

The Responsibility to Protect

A critical case study of the Central African Republic



LUND UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Social Sciences

Hanna Norelius

Abstract

Governments around the world committed to the Responsibility to Protect principle at the World Summit in 2005. The principle declares that states have the primary responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and that this responsibility is transferred to the international community if a state would be unable or unwilling to protect its population. This is a controversial principle since it implies a modification of both state sovereignty and the norm of non-intervention. This study investigates how the R2P is referred to, and why, in the case of the Central African Republic. This will be done by conducting a critical discourse analysis of resolutions from the United Nations Security Council. The two main wings of the English school theory, solidarists and pluralists, will be applied in order to understand the nature of R2P. This study finds clear references to the R2P but also indications of sensitivity surrounding the sovereign concept and the international response. The conclusion can be drawn that the solidarist international society can better explain how the R2P is referred to in the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the Central African Republic.

Key words: R2P, sovereignty, Central African Republic, solidarists, pluralists

Words: 9316

List of Abbreviations

CAR	Central African Republic
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
EU	European Union
EUFOR RCA	European Union Force to the Central African Republic
ICISS	International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty
MINUSCA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic
MISCA	Mission internationale de soutien á la Centrafrique (International Support Mission in the Central African Republic)
R2P	Responsibility to Protect
UN	United Nations
UNSC	United Nations Security Council

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Purpose and Research Question	3
1.2	Methodology	3
1.3	Empirical Material.....	5
1.4	Source Criticism.....	6
1.5	Delimitations	7
1.6	Disposition	7
2	Theoretical Framework.....	8
2.1	The three elements of the English school.....	8
2.2	Types of international society	9
2.2.1	The pluralists	10
2.2.2	The solidarists	11
3	Analysis.....	13
3.1	Responsibility.....	13
3.2	State Sovereignty.....	14
3.3	International Response	17
3.4	Summary of the analysis	20
4	Conclusion	22
4.1	Suggestions for further research.....	23
5	References.....	24

1 Introduction

The principle “the Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) was coined by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in a report published in 2001. The ICISS wrote the report on R2P as a response to a question posed in 1999 by the United Nations Secretary-General at the time Kofi Annan:

“...if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that affect every precept of our common humanity?”

(ICISS 2001: VII)

As the R2P had been revised, governments committed to the principle at the World Summit in 2005 (Piiparinen 2012: 410). The R2P rests upon three pillars that are of equal weight and importance. Pillar one declares that the state has the primary responsibility to protect its people from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The second pillar emphasizes that the international community has a duty to assist the state to fulfill its responsibility to protect, while pillar three announces that the international community should take timely and decisive action if a state is manifestly failing to fulfill pillar one. The response should primarily be of a non-military nature, but in extreme cases pillar three recognizes that it might be necessary to resort to military action (Bellamy 2013: 487-488; ICISS 2001: XI; Thakur & Weiss 2009: 4, 24). The R2P encompasses three elements, namely the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild. This study will mainly focus on the responsibility to react, as this element is emphasizing that states have a responsibility “to respond to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures, which may include coercive measures like sanctions and international prosecution, and in extreme cases military intervention.” (ICISS 2001: xi). The focus of this study is the crisis in the Central African Republic (CAR) and since the crisis is ongoing this element seems to be the most relevant at this time.

The emergence of the R2P coincided with a post-Cold War world that was experiencing a shift in the origins of international security threats; there has arguably been a decline in interstate wars while armed conflicts, violent eruptions and humanitarian emergencies from within states are increasing. Associated with

this new trend is an escalation of the targeting of civilians, both by national governments and non-state actors such as insurgency groups (ICISS 2001: 4; Thakur & Weiss 2009: 13; Williams 2013: 194, 197). The previous century had witnessed a variety of grave mass atrocities, such as the genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda and Bosnia. This violence caused outrage around the globe which resulted in increased pressure on governments to react to crimes against humanity (Bellamy 2011: 1; ICISS 2001: 7). Accompanying the changing nature of conflicts is the growing influence of the human security paradigm and respect for human rights. These doctrines claim that global security is depending on the security of individuals and that the individual rather than the state should be placed at the core of the security debate (ICISS 2001: 14-15). This perspective on security implies that international security is threatened if the security of individuals is threatened (Hampson 2013: 282).

However, as mentioned in the quote by Kofi Annan (ICISS 2001: VII), intervention in another state to protect civilians is perceived as an assault on state sovereignty. The complexity surrounding the debate concerning intervention is centered on whether state sovereignty should be prioritized over human rights or vice versa. The current international order is commonly recognized to have emerged from the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, from which the concept 'Westphalian sovereignty' originated (Bellamy 2013: 487). Westphalian sovereignty entails that all states are equal independent of the size or wealth of the country and that a sovereign state has the authority to rule a particular territory. State sovereignty is closely connected to the norm of non-intervention, which means that states should not intervene in another state's internal affairs (ICISS 2001: 12).

The R2P promotes a modified version of state sovereignty, namely 'sovereignty as responsibility' (ICISS 2001: 13). This concept was developed by Deng (1996) who criticizes Westphalian sovereignty on the basis that it has proved to be unable to protect and uphold the dignity of humans time and again (Deng 1996: 1). Sovereignty as responsibility prevents states to use their sovereign status as a veil behind which they can abuse their citizens with impunity (Bellamy 2011: 12; Moses 2013: 113). Sovereignty is connected to an internal as well as external responsibility. Internally, state authorities should ensure the welfare and safety of its citizens while the external responsibility is towards the international community through the United Nations (UN). In addition, the agents of the state are responsible for their actions and can be held accountable (ICISS 2001: 13). Opponents of the R2P argue that the principle connotes an erosion of the sovereignty concept, but proponents emphasize that the R2P does not entail a dilution of state sovereignty, rather a shift from sovereignty as control to sovereignty as responsibility (ICISS 2001: 13; Orford 2011: 13).

1.1 Purpose and Research Question

R2P has attracted much attention, both praise and critique, and there is a vast literature on the subject. Interventions are controversial not only when they occur, but also when they do not (ICISS 2001: 1). However, skeptical voices (see for example Reinold 2010) deem the acceptance of R2P to be merely rhetorical and argue that the issues that need to be solved in order to transform R2P into a norm are too complex to be solved in the near future. Consequently, this study is inquiring how the more controversial aspects are touched upon when discussing the applicability of R2P when mass atrocities are occurring. This study aims to answer the research question:

"How is R2P referred to in the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the Central African Republic and how can these references be explained?"

