The aim of the thesis is to analyze the policies of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) on humanitarian intervention. The general discussions and literature on the matter indicate that there are difficulties in this policy-making, therefore the assumption that this study tested was that the policies of NGOs on humanitarian intervention are unclear. Unclear in this context is defined as a 'weak or inexistent link between objective, policy and outcome'. This is tested by analyzing the following determining variables, derived from literature on the subject: Organisational Structure, General Organizational Principles, General Policy on Humanitarian Intervention, Objective with Humanitarian Intervention Policy, General Principles into Humanitarian Intervention Policy, Evaluation Criteria on Humanitarian Intervention, Contribution to general Humanitarian Intervention Discussion and finally, Actions and Statements in actual Crises. Regarding the literature used in the literature review, types of earlier papers were reviewed; the first concerning general issues of NGO Policy making and the second concerning specific issues regarding NGO policies on Humanitarian Intervention. The above-mentioned variables were further divided into two groups; internal variables showing the consistency of the policy with organizational principles as well as a clear policy-making structure, and external variables showing how the policy is presented to the outside. The external variables were tested by analyzing how the NGOs have acted in two crisis situations, Rwanda and Kosovo, which were used as case studies. The units of the study were five international organizations; Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Oxfam International, Médécins Sans Frontières and the International Committee of the Red Cross. The method used was policy analysis, a model for analyzing NGO policies on the matter of humanitarian intervention was built up. The result is presented in a figure, which shows that all NGOs indeed have unclear policies on humanitarian intervention. The research- and advocacy-oriented NGOs; Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, as well as the International Committee of the Red Cross, had a rather well-structured internal policy making, but did not get this picture to the outside by making policy statements and participating in the general discussion on the matter. The service-oriented NGOs, Oxfam International and Médécins Sans Frontières, were the opposite; they participated acitely in discussions on the matter, but did not have clear policy documents and did not ground their policy on their organizational principles. The contradiction with the result was the following: Service-oriented NGOs seem to consider that policy-making and internal analyzing is not their main task; for them it is most important to be able to reach the victims they aim to help. They have not just realized that their campaigning is also to the highest degree advocacy, and that structurizing their policy-making on humanitarian intervention would facilitate their work. Research- and advocacy-oriented NGOs have quite the opposite problem; they have thoroughly designed policies on humanitarian intervention based on their general principles, but remain quiet on the general discussions on the matter as well as in specific crises. Why does it seem so difficult to give statements and participate in discussions, as this is already done indirectly by having a policy on the issue? This has not been a problem for research- and advocacy NGOs in other matters, they usually actively debate. Is it a question of fear of how the outside will react? The issue of humanitarian intervention is, after all, rather controversial.