

The Responsibility to Protect or the Responsibility to Select? A Critical Analysis of the Selectivity of Russia, the United States and France to Intervene in Libya but not in Syria

Master Thesis Human Geography
Specialization Conflicts, Territories and Identities
Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
Research Internship IKV PAX Christi

Supervisors:

Dr. H.W. Bomert, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
Prof. Dr. H. van Houtum, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen
Jan Jaap van Oosterzee, IKV Pax Christi

Suzanne Leurs

s4241401

suzanne.leurs@student.ru.nl

February 11, 2014



Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Table of contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Abstract..... | p.3 |
| List of Abbreviations..... | p.4 |
| Introduction..... | p.5 |
| - Methodology..... | p.6 |
| - Critical Discourse Analysis..... | p.7 |
| - Limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis..... | p.8 |
| - Scientific and societal relevance..... | p.8 |
| - Setting the context: Libya..... | p.10 |
| - Setting the context: Syria..... | p.11 |
| CHAPTER I. BACKGROUND OF THE PRINCIPLE OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT | |
| Paragraph 1.1 Collective Security Theory..... | p.12 |
| Paragraph 1.2 Adoption by the UN..... | p.12 |
| 1.2.1 UN Charter..... | p.12 |
| 1.2.2 Core principles of the UN..... | p.13 |
| 1.2.2.1 Principle of Sovereignty..... | p.12 |
| 1.2.2.1 Principle of Human Rights..... | p.14 |
| Paragraph 1.3 Definition R2P..... | p.14 |
| Paragraph 1.4 Evolution of R2P..... | p.15 |
| Paragraph 1.5 Changing context..... | p.15 |
| Paragraph 1.6 Dimensions of R2P..... | p.16 |
| 1.6.1 Responsibility to Prevent..... | p.17 |
| 1.6.2 Responsibility to React..... | p.18 |
| 1.6.3 Responsibility to Rebuild..... | p.20 |
| Paragraph 1.7 Critique on R2P..... | p.21 |
| Paragraph 1.8 R2P as perceived by | p.21 |
| 1.8.1 France..... | p.21 |
| 1.8.2 United States..... | p.22 |
| 1.8.3 Russia..... | p.23 |
| 1.8.4 R2P in the Security Council..... | p.23 |
| CHAPTER II. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF FRANCE, THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL | |
| Paragraph 2.1 Framework of Critical Discourse Analysis..... | p.24 |
| Paragraph 2.2 Analysis of speeches of Russia, US and France in the case of Libya..... | p.24 |
| 2.2.1 Resolution 1970 and 1973..... | p.25 |
| 2.2.2 Russia..... | p.26 |
| 2.2.3 United States..... | p.29 |
| 2.2.4 France..... | p.31 |
| Paragraph 2.3 Analysis of speeches of Russia, the US and France in the case of Syria.... | p.35 |
| 2.3.1 Presidential statement and (failed) resolutions..... | p.35 |
| 2.3.2. Russia..... | p.37 |

| | |
|---|------|
| 2.3.3 United States..... | p.41 |
| 2.3.4 France..... | p.45 |
| Paragraph 2.4 Discussion of main findings..... | p.51 |
| CHAPTER III. Comparative analysis of Libya and Syria | |
| Paragraph 3.1.Main findings previous chapter..... | p.54 |
| Paragraph 3.2 Application of R2P on Libya and Syria..... | p.55 |
| 3.2.1 Conclusion..... | p.58 |
| Paragraph 3.3 Comparative analysis of Libya and Syria..... | p.59 |
| 3.3.1 Differences between Libya and Syria..... | p.59 |
| 3.3.1.1 Timing..... | p.60 |
| 3.3.1.2 Level of threat..... | p.60 |
| 3.3.1.3 Organization of opposition..... | p.61 |
| 3.3.1.4 Role of international organizations..... | p.62 |
| 3.3.1.5 Role of regional organizations..... | p.63 |
| 3.3.1.6 Chances of success | p.65 |
| 3.3.1.7 Operational factors..... | p.66 |
| Paragraph 3.4 Discussion of main findings..... | p.67 |
| 3.4.1 Selective (non)intervention in Libya and Syria..... | p.67 |
| CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| Paragraph 4.1 Conclusion..... | p.70 |
| 4.1.1 Reflection on R2P..... | p.72 |
| Paragraph 4.2 Limitations..... | p.73 |
| 4.2.1 Suggestions for further research..... | p.73 |
| 4.1.1 Recommendation..... | p.73 |
| Attachment of the Discourse Analysis of Security Council meetings on Libya and Syria..... | |
| | p.75 |
| Bibliography..... | |
| | p.89 |

Abstract

This Master thesis research aims to explain the selectivity of the international community on humanitarian intervention in the cases of Libya and Syria. It attempts to explain how it can be that in two seemingly comparable cases, the reaction of the international community can be so different. This research aims to explain why a universal rule – the Responsibility to Protect – is not applied universally, but selectively. It will do so by looking at three international actors namely Russia, the United States and France. These actors were chosen because they are key players in international politics, permanent members of the Security Council, their viewpoints range from realists to interventionists and they all have different relations, interests and roles with regard to Libya and Syria. The main research question is formulated as follows: The Responsibility to Protect or the Responsibility to Select? A Critical Analysis of the Selectivity of Russia, the United States and France to Intervene in Libya but not in Syria. The research consists of four Chapters. Chapter 1 gives a background on the R2P principle, its adoption in the UN Charter, its evolution, criteria and the perspective of Russia, the United States and France on R2P. Chapter 2 is a Critical Discourse Analysis of the discourses that were used by Russia, the US and France on Libya and Syria in the United Nations Security Council. The period that has been analyzed ranged for Libya from February 22, 2011, up until March 17, 2011, and for Syria from April 21, 2011, up until July 19, 2012. It resulted that the discourses that were used on Libya varied greatly from the discourses that were used in the discussions on Syria. In the discussions on Libya, the responsibility of the international community, human security and the protection of civilians stood central. Whereas in the meetings on Syria, the complexity of the situation and the destabilizing risks for the already fragile region dominated the discussion. Three main findings resulted from this chapter, namely 1) for Libya it was not the question *if* the international community should intervene but *how*, 2) R2P resulted to be less important than anticipated and 3) intervention in Libya was associated with positive consequences such as the protection of civilians while intervention was assumed to contribute to further destabilization of the region. Chapter 3 is a comparative analysis of the situation in Libya and Syria based on seven factors that underline the uniqueness of Libya and Syria. Furthermore Chapter 3 applies the criteria of R2P to the cases of Libya and Syria. It resulted that in the case of Libya all criteria seem to be fulfilled while only one criterion is applicable to Syria. It resulted that in the case of Libya the clear level of threat, the poor international standing of the Gaddafi regime and the support of regional and international organizations for the establishment of a no-fly zone facilitated the intervention. Libya was contextualized in the inaction of the Rwandan genocide while Syria was associated with the high risk of further destabilizing the (wider) region. The support of Russia and Iran, the timing (after Libya), the fragmentation of the opposition, the risk for spill-over effects and possibly even a sectarian war led to a great irony and one of the main reasons not to intervene in Syria: it seemed as if the situation in Syria was too complex to prevent more harm than good. Agreeing on the idea that people should be protected in the case of mass atrocities is easy, but agreeing on a common response is a whole different story. Like R2P, the idea of collective security is compelling in theory but highly selective in practice. This is a consequence of a state's individualism in a supposedly universal security system. R2P aims to protect civilians against atrocity crimes but it is only a normative instrument that has no legal stance so in the end it is all dependent upon political will. Intervention based on unique features in one case (Libya) does not imply intervention in another case (Syria). This wrongly assumes that the situations are analogous, that interventions are purely humanitarian or altruistic and that there is a duty or legal obligation to intervene.

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|--|
| AU | African Union |
| EU | European Union |
| GA | General Assembly |
| GCC | Gulf Cooperation Council |
| GCR2P | Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect |
| ICC | International Criminal Court |
| ICISS | International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty |
| IDMC | Internally Displacement Monitoring Centre |
| IDP | Internally displaced person |
| LAS | League of Arab States |
| NTC | National Transition Council |
| PILPG | Public and International Law & Policy Group |
| R2P | Responsibility to Protect |
| SOC | Syrian Opposition Coalition |
| SG | Secretary-General of the United Nations |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNSC | United Nations Security Council |
| US | United States |

Introduction

An often heard dictum after World War II is 'never again'. World War II is now almost seventy years ago but in the meantime many wars have been fought. During the 54th session of the United Nations General Assembly former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan challenged member states to establish a principle to prevent 'another Rwanda' (United Nations General Assembly, 1999). The concept of Responsibility to Protect was established in response to mass atrocities such as Rwanda and Bosnia. It originated from the idea of collective security which entails that the international community had a moral duty to respond in the case that one of the four mass atrocities (war crimes, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, or genocide) was being committed. In that case, the international community would have the Responsibility to Protect the civilians that were under threat.

For over more than two years there is a war going on in Syria, a war that has caused more than 100,000 deaths, over 1.6 million refugees, and more than 4.25 million internally displaced persons (IDMC, 2013). Why does the international community not intervene under the Responsibility to Protect, as it did in Libya two years ago, in 2011? This research aims to explain why there is such a different response in these two seemingly comparable cases. How can it be explained that a universal rule – the Responsibility to Protect – is not applied universally but selectively (Jeangène Vilmer, 2012)? Are the people in Libya more worthy than the people in Syria? How to justify this asymmetry, this selectivity of a universal principle? That is the aim of this research. It will do so by looking at three international actors, namely Russia, the United States and France. These actors were chosen because they are key players in international politics, permanent members of the Security Council and their viewpoints range from realist to interventionist. Besides, they all have different relations, interests and roles with regard to Libya and Syria. The paragraph on methodology gives a detailed explanation of how this research will be conducted.

This research should be seen in the framework of the Collective Security Theory as will be discussed into more detail in paragraph 1.1. R2P is a direct outcome of this idea that international cooperation (like in the United Nations Security Council) is the most successful strategy in maintaining international peace and security. However, this touches upon the core principles of the United Nations namely the principle of human rights and the principle of sovereignty. R2P addresses this 'moral inequity' and reformulated sovereignty as a responsibility. With R2P as a universal toolbox to justify an intervention in states that fail to meet this responsibility, it remains unclear why there was an intervention in Libya under R2P but not (yet) in Syria. The main research goal has therefore been formulated as follows: The Responsibility to Protect or the Responsibility to Select? A Critical Analysis of the Selectivity of Russia, the United States and France to Intervene in Libya but not in Syria.

Methodology

The research consists of four chapters. Chapter 1 is a theoretical discussion of the R2P principle which directly results from the Collective Security Theory. It discusses the Collective Security Theory as anchored in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and R2P as the result of this theory. Furthermore, the background, dimensions and criteria of R2P are discussed in this chapter as well as the positions of Russia, the US and France towards R2P.

As will result from Chapter 1, the policies of the three countries regarding the Responsibility to Protect vary greatly. Since a country's policy is clearly reflected in the discourse that is being used in its speeches, it is expected that similar findings will be brought to light in Chapter 2. Chapter 2

closely analyzes speeches of Russia, the US and France in the UN Security Council (UNSC) on the situation in Libya and Syria. First, the UNSC meetings on the situation in Libya will be addressed and then the UNSC meetings on Syria will be discussed. The period that will be analyzed, will range from the first meeting in the UNSC regarding the situation in that country until the (attempted) adoption of a resolution. Obviously, this is different in both cases, since the adoption of Resolution 1973 on Libya led to military intervention whereas in Syria there is (still) no such resolution. The research period for Libya will therefore range from February 22, 2011 until March 17, 2011. Within this time period there were two open meetings and two closed meetings. For Syria, the research period will range from April 21, 2011, until July 19, 2012; twelve open meetings within this time period have been analyzed. The main question that this chapter will address is: How can the main types of discourse by Russia, the US and France on Libya and Syria be characterized? In doing so, there are several sub-questions that have to be answered. The sub-questions are: what language has been used by Russia, the US and France that led to the adoption of Resolution 1970 and Resolution 1973 on Libya? How is this language different from the language that has been used in the case of Syria? How do Russia, the US and France respectively contextualize their arguments and what relations are being drawn in their argumentation? How do members in the Security Council refer to 'Libya' and 'the responsibility to protect' in the Security Council meetings on Syria? In the discussion of the main findings of this textual analysis, special attention will be paid to the question whether there are any shifts or inconsistencies in the lines of argumentation and positioning in the case of Syria compared to the case of Libya? The analysis of speeches has been conducted with a method called Critical Discourse Analysis. Paragraph 2.1.1. illustrates the framework of how critical discourse will be applied to answer these questions. The analysis of the speeches of Russia, the US and France on the situation in Libya is presented in paragraph 2.2 and on the situation in Syria in paragraph 2.3. Paragraph 2.4 will discuss and summarize the main findings of this chapter.

Chapter 3 moves beyond what has been discussed in the UNSC and is a comparative analysis of Libya and Syria, based on seven factors that show the uniqueness of the situation in Libya and Syria. First, paragraph 3.1 gives an overview of the main findings of Chapter 2 since they will be analyzed in more depth in paragraph 3.3.1 Paragraph 3.2 applies the criteria of R2P, as described in paragraph 1.6.2, to the situation in Libya and Syria. In order to understand why intervention in one case does not imply intervention in another case, one has to understand all the factors on which intervention is based and not only the criteria for intervention that are applied to Libya and Syria in paragraph 3.2. While the speeches of Russia, the US and France reveal their policy towards Libya and Syria to a large extent, this research aims to give a comprehensive analysis of all the factors that have played a role in the decision (not) to intervene in Libya and Syria. This research will not limit itself to addressing merely the position of Russia, the US and France towards R2P or their statements in the UNSC. Therefore, Paragraph 3.3 includes a comparative analysis of Libya and Syria based on seven factors that show the uniqueness of the two situations. The aim of paragraph 3.3 is twofold. First, it shows that Libya and Syria are two separate cases with many differences on crucial points that explain the different response of the international community (not) to intervene. Second, it further analyzes reasons for (non) intervention that were brought forward by Russia, the US and France in the UNSC meetings on Libya and Syria. Paragraph 3.4 discusses the main findings of this chapter.

In Chapter 4, the main findings of this research are discussed and analyzed in the context of collective security. Furthermore, Chapter 4 will answer the main research question, gives a reflection on R2P, discusses the limitations of this research, does some recommendations and gives suggestions for further research.

Critical Discourse Analysis

The method that has been used to analyze the speeches of Russia, the US and France is Critical Discourse Analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis studies how meaning is being created through language. Discourses act as frames in which we interpret the language that is being used and attach meaning to it. Gee (2010) describes discourse analysis as a method in which language is being used to build “significance, activities, identities, relationships and politics”. Critical Discourse Analysis as associated with Norman Fairclough (2003) adds to this three dimensions that comprise any ‘discursive event’, namely the ‘text’, the ‘discursive practice’ and the ‘social practice’ (Wagenaar, 2011:159; Ernste, 2012). The three dimensions help to get to the core of critical discourse analysis around issues of “power, ideology and struggle” (Wagenaar, 2011:161). The linguistic level tells what the text is about, identifies the speaker and the audience and the tone of the text. The discursive layer reveals references to intertextuality and interdiscursivity to create meaning. Intertextuality is being used to make a seemingly neutral text highly political. It draws relations between (non)related objects or events and it shows the contextualisation of what is being said and what is being left out. Interdiscursivity shows a contradiction within a discourse in combination with sensitivity to associated practice. This means that when there are contradictions within a discourse (‘bombing for peace’, for example), this can lead to wrong associations on the associated practice level (when you start using real life examples). This dimension also reveals the creation of a second voice that the speaker can address to distance himself from the text and make a moral distinction while creating an ‘us’ versus ‘them’. The social layer sets a frame for the text to be contextualised in. Wagenaar (2011) explains that social conventions (re)produce power differentials which are expressed through language. The power aspect is obscured through ideology and is therefore often interpreted as ‘common sense’, it thus becomes hegemonic. But since no social relation or discourse is ever fixed, actors have the capability to fight over meaning and interpret the same text differently. Discourse functions to shape the “common background [...] by inserting various kinds of assumptions” (Wagenaar, 2011:163). The power of language is often hidden in discourse since it creates a context in which the reader should interpret the text. Moreover, ideologies are brought forward in which the reader textualizes and interprets the text in a particular way that is also being reproduced in the process. By using the ideologies in a very subtle way, the reader is under the impression that a text is neutral while in fact it is not. It is a subjective idea brought forward as the truth. This shows the many ways in which language can be (mis)used to serve a certain (political) goal. Discourse reflects our way of thinking and it (de)limits and determines the way we make our thoughts explicit in speech and acts. Discourse can be seen as a frame in which language is used to make claims, relate certain concepts and to call for (political) acts.

By using Critical Discourse Analysis, this research aims to provide an insight in how Russia, the US and France have positioned themselves towards Libya and Syria. Their policies and preferences are to a large extent reflected in the discourse that they use in the UNSC meetings on Libya and Syria. Since discourse is a clear reflection of the policy of a country, analyzing the speeches of Russia, the US and France provides an insight in how these countries approach (or frame) the situation in Libya and Syria. Critical discourse analysis helps to analyze the position of Russia, the US and France by linking it to the three dimensions; the text, the discursive practice and the social practice. On a linguistic level it can be seen that sometimes surprising terminology has been used. Russia, for example, refers to Syria as a ‘crisis’ (S/PV.6710), whereas other countries prefer to use the term ‘war’ or ‘conflict’. On a discursive level it can be seen what relationships are drawn to other concepts or texts. Moreover, it also reveals on which assumptions argumentations are based. This

can all be seen in a broader social level that acts as an institutional and power context in which a speech is interpreted.

Limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis is a research method that can be used to analyze data. Nonetheless, this methodology is by no means an absolute or objective methodology. It does not claim or aim to be an objective methodology and therefore it should not be judged as such. In fact, critical discourse analysis is a subjective methodology, because it is an interpretation of the analyzed data. Even the most educated scholars, no matter how sincere and with the best intentions, cannot avoid some level of interpretation since this is inherent to this method. It will always be someone's perceived truth of the analyzed data. This is simply not limited to only one interpretation; there are always multiple interpretations possible. Therefore it is of crucial importance for researchers to follow the steps of this methodology and to be as transparent as possible so that it is always clear for the reader how certain discourses have been established. Nevertheless, this complicates the reproduction of such a research. In an attempt to improve the reproduction of this research and to add to the objectivity, it was decided to add a quantitative dimension to the critical discourse analysis. Yet, this posed several additional problems as to how to conduct this quantitative research. For example, at the beginning the idea was to count the word 'Responsibility to Protect', but since it was referred to in so many different ways, counting the number of times 'R2P' was mentioned would be meaningless. R2P was sometimes mentioned only implicitly, sometimes in a positive or negative way, sometimes seen as the responsibility of the state, or as the responsibility of the international community, etc. Simply counting the word R2P would then lose all significance. Instead, it was decided to count the number of references to the so-called 'family codes' or discourses.

Based on the number of references to a particular discourse, the analysis has been able to list the dominant discourses. In doing so, this critical discourse analysis has been based on both a qualitative as well as a quantitative method, which adds to the objectivity and neutrality of the analysis. However, it remains that critical discourse analysis cannot give the 'definite' truth - but only 'a' truth. It is impossible to discover the 'divine' truth, because this can only be done by the author of the speech himself. This research is merely giving an interpretation of the truth, since discourse research is simply not limited to only one single explanation. It will always be dependent on the perspective, the background and pre-knowledge. This is inherent to this method and therefore unavoidable. However, this should not discredit the method, since this method shows the power of language and transports this to a different level (i.e. the social practice). Therefore it is a unique method that attempts to make interest, ideologies and power relations explicit.

Scientific and societal relevance of this research

This research is important because it gives an in-depth analysis of two very recent cases, Libya and Syria, and the application of R2P as a newly established principle. R2P has hardly been used so far and how and when to use is still up to debate. The R2P principle touches upon the core principles of the UN and tries to bridge the gap between the legal constraints on the use of force and respect for state sovereignty and the protection of human rights. The principle to intervene and respond in cases of mass atrocities is already on the table, but it has hardly been used so far. By analyzing how R2P has been used in Libya, it can bring to light issues that have facilitated the intervention in Libya and that might bring future interventions in other cases a few steps closer. What ingredients for success can be identified in the case of Libya and how can these be applied for future use in Syria or in other

cases? Furthermore this research has applied the R2P criteria, as established by the ICISS, in two very recent cases, as well as giving some recommendations that could strengthen the future use of R2P as an effective toolbox in offering civilian protection against mass atrocities.

What makes this research valuable is that it went further than a general R2P research in the sense that it not only discussed, but also applied the criteria of R2P to the cases of Libya and Syria. Given the qualitative and quantitative Critical Discourse Analysis of the three countries in the UNSC in combination with the comparative analysis of the situation in Libya and Syria, this research is rather unique from any other research so far. This research has provided a complete picture of the reasons why the reaction of the international community was so different in the case of Libya than it was (and still is) in the case of Syria. This thesis underwrites the value of discourse as used to create meaning or as a frame in which a, seemingly, neutral text, can in fact be highly political. It has shown how discourses on textual level can be interpreted set in a broader social level.

This research has provided a detailed insight in the policies of Russia, the US and France towards R2P, interventions and their stance towards the situations in Libya and Syria. Moreover, it has shown how argumentations were brought forward and contextualized (or to put it in more political terms, were framed) by those three countries. In addition to giving an insight in the policies of Russia, the United States and France, this research has drawn attention to, and has explained the irony in the situation in Syria and the fact that humanitarian intervention is selective and double-edged. In theory it was already known that decisions of the UNSC to intervene are made on case-to-case basis. Nevertheless, this research has shown how, amongst other reasons, distinct features in Libya and Syria that explain the selective application of R2P in practice. In doing so, it has provided a detailed insight in the (differences between) the two conflicts in Libya and Syria.

Setting the context in Libya

Libya

Libya covers 1,759,540 square kilometers (CIA World Factbook, 2013). Libya is surrounded by Egypt, Sudan, Chad, Niger, Algeria and Tunisia (see figure 1). According to the CIA World Factbook, Libya has a population of just over 6 million. Officially, 97% of the population consider themselves Sunni Muslim, 3% are considered to have an 'other' religion (CIA World Factbook, 2013). The Sunni Muslims (97%) are all Berber and Arab, while the remaining 3% includes Greeks, Maltese and Italians, amongst others (CIA World Factbook, 2013). The religious and ethnic composition of Libya can thus to a large extent be considered as homogenous. Libya is rich in natural resources, most notably in petroleum, natural gas and gypsum (a sulphate mineral). Libya's main export commodities are "crude oil, refined petroleum products, natural gas and chemicals" (CIA World Factbook, 2013). In 2008, Libya held the 44th position worldwide for its refined petroleum production of 309,000 barrels per day, of which 84.490 barrels per day were exported (CIA World Factbook, 2008). These commodities are mainly exported to Italy (22.8%), Germany (14.3%), France (14.2%), China (10.7%), Spain (5.2%) and Tunisia (4.8%) (CIA World Factbook, 2011). Libya ranked 64th in the Human Development Index in 2011 (Human Development Report, 2011). For an African country, this is a relatively high position and can to a large extent be explained by the beneficial energy resources export.

Libya has a relatively small army since Gaddafi was afraid that it might stage a coup. Yet, the unrest that Gaddafi always feared did not come (directly) from this army but from his own population. In February 2011, demonstrations took place against the 42-year rule of Moammar Gaddafi. The demonstrations calling for political changes and greater political freedom were held in Benghazi and quickly spread to other Libyan cities. The demonstrations were harshly repressed by the Gaddafi regime, leading to many bloody clashes between security forces of the regime and demonstrators. The clashes between protestors and Gaddafi forces in Benghazi led to a rapid escalation of the conflict and threatened to turn into a violent civil war. The threat was fuelled by incendiary speeches of Colonel Gaddafi and his son, Saif al-Islam, who threatened to commit violent acts against Libyan protestors. This will be discussed into more detail in paragraph 3.3.1.2. This immediately resulted in a strong condemnation by the international community, which feared a bloodbath in Libya. From that point onwards and "faced with Gaddafi's imminent intention to massacre the city's population, it was clear that tough international action in response to the Libyan government manifest failure to uphold its responsibility to protect was needed to halt ongoing crimes and prevent a bloodbath" (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, n.d.:1). Therefore, "the decision among Member States [of the UNSC] around the situation in Libya was not about *whether* to act to protect civilians from mass atrocities but *how* to best protect the Libyan population" (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, n.d.:3). Four days later, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) adopted Resolution 1970 in which sanctions were imposed against the Libyan regime, including an arms embargo, asset freeze and travel bans. Resolution 1970 also referred Gaddafi to the International Criminal Court for alleged



crimes against humanity. A no-fly zone was imposed under Resolution 1973, which rules to take “all measures necessary” to protect civilians. This was referred to as Operation Odyssey Dawn, carried out by Belgian, Canadian, Danish, Italian, Dutch, Norwegian, Spanish, United Arab Emirates, Qatari and American forces. At the end of March 2011, NATO took over sole command (with France in the leading role) and the operation was renamed Operation Unified Protector. On October 20, Muammar Gaddafi was captured by the opposition forces in Sirte. It is unclear what happened precisely, but officially Gaddafi was killed in a crossfire after being captured by opposition forces. Operation Unified Protector lasted 214 days in which “almost 25,000 airstrikes were executed among which 8,000 bombing flights that damaged or destroyed over 5,000 targets” (Homan, 2011).

Setting the context in Syria

Syria

The Syrian Arab Republic (Syria) covers 185,180 square kilometers (CIA World Factbook, 2013). In June 2013, Syria had a population of 22.5 million (CIA World Factbook). As a consequence of the ongoing civil war, the many casualties and large refugee flows to its neighboring countries Turkey, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon (see figure 2), this number could be no longer up to date. According to the CIA World Factbook (2013), the large majority of Syria’s ethnic population is composed of Arabs (90.3%), the rest is made up of Kurds, Armenians and other (9,7%). Syria’s religious composition is made up of Sunni Muslims (74%), Shiites (including Alawites and Druzes) (16%), Christians (various denominations) and a tiny Jewish community in Damascus, Al Qamishli and Aleppo (CIA World Factbook, 2013). Syria’s main export commodities are “crude oil, minerals, petroleum products, fruits and vegetables, and cotton fiber” (CIA World Factbook, 2013). These commodities are mainly exported to Iraq (38.8%), Italy (7.9%), Germany (7.1%), Saudi Arabia (6.5%) and Kuwait (4.2%) (CIA World Factbook, 2011). Syria’s petroleum production is slightly lower than Libya’s. In 2008, Syria produced around 255,600 barrels a day and it exported 14,540 barrels a day, leading to a 83th position in refined petroleum export worldwide (CIA World Factbook, 2013). In the Human Development Index 2011, Syria ranked 119th (Human Development Report, 2011).



Figure 2: CIA World Factbook (2013)

The poor economic situation in Syria was one of the reasons that peaceful protests broke out in March 2011. The crisis in Syria “began as peaceful protests against deplorable economic conditions and never-ending emergency laws” (OilPrice, 2012). The peaceful protests called on Assad and his ruling Baath party to step down. The protests escalated from a violent uprising into a civil war. Attempts of the UN to settle the differences in a peaceful way have failed. Both the Special Envoy of the UN, Lakhdar Brahimi, and former Secretary-General Kofi Annan proposed peace plans for Syria but both have failed since the proposed ceasefire was broken by both parties. As will result from paragraph 2.3, the international community, obstructed by vetoes from China and Russia, seems unable to agree on what to do to halt the atrocities in Syria. With the UNSC deadlocked, the opposition heavily divided and the Assad regime still in place, the atrocities still continue on a daily basis in Syria.

Chapter I

Background of the principle of Responsibility to Protect

1.1 Collective Security Theory

Collective Security Theory is based on the idea that global cooperation is necessary to preserve security. The UNSC is aiming to respond collectively to threats to peace worldwide. The irony is that it did collectively respond to threats to peace in Libya, but (so far) it failed to do so to threats to peace in Syria. This research discusses the R2P principle as an instrument that can be (and even has been) used to legitimize an intervention. The R2P principle emerged from the idea of collective security. Already in the early twentieth century the base for this theory was laid by the American president Woodrow Wilson. The idea of collective security laid the foundation for the establishment of the League of Nations and later also for the United Nations. The theory of collective security was cultivated after the nuclear build-up of the 1970s during the Cold War. It emerged from the core assumption that regional and international cooperation were more successful strategies than having to fear each other. Its main aim is to prevent war and guard itself against aggressors by forming a coalition with other states. As history has shown, “in the face of security threat perceptions, states feel the necessity to combine their efforts to strengthen their own security together” (Ulusoy, 2012:3). According to Ulusoy (2012:1) collective security efforts are “instrumental in preserving the security of states better”. Ulusoy (2012:2) describes collective security as being “related to efforts of a group of states to act together in order to better preserve their own security”.