The first part of the research question is descriptive, while the second part has a more explanatory nature. The decision to undertake a descriptive study is based on the fact that the R2P is a complex principle, especially when being transferred from paper to practice. Therefore, a description is needed to identify factors which in turn can facilitate future explanatory studies (Punch 2005: 15). A further reason for undertaking a descriptive study is that the crisis in the CAR is frequently referred to as a 'forgotten conflict' (ICRtoP, 2014; UNSC meeting S/PV.7098) and I have not found any academic articles on the CAR crisis yet, which makes it an interesting case to scrutinize. Punch (2005: 15) emphasizes that descriptive studies are important when new areas or areas not well researched are studied, since description is required to enable explanation later on. The second part of the research question mirrors a more explanatory ambition. The aim is to analyze the reason behind R2P being referred to in the way discovered in the descriptive analysis (Punch 2005: 15).

1.2 Methodology

This study will undertake a qualitative research strategy and the research design will be a case study. The case study design is appropriate since I will study a case in detail and in this study the case will be the crisis in the CAR. A case study

attempts to understand the complexity and wholeness of one case, as well as understand the context of that case (Bryman 2012: 66; Punch 2005: 144). In this study, the CAR function as a so called instrumental case study, described by Punch (2005: 144) as a study “where a particular case is examined to give insight into an issue [...]”. This means that the CAR will be studied in order to provide insight into how the R2P is referred to in relation to this specific case (Punch 2005: 144). Consequently, the findings of this study cannot be generalized across social settings and be representative of other cases, since this is a study that aims to describe this specific case which has a unique context (Bryman 2012: 69-70, 390). However, this study will contribute to an understanding of how the R2P is referred to in the case of the CAR and might shed some light on how the R2P works in practice and highlight important aspects of this contested research area (Punch 2005: 147-148).

I will employ critical discourse analysis (CDA) to analyze my empirical material. This method focuses on language and can be applied to various kinds of written communication; therefore this method is appropriate for my thesis since my empirical material consists of resolutions from the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) (Bryman 2012: 528). The concept ‘discourse’ refers to a focus that goes beyond looking at words; rather it captures the broader “framework from within which ideas are formulated” (Punch 2005: 221). CDA emphasizes the connection between language and power and highlights how language can be used as a tool of domination. It further emphasizes how ideology is shaped by power relations which in turn affect language. (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 348; Bryman 2012: 536; Fairclough 2001: 3; Punch 2005: 224). Fairclough (2001: 4) explains that “*Critical* is used in the special sense of aiming to show up connections which may be hidden from people – such as the connections between language, power and ideology [...]” (Fairclough 2001: 4).

CDA views language as a form of social practice, which implicates that language is part of society rather than external to it. Further, language is more than solely the text; it is a social process that includes the process of production as well as the process of interpretation (Fairclough 2001: 18-20). The last implication of viewing language as social practice is that language is a process that is socially conditioned. This means that people have what Fairclough (2001: 20) refers to as ‘members’ resources’ (MR), which in essence is the cognitive knowledge, values, beliefs and assumptions that all individuals have that stem from the social world. When people produce and interpret texts they draw upon their MR (Fairclough 2001: 20). This means that the analysis in this study will be characterized by me since I have my own personal experiences, knowledge, assumptions, and so on. Therefore, if another individual conducts the same study, the analysis and consequently the findings will most likely not be identical to that of this study. However, I will include quotations that are representative of the themes in order to provide the reader with an understanding of the formulation of the text as well as increase the reader’s ability to follow the arguments put forth in relation to the themes.

When working with the empirical material I will read it thoroughly and code it, which will enable me to extract themes from the text. The themes will be extracted based on the level of relevance in connection to R2P and how much attention the theme received in the empirical material. The analysis will be structured based on these themes. When undertaking the CDA I will follow the stages outlined in Fairclough's three-dimensional framework for analysis. The first stage is concerned with *description* and focuses on the text; the choice of words used and text structure (Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000: 448; Fairclough 2001: 91). The second stage is focusing on *interpretation*, with the purpose being that of analyzing the relationship between text and interaction. The text should be seen in a broad perspective and the various processes the text passes through should be analyzed. That is, the text is the outcome of production and it is circulated, consumed and interpreted in society. The third and last stage is concerned with *explaining* the connection between interaction and the social context, this includes analyzing power structures and hegemonic processes in which discourse constitutes a part (Bergström & Boréus 2005: 322; Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000: 448-449; Fairclough 2001: 91). Noticeably, the CDA is a comprehensive method and because of the limited time and word limit of this study, the analysis will thus use a shortened version of CDA.

1.3 Empirical Material

My empirical material consists of UNSC resolutions concerned with the CAR. Resolutions from the Security Council will be analyzed because the report on the Responsibility to Protect by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) states explicitly that "there is no better or more appropriate body than the Security Council to deal with military intervention issues for human protection purposes" (ICISS 2001: 49). The report further states that the UNSC's role is of paramount importance and it is the Council that should make the decisions regarding overriding state sovereignty and mobilizing resources (ICISS 2001: 49). The following quotation is clarifying what a resolution is and how it is structured:

"United Nations resolutions are formal expressions of the opinion or will of United Nations organs. They generally consist of two clearly defined sections: a preamble and an operative part. The preamble generally presents the considerations on the basis of which action is taken, an opinion

expressed or a directive given. The operative part states the opinion of the organ or the action to be taken.”

(United Nations Security Council 2014)

The CAR has experienced conflicts and rebellions since the country gained independence from France in 1960 (Freedom House 2013). Because of the CAR’s unstable history, the international community (for example the United Nations and France) has been involved in the CAR and provided the country with assistance and peacekeepers during times when the situation has been particularly worrying and violent (Freedom House 2013). To delimit my empirical material I have decided to analyze resolutions from the beginning of 2013 up until the present day. I have made this delimitation since the conflict reawakened in December 2012 when the rebel group Séléka launched attacks in the north and central provinces of the CAR and began to advance throughout the country (Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect 2014). The empirical material consists of five resolutions, a total of 47 pages.

