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Abstract
The responsibility to protect is primarily a preventative doctrine. It is a global commitment adopted at the 2005 United Nations World Summit and has been central to international discourse on how to respond to mass atrocity crimes. The central normative Tenet of R2P explains that State Sovereign entails responsibility and therefore each state has a responsibility to protect its citizens from mass killings and other gross violations of their rights. The implementation of R2P at extreme case of Sectarian Conflict in which states apply disproportionate military force could require humanitarian intervention by the UN to control mass violations of human rights. The UN chapter VII stipulates that only the UN Security Council can approve humanitarian intervention. Constant veto among permanent members of the Security Council has made humanitarian intervention in Syria impossible. The objective of this study is to evaluate the crisis in Syria and the role of UN, UN Security Council in implementing R2P to halt the crisis in Syria. Qualitative method was used in carrying out this research. Secondary data from reports of various International Organization were used. It was however observed that dissension among permanent members of the Security Council frustrated the humanitarian intervention and further escalated the sectarian war. The permanent members of the Security Council must reach consensus in resolving the crisis.
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Introduction
The responsibility to protect is primarily a preventative doctrine. It is a global commitment adopted at the 2005 United Nations World Summit and has been central to international discourse on how to respond to mass atrocity crimes. The UN whose primary responsibility is to maintain Global peace and stability and also holding the normative architecture of world order must be at the fore front in sustaining responsibility to protect and holding sovereign states accountable for egregious violations of Human Rights and mass atrocities.

In the course of this write up, I will briefly explain the following concepts:
- The Responsibility to Protect
- The concept of Sovereignty
- The concept Humanitarian intervention
The Concept Of Responsibility To Protect (R2P)

Responsibility to protect (R2P) is a recent concept of international politics, whose goal is to define the best attitude to adopt when the world is confronted with grave humanitarian crisis. Within R2P framework, each state carries the primary responsibility to protect human beings living in its territory. The international society carries a collective duty to solve a humanitarian crisis when a state has failed to fulfill this responsibility. In order to proceed, the international society may need to use coercive action against the state.

September 2005 was a defining moment in the normative evolution of the responsibility to protect. It marked the first time R2P was endorsed in a universal forum, with all UN member states unanimously accepting their responsibility to protect their own populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In the report of the UN Secretary General R2P’s central normative tenet has remained a constant throughout its progression (Deng, 2010). State sovereignty entails responsibility and therefore, each state has a responsibility to protect its citizens from mass killing and gross violations of their rights. If a state is unable to carry out that function, the state abrogates its sovereignty as responsibility and international responsibility in egregious circumstances.

Thakur (1999), further elaborates that the R2P framework addresses the ‘moral imbalance’ between Sovereignty and human rights, and suggests that approaching sovereignty as responsibility answers this moral inadequacy. He further explained that the right to interfere in a state where extreme violations of human rights are taken place comes from failure of that state to meets its responsibilities as a sovereign member of the international community.

According to Annan’s report on the need to embrace responsibility to protect in the 2005 summit, if a state fails to protect its citizens, the international community must apply a range of peaceful diplomatic and humanitarian measures, with force to be employed as a last resort.

It is worthy of note that R2P was endorsed ten years after the failures to react to the horrors of Rwanda and Srebrenica and thirty years after the Cambodian killing fields and sixty years after the liberation of the Holocaust Nazi death camps, when the never again dictum was born (Badescu, 2011).

According to Francis Deng in his 2010 Hammarkjold lecture “The concept of sovereignty as responsibility to protect in the 2005 outcome document of the Summit of heads of state and Government as the Responsibility to Protect has three pillars: the responsibility of the state to protect its own populations; the responsibility of the international community to take collective action under the UN charter when a state is manifestly failing to protect its own population. Measures under this cast pillar range from diplomatic intercession to the Imposition of sanctions and in extreme cases, to military intervention” (Francis Deng, 2010).