Given the many different analytical perspectives on security, there is no consensus on a precise definition of collective security. Collective security is based on the idea of one for all and all for one. “States retain considerable autonomy over the conduct of their foreign policy, participation in a collective security organisation entails a commitment by each member to join a coalition to confront any aggressor with opposing preponderant strength” (Ulusoy, 2012:4). The aim of collective security is twofold. First and foremost, it aims to prevent war and ensures that aggressors will face an opposing coalition that has preponderant power. Second, it aims to create an international setting in which stability is reached through cooperation rather than competition (Ulusoy, 2012). States believe that if they use aggression, they will face a very strong and powerful opposition and therefore they should refrain from it. States should become aware of the idea that aggression does not pay. Furthermore, the idea is that, if states are being threatened themselves, they can count on the help of other states. Collective security should be seen in a global context in which borders are transcended and in which global peace based on national security alone is no longer sufficient. National security and collective security become interrelated and therefore it is important that (global) security concerns are being addressed on a global level.

Mearsheimer (1995) criticises the collective security theory because it assumes that a state’s national interests are intertwined with the national interests of other states in the coalition. Yet, this does not necessarily have to be the case, since the national interests of one state can be different from the national interests of another state. As the Realist theory has pointed out, states are, by definition, self-interested and will attempt to maximize their individual gains. The idea that states will only pursue their national interests leads to the conclusion that as long as a state’s vital national interests are not under threat, a state will not engage itself but rather stay on the sidelines. This argument will play an important role in this research and will be discussed later on.

1.2.2 Adoption by the UN

At the 2005 World Summit all 191 members of the UN agreed to paragraphs 138 and 139. Paragraph 138 focuses on the responsibility of the state to protect its civilians from the four mass atrocities. Paragraph 138 rules that

Each individual state has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help states to exercise this responsibility and support the United Nations in establishing an early warning capacity (United Nations General Assembly, 2005:30).

Paragraph 139 describes the role of the international community to protect populations against the four crimes if a state fails to do so. It rules that

(...) In this context, we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations as appropriate, should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity (...). We also intend to commit ourselves, as necessary and appropriate, to helping States building capacity to protect their populations [against these crimes] and to assisting those which are under stress before crisis and conflicts break out (United Nations General Assembly, 2005:30).

1.2 UN Charter

The UN was founded after the Second World War and aims, against the background of the idea of collective security, to “maintain international peace and security, develop friendly relations among nations and promote social progress, better living standards and human rights” (United Nations, n.d.) The UN Charter forms the legal base for a world in which peace and security are a common collective priority and outlines the rights and responsibilities of the UN members. In the UN Charter the “vision for a world based around an agreement that peace and security would be a priority” (Axworthy, 2011:5) is set out. These priorities are a direct consequence from the collective security theory as discussed previously. The idea of the preservation of peace by cooperation is at the base of the UN Charter. Chapters VI and VII rule on the use of force. The use of force is prohibited by Art. 2(4), intervention in domestic politics is prohibited by Art. 2(7). Art. 2(4) of the Charter states that “all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations” (Charter of the United Nations, 1945). The Charter was designed in response to wars between states. Therefore, it was designed to discourage state-to-state violence and to “formalize the established international norm of non-intervention that had its roots in the Westphalian system” (Axworthy, 2011:6). This is laid down in Art. 2(7) of the UN Charter that states that “nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state” (Charter of the United Nations, 1945). This article is clearly defending the issue of state sovereignty and can be used by UN

members as a reason not to intervene in a state's domestic affairs, even when states fail to uphold their responsibility in protecting its citizens. As pointed out by Axworthy, there are constant tensions between "the sovereignty clause and the necessity of forging international agreements requiring collective action that challenge the spirit of Article 2(7)" (Axworthy, 2011:6). One of the downsides of the UN Charter is that it was set up in response to wars between states (interstate wars), while in the last decades, within states (intrastate wars) have become far more common. The UN Charter (Art. 2(7) in particular) thus upholds the principle of state sovereignty.

1.2.1 Two core principles of the United Nations: sovereignty and human rights

The Responsibility to Protect touches upon the core of the United Nations since it is related to the two core principles upon which the UN is founded. These are the principle of sovereignty and the principle of human rights. As Badescu (2010:5) states, R2P "addresses the 'moral imbalance' between sovereignty and human rights, and suggests that approaching sovereignty as responsibility answers this moral inadequacy".

1.2.1.1. Principle of sovereignty

Sovereignty has been a fundamental concept in international diplomacy since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The Peace of Westphalia set ground rules for relations between states. "Integrity and inviolability of territorial borders" (Axworthy, 2011:1) have long been fundamental principles of international diplomacy. The principle of sovereignty embodies the "legal identity of a state in international law" (ICISS, 2001:12) and is laid down in Art. 2(1) of the UN Charter. As stated by Ayooob (2002:81), "international order can be maintained only if states respect each other's sovereignty". Sovereignty is frequently connected to the principle of non-intervention. The R2P framework is revolutionary in the sense that it proposes a reinterpretation of state sovereignty. R2P does not aim to "replace the concept of sovereignty but [R2P] re-sets its application" (Axworthy, 2011:1). R2P reinterprets sovereignty as a "necessary concept in global governance, but with its benefits come responsibility as well" (Axworthy, 2011:1). As pointed out by Badescu (2010:4), "state sovereignty entails responsibility and, therefore, each state has a responsibility to protect its citizens from mass killings and other gross violations of their rights". Sovereignty is often contested since it hinders states from pressing key issues with other states. Badescu (2010:167) even goes as far as to claim that sovereignty can act as a "shield behind which states can hide to commit mass atrocities". UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan once famously asked "if humanitarian intervention is, indeed an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity?" (Annan, 2000).

The reinterpretation of R2P of 'sovereignty as a responsibility' is revolutionary. It is important to note that this reinterpretation of sovereignty reflects a "shift in the culture of sovereignty from one of impunity to one of accountability and responsibility of states in light of their obligation to protect" (ICISS, 2001:41).

1.2.1.2. Principle of Human rights

Promotion of human rights is rooted in the foundations of the UN. Many treaties, conventions and declarations reaffirm the willingness of the UN to protect civilians from war and genocide. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) of 1948 was the first landmark event that affirmed the UN's dedication to upholding the worth and dignity of every person. The UDHR is important because "it is the first UN document to state that the individuals have a right to protection by the

international community, as opposed to being protected by their own state” (Badescu, 2010:29). The dedication to a non-discriminatory and equal approach to human rights was reaffirmed by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide that rules that genocide is made into a matter of universal jurisdiction. The UN World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in 1993 and the 1997 Rome Statute that established the International Criminal Court also show the commitment of the UN to uphold human rights. With the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC), people that committed war crimes and crimes against humanity can be held accountable.

1.3 Definition of R2P

The idea of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is based on two core principles. The first principle rules that sovereignty implies both a right and a responsibility. By signing the UN Charter a state accepts the responsibilities of UN membership. It is the primary responsibility of a state to protect and secure its people. In the framework of R2P, state sovereignty is reinterpreted not only as a right but mainly as a responsibility. As pointed out by Badescu (2010:4) “Each state has a responsibility to protect its citizens from mass killings and other gross violations of their rights. If that state is unable or unwilling to carry out that function, the state abrogates its sovereignty, and the responsibility to protect falls to the international community”. The responsibility of the international community to act is laid down in the second principle that rules that “where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect” (ICISS, 2001:XI). The Responsibility to Protect principle can be defined as follows: “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 only as a last resort” (Badescu, 2010:6).

1.4 Evolution of Responsibility to Protect

During the 54th session of the United Nations General Assembly in September 1999, Secretary-General Kofi Annan recalled the failings of the international community to protect the people in Kosovo and Rwanda and called upon the international community to find common ground in upholding the principle of human security. In his speech Annan challenged member states to prevent ‘another Rwanda’. In the 2000 Millennium Report to the General Assembly Kofi Annan stated that “(...) 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 offend every precept of our common humanity?” (Annan, 2000).

The Canadian government was the first to respond to the Secretary-General’s challenge. It proposed the establishment of an independent commission: the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). The ICISS was launched in September 2000 and was designed to “build a broader understanding of the problem of reconciling intervention for human protection purposes and sovereignty; more specifically, it was to try to develop a global political consensus on how to move from polemics – and often paralysis – towards action within the international system, particularly through the United Nations” (ICISS, 2011:2). The ICISS was an independent commission, composed of panel members from Australia, Canada, the US, Russia, Germany and Switzerland. The concept of Responsibility to Protect was introduced by Frances Deng, the Representative of the UN Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) at that time. When the adoption of R2P came closer, there were also increasing concerns about the potential abuse of R2P for other reasons than the protection of civilians. The concerns were mainly expressed

after the US invasion in Iraq, when R2P was used as a justification for intervention. The ICISS report was brought out shortly after the 9/11 attacks. Therefore it was often (mis)interpreted as a “sophisticated legitimization mechanism for intervention” (Badescu, 2010:10).

The 2004 report of the UN High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, could take away most of the concerns and set the criteria for the use of R2P. The High Level Panel was composed of members from France, Norway, the UK, Russia and the US. This report states that “there is a growing recognition that the issue is not the ‘right to intervene’ of any state, but the ‘responsibility to protect’ of every state when it comes to people suffering from catastrophe - mass murder and rape, ethnic cleansing by forcible expulsion and terror, and deliberate starvation and exposure to disease” (HLPTCC, 2004:65). This report and the 2005 UN Secretary General’s report *In Larger Freedom* endorsed the establishment of the R2P principle and laid the base for the adaptation of the R2P principle at the 2005 UN World Summit.

At the 2005 World Summit, members of the UN committed themselves to the three pillars of R2P. The first pillar is the Responsibility to Prevent, as described in paragraph 1.6.1. The second pillar presents the “responsibility of the international community to assist states in fulfilling their national obligation” (Badescu, 2010:7), also known as the Responsibility to React, as described in paragraph 1.6.2. The third and final pillar rules that the international community also has a Responsibility to Rebuild, as laid out in paragraph 1.6.3. Paragraphs 138 and 139 of the World Summit Report rule that it is not only the responsibility of the state to protect its population but also the responsibility of the international community to use peaceful, humanitarian and coercive measures if a state fails to do so. In April 2006, the UNSC made its first official reference to the responsibility to protect in Resolution 1674 on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict. This resolution “reaffirms the provisions of paragraphs 138 and 139 of the World Summit Report regarding the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity” (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, n.d.).

The 2009 report of the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon, *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect*, was a step-by-step strategy for the implementation of R2P in national legislation. During the 2009 General Assembly debate this UN Secretary-General’s report was discussed and the first UN resolution on the Responsibility to Protect was adopted on September 14, 2009, in resolution A/RES/63/308.

1.5 Changing context

The coming into being of R2P should be seen in a changing context that is dominated by a global and borderless thinking. As Axworthy (2011:2) noted, “it is an environment which demands a new paradigm of understanding and response”. After the Cold War there has been a shift from wars that are increasingly being fought *within* states rather than *between* states. Over the last decades, wars thus became increasingly intra-state rather than inter-state. Non-state actors thus play an increasing role in many conflicts. Therefore new threats such as genocide, civil war and terrorism need to be addressed. Axworthy (2011:2) refers to Kofi Annan who expressed his concerns and the “need for international intervention to protect innocent people even if it meant challenging the sacredness of sovereignty”. Axworthy also points out that wars have caused increasingly more civilian casualties, cross territorial boundaries and often have a spillover effect.

This argument has also been made by Mary Kaldor (1999) who made a distinction between ‘old wars’ and ‘new wars’. These so-called ‘new wars’ explain the “recent shift in focus from national security to human security” (Axworthy, 2011:2). The increased understanding that security threats go

across borders asks for a renewed understanding of sovereignty and requires a new strategy in which the principle of human security and protection of civilians becomes increasingly important. Members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) came to the understanding that “internal conflicts constitute a threat, not just to states internally, but also to international peace and security” (Vlasic, 2011:160). Moreover, it should be seen in the “growing framework of international laws, conventions, treaties and agreements that sets limits on the supreme authority any government has over a given territory” (Axworthy, 2011:2). Vlasic summarizes this changing context as follows: “(...) the idea that sovereigns have certain responsibilities to their citizens, that coercive force should be used only as a last resort, and that the international community should attempt to rebuild war-torn nations after humanitarian interventions” (Vlasic, 2011:168). R2P thus proposes a reinterpretation of the concept of sovereignty and reformulates sovereignty as a responsibility.

As lined out above, the rise of the R2P principle should be seen in a context in which there is a “growing awareness that a crisis within any given state could have regional or international spillover effects and that turning a blind eye could lead to deleterious outcomes” (Axworthy, 2011:9). The R2P principle is thus directly in line with the collective security theory that presupposes that global cooperation efforts are necessary in order to preserve security. R2P can thus be seen as a consequence of the collective security theory. The main example of the possible consequences of turning a blind eye is the genocide in Rwanda in 1994. Heinbecker referred to it as the “worst single failure of the UN” (Heinbecker, 2010:114). The mandate of the UN did not provide the international community with enough means to protect the Rwandan population and almost a million men, women and children were murdered. This makes one wonder, “What (...) if the international community was faced with another Rwanda? R2P shaped itself as the answer to this question.” (Badescu, 2010:4).

1.6 Dimensions of R2P

R2P consists of three dimensions that were adopted in paragraphs 138 and 139 of the World Summit Report of 2005. R2P consists of the Responsibility to Prevent a catastrophe, preferably in an early stage. If this cannot be realized, there is the Responsibility to React. Reaction can take all kinds of forms, ranging from diplomatic measures to the use of force, only as a last resort. The Responsibility to Rebuild encloses the responsibility to provide assistance with regard to recovery, reconstruction and reconciliation.

1.6.1. The Responsibility to Prevent

One of the things that the ICISS attempted to do when it established the principle of R2P, was to “close the gap between rhetorical support for prevention and tangible commitment” (ICISS, 2001:19) on prevention of the four crimes. The ICISS wholeheartedly endorsed the “need to do much better on prevention and to exhaust prevention options before rushing to embrace intervention” (ICISS report, 2001:19). The preventive aspect of R2P is deemed as the most crucial dimension since successful preventive efforts can reduce, and maybe even eliminate, a reaction in the form of an intervention. The ICISS Report rules that “prevention options should always be exhausted before intervention is contemplated, and more commitment and resources must be devoted to it” (ICISS Report, 2001:xi).

First and foremost, the prevention of the four crimes is the responsibility of sovereign states. The commitment of states to secure and protect its citizens is the basis for successful conflict prevention. The commitment of the states can be shown by “efforts to ensure accountability and

good governance, protect human rights, promote social and economic development and ensure a fair distribution of resources” (ICISS, 2011:19). While recognizing that the prevention of conflict is primarily a national affair, the report also stresses that the failure of conflict prevention can have “wide international consequences and costs” (ICISS, 2011:19). Prevention can come in different forms that vary from international aid, humanitarian support, judicial assistance, mediation and reconciliatory efforts. It also includes punitive measures such as economic sanctions and trade restrictions.

The importance of conflict prevention in the United Nations is laid down in several resolutions that were adopted by the UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council. These mechanisms are, amongst others, the *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations* (United Nations General Assembly, 2000), and the *Report of the Secretary-General on Prevention of Armed Conflict* (United Nations General Assembly, 2001). As pointed out in the ICISS Report (2001:20) a more effective preventive approach is by far less expensive if compared to the huge amounts of money that are spent on conflict management.

1.6.2 The Responsibility to React

When prevention is failing or cannot contain a situation, there is the second dimension of R2P, which is the Responsibility to React. It occurs first and foremost when states themselves are unable or unwilling to ensure the safety and protection of its citizens. The reaction of the international community is thus based on the “failure of that state to meet its responsibilities as a sovereign member of the international community” (Badescu, 2010:5). In this case additional measures of the international community are required. These measures can take different forms and are mainly coercive measures like political, economic and judicial action. Only in extreme cases, these coercive measures can include military action. Yet, “less intrusive and coercive measures should always be considered before more coercive and intrusive ones are applied” (ICISS, 2011:29). Military intervention can only be contemplated if tough threshold conditions are satisfied. The barrier to use political, economic and judicial action is set lower, since it does not require the grave circumstances that are needed to justify military intervention. Besides the threshold conditions, there are additional (precautionary) conditions that have to be satisfied. As stated earlier, the use of non-military measures is preferable to the use of military force, but it should be noted that these coercive measures can also be indiscriminate and have to be used with extreme care (ICISS, 2001:29). The rule of thumb here is not to do more harm than good.

The decision to intervene military should thus only be made in extreme and exceptional cases that are determined by several conditions. The ICISS Report rules that military intervention is justified “when all order within a state has broken down or when civil conflict and repression are so violent that civilians are threatened with massacre, genocide or ethnic cleansing on a large scale” (ICISS, 2001:31). The ICISS Report lists six criteria that have to be fulfilled before military intervention for human protection purposes can be executed. These criteria originate from Augustine’s just war (bellum iustum) theory that states that three types of criteria have to be fulfilled for a war to be justified. These criteria are *ius ad bellum* (criteria that have to be fulfilled before one goes to war), *ius in bello* (during a war) and *ius post bellum* (after a war for reconciliation) (Verweij, 2013). The criteria that are laid out in the ICISS Report directly descent from this just war theory that dates back to Augustine of Hippo and Thomas Aquinas. The criteria that are listed in the ICISS criteria are; 1) right authority, 2) just cause, 3) right intention, 4) last resort, 5) proportional means and, 6) reasonable

prospects. This paragraph discusses these criteria and applies these criteria to the cases of Libya and Syria in paragraph 3.2.

Right authority

The right authority that is responsible for authorizing the use of force is the United Nations Security Council. The ways in which requests for intervention can be made are threefold. A member state can formally request authorization for an intervention, the UNSC can take its own initiative and raise the matter in the Council or the United Nations Secretary-General can raise a call for an intervention under Article 99 of the UN Charter (ICISS, 2001:xii). The five Permanent members of the UNSC (Russia, China, the US, France and United Kingdom) hold veto power. If the UNSC cannot find agreement, there are two alternatives. First, the United Nations General Assembly can hold an Emergency Special Session under the so-called 'Uniting for Peace' procedure. This can be done when members of the UNSC opt for an intervention without UNSC authorization. A second option could be that regional or sub-regional organizations (like the League of Arab States or the African Union) can opt for the use of force under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter.

Just cause

The just cause principle is defined as the "kind of harm [that] is sufficient to trigger a military intervention overriding the non-intervention principle" (ICISS, 2001:32). Military intervention for human protection is legitimized when it can halt or avert "large scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product either of deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or large scale "ethnic cleansing", actual or apprehended, whether carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape" (ICISS, 2001:32). In case either one of these or both conditions are satisfied, the decision to intervene is considered to be based on a just cause. Since these conditions can still be broadly interpreted, it is important to see what they include and what they exclude. These conditions include the following "conscience-shocking situations" (p. 32): the "threat or occurrence of large scale loss of life, whether the product of genocidal content or not, and whether or not involving state action; different manifestations of ethnic cleansing (...); crimes against humanity and violations of the law of war as defined in the Geneva Conventions (...); situations of state collapse and the resultant exposure of the population to mass starvation and/or civil war and overwhelming natural and environmental catastrophes, where the state concerned is either unwilling or unable to cope, or call for assistance, and significant loss of life is occurring or threatened" (p. 33). The ICISS Report does not quantify 'large scale'. It does however foresee in military action as a legitimate and an anticipatory measure when there is clear evidence of likely large scale killing. Without this possibility, the international community would be placed for a moral and ethical dilemma in which it is forced not to take any action before the number of casualties reaches a threshold and genocide begins. Situations that are excluded to fulfill the 'just cause' condition and do not justify the use of coercive or military action are threefold. These are "human rights violations falling short of outright killing or ethnic cleansing (...); the overthrow of a democratic government and (...); the use of military force by a state to rescue its own nationals on foreign territory" (p. 34).

Right intention

The third condition for military intervention is that military force is used for the right intention. The ICISS (2001:35) rules that the "primary purpose of the intervention must be to halt or avert human suffering". The alteration of borders, advancing a particular actor in the conflict, occupation of

territory or the overthrow of a regime are not legitimate objectives that can be justified. Yet, it has to be noted that there is a thin line between what is justified and what is not. The overthrow of a regime is not a legitimate objective, but disabling the capacity of a regime to harm its own population can be inherent in the protection of civilians. The question is where to draw the line and how to prevent that unintended consequences can lead to a wider interpretation of the mandate. This will vary from case to case. In order to ensure that there is an actual 'right intention', military intervention cannot take place on a unilateral basis but only on a multilateral, collective basis.

Last resort

Fourth criterion is that the use of military force is used as last resort only. This means that "every diplomatic and non-military avenue for the prevention or peaceful resolution of the humanitarian crisis must have been explored" (ICISS, 2001:36). Since there is not always the time to literally carry out every available option, the ICISS ruled that "there must be reasonable ground for believing that, in all the circumstances, if the measure had been attempted it would not have succeeded" (p.36).

Proportional means

This criterion ensures that the means of the military intervention are in line with the purpose of the intervention and that the means are limited to what is strictly necessary to achieve the goal of the intervention. The ICISS Report states that "the scale, duration and intensity of the planned military intervention should be the minimum necessary to secure the humanitarian objective in question" (ICISS report, 2001:37). Obviously, the military action should be in line with international humanitarian law.

Reasonable prospects

The final criterion that has to be taken into account for military intervention to be justified is a reasonable prospect of success in "halting or averting the atrocities or suffering that triggered the intervention in the first place" (ICISS, 2001:37). One should thoroughly research the consequences of action and inaction. It has to be noted that a military intervention can have some unintended consequences. Therefore an analysis should be made in which the consequences of military action are not worse than when there is no military intervention carried out at all. This is in line with the principle of doing no harm. If there are huge risks of further escalation of the conflict, spill-over effects and regional instability, military action cannot be justified.

1.6.3 The Responsibility to Rebuild

The third dimension is the Responsibility to Rebuild. A military intervention comes with certain obligations. One of these obligations is a "genuine commitment to helping to build a durable peace, and promoting good governance and sustainable development" (ICISS, 2001:39). The post-intervention obligations should aim at establishing security, justice, reconciliation and development. Conditions of public security should be established by cooperation between international and local actors. Factors that facilitate a sustainable reconstruction are "the commitment of sufficient funds and resources and close cooperation with local people (...) [as well as] the need for a post-intervention strategy" (p. 39). Security sector reform (SSR), disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), the establishment of a properly functioning judicial system, the establishment of truth- and reconciliation committees and encouraging economic growth are all part of the rebuilding process.

1.7 Critique on R2P

It is always easy to criticize existing mechanisms for their failures and limitations. Nevertheless, R2P is an important new framework that has an enormous potential to grow as a serious and effective mechanism for the international community. R2P is still developing and obviously it has its shortcomings and challenges to face.

The release of the ICISS Report shortly after the 9/11 attack was very unfortunate since R2P has since then often been interpreted as an aggressive mechanism to intervene in other states. Weiss & Bellamy (2004) argue that the preventive aspect of R2P is unrealistic and was only included to lessen the aggressive tone of R2P. When it comes to the Responsibility to Rebuild, it results that there is no specification on who pays for it and maybe even more importantly, it fails to address the root causes of the conflict. The criteria that are formulated in the ICISS Report (2001) and by the UN High-Level Panel (2004) are very flexible and can to a large extent be interpreted along the lines of one's own national interests. The different ideologies in the UNSC make it almost impossible for R2P to succeed. The five permanent members (who possess a highly debatable veto power in R2P situations) vary tremendously in their perceptions of R2P. While China and Russia are fiercely against the R2P principle, the UK and France are its main supporters. Moreover, as also pointed out by Badescu (2010:43), some states are "more equal than others". This results in a selective application of R2P situations that will be the main focus of the next two chapters.

Moreover, there is an interesting paradox between regime change and R2P that might endanger the future use of R2P. After Libya, R2P was heavily criticized for being used to overthrow the Libyan regime. While regime change is not at all the aim of R2P, in some cases (for example in Libya) it remained almost impossible to offer civilian protection without regime change. After all, R2P was used to protect civilians against the atrocities committed by the regime. Luck (2011) explains that regime change "is not the goal of the responsibility to protect (...). The goal is to protect populations. It may be in some cases that the only way to protect populations is to change the regime, but that certainly is not the goal of the R2P per se" (Luck, 2011). This is somewhat paradoxical and should be addressed because this has led to misunderstandings about the limitations of R2P. In the end R2P is not (yet) a legal framework and member states are not legally obligated to act on it. Jeangène Vilmer (2012) points out that "R2P [is] (...) not a legal obligation but a moral and political appeal (...) which is more wishful thinking than reality" (Jeangène Vilmer, 2012). Therefore it remains a normative and highly political framework that is in the end dependent upon political will.

1.8 Perception of R2P by main actors

When the R2P principle was endorsed, all UN member states unanimously accepted their responsibility to protect their citizens from the four crimes (Badescu, 2010:6). Yet, in July 2009, when the R2P debate took place in the UN General Assembly, "fears of a potentially negative outcome of the debate loomed" (Badescu, 2010:8). This can mainly be explained because of strong resistance from the President of the UN General Assembly at the time, Father Miguel d'Escoto Brockman from Nicaragua. His skepticism was shared by Venezuela, Egypt, Sudan, Pakistan and Syria. Eventually, only "Venezuela, Cuba, Sudan and Nicaragua directly questioned the 2005 World Summit Agreement and attempted to roll back on R2P" (Badescu, 2010:8). India, Brazil, Nigeria and Japan showed some minor reservations regarding the R2P principle. This paragraph will analyze the positions of the three main actors in this Thesis, namely Russia, the US and France.

1.8.1 Russia

While most of the Western states support the principles and ideas of R2P, Russia takes a different position. Russia is a “fierce proponent of sovereignty and the view that states are masters of their own internal affairs” (Genser et al, 2011:166). Consequently, Russia has a very classical view upon the R2P principle (Depondt, 2013). As was pointed out by Gerrits (2013), R2P does not fit at all with Russia’s foreign policy. Russia’s foreign policy is a Realist policy (with a capital R) aimed at pursuing self-interest and maximizing its own power (Gerrits, 2013). According to Russia’s Realist policy, there is no actor above the state that can dictate a state how to regulate its interactions within that state or with other states. Therefore, the principle of state sovereignty is crucial to Russia. It is argued by Russia that R2P interferes with the principle of sovereignty and therefore it looks upon R2P as a rather useless mechanism. According to Russia, international politics should be based on state sovereignty and other countries should not interfere with domestic politics (Gerrits, 2013). Moreover, Russia fears that the international community would never be consistent in applying the R2P principle and will only use R2P for regime change (Gerrits, 2013). Russia is in favor of putting pressure on regimes using diplomatic means rather than coercive measures and has always taking a skeptical stance towards external intervention in a state’s domestic affairs. However, morally it is hard to disagree with a principle that offers protection for the civilian population against mass atrocity crimes.

Given Russia’s skeptical stance, it was therefore surprising that Russia in September 2009 supported Resolution 1674 on the Responsibility to Protect. Bellamy (2006:152) argues that “Russia (...) shared China’s position that no military intervention should take place without Security Council authorization. Russia argued that the UN was already able to deal with humanitarian crises, and that the R2P risked undermining the UN Charter by opening the door to interventions unauthorized by the council”. In response to this resolution, Russia claimed that “responsibility should be placed initially on national governments” (Vlasic, 2011, p.168) but recognized at the same time that there should also be room for a “timely reaction coming from the UN” (Vlasic, 2011:168). Yet, it should be noted that Russia’s resistance against R2P is paradoxical and hypocrite, since in 2008 Russia invaded Georgia while claiming to protect civilians in South Ossetia. It also invaded Abkhazia while attempting to justify its actions using R2P (The Economist, 2009:65-66). Sergey Lavrov, Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs claimed that “According to our Constitution there is a responsibility to protect (...). So the Constitution of the Russian Federation, the laws of the Russian Federation make it absolutely unavoidable to use to exercise responsibility to protect” (BBC, 2008). This explicit reference to R2P as a constitutional mechanism is remarkable and should be interpreted as merely serving Russia’s national interests at the time. After Libya, Russia fiercely rejected the R2P principle and argues that it was used beyond the mandate and that it was used for regime change in Libya.

1.8.2 The US

For many Western countries the ideals and principles of R2P are very much in line with their national identities and foreign policy. Among these countries are the US, France and the UK, who are regarded as the most capable states, both financially and military, of executing R2P interventions. In previous cases, the US seemed to have preferred “unilateral action [Iraq and Afghanistan], coalitions of the willing [Iraq in 1991], and interventions without UN authorization [Kosovo]” (Badescu, 2010:54). Bellamy (2006) adds that “the US (...) have continuously argued that the need to prevent ‘future Rwanda’s’ implied that unauthorized interventions were not to be entirely overlooked (Bellamy, 2006:152). During the 2009 General Assembly debate on the Responsibility to Protect,

Ambassador Rosemary A. Di Carlo, US Alternative Representative for Special Political Affairs, stated that the US supports the R2P principle and that the US is “determined to work with the international community to prevent and responds to such [mass] atrocities” (USUN Press Release, 2009). Di Carlo stressed the importance of the R2P principle and highlighted that more must be done “to respond effectively to early warning signs” (USUN Press Release, 2009). The use of force should only be used “where prevention fails and a state is manifestly failing its obligations (...) [and] only rarely, and in extremis” (USUN Press Release, 2009). The US sees R2P as an “indispensable mechanism for the effective use of force” (Badescu, 2010:54). Immediately after the adoption of the resolution that supported R2P, the US “expressed support for the Secretary-General’s three pillar approach to R2P and for the need for early warning mechanisms and rapid reaction forces” (Genser et al., 2011:167).