1.4 Source Criticism

The quality of the empirical material will be assessed using Scott’s four criteria: authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning (Bryman 2012: 544). I perceive the resolutions to be authentic and have meaning, that is, they are genuine, clear and easy to comprehend. However, in relation to representativeness one should be aware of the fact that the UNSC is not regarded to be representative since some of the world’s largest and most populous countries are not permanent members, and in particular countries from Africa, Latin America and Asia lack permanent membership (ICISS 2001: 51). It is thus necessary to take into consideration that the resolutions derive from the UNSC, an international body that has a somewhat questionable democratic legitimacy (ICISS 2001: 51). Yet the purpose of this study is to describe and explain how the UNSC refers to R2P, which clarifies that the study does not aim to claim that other organizations would refer to the R2P in a similar manner. When it comes to assessing the criteria of credibility, one should ask the question “[i]s the evidence free from error and distortion?” I suggest that the resolutions might be distorted for the reason that the UNSC is regarded to be unrepresentative and therefore the resolutions might be biased. However, would this be the case, I do not perceive that the documents’ questionable credibility would constitute a problem since the biases themselves might be interesting for this study (Bryman 2012: 550).

1.5 Delimitations

The R2P is a broad topic and this study has a limited timeframe as well as limited resources. Consequently, it has been necessary to make delimitations and I have therefore decided to undertake a single case study research design. As previously mentioned, however, this implies that the findings of this study cannot be generalized. The empirical material derives from one international organ, namely the UNSC, which means that this study will examine how and why this particular body refers to the R2P. If one would undertake a study that focuses on other organizations or actors, the findings are likely to differ.

1.6 Disposition

So far, this paper has introduced the R2P principle and presented the purpose of this study as well as the research question that this study aims to answer. Following this the method that will be employed in this study, critical discourse analysis, was described together with an explanation of how I intend to use the method in the analysis chapter. Thereafter the empirical material was introduced, which consists of five UNSC resolutions. In the last part of the introductory chapter, source criticism and delimitations were discussed.

The following chapter will present the theory that will be utilized in this study, namely the English school theory. Initially I will explain why this theory is appropriate for this study and thereafter introduce the three elements that constitute the foundation of the English school theory; the international system, international society and world society. Subsequently, I will further develop on the element of international society since this is the element that has received most attention within the English school. There are two types of international society, namely the pluralist international society and the solidarist international society, and both of these approaches will be explained in more detail. In the third chapter, critical discourse analysis will be used to analyze the UNSC resolutions and the pluralist and solidarist strands of thoughts will be discussed in relation to the findings in order to understand the nature of R2P. In the last chapter, findings will be summarized and the research question will be answered.

2 Theoretical Framework

The R2P debate is dominated by the English school theory (Bellamy 2003: 321) and this school of thought is an important approach to international politics (Linklater 2005: 84). For these reasons I have decided to use the English school as theoretical framework. The English school is often placed in the middle of the spectrum of International Relations (IR) theories between the more dominant theories of neorealism and neoliberalism. For instance, English school theorists perceive international politics to be more orderly and civil than do realists, but recognize that it is not possible to eradicate violence which distinguish English school theorists from utopians (Linklater 2005: 85). This is a preferable location since the English school has been able to find middle ground between the dominant theories and can thus avoid dichotomies and either/or framings (Buzan 2004: 10). Consequently, the boundaries of the English school can appear to be rather vague and at times it might be difficult to discern what makes the English school different from other IR theories and who belongs within the English school (Dunne 2013: 133).

2.1 The three elements of the English school

The foundation of the English school is made up of three elements: international system, international society and world society (Buzan 2004: 6-7). These three elements exist simultaneously, which gives the English school a holistic character and, as mentioned above, enables this theory to move beyond the dichotomies of other IR theories (Buzan 2004: 10). This chapter will briefly explain all of the three elements but will focus on international society in particular, since this element is deemed most significant and has received more attention than the other two elements (Dunne 2013: 138). However, I find it relevant to briefly explain all elements to give the reader a greater contextual insight which will facilitate the understanding of international society.

The **international system** consists of states that have sufficient interaction between them but have no collective institutions and rules (Dunne 2013: 144). Anarchy is prevailing and the international system is basically about power politics between states, which makes this element closely related to mainstream

realism (Buzan 2004: 7; Dunne 2013: 144). This element is of interest to English school theorists mainly since this tells us about the origin and history of international society, because an international society presumes the occurrence of an international system (Dunne 2013: 144).

The **international society** emerges when states apprehend the relations between them to be based on certain commonalities regarding for instance institutions, rules and values (Dunne 2013: 139). Further, the international society consists of sovereign states and the relationship between them are characterized by recognition, meaning that states claim sovereign status as well as recognizes that other states have a sovereign status (Dunne 2013: 139; Linklater 2005: 91). Interestingly, Dunne (2013: 139) inform that in the nineteenth century states could be members of the international society as long as they could measure up to a certain 'standard of civilization', that is, if other states' governance conformed with European states' governance, values and beliefs. However, so called 'quasi' sovereign states can also be members of international society. The sovereign rights of these states are somewhat constrained due to economic or security reasons. Formerly colonized countries are commonly placed in the category of 'quasi' sovereign states, which entails that these states are recognized by other states but are unable to uphold intrastate stability and govern the country effectively (Dunne 2013: 140). English school theorists perceive states to have agency through their appointed representatives and officials (Dunne 2013: 139), consequently, the "diplomatic and foreign-policy elite are the real agents of international society" (Dunne 2013: 140).

Unlike the previous two elements, **world society** is not based on an ontology of states. Rather, world society transcends the state-system and concentrates on individual, the global population as well as organizations that are independent of the state (Buzan 2004: 7). In comparison to international society, world society includes shared norms and values at the individual level and human rights have a prominent role in world society (Buzan 2001: 477; Dunne 2013: 146). However, this element has been criticized since it is seriously underspecified and the transformation from international society to world society remains fairly unclear (Buzan 2001: 477).

2.2 Types of international society

Two different types of international society can be found within the English school. These approaches share the understanding that there is an international society, however, they differ when it comes to the normative content of that as

well as the relationship between justice and order (Bellamy 2003: 232; Linklater 2005: 93). On the one hand, we have the *pluralist international society*. If one imagines a spectrum of international societies the pluralists can be placed on the minimal end. While, on the other hand, the *solidarist international society* belong towards the other end of the spectrum (Dunne 2013: 141).