Having considered the report of the secretary-general on the prevention of armed conflict (8/2001/574) and in particular the recommendations contained therein relating to the Security Council. Reiterating the purposes and principles enshrined in the charter of the United Nations and re-affirming its commitment to the principle of the political independence, sovereignty equality and territorial integrity of all states. Bearing in mind its primary responsibility under the charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security and re-affirming its role in the prevention of conflicts. Reiterating that conflict prevention is one of the primary responsibilities of member states. Reiterating that early warning, preventive diplomacy preventive deployment, practical disarmament measures and post conflict peace building are interdependent and complementary components of a comprehensive conflict prevention strategy. Reiterating the shared commitment to save people from the ravages of armed conflict, acknowledge the lessons to be learned for
all concerned from the failure of preventative efforts that preceded such tragedies as the genocide in Rwanda (A/54/549_ and resolving to take appropriate action within its competence, combined with the efforts of member states, to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies. (The 2010 Dag Hammarskjold lecture at Upsala University Upsala Sweden).

According to Francis Deng (2010), sovereignty must be exercised with due responsibility thus crucial normative shift was articulated to ensure the sustenance of R2P as a normative doctrine in the protection and advancement of international human rights as the threats to international security have come from violent eruption of crises within state, including civil wars. The goal of promoting human rights and democratic governance, protecting civilian victims of democratic governance, humanitarian atrocities and punishing governmental perpetrators of mass crime is now very important (Francis Deng, 2010).

Thakur (2005), in his postulations emphasized that the idea of sovereignty as responsibility is not all that new. It has along evolutionary pedigree, the principle of “responsibility to protect” was considered by the ancient gentium as the foundation of every action taken by those in government in regard to the governed. Pope Benedict XVI told UN diplomat that While the responsibility to protect “has only recently been defined… it was always present implicitly at the origins of the United Nations and is now increasingly characteristics of its activity(Thakur, 2005).

Francis Deng (2010) emphasized the importance of sovereignty as the key organizing principle of the modern world order. It received a strong affirmation in the ICSS report, it took pains to emphasize that a cohesive and peaceful international system is more likely to be achieved through the cooperation of effective and legitimate states confident of their place in the world, than in environment of fragmenting or generally chaotic states. According to Francis Deng, stability provides order and predictability in International Relations and not merely a pretext or abuse. As such to respect the sovereignty of other states and internally to respect the dignity and basic rights of all the people within the state (Francis Deng, 2010).

The Concept Of Sovereignty
Shinoda (2000), extrapolates that internally, sovereignty refers to the exclusive competence of the state to make authoritative decisions of government with regard to all people end resources within its territory. Externally, it means the legal identity of the state in international law, an equality of status with all other states and the claim to be the sole official agent acting in international relations on behalf of the governed. In political theory, sovereignty is a substantive term designating supreme authority over some polity. It is a basic principle underlying the dominant Westphalian model of state foundation(Shinoda, 2000).

According to Shinoda (2000), National sovereignty locates the state as the ultimate seat of power and authority unconstrained by internal or external checks. He further emphasized that constitutional sovereignty holds that the power and authority of the state are not absolute but contingent and constrained (Shinoda 2000).

The responsibility to protect acknowledges that responsibility rests primarily with the states concerned. It is only when states fail in their responsibility to protect its citizens that it becomes the responsibility of others to act in its place. Thus the responsibility to protect is more of a linking concept that bridges the divide between the international community and the sovereign state. Sovereignty has its philosophical and political roots in European thought and practice ironically while aspects of sovereignty are begin progressively superseded in the construction of the increasingly borderless European Union, some of its most passionate defenders are to be found among developing countries (Shinoda, 2000).

Thakur (2005), explained that commitment to sovereignty is functional. The state according to him is the cornerstone of the international system. State sovereignty provides order stability and predictability in international relations. It mediates relations between rich poor states, strong and weak states etc (Thakur, 2005).