Yet, the role of the US is (like all other countries) determined to a large extent by national interests. “The US stance reflects its perception of the legitimacy of international institutions. 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” (Welsh, 2004:189). Also in the case of the US, the support of R2P seems to be much more reserved since the US was accused of extending R2P beyond the mandate and using it for regime change. The next chapters will give an in-depth analysis of this issue.

1.8.3 France

France (together with the UK) is generally regarded as the “strongest R2P supporter among the five permanent members of the Council” (Badescu, 2010:54). Like many other European states, France had expressed its full support for Resolution 1674 for “prevention as critical to R2P and for the new interpretation of sovereignty as a responsibility” (Vlasic, 2011:168). In the 2009 UN General Assembly Debate on R2P, France recognized the importance of “preventive action (...) [as] a key component of the responsibility to protect” (Lacroix, 2009). France gave its full support to the R2P principle and called upon other states to “fully adhere to the permanent international instruments pertaining to these rights and to collaborate with the institutions associated with them” (Lacroix, 2009). France sees the UN as the only appropriate body to authorize the use of force and argues that (in addition to prevention against the four crimes), France would like to use R2P also in cases of natural disasters where governments refuse the necessary international assistance. France is thus a fierce supporter of an active international community.

1.8.4 R2P in the United Nations Security Council

After a military intervention was carried out in Libya under R2P, for many countries the view upon R2P changed dramatically. It was argued, mainly by China and Russia, that R2P was used for regime change and was stretched far beyond the mandate. As pointed out by Pronk, this brought China and Russia in the position to always veto R2P for the reason that it was misused by NATO in the case of Libya (Pronk, 2013). He stressed very much that it should have been prevented that Russia and China were ever able to take that position in the first place (Pronk, 2013).

The next chapter will delve more into this issue of how the principle of R2P has been discussed in the UNSC in the various meetings on the situation in Libya and Syria. It will analyze the discourse that has been used by Russia, the United States and France to describe the situation in Libya and Syria. Furthermore, the next chapter will examine if and how these countries refer to R2P and whether their discourses show significant differences when discussing Libya and Syria.

Chapter II

Textual analysis of France, the United States and Russia in the United Nations Security Council

2.1 Framework of Critical Discourse Analysis

This paragraph will explain how the research has been conducted. As pointed out by Dankers (2013) and Graauwmans (2007), the process of Critical Discourse Analysis¹ consists of several steps.

Obviously, the first step is to read and analyze the data, in this case the minutes which contain the contributions to the discussion in the Security Council by Russia, the US and France. This analysis is done by thoroughly coding the text, by allocating words that capture the essence of a sentence or short paragraph in one or two words. After making these codes or annotations, the next step is to categorize the data and link and connect comparable codes (Dey, 1993) in order to identify so-called 'family codes'. These 'family codes' are codes that embody the collective meaning of overlapping codes and meanings found in the text. By identifying the most important 'family codes' one can give a clear overview of the account of the data. This research will use the more familiar term 'discourse' instead of 'family codes'. An overview of the analysis of the discourses and how they have been identified, can be found in the Attachment. This Attachment gives a detailed overview of how, based on which codes and quotes, the main discourses have been established and how often they were mentioned by the different actors. It provides an overview of the codes and shows how they are linked to a certain discourse. Visually, this is shown by using different colors that correspond to a discourse of the same color. The number of family codes of a discourse is added and that determines what discourses are identified as the main ones. The number of codes from which the discourses are composed are mentioned in brackets behind the respective discourse.

The Attachment does not only provide an overview of the codes, but it also adds two important aspects to this research. Firstly, it allows not only for a qualitative structure of the analyzed data but also for a quantitative structuring. It thus adds an extra dimension to the Critical Discourse Analysis. Second, it shows how the discourses have developed over time and how some discourses became more dominant over time, while the frequency of others declined as time has passed by. However, it should be noted that, since this was not the aim of the research, this research did not focus on drawing conclusions from how changes of discourses over time within the meetings on Libya or Syria.

This chapter separately discusses the main discourses for Russia, the US and France. In explaining the types of discourse, the main features of the discourse will be discussed and they will be supported by relevant quotes (Graauwmans, 2007). A scheme that includes the discourses, main features and relevant quotes will give a clear visual overview of the main findings. In the final paragraph the findings of the analysis of the speeches of the three countries will be compared, so that conclusions can be drawn with regard to the characterization of the type of discourse that was used in the case of Libya and Syria.

2.2 Analysis of speeches of Russia, US and France in the case of Libya

In order to give a complete and thorough overview of the discourse that was used that led to the

¹ This framework is based on the Qualitative Methods course as taught at Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. It follows all the steps that were laid out in this course and gives a visual overview of the main findings in a scheme. In doing so, it follows the same logic as was done by Graauwmans, 2007.

adoption of Resolution 1970 and 1973, multiple documents have been analyzed. The documents that were analyzed were the minutes of official meetings of the United Nations Security Council between its first meeting regarding the situation in Libya at February 22, 2011, until the adoption of Resolution 1973 on March 17, 2011. In total there have been four meetings of the UNSC on Libya in the period that was researched. From the first outbreak of violence in Libya, the members of the Security Council were deeply concerned about the situation in Libya. This was reflected in the joint press statement in which the Council issued fifteen kinds of measures that reflected their grave concern. Paragraph 2.2.1 will provide the background on the two resolutions that were adopted. In the following paragraphs the discourse of Russia (2.2.2), the US (2.2.3) and France (2.2.4) on the situation on Libya will be analyzed.

2.2.1 Resolutions in the UNSC on Libya

Two resolutions were adopted that led to the military intervention in Libya. Resolution 1970 and Resolution 1973 were both adopted within one month after the first meeting in the UNSC regarding the situation in Libya. They followed after the adoption of a Press Statement on February 22, 2011, in which the members of the Security Council expressed their grave concern over the situation in Libya and called upon the Government of Libya to meet its responsibility to protect its population (SC/10180). The content of both resolutions will be discussed in detail in the following two paragraphs.

2.2.1.1 Resolution 1970

Resolution 1970 (2011) was unanimously adopted in the UNSC on February 26, 2011. In the resolution, the Security Council expresses grave concern on the situation in Libya and the members unanimously condemned the violence against civilians. It recalls “the Libyan authorities’ responsibility to protect its population” (S/RES/1970). The resolution refers to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations that rules that under Article 41 the UNSC “*demand*s an immediate end to the violence and calls for steps to fulfil the legitimate demands of the population” (S/RES/1970). The resolution explicitly states the word ‘civilians’ or ‘civilian population’ five times. There can be multiple explanations, but it shows that the conflict in Libya is not so much seen as a conflict between armed government troops against an armed opposition but more as a one-sided conflict in which armed government troops simply fight against civilians. Furthermore, the Council urges the Libyan authorities to take certain steps that ensure the respect of human rights and international humanitarian human law. Additionally, the resolution rules that the situation in Libya will be referred to the International Criminal Court (ICC), the establishment of an arms embargo, a travel ban and an asset freeze of the Gaddafi regime. Resolution 1970 thus establishes several non-military means in an attempt to stop the “gross and systematic violation of human rights (...) and violence against the civilian population made from the highest level of the Libyan government” (S/RES/1970).

2.2.1.2 Resolution 1973

In addition to the peaceful means that were proposed in Resolution 1970, Resolution 1973 adds the use of coercive means against the Gaddafi regime. These coercive means take the form of a no-fly zone and a ban on flights. These coercive means that were adopted in Resolution 1973, paved the way for the establishment of a no-fly zone in Libya. Resolution 1973 (2011) was adopted by the Security Council on March 17, 2011. Ten members voted in favor of this resolution: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, France, Gabon, Lebanon, Nigeria, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. None of the member states

voted against the resolution, but there were five abstentions: Brazil, China, Germany, India, and the Russian Federation. Resolution 1973 reiterated “the responsibility of the Libyan authorities to protect the Libyan population and *reaffirming* that parties to armed conflicts bear the primary responsibility to take all feasible steps to ensure the protection of civilians” (S/RES/1973). In the resolution it is stated that the “widespread and systematic attacks (...) against the civilian population may amount to crimes against humanity” (S/RES/1973). Crimes against humanity are considered as one of the four mass atrocities against which R2P aims to offer protection.

The protection of civilians seems to be a central concept in Resolution 1973. There are seven explicit references to “protection of civilians” (S/RES/1973) and six implicit references that express “grave concern at the heavy civilian casualties” and the “widespread and systematic attacks against the civilian population” (S/RES/1973). This is not very surprising since Resolution 1970 already made five explicit references to the position of ‘civilians’ and the ‘civilian population’, showing a concern for their safety. The resolution “condemn[s] the violence against civilians” and calls for “a complete end to violence and all attacks against (...) civilians” (S/RES/1973). A central concept in the discussions on Libya is clearly the protection of civilians. It is often explicitly mentioned by Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon, members of the UNSC, as well as the Arab League and the African Union. This makes the protection of civilians a fundamental concept around which the situation in Libya is interpreted. Moreover, it is important to note that it is assumed that an intervention in Libya will contribute to the protection of civilians. It is thus expected that the risks of an intervention for the civilian population outweigh the consequences if there was no intervention at all.

2.2.2 Russia

As already pointed out in the previous Chapter, Russia is often considered as one of the main critics of foreign intervention. It greatly attaches to the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention. Russia’s Realist policy assumes that there is no actor above the state that can dictate how a state should regulate its domestic politics. Russia advanced these issues repeatedly in the UNSC meetings but abstained from using its veto power on Resolution 1970 as well as on Resolution 1973. Resolution 1973 is considered to be mainly aimed at the protection of civilians. Despite some of Russia’s concerns about the principle of sovereignty and the limits of the use of force, Russia did not use its veto power against Resolution 1973. Russia condemns the use of force against the Libyan civilian population and also stresses that war and destabilization of the region should be prevented. The main discourses of Russia regarding the situation in Libya have been identified as follows:

Discourse 1: Prevent war and avoid destabilization of the region (5)

Discourse 2: Condemnation of the use of force against civilians (4)

Discourse 3: Adoption of Resolution 1970 (3)

Discourse 4: Problems with Resolution 1973 and the fear of excessive use of force (3)

Discourse 5: Territorial integrity and sovereignty (1)

Discourse 1: Prevent war and avoid destabilization of the region

Russia advocated a settlement of the situation in Libya through political means. Russia did so in order to “prevent a full-scale war and to preserve Libya as a united, sovereign State with territorial integrity” (S/PV.6491). Russia was convinced that an immediate ceasefire could be the solution to a long-term stabilization which it aspires. Establishing peace and security through military intervention

is not in line with Russia's foreign policy. Russia argued that "upholding peace and security throughout the entire region of North Africa and the Middle East will suffer [because of military intervention]. Such destabilization effects must be avoided" (S/PV.6498).

On a discursive level, a clear example of intertextuality can be found in the reasoning of Russia that it is convinced that the use of force will lead to a full-scale civil war, will worsen the situation and will further destabilize the region. A direct relation is drawn between the use of force and various kinds of negative outcomes. On the broader social level, this might be an explanation for the reluctance of Russia to support a resolution that fails to exclude the use of force in Libya.

Discourse 2: Condemnation of the use of force against civilians

During the third meeting of the UNSC, on February 26, 2011, Ambassador Churkin expressed his "serious concern over the events taking place in Libya (...) [and condemned] the use of military force against peaceful demonstrators" (S/PV.6491). He argued that it was "absolutely unacceptable" and called for "an immediate end to such actions" (id.). He urged the Libyan authorities "to comply with the demands of the international community, including the League of Arab States and the African Union" (id.). On March 17, 2011, Churkin reaffirmed Russia's position that the use of force of the regime against Libyan civilians was "clearly unacceptable" and should "immediately and unconditionally cease" (S/PV.6498). Moreover, Russia stated that the protection of the civilian population should be ensured.

Discourse 3: Adoption of Resolution 1970

Russia adopted Resolution 1970 because it aimed to address the situation in Libya through political means (only). The resolution imposed "targeted, clearly expressed, restrictive measures with regard to those guilty of violence against the civilian population. However, it does not enjoin sanctions, even indirect, for forceful interference in Libya's affairs, which would make the situation worse" (S/PV.6491). Russia made clear that it aimed to "find a peaceful way out of the current crisis" (id.).

Discourse 4: Problems with Resolution 1973 and the fear of excessive use of force

Russia is very sceptical of external intervention in domestic affairs and therefore it is not surprising that Russia complained that work on Resolution 1973 "was not in keeping with standard practice" and that a "range of questions (...) remained unanswered" (S/PV.6498). These questions and concerns related to the enforcement of a no-fly zone, the rules of engagement and the limits on the use of force (id.). Russia claimed that the draft resolution "was morphing before our very eyes, transcending the initial concept as stated by the League of Arab States. Provisions were introduced into the text that could potentially open the door to large-scale military intervention" (id.). Moreover, Russia spoke of the "excessive use of outside force" (id.). Russia regretted that "the passion of some Council members for methods involving force prevailed" (id.) and called this "most unfortunate and regrettable" (id.). As pointed out previously, since Russia greatly attaches to the principle of sovereignty, R2P is considered a rather useless mechanism. To a certain extent this is also because Russia fears that the application of R2P will be inconsistent and that it will be used as a pretext for regime change.

Discourse 5: Territorial integrity and sovereignty

As already pointed out in the previous chapter, the respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty lies at the heart of Russia's Realist foreign policy. In the UNSC meetings on Libya, Russia stated that

the Council should “preserve Libya as a united, sovereign State with territorial integrity” (S/PV.6491). Yet, Russia did not see a threat to sovereignty by adopting Resolution 1970 and 1973.

Russia on Libya

| Type of Discourse | Key features | Examples |
|--|---|---|
| Discourse 1: Prevent war and avoid destabilization of the region | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Russia advocates a political solution to the situation in Libya - Russia also calls for an immediate ceasefire since it regards this as the best option for a long-term stabilization - Russia assumes that the use of force will lead to further destabilization and possibly a full-scale civil war | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “prevent a full-scale war” (S/PV.6491) - “destabilization effects must be avoided” (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 2: Condemnation of the use of force against civilians | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns of situation and call upon Libyan authorities to end violence against Libyan population | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “serious concern over the events taking place in Libya (...) [and condemn[s] the use of military force against peaceful demonstrators” (S/PV.6491) - urges the Libyan authorities “to comply with the demands of the international community” (S/PV.6491) |
| Discourse 3: Adoption of Resolution 1970 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Russia adopted Resolution 1970 because it addressed the situation in Libya through political means only - The use of force is unacceptable for Russia | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resolution imposed “targeted, clearly expressed, restrictive measures with regard to those guilty of violence against the civilian population. However, it does not enjoin sanctions, even indirect, for forceful interference in Libya’s affairs, which would make the situation worse” (S/PV.6491) |
| Discourse 4: Problems with Resolution 1973 and the fear of excessive use of force | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Russia has addressed questions and concerns regarding the no-fly zone, rules of engagement and the limits on the use of force - Resolution transcended the concept as proposed by the League of Arab States - Fear excessive of force (that Russia fiercely opposes) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work on Resolution 1973 “was not in keeping with standard practice” and that a “range of questions (...) remained unanswered” (S/PV.6498) - The draft resolution “was morphing before our very eyes, transcending the initial concept as stated by the League of Arab States. Provisions were introduced into the text that could potentially open the door to large-scale military intervention” (S/PV.6498) - “The passion of some Council members for methods involving force prevailed” (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 5: Territorial integrity and sovereignty | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The concept of sovereignty and territorial integrity are (and have always been) crucial for Russia | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “preserve Libya as a united, sovereign State with territorial integrity” (S/PV.6491) |

2.2.3 The United States

The speeches of the United States regarding the situation in Libya can quite easily be recapitulated in concerns on the humanitarian situation in Libya. The atrocities of the Gaddafi regime against its own population are strongly condemned and the situation is very much framed as a situation of ‘good versus evil’. The US has often stressed the “need to prevent future Rwanda’s” (Bellamy, 2006:152) and to a certain extent this is also how the situation in Libya is being approached. Consequently, the US argued that the international community should take its responsibility in protecting the civilian population. Furthermore, the US stressed the importance of accountability. The following discourses reflect the position of the US towards Libya:

Discourse 1: Humanitarian situation in Libya (8)

Discourse 2: Atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime (5)

Discourse 3: Role of international community to protect the civilian population (4)

Discourse 4: Accountability of the Gaddafi’s regime for its actions (3)

Discourse 1: Humanitarian situation in Libya

The US referred numerous times to the “human rights and fundamental freedoms” of the Libyan civilian population (S/PV.6491). The US stressed the “Libyan people’s universal rights” (id.) and the fact that the Libyan crisis is “about people’s ability to shape their own future” (id.). The Security Council should “end (...) violence and attacks against civilians” (S/PV.6498) and respond “to the Libyan people’s cry for help” (id.).

The ‘cry for help’ is a clear example of the power *in* discourse that sets the tone in which the reader should interpret the text. ‘The cry for help’ immediately sets the tone of a Libyan population that is completely helpless and calls upon the international community to help them. This call for action is not explicitly mentioned in the discourse, but it certainly is present and therefore it is referred to as power in discourse. These quotes clearly reflect the philosophy of the US that is very much aimed at the respect for human rights and a stable humanitarian situation.

Discourse 2: Atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime

The US stressed the atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime against innocent civilians. The US accused the Libyan government of “attack[ing] its own people” (S/PV.6491). The US claimed that Gaddafi was using “mass violence against its own people” (id.). Moreover it was argued that the Gaddafi regime “grossly and systematically abuse the most fundamental human rights of Libya’s people” (S/PV.6498).

Discourse 3: Role of the international community to protect the civilian population

As pointed out in Chapter 1, the US is a key supporter of R2P since the ideals and principles of R2P correspond to the foreign policy of the US when it comes to civilian’s protection. The US argued that in case of mass atrocities, it is the responsibility of the international community to protect civilians. The Security Council should “condemn the violence, (...) stop the killing [and the] slaughter [of] civilians” (S/PV.6491). The US stated that it is important to find unity within the council. “When atrocities are being committed against innocents, the international community must speak with one voice” (S/PV.6491).

This is an example of building politics (Gee, 2010). Building politics is done through making the social good relevant in the operative discourse. This means that the atrocities that are being committed are directly linked with the idea that there must be unity within the international

community, which is thus proposed as a ‘solution’ to the fight against atrocities. Moreover, it is also an example of intertextuality because it is a seemingly neutral, but in fact highly political statement. It is political because calling for the unity of the international community can be seen as a pretext for calling upon further action.

Discourse 4: Accountability of the Gaddafi’s regime for its actions

The US stressed the importance of pursuing accountability when atrocity crimes are committed. It claimed that “Libyan leaders will be held accountable for violating these rights and for failing to meet their most basic responsibilities to their people” (S/PV.6491). In addition, the US pursued “genuine accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity by referring the situation to the International Criminal Court” (S/PV.6498).

The US on Libya

| Type of discourse | Key features | Examples |
|--|--|--|
| Discourse 1: Humanitarian situation in Libya | - The US referred numerous times to the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the Libyan civilian population | - The US praised the fact that the UNSC “responded to the Libyan people’s cry for help” and to “protect innocent civilians”, [attempted to bring an] “end to violence and attacks against civilians” (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 2: Atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime | - The US stressed the atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime against the innocent civilians | - Libyan government “attack its own people” and Gaddafi using “mass violence against its own people” (S/PV.6491) - “grossly and systematically abuse the most fundamental human rights of Libya’s people” (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 3: Role of international community to protect the civilian population | - In case of mass atrocities the international community it is the responsibility of the international community to protect civilians - Protection of civilians in Libya as a fundamental concept - Legal to act under Chapter VII of the UN Charter | - “When atrocities are being committed against innocents, the international community must speak with one voice” (S/PV.6491) - “condemn the violence, (...) stop the killing [and the] slaughter [of] civilians” (S/PV.6491) |
| Discourse 4: Accountability of the Gaddafi’s regime for its actions | - Pursuing accountability when atrocity crimes are being committed - Referral to International Criminal Court (ICC) | - “Libyan leaders will be held accountable for violating these rights and for failing to meet their most basic responsibilities to their people” (S/PV.6491) - “genuine accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity by referring the situation to the International Criminal Court” (S/PV.6498) |

2.2.4 France

France has always been one of the main supporters of humanitarian intervention and the protection of civilians. Therefore, it is not surprising that France took the initiative in proposing Resolutions 1970 and 1973. Moreover, it encouraged other members of the Security Council to adopt the resolutions and positioned itself in the Security Council as one of the main supports of intervention. It stressed the atrocities of the Gaddafi regime that were committed against innocent civilians. France narrated the situation as a clear 'good vs. bad' in which the international community had a leading role in protecting the Libyan civilian population. This was also placed in a broader context in which the situation was deteriorating every day; the crisis in Libya could not be regarded apart from the Arab Spring that was changing history. The analysis led to the identification of the following discourses:

Discourse 1: Atrocities against innocent civilians (6)

Discourse 2: Gaddafi regime as brutal and violent (4)

Discourse 3: International community as protectors of Libyan civilian population (3)

Discourse 4: Responsibility to Protect (2)

Discourse 5: The time is now (2)

Discourse 6: Historical event (placing it in a broader context) (2)

Discourse 1: Atrocities against innocent civilians

France stressed the enshrining humanitarian situation in Libya and it was argued that innocent civilians were the victims of the "brutal and bloody repression" (S/PV.6491) of the Gaddafi regime. Moreover, France repeatedly pointed to the fact that "the High Commissioner for Human rights said (...) crimes against humanity may be committed in Libya" (S/PV.6491 and S/PV.6498). Therefore, France called for the "immediate stop to the use of force against the civilian population" (S/PV.6491). France claimed that the regime was guilty of "unacceptable violence committed against their own people, who have the right to democracy, freedom and justice" (id.). Furthermore, the situation in Libya was approached from a so-called crisis frame in which "impunity is no longer an option" (id.). The crisis frame served to distinguish the current situation from a 'normal' situation in which different rules apply and a new (and often radical) approach as a solution is necessary.

Discourse 2: Gaddafi regime as brutal and violent

In all its speeches, France very much stressed the brutal and violent acts that were committed by the Gaddafi regime. France claimed that the force used by the Gaddafi regime was deliberately directed at its own population and was therefore unacceptable. The Gaddafi regime also topped the use of force with more threatening statements. It was said by France that in Libya "(...) the will of the people has been crushed by the murderous repression lead by Colonel Al-Qadhafi's regime against his own people" (S/PV.6498). Furthermore, France argued that Gaddafi "choose to turn against his own people" [and] "has chosen to commit atrocities" (S/PV.6491). These quotes clearly stress that it was the intention of the Gaddafi regime to deliberately use violence against its own people, while intentionally ignoring the option to abstain from using violence.

Discourse 3: International community as protectors of Libyan civilian population

After repeatedly having outlined the enshrining humanitarian situation in Libya, France stressed the role of the international community in protecting the Libyan civilian population. The concept of 'protection of civilians' is often mentioned by France. Additionally, France expressed the hope to

“help each people to build its own future” (S/PV.6498). Moreover, France stated that “we must not give free reign to warmongers; we must not abandon civilian populations, the victims of brutal repression, to their fate; we must not allow the rule of law and international morality to be trampled underfoot” (id.).

This quote clearly reflects a polyphone structure. By first telling what something is not (‘We must not...’) one does already acknowledge that this is also a possibility that sets the tone in which something should be interpreted. The quote also employs intertextuality by relating two non-related events (the rule of law and warmongers) in an attempt to build significance. As reflected in France’s statements, it was assumed that it is not only the duty of the international community to put an end to the violence against Libyan civilians but that the international community is also capable of successfully doing so.

Discourse 4: Responsibility to Protect

One of the main reasons why the international community should protect the civilian population in Libya can be found in the principle of Responsibility to Protect. As pointed out in Chapter 1, France (together with the UK) is seen as the strongest supporter of R2P. France made many direct and indirect references to R2P in its speeches. France often recalled “the responsibility of each State to protect its own population and of the international community to intervene when States fail in their duty” (S/PV.6491). France argued that is the responsibility of the international community to end the suffering of the Libyan population. The “measures [of Resolution 1970] have not been sufficient (...) violence against the civilian population has only increased” (S/PV.6498).

The fact that Resolution 1970 had not been sufficient and that violence was increasing is falsely related with one another by employing intertextuality. This was also used as a reason for France to adopt another Resolution (1973) that should bring an end to the increasing violence. Here it can be seen very clearly how intertextuality can make a seemingly neutral claim in fact highly political. In Resolution 1973 France proposed to “to take all measures necessary” (S/PV.6498). France stressed the need for a timely response because “every hour and day that goes by increases the burden of responsibility on our shoulders” (id.).

Discourse 5: The time is now

France pointed out that “the situation in Libya today is more alarming than ever” (S/PV.6498). Claiming that there is no time to loose and distancing the current situation from ‘normal’ situations, is referred to as the crisis frame. France called for a timely and decisive response of the international community. France had always argued that preventive action is a key component of R2P. This is also reflected in the following quotes, in which France described the situation as: “we do not have much time left. It is matter of days, perhaps even hours. Every hour and day that goes by means a further clampdown and repression for the freedom-loving civilian population (...). Every hour and day that goes by increases the burden of responsibility on our shoulders. If we are careful not to act too late, the Security Council will have the distinction of having ensured that in Libya law prevails over force, democracy over dictatorship and freedom over repression” (id.).

This also reflects the crisis frame that France had adopted. Moreover, it employs interdiscursivity because it contains a contradiction within discourse in combination with sensitive practice. Law did not prevail over force in Libya and democracy and freedom are (unfortunately) not yet established in Libya.

Discourse 6: Historical event (placing it in a broader context)

The situation in Libya is interpreted by France in the context of the Arab Spring which is considered to be revolutionary and a “wind of liberty”. France stated that “the world is experiencing one of the great revolutions that change the course of history” (S/PV.6498). France attached great importance to the adoption of Resolution 1973 and stated that “if we are careful not to act too late, the Security Council will have the distinction of having ensured that in Libya law prevails over force, democracy over dictatorship and freedom over repression” (id.). The vote in favor of Resolution 1973 was seen by France as a vote with “historic significance” [that] we hope will open, beyond Libya, a new era for the international community as a whole” (S/PV.6491).

This quote reflects France’s value assumption and employs interdiscursivity and intertextuality because it links two non-related concepts.

France on Libya

| Type of discourse | Key features | Examples |
|---|--|---|
| Discourse 1: Atrocities against innocent civilians | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innocent civilians are the victim of the brutal and bloody repression of the Gaddafi regime - Possible crimes against humanity committed in Libya | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “immediate stop to the use of force against the civilian population” (S/PV.6491) - “unacceptable violence committed against their own people, who have the right to democracy, freedom and justice” (S/PV.6491) |
| Discourse 2: Gaddafi regime as brutal and violent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stressing the brutal and violent act committed by the regime - Gaddafi regime using deliberate and unacceptable force - Use of force toppled with threatening statements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gaddafi regime “turn[ed] against his own people”[and] “has chosen to commit atrocities” (S/PV.6491) - In Libya (...) “the will of the people has been crushed by the murderous repression lead by Colonel Al-Qadhafi’s regime against his own people” (S/PV.6491) |
| Discourse 3: International community as protectors of Libyan civilian population | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The role of the international community in protecting the Libyan civil population is stressed - Protection of civilians is often mentioned | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “protect the civilian populations in Libya” (S/PV.6498) - “We must not give free reign to warmongers; we must not abandon civilian populations, the victims of brutal repression, to their fate; we must not allow the rule of law and international morality to be trampled underfoot” (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 4: Responsibility to Protect | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indirect references to R2P - Reference to R2P in Resolution 1970 - Resolution 1970 not sufficient so in Resolution 1973 ‘take all measures necessary’ - Stressing that is the responsibility of the international community to end the suffering of the Libyan population | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “recalls the responsibility of each State to protect its own population and of the international community to intervene when States fail in their duty” (S/PV.6491) - In Resolution 1970 “the Security Council recalled the Libyan authorities’ responsibility to protect the Libyan people” (S/PV.6498) - “Every hour and day that goes by increases the burden of responsibility on our |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | shoulders" (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 5: The time is now | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sounding the alarm bells since the humanitarian situation is deteriorating every day - No time should be wasted since the Libyan civilian population are repressed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "We do not have much time left. It is matter of days, perhaps even hours. Every hour and day that goes by means a further clampdown and repression for the freedom-loving civilian population (S/PV.6498) - "the situation in Libya today is more alarming than ever" (S/PV.6498) |
| Discourse 6: Historical event | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The situation in Libya is being interpreted in the context of the Arab spring which is considered to be revolutionary and a "wind of liberty" - The vote in favor of Resolution 1973 is seen by France as a vote that will open a new era in which the commitment to protection of civilians will be a central concept | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "the world is experiencing one of the great revolution that change the course of history" (S/RES/1970) - "If we are careful not to act too late, the Security Council will have the distinction of having ensured that in Libya law prevails over force, democracy over dictatorship and freedom over repression" (S/RES/1970) - "historic significance of the vote this evening - a vote that we hope will open, beyond Libya, a new era for the international community as a whole" (S/PV.6491) |

2.3 Analysis of speeches of Russia, the US and France in the case of Syria

The research that was conducted to analyze the speeches of Russia, the US and France on Syria ranged from the first UNSC meeting on Syria on April 21, 2011, up until July 19, 2012. This brings the total of analyzed meetings in which the case of Syria was discussed on 18 meetings. Obviously, this is far more than in the case of Libya. Yet, within this period of time, the Security Council did not manage to adopt one single resolution. Three resolutions were proposed in October 2011, February 2012, and July 2012, respectively. These resolutions were all blocked because Russia and China used their veto power against the resolutions. The background of these resolutions, the reasoning behind the vetoes and the reaction from the other members in the Security Council will be discussed in the next paragraph. In the following paragraphs the speeches of Russia (2.3.2), the US (2.3.3) and France (2.3.4) will be analyzed.