2.2.1 The pluralists

The pluralist international society emphasizes that the world is culturally diverse and that all countries have different traditions and political systems (Bellamy 2003: 321, 323; Dunne 2013: 141). Because of the diversity of states and humans, the pluralist international society is based on the shared ambition to maintain order and stability among states (Dunne 2013: 141). Sovereignty is thus perceived to be a norm that refines the distinctness as well as the political difference of states (Buzan 2001: 478; Jackson 2000: 165).

Pluralists argue that the likelihood of achieving freedom is highest if the international society respects states' sovereign status and abstain from intervention independent of states' capability to sustain effective government internally. This would allow cultures, religions and traditions to flourish within sovereign territories and people would be free to live in accordance with their beliefs and chosen way of life. Thus, notions of rights and justice cannot be universal since states have different ideas of what such notions mean and pluralists acknowledge that such matters should be left to individual states to decide (Linklater 2005: 94). The pluralist international society is "based on the values of equal sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-intervention of member states" (Jackson 2000: 178). Interventions in other states' internal affairs threaten the mutual respect and the liberal code of tolerance that exist in international society (Dunne 2013: 141).

Jackson (2000: 181) argues that we need to realize that people are different and that we need to share our planet and show mutual respect. If we do not wish to eradicate or subordinate people who are not like us, or remake them into people who are more like us, which are alternatives that have been tried at various times by Western countries. But as stressed by Jackson, "they failed, and rightly so, because they were trespassing on human freedom and the entailed right of people everywhere to live their own domestic lives, in their own way, according to their own values." (Jackson 2000: 181). Under prevailing anarchy, the shared concern states have in pluralist international society is to preserve international order. Thus, international anarchy constitutes a threat of disorder and international society functions as a counterweight to this impending threat (Buzan 2001: 478). Dunne (2013:141) explains that states comply with the collective

rules of maintaining order because for individual states it is relatively cost free and for the collective of states there are huge benefits.

The pluralist international society has been criticized since the continued existence of war between states indicates that not all states respect the sovereign status of other states and are satisfied with simply maintaining international order. Further critique is concerned with so called sovereign immunity. That is, the fact that sovereignty might serve as a veil behind which governments and elites can violently abuse their population without consequences due to the prevailing norm of non-intervention in other states' internal affairs (Dunne 2013: 141). Because of this critique, another strand of thought exists that perceives the nature of international society differently than the pluralists.

2.2.2 The solidarists

The solidarist international society, like the pluralist international society, is constituted by states that share values and institutions and binding legal rules that hold the states together (Dunne 2013: 142). However, the solidarists differ from the pluralists in the sense that they hold that states share more values and norms than just those of maintaining order, sovereignty and non-intervention (Buzan 2001: 478). The solidarist international society entails individuals' entitlement to basic rights and universal solidarity between people throughout the international society (Bellamy 2003: 321, 324; Dunne 2013: 142). Consequently, the rules in solidarist international society differ from the rules in pluralist international society; would a state violate the basic rights of its population, the other states in international society have a duty to intervene in that state's internal affairs to protect the population whose basic rights have been violated. Accordingly, the norms of both sovereignty and non-intervention are modified in solidarist international society (Dunne 2013: 142).

One might notice that the solidarists share some understandings with cosmopolitanism. However, the view held by solidarists differs from cosmopolitanism in the sense that solidarists do not share cosmopolitans understanding of how to deliver universal values. Cosmopolitans are debating whether a world government or the abandonment of political hierarchies would be more effective, while solidarists perceive solidarism to be an extension, and not an alteration, of international society (Dunne 2013: 142).

Solidarists might refer to conventions regarding, for instance, the bans on slavery to highlight the prevalence of solidarism in international society (Weinert 2011: 22). Further, violent human rights abuses in Yugoslavia and Rwanda amongst other countries have increased the attention paid to the issue of human rights and the norm of non-intervention. However, the dilemma persists

concerning when the norm of sovereignty should be transgressed in favor of the protection of human rights (Linklater 2005: 95-96). Pluralists are concerned that without global consensus a state might intervene in another state based on its own moral principles and values that are not shared by the state that is subject to intervention. An intervention of this kind could disturb and weaken international order, which would possibly hurt individuals in turn since well-being is dependent upon order and security (Wheeler 2000: 29).

3 Analysis

In this chapter I will analyze the UNSC resolutions concerning the CAR using a shortened version of critical discourse analysis. The analysis is based on three themes and the solidarist and pluralist strands of thoughts will be applied in order to understand the pattern and nature of the R2P. The themes are the following: responsibility, state sovereignty and international response. All of these themes are extracted from the resolutions since they are central to the R2P principle.

The first theme, responsibility, is essential in order to answer my research question, since responsibility is a fundamental part of the R2P (ICISS 2001: xi). State sovereignty, the second theme, was extracted from the empirical material since the concept of sovereignty figures in the basic principles of the R2P (ICISS 2001: xi) and the concept appears in all of the resolutions. Further, as mentioned in the introduction, state sovereignty is a controversial and well-discussed part of the R2P principle. International response, the third theme, is related to the first theme as the international response is likely to depend on whether or not the authorities of the CAR are able to uphold its responsibility to protect. This theme is also connected to the second theme in the sense that the international response might be contradicting the traditional concept of state sovereignty. The themes are closely related and therefore the discussions in the different themes are likely to overlap at times.

3.1 Responsibility

“Underscores the primary responsibility of the Central African authorities to protect the population, as well as to ensure the security and unity in its territory, and stresses their obligation to ensure respect for international humanitarian law, human rights law and refugee law;” (UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2121)

“Expressing deep concern at the continuing deterioration of the security situation in the CAR, characterized by a total breakdown in law and order, the absence of the rule of law, religiously motivated targeted killings and arson, and further expressing its grave concern about the consequences of instability in the CAR, on the central African region and beyond, and stressing in this regard the need for the international community to respond swiftly,” (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134)

The above quotations are connected to pillar one of the R2P, that is, that the state has the primary responsibility to protect its people (ICISS 2001: xi). The first quote is included in all the resolutions analyzed in this study and it clearly emphasizes that the primary responsibility to protect the Central African population lies with the authorities of the CAR. The first part of the statement that is concerned with the ensuring of security and unity in the territory of the CAR contains both pluralist and solidarist characteristics (Buzan 2001: 478). However, it is mainly solidarist in nature because it refers to human rights law and international human law, which point to individuals' entitlement to basic rights and to the existence of universal solidarity (Bellamy 2003: 321, 324; Dunne 2013: 142).