Weiss (1998), further explains that following the globalization of the norm of self- determination, the principle of state sovereignty was constitutionally used by newly decolonized countries to try to reconstitute disrupted societies and polities and to restart arrested economic development (Weiss, 1998).

Ayoob (2002), further explains that developing countries typically sought order within and justice among states. By contrast the industrialized western countries have given primacy to order among and justice within
states. The UN commission asserts that the core principle of sovereignty is responsibility and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lies with the broader community of states (Ayoob, 2002). Thakur (2005), further explains that where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgence in repression or state failure and the government in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect. He further explains that the foundation of that responsibility lies in the obligation inherent in the concept of sovereignty. The responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security in specific legal obligations under human rights and human protection declarations, Covenant and treaties of international humanitarian law and national law and the developing practices of states in regional organizations and the security council itself (Thakur, 2005).

The notion of sovereignty has been criticized; it has been described as ‘problematic’ (Philpot 1995, Krasner 2010). Badescu (2011), explains that sovereignty is very broad and highly contested. She further explains that for the dispute question whether the concept is absolute or not, whether it implies solely a legitimate authority or discuss the extent to which executing norms on sovereignty hinder the solutions to key pressing issues today (Badescu, 2011).

Jackson (2014), describes sovereignty as ‘hard law’ meaning that it encompasses legally binding obligations that are precise. And so, many scholars argue that respect for the sovereignty of other states is the universal standard of international conduct. Badescu argues further that despite the fact that non-intervention is one of the most basic in the affairs of other states in the past for various reasons, including strategic interests, security of their territory and humanitarian motives (Jackson, 2004).

According to Badescu (2011), there is now a growing acceptance that humanitarian objectives advanced in extreme cases of human rights violations are permissible in accordance with international law and cannot be held hostage to the norm of the state sovereignty, classically understands While some argue that the norm of state sovereignty is no longer sacrosanct, others’ phrase it differently but launch the same critical message. The secretaries-general of the UN, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Kofi Annan and Ban Ki-Moon declared that sovereignty is no longer absolute and that it can be overridden in exceptional circumstances Annan in particular has achieved significant progress in advancing his argument that there are two concepts of sovereignty and that the international community should embrace the one that encompasses the responsibilities, along with the rights of statehood (Badescu, 2011).

The Concept Of Humanitarian Intervention

The concept of humanitarian intervention is related to different fields including international law, political science, international relations and ethics. Different definitions of the concept exist. For the purpose of my study I will use the definition of Adams Roberts, which is “coercive action by one or more states involving the use of armed force in another state without the consent of its authorities, and with the purpose of preventing widespread suffering or death among inhabitants” (Roberts 2000)

The question of authorization for the use of force has become central to recent debates on military intervention for humanitarian purposes Kofi Annan is his assertions further elaborated this in his 1999 general address to the UN general assembly.

“To those for whom the greatest threat to the future of international order is the use of force in the absence of a Security Council mandate one might say: leave Kosovo aside for a moment, and think about Rwanda. Imagine for one moment that, in those dark days and hours leading up to the genocide, there had been a coalition of states ready and willing to act in defence of the Tutsi Population, but the council had refused or delayed giving the green light- should such a coalition then stoodidly while the horror unfolded? (Annan, 1999).

Welsh (2004), further expatiated that the northern stance on the need for Security Council authorization is also divided. Welsh further maintained that humanitarian interventions can proceed without UN authorization in instances when the Security Council is paralyzed by dissension among its permanent
members of five (P5). In such occasions, the just war argument is invoked together with new readings of international law to support by passing the UN process (Welsh, 2004).

For the US, the legitimacy of the council depends on its ability to advance the American notion of what best ensures international peace and security. This is the US recent preference for unilateral action, coalition of the willing, and intervention without UN authorization could seriously damage the role of the UN in the future (Badescu, 2011).