2.3.1 Failed resolutions

This paragraph discusses the adopted Presidential Statement of the UNSC and the three proposed resolutions on Syria that were blocked because of vetoes from China and Russia.

2.3.1.1 Presidential statement August 3, 2011

On August 3, 2011, a Presidential statement (S/PRST/2011/16) of the UNSC was adopted. This was the first statement that the UNSC could agree upon since its first meeting on April 21, 2011. In the statement the UNSC “expresses its grave concern at the deteriorating situation in Syria (...), condemns the widespread violations of human rights and the use of force against civilians by the Syrian authorities” (S/PRST/2011/16). The Security Council “calls for an immediate end to all violence and urges all sides to act with utmost restraint, and to refrain from reprisals, including attacks against State institutions” (id.). Additionally, it calls “on the Syrian authorities to fully respect human rights and to comply with their obligations under applicable international law” (S/PV.6524). Surprisingly, it also contains the following paragraph in which the Security Council “reaffirms its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Syria. It stresses that the only solution to the current crisis in Syria is through an inclusive and Syrian-led political process” (S/PV.6598). This additional paragraph might elucidate the fact that Russia and China agreed with this statement.

2.3.1.2 First resolution October 4, 2011

On October 4, 2011, draft resolution S/2011/612 was proposed by France, Germany, Portugal and the United Kingdom. Nine members were in favour of the resolution; Brazil, India, Lebanon and South Africa abstained from voting, and Russia and China used their veto power against the adoption of the resolution. The US was “outraged that this Council has utterly failed to address an urgent moral challenge and a growing threat to regional peace and security” (S/PV.6627). The US argued that it “deeply regret[s] that some members of the Council have prevented us from taking a principled stand against the Syrian regime’s brutal oppression of its people (...) and we will not rest until the Council rises to meet its responsibilities” (id.). France urged that a “united response from the international community was, and continues to be necessary” (id.). Additionally, France stated the number of victims, refugees and displaced persons in Syria at the time and noted that “that is the terrible toll that some around this table today have still refused to condemn” (id.). Russia defended its veto by claiming that the resolution “contravenes the principle of a peaceful settlement of the crisis on the basis of a full Syrian national dialogue. Our proposals for wording on the non-acceptability of foreign military intervention were not taken into account, and, based on the well-known events in North Africa, that can only put us on our guard” (id.). This is a clear reference to the

resolution that was adopted and led to intervention in Libya which, in the eyes of Russia and China, was a clear breach of the mandate. For both Russia and China “the logic of respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria as well as the principle of non-intervention” (id.) was at the heart of their policy. It was pointed out by both France and Russia that “it is clear that the result of today’s vote reflects not so much a question of acceptability of wording as a conflict of political approaches” (id.).

2.3.1.3 Second resolution February 4, 2012

Thirteen members voted in favour of Resolution S/2012/77, but it was not adopted because China and Russia used their veto power against the resolution. Russia explained that it favours a solution based on political dialogue and that this resolution did not offer any such thing. Russia stated that “influential members of the international community (...) have undermined any possibility of a political settlement, calling for regime change, encouraging the opposition towards power, indulging in provocation and nurturing the armed struggle” (S/PV.6711). Other reasons Russia gave for its veto address concerns that the resolution “did not adequately reflect the true state of affairs in Syria and sent a biased signal to the Syrian sides” (id.). Russia complained that its amendments to the draft resolution were not taken into account and that its proposals regarding Syrian armed forces were ignored. The US was “disgusted that a couple of members of this Council continue to prevent us from fulfilling our sole purpose here, which is to address an ever-deepening crisis in Syria and a growing threat to regional peace and security” (id.). The US reacted fiercely against the veto from Russia and China when it stated that “the international community must protect the Syrian people from that abhorrent brutality. But a couple of members of this Council remain steadfast in their willingness to sell out the Syrian people and to shield a craven tyrant” (id.). The US concluded by stating that “any further bloodshed will be on their hands” (id.). This can be considered as very strong language. France concluded that “this is a sad day for the Council; it is a sad day for the Syrians; and it is sad day for all the friends of democracy” (id.). France also condemned the veto of China and Russia by stating that “we cannot and must not overlook the harrowing conclusion that two permanent members of the Council have systematically obstructed all its action. They do so in the full knowledge of the tragic consequences of their decisions for the Syrian people” (id.). France showed its commitment to continue the support of the Syrian opposition.

2.3.1.4 Third resolution July 19, 2012

On July 19, 2012, a third resolution (S/2012/538) was brought to vote and this resolution was also not adopted because of a double veto by China and Russia. Eleven members were in favour of the resolution; Pakistan and South Africa abstained from voting. This resolution demanded that all parties cease violence, strengthened the six-point plan of the Joint Special Envoy and threatened the regime with sanctions if it would not fulfil its commitments within ten days. Russia claimed that it “cannot accept a document, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, that would open the way for the pressure of sanctions and later for external military involvement in Syrian domestic affairs” (S/PV.6810). The fact that several (Western) members of the UNSC refused to fully exclude military intervention gave Russia the idea that this resolution was used to “further their plans of imposing their own designs on sovereign States” (id.). Russia did stress its effort to find a political solution to the situation. The US called this veto of Russia and China “even more dangerous and deplorable” (id.) than their first two vetoes. Besides, the US expressed its concern for the use of chemical weapons by the regime against its own people. The US stated that it would intensify its

work to pressure the Assad regime and regretted that the Security Council had failed “in the most important task on its agenda this year” (id.). In addition, the US expressed its hope that “before too many thousands more die, Russia and China will stop protecting Al-Assad” (S/PV.6810). France was furious and claimed that “it is now clear that Russia merely wants to win time for the Syrian regime to crush the opposition” (id.). Moreover, it stated that a third veto of Russia and China meant that “there will be no consequences for the Syrian regime’s disregard of its commitments. The crimes will go unpunished; their perpetrators will continue to proceed with their disgusting plans; the people’s legitimate aspirations can be disregarded; and the victims are insignificant in number” (id.). In its speech, France turned directly to the Syrian people and provided its full support to them and expressed its commitment to continue the support of the Syrian opposition and assured them that “France will not leave the Syrian people to face the crimes to which they are victim alone” (id.).

Except for analyzing what has been discussed, it is also important to look for what issues have not been discussed. Whereas in the case of Libya the concept of protection of civilians laid the base for intervention in Resolution 1973, this concept has not been discussed in the meetings on Syria. This could be for various reasons, but what is most striking is that in the discussion on Libya an intervention was assumed to ensure the protection of civilians. In the discussion on Syria, it is the exact opposite, since it is assumed that an intervention will only lead to a further escalation in an already unstable region.

2.3.2 Russia

When analyzing the speeches of Russia in the Security Council, it becomes clear that the discourse that is being used is very different from the discourse that was used in the case of Libya. In the case of Libya, Russia mainly aimed to prevent war and avoid destabilization of the region. Moreover, it feared the excessive use of force. To a large extent the same will also be true for Syria. Yet, in the case of Syria, the language is ‘stronger’, the respect for sovereignty is stressed more often and again the use of force is explicitly condemned since it is feared that it will only lead to further destabilization of the region. Especially in the beginning of 2011, when the situation in the Middle East is being discussed, Russia’s comments on the situation in Syria remained brief and firm. The main discourse of Russia in the period between the April 21, 2011, and July 19, 2012, is reflected by the following types of discourse:

Discourse 1: Explicitly oppose (any intention of) the use of force (22)

Discourse 2: Work on political solution for Syria (13)

Discourse 3: Sovereignty and territorial integrity (12)

Discourse 4: Violence is not one-sided (10)

Discourse 5: Warn for risk of destabilizing the region (8)

Discourse 1: Explicitly oppose (any intention of) the use of force

Russia explicitly opposed ANY statement or resolution that could possibly lead to the use of force. This is not surprising, since this is in line with Russia’s Realist policy and skeptical stance towards R2P as pointed out in Chapter 1. Russia stated “we deem unacceptable any external interference in Syrian affairs or those of other States in the region” (S/PV.6520). Russia’s rejection of external intervention should be seen in the light of what happened in Libya, where the Russians agreed to a resolution (Resolution 1973) that was used for the establishment of a no-fly zone in Libya and for heavy bombardments. Russia, and many other states, argued that the decision to intervene in Libya was

stretched way beyond the mandate and therefore opposed any statement or resolution that could possibly lead to any such scenario in Syria. Moreover, Russia stated that the “noble goal of protecting civilians should not be compromised by attempts to resolve in parallel any unrelated issues” (S/PV.6531). This is closely linked to the conceptual challenge of R2P as explained by Badescu (2006) in which, in this case, Russia fears that humanitarian action language will be used to justify the unilateral use of force directed at regime change. In a UNSC meeting on October 4, 2011, Russia made its fear explicit by stating that it is “easy to see that today’s ‘Unified Protector’ model could happen in Syria” (S/PV.6627) and that “the situation in Syria cannot be considered in the Council separately from the Libyan experience” (id.). The unwillingness of Russia to use R2P as a legitimization for the use of force thus comes from a fear that R2P will not be applied consistently and that it will be used for regime change. Besides the Libyan experience, Russia explicitly made clear that external intervention will have negative outcomes like a further destabilization of the region (S/PV.6524) and eventually an endless cycle of violence and civil war (id.). Russia also stressed the authority of the UNSC (where Russia holds veto power) to use force.

Discourse 2: Work on political solution for Syria

As pointed out in Chapter 1, Russia favours diplomatic means rather than the use of coercive measures. Especially in the beginning of the crisis in Syria, Russia clearly stated its support for the Assad regime and its confidence that Syria made good progress on issuing political reforms. Additionally, Russia stated that “we support the maintenance of law and order and the achievement of stability (...) that, as we see it, is the aim of the efforts of President Al-Assad” (S/PV.6520). Russia very much stressed that it favors a “peaceful settlement of the crisis on the basis of a full Syrian national dialogue” (S/PV.6627). Russia and China proposed a Russian-Chinese resolution aimed at peaceful settlement, sovereignty and non-intervention. Moreover, Russia stressed that it made amendments to the proposed draft resolution, but that these amendments which aimed for a political settlement were not taken into account. It also stressed that “sides must be encouraged to engage in dialogue rather than be intimidated into doing so” (S/PV.6710).

Discourse 3: Sovereignty and territorial integrity

As also pointed out in Chapter 1, the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity lies at the heart of Russia’s foreign policy. Russia’s Realist policy is aimed at the principle of non-interference and rules that other states should not interfere in the domestic affairs of a state. This has always been one of the main characteristics of Russia’s foreign policy. Especially after the intervention in Libya, heavily criticized by Russia and other members, there seemed to be a renewed conviction for the principle of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference. This can be seen very clearly in the discussions on Syria where many references, both implicitly as well explicitly, were made to “the logic of respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria as well as the principle of non-intervention” (S/PV.6627). Moreover, Russia framed the conflict in Syria as an “extreme internal political crisis” (S/PV.6710) that required an internal solution. Therefore, external states should not interfere with the domestic affairs of Syria as a sovereign’s state. Russia argued that the international community should abstain from intervening in domestic affairs and “be drawn into armed conflict and (...) to take the side of one of the parties” (S/PV.6531).

Discourse 4: Violence is not one-sided

While Russia recognized the severity of the situation in Syria, it refused to see the Syrian government forces as the only force that was responsible for the atrocities committed. Russia criticized the

opposition forces and urged them to “refrain from reprisals, including attacks against State institutions” (S/PV.6598). Russia stated that the opposition forces “lack (...) to distance themselves from extremists” (S/PV.6627) and that the “radical opposition no longer hides its extremist bent and is relying on terrorist tactics” (id.). This contributes to the idea that Syria is in an extremely deep internal crisis in which there is no ‘good’ versus ‘bad’, but a conflict in which (at least) two parties are responsible for the atrocities committed.

Discourse 5: Warn for risk of destabilizing the region

Russia very much stressed the importance of stability in Syria for peace and stability in the wider region. Syria is regarded by Russia as “the cornerstone of the Middle East security architecture” (S/PV.6524). It directly links the stability and peace in the region with the stability of Syria. This is thus a clear example of intertextuality, in which relations are being drawn between two concepts that are not directly related. Moreover, it is done for political purposes of making it more difficult to intervene in Syria when the risk of a destabilized region is constantly being stressed by arguing that the “collapse of Syria as a result of a civil war would have a very destructive impact on the situation in the entire Middle East” (S/PV.6627). It was also claimed by Russia that foreign intervention would be “a real threat to regional security” (S/PV.6524) and would only lead to further destabilization which should be prevented at all costs.

Russia thus contextualized the situation in Syria as impossible to be seen apart from the consequences for the region. The situation is framed by using intertextuality. A “worsening of the crisis (...) would also inevitably destabilize the neighbouring countries and further stir up the strategically important region of the Middle East” (S/PV.6710).

Russia on Syria

| Discourse | Key features | Relevant quotes |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Discourse 1: Explicitly oppose (any intention of) the use of force</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Russia explicitly opposes ANY statement or resolution that could possibly lead to the use of force - Russia argues that protection of civilians and R2P was only used as a pretext to intervene on Libya - Russia opposes any attempt of the international community to intervene so that Syria does not have to endure the same as Libya - Intervention would do more harm than good - Stress that the authority of the UNSC is necessary for using force | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “we deem unacceptable any external interference in Syrian affairs or those of other States in the region” (S/PV.6520) - Intervention will “lead to an endless cycle of violence and represent an invitation to civil war” (S/PV.6524) - “noble goal of protecting civilians should not be compromised by attempts to resolve in parallel any unrelated issues” (S/PV.6531) - “the situation in Syria cannot be considered in the Council separately from the Libyan experience” (S/PV.6627) - “easy to see that today’s ‘Unified Protector’ model could happen in Syria” (S/PV.6627) - “attempts by outside forces (...) to serve their own interests are fraught with grave consequences (...) for regional stability and international peace and security” (S/PV.6706) |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Discourse 2: Work on political solution for Syria</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Russia very much stresses that it wants a political solution for Syria - Dialogue with Syria - Supports Assad - Proposed a Russian-Chinese resolution aimed at peaceful settlement, sovereignty and non-intervention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “we support the maintenance of law and order and the achievement of stability (...) That, as we see it, is the aim of the efforts of President Al-Assad” (S/PV.6520) - “principle of a peaceful settlement of the crisis on the basis of a full Syrian national dialogue” (S/PV.6627) - “sides must be encouraged to engage in dialogue rather than be intimidated into doing so” (S/PV.6710) |
| <p>Discourse 3: Sovereignty and territorial integrity</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The importance of sovereignty and territorial integrity is stressed - The conflict in Syria is framed as an internal crisis and should therefore only be addressed by domestic politics without outside interference | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “unacceptable for United Nations peacekeepers to be drawn into armed conflict and (...) to take the side of one of the parties” (S/PV.6531) - “the logic of respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria as well as the principle of non-intervention” (S/PV.6627) - “extreme internal political crisis, the role of the international community should not be to exacerbate conflict or meddle by using economic sanctions or military force” (S/PV.6710) |
| <p>Discourse 4: Violence is not one-sided</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While Russia recognizes the severity of the situation in Syria, it refuses to see the Syrian government forces as the only force responsible for the atrocities committed - Russia sees the opposition forces as terrorists and labels their acts as terrorist acts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “lack of an appeal to them to distance themselves from extremists” (S/PV.6627) - “radical opposition no longer hides its extremist bent and is relying on terrorist tactics” (S/PV.6627) |
| <p>Discourse 5: Warn for risk of destabilizing the region</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Russia very much stresses the importance of stability in Syria for peace and stability in the region - Foreign intervention would lead to further destabilization - Further destabilization of Syria should be prevented at all costs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Syria as “the cornerstone of the Middle East security architecture” (S/PV.6524) - “A real threat to regional security (...) could arise from outside interference in Syria’s domestic situation” (S/PV.6524) - “collapse of Syria as a result of a civil war would have a very destructive impact on the situation in the entire Middle East” (S/PV.6627) - “worsening of the crisis (...) would also inevitably destabilize the neighbouring countries and further stir up the strategically important region of the Middle East” (S/PV.6710) |

2.3.3 The United States

Based on previous paragraphs, it can be concluded that in the case of Libya, the US was mainly concerned about the humanitarian situation and the atrocities that were committed by the Gaddafi regime. The discourse of the US towards Assad is strong and his actions are strongly condemned. In both cases the role of the international community in protecting the civilian population is stressed. The discourse of the US takes a variety of forms. A majority of the discourses that the US is using most frequently is a result from the deadlock in the Security Council. The US holds great frustration towards China and Russia, whom it holds responsible for the silence in the Council and the further bloodshed in Syria. The US strongly condemns the violence of the Assad regime against his own population. The deteriorating situation in Syria causes the US to use very strong language towards China and Russia. Like Russia, the US cannot see the security in the region separate from the stability of Syria. Despite the support of the US for the Syrian civilian population, it results that the US is not completely convinced of the willingness of the opposition to refrain from (counter) violence. Moreover, the US clearly distances the situation in Syria from the situation in Libya. From all the UNSC meetings on Syria, the following discourses were identified as the main discourse regarding the US' position on Syria:

Discourse 1: Condemn Assad regime (21)

Discourse 2: Call on Security Council to take action (16)

Discourse 3: Blaming Russia and China for their vetoes (12)

Discourse 4: Peaceful demonstrators calling for legitimate reform (9)

Discourse 5: Unstable Syria linked with unstable region (4)

Discourse 6: Complexity of situation (4)

Discourse 1: Condemn Assad regime

The US clearly condemned the use of force of the Assad regime that is used against the Syrian civilian population. The US has repeatedly called upon the Assad regime to respect human rights and bring an end to the violence without success. Consequently, the US argued that Syria is “neither a responsible Government nor a credible member of the international community” (S/PV.6524). Moreover, the US accused Syria that it “divert[s] public attention from its own indiscriminate killings and abuses of the human rights of the Syrian people” (S/PV.6572). The US argued that “the Al-Assad regime has deliberately unleashed violence, torture and persecution against peaceful protesters, human rights defenders and their families” (S/PV.6627). The US repeatedly referred to a statement made by the High Commissioner for Human Rights, who claimed that “the Syrian Government’s appalling actions might amount to crimes against humanity” (id.). The US framed the situation as a choice between “stand with the people of Syria and the region or become complicit in the continuing violence there” (S/PV.6710). Yet, this decision is framed as if there is no other possibility than to choose between those two options. This is not the case, since there is also an alternative which is being left out for strategic purposes, namely to convince the Assad regime that there can be a political solution to the conflict. Yet, the US ruled this out as a possibility because it does not suit with its policy.

Discourse 2: Call on Security Council to take action

As pointed out above, the US criticized the Security Council for its inaction. The US argued that “the Security Council has a responsibility to address the situation in Syria” (S/PV.6590) and that the US “will not rest until the Council rises to meet its responsibilities” (S/PV.6627). Moreover, the US

claimed that “the Security Council has failed utterly in the most important task on its agenda this year” (S/PV.6810). Therefore the US called for action and unity within the Council so that the Council can “answer Syrian people’s cry for freedom” (S/PV.6524). After Libya, the US was accused of having extended R2P beyond its mandate and using it for regime change. It is hypothesized that this explains why the US policy towards intervention became more oriented towards a more reserved and multilateral approach. The US stressed that it is important that “the international community must remain united in the commitment to protecting civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack” (S/PV.6531). The US “urge[s] the Security Council to back the Arab League’s call for an inclusive, Syrian-led political process to effectively address the legitimate aspirations and concerns of Syria’s people” (S/PV.6710). After the third veto, the US called upon the Security Council for “decisive action under Chapter VII to stop the killing” (S/PV.6810).

Discourse 3: Blaming Russia and China for their vetoes

The three vetoes against resolutions in Syria have led to many frustrations between the US and China and Russia. The US blamed China and Russia for deliberately obstructing progress in the Security Council. The following quote best describes the frustration of the US: “one can only hope that one day, before too many thousands more die, Russia and China will stop protecting Al-Assad and allow the Council to play its proper role at the centre of international response to the crisis in Syria” (S/PV.6810). The US used strong language to describe its aggravation towards Russia and China: “the United States is disgusted that a couple of members of this Council continue to prevent us from fulfilling our sole purpose (...) to address an ever-deepening crisis in Syria” (S/PV.6711). “Those members stand behind empty arguments and individual interests (...) that (...) is (...) shameful [especially considering] “that at least one of those members continues to deliver weapons to Al-Assad” (id.). The growing frustration of the US is reflected in its ever stronger language against China and Russia. The US stated that China and Russia “remain steadfast in their willingness to sell out the Syrian people and to shield a craven tyrant (id.) and that “any further bloodshed will be on their hands” (id.). Moreover, the US claimed that Russia “would rather sell arms to the Syrian regime than stand with the Syrian people” (S/PV.6627).

Discourse 4: Peaceful demonstrators calling for legitimate reforms

The position of the US towards the Syrian civilian population can be described as concerned, supportive and compassionate. This results from the following quotes in which the US referred to the Syrian civilian population as the “long-suffering people of Syria” (S/PV.6711) who “cry for freedom” (S/PV.6524). The Syrian people that participated in the uprisings that initiated the war are described by the US as “courageous and peaceful protestors who demand universal rights” (S/PV.6590). It is argued by the US that the Syrian government should “allow peaceful protest and freedom of speech” (id.). The US praised the Syrian population repeatedly for its courage (S/PV.6590, S/PV.6627). The US spoke of “legitimate calls for reform” from Syrian people.

This quote reveals a value assumption since the word ‘legitimate’ discloses the idea that the US supports the calls for reform that the Syrian people desire. It was also stated by the US that it “supports the Syrian people’s demand for democratic, representative and inclusive government” (S/PV.6706). It is argued by the US that the international community must protect the Syrian population from the brutalities of the Syrian regime. The US heavily criticized some members that “remain steadfast in their willingness to sell out the Syrian people and to shield a craven tyrant” (S/PV.6711). In the next sentence it was stated that, “by contrast, the US stands fully and irrevocably

with the long-suffering people from Syria” (id.). This quote shows on the one hand that the US is compassionate with the people in Syria who are suffering from the devastating consequences of the war. On the other hand, this quote shows how the US is distancing its role from other countries that are supporting the Assad regime. By first telling what something is not, a context is created in which something should be interpreted. In discourse analysis this is referred to as a polyphone structure.

Discourse 5: Unstable Syria linked with unstable region

Like Russia, the US also directly links the stability in Syria with the stability in the wider region. The US argued that “the Security Council has a responsibility to address the situation in Syria (...) which could further destabilize the country and undermine peace and security in the region” (S/PV.6590).

Whenever the US talked about the situation in Syria, it only did so in the context of the consequences for the region. The US stated multiple times that “the situation in Syria (...) could further destabilize the country and undermine peace and security in the region” (id.) and named “an ever-deepening crisis in Syria (...) a growing threat to regional peace and security” (S/PV.6711). The situation in Syria is regarded by the US as “an urgent moral challenge and a growing threat to regional peace and security” (S/PV.6627). Just as was done by Russia, the US also acknowledged that a deteriorating situation in Syria has direct consequences for the regional security and peace.

As pointed out before, this is an example of how intertextuality can be used to further complicate an issue because it cannot be considered separately from related issues. The situation in Syria can thus no longer be seen apart from the consequences of the region if the US was to intervene militarily in Syria. Fear for destabilization of the region resulted to be one of the main reasons not to intervene in Syria.

Discourse 6: Complexity of situation

Despite the US’s heavily criticism on the inaction of the Security Council it seems to regard the situation in Syria as a rather complex situation. The US noted that “as more citizens take up arms to resist the regime’s brutality, violence is increasingly likely to spiral out of control” (S/PV.6710). Despite the US support to the Syrian population, the US called “on the opposition to refrain from violence, while recognizing that exercising such restraint becomes more and more difficult as the regime ratchets up its repression” (S/PV.6706). The US praised the “courageous and peaceful protesters who demand universal rights” (S/PV.6590). Yet, at the same time it painted a rather daunting picture of Syria’s future that will be characterized by “a crumbling economy, rising sectarian tensions, and a cauldron of instability in the heart of the Middle East” (S/PV.6710). The presence of chemical weapons further complicates this. The “large stockpiles of chemical weapons (...) must remain secure (...) because (...) the potential that this regime could consider using chemical weapons against its own people should be a concern for us all” (S/PV.6810).

The US on Syria

| Discourse | Key features | Relevant quotes |
|--|---|--|
| Discourse 1: Condemn Assad regime | -Condemn violence used by the Assad regime against his own people -Call upon respect for human rights and human freedoms | - Syria “neither a responsible Government nor a credible member of the international community” (S/PV.6524) - “casting blame on outsiders instead of addressing its own internal failures is no way for a Government to respond to legitimate calls for reform from its people” (S/PV.6524) - Accuses Syria that it “divert[s] public attention from its own |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Call upon Assad to bring an end to violence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> indiscriminate killings and abuses of the human rights of the Syrian people” (S/PV.6572) “ the Al-Assad regime has deliberately unleashed violence, torture and persecution against peaceful protesters, human rights defenders and their families” (S/PV.6627) “The High Commissioner for Human Rights has already warned that the Syrian Government’s appalling actions might amount to crimes against humanity” (S/PV.6627) “evidence is clear that Al-Assad’s forces are initiating nearly all of the attacks that kill civilians” (S/PV.6710) |
| Discourse 2: Call on Security Council to take action | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Call for action and unity in the Council -It is the responsibility of the Security Council to address the situation in Syria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “answer Syrian people’s cry for freedom” (S/PV.6524) “The international community must remain united in the commitment to protecting civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack” (S/PV.6531) “The Security Council has a responsibility to address the situation in Syria” (S/PV.6590) “We will not rest until the Council rises to meet its responsibilities” (S/PV.6627) “We urge the Security Council to back the Arab League’s call for an inclusive, Syrian-led political process to effectively address the legitimate aspirations and concerns of Syria’s people” (S/PV.6710) The US calls for “decisive action under Chapter VII to stop the killing” (S/PV.6810) “The Security Council has failed utterly in the most important task on its agenda this year” (S/PV.6810) |
| Discourse 3: Blaming Russia and China for their vetoes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Blaming China and Russia for obstructing the UNSC -Using strong language against Russia (and China) -Blaming Russia for delivering weapons to Assad regime -Holding China and Russia responsible for the consequences of their veto | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Those who oppose this draft resolution and give cover to a brutal regime will have to answer to the Syrian people” (S/PV.6627). “Any further bloodshed will be on their hands” (S/PV.6711) US claims that Russia “would rather sell arms to the Syrian regime than stand with the Syrian people” ” (S/PV.6627) “The United States is disgusted that a couple of members of this Council continue to prevent us from fulfilling our sole purpose (...) to address an ever-deepening crisis in Syria” (S/PV.6711). “Those members stand behind empty arguments and individual interests, while delaying and seeking to strip bare any text that would pressure Al-Assad to change his actions. That (...) is (...) shameful [especially considering] “that at least one of those members continues to deliver weapons to Al-Assad” (S/PV.6711) “a couple of members of this Council remain steadfast in their willingness to sell out the Syrian people and to shield a craven tyrant” (S/PV.6711) “One can only hope that one day, before too many thousands more die, Russia and China will stop protecting Al-Assad and allow the Council to play its proper role at the centre of the international response to the crisis in Syria” (S/PV.6810) |
| Discourse 4: Peaceful protestors calling for legitimate reforms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The US supports the Syrian people in their (peaceful) quest for legitimate reforms - The US shows compassion for the Syrian people who are suffering from the consequences of the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“The US stands fully with the long-suffering people of Syria” (S/PV.6711) who “cry for freedom” (S/PV.6524) - “Legitimate calls for reform” (S/PV.6524) - “Courageous and peaceful protesters who demand universal rights” (S/PV.6590) - “The US supports the Syrian people’s demand for democratic, representative and inclusive government” (S/PV.6706) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | war | |
| Discourse 5: Unstable Syria linked with unstable region | -Deteriorating situation in Syria linked with threat to regional security and peace | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“the situation in Syria (...) which could further destabilize the country and undermine peace and security in the region” (S/PV.6590) -“an urgent moral challenge and a growing threat to regional peace and security” (S/PV.6627) -“an ever-deepening crisis in Syria and a growing threat to regional peace and security” (S/PV.6711) |
| Discourse 6: Complexity of situation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Violence is spiraling out of control -Calls upon the opposition to refrain from violence -Pessimistic image of future of Syria -Worried about presence of chemical weapons | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“as more citizens take up arms to resist the regime’s brutality, violence is increasingly likely to spiral out of control” (S/PV.6710) -“Already the challenges ahead for the Syrian people are daunting: a crumbling economy, rising sectarian tensions, and a cauldron of instability in the heart of the Middle East” (S/PV.6710) -Despite the US support to the Syrian population, the US calls “on the opposition to refrain from violence, while recognizing that exercising such restraint becomes more and more difficult as the regime ratchets up its repression”(S/PV.6706) -“The escalation of the regime’s attacks (...) is even more troubling because of its large stockpiles of chemical weapons. (...) those weapons must remain secure (...) because (...) the potential that this regime could consider using chemical weapons against its own people should be a concern for us all” (S/PV.6810) |

2.3.4 France

In the case of Libya, France was mainly concerned about the atrocities that were committed against innocent civilians. It had the same concerns in the case of Syria, which was primarily voiced as fierce criticism against certain members of the Security Council. Whereas France saw the Gaddafi regime as brutal and violent, its discourse towards the Assad regime is somewhat more moderate, although this changes over time. France is clearly frustrated by the paralysis of the UNSC due to three vetoes of China and Russia against resolutions in October 2011, February 2012, and July 2012. France blamed the Chinese and Russian government for obstructing action in the UNSC and choosing sides with the Assad regime. At the same time, France was deeply concerned about the humanitarian situation in Syria, which it is strongly committed to improve. Yet, as could also be seen in the case of Russia and the US, France also acknowledged that the stability of Syria is crucial for peace and stability in the Middle East. There has been a clear shift in the discourse of France when it comes to the Assad government. The change in discourse is a mere reflection of the diminishing support for the Assad regime in France since the second half of 2011. France is one of the few countries, alongside the United Kingdom and, to a limited extent, the United States, that is determined to pursue the protection of civilians in cases where states fail to meet their obligations. This leads to the identification of the following discourses:

Discourse 1: Focus on incapability of the Council (due to vetoes of Russia and China) (42)

Discourse 2: Deeply concerned about the situation in Syria (27)

Discourse 3: Strong commitment to helping Syrians (21)

Discourse 4: Changing discourse towards Assad regime (13)

Discourse 5: Peace and stability in region under threat (10)

Discourse 6: The importance of protection of civilians (5)

Other observations regarding the speeches of France in the UNSC show the emotional and vivid reactions of France to the vetoes of China and Russia; this often resulted in the use of very strong language against China and Russia. Moreover, France was the only member of the UNSC that addressed the Syrian people directly in its speech.