Further, the second quotation is representative of how the crisis is described in the resolutions. Severe human rights violations and widespread violence along ethnic and religious lines are increasing the risk of mass atrocities to occur (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134). The breakdowns in important institutions upholding order and security are indicative of the CAR authorities' inability to uphold their responsibility to protect. However, without stating explicitly that the CAR authorities are unable to fulfil pillar one, the description of the worsening security situation together with a paragraph in one resolution that declares that the CAR authorities approved of a European Union (EU) led operation to be deployed in the CAR (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134), indicates that the authorities are unable to halt the violence and protect its population without support.

The statements expressing concern about the deteriorating security situation that can be found in the resolutions can also be argued to be solidarist in nature. In pluralist international society the norm is to let states govern internally as is deemed appropriate by their own standards and values and since the main concern of pluralists is to maintain order between states, one might draw the conclusion that states in pluralist international society would not perceive CAR's ability to protect its population to be their concern as they argue that states should not intervene in other states domestic affairs (Dunne 2013: 141; Jackson 2000: 178; Linklater 2005: 94).

3.2 State Sovereignty

"Reaffirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the CAR, and recalling the importance of the principles of non-interference, good-neighbourliness and regional cooperation," (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2149)

”Underlines the importance of preserving the unity and territorial integrity of the CAR;”
(UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2149)

”Emphasizes the need for all military forces in CAR, while carrying out their mandate, to act in full respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of CAR and in full compliance with applicable international humanitarian law, human rights law and refugee law and recalls the importance of training in this regard;” (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134)

The first of the above quotations is the second paragraph in all of the five resolutions and it clearly declares that the sovereign status of the CAR is recognized. What can be discerned in the quote is that the UN has a strong sense of commitment to the sovereignty of the CAR and stresses the importance of actors to respect this sovereign status as well as the values that accompanies sovereignty. Further, one might assume that it is important for the UN to place the paragraph that confirms the sovereign status of the CAR in the beginning of all resolutions because this is, as I mentioned in the introduction, a controversial aspect of the R2P. This statement has a strong pluralist character, as pluralist international society is based on a shared strong commitment to equal sovereignty, territorial integrity, and non-intervention (Jackson 2000: 178).

The language used in all of the resolutions is diplomatic and statements might seem uncontroversial without further scrutiny. However, if bearing in mind the controversies surrounding sovereignty and non-intervention, one might reflect over the fact that statements that are ensuring the commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity are frequently recurring throughout the resolutions. It indicates that the discussions underlying the formulations of the resolutions are focused on these issues. Although consensus is reached in the resolutions, one might be able to detect the hidden presence of unease since there is a need to regularly confirm the sovereign status of the CAR. The regular references to sovereignty highly suggest that the concept is still fundamental to our world order and is of highest relevance within the UN. However, based on how the concept itself is used as well as if taking all the information from the resolutions into consideration, I would propose that the concept has been modified in the sense that it corresponds well to the way sovereignty is used in R2P and amongst solidarists.

If the first quotation in this theme was read taken from its context I would argue that sovereignty could be interpreted in both the traditional sense, sovereignty as control, and in the modified sense as sovereignty as responsibility. When taking the context into consideration, however, it is noticeable that sovereignty implies responsibility. Developing this further, it is not stated explicitly that the authorities of CAR have failed to fulfil pillar one. But the combination of other paragraphs that are emphasizing the lack of security and order, the need to restore state authority over the CAR territory, widespread

human rights violations, countrywide religious and ethnic divisions, violations of international humanitarian law, prevailing impunity and so on, it might be implicitly understood that the authorities of the CAR are unable to protect its population. This implies that sovereignty is perceived as entailing a responsibility (UNSC resolution 2013 S/RES/2088; UNSC resolution 2014 S/RES/2134; UNSC resolution 2014 S/RES/2149). The modified version of sovereignty is corresponding to the values and ideas discernable in solidarist international society (Dunne 2013: 142).

Pluralists argue that the norm of equal sovereignty among states is the best defense some of the less powerful states have (Bellamy 2003: 324; ICISS 2001: 7). For this reason, many states in the global South are skeptical of the R2P since they hold that this principle will undermine their state sovereignty. Moreover, an associated fear is that the R2P enables great powers in general and the United States in particular to abuse their power and intervene in countries based on their own national interests but justifying it with R2P rhetoric (Graubart 2013: 72-73). The power aspect of the R2P is interesting, especially since the UNSC, which is seen as a great power-dominated body, is the primary authorizing body of the R2P (Graubart 2013: 86; Rose 2014: 224).

As emphasized by Graubart (2013: 86) “the United States has been the ‘principle driver of the Security Council’s agenda and decision’ in the post-Cold War era”. Consequently, critical voices have argued that interventions, even those based on good intentions, will support the hierarchical and Western dominated world order as well as reinforce existing structural inequalities (Graubart 2013: 71). Evans (2006: 711) explains that interventions will never be undertaken against any of the five permanent members of the UNSC (the United States, Russia, China, France and the United Kingdom). This statement is based on the fact that these countries have veto-power, thus the power to prevent an intervention, but also because an intervention in one of these countries would worsen the situation rather than alleviating the suffering (Evans 2006: 711).

This power structure is thus dominating the context in which these resolutions have been produced. The support directed to the CAR has been approved by the permanent members of the UNSC. ICISS (2001: 36) recognizes that it is more or less unavoidable that intervening states are motivated by national interests. Because of the risk and cost involved in an intervention, one might expect the intervening countries to have some kind of a national interest behind contributing resources to the intervention (ICISS 2001: 36). However, the national interest might not be of an economic or strategic nature, but might be involving the interest of avoiding increased drug production and trade, refugees illegal flows of weapons and havens for terrorists (ICISS 2001: 36). The worry that the crisis in the CAR is providing a conducive environment for criminal activities is explicitly stated in one of the resolutions (UNSC resolution 2013 S/RES/2127).