Buchanan (2004), suggests minimizing the dependency on the US for humanitarian interventions and instead increasing the rich European states involvement and investment in military capacities (Buchanan 2004) however this is not an easy task, as the US pays the largest percentage of all UN peacekeeping costs currently 25 percent (Badescu, 2011).

Interpretations Of Humanitarian Intervention

The UN charter provides the most important source of legal and constitutional authority regarding the use of force. The UN charter restricts states right to use force internationally, first, to instances of individual of collective self-defence (UN charter Art: 51) second to cases in which states have to assist in UN authorized or UN controlled military endeavours (UN charter chapter VII) the UN charter does not directly address the question of humanitarian intervention and this the responsibility to protect. The UN charter has two distinct elements that pertain to humanitarian intervention; the first is in preamble and article 1 provision regarding fundamental human rights. The second is the possibility of using force under UN patronage the final phase of Article 2(7) of the UN charter allows for the use of force within states under chapter VII.

According to Badescu (2007), the Security Council’s legal capacity to settle humanitarian crises is set out in chapter VI and VII of the UN charter despite being designed for international disputes, the evolving practices of the UN suggest that the provisions in these two chapters empowers the Security Council the ‘primary responsibility’ to deal with security threats of all types. Thus the council is empowered to decide what measures shall be taken to maintain or restore international peace and security. In addition to the Security Council, the UN charter refers to two other sources of authority. Despite being subordinated to the Security Council, the general assembly can also address matters of peace and security. Regional arrangements or agencies are the second potential sources of authorization for humanitarian intervention. They lack an explicit definition in the literature on humanitarian intervention, but they are usually perceived as cooperating among regional states to enhance their national well-being through collective action (Badescu, 2007).

Badescu (2011), explained that regional arrangement started to assume a larger role in peace operations in the 1990s. According to article 53 (1) of the UN charter, the Security Council has power to utilize regional arrangements under its authority, but these organizations lack independent authority, and must keep the Security Council fully informed of activities undertaken or contemplated with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Weis (2001) argues that the protection of civilians from gross violations of human rights played a significant role in the contemporary human rights regime, and in the UN charter. In action by the Security Council can result in even greater human right abuses, thus making the UN liable to charges of ineffectiveness (Weis 2001) in such instances, regional organizations appear as the next authoritative alternative in what would resemble a legitimacy pyramid (Badescu 2011).

Badescu (2011), further explained that several interventions undertaken by regional actors since 2000, without prior Security Council authorization are also relevant: the ECOWAS interventions in cote d’ voire (2003) and Liberia (2003) and the AU interventions in Burundi (2003) and Darfur (2004). The Security Council has subsequently welcomed the last three. Such examples can be used to verify the trends announcing the end of absolute requirement prior to UN authorization in instances of grave humanitarian emergencies seeking ex post facto authorization from the UN is another notable trend, illustrated once again by NATO’S intervention in Kosovo aid by ECOWAS interventions in sierra Leone and Liberia. Given the Security Council’s past unwillingness or inability to authorize interventions to halt humanitarian disasters, there is clear need of alternative authorization mechanisms in such instances after the UN image was negatively affected by the 2003 invasion in Iraq by the US. Having regional organizations authorize military
operations in the territories of their respective member states appeared at times a more cautious alternative (Badescu, 2011).

**Sovereignty As Responsibility**
The Brookings Institution has been developing the concept of Sovereignty as responsibility (Deng 1996). The institution defined sovereignty as building obligations towards one’s people as well certain privileges internationally. Domestically, the defence of the basic rights of citizens legitimizes international recognition. The respect for fundamental human rights and other obligations of rights of citizens reduces foreign coercive interventions and guarantees state’s legitimacy. These reflect the existing notion of Sovereignty that has historical antecedents in both western and non-western political thought and doctrine (Luck, 2008).