Discourse 1: Focus on incapability of the Council (due to vetoes of Russia and China)

France has heavily criticized the inaction of the UNSC which carries the primary responsibility to protect civilians. Additionally, France was frustrated by the deadlock in the Security Council that resulted from the three vetoes of China and Russia. France blamed Russia and China for deliberately obstructing action of the UNSC. Additionally, France claimed that the veto of Russia and China were “a political choice. It is a veto on principle, which means that it is a refusal of all Council resolutions against Syria. (...) It is a rejection of this tremendous movement for freedom and democracy that is the Arab Spring” (S/PV.6627). China and Russia are blamed for choosing sides in favor of the Assad regime, delivering weapons to Syria and for allowing the atrocities of the regime to take place. The countries that abstained from voting on the resolutions (Brazil, India, Lebanon, South Africa, and Pakistan), were criticized for showing their indifference to the grave atrocities in Syria. France condemned the position of China and Russia, by using very strong language against the two countries. It was argued that “faced with the extreme violence being brought against a population (...) a united response from the international community (...) continues to be, necessary” (id.). Moreover, it was stated by France that “we cannot and must not overlook the harrowing conclusion that two permanent members of the Council have systematically obstructed all its action. (...) in so doing, they are making themselves complicit in the policy of repression being implemented by the Damascus regime. Whatever they may claim, they have de facto taken the side of the Al-Assad regime against the Syrian people” (S/PV.6711). After the third veto of Russia, France concluded that “it is now clear that Russia merely wants to win time for the Syrian regime to crush the opposition” (S/PV.6810). France regarded the position of the Security Council as “serious failing by the Council, whether in humanitarian or political terms” (S/PV.6650). France pointed out that “the Council — which has been able to see the cost of its inaction — [should] finally play its role” (id.).

France thus contextualizes the position of the Security Council in terms of what it should not do, remain inactive. This thus sets a context in which no action is related with failure of the international community and in which action is framed as (more) positive. In Critical Discourse Analysis this is referred to as the polyphone structure. The UNSC is regarded by France as “the keystone of international peace and security. If it is to remain so, it has the responsibility to pronounce cases as serious as Syria’s” and “put an end to the scandalous silence of the Security Council” (S/PV.6710).

Discourse 2: Deeply concerned about the situation in Syria

France expressed its deep concerns regarding the humanitarian situation in Syria. The use of force is condemned and France calls upon respect for human rights. “Indiscriminate and brutal repression must stop. The Syrian government must respect fundamental rights and freedoms” (S/PV.6524). It was added that “systematic and massive violations of human rights to suppress the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people continue with complete impunity” (S/PV.6706). France recalled that crimes against humanity might take place in Syria. This was done in reference to statements made by

“the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect [who] said on 21 July 2011 that crimes against humanity may have been committed and continue to be committed in Syria” (S/PV.6590). In response to this France made a comparison with the massacre in Hama 30 years ago. “The memories of the bloody massacres of the civilian population in Syria in the early 1980s, in particular in Hama, are too painful for the international community to silently stand by in the face of escalating repression” (S/PV.6524). At a later stage France stated in the same context that “the father killed on a mass scale; the son has followed in his footsteps” (S/PV.6711). In Syria the “civilian population has been crushed by heavy artillery and attacks by combat helicopters” (S/PV.6810). France stated that “words are inadequate to describe the horror of the brutal repression” (S/PV.6710) and that the “humanitarian situation is deteriorating day by day (id.). Therefore the question was asked: “What level of horror must be reached for the Council to enforce a stop to human rights violations” (id.).

Discourse 3: Strong commitment to helping Syrians

France has clearly stated its commitment to assist the Syrian population. It praised the courage of the Syrian people that calls for freedom and turned directly to Syrian people in its speeches in the UNSC. France’s speeches were the most emotional and vivid and reflected the clear commitment of the French that it “will not cease its efforts to ensure that the rights of the Syrian people are recognized and respected” (S/PV.6627). France called for action and unity in the UNSC to take up responsibility as UN peacekeepers. In October 2011 France stated that “this is no longer the time for words (...) we must take action” (S/PV.6636). The wish was expressed to “rise above our differences and support the plan submitted today. Let us live up to our responsibilities and to the political and moral duty that falls to us from the peaceful uprising of the Syrian people inspired by the momentum of the Arab Spring” (S/PV.6710). After the second veto of China and Russia, France named it “a sad day for the Council; (...) a sad day for the Syrians; and (...) [a] sad day for all the friends of democracy” (S/PV.6711). It pushed for action and stated that there was “no time to lose” in this “Syrian nightmare” (S/PV.6710).

This is a clear example of introducing a crisis frame to allow for radical solutions. France expressed its full commitment “to support the peaceful Syrian opposition” (S/PV.6711) and the promise that “France will not leave the Syrian people to face the crimes to which they are victim alone” (S/PV.6810).

Discourse 4: Changing discourse towards Assad regime

There has been an interesting shift in discourse regarding the Assad regime. The change in discourse followed the diminishing support of the Assad regime in 2011. At the beginning of the crisis in Syria in 2011, France attempted to preserve stability in Syria (and the region) through reforms of the Syrian government. France argued that reforms such as lifting the state of emergency, the release of political prisoners and respect for peaceful demonstrations could lead to a more stable situation in Syria. At first, France expected that “such stability can (...) come about through (...) the effective implementation of reforms” (S/PV.6572). Eventually, France realized that the Assad regime was not implementing its reforms and it started to condemn the Assad regime. France claimed that the Assad regime had lost its legitimacy and France was the first country to recognize the Syrian Opposition Coalition Council (SOC). It argued that “in Syria, leaders who have lost all legitimacy are hanging on to power and dragging their country into a bloody spiral of violence” (S/PV.6636). Furthermore, France argued that “the provisions adopted by the Council have been systematically violated by the Syrian

regime, which has not even started to implement the first of its commitments” (S/PV.6810). France strongly condemned the Assad regime and argued that the “veto will not stop us. No veto can give carte blanche to the Syrian authorities, who have lost all legitimacy by murdering their own people” (S/PV.6627).

Discourse 5: Peace and stability in region under threat

In line with the arguments being made by the US and Russia, France acknowledged that “Syria plays a decisive role in regional stability” (S/PV.6524). France stated that the “stability of Syria is crucial for the Middle East, a region whose fragility the Council knows only too well” (S/PV.6572). France expressed “deep concern about the potential destabilizing influence in the region” (id.). It is deemed important “to restore stability to Syria and preserve stability in the region, which is threatened” (S/PV.6636) and on which “depends the stability of a fragile region” (S/PV.6627).

As pointed out before, this is an example of intertextuality because the stability of the region and the stability in Syria are being framed as mutually exclusive. (In)Stability in Syria directly linked with (in) stability in the region. France makes explicit the many risks that threaten regional stability like the “refugees [that] flow into neighbouring countries, [the] Lebanese sovereignty is repeatedly challenged, fears for the future of minorities and of fragile religious equilibriums are growing” (S/PV.6706).

Discourse 6: The importance of protection of civilians

It is exceptional that France touched upon the very sensitive issue of the protection of civilians, Responsibility to Protect and even Libya. Yet, France did so and claimed that “The protection of civilians is at the heart of the mandate of United Nations peacekeeping operations” (S/PV.6650). It is argued by France that when governments do not protect their civilians and atrocities are committed, it is the duty of the UNSC to intervene to protect civilians. “When civilians die, to think about how to protect them is good, but to protect them is much better” (id.). This should not be a decision that is taken lightly, but it is the responsibility of every state to “to protect its civilian population. France is even defending the action in Libya by stating that in Benghazi, the UNSC was “able to prevent a massacre” (id.) and France “is proud that it did not fail to meet that” (id.). France argued that the UNSC should end its silence on Syria. It argued that “even without reference to the responsibility to protect, those regional consequences are enough to establish the Council’s responsibility. (...) How can this even be up for discussion?” (S/PV.6710).

France on Syria

| Discourse | Key features | Relevant quotes |
|--|---|---|
| Discourse 1: Focus on incapability of the Council (due to vetoes of Russia and China) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blaming Russia and China for obstructing action of UNSC - Using very strong language against Russia (and China) for using veto power against freedom, democracy and Syrian people - Blaming China and Russia for choosing sides in favor of the Assad regime, delivering weapons to Syria and for | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The veto of China and Russia is seen as “a political choice (...) a veto on principle (...) [and] a refusal of all Council resolutions against Syria (S/PV.6627) - “Opting for Security Council paralysis is tantamount to supporting the Al-Assad regime and taking his side” (S/PV.6636). “Others chose to abstain (...) to show their indifference” (S/PV.6650) - “We cannot and must not overlook the harrowing conclusion that two permanent members of the Council have systematically obstructed all its action. (...) in so doing, they are making themselves complicit |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>allowing the atrocities of the regime to take place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blaming the countries that abstained for showing their indifference - Heavily criticizing the inaction of the UNSC who carries the primary responsibility to protect civilians | <p>in the policy of repression being implemented by the Damascus regime (S/PV.6711)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “serious failing by the Council, whether in humanitarian or political terms” (S/PV.6650) - “It is now clear that Russia merely wants to win time for the Syrian regime to crush the opposition” (S/PV.6810) - “for Russia and China (...) the crimes will go unpunished; their perpetrators will continue to proceed with their disgusting plans” (S/PV.6810) - “a united response from the international community (...) continues to be, necessary” (S/PV.6627) - “The Security Council is the keystone of international peace and security. If it is to remain so, it has the responsibility to pronounce cases as serious as Syria’s” [and] “put an end to the scandalous silence of the Security Council” (S/PV.6710) |
| Discourse 2: Deeply concerned about the situation in Syria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Condemn violence and the regime and call for respect to human rights - Describe the deteriorating humanitarian situation and call for action - Recall that crimes against humanity might take place in Syria - Draw comparison to massacre in Hama 30 years ago | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect said on 21 July that crimes against humanity may have been committed and continue to be committed in Syria” (S/PV.6590) - “Today is the anniversary of the Hama massacre and falls only one day after another massacre in Homs. The father killed on a mass scale; the son has followed in his footsteps” (S/PV.6711) - “civilian population has been crushed by heavy artillery and attacks by combat helicopters” (S/PV.6810) - “Words are inadequate to describe the horror of the brutal repression” (S/PV.6710) - “Humanitarian situation is deteriorating day by day. What level of horror must be reached for the Council to enforce a stop to human rights violations” (S/PV.6710) |
| Discourse 3: Strong commitment to helping Syrians | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly state their commitment in assisting the Syrian population - Call for action, unity in UNSC and taking up responsibility as UN peacekeepers - Praises courage of Syrian population - Turned directly to Syrian people in several speeches - Lively and emotional speeches in UNSC | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “France (...) will not cease its efforts to ensure that the rights of the Syrian people are recognized and respected” (S/PV.6627) - “I should like to pay tribute to the courage of all those women and men who continue (...) to call for freedom in Syria” (S/PV.6627) - “Let us rise above our differences and support the plan (...). Let us live up to our responsibilities and to the political and moral duty that falls to us” (S/PV.6710) - “There is no time to lose” in “Syrian nightmare” (S/PV.6710) - “This is a sad day for the Council; it is a sad day for the Syrians; and it is sad day for all the friends of democracy” (S/PV.6711) - “We will continue to support the peaceful Syrian opposition” (S/PV.6711) - “France will not leave the Syrian people to face the crimes to which they are victim alone” (S/PV.6810) - “The double veto will not stop us” (S/PV.6810) |
| Discourse 4: Changing discourse | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beginning 2011: attempt to preserve stability through | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Such stability can only come about through an end to the violence against the demonstrators and the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>towards Assad regime</p> | <p>reforms of government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - End 2011: condemning Assad regime - Claiming Assad regime lost legitimacy - Strongly condemning the brutal Assad regime | <p>effective implementation of reforms” (S/PV.6572)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “In Syria, leaders who have lost all legitimacy are hanging on to power and dragging their country into a bloody spiral of violence” (S/PV.6636) - “The provisions adopted by the Council have been systematically violated by the Syrian regime, which has not even started to implement the first of its commitments” (S/PV.6810) |
| <p>Discourse 5: Peace and stability in region under threat</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledges that Syria plays an important role in regional stability - Regional stability in Middle East under threat -(In)Stability in Syria directly linked with (in)stability in the region <p>Describe many risks that threaten regional stability</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Syria plays a decisive role in regional stability” (S/PV.6524) - “Deep concern about the potential destabilizing influence in the region” (S/PV.6572) - The “stability of Syria is crucial for the Middle East, a region whose fragility the Council knows only too well” (S/PV.6572) - “Restore stability to that country, on which depends the stability of a fragile region” (S/PV.6627) - “To restore stability to Syria and preserve stability in the region, which is threatened” (S/PV.6636) - “Entire region is threatened: refugees flow into neighbouring countries, Lebanese sovereignty is repeatedly challenged, fears for the future of minorities and of fragile religious equilibriums are growing” (S/PV.6706) |
| <p>Discourse 6: The importance of protection of civilians</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stresses the importance of protection of civilians and R2P - Claims that when governments fulfill to protect their civilians and when atrocities are committed, it is the duty of the UNSC to intervene to protect civilians - Defending action in Libya | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The protection of civilians is at the heart of the mandate of United Nations peacekeeping operations” (S/PV.6650) - “When civilians die, to think about how to protect them is good, but to protect them is much better” (S/PV.6650) - In Benghazi, the UNSC was “able to prevent a massacre” (S/PV.6650) and France “is proud that it did not fail to meet that” (S/PV.6650) - “Every State has the responsibility to protect its civilian population. Even without reference to the responsibility to protect, those regional consequences are enough to establish the Council’s responsibility. (...) How can this even be up for discussion?” (S/PV.6710) |

2.4 Discussion of main findings

This Chapter has analyzed how discourse can be used to create a context in which the reader can interpret the text. The speeches of Russia, the US and France reflected their respective way of thinking about Libya and Syria. Discourse should be seen as a frame in which language is used to make claims, relate certain concepts and call for (political) acts. It is obvious that there is a wide variety between the discourses that were used to describe the situation in Libya and in Syria. Moreover, there is also a wide variety between the three members of the United Nations Security Council in addressing the two conflicts.

This paragraph will discuss three main findings of this chapter. First, the fact that the meetings on the situation in Libya were mainly aimed at the question *how* to act, not *if* the international community should act. Second, it resulted that R2P is far less important than anticipated. Especially in the case of Syria, the R2P concept seemed to be avoided completely. Third, in the case of Libya an intervention was assumed to be motivated by and to contribute to the protection of civilians, whereas in the case of Syria an intervention was assumed to further threaten the internal peace and security in Syria, and wider, the Middle East region. In Libya, an intervention was expected to ensure and improve the protection of civilians. Intervention in Syria was only approached as further endangering the faith of the civilian population and further destabilizing peace and security in an already unstable Syria. There is thus a crucial difference in how the two conflicts are being approached and contextualized.

It can be concluded that all actors approach or frame the conflict in their own way. This explains to a large extent the different responses of members of the international community.

Looking at the speeches from a Critical Discourse Analysis angle, it is clear that on the textual level, the terminology and type of language already reveal some of the author's position to a certain extent. When France, for example, turned directly to the Syrian people in its statements, it revealed the commitment of France to support the Syrian civilians. Russia (mainly and exclusively) stressed the importance of sovereignty; this is not surprising, considering that this is one of the core values of Russia's Realist policy. On a discursive level, the concepts of intertextuality, interdiscursivity and the polyphone structure brought to light some very interesting findings. One of the main findings was that Russia, the US and France all related the stability in Syria directly to peace and security in the region. This was of crucial importance and will further be discussed in the next chapter. Another important finding was that there were far less references to R2P than originally anticipated. Mainly France, and sometimes the US, referred to R2P but only during the discussions on Libya. In the discussion on Syria it seems as if R2P was avoided on purpose. While R2P was mentioned multiple times by various actors in the Security Council meetings on Libya, R2P has only been mentioned sporadically during the Security Council meetings on Syria. It is assumed that this is a consequence of the fact that in the case of Libya, seen at least from a Chinese or Russian perspective, the concept of R2P has been misused for regime change and that R2P got a primarily negative connotation. However, this cannot be concluded with absolute certainty yet, and will therefore be analyzed in more detail in the next chapter.

The introduction of the crisis frame was used to contextualize speeches. The speeches do not stand on its own, and should be seen in the broader social level that reveals the institutional and power context in which these speeches have to be interpreted and that serve to answer the research question. The next chapter will offer the broader context in which these speeches should be interpreted.

Already at a very early stage the Security Council adopted a Press Statement on the situation in Libya (SC/10180), in which the use of force was condemned and several measures were issued against the Gaddafi regime. The High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ms. Pillay, “reminded member States that, when a State manifestly fails to protect its population from serious international crimes, the international community has the responsibility to step in and take protective action” (S/PV.6490). Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon underlined the call for protective action, by stating that “in these circumstances, the loss of time means more loss of lives” (id.). Not surprisingly, therefore, the meetings of the Security Council on Libya were dominated by discourses on ‘the protection of civilians’, ‘the role of the international community to respond to the atrocities committed by the regime’ and the ‘responsibility to protect the Libyan civilian population’. The use of force by the Gaddafi regime against its own population was condemned and the situation was framed into a ‘good versus evil’ scenario in which the international community had the responsibility to protect the Libyan civilian population against the brutal and bloody repression of the Gaddafi regime. This was mainly the discourse that was being used by France and the US, who played a leading role in the intervention in Libya. Russia, in line with its foreign policy, was very sceptical about Resolution 1973, but its concerns on the limits of the use of force and its concerns about infringing with the sovereignty principle did not lead to a veto. When NATO overstepped its mandate, by initiating heavy bombardments on Libya, Russia (and China) came to the conclusion that it would never agree to any such resolution in the (near) future by using its veto power. This explains to a large extent the deadlock in the Security Council in the case of Syria.

Whereas in the case of Libya multiple reasons could be found to intervene in Libya, in the case of Syria the list of reasons why NOT to intervene was, and still is, increasing. The situation in Syria was literally approached as part of the ‘situation in the Middle East, including the Palestine question’, the heading under which all the meetings in the UNSC on Syria are held. This immediately brings to light one of the main differences in the discussions on the two situations in the Security Council. Russia, the US as well as France approached Syria as a keystone in the stability of the wider Middle East. It was assumed by all three countries that a destabilized Syria will threaten peace and security in the entire region. And that is something that should be prevented at all costs.

One of the main – and not anticipated - findings of this chapter is that references to Libya, as well as to the concept of R2P and the protection of civilians, were limited to a minimum. As soon as there were references to R2P, they were included in this analysis. However, especially in the Security Council meetings on Syria, the R2P principle was hardly ever mentioned at all. The US attempted to convince Russia and China that Syria was a unique case that required its own approach, but without success. Another difference between the discussions on Libya and Syria in the UNSC is the fact that in the case of Syria member states used stronger language against one another. France and the US, as well as many other members of the UNSC, were furious about China and Russia using their veto powers three times in a row and thereby blocking all resolutions that attempted to bring an end to the ever ongoing crisis in Syria. Russia (and China) justified their vetoes by arguing that it was not in line with the principle of sovereignty. Russia feared a destabilization of the region, and was only interested in a political solution, against the background of the fact that violence in Syria was not one sided. The US increasingly seemed to share the latter argument.

Given these circumstances, it is obvious that in the case of Syria reaching an agreement in the Security Council was, and still continues to be, almost impossible. For the period analysed, the Security Council only managed to reach agreement on a single Presidential Statement on August 3, 2011. The members of the UNSC spend most of the time trying to overcome the political differences

between the respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity on the one hand and the respect for human rights and protection of civilians on the other hand. These issues touch upon the core of the international system, as embodied in the United Nations, and are hard to overcome. Moreover, it puts members in a moral dilemma (which is also at the heart of the debate on the Responsibility to Protect): how long can you hold on to the sovereignty of a state if this state is unable, or even unwilling, to ensure the safety of its citizens?

In both cases it was pointed out that crimes against humanity have been committed. Yet, the reasons why this led to a timely and decisive response in the case of Libya and three un-adopted resolutions and a deadlock in the Security Council in the case of Syria will be further discussed in the next chapter that will move beyond the speeches in the UNSC. The fact that Russia and China have used their veto power to block any Security Council action on Syria, is not considered to be a satisfactory answer to the question why the international community decided to intervene in Libya but not in Syria. Therefore, the next chapter will further analyze the main discourses of Russia, the US and France that this chapter has identified and will analyze in how far this can help to answer the main research question.

Chapter III

Comparative analysis of the situation in Libya and Syria

3.1 Main findings of the previous chapter

In the previous chapter, an analysis has been given of the main types of discourses of Russia, the US and France in the UNSC meetings on Libya and Syria. It turned out that in the two cases the used discourses differed widely. It was concluded that the meetings on the situation in Libya were mainly aimed at the question *how* to act, not *if* the international community should act. Other major findings were that there was far less attention to R2P than originally anticipated and that the two cases were approached, contextualized and framed differently.

Chapter 2 provided a comprehensive overview of the main discourses that were used by the various actors. In order to give this complete overview between four and six discourses have been identified. The main discourses have now been limited to the three most important discourses that capture the essence of the discourses of Russia, the US and France on Libya and Syria, all in table. The three main discourses of the different actors in the respective situation are shown in the table below. This was done for several reasons. First, some discourses of the same actor in the same case were almost similar and could therefore easily be combined into one discourse. For example, in the case of France on Syria, discourses such as ‘strong commitment to helping the Syrian population (21)’ and ‘concerns about the situation in Syria (27)’ have been combined to ‘concerns about humanitarian situation and commitment to helping the Syrian population (48)’. Second, the three discourses in the table are based on a quantitative selection which means that, if two discourses were merged into one main discourse, the number of codes was added together. The number in brackets refers to the (total) amount of codes that is related to the specific discourse. Therefore, it can be said with certainty that these three discourses are the three main ones. Third, this research consists of six (fairly large) tables that show in detail how the discourses of the three actors concerning the cases of Libya and Syria are established. In order to give a clear visual overview that shows the essence of the discourse analysis, it was decided to show this all in one table. By combining several related discourses, the table below gives a complete overview of how the discourses were framed by the three different actors in the two situations.

| | Libya | Syria |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Russia | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fear that (excessive) use of force by the international community will lead to a civil war and destabilization of the region (5) 2. Condemn the use of force of Libyan authorities against civilians (4) 3. Territorial integrity and sovereignty (1) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explicitly oppose the use of force (Destabilization of region and sovereignty and territorial integrity) (42) 2. Work on political solution (13) 3. Violence is not one-sided (10) |
| The United States | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about the humanitarian situation (8) 2. Atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime (5) 3. Role of the international community to protect civilians (4) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condemn the violence of Assad regime against demonstrators calling for reforms (30) 2. Call on the UNSC to take action (blame veto Russia and China) (28) 3. Syria is an unstable region (4) |

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| France | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brutal and violent dictator vs. innocent civilians (10) 2. Responsibility of the international community to protect civilians (5) 3. Crisis frame (Deteriorating situation and new era for protection of civilians) (4) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about humanitarian situation and commitment to helping the Syrians (48) 2. Incapability of the Council (due to veto Russia and China) (42) 3. Peace and stability in region under threat (10) |
|---------------|--|--|

Chapter 1 discussed the background and criteria of the concept of R2P in detail and has shown how Russia, the US and France position themselves towards R2P. Chapter 2 has analysed the speeches of Russia, the US and France on Libya and Syria in the UNSC and gave a detailed insight in how these three actors have approached the two conflicts. The way these conflicts have been approached, or in more political terms, have been framed, inevitably leads to a certain call for action from the three main actors; either in the form of a military intervention or striving for a more political solution. The expectation was that the R2P principle would have played an important role in the decision whether or not to intervene. However, the role of R2P was not as important as previously anticipated. Therefore, this chapter will look more into the situation in Libya and Syria on the ground. It will further analyze the reasons that were given for (non) intervention in the cases of Libya and Syria. The table shows that, in the case of Libya, the use of force by the Gaddafi regime against the civilian population was condemned and that the international community had a responsibility in protecting civilians. The responsibility of the international community, by means of applying R2P as a justification for intervention, is analyzed in paragraph 3.2. The essence of this chapter is to analyze the other reasons for (non) intervention that were giving by Russia, the US and France, resulting from the Critical Discourse Analysis from the previous chapter and to show that Libya and Syria are two separate cases with their own characteristics. Russia stated that it opposed an intervention in Syria because the violence was not one-sided and Russia, the US and France all feared that an intervention would lead to a destabilization of the wider region. This chapter assesses these discourses in paragraph 3.3 by analyzing and comparing the situation in Libya and Syria based on seven factors that have influenced the decision to intervene in Libya, but not in Syria.

The numerous meetings on Syria in the UNSC suggest that the situation in Syria is more complex. This chapter will give an insight into the complexity of the situation in Syria compared to Libya, based on these seven factors that have been selected by the author, partly derived from Bijl (2012). These factors give a more complete picture of the uniqueness of the situation in Libya and Syria. By applying the seven factors to the situation in Libya and Syria, this chapter clarifies how the uniqueness of these cases explains the different response of the international community to intervene in one case but not in the other. As pointed out before, the decision to intervene is a highly selective one and assuming that intervention in one case will automatically imply intervention in another (seemingly comparable) case is starting from the wrong assumption. Therefore, the main question that this chapter will address is: how can the uniqueness of these two cases offer an explanation for the selectivity of Russia, the US and France to intervene in Libya but not in Syria?

3.2 Application of R2P criteria

It was concluded in Chapter 2 that the role of R2P was not as important as previously anticipated. There were only a few references to the R2P principle and the obligation of the actors in the Security

Council to take responsibility for the crisis in Syria. A distinction should be made here for the case of Libya, where R2P turned out to be a key concept in drawing up Resolutions 1970 and 1973. However, in the case of Syria the R2P concept has been carefully avoided by all members of the Security Council. It is hypothesized that this can partly be explained by the misuse of R2P beyond the mandate in the case of Libya. In this paragraph the criteria of R2P as outlined in Chapter 1 will be applied to the situation in Libya and Syria. It has to be noted that, since this research is based on an analysis of speeches in the UNSC between February 2011 and July 2012, this paragraph will also assess the application of R2P based on this time period. This was decided because the application of R2P should be seen in the light of what has been discussed in the UNSC at that time. Therefore, it could be that criteria of R2P might have not been fulfilled at the time of the researched period but if they were re-assessed based on the current situation in Syria, they might would have been fulfilled.

In paragraph 1.6.2 the criteria for R2P as established by the ICISS have been discussed. These criteria serve as guidelines in determining in which situations R2P can or should be applied. This paragraph will address these six criteria to the situation in Libya and Syria and will analyze whether or not these criteria have been fulfilled. The reaction of the international community is based on the “failure of that state to meet its responsibilities as a sovereign member of the international community” (Badescu, 2010:5). The measures on which the international community can rely, can take different forms and will only include coercive measures in extreme cases.

Right authority

As pointed out in paragraph 1.4.2 the right authority which is responsible for authorizing the use of force is the United Nations Security Council. In the case of Libya, the members in the UNSC agreed on Resolution 1973 that ruled that the use of coercive means was legitimate. Ten countries voted in favor of this Resolution while Russia, China, Brazil, India and Germany abstained from voting. With the adoption of Resolution 1973, the UNSC authorized the use of force which leads to a fulfillment of this criterion in the case of Libya.

In the case of Syria, there has not been any such Resolution so far. The members in the UNSC are not able to agree on the proper way to take action, resulting in a deadlock in the UNSC. Without UNSC agreement there is no right authority that authorizes the use of force and therefore the outcome of this criterion is negative for Syria.