Also, in today’s interconnected world, the ICISS emphasizes that “good international citizenship is a matter of national self-interest” (ICISS 2001: 36). The fear of interventions occurring based on national interests might be even more

valid in the case of coercive intervention (Graubart 2013:74) which is not the case with the CAR since the authorities of the country have approved the deployment of foreign military operations on their territory. However, if one of the permanent five would have perceived the intervention to be too controversial or conflicting with their own interest one could suspect that they would have used their veto to prevent the action undertaken in the case of the CAR (ICISS 2001: 6; Zifcak 2012).

In case of existing national interests underpinning the resolutions concerning the CAR they are obviously not expressed so that the reader can detect them. However, being aware of the context of production is important since these power relations are actively shaping the prevailing ideology detectable in the resolutions.

3.3 International Response

“Authorizes the deployment of MISCA for a period of twelve months after the adoption of this resolution, to be reviewed six months after the adoption of this resolution, which shall take all necessary measures, consistent with the concept of operations adopted on 19 July 2013 and reviewed on 10 October 2013, to contribute to:

- (i) the protection of civilians and the restoration of security and public order, through the use of appropriate measures;
- (ii) the stabilization the country and the restoration of State authority over the whole territory of the country;” (UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2127)

“Welcoming the decision of the European Union, expressed at the meeting of the Council of the European Union held on 1 April 2014, to launch a temporary operation, EUFOR RCA, to support MISCA in the Central African Republic,” (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2149)

“Taking note of the letter from the Transitional authorities of the Central African Republic dated 22 January 2014 approving the deployment of an operation by the European Union,” (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134)

The first two quotations describe the support that the CAR is receiving from the international community. There are military operations in the CAR that are working to restore stability and order as well as to support the authorities in the CAR to enable the reestablishment of state authority. Sanctions in the form of travel bans, asset freezes and arms embargoes have also been issued (UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2127; UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134). This can be interpreted as a response to the inability of the authorities of the CAR to fulfil

their responsibility to protect its population. Therefore the quotations above are implicitly referring to the responsibility to react, which is the part of R2P that is activated when a state is unable to fulfil pillar one and the international community needs to react to protect the suffering population (ICISS 2001: 29).

International military operations such as the European Union-led EUFOR RCA, the UN-led MINUSCA and the African Union-led MISCA, are deployed on the ground in the CAR with the main responsibility to protect civilians and reestablish order and security in the country (UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2127; UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2149). Clearly, the situation in the CAR has been assessed as grave enough to take action beyond the military, economic and political sanctions mentioned previously (ICISS 2001: 29-30). The ICISS (2001: 31) explains that it is in all states' interest to maintain order and when a state's internal order is broken down to the extent that the population faces an imminent threat of mass atrocities or when the situation constitutes a threat to international order and security it is in all states' interest to intervene to restore stability. This claim is inherent in the R2P principle and the resolutions indicate that action is taken that reflects this as well. Both the pluralists and solidarists emphasize that maintaining order is a fundamental principle that all states in international society agree upon (Buzan 2001: 478; Dunne 2013:141).

In pluralist international society, the inability of the authorities of the CAR to fulfil pillar one of the R2P and govern the territory effectively would not have resulted in an intervention, since pluralists argue that states should abstain from intervention independent of the other state's capability to sustain effective governance internally (Linklater 2005: 94). As mentioned earlier, pluralists consider interventions to diminish peoples' prospects of achieving freedom (Linklater 2005: 94). However, one might argue that in the case of the CAR, the people are not able to achieve their freedom in the present moment since the violence has taken a religious and ethnic character (UNSC meeting S/PV.7098). Consequently, people are targeted on the basis of their ethnicity and religious beliefs and are thus not free to live in conformity with their chosen way of life.

The resolutions do not mention the words solidarity, morality or common humanity explicitly but there are frequent references to human rights and international humanitarian law throughout all resolutions. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights incorporates a moral code of human rights and is universal in the sense that it concerns all humans, independent of religion, race, sex, language, etc. (ICISS 2001: 14). The reference to human rights thus implies the recognition of a common humanity, morality as well as solidarity. Seemingly, human rights provide a basis for UNSC action which is also recommended in the R2P (ICISS 2001: xi). The solidarist international society, in contrast to the pluralist international society, stresses that all states in international society agree that individuals are entitled to basic human rights. Humans in solidarist international society experience a universal solidarity and states thus perceive it as a duty to intervene in a state if the basic rights of the population are seriously threatened (Bellamy 2003: 321; Dunne 2013: 142). An interesting point is

expressed by O'Connell (2010: 39) who is highlighting the contradiction inherent in the R2P principle where force is allowed to protect human rights but force also happens to be the source of human rights violations.

As was established in the previous theme 'state sovereignty', the concept of sovereignty referred to in the resolutions is implying responsibility rather than control. 'Sovereignty as responsibility' was described in the introduction and implicates a dual responsibility; internally to the population and externally to the international community through the UN (ICISS 2001: 13). The last quotation in this theme is informing us that the authorities of the CAR have approved the deployment of an EU operation (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134). This might be a further confirmation of that sovereignty implies responsibility in these resolutions; the authorities of the CAR are exerting their external responsibility in the sense that they are accepting support from the international community through the UN. This indicates that the authorities realize that they need assistance to protect the Central African population, but also that they are in need of assistance to maintain order and security in the international community in general and in the region in particular. It is clearly stated in the resolutions that the crisis in the CAR constitutes a threat to international and regional peace and security (UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2121; UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134).

Further, the fact that the authorities of the CAR have approved the international community's support might make the military operation less controversial since it is based on consensus between the CAR and the international community through the UNSC. The consensus can be identified in the resolutions, since the CAR approves the deployment of foreign operations on their territory and the international community provides assistance (UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134). This contrasts the case of the CAR with that of other contemporary crises, for instance Libya and Syria, where the violence was/is state-sponsored and the governments rejected foreign interference in their domestic affairs (Zifcak 2012: 2, 15). In the CAR the violence was initially of a political nature as the rebel coalition Séléka overthrew the national government, but subsequently the character of the violence adopted a sectarian nature. Confrontational violence erupted between two rebel coalitions: ex-Séléka and anti-Balaka (ICRtoP 2014). However, the situation has evolved into including confrontations between Muslim and Christian civilians and this development entails high risk of crimes against humanity as well as genocide (UNSC meeting S/PV.7098).