**R2P Within The Framework Of International LAW**
The first pillar of R2P -State responsibility is based on the existing international law. Treaty based legal obligations and duties and requires states to prevent and punish genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity (Davies 2000). Ethic cleansing the fourth category crime, although is not currently a crime in its own right under international law. But since the crime may be used to describe conduct that may constitute genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity. It is likely to constitute at least one of these well-established international crimes (Davies, 2000). R2P is not meant to detract from broader range of obligations existing under International Humanitarian and human rights law, refugee law and international criminal law (Crawford, 2002). Together they provide the normative foundation for R2P. The ends of R2P should be to bolster effort for the protection of humanity at large.

Generally, international law stipulates that when a state violates its international obligations, it is expected to cease and make restitutions for any injury caused. However, the prohibitions on genocide and a number of specific acts that may constitute war crimes or crimes against humanity are considered peremptory norms of international law (Crawford, 2002).

**Norms And Laws As Instrument Of International Stability**
A norm can be defined statistically to mean the pattern of behaviour that is most common or unusual, a widely prevalent pattern of behaviour (Thakur, 2005). Norms can also be defined as a pattern of behaviour that should be followed in accordance with a given value system; a generally accepted standard of proper behaviour. According to Thakur (2005), it is clear that norms and laws are alternate mechanisms for regulating human and social behaviour (Thakur, 2005).

Thakur (2005), explains that human beings are social actors; norms are essential to the functioning of social actors; norms are essential to the functioning and existence of society; therefore social interaction is viewed through the normative lenses, from bilateral relations between two individuals to relations among national leaders. Thakur (2005), further explained that laws, norms and laws shape decisions, the language of norms and laws permit human being to pursue goals, challenge the assertions and justify actions. Kratochwill (1989), exemplified the role of norms in political stability by asserting that habitual disobedience to particular laws will engender a more generalized disrespect for the system of laws, for the principle of polity is being governed by laws and all its actors rulers as well as citizens being subject to the rule of law (Kratochwill, 1989).

**The UN Within The Context Of Sovereignty**
International law help regulate the relations among states and the fabric of international institutions. International law has a direct relationship with state sovereignty and the protection of human rights. It has long been argued that the concept of state sovereignty is a fundamental pillar of the international system. The basic norm upon which the society of states rest, the cardinal principle of international law, the cornerstone of the UN charter and the global covenant (Brown 1999, Jackson 2000 Ayoob 2002). According to such views, international law, International Organizations and other rules and institutions governing International Society share the fundamental promise that international order can be maintained only if States respects each other’s sovereignty (Ayoob 2002).
Sovereignty has thus been described as “hard law” meaning that it encompasses legally binding obligations that are precise and so many scholars argue that respect for the sovereignty of other states is the Universal Standard of International conduct (Jackson 2004). Sovereign States also have duties, apart from rights, such duties constrain state behaviour by making their sovereignty conditional on minimal level of respect for the human rights of their own citizens. In the twentieth century, Sovereignty came to be justified increasingly in terms of the state’s role as a guarantor of certain basic human rights, replacing the politically ineffective legitimating principle of absolute right (Reus-Smit 2001). A significant number of scholars, especially liberal international lawyers, have persuasively argued that sovereignty is vested in the people and not in the State (Makinda 2002, Franck 2003; Teson 2003). Such interpretations of State Sovereignty are not centred on a primary need to respect territorial borders, but on a key requirement to protect citizens of a State caught up in internal strife.

While some scholars argue that State Sovereignty is no longer sacrosanct (Chopra and Weiss 1992) others phrase it differently but launch the same critical message, namely that State Sovereignty is becoming less than absolute (Philpott 1995, Mill 1998) Even some of the strongest supporters of the traditional concept of Sovereignty suggest there is a certain hierarchy with respect to each Sovereigns states responsibilities, which ultimately includes humanitarian objectives. (Barroso 2011), Robert Jackson (2004), argues that the first tier responsibility of a State is focused on National and International responsibility. The limitations on absolute immunity for heads of State, which culminated with the 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) is another example in point. State relate with each other as equals through international law.