Just cause

A decision to intervene is considered to be based on a just cause in case “it can halt or avert “large scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product either of deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or large scale ‘ethnic cleansing’, actual or apprehended, whether carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape” (ICISS report, 2001:32). In case it satisfies either one of these conditions, intervention is considered as just. R2P aims to offer protection against mass atrocities, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing or genocide. For Libya, it was clear that the establishment of a no-fly zone and the use of coercive means could offer protection against the atrocities that were committed by the Gaddafi regime. It was laid down in Resolution 1973 that “widespread and systematic attacks (...) against the civilian population may amount to crimes against humanity” (S/RES/1973). The explicit reference that ‘crimes against humanity’ might take place in Libya legitimizes the use of R2P. In addition, because of the imminent threat that the Gaddafi regime posed against its own people when Gaddafi threatened to slaughter the ‘rats and cockroaches’, the members in the UNSC feared

deliberate state action that could lead to a violation of the four mass crimes.

In Syria, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect stated on July 21, 2011, that crimes against humanity might have been committed and continue to be committed in Syria (S/PV.6590). This has been confirmed in the UN Report (2012) on Syria. Combined with over 100,000 deadly victims, large scale loss of life seems to be the case. It can thus be concluded that in both cases the just cause criterion was fulfilled.

Right intention

It is stipulated by the ICISS (2001:35) that that the use of military force is done for the right intention if the “primary purpose of the intervention must be to halt or avert human suffering”. The alteration of borders, advancing a particular actor in the conflict, occupation of territory or the overthrow of a regime are not legitimate objectives that can be justified. The fact that decisions to intervene are taken on a multilateral basis, support of the people that is affected by the outcome of the intervention and support of neighboring countries add to the fulfillment of the right intention criterion. Resolution 1973 on Libya contained six implicit references that express “grave concern at the heavy civilian casualties” and the “widespread and systematic attacks against the civilian population” (S/RES/1973). In addition, there were seven explicit references to “protection of civilians” (S/RES/1973). This clearly shows that intervention was seen as an attempt to halt or avert human suffering and ensure human protection in Libya.

In the case of Syria, the matter is more complex. Despite calls from the US that the international community should protect the Syrian people from the brutality of the regime (S/PV.6711), the strong commitment of France in assisting the Syrian population and numerous calls for the protection of civilians, Russia (and China) had serious doubts about the right intentions of the countries that were in favor of an intervention in Syria. Russia feared the US and France would “further their plans of imposing their own design on sovereign states” (S/PV.6810) and use R2P as a pretext to impose regime change, as was the case in Libya. According to Russia (and China), there is no such right intention; based on the statements of the US and France in the UNSC, their intentions are purely humanitarian. Therefore, for Syria this criterion is neither fulfilled nor not fulfilled.

Last resort

It has been stipulated by the ICISS that the rule of thumb for the use of force is that “every diplomatic and non-military avenue for the prevention or peaceful resolution of the humanitarian crisis must have been explored” (ICISS, 2001:36). Since there is not always time to carry out every available option, the ICISS ruled that “there must be reasonable ground for believing that, in all the circumstances, if the measure had been attempted it would not have succeeded” (p.36). Resolution 1970 on Libya established non-military measures, like a referral of the Libyan case to the International Criminal Court (ICC), the establishment of an arms embargo, a travel ban and an asset freeze of the Gaddafi regime. Additionally, Resolution 1973 established several coercive measures like the establishment of a no-fly zone and the ban on flights. After the peaceful means were exhausted, the use of force was thus legitimately used as a last resort for Libya.

For Syria, this stage has not yet been reached since no agreement could be reached on peaceful measures such as broader economic sanctions, the six-point plan of the Joint Special Envoy Annan and a ceasefire agreement. All these measures were blocked by a veto of Russia and China on the third failed Resolution on July 19, 2012. Since the focus for Syria is on a political solution and the

diplomatic means have not been explored, the criterion of the use of force as a last resort is not fulfilled.

Proportional means

Military intervention should be in line with the purpose of the intervention and the means should be limited to what is strictly necessary in order to achieve the goal of the intervention. Obviously, the military action should be in line with international humanitarian law. According to the ICISS Report “the scale, duration and intensity of the planned military intervention should be the minimum necessary to secure the humanitarian objective in question” (ICISS, 2001:37). After Gaddafi threatened to “slaughter” [protestors] “inch by inch” [and] “house by house” and referred to the protestors as “rats and cockroaches” (ABC News, 2011), a direct reference to the genocide committed in Rwanda, the international community feared a bloodbath in Libya. From that point onwards and “faced with Gaddafi’s imminent intention to massacre the city’s population, it was clear that tough international action in response to the Libyan government manifest failure to uphold its responsibility to protect was needed to halt ongoing crimes and prevent a bloodbath” (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, n.d., p.1). The establishment of a no-fly zone and the ban on flights can be considered as proportional to the threatening situation.

Since there is no such discussion (yet) for the situation in Syria, it is impossible to judge whether it is proportional or not.

Reasonable prospects

The sixth and final criterion that has to be taken into account for military intervention to be justified, is a reasonable prospect of success in “halting or averting the atrocities or suffering that triggered the intervention in the first place” (ICISS, 2001:37). The rule of thumb here is the principle of doing no harm. As pointed out in the section on the previous criterion, the situation in Libya was so threatening that the international community feared a bloodbath if it would not intervene. The reference to the genocide in Rwanda, strengthened the Security Council in its decision that military intervention was justified in order to halt further atrocities in Libya. Moreover, an intervention in Libya was considered as rather easy to carry out since the Libyan army was not very strong and a no-fly zone was relatively easy to carry out in Libya’s coastal areas.

In the case of Syria, there are various risks that the conflict will further escalate. Mainly Russia has often voiced its concerns over the consequences of military intervention. It is often assumed that a military intervention in Syria will lead to further escalation of the conflict, contribute to the destabilization of the region and have spill-over effects neighboring countries. If the outcome and unintended consequences of military action are worse compared to the situation where there is no military intervention at all, it seems logic to not carry out a military intervention at all. However, the humanitarian situation in Syria is so threatening that not acting can be considered as morally highly questionable. Since it is not the goal of this research to analyze the consequences of action and inaction of military intervention, the applicability of this criterion for Syria remains uncertain.

3.2.1 Conclusion

This paragraph has analyzed and applied the ICISS criteria for military intervention to the situations in Libya and Syria. The outcomes of (non)applicability of the criteria in the two cases are very different. Whereas for the situation in Libya all six criteria seem to be fulfilled, only one criterion is applicable to Syria. The right authority and the use of force as last resort are not applicable and the outcome concerning right intention and reasonable prospects of intervention are unclear. To a great extent

this can be attributed to the fact that the discussion was not so much about whether or not to intervene, but more about finding consensus on peaceful means to solve this conflict. The discussions were often dominated by the idea that a solution could still be found through diplomatic means rather than the use of force. Therefore, the criteria whether or not the military intervention as proposed was proportional, cannot be judged for Syria.

| Application of R2P criteria | Libya | Syria |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|
| Right authority | + | - |
| Just cause | + | + |
| Right intention | + | +/- |
| Last resort | + | - |
| Proportional means | + | n/a |
| Reasonable prospects | + | +/- |

3.3 Comparative analysis of Libya and Syria

The discourse analysis alone does not suffice in answering the main research question, since it fails to explain why R2P has been avoided in the case of Syria. Chapter 2 concluded that all the actors frame the conflict in their own way. In order for the discourse analysis to ‘make sense’, it has to be placed in a broader context, i.e. the social practice. Therefore, this paragraph will look more closely into the situation of Libya and Syria. As stated before, since this research is based on an analysis of speeches in the UNSC between February 2011 and July 2012, this paragraph will also analyze the situation in Libya and Syria of this time period. This was decided because the analysis of the situation on the ground should be seen in the light of what has been discussed in the UNSC at that time. Since the situation in Syria is changing rapidly, it could be that the current situation is different from the situation that has been described below. This paragraph compares the situation in Libya and Syria and shows the uniqueness of these two cases, based on the following seven factors; 1) timing, 2) the level of threat, 3) the organization of the opposition, 4) the role of international organizations, 5) the role of regional organizations, 6) the chance of success and 7) the operational factors. The aim of this paragraph is twofold. First, it shows that these are two separate cases and that there are many differences on crucial points that explain the different response of the international community (not) to intervene. Second, it further analyzes reasons for (non) intervention that were brought forward by Russia, the US and France in the UNSC meetings on Libya and Syria such as the fact that violence in Syria is not one-sided and that an intervention in Syria leads to a destabilization of the wider region.

3.3.1 Differences between Libya and Syria

Despite some similarities between the cases of Libya and Syria, it is important to see them as two separate cases. It is too simple to expect that an intervention in one country automatically means an intervention in another country. The question, ‘if there was an intervention in Libya, then why not in

Syria?', "assumes that the two situations are analogous and can be dealt with in the exact same way" (OilPrice, 2012). As has been pointed out above, Libya and Syria share some similarities but far more differences: "Syria is not Libya and this difference is made all the more clear by the geopolitical interests, great power relations, and the harsh realities of realpolitik that are involved" (OilPrice, 2012). This paragraph will discuss the aspects that help to answer the question: why an intervention in Libya, but not in Syria?

3.3.1.1 Timing

When it comes to intervention, timing is crucial. The British military think tank Royal United Services Institute for Defense and Security Studies (RUSI) pointed out in a report that "the Libyan intervention took place in a singularly unique moment where the international stars (...) were aligned in a set of propitious circumstances" (Walt, 2012). The successes and failures of previous interventions will always reflect on new cases. Obviously, the intervention in Libya happened first and therefore the case of Syria is considered in the light of the intervention in Libya. This remained of vital importance for the discussion in the Security Council intervention on Syria. Chapter 2 already pointed out that China and Russia were furious that the intervention was stretched far beyond the mandate and that it has been used to impose regime change. This touches upon a sensitive issue and that is that R2P was used for regime change. The fact that R2P has been misused for regime change in Libya complicated the future use of R2P in the case of Syria. Moreover, some scholars claim that the international community waited too long to take action in Syria, leaving only a choice between doing nothing and military intervention.

3.3.1.2 Level of threat of the regime towards its own population

If there is one event that triggered the timely and decisive response of the international community in Libya, it is Muammar Gaddafi's incendiary speech in which he referred to the demonstrators as "enemies of Libya who deserved to die" and ordered the public to "capture the rats" (ABC News, 2011). Gaddafi's son Saif al-Islam also warned that if the demonstrators did not accept the (minimal) reform offers, "rivers of blood will run through Libya" (Al Arabiya, 2011). Muammar Gaddafi threatened to "slaughter" [protestors] "inch by inch" [and] "house by house" and referred to the protestors as "rats and cockroaches" (ABC News, 2011). This was a direct reference to the genocide committed in Rwanda. As pointed out by Genser (2011:163) "the sheer immensity of the Rwandan genocide served notice to the world that ignoring atrocities would not make them disappear". The gravity of the crisis in Rwanda and the possible consequences of non-intervention made states realize that insufficient or no peacekeeping presence at all can lead to a horrible bloodbath. Genser (2011) underlines this when he states that "it was the memory of inaction in Rwanda and Srebrenica that motivated many political leaders to back RtoP-related action in Libya" (p.163). For members of the UNSC "it was clear that tough international action (...) was needed to halt ongoing crimes and prevent a bloodbath" (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, n.d:1). The international community "could not stand by and watch civilians get massacred" (Walt, 2012). Moreover, Gaddafi clearly stated in his speech that "he would rather die a martyr than step down" (ABC News, 2012), leaving no room for political settlement.

In an interview, Edward Luck, Special Adviser to the UN Secretary General confirmed that the incendiary speech of Gaddafi facilitated the support for Resolution 1970 and 1973. Luck argued that "when Qaddafi decided to characterize the protestors as 'cockroaches', it was a very worrisome sign (...). His early attacks on the protestors showed that he did not seem to understand the limits of

international law and human rights. In many ways, his own behaviour encouraged the international community to take strong action” (Luck, 2011). This is confirmed by Walt (2012), who argued that “Gaddafi did critical damage to his own cause - a mistake from which Assad seems to have learned” (Walt, 2012). The RUSI report concluded that Gaddafi “virtually invited military action upon himself. What dictator would now ever risk announcing the world’s media his intention to butcher an entire city like rats” (Walt, 2012).

In Syria, President Assad abstained from using the incendiary language that Gaddafi used in his speech. Especially in the beginning of the conflict, the Assad regime showed its willingness to implement political reforms and never excluded the option of a political settlement. Assad’s “promises to implement new political reforms contributed to the willingness of the international community not to put too much pressure on Syria” (Bijl, 2012:48). This explains why there was no quick and strong condemnation from the West. Moreover, the Assad regime argued that a civil war was taking place in Syria and that there were many civilians fighting one another and that the regime was merely fighting terrorists. Luck (2011) confirms “the fact that the government in Damascus has been more careful with its rhetoric means that the case there was not as obvious” (Luck, 2011). In Libya there was a quick escalation of the level and scale of violence, a clear threat to civilians and a direct incitement for crimes against humanity which left no room for political settlement. In Syria, the violence did not escalate that quickly as in Libya and the violence did not happen on such a scale and manner as happened in Benghazi. It has to be noted that, since this analysis researches the situation in the period between February 2011 and July 2012, the current situation (which is now far more threatening towards its own population) would have been assessed differently.

3.3.1.3 Organisation of the opposition

The opposition in Libya was “in large part made up of inexperienced young volunteers” (Guardian, 2011). The opposition consisted of civilians, mainly young men and military troops that had abandoned Gaddafi’s regime (Bijl, 2012:47). It was backed by many deserting military troops that often brought heavy weaponry with them. One of the main advantages of the opposition was that it had some liberated areas that were under opposition control like Benghazi and Tobruk. This had important logistical and operational advantages for the opposition forces. The opposition also organized itself on a political level and formed an interim government, the National Transitional Council (NTC). The NTC had a territorial stronghold in Benghazi and was unanimously recognized as legitimate representative of Libyan people. Moreover, the head of Libya’s revolutionary council, Mustafa Abdel Jalil, pleaded at the international community to impose a no-fly zone over Libya because “the longer the situation carries on, the more blood is shed. (...) They [the international community] have to live up to their responsibility” (CNN, 2011). Furthermore, the regular army of Libya has always been quite small because Gaddafi feared that it would undertake a coup. The opposition “had effective control over a part of the territory [and] the regular army was weak” (Jeangène Vilmer in Fair Observer, 2012). This facilitated the support for the imposition of a no-fly zone in Libya.

In Syria, the opposition is more fragmented. The Syrian opposition is “more splintered and inchoate than were the Libyan rebels” (Crowley, 2012). Except for the Northern region, one cannot speak of liberated areas because there are constant fights about territory and once territory has been liberated by the opposition, it can always be (re)conquered by the government troops. There are some deserting soldiers but not like Libya where they brought heavy weaponry. It has to be noted that this will change in a later stage but not in the period that is analyzed. The opposition

mainly uses guerrilla style tactics. The opposition is heavily divided politically, but also operationally. This makes it difficult for other coalitions and the international community to provide assistance because situations are always changing. The Syrian Opposition Coalition (SOC) is a coalition of opposition groups who is recognized as the (sole) legitimate representative of Syria by many countries worldwide and enjoys support of many NATO countries. It is plagued by internal struggle and the lack of clear leadership. The Free Syrian Army (FSA) is its military arm, but the SOC does not have full control over the FSA and there is a gap between the military aspirations of the FSA and the political aspirations of the SOC. The heavily divided opposition groups are characterized by internal disagreements and are mainly united by their hatred against the Assad regime. Leaders of opposition groups do not always have full control over their troops. This has led to the accusation of opposition groups also being responsible for war crimes, an argument that was also brought forward by Russia in the UNSC as a reason not to intervene in Syria. The line between 'good' opposition groups and the 'bad' government is not always as clear. The opposition mainly consists of Sunni Muslims and Islamists but these groups all have their own agenda. In order to understand the complexity of the situation in Syria it is important to understand the ethnic and religious composition of Syria that is underlying the (support of a certain) opposition group.

Ethnic and religious composition

Libya consists mainly of clans and tribal communities that live within marked territories (Franssen, 2012). Bitar argues that "Syria is extremely different than Libya in terms of ethnic and sectarian heterogeneity. Libya is extremely homogenous – over 90 percent of its population is Sunni Arab. Syria's sectarian makeup renders intervention much more difficult" (Syria Deeply, 2012). Syria has an Alawite president who rules over a Sunni Muslim majority. His minority rule is supported by the Alawites and Christians who fear majority (Sunni Muslim) domination. Under the Assad regime minority groups were more or less protected therefore "some people prefer the Assad regime above the war and the insecurity of a new regime" (Klaassen, 2013). Under the Assad regime, Sunni Muslims have always been oppressed while Alawites were favoured by the regime. Consequently, it is feared that Sunni Muslims will direct their revenge not only to the Assad regime but also to its supporters, the Alawites. Zeegers (2012) confirms that ethnicity plays a major role in the conflict when states that "Qatar and Saudi Arabia (...) [are] the main enemies of the regime [and] very conservative Sunni states. (...) Supporters of the regime of Bashar al-Assad are (...) Iran, (...) [and] Hezbollah [all Shi'a states]. (...) this is basically the main reason why this conflict is so difficult for all the parties involved. It is not just revolved from repressed people to a repressing regime" (Zeegers, 2012). Furthermore Zeegers (2012) goes as far as to claim claims that this also explains why the West has not intervened in Syria. He said "I believe the people that the West wants to see in power, like secular people (...) are already in the regime. The people that they don't want to see in power, [are] conservative Muslims [and] Salafists" (Zeegers, 2012).

3.3.1.4 Role of international organizations

For the intervention in Libya, France and the UK played a leading role in mobilizing support for military intervention at the UN and NATO. The US participated in the intervention in Libya in a strategy that was referred to as 'leading from behind'. Despite some abstentions on Resolution 1973, none of the members in the Security Council vetoed against an intervention in Libya. Moreover, there was support from the European Union, the UN Secretary-General and the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Ms. Pillay, the League of Arab States (LAS), the Gulf Cooperation

Council (GCC) and the National Transitional Council (NTC). Mainly, there were no clear protestors against a no-fly zone. 16 NATO members provided military support to Operation Unified Protector and Jordan, Qatar, Sweden and the United Arab Emirates took part in Operation Unified Protector.

As pointed out in paragraph 2.3 the Security Council meetings on Syria were dominated by the multiple vetoes of China and Russia which led to harsh diplomatic language and a paralysis in the Security Council. China and Russia were already skeptical on R2P from the beginning and were even more cautious with R2P when it had been misused for regime change in Libya. Moreover, Pivovarchuk (2012) explains that Russia “continues to view the West and the US not only with suspicion, but also as a direct threat to its strategic and national interests, bringing regime change too close to home”. Hahn (2012) adds that Russia fears precedents since “a loose attitude towards humanitarian intervention could one day lead to a UN resolution allowing for Western intervention in the North Caucasus [or] Kaliningrad”. Additionally Hahn (2012) argues that, after Libya, Russia “felt betrayed by the West” [and] “does not believe that restrictions on Western actions written into a UN resolution on Syria will be honored”.

The EU, one of the main trading partners of Syria adopted an arms embargo, a visa ban and an asset freeze on government officials from Syria. Later the EU targeted economic sanctions for the duration of the conflict and a ban on oil exports. Recently, the EU has dropped the arms embargo allowing for France and the UK to send arms to the Syrian opposition. As pointed out by Baczynska (2013) NATO Chief Fogh Rasmussen said that “In Libya we took responsibility for the operation based on a United Nations mandate to protect the Libyan population against attacks from its own government (...) and we had active support from the countries in the region. None of these conditions are fulfilled in Syria”. However, there are some doubts about the political willingness and the financial and military capacity of Western states Molier (2011:5) to intervene in Syria. Zeegers (2012) argues that “these technical objections that Russia vetoes or China vetoes, in my opinion, is just an excuse, a pretext not to do anything. In their hearts, I do not believe that Western governments are willing to intervene in Syria (Zeegers, 2012). Ramberg (2012) shares his criticism when he states that “neither the West nor the Arab League has the stomach to mire themselves in the potential quagmire that Syria’s sectarian and ethnic division pose”.

3.3.1.5 Role of regional organizations

This paragraph will compare the role of the regional organizations, the League of Arab States, the African Union and the Gulf Cooperation Council with regard to Libya and Syria. Luck (2011) argues that “there was a lot of regional pressure to act in the case of Libya, and (...) even countries that are rather cautious about the responsibility to protect felt that in that particular case they couldn't go against the Arab League [or] against the African Union and try to block this kind of action”.

The League of Arab States (LAS)

The League of Arab States announced on February 22, 2011 that Libya’s membership in the Arab League had been suspended. From August, the National Transition Council (NTC) participated in the Arab League on behalf of Libya. On March 12, 2011, the LAS passed a resolution in which it called upon the Security Council to impose a no-fly zone and to establish safe areas that allowed for the protection of the Libyan People. According to Al Jazeera (2011) Amr Moussa, Secretary-General of the Arab League claimed that “the main goal of the decision is to protect the civilian population in Libya”. As pointed out by the Guardian (2011) “the Arab’s league call for a no-fly zone gives the regional seal of approval NATO has said it needed for military intervention”. Moreover, the LAS stated that due to the serious violations and grave crimes committed by the Gaddafi regime, the

regime consequently lost its legitimacy and that the LAS will cooperate with the National Transition Council (NTC) instead. Bellamy and Williams (2011:841) point to some contextual factors that might have played a role in the support of the LAS for a no-fly zone. First, the prominent role of the pro-US GCC and the fact that only eleven LAS members were present. Second, Bellamy and Williams (2011:842) argue that “Qadhafi’s regime (...) was widely distrusted across Africa and the Middle East, not least for its role in fuelling conflicts in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Chad, as well as the radical Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Moreover, Gaddafi’s personal relations with key Arab leaders were bad since he had insulted them. Third, Bellamy and Williams (2011:842) argue that a “combination of genuine humanitarian solidarity and opportunism” have played an important role. It was clear that atrocities were being committed in Libya and this facilitated Gaddafi’s unpopularity in the region. After close coordination with the UN, the EU, the GCC and the AU, the LAS called for the imposition of a no-fly zone and safe area to ensure the protection of civilians. Bellamy and Williams (2011:843) claimed that “Resolution 1973 would have been unthinkable without the LAS resolution”.

In the case of Syria, the regional organizations LAS, GCC and AU played a more nuanced role. The Arab League and the GCC did not respond timely and decisive manner as was done in the case of Libya. According to Bijl (2012:4) this can partly be explained because the “Arab League is much closer to Bashar al-Assad”. As stated by Luck (2011) “the Arab League condemn[ed] the violence against peaceful protestors, but it took a while before they came to that position”. The LAS condemned the use of violence against protestors without proposing any manners to end human rights violations. The LAS “suspended Syria from the body, prohibited travel of designated Syria officials to Arab states, froze Syria’s government assets abroad and halted transactions with Syria’s central bank and commercial exchanges with the government while calling for President Bashar al-Assad to step down” (Ramberg, 2012). Kuwali (2012:2) argues that it is clear that the different relations with Syria are reflected in the “absence of unanimity in the Arab League to take a decisive action to halt the atrocities”.

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC)

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) consists of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. On March 7, 2011, the GCC “called on the UN Security Council to ‘take all necessary means to protect civilians’, including enforcing a no-fly zone over Libya” (2011:841). On March 10, 2011, the GCC claimed that Gaddafi’s regime had lost all legitimacy and advise the League of Arab States to work with the National Transition Council instead.

The African Union (AU)

According to Bellamy and Williams (2011:284) the African Union (AU) was “more cautious and rather less generous to the Interim Council than (...) the LAS”. On February 23, 2011, the African Union declared that indiscriminate and excessive use of violence and lethal weapons against peaceful demonstrators was considered as violation of human rights and international humanitarian law.

Libya and Syria’s role in the region

Since the role of regional organizations is to a large extent dependent upon the role of Libya and Syria in the region, the following paragraph will give an overview of their role in the region and with neighbouring countries. The RUSI report (2012) concluded that “Gaddafi had no powerful friends and was isolated in a way that Bashar al-Assad (...) is not”. OilPrice (2012) stated that “Gaddafi’s regime has virtually no regional allies, most leaders viewed him as a nonsensical maniac and, unlike in Syria, the Arab League (...) actually welcomed a no-fly zone in Libya”.

Syria has many allies in the region of which Iran and Hezbollah are its closest allies. Syria maintains a very close relationship with Iran that dates back to Syria's controversial support to Iran in the Iran-Iraq war. Lim (2012) claims that Syria "serves as an Arab counterweight to surrounding Sunni Arab governments hostile to Iran (...), as force enabler and supply conduit between Teheran and Hezbollah, and as safe haven for Hezbollah". Lim (2012) clarifies that "If Assad goes, so would Iran's only other regional state ally and a significant toehold on the Arab street". Hezbollah is another close ally of Syria and its leader has openly admitted that Hezbollah is participating in the war in Syria at the side of the Gaddafi regime.

Importance of support of regional organizations

Bellamy and Williams (2011:839) concluded that "activism by the UN Secretariat and the relatively tough stance taken by regional organizations thus set the context for the Security Council's discussions on the crisis". With the support of the LAS, the GCC, the IOC, the AU, the NTC and civil population in Libya it was easy to mobilize political will for an intervention in Libya. As argued by the International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (n.d.:2). "Early condemnation and calls for action in response to the crisis by the League of Arab States (LAS) on 22 February, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) on 22 February, and the African Union (AU) on 23 February were crucial for the international community to move forward with stronger measures to protect civilians".

3.3.1.6 Chance of success

The chance of success is one of the criteria of R2P and is crucial in determining whether or not intervention is the best option. This paragraph will look at the level of support for the regime and the regional consequences of an intervention. Because of the immense level of threat in Libya (as discussed in paragraph 3.3.1.2, it was assumed that a military intervention in Libya was the only way to prevent a bloodbath in Benghazi where an indiscriminate massacre was expected to take place. Moreover it was generally believed that Libya would be a fairly simple operation (...). Libya is flat, without foliage or places to hide equipment, and the Libyan air force is a joke" (News 24, 2011).

The chance of success is also influenced by the level of support for the regime. The Assad regime "still receives the support of a sizeable portion of the Syrian population. (...). With Alawites monopolizing political and military positions of power within the Syrian state, and with the military still loyal to the Syrian government, inducing Assad to relinquish power will be no easy feat" (OilPrice, 2012). Balanche confirms that "the Assad regime is firmly anchored by part of the population, particularly the Alawite minority" (Syria Deeply, 2012). Bitar adds that "It is also not enough [just] for Assad to fall – he has a constituency that might continue to fight even when he's ousted" (Syria Deeply, 2012).

The consequences for the region also impact the level of success. In Libya "the risk of regional escalation was almost negligible [because] Libya's isolation avoided an extension of the war to neighbouring countries" (Jeangène Vilmer, 2012). Yet, the fact that the Tuaregs, who were former soldiers of the Gaddafi regime, would flee to Mali while bringing heavy weaponry from Libya to start a crisis in Mali was underestimated. As could also be seen in the meetings of the UNSC, the discussions on whether or not to intervene in Syria were always contextualised in what the consequences for the region would be. In the case of Libya, it was assumed that an intervention would contribute to the protection of civilians but in the case of Syria, an intervention was expected to further destabilize the wider region as argued by Russia, the US and France. Syria is considered to be a keystone in upholding security in the Middle East. However, an intervention in Syria seems highly unlikely since (Western) "governments saw problems everywhere; the strong air force of the

Syrian army, the fragmentation of the opposition. The idea that a new regime would arise from the Sunni majority and that it would endanger the stability in the region. A new civil war in Lebanon, increased sectarian violence in Iraq and (...) the consequences for Israel” (Roelants, 2013).

As pointed out in paragraph 3.3.1.3 there is a serious risk of a sectarian war in Syria. “There are already sectarian undertones embedded in the civil unrest and a sectarian war, exacerbated by foreign military intervention, would be a mess that NATO would rather not get entangled in” (OilPrice, 2012). With the risk of the conflict turning into full-blown sectarian warfare, “NATO leaders might feel that if they don’t talk about Syria, these outcomes won’t be blamed on them” (Washington Post, 2012). Nerguizian concludes that “this the most complex situation that any military planner can imagine.(...) The question isn’t whether or not NATO can act –any country with air power can act. But producing a desired outcome cannot be guaranteed” (Syria Deeply, 2012).

When talking about levels of success, it is important to ask the question: success for whom? This depends on the perspective that is chosen: the perspective from the intervener or from the people of the country that is being intervened in. The rule of thumb in interventions is based on the Hippocratic principle not to do more harm than good. There is an irony to the complexity of Syria and that is that it almost seems too complex to be solved successfully. With the multiple risks of spill-over effects to other countries and the risk of turning into a sectarian warfare it becomes almost impossible not to cause more harm than to prevent. For that reason, critics have questioned the *willingness* of the international community to intervene. Jeangène Vilmer (2012) claims that “it is comforting to use Russia and China as convenient scapegoats for the lack of intervention”. With the risk of doing more harm than good, a military intervention seems unlikely. Whereas the chances of success in the case of Libya can be seen as rather high, the chances of success in the case of Syria seem low.