Placing the international response in a social context, which is the third stage of critical discourse analysis, one might consider the recent history of crises and interventions. The absence of intervention in Rwanda has shown the world the horrors that can happen if the international community do not intervene to protect a population and there is a global consensus that the genocide in Rwanda should never have been permitted. Consequently, a sense of duty might exist in the international community to provide assistance to Africa since 'another

Rwanda' cannot happen again (Bellamy 2005: 31, 33). However, more recent event, such as the invasion of Iraq in 2003 has increased the skepticism towards interventions in other states.

The leading powers behind the invasion of Iraq (mainly the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia) used humanitarian arguments to justify the invasion. It was widely perceived to be wrong and abusive to justify the Iraq invasion by emphasizing that it had a humanitarian case (Bellamy 2005: 37-38; McCormack 2010: 71-72). The direct impact that the Iraq invasion has had on the R2P principle is difficult to establish. Yet, it might be the case that states are more skeptical to the intensions behind R2P since the Iraq invasion indicated that it is possible to use the language of the R2P to pursue interventions that are based on national interests rather than the intention to protect a population at risk (Bellamy 2005: 38; Brown 2013: 437; Hampson 2013: 287; Macfarlane et al. 2004: 979). Taking the quotations from this theme, in combination with the previous two themes, it is noticeable that mutual recognition of state sovereignty among states are still of great importance. Great emphasis is placed on confirming the sovereign status of the CAR and to highlight that the international military operations' main tasks are to protect the Central African population and to assist the authorities of the CAR to regain authority.

This could be interpreted as an assurance that the international community is responding with the purpose to assist the CAR and with the aim to ensure that the order in the country is restored so that the authorities of the CAR are able to protect its population without assistance. At first glance at the resolutions it could be considered peculiar that there are frequent confirmations concerning the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the CAR while the international community evidently has military operations on the ground. However, if keeping the Iraq invasion and the skepticism that this invasion raised in mind, this frequent confirmation of the status of the CAR might be a way for the UNSC to reassure the international society that the intervention in the CAR has the intention to support and that the status of the CAR is not forgotten.

3.4 Summary of the analysis

This study analyzed UNSC resolutions concerning the CAR and the analysis was structured based on the three themes responsibility, state sovereignty and international response. The solidarist and pluralist approaches from the English school were applied in order to understand the nature of the R2P principle. The first theme, responsibility, established that it was clearly stated that the authorities

of the CAR has the primary responsibility to protect the Central African population. It was not explicitly stated that the CAR authorities had failed to protect its population; however, one could discern that this was implicitly confirmed in the statements on the graveness of the security situation. Therefore, one could conclude that the authorities of the CAR have failed their responsibility to protect its population and that the statements expressing this were predominantly of a solidarist nature.

State sovereignty was analyzed in the second theme and it was clear that there exists a strong sense of commitment to the sovereignty of the CAR and that this concept is highly relevant within the UN and for the states in international society. The way in which the concept of sovereignty was used indicated that the concept had been modified to imply responsibility rather than control. This modified version of state sovereignty, 'sovereignty as responsibility', lies at the core of the R2P and is also corresponding to solidarist international society. However, the strong commitment to sovereignty has a strong pluralist character. A possible explanation to the importance of state sovereignty is that this is many less powerful states' best defense in an unequal world. Because of the power structures that are present in the UNSC, fear that great powers will abuse the R2P principle to justify interventions made in their own national interests exists among less powerful states.

The last theme, international response, revealed that the international community has indeed responded to the crisis in the CAR. Military operations have been employed as well as economic, diplomatic and military sanctions. This theme thus indicates that both pillar two and three of the R2P has been activated. The international response is strongly connected to solidarist international society since solidarists recognize that the international community has a duty to intervene in a state's internal affairs to protect a population if their basic rights are violated (Dunne 2013: 142). In the following chapter I will answer the research question and provide suggestions for further research.

4 Conclusion

The R2P principle emerged as the nature of conflicts was changing from being mostly interstate to being mainly intrastate and the world had witnessed grave mass atrocities in for instance Rwanda and Bosnia. Accompanying this is a growing influence of the human security paradigm and increasing respect for human rights, which are two doctrines that claim that the individual should be placed at the core of the security debate. The R2P was adopted by governments around the globe at the World Summit in 2005, however, there are controversies surrounding the R2P that are profound. At the core of the debate are the concept of state sovereignty and the norm of non-intervention.

"How is R2P referred to in the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the Central African Republic and how can these references be explained?"

Revisiting the research question that has been guiding this study, the findings indicate that there are frequent references to the R2P in the empirical material. Clear references to the R2P can be detected in paragraphs stating that the primary responsibility to protect the Central African population lies with the authorities of the country. When explicit references to R2P could not be detected, the combination of paragraphs formed implicit references. This was the case with state sovereignty. The combination of paragraphs indicated that the concept of sovereignty entailed responsibility rather than control, which corresponds with the understanding of sovereignty that is included in the R2P. The adoption of 'sovereignty as responsibility' became increasingly clear as the international response was centered on protecting civilians.

The frequent emphasis on the sovereign status of the CAR might be explained by the fact that the sovereign status of less powerful states is the best defense they have against intervening forces in an unequal world. The power structures that are underpinning the UNSC, that is, that the UNSC is more or less controlled by the permanent five-members, increases the fear that the R2P will be abused to justify interventions made in the powerful states own national interests. Therefore, the expressed commitment to the sovereign status of the CAR might be intended to reassure the CAR and the international community that the sovereign status of CAR is not forgotten.

The reference to the R2P was clear in the theme concerned with the international response first and foremost because there was in fact a response. However, the R2P was also referred to in the sense that the mandate of the

deployed military operations includes, as previously mentioned, the protection of civilians but also the restoration of state authority. This suggests that the international community is acting under pillar two and three of the R2P that is, assisting as well as taking timely and decisive action in order to enable the CAR authorities to protect the population. In all of the themes, the solidarist international society seems to better explain how the R2P is referred to in the UNSC resolutions concerning the CAR. This conclusion is mainly based on two features found in solidarist international society.

Firstly, the solidarist international society entails individuals' entitlement to basic rights and universal solidarity between people throughout the international society which is discerned in the references to the R2P in the resolutions. Secondly, the solidarist understanding of sovereignty corresponds with the understanding of 'sovereignty as responsibility' that is inherent in R2P. However, this does not completely rule out the pluralist international society, since pluralist characteristics can be detected especially in the recurrent confirmation of the sovereign status of the CAR.