The Theoretical Framework
This study adopted two theories: Games Theory and Realism Theory to describe the motive of the crisis in Syria. Some researchers (Skansholmolm, 2013 and Garcia, 2013) have instead focused on three leading theories in international relations (IR) Critical theory, liberalism and social constructivism. Critical theorist believes that states are means and not the end of Security Policy and hence they should be de-centred in scholarly studies as well as in policy practice (Ramirez 2009). Liberalism specifies that state is a rational actor, influenced by internal bargaining among and within bureaucracies, institutions etc, and willing to cooperate to ensure mutual benefits with other actors. (Maessen, 2012 Social Constructivism is characterized by social Ontology, where cooperation and discussions are driven by rules and actors seek to fulfill their roles in a community or institutions (Ramirez, 2009).

Games Theory
Games Theory is the science of interactive decision making especially during conflict. (Williams, 2008). It was created in one fell swoop with the publications of John Von Neumann and Oscar Morgern’s theory of Games and Economic behaviour, by Princeton University Press (William 2008).

In game theory, decision-makers are called players. Players may be individuals or group of individuals who in some sense operate as a coherent unit. Presidents or statesmen can act as players. The decision of players eventually leads to outcome. Sometimes, generic terms such as compromise or conflict are used to portray outcome in games theory.

A zero-sum game is any game in which the interests of the players are diametrically opposed. A non zero-sum game is an interactive situation in which the players have mixed motives that is, in addition to conflicting interests, they may also have some interests in common. A non-cooperative game is any game in which players are unable to irrevocably commit themselves to a particular course of action. It should come as no surprise that non-cooperative game theory holds a particular attraction for theorists of interstate conflict. (Williams, 2008).

In games theory, players use strategy to actualize their goals. A strategy is defined as a complete contingency plan that specifies a player’s choice at every situation that might arise in a game. A typical arms games between President Assad controlled government and the Syrian opposition in a strategic form will suffice for this. In this representation, each unit has two strategies; to cooperate by not arming, and to defect from cooperation by arming. If neither arms, the outcome is a compromise; a military balance is maintained.
both arm, both lose, as an arms race takes place. Finally, if one state arms and the other does not, the state that arms gains a strategic advantage, and the state that chooses not to arm is put in military disadvantage. In game theory the players are assumed to be instrumentally rational. Rationally players are those who maximize their utility. It indicates the worth of an outcome of a particular player. The rational assumption is simply another way of saying that players are purposeful, that they are pursuing interests that they themselves define (Williams, 2008).

Realism
Realists stress the importance of competition and argue that states are rational and autonomous units that control international politics, since the latter is assumed anarchical; hence each decision made is based on self-interest (Keohane, 1986).
In the theory of International politics, Waltz (1979), argues that systems are composed of a structure and their interacting unit. Political structures are best conceptualized as having three elements; an ordering principle, the character of the units and the distribution of capabilities. Waltz argues that two elements of the structure on international system are constant. The lack of an overarching authority means that its ordering principle is anarchy, and the principle of self-help means that all the units remains functionally alike. (Waltz, 1979).
Morgenthau’s (1948), seminal statement of classical realism relied on the assumption that leaders of states are motivated by their lust for power. Waltz (1979), by contrast, omits leader’s motivation and state characteristics as casual variables for international outcomes, except for the minimal assumption that states seek to survive. Waltz notes that international politics is characterized by a disheartening consistency; the same depressingly familiar things happen over and over again. Waltz concludes that state units must at the minimum seek for their own survival.
Accordingly Waltz concludes that systems are generative, the international political system is characterized by complex non-linear relationship and unintended consequences. The outcomes can result to a tendency towards unintended and ironic outcomes.
The realist stands of President Bashar Assad who not only lust for power, but sees the control of power as a means of survival exacerbated the conflict in Syria. To the regime of Assad, International law, the concept of responsibility to protect and humanitarian law is share ivory tower idealism. The control of power via the medium of monopoly of coercion and disproportionate use of force will only guarantee his stay in power. The alliance with Russia and the supply of strategic arms will bolster his stay in power and obliterate the opposition. The application of the policy of collective punishment in Syria will act as deterrence to other rebel groups and implement a difference measure which at the long run will consolidate his regime. Since the international system is anarchic, states must seek power to survive. Assad believes he must seek power via strategic arms build up to remain in power.