3.3.1.7 Operational considerations

This paragraph will analyze several operation consideration such as the strength of the army of Libya and Syria, geographical factors that influences the establishment of the no-fly zone and the presence of resources. Despite the fact that the army of Libya was composed of ill equipped and poorly trained troops “the NATO intervention in Libya was not a walk in the park. Though [Libyan dictator Muammar] Gaddafi’s army was amateurish compared to [Bashar al-Assad’s] Syrian Army, it took six months for NATO to oust him (...). The Syrian Army has much more serious capabilities” (Syria Deeply, 2012). Kuwali (2012:5) describes the Syrian army as a “strong army which would make any conceivable military intervention difficult and bloody”. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) “Assad has [unlike Gaddafi] hugely upgraded his air- and sea-attack capabilities since the revolt against him erupted a year ago” (Walt, 2012). Unlike Libya, Syria’s army had only few military defections, “mainly of low-rank conscripts, but not of entire units with their armour” (Lister, 2012).

Geographical factors also play an important role since the establishment of a no-fly zone was significantly than it would be in Syria. Since most of the fighting in Libya took place along a narrow and flat coastal strip, “target acquisition was relatively simple [and] most regime targets in Libya were close to the Mediterranean coast and within easy reach of NATO air bases in Italy” (Lister, 2012). “Syria’s physical geography is more challenging (...) [it] is mountainous, with few major roads” (Lister, 2012). Additionally the “dense urban environment poses (...) problems” (OilPrice, 2012), one should have to fly over hostile territory and there would be an overall greater risk for collateral damage. With the clear exception of Turkey, only “few of Syria’s neighbours would likely allow their

territory to be used for pre-position supplies or military units” (Lister, 2012). Balanche adds that “the geography of Syria is also different: there are densely populated zones where civilian casualties cannot be avoided by aerial strikes, whereas in Libya it was possible to target military positions in the desert” (Syria Deeply, 2012).

It is often assumed that the presence of oil resources in Libya contributed to the willingness of countries to intervene in Libya. Syria has “not any significant long-term foreign oil interests at play in Syria. Indeed Syria exports very little oil to other states” (OilPrice, 2012). Chomsky claimed that “If Libya was producing asparagus, they [France and Britain and to an extent the US] would be much less interested, that is for sure” (Chomsky, 2011). French oil company Total is one of the biggest oil investors in Libya and France is one of the main importers of crude oil. In terms of oil politics, France profited from the intervention but it is too simple to say that this explains the role of the French in Libya.

3.4 Discussion of main findings

The previous chapter pointed out that “the decision among Member States around the situation in Libya was not about *whether* to act to protect civilians from mass atrocities but *how* to best protect the Libyan population” (International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, n.d., p.1). After having analyzed and compared the situations in Libya and Syria it results that there are some similarities but overall far more differences. In terms of the factors that the previous chapter has discussed, it resulted that in Libya there was a clear threat for the civilian population and that regional organizations seemed to have play a crucial role in the establishment of a no-fly zone. In Syria, the situation is more complex; there is a heavily divided opposition, there is an enormous risk of further escalation that does not halt at the Syrian border, the risk of a sectarian warfare and the support of Russia and Iran to the Assad regime. Chapter 2 pointed out that Russia, the US and France all feared that an intervention in Syria would lead to further destabilization of the (wider) region. In addition, Russia argued that the violence in Syria was not one-sided. Both were reasons for not to intervene in Syria. This chapter has shown that these seem valid arguments since the opposition groups, like the regime, are also accused of war crimes. Moreover, the risks that are associated with an intervention explain the reluctance of Russia, the US and France to strive for intervention. The following paragraph will discuss the selective application of R2P in Libya and Syria in more detail.

3.4.1 Selective (non-)intervention in Libya and Syria

Article 139 stipulates that R2P should be considered on a case-to-case basis. This means that “intervening in Libya, for reasons that are unique to this particular situation, does not imply having to intervene in Syria or elsewhere” (Fair Observer, 2012). However, the question why there is no intervention in Syria while there was an intervention in Libya wrongly assumes that the two cases are comparable while they differ from one another on crucial points. When looking back at the seven factors that were discussed in this chapter, it becomes clear that in none of these factors the situation on Libya and Syria were comparable. All seven of those factors thus reinforce the idea that Libya and Syria have to be considered as two separate cases that each require a different response from the international community. As pointed out by Shanahan (2011:2) “Conditions that justify intervention in Libya do not apply in Syria. The reason for this anomaly (some might say hypocrisy), of course lies in the UN World Summit outcome that noted R2P interventions would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis”. It can be said that the massacres that are committed in Syria, are at least similar to the massacres that were committed in Libya. Yet, “the rationale of humanitarian

intervention is not for it to occur whenever it is justified, but for when it can save more lives than it kills” (Fair Observer, 2012). The rule of thumb for intervention is that it should not do more harm than good. The benefits of a military intervention for the country that is intervened in, should thus outweigh the costs. In Libya, it was generally believed that intervention under R2P would prevent a bloodbath. The fact that Gaddafi made a reference to the Rwandan genocide in his speech played an important role for the international community to intervene. Therefore, the case of Libya was contextualized in the memory of inaction of the Rwandan genocide and this facilitated the support for Resolution 1970 and Resolution 1973 based on R2P. This can also be dangerous and Jeangène Vilmer (2012) warns for, what he calls, ‘military romanticism’: calling for intervention because of concerns for humanitarian situation but underestimating the consequences of military intervention.

It can be concluded that the selectivity of R2P is inherent to the instrument. However, Jeangène Vilmer (2012) raises an important point when he clarifies that the double standards critique is in fact “a false problem, arising only to those with two convictions. First, that intervention is purely humanitarian or altruistic, and second, that there is a duty, not just a right, to intervene” (Fair Observer, 2012). It is true that intervention is not purely based on humanitarian considerations alone. Intervention is not purely altruistic because a country will only intervene in another country if the costs of intervention do not outweigh the benefits of an intervention. As this research has pointed out, the national interest of intervening countries are of importance in the decision whether or not to intervene. Intervention brings along (material) costs and the risk of lives of (military) personnel involved in the intervention and therefore the intervening states will have a degree of self-interest in order to make this sacrifice.

Colijn states in Van der Have (2012) that “the claim that the R2P has been stretched in the case of Libya to make regime change possible leads to the very complicated discussion of when and which governments can legitimately be toppled. Therefore, the R2P norm was, from the start, doomed to become a responsibility to select”. Political support for an intervention under R2P has decreased after the intervention in Libya was stretched far beyond the mandate. This explains to a large extent the paralysis in the UNSC in the situation on Syria.

There is a great irony in the situation of Syria and that is that the case of Syria is almost seems too complex to be solved successfully. With the enormous risks of spill-over effects to other countries and the risk of turning into a sectarian warfare it becomes almost impossible not to cause more harm than to prevent. For that reason, the willingness of the international community is often questioned. After all, who would want the responsibility of doing more harm than good? It is easy to agree on a principle that rules that people should be protected from serious crimes but finding agreement on the application of this principle is far more difficult. More importantly, R2P lacks a legal stance and this became painfully clear in the situation in Syria where it resulted that “the UN is only as strong as the political will if its member states, particularly those in the Security Council” (Shahbaz, 2012).

One of the prerequisites for collective security to be successful is that states are willing to put their national agendas aside and look at the common goal of preserving security where it is under threat. In the case of Syria, it resulted that both China and Russia were unable to overcome their national preferences. This points to a paradox in collective security since the international community as such does not exist and there are hardly any threats against collective security, but mainly against national security. What can be perceived as a threat to one state, does not automatically assume a threat to any other state. This depends on, among many other factors, the geographical proximity, the national interests and the fact that not all states share the same values

and concerns. Consequently, states approach threats against security according to their own national interests on a national level. Inevitably, this leads to a selectivity in which states decide what affects their national security and what not. In doing so, they place their own interest above the collective interest. Bennett (2012:4) argues that the selectivity of collective security is a consequence of “states’ individualism in a supposedly universal system”. Bennett (2012:4) underwrites the collective security theory, but he rightly points out that it is “compelling in theory, but inevitable selective in practice”.

Chapter IV

Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

As was pointed out in the ICISS report (2001) “humanitarian intervention has been controversial both when it happens, and when it has failed to happen” (ICISS, 2001:1). This thesis has aimed to analyze and compare the situations in Libya and Syria in order to give an explanation for the question: the Responsibility to Protect or the Responsibility to Select? How can the selectivity of the international community to intervene in Libya but not in Syria be explained? By analyzing the role of Russia, the United States and France, it became clear that all three countries have a different approach towards humanitarian intervention and the R2P concept. In the case of Syria, it became painfully clear that these differences are almost impossible to overcome. Yet, the Security Council remains deadlocked because of the vetoes of China and Russia and the concept of R2P seems to have lost its credibility after it has been (mis)used for regime change in Libya.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the meetings of the Security Council on Libya and Syria were dominated by completely different discourses. Whereas the responsibility of the international community, the protection of civilians, human security and the humanitarian situation were central concepts in Libya, the meetings on Syria were dominated by the complexity of the situation and the risk of (further) destabilizing the region. It was generally expected that an intervention in Libya would contribute to the protection of civilians whereas an intervention in Syria was merely approached as further endangering the faith of the civilian population and the peace and security in an already unstable wider region. Chapter 2 had also shown how the three actors all approached and framed the two cases in their own way. In response to the misuse of R2P for regime change, China and Russia stressed the importance of state sovereignty and used their veto to block resolutions on Syria. In the meetings of the Security Council on Libya it was never the question *if* the international community should act but *how* it should act to protect civilians. Moreover, Chapter 2 has shown that the concept of R2P was far less important as previously anticipated. Especially in the case of Syria there were far less references to R2P than expected. A possible explanation for this is that Russia (and China) maintains that R2P was used far beyond the mandate in Libya and that it was used under the pretext of protection of civilians while in fact it was used to impose regime change. R2P was contested and was carefully avoided in the discussions on the situation in Syria.

The application of R2P to the situation in Libya and Syria alone would not give a satisfactory answer to the main research question. Therefore, Chapter 3 has shown how, based on seven factors that have partly been selected by the author and that are partly derived from Bijl (2012). These factors clearly set the context of the two conflicts and show the distinct features of Libya and Syria and what makes them unique. It is important to analyze the differences between the two cases because this might be an explanation for the decision of the UNSC to intervene in Libya but not in Syria. Despite some similarities, Libya and Syria vary greatly from one another in many ways. As this thesis has pointed out, the intervention in Libya was a combination of several factors. The clear level of threat, the poor international standing of the Gaddafi regime, the leading role of France (and the UK), and the role of regional organizations (such as the LAS and the GCC) facilitated the decision of the UNSC to intervene. Gaddafi’s incendiary speech in which he referred to Libyans as ‘rats and cockroaches’ was a direct reference to the genocide committed in Rwanda. With this inflammatory speech, Gaddafi immediately drew attention from the international community who were convinced that they had to act in order to prevent a bloodbath in Benghazi. Therefore the situation in Libya was

contextualized in the memory of inaction in the Rwandan genocide which facilitated the support for an intervention under R2P in Libya.

The timely and decisive response of the international community was not repeated in the case of Syria, in fact the contrast almost could not have been bigger. This can partly be explained because of Article 139 that stipulates that R2P should be considered on a case-to-case basis which means that an intervention in Libya, based on reasons that are unique to that particular situation, does not automatically imply an intervention in Syria. According to China and Russia, R2P was misused for regime change in the case of Libya. Consequently, China and Russia decided to use its veto to block future interventions under R2P. Moreover, other reasons why (not) to intervene were identified in Chapter 2 and further analysed in Chapter 3. Chapter 3 has aimed to point out that one should not make the mistake to assume that these are comparable cases because they are unique and therefore require a unique response. As Chapter 3 has pointed out, in Syria, the situation is more complex; there is a heavily divided opposition, there is an enormous risk of further escalation that does not halt at the Syrian border, the risk of a sectarian warfare and the support of Russia and Iran to the Assad regime. However, the rule of thumb for interventions is not to do more harm than good. There is thus a great irony in the immense complexity of Syria and that is, that the situation in Syria seems almost too complex to be solved successfully. With the multiple risks of spill-over effects to other countries and the risk of turning into a sectarian warfare it becomes almost impossible not to cause more harm than to prevent. Doing more harm than good is a serious risk of intervention and it is almost impossible to balance the costs of action and the costs of inaction. This is a very serious problem because who then would want the responsibility of doing more harm than good? This is underlined by Ramberg (2012): “neither the West nor the Arab League has the stomach to mire themselves in the potential quagmire that Syria’s sectarian and ethnic division pose”.

Colijn stated in Van der Have (2012) that “the claim that the R2P has been stretched in the case of Libya to make regime change possible leads to the very complicated discussion of when and which governments can legitimately be toppled. Therefore, the R2P norm was, from the start, doomed to become a responsibility to select”. It has been stated before that the benefits of intervention should outweigh the costs of intervention, such as budgetary costs for the material and personnel involved. This goes for the intervening country as well the country that is intervened in. Nonetheless, it is often not clear which of the two prevails and this is very unfortunate. However, if the costs of a military intervention are higher than the benefits, there is nothing to gain for a county and then it will not intervene. An intervention is thus double-edged; on the hand it is based on improving the humanitarian situation but on the other hand it is also to a large extent based on the needs of the intervening country. Assuming that humanitarian interventions are purely based in humanitarian or altruistic considerations is an anomaly. Moreover, the Responsibility to protect is not an actual responsibility or a duty but merely a right (if properly justified based on the ICISS criteria), to intervene. There is no legal duty to act, merely a moral duty but, as this research has pointed out, this is not always sufficient. What can be concluded from this research is that R2P is compelling in theory but in practice it remains an empty slogan that lacks the legal value. In the end, the success of R2P depends on the political will of a state, if not on the national interest of the five Permanent members in the UNSC who hold veto power. Agreeing on a principle that people should be protected from the four mass atrocity crimes is easy; agreeing on a common strategy if those rights are violated remains far more complex.

There is a great irony in the immense complexity of Syria and that is that it almost seems too complex not to cause more harm than that it will prevent. However, this poses a moral dilemma

since the extreme complexity and the bleakness of the situation should not withhold the international community from providing assistance. The hypocrisy of humanitarian intervention is that it is double-edged, selective and in the end all dependent upon political will. R2P was set up as a response to the genocide in Rwanda and Bosnia but it remains highly questionable whether a universal security system such as R2P can be successful in a world in which states make individualistic choices based on their own national interests. Like R2P, the idea of collective security is compelling in theory but highly selective in practice. Common threats to security hardly exist, national threats do and therefore a common response for problems on national levels is not very likely. Especially because it is ceding with states' sovereignty. Defeating the dictum of 'never again' will demand a common response to security threats. A response that the international community failed to find in the case of Syria, leaving the dictum of 'never again' undefeated.

4.1.1. A reflection on R2P

Paragraph 3.2 has applied the criteria of R2P as described in Chapter 1 and it resulted that the (non-) applicability of R2P in the two cases are very different. For the situation in Libya all six criteria seem to be fulfilled, whereas only one criterion is applicable to Syria. This can mainly be attributed to the fact that the discussion on Syria in the UNSC was mainly about finding consensus on peaceful means to solve the conflict. Moreover, since Russia and China were convinced that R2P in the case of Libya was misused for regime change, they decided to block future R2P resolutions by using their veto, leading to a deadlock in the UNSC. It has to be noted that the situation in Syria is now different than it was in the period analyzed but still it remains highly questionable if there will ever be an intervention under R2P in Syria. R2P has often been criticized for being a normative concept and that it has been misused by NATO in Libya. Since it has no legal stance, it is ultimately about the political will of the Permanent five members in the UNSC. There is a 'Responsibility to Reality' which means that at the end of the day, the use of R2P depends to a large extent upon political will.

The aim of R2P, offering protection against the four mass atrocity crimes, is extremely high and this creates high expectations. There is thus a gap between, on the one hand, what can be expected from R2P and, on the other hand, what the international community is capable of or what people would like R2P to be. Instead of asking the question whether the capacities of R2P are high enough one can also wonder if the expectations of R2P were maybe too high? R2P is based on three dimensions: the responsibility to prevent, to react and to rebuild. The coercive measures and the use of force was only to be used as a last resort and only if six criteria were justified. It is thus important to realize the limitations of R2P. Syria painfully demonstrates the gap between the expectations and the capabilities of R2P and the need for reforms of R2P. However, it is important to note that R2P is a fairly new concept and judging it in this stage would not be fair. R2P was groundbreaking in the way that it reformulated sovereignty as a responsibility and because of this reinterpretation that "state sovereignty is no longer a shield behind which states can hide to commit mass atrocities" Badescu (2010:178). This is already a huge achievement in itself. Molier (2011) pointed out that, resulting from R2P, states now have a dual responsibility; an internal responsibility towards its own population but also an external responsibility towards the international community for protecting its civilians. Moreover, the fact that R2P has been invoked in Resolution 1970 and 1973 on Libya reflects that members of the UNSC can find consensus on R2P. Fierce opponents of R2P like China and Russia cannot be expected to drastically change their perspective on fundamental issues such as humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty at once. It is a timely process and successful applications of R2P will contribute to the recognition of the value of this principle. It reformulated

sovereignty as a responsibility and it holds regimes accountable for their actions and aims to protect civilians against the four crimes. These are valuable and ambitious goals that cannot be achieved overnight and therefore should not be judged as such. Despite the fact that R2P has the potential to grow as a toolbox in ensuring protection against mass atrocity crimes, its (ambitious) role in offering protection against mass atrocity crimes is not (yet) significant.

4.2. Limitations of this research

Although a careful and thorough research was carried out, this research has its limitations. First of all, the methodology that was used in Chapter 2 for analyzing the meetings in the UNSC is by no means an objective methodology. Critical Discourse Analysis is by definition subjective since it is merely an interpretation of the speeches and not the divine truth. Despite the fact that this is inherent to this method, it was attempted to minimize the subjectivity by combining the qualitative analysis with a quantitative analysis. Second, the Responsibility to Protect has three dimensions; the Responsibility to Prevent, the Responsibility to React and the Responsibility to Rebuild. This research has limited itself to describing the Responsibility to React because it has analyzed the reaction of three countries in the UNSC. Including the other dimensions would not directly be helpful in answering the main research question and would be beyond the scope of this research. Third, Chapter 3 might have attempted to include too many factors to distinguish the situation in Libya from the situation in Syria, thereby not giving the most important factors the attention that it deserves. In general, this thesis has discussed many different issues and this made this thesis a very lengthy one. The fourth and final limitation of this research is that the topic of research is a highly political issue and approaching it in a purely scientific and neutral way was a personal challenge for me. Moreover, when conducting the research, the political sensitivity of the topic was clearly present in many sources which this research has carefully trying to avoid.

4.2.1 Suggestions for further research

My research has pointed to several anomalies, paradoxes and challenges. One of the main paradoxes that my research has pointed out is the paradox between regime change and R2P. While regime change is not an aim of R2P, it is hard to avoid regime change when the regime is committing the atrocities. This was for example the case in Libya and is one of the main critiques of R2P today. It would be interesting to see if protection of civilians is even possible without overthrowing the regime? If so, how should this be carried out? Maybe by establishing additional criteria or by creating a roadmap for intervention? If the paradox of regime change and R2P could be addressed, this could possibly lead to greater support for R2P in the future. Another interesting research would be on the legal grounds for R2P. R2P is laid down in Chapter IV of the UN Charter and therefore it is not legally binding and members are not mandatory to act on it. Are there any possibilities that could make R2P legally binding? And can the Uniting for Peace procedure (which is also not legally binding) play a role in this?

4.3 Recommendations

As also pointed out in the reflection on R2P in paragraph 4.1.1, there is a clear gap between the expectations and the capacity of R2P. To a large extent this can be explained because R2P is a normative concept without legal stance and therefore dependent upon political willingness. Improving the efficiency of R2P should thus primarily be aimed at mobilizing political will. As pointed out by Badescu (2010:159) this can be done by the UN Secretary-General who can bring matters under the attention of the UNSC and stress the importance of R2P, civil society networks that

attempt to convince policy makers and regional bodies that strengthen the role of R2P. Many states oppose R2P because they fear that supporting it will threaten their domestic politics and national interest. However, R2P is designed in response to mass atrocities abroad that can spill-over and have destabilizing effects in the region. Therefore, states should be convinced that national interest can be under threat by mass atrocities in surrounding countries. Instead of threatening the national interests of a state, R2P can offer protection.

The biggest problem in the case of Syria is the deadlock in the Security Council. Russia and China have blocked multiple resolutions on Syria and can continue to do so in the future. Although member states could not agree upon it at the time of the ICISS Report was brought out in 2001, but the so-called 'Code of Conduct' could end the inaction in the Security Council. The Code of Conduct entails that the Permanent five members of the Security Council abstain from their veto in cases where there is a majority support for authorizing the use of force. Additionally, regional organizations like the Arab League could play a more important role in the future. They have the knowledge on the region and have a greater proximity and this makes them more acceptable to the warring parties. In the case of Libya, it became clear that both the activism of the UN Secretariat in combination with the early condemnation, calls for action and support for a no-fly zone of various regional organizations such as the LAS, the GCC, the IOC and the AU might have facilitated the mobilization of political will in the UNSC for an intervention in Libya.

Attachment

Discourse Analysis of Security Council meetings on Libya and Syria

Libya

S/RES/1970, February 26, 2011

- Civilians IIIII
- Crimes against humanity
- R2P
- Hold accountable those responsible for attacks (...) on civilians
- Commitment to sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity
- Responsible for maintenance of international peace and security under UN Charter
- Chapter VII of UN Charter
- Article 41 of UN Charter
- ICC referral
- Arms embargo
- Travel ban
- Asset freeze

S/RES/1973, March 17, 2011

- Civilians II
- Protection of Libyan people
- Responsibility of Libyan authorities
- Protection of civilians IIIII
- Crimes against humanity
- Threat to international peace and security
- Chapter VII of the UN Charter
- No-fly zone
- Arms embargo
- Flight ban
- Asset freeze
- Take all feasible steps to ensure the protection of civilians

Russia on Libya

Discourse 1: Prevent war and avoid destabilization of the region (5)

Discourse 2: Condemnation of the use of force against civilians (4)

Discourse 3: Adoption of resolution 1970 (3)

Discourse 4: Problems with resolution 1973 and the fear of excessive use of force (3)

Discourse 5: Territorial integrity and sovereignty (1)

S/PV.6490, February 25, 2011

Closed meeting, no records

S/PV.6491, February 26, 2011

- Serious concern on the situation in Syria
- Regret the loss of lives
- Condemn use of force against peaceful demonstrators
- Call upon Libyan government to comply with demands of international community
- Force will lead to a full-scale civil war
- Force will worsen the situation
- Libya as a united, sovereign state with territorial integrity
- Political settlement and/or peaceful way out of crisis

S/PV. 6498, March 17, 2011

- Use of force against civilian population unacceptable
- Considerations of principle against Resolution 1973
- Several reasons why Russia decided to veto against Resolution 1973 (mainly because it transcended its initial concept and provisions were included that made Russia fear that it would be used for large-scale military intervention)
- Advocate of protection of civilians
- Security for civilian population and long-term stability of Libya
- Unfortunately the use of force prevails for other countries
- Excessive use of force will have humanitarian consequences
- Force will further destabilize the region

The US on Libya

Discourse 1: Humanitarian situation in Libya (7)

Discourse 2: Atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime (5)

Discourse 3: Role of international community to protect the civilian population (5)

Discourse 4: Accountability of the Gaddafi's regime for its actions (3)

S/PV.6490, February 25, 2011

Closed meeting, no records

S/PV.6491, February 26, 2011

- Atrocities committed against innocents
- Chapter VII (of the UN Charter)
- Condemn violence and pursue accountability
- Stop the killing and slaughter of civilians
- Libyan government attacking its own people
- Libyan government using mass violence
- Libyan government is losing its legitimacy
- Libyan leaders are not meeting their responsibility in protecting people
- International Criminal Court (ICC) referral
- Human rights, fundamental rights
- Supporting Libyan people's universal rights. Not about Libyan people but about the people's ability in general to shape their own future

S/PV. 6498, 17 March 2011

- Libyan's people cry for help
- End attacks against civilians
- Protect innocent civilians
- Protection of civilians II
- Accountability
- War crimes and crimes against humanity
- Abuse of human rights
- International community should consider: no-fly zone, arms embargo, flight ban, asset freeze and sanction committee
- Universal rights: US should help Libyans

France on Libya

Discourse 1: Atrocities against innocent civilians (6)

Discourse 2: Gaddafi regime as brutal and violent (4)

Discourse 3: International community as protectors of Libyan civilian population (3)

Discourse 4: Responsibility to Protect (2)

Discourse 5: The time is now (2)

Discourse 6: Historical event (placing it in a broader context) (2)

S/PV.6490, February 25, 2011

Closed meeting, no records

S/PV.6491, February 26, 2011

- Continued brutal and bloody repression
- Threatening statements [Libyan leadership](#)
- Stop use of force against civilians
- Crimes against humanity
- ICC referral
- Atrocities
- Impunity is no longer an option
- [Gaddafi choose](#) to turn against his own people
- [Gaddafi choose](#) to commit atrocities
- [Responsibility to Protect](#)
- [Duty of the international community](#) to put an end to unacceptable violence committed against own people
- Context: wind of liberty, historic significance, open a new era: crisis frame

S/PV. 6498, 17 March 2011

- Historical context
- New Arab Spring is positive in three ways
- Innocent people versus brutal murderer (Gaddafi)
- **Crimes against humanity**
- ICC referral
- **R2P**
- Sanctions
- No-fly zone III
- **Violence against civilian population II**
- [Crisis frame II](#)
- Protection of civilians II
- Bottom line: [if the Security Council acts, it will improve the situation](#) (hope, solution)

Syria

Russia on Syria

Discourse 1: Explicitly oppose (any intention of) the use of force (22)

Discourse 2: Work on political solution for Syria (13)

Discourse 3: Sovereignty and territorial integrity (12)

Discourse 4: Violence is not one-sided (10)

Discourse 5: Warn for risk of destabilizing the region (8)

S/PV/6520, April 21st 2011

- Support the maintenance of law and order and the achievement of stability, internal consensus and social peace
- Prevent unfavourable developments and casualties
- Support and defend Assad
- Stress reforms made by Assad
- External interference in Syria is unacceptable
- Bottom line: support Assad (he prevents destabilization) and no external intervention

S/PV/6524, April 27th 2011

- Concerned on increasing tensions and manifestations in Syria
- Russia's solution: continue to support the Syrian Government who made good progress
- Good progress of Syrian government (re)confirms its legitimacy
- Russia wants stable Syria and think that Assad will ensure this stability
- Syria as a cornerstone in Middle Eastern security
- Fear for an unstable Syria and more importantly the consequences for the region
- Violence is not one-sided
- Opposition is also using force
- External intervention will further destabilize and threaten the region
- Russia fears that external intervention will cause further harm
- International community should avoid taking sides
- External intervention will lead to an endless cycle of violence and to civil war
- This must absolutely be avoided
- Bottom line: prevent doing more harm than good (external intervention) and Assad making good progress in implementing reforms, support Assad. External intervention absolute no-go since threatening and destabilizing

S/PV/6531, May 10th 2011

- Confirm that governments of state bear the primary responsibility for protecting its own population. Yet, argue that all parties to the conflict are responsible for the security of civilians and that the role of the international community should limit itself to merely assisting national efforts.
- External intervention requires the authorization of the UNSC
- External intervention should be in line with the UN Charter and Security Council resolutions
- Reaffirm that it is unacceptable for Russia that UN intervenes in armed conflict and takes sides II
- Warns that protection of civilians should not be used to resolve unrelated issues
- Reference to Libya and Resolution 1973: was not in line with reality

S/PV/6572, June 30rd 2011

"Syria is not on the agenda of the Security Council because it does not pose a threat to international peace and security".

S/PV/6590, July 26th 2011

General meeting on the protection of civilians. While all other countries referred to the situation in Syria, Russia did not mention Syria at all.

S/PV/6627, October 4th 2011

- Refers to the situation in Syria as a conflict of political approaches
- Stressing the efforts of the Russia delegation to respond to the dramatic events in Syria
- Stressing the importance of national sovereignty, territorial integrity, the principle of non-intervention, including military, and refraining from confrontation in its affairs
- Russia proposes a comprehensive dialogue aimed at achieving civil peace and national agreement by reforming the socioeconomic and political life of Syria
- Rejected resolution was based on the philosophy of confrontation
- International community is taking sides against the government and should not make accusations against it
- Russia proposes a peaceful settlement of the crisis on the basis of a dialogue
- Sanctions contravene with the principle of peaceful settlement
- Foreign military intervention is unacceptable and "based on the well-known events in North Africa, that can only put us on our guard"
- The opposition cannot/does not distance itself from extremists and this is problematic
- If Assad would lose its legitimacy, this would have very negative consequences: it could trigger a full-fledged conflict, destabilization and a civil war of Syria and possible in the entire Middle East
- The situation in Syria cannot be considered separately from Libya
- NATO interpretation of resolution on Libya to implement R2P could also happen in the same way in Syria. "It is easy to see that today's "Unified Protector" model could happen in Syria"
- Radical opposition has an extremist bent and is relying on terrorist tactics
- Radical opposition acting outside of the law, all kinds of illegal activities and perpetrating atrocities against Syrian authorities
- Opposition is referred to as terrorists and their actions as terrorist attacks
- No foreign interference in their internal affairs

S/PV/6636, October 24th 2011

- Reminder of the availability of the Russian-Chinese draft resolution that proposes a peaceful settlement for Syria
- Rejected Resolution S/2011/612 was "inciting conflict"
- Threats and sanctions only worsen the situation in Syria

S/PV/6650, November 9th 2011

- Russia states that the Brazilian concept of 'responsibility while protecting' is very interesting
- Reactive measures (especially those involving the use of force) of the international community only in very exceptional cases (sanctioned by the UNSC and in strict compliance with the UN Charter)
- Efforts to protect civilians must be based on a clear UNSC mandate and must be strictly followed. Breach is simply unacceptable even for the noblest of goals.

