Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Application of Countermeasures to Justify the Establishment of Safe Zones as a Response to Large-Scale Refugee Outflows 5

2.1 Analysis of the Requirements for a Countermeasures Defense to Establish of Safe Zones 6

2.1.1 A Response to a Previous Internationally Wrongful Act 6

2.1.2 The Responsible State Must Be Called upon to Return to a Lawful Situation Before Countermeasures Are Adopted 8

2.1.3 Countermeasures Must Be Directed Only Against the Wrongdoer State to Induce Compliance with Its International Obligations 9

2.1.4 Duration 10

2.1.5 Reversibility 11

2.1.6 Proportionality 12

2.2 Collective Countermeasures 16

2.3 Forcible Countermeasures 17

2.3.1 Character of the Use of Force 18

2.3.2 The Ban on the Use of Force and Forcible Countermeasures 19

2.3.3 Forcible Measures Against Large-Scale Refugee Outflows 22

3 Application of the Concept of Necessity to Justify the Establishment of Safe Zones to Prevent Large-Scale Refugee Outflows 25
3.1 Analysis of the Requirements for a Necessity Defense to Establish of Safe Zones 26
3.1.1 An 'Essential Interest' of the State Must Be at Stake 26
3.1.2 Presence of a 'Grave and Imminent Peril' 29
3.1.3 The State Must Have no Other Means of Safeguarding Its Interest 30
3.1.4 Balancing Conflicting Interests 40
3.1.5 State's Contribution to the Occurrence of the Situation of Necessity 42
3.2 Application of the Necessity Doctrine to Justify Forcible Action Abroad 43

4 Application of the Humanitarian Intervention Doctrine to Justify the Establishment of Safe Zones to Alleviate Human Suffering 47
4.1 Responsibility to Protect or Humanitarian Intervention? 48
4.2 Breaking the Sovereignty Shield 49
4.3 The Link Between Human Suffering, Refugee Outflows and International Security 51
4.4 Historical Instances of Humanitarian Intervention 53
4.5 Legality of Humanitarian Intervention and the Establishment of Safe Zones 56
4.6 Disinterest 59

5 Conclusion 61

References 63

List of Cases 71