Justification of the theories on R2P
R2p is the latest step in the historic development of human rights and humanitarian norms as seen from the ICISS report. It reverberates legal conceptions of individual and collective responsibility and of the obligations of sovereignty. It also resonates the need to prevent the re-occurrence of mass atrocities in the scale of Cambodia, Rwanda or Srebenica.
The notion of R2P is still vulnerable to misinterpretation and manipulations. Like most infants R2P will walk before it can run. The consensus scope must be respected if the concept is to gain political recognition required for its implementation.
The first two pillars, stressing on prevention, capacity building and re-building, early warning and global and regional collaboration, face little political opposition. The challenge here is more institutional them intellectual. The implementation of the third pillar which stresses timely and decisive response in the face of egregious violations of rights by states is subject to the ratification by the UN Security Council. Constant dissension amongst the veto wielding permanent members meant that consequence on the need for prompt and tacit approval for humanitarian intervention.
Sub-marine launched ballistic missiles helped in the capture of Damascus by the government forces and the complete destruction of Aleppo in December 2016 which was the rebel stronghold.
The rebel with strategic support from the GCC (Gulf Cooperating Council) was not a match to the strategic formations of the Russia backed Syrian government. This explains the defeat of the rebel forces which are predominantly Sunni fighters.

Presentation Of Result

The fundamental core of the Responsibility to Protect is the protection of civilians from state use of monopolized violence. In a situation of continuous violations of rights of citizens by government, the principle of non-intervention by other states in internal affairs of the affected state is jettisoned allowing the international community to intervene. R2P is the latest step in the historic development of human rights and humanitarian norms as seen from the ICISS report. It reverberates legal conceptions of individual and collective responsibility and of the obligations of sovereignty. It also resonates the need to prevent the re-occurrence of mass atrocities in the scale of Cambodia, Rwanda or Srebrenica.

The notion of R2P is still vulnerable to misinterpretation and manipulations. Like most infants R2P will walk before it can run. The consensus scope must be respected if the concept is to gain political recognition required for its implementation.

The first two pillars, stressing on prevention, capacity building and re-building, early warning and global and regional collaboration, face little political opposition. The challenge here is more institutional them intellectual. The implementation of the third pillar which stresses timely and decisive response in the face of egregious violations of rights by states is subject to the ratification by the UN Security Council. Constant dissension amongst the veto wielding permanent members meant that consequence on the need for prompt and tacit approval for humanitarian intervention. Sovereignty is broad and contextual with legally binding obligations. The principle of non-intervention remains a major binding block of the international law. The law on non-interference has never been fully practiced as states has interfered in the affairs of other state for various reasons which include economic strategic or for humanitarian motives.

The advancement of humanitarian objectives in face of egregious violations of human rights and mass atrocities is permissible within the confines of international law and supersede the norm of state sovereignty. The authorization of humanitarian intervention by the use of military force for the purpose of preventing gross human right violations is the fundamental core of the R2P. This is the main motivation for setting up the ICISS in developing a normative framework to ensure that genocidal killings are prevented in the future. The lack of consensus among the permanent members of the Security Council has been the bane in the implementation of humanitarian intervention which is pivotal for the sustenance of R2P. The continuous advancement of individual interests of the permanent members of the UN Security Council has jeopardized the ability to implement humanitarian intervention in the face of gross violations of human rights as we have in Syria today. The need to review Article 2(7) of the chapter VII of the UN Charter will not only reform the activities of the veto wielding permanent member of the UN Security council and the approval of humanitarian initiatives but will bolster a better way of managing international crises.
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