S/PV/6706, January 24th 2012

- Outside forces manipulating the situation by bringing to power certain groups rather than others to serve their own interests
- Interference of outside forces will lead to grave consequences for the people of Syria
- Interference of outside forces will lead to regional instability and threaten international peace and security

S/PV/6710, January 31th 2012

- Russia fears a worsening of the crisis and a full-scale conflict

- This would be a tragedy for the Syrian people but also this will inevitably destabilize the region
- Middle East is strategically important and should therefore be stable
- Russia stresses that the violence is two-sided and should cease
- Crisis in Syria can only be solved a Syrian-led inclusive political process
- Syria deals with an “extreme internal political crisis”
- Role of international community should be limited to fostering dialogue, not to exacerbate conflict or impose economic sanctions
- Violence is two-sided: armed elements attack Syrian security forces and civilians
- Not only the government but also the opposition groups should cease all forms of violence
- Russia proposes and informal contact meeting in Moscow with Syrian authorities and opposition groups
- Dialogue to agree on the political future of Syria
- Russia opposes and rejects sanctions and a foreign military interference
- It is an internal political settlement and the Council has no authority to impose parameters
- The Council should not intimidate but rather encourage to engage in a dialogue

S/PV/6711, February 4th 2012

- Russia voted against resolution
- Political dialogue as the solution to the Syrian crisis
- Some members of the international community have undermined the possibility for a political settlement
- Some members of the international community have called for regime change
- Some members of the international community have encouraged the opposition towards power, provocation and have nurtured armed struggle
- Russia rejected the resolution because:
 - The resolution did not reflect the true state of affairs in Syria
 - Russia’s amendments were not taken into account
 - Syrian opposition should distance itself from extremists groups who are committing violent acts
 - Russia’s proposals were not taken into account
 - Other countries did not supported Russia’s proposal to increase the role of the League of Arab States

S/PV/6810, July 19th 2012

- Russia and China against the resolution and South Africa and Pakistan abstained
- Accepting a document under Chapter VII of the UN Charter is impossible
- Accepting a document under Chapter VII of the UN Charter will open the way for pressure on sanctions and later external military involvement
- External military involvement in Syrian domestic affairs
- Despite their denial, Western members of the SC do not exclude military intervention
- Russia fears that Western members of the SC “further their plans of imposing their own design on sovereign states”
- Russia stresses that it always has attempted to find a political solution to the situation, that it has provided key support to the UN support mission and a UN Supervision Mission in Syria
- “These Pharisees have been pushing their own geopolitical intentions, which have nothing in common with the legitimate interests of the Syrian people. This has led to an escalation of the conflict”.

The US on Syria

Discourse 1: Condemn Assad regime (21)

Discourse 2: Call on Security Council to take action (16)

Discourse 3: Blaming Russia and China for their vetoes (12)

Discourse 4: Peaceful demonstrators calling for legitimate reforms (9)

Discourse 5: Unstable Syria linked with unstable region (4)

Discourse 6: Complexity of situation (4)

S/PV/6520, April 21st 2011

- The US is concerned about the humanitarian situation in Syria
- Syrian government should respect human rights and implement political reforms

S/PV/6524, April 27th 2011

- Condemnation of the violence of the Assad regime against its own people
- The US calls upon Assad to stop the violence
- The international community should respond to human rights violations
- Syrian government has accountability
- The international community should consider sanctions
- Refers to Syria as “neither a responsible Government nor a credible member of the international community”
- Legitimate calls for reform from its people
- Syrian government using violence against unarmed demonstrators
- Syrian’s people cry for freedom

S/PV/6531, May 10th 2011

- Investigate alleged violations of human rights law
- Call upon Syria to allow journalists and human rights monitors for verifications on the ground

S/PV/6572, June 30rd 2011

- Syrian government tries to divert public attention away from its own indiscriminate killings
- Syrian government abuses human rights of the Syrian people
- Regime’s hypocrisy: using the Palestine cause for encouraging violence and risking its long-standing ceasefire with Israel while brutally repressing the Syrian people
- Syrian government is denying the Syrian people’s call for reform and democratic change

S/PV/6590, July 26th 2011

- “Let me say a few words about the ongoing crisis in Syria”
- Courageous and peaceful protesters who demand universal rights
- Violent response of regime: brutality and arrests
- Call upon the Syrian Government to stop the violence and arrests immediately
- Allow peaceful protests and freedom of speech
- Responsibility of the Security Council to address the situation in Syria
- The US fears a further destabilization of Syria and peace and security in the region

S/PV/6627, October 4th 2011

- The Security Council failed to address an urgent moral challenge
- Situation in Syria is a growing threat to regional peace and security
- Defend the lives of innocent civilians from Assad’s brutality
- Resolution is a watered down text that does not even mention sanctions

- Courageous people of Syria
- Those that oppose this resolution, cover a brutal regime and will have to answer to Syrian people
- Assad regime has deliberately unleashed violence, torture and persecution against peaceful protesters and human rights defenders
- The Syrian Government's appalling actions might amount to crimes against humanity.
- Distancing from military intervention and Libya: "Others claim that strong Security Council action on Syria would merely be a pretext for military intervention. Let there be no doubt: this is not about military intervention; this is not about Libya"
- There are countries "who would rather sell arms to the Syrian regime than stand with the Syrian people"
- Regret that other Council members have prevented the US from taking a stance against the regime's brutal oppression of its people
- The US will not rest until the Council rises to meet its responsibilities

S/PV/6636, October 24th 2011

- About Israel-Palestinian conflict
- "Tragic that Al-Assad's barbaric acts have recently been met by silence from the Council"
- Sceptical about Assad's intention of meeting the opposition, free of intimidation
- Call for full access of professional and international observers

S/PV/6650, November 9th 2011

- Protection of civilians is at the heart of what we should be doing in the Council.
- Reference to Libya: Gaddafi threatened with a massacre and the Council acted upon that threat. US is proud to have taken part of this NATO-led coalition. It was necessary and appropriate given the brutalities of the Gaddafi regime. Protection of civilians.
- The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights warned that the actions of the Syrian Government might amount to crimes against humanity.

S/PV/6706, January 24th 2012

- Deteriorating situation despite Arab League monitors
- Arab League plan is failing
- Call on the Syrian Government to allow access to the commission of inquiry
- The US supports the Syrian people's demand for democratic, representative and inclusive government
- US calls on the opposition to refrain from violence, while recognizing that this becomes difficult with the repression of the regime

S/PV/6710, January 31th 2012

- Assad's forces are initiating nearly all the attacks that kill civilians
- Fear a spinning out of control of the violence
- Challenges ahead for Syrian people: a crumbling economy, rising sectarian tensions, and a cauldron of instability in the heart of the Middle East.
- "We all have a choice. We can stand with the people of Syria and the region or become complicit in the continuing violence there"
- Security Council should back the call of the Arab League to support an inclusive, Syrian-led political process
- Reference to Libya: This is not another Libya, Syria is a unique situation that requires a unique approach tailored to Syria's specific circumstances
- Support the plan of the Arab League towards political transition of Syria
- The goal should be to help the Syrian people realize the goal for the future they seek

S/PV/6711, February 4th 2012

- Sole purpose of this Council: address an even-deepening crisis in Syria and a growing threat to regional peace

and security

- The US is disgusted by certain members who block resolutions and thus prevent us from fulfilling this purpose
- Those countries do so using empty arguments and only do so because of individual interests
- At least of one these countries (i.e. Russia) even delivers weapons to Assad
- **The international community should protect the Syrian people from the brutality**
- Some countries in the Council “remain steadfast in their willingness to sell out the Syrian people and to shield a craven tyrant”
- **In contrast, the US stands fully with the long-suffering people of Syria**
- **Reports from the High Commissioner for Human Rights show that the regime may be committing crimes against humanity**
- Countries that oppose Council resolutions: “any further bloodshed will be on their hands”

S/PV/6810, July 19th 2012

- Russia and China have, yet again, prevented the Council from giving a credible response to the Syrian crisis
- First two vetoes of China and Russia: very destructive. This third veto: even more dangerous and deplorable
- The draft resolution demanded a ceasefire of all parties involved, a reference to Chapter VII of the UN Charter and it would have provided political support for the UNSMIS mission
- **The Council should be ashamed that it did not succeed in doing so**
- **Escalation of regime’s attacks against its own people**
- **Troublesome because of its stockpiles of chemical weapons**
- **The potential that this regime could consider using chemical weapons should be a concern for all**
- **There should be decisive action under Chapter VII to stop the killing and start a process of transition to post-Al-Assad Syria**
- **“We have missed yet another opportunity to work together**
- **“The situation in Syria will continue to deteriorate in the face of the Council’s inaction”**
- **We, and especially the people of Syria, cannot afford to miss any more”**
- Intensify our work with partners outside the Council to pressure the Assad regime and to assist those in need
- **The Council failed utterly in the most important task on the agenda this year. “This is another dark day in Turtle Bay”**
- **One can only hope that one day, before too many thousands more die, Russia and China will stop protecting Al-Assad and allow the Council to play its proper role at the centre of international response to the crisis in Syria**

France on Syria

Discourse 1: Focus on incapability of the Council (due to veto Russia and China) (42)

Discourse 2: Deeply concerned about the situation in Syria (27)

Discourse 3: Strong commitment to helping Syrians (21)

Discourse 4: Changing discourse towards Assad regime (13)

Discourse 5: Peace and stability in region under threat (10)

Discourse 6: The importance of protection of civilians (5)

S/PV/6520, April 21st 2011

- France expresses concern for humanitarian situation
- France calls for respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms
- Syrian government should make reforms; lift state of emergency, release political prisoners and respect for peaceful demonstrations
- There is a need for “inclusive political dialogue”

S/PV/6524, April 27th 2011

- France is deeply concerned
- Harsh condemnation of the violence in Syria
- Draw parallel with massacres in Syria in 1980s in Hama
- International community cannot silently stand by when escalating repression
- Indiscriminate and brutal repression must stop
- Syrian government must respect fundamental rights and freedoms (peaceful protest and freedom of press), release prisoners of conscience and stop restrictions on media.
- “Syria plays a decisive role in regional stability”
- > Preserve stability through reforms of government: in interest of all
- France willing to take steps and strong measures (HR Council, investigation of crimes committed; accountability)

S/PV/6531, May 10th 2011

- Protection of civilians
- Reference to Libya: for humanitarian assistance and to prevent massacre in Benghazi
- Protection of civilians has priority and protection of human rights important

S/PV/6572, June 30rd 2011

- Deeply concerned about the potential destabilization of the region
- Stability of Syria is crucial for the Middle East
- Already an unstable region
- Stable situation can be reached through ending the violence against demonstrators and reforms of the Syrian government

S/PV/6590, July 26th 2011

- The Syrian regime is systematically repressing peaceful demonstrations
- Appeals of the international community are ignored
- Civilian victims
- Crimes against humanity may have been committed
- Foreign embassies were attacked in Syria
- Expresses hope that the Security Council will finally be able to take up its responsibilities

- International community should condemn the violent repression of the Syrian people

S/PV/6627, October 4th 2011

- Criticizing the Security Council for not being able to condemn the situation in Syria
- Brutal crackdown of the Syrian regime against its own people
- Syrian people only exercising their fundamental rights
- France proposes diplomatic measures and sanctions
- Extreme violence of Syrian authorities against a population that demands to exercise their rights
- Deafness of the Syrian regime
- Risk of regional stability
- United response of the international community is necessary
- Security Council is primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security
- Many concessions were made and thus veto of Russia and China is veto on principle
- This veto of Russia and China means a refusal for all Council resolutions against Syria
- Veto of Russia and China is a political choice
- Veto of Russia and China is a rejection of the movement for freedom and democracy
- Syrian authorities have lost legitimacy by murdering their own people
- France and the EU will continue to ensure the recognition and respect for the Syrian people
- Those responsible for the violence should be brought before justice
- Courageous men and women who call for freedom in Syria
- Months of bloody repression
- Restore stability in Syria through an effective response of the Security Council
- Stability of fragile region depends on the stability of Syria

S/PV/6636, October 24th 2011

- Syrian leaders have lost all legitimacy
- Syrian leaders dragging Syria into a bloody spiral of violence
- Those responsible for violence should be held accountable to justice
- Repression must end
- If repression ends, Syria can engage in a peaceful transition
- Peaceful transition as the key to stability in Syria and to preserve stability in the region
- Stability in the region under threat
- Those members in the Council that opposed the draft resolution are responsible for the continuation of the violence
- No longer time for words, the Security Council must take action
- Security Council paralysis is tantamount to supporting the Assad regime and taking his side

S/PV/6650, November 9th 2011

- Protection of civilians at the heart of the mandate of UN peacekeeping operations
- Security Council has a responsibility to help deal with the challenge of protection of civilians
- Responsibility to protect civilians firstly belongs to the national government
- If they fail to do so in combination with serious violations, the Security Council has the duty to intervene to protect civilians
- No other choice when government is committing atrocities against its own population
- Thinking about civilian protection is good but actually protecting them is much better
- Reference to Libya: for civilian protection against their own leaders. By doing so, the Security Council prevented a massacre
- Reference to Libya: abstaining would be like turning our eyes away for the suffering of the Libyan people and joining the half-hearted who deplore evil but do nothing to reduce it
- In Syria, we must protect civilians and this is undeniable

- The Security Council abdicated its responsibilities and should play its role towards protection of civilians II
- Abstaining from the resolution is like showing one's indifference
- Serious failing of the Security Council in humanitarian or political terms
- France will continue to strive that the Security Council can play its role
- The Council has seen the cost of inaction
- Indirect reference to R2P II
- Distinguishing itself from lightly involving in military action
- Responsibility of the international community
- Reference to Libya: joy of the Libyan people today is reward and justification for our action

S/PV/6706, January 24th 2012

- Massive violations of human rights
- Suppress legitimate aspirations of Syrian people
- Impunity
- Violence committed against Syrian people
- Entire region is under threat: refugees, minorities and sovereignty of neighboring countries
- Support of Arab League's plan only way to return stability to Syria and to preserve stability in the region

S/PV/6710, January 31th 2012

- Security Council should shoulder its responsibility towards suffering people
- Peace in the region is under threat
- Bloody downward spiral of Syrian regime
- The months-long silence of the Council is no longer acceptable
- Today we should end the scandalous silence of the Security Council.
- Syrian people are defending their liberty
- Words are inadequate to describe the horror of the brutal repression
- Humanitarian situation is deteriorating day by day
- > What level of horror must be reached for the Council to enforce a stop to human rights violations and ensure free access to humanitarian assistance?
- Every State has the responsibility to protect its civilian population.
- Responsibility to protect
- Council's responsibility to respond to regional consequences
- How can this even be up for discussion?
- Stressing the authority of the Security Council
- Security Council as keystone in international peace and security
- Seriousness of Security Council under threat
- Tragedy of the Syrian people sufficient justification for action
- Goal: to find a peaceful way out of the crisis that allows the Syrian people to freely express their aspirations
- Syrian society should be free to determine its own future
- We have no intention of imposing a political regime from the outside
- Responsibilities, moral duty
- Peaceful uprising of the Syrian people
- No time to lose
- Syrian nightmare

S/PV/6711, February 4th 2012

- Sad day for the Council, sad day for the Syrians, sad day for friends of democracy
- "History has compounded our shame": Hama massacre and massacre in Homs today
- Father killed on mass scale and sons has followed in his footsteps: horror is hereditary
- Only thing that we have reached so far is a presidential statement

- Victims of repression
- The Council should stop the crimes of humanity being committed in Syria
- Yet, the Council remained silent
- “We cannot and must not overlook the harrowing conclusion that two permanent members of the Council have systematically obstructed all its action”
- Veto of China and Russia in the full knowledge of the tragic consequences for the Syrian people
- China and Russia make themselves complicit in the crimes committed by the regime
- China and Russia have taken the side of the Assad regime against the Syrian people
- France was accused of seeking regime change and preparing for military intervention: this is being denied by France
- “We have no right to abandon the Syrian people to its tragic fate”
- France will continue to support the peaceful opposition
- France will continue to pressure the Syrian regime by imposing further sanctions
- Regime that slaughters its own people

S/PV/6810, July 19th 2012

- Accuses Russia that it merely wants to win time for the Syrian regime to crush the opposition
- Syrian regime has violated the provisions adopted by the Council
- Syrian regime has not even started implementing its commitments in the provision
- Civilian population has been crushed by heavy artillery and attacks by combat helicopters
- The third veto of Russia and China means that the disregard of the Syrian regime of its commitments goes without any consequences
- Crimes of the Syrian regime will go unpunished
- The people’s legitimate aspirations are disregarded
- Insignificant number of victims
- Directly turning to Syrian men and women
- Unheard-of-suffering of the Syrian people
- Syrian people carrying the torch of their ideal of liberty
- France supports and respects the Syrian people
- France continues to support the Syrian opposition on its road to a democratic transition
- The Council is left helpless with the veto of China and Russia
- Violence of the Syrian regime
- France will not leave the Syrian people to face the crimes to which they are victim alone

Bibliography

- ABC News (2011). Raging Gaddafi orders forces to 'capture the rats'. Australian Broadcasting Channel. Barker, A. February 23rd 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2011-02-23/raging-gaddafi-orders-forces-to-capture-the-rats/1953788>
- Al Arabiya (2011). Gaddafi's son warns 'rivers of blood' in Libya. February 21st 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.alarabiya.net/articles/2011/02/21/138515.html>
- Al Jazeera (2011). Arab States Seek Libya No-Fly Zone. 12th March 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/africa/2011/03/201131218852687848.html>
- Annan, K. (2000). Millennium Report. We The Peoples. The role of the United Nations in the 21st century. General Assembly of the United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/briefing/report/overview.pdf>
- Axworthy, L. (2011). RtoP and the Evolution of State Sovereignty. Genser, J. Cotler, I., Tutu, D. and Havel, V. (eds.). The Responsibility to Protect. The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities in our Time. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.proxy.ubn.ru.nl/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199797769.001.0001/acprof-9780199797769-chapter-001>
- Ayoob, M. (2002). Humanitarian Intervention and State Sovereignty. The International Journal of Human Rights. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp.81-102
- Baczynska, G. (2013). NATO Head Urges Syria Political Solution, Rules Out Intervention. Reuters. March 27, 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/27/us-syria-crisis-nato-idUSBRE92QJL20130327>
- Badescu, C.G. (2010). Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect. Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- BBC (2008). Interview with Sergey Lavrov, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Russia Federation to BBC, in Moscow, Russ. (Aug. 9, 2008), available at <http://www.un.int/russia/new/MainRoot/docs/warfare/statement090808en.htm>
- Bellamy, A. J. (2006). Whither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit, *Ethics and International Affairs*, 20(2): 143-170
- Bellamy, A.J. and Williams, P.D. (2011). The New Politics of Protection? Côte d'Ivoire, Libya and the Responsibility to Protect. Retrieved from http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/87_4BellamyWilliams.pdf
- Bennett, M. (2012). Collective Security is Compelling in Theory, but Inevitably Selective in Practice. Discuss With Reference to Both the League of Nations and the United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/3024956/Collective_Security_is_compelling_in_theory_but_inevitably_selective_in_practice._Discuss_with_reference_to_both_the_League_of_Nations_and_the_United_Nations
- Bijl, E. (2012). Libya, Syria and the Responsibility to Protect. The Hague University of Applied Sciences – Academy of European Studies. Retrieved from <http://hbo-kennisbank.uvt.nl/cgi/hh/show.cgi?fid=2654>
- Central Intelligence Agency (2013). CIA World Factbook. Africa: Libya. June 11, 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ly.html>

- Central Intelligence Agency (2013). CIA World Factbook. Middle East: Syria. June 11, 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sy.html>
- Charter of the United Nations (1945). Chapter 1: Purposes and Principles. *United Nations*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>
- Chomsky, N. (2011). Noam Chomsky Explores the Decision to Intervene in Libya. *BBC News*. April 15, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13082106>
- Cohen, S. (2003). *Geopolitics of the World System*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Crowley, M. (2012). The Obama Doctrine: Syria vs. Libya Intervention. *Time*. June 1, 2012. Retrieved from <http://swampland.time.com/2012/06/01/the-obama-doctrine-syria-vs-libya-intervention/>
- Dankers (2013). Lecture Qualitative Research. Reflection of Critical Discourse Analysis Assignment. From the course Qualitative Methods. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. 8th January 2013.
- Depondt, C. (2013). Informal consultation with Cinta Depondt, IKV Pax Christi, Senior Programme Officer Caucasus.
- Dey, (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge
- The Economist (2009). Georgia, Abkhazia and Russia: The Blame Game. *The Economist*. October 1, 2009, pp. 65-66. Retrieved from <http://www.economist.com/node/14560958>
- Fair Observer (2012). 360 degree analysis. *Adding Fuel to Syria's Fire*. Foreign Policy In Focus. 16th February 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.fairobserver.com/article/adding-fuel-syrias-fire>
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge New York
- Franssen, J. (2012). Waarom Syrië wel/geen Libië is. *De Redactie*. February 27th, 2012. Retrieved from <http://analyse.deredactie.be/2012/02/27/waarom-syrie-welgeen-libie-is/>
- Gee, J. (2010). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. Theory and Method*. Routledge New York
- Genser, J., Cotler, I. and Tutu, D. And Havel, V. (2011). *The Responsibility to Protect. The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities of Our Time*. Oxford Scholarship Online. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.proxy.ubn.ru.nl/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199797769.001.0001/acprof-9780199797769>
- Gerrits, A. (2013). Telephone interview with Prof. Dr. André Gerrits from Universiteit Leiden. May 14th 2013.
- Graauwmans (2007). *Geopolitical Discourses of the Bush Administration after 9/11. A Critical Analysis of the attacks of September 11th 2001 and the War on Terrorism*. Master Thesis Human Geography Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. August 2007. Retrieved from <http://gpm.ruhosting.nl/mt/2007MASG04GraauwmansVincent.pdf>
- Guardian (2011). Gaddafi's army will kill half a million, warn Libyan rebels. McGreal, C. 12th March 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/mar/12/gaddafi-army-kill-half-million>
- Hahn, G. (2012). Russia's Hard-Nosed Realism in Syria: The Roots and Reasoning. *Fair Observer*. February 16, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.fairobserver.com/article/russia%E2%80%99s-hard-nosed-realism-syria-roots-and-reasoning>

Have van der, N. (2012). The Responsibility to Protect: Why Libya but not Syria? Panel Discussion and Book Launch. 12 March 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.sharesproject.nl/the-responsibility-to-protect-why-libya-but-not-syria-panel-discussion-and-book-launch/>

Heinbecker, P. (2010). Getting Back in the Game: A Foreign Policy Playbook for Canada

Homan, K. (2011). Libië: Responsibility to Protect en de NAVO. Published in *Atlantisch Perspectief*, Nr. 35 (8), pp. 24-29, April 2011. Retrieved from http://www.clingendael.nl/sites/default/files/20111200_homan_ap_libie_nav_o_responsibility.pdf

Human Development Report (2011). Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future For All. United Nations Development Programme. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2011/download/>

Internally Displaced Monitor Centre (IDMC) (2013). Syria: A Full-Scale Displacement And Humanitarian Crisis With No Solutions in Sight. Retrieved from <http://www.internal-displacement.org/countries/syria>

International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (n.d). Crisis in Syria. Retrieved from <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crises/crisis-in-syria>

International Coalition for Responsibility to Protect (n.d.). Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved from <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/R2Pcs%20Frequently%20Asked%20Question.pdf>

International Coalition for Responsibility to Protect (n.d). From Principle to Practice. Retrieved from <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/Responsibility%20to%20Protect%20Powerpoint%20Presentation.pdf>

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001). The Responsibility to Protect. Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. December 2001. Retrieved from <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>

Jeangène Vilmer, J-P. (2012). 360 degree analysis. *Libya and Syria: R2P and the 'Double Standards'*. *Fair Observer*. 23 July 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.fairobserver.com/article/Libya-to-Syria-R2P-Double-Standards-Issue>

Kaldor, M. (1999). *New and Old Wars. Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Stanford

Klaassen, N. (2013). 'Assad is Niet al te Intelligent'. Interview Désirée Bonis. *Dagblad de Limburger*. May 24, 2013.

Kuwali, D. (2012). Responsibility to Protect : Why Libya and not Syria? *Accord*. Policy and Practice Brief: Knowledge for Durable Peace. Issue 16, March 2012. Retrieved from http://www.accord.org.za/downloads/brief/policy_practice16.pdf

LaCroix, J.P. (2009). *Mission Permanante de la France Aupres des Nations Unies*. 63ième session de l'Assemblée Générale des Nations Unies. Points 44 et 107. Réunion Plénière sur la Responsabilité de Protéger. Intervention prononcée par M. Jean-Pierre LACROIX, chargé d'affaires a.i., Représentation la France auprès des Nations Unies. New York 23, 2009. Retrieved from http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/France_FR.pdf

Lim, K. (2012). Is Assad's Syria 'Too Important to Fail' for the Resistance Axis? *Fair Observer*. February 14, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.fairobserver.com/article/assad%E2%80%99s-syria-%E2%80%98too-important-fail%E2%80%99-resistance-axis?page=3>

Lister, T. (2012). No Libya Play for the West in Syria. *CNN* February 8, 2012. Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/02/07/world/meast/syria-analysis>

- Luck, E. (2011). Will Syria follow Libya? Interview with Bernard Gwertzman on September 11, 2011. *Council on Foreign Relations*. Retrieved from <http://www.cfr.org/syria/syria-follow-libya/p25745>
- Mearsheimer, J. (1995). The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*. Vol. 19, 3, pp.5-49. Retrieved from <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0021.pdf>
- Molier, G. (2011). *Libië als Lakmoesproef voor "Responsibility to Protect" als Internationaal Rechterlijk Beginsel*. Published in *Civis Mundi* 11 mei 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.civismundi.nl/index.php?p=artikel&aid=1665>
- News 24 (2011). Libya No-Fly Zone Should Be 'Easy'. March 19, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.news24.com/World/News/Libya-no-fly-zone-should-be-easy-20110318>
- OilPrice (2012). Why NATO Cannot Deal With Syria, in the Same Way as Libya. *OilPrice*. July 2, 2012. Retrieved from <http://oilprice.com/Geopolitics/Middle-East/Why-NATO-Cannot-Deal-with-Syria-in-the-Same-Way-as-Libya.html>
- Pivovarchuk, A. (2012). Russia Supports Syria For Old Times' Sake. *Fair Observer*. July 10, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.fairobservers.com/article/adding-fuel-syrias-fire>
- Public and International Law & Policy Group (PILPG) (2012). Humanitarian Intervention in Syria: The Legal Basis. July 2012. Retrieved from <https://share.ru.nl/service/home/~/PILPG%20-%20Humanitarian%20Intervention%20in%20Syria.pdf?auth=co&loc=nl&id=3576&part=2>
- Pronk, J. (2013). Lecture Critical Evaluation of UN Peace Missions. Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Soeterbeek Programme and CICAM. April 11, 2013
- Ramberg, B.(2012). Applying the Responsibility to Protect to Syria. *Yale Global*. March 5, 2012. Retrieved from <http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/applying-responsibility-protect-syria>
- Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Changes (2004). A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility. Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Changes. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report2.pdf>
- Roelants, C. (2013). Oorlog in Syrië Wordt Ook Ramp Voor Regio. *NRC Next*. March 16, 2013.
- Shahbaz, A. (2012). Syria: At the Epicenter of Regional Fault Lines. *Fair Observer*. July 24, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.fairobservers.com/article/syria-epicenter-regional-fault-lines?page=2>
- Shanahan, R. (2011). R2P: Seeking Perfection In An Imperfect World. The Responsibility to Protect: Challenges and Opportunities in the Light of the Libyan Intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.printfriendly.com/print?url=http://www.e-ir.info/2011/10/07/r2p-seeking-perfection-in-an-imperfect-world/>
- Syria Deeply (2013). Syria Deeply Asks: Why did NATO intervene in Libya, and not in Syria? Tahmizian Meuse, A. March 22, 2013. Retrieved from <http://beta.syriadeeply.org/2013/03/syria-deeply-asks-nato-intervene-libya-syria/>
- Ulusoy, H. (2012). Collective Security in Europe. Retrieved from <http://sam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Hasan-Ulusoy2.pdf>
- Nations (n.d.). United Nations at a Glance. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml>

United Nations (2012). *Responsibility to Protect faces urgent test 'here and now, Secretary-General tells General Assembly, stressing immense human cost of failure in Syria*. Secretary-General. SG/SM/14490 GA/11271. September 5, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2012/sgsm14490.doc.htm>

United Nations General Assembly (1999). Secretary-General's Speech to the General Assembly, 54th Session, September 20, 1999 (A/54/1).

United Nations General Assembly (