coercive diplomacy can be effective in halting violence and enabling transition, its success depends heavily on international consensus, regional cooperation, and commitment to post-conflict governance.

Conclusion

This study finds that coercive diplomacy in humanitarian interventions is conditionally effective rather than inherently successful or unsuccessful. Across Kosovo (1999), Libya (2011), and East Timor (1999), coercive pressure demonstrated clear short-term capacity to alter the behavior of targeted actors and reduce immediate large-scale violence against civilians. However, the sustainability of political stability varied according to the institutional and strategic context in which coercion was embedded. The comparative evidence indicates that three structural conditions are particularly significant: multilateral legal authorization, credible and proportionate enforcement capacity, and sustained post-intervention governance engagement. Where coercive diplomacy was integrated with long-term institutional administration and reconstruction, as in East Timor, it contributed to comparatively durable stabilization. Where extended international oversight compensated for legal ambiguity, as in Kosovo, relative stability was also achieved, but within a contested sovereignty framework. By contrast, Libya demonstrates that coercive action, even when formally authorized, may produce regime collapse without institutional consolidation if post-conflict planning is limited or fragmented. The findings therefore suggest that coercive diplomacy is most effective as part of a broader multilateral strategy linking protection, legitimacy, and reconstruction. Absent to these reinforcing conditions, coercive humanitarian intervention may achieve immediate compliance but fail to generate sustainable political order.

References

Ahmed, S. (2006). The international community and East Timor: A test of humanitarian intervention. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 1*(2), 123–140.

Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P. D. (2013). The new politics of protection? Côte d'Ivoire, Libya and the responsibility to protect. *International Affairs, 87*(4), 825–850. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2011.01006.x

Bello, V. (2017). The responsibility to protect and the 2011 intervention in Libya. *Global Responsibility to Protect, 9*(3), 271–298.

Hehir, A. (2008). *Humanitarian intervention after Kosovo: Iraq, Darfur and the record of global civil society.* Palgrave Macmillan.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19655537
Human Rights Watch. (2012). *Unacknowledged deaths: Civilian casualties in NATO's air campaign in Libya.* Human Rights Watch.

Joyner, C. C. (2002). The Kosovo intervention: Legal analysis and humanitarian implications. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights, 9*(2), 123–154.

NATO. (2011). *NATO and Libya: Operation Unified Protector.* North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Newman, E., & Visoka, G. (2024). NATO, Kosovo and the evolution of security practices. *European Security, 33*(1), 1–20.

Southgate, L. (2019). ASEAN's response to the East Timor crisis and the limits of non-interference. *Asian Security, 15*(3), 259–276.

Wheeler, N. J., & Dunne, T. (2001). East Timor and the new humanitarian interventionism. *International Affairs, 77*(4), 805–827.