4.1 Suggestions for further research

A suggestion for further research is to conduct a comparative study between the CAR and Syria. Both countries experience grave conflicts at present; however, it would be interesting to compare how the international community has responded to the conflicts. If the response has differed, one could conduct an explanatory study to attempt to answer the question *why?* Also, attention should be directed to the responsibility to prevent, which is one of the elements inherent in the R2P principle. One could study how preventive measures were taken in the cases of the CAR and Syria and also examine if/how the preventive measures responded to early warning signs. Additionally, the crisis in the CAR is ongoing and the crisis as well as the response from the international community should be monitored and further researched. Indeed, this is of relevance especially since there seems to be a gap in the academic literature concerning the crisis in the CAR in general and the R2P and the CAR in particular.

5 References

Bellamy, A. J., 2013. "The Responsibility to Protect" in Williams, P. D. (eds.) 2013. *Security Studies An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Routledge.

Bellamy, A. J., 2011. *Global Politics and the Responsibility to Protect: From Words to Deeds*. New York: Routledge.

Bellamy, A. J., 2005. "Responsibility to protect or Trojan horse? The crisis in Darfur and humanitarian intervention after Iraq", *Ethics & International Affairs* Vol. 19, No. 2, p. 31-54.

Bellamy, A. J., 2003. "Humanitarian responsibilities and interventionist claims in international society", *Review of International Studies* Vol. 29, No. 3, p. 321-340.

Berström, G., Boréus, K., 2005. *Textens mening och makt*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.

Blommaert, J., Bulcaen, C., 2000. "Critical Discourse Analysis", *Annual Review of Anthropology* Vol. 29, p. 447-466.

Brown, C., 2013. "The Antipolitical Theory of Responsibility to Protect", *Global Responsibility to Protect* Vol. 5, No. 4, p. 423-442.

Bryman, A., 2012. *Social Research Methods* 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buzan, B., 2004. *From international to world society? English school theory and the social structure of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B., 2001. "The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR", *Review of International Studies* Vol. 27, No. 3, p. 471-488.

Deng, F. M. (eds.) 1996. *Sovereignty as responsibility: conflict management in Africa*. Brookings Institution Press.

Dunne, T., 2013. "The English School" in Dunne, T., Kurki, M., Smith, S. (eds.) 2013. *International Relations Theories Disciplining and Diversity*. 3rd ed. Oxford University Press.

Evans, G., 2006. "From humanitarian intervention to the responsibility to protect", *Wisconsin International Law Journal* Vol. 24, p. 703-722.

Fairclough, N., 2001. *Language and power*. Pearson Education.

Freedom House, 2013. "Central African Republic" Available: http://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2013/central-african-republic#.U4OY7_1_tbd. Download date: 2014-05-26.

Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, 2014. "Populations at risk Central African Republic". Available: http://www.globalr2p.org/regions/central_african_republic. Download date: 2014-05-26.

Graubart, J., 2013. "R2P and Pragmatic Liberal Interventionism: Values in the Service of Interests", *Human Rights Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 1, p. 69-90.

Hampson, F. O., 2013. "Human Security" in Williams, P. D. (eds.) 2013. *Security Studies An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Routledge.

ICISS: International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty., 2001. *The Responsibility to Protect*. Ottawa: ICISS

ICRtoP, 2014. "Crisis in the Central African Republic". Available: <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crises/crisis-in-the-central-african-republic>. Download date: 2014-05-26.

Jackson, R., 2000. *The global covenant: human conduct in a world of states*. Oxford University Press.

Linklater, A., 2005. "The English School" in Burchill, S., Linklater, A., Devetak, R., Donnelly, J., Paterson, M., Reus-Smit, C., True, J., 2005. *Theories of International Relations*. 3rd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Macfarlane, S. N., Thielking, C. J., Weiss, T. G., 2004. "The Responsibility to Protect: Is Anyone Interested in Humanitarian Intervention?", *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 25, No. 5, p. 997-992.

McCormack, T., 2010. "The Responsibility to Protect and the End of the Western Century", *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 69-82.

Moses, J., 2013. "Sovereignty as irresponsibility? A Realist critique of the Responsibility to Protect", *Review of International Studies* Vol. 39, No. 1, p. 113-135.

O'Connell, M. E., 2010. "Responsibility to Peace: A Critique of R2P", *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 39-52.

Orford, A., 2011. *International Authority and the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge University Press.

Piiparinen, T., 2012. "Sovereignty-building: three images of positive sovereignty projected through Responsibility to Protect", *Global Change, Peace & Security* Vol. 24, No. 3, p. 405-424.

Punch, K. F., 2005. *Introduction to Social Research Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. 2nd ed. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Reinold, T., 2010. "The responsibility to protect – much ado about nothing?", *Review of International Studies* Vol. 36, p. 55-78.

Rose, S. J., 2014. "Moving Forward with the Responsibility to Protect: Using Political Inertia to Protect Civilians", *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review* Vol. 37, No. 1, p. 209-240.

Thakur, R., Weiss, T. G., 2009. "R2P: From Idea to Norm – and Action?", *Global Responsibility to Protect* Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 22-53.

United Nations Security Council, 2014. Available:

<http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/resolutions/>. Download date: 2014-05-26.

UNSC meeting S/PV.7098, 2014. Available:

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.7098. Download date: 2014-05-26.

UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2149. Available:

[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2149\(2014\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2149(2014))
Download date: 2014-05-27.

UNSC Resolution 2014 S/RES/2134. Available:

[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2134\(2014\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2134(2014))
Download date: 2014-05-27.

UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2127. Available:

[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2127\(2013\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2127(2013))

Download date: 2014-05-27.

UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2121. Available:

[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2121\(2013\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2121(2013))

Download date: 2014-05-27.

UNSC Resolution 2013 S/RES/2088. Available:

[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2088\(2013\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2088(2013))

Download date: 2014-05-27.

Weinert, M. S., 2011. "Reframing the Pluralist – Solidarist Debate", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* Vol. 40, No. 1, p.21-41.

Wheeler, N. J., 2000. *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. Oxford University Press.

Williams, P. D., 2013. "War" in Williams, P. D. (eds.) 2013. *Security Studies An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Routledge.

Zifcak, S., 2012. "The Responsibility to Protect After Libya and Syria", *Melbourne Journal of International Law* Vol. 13, No. 1, p. 1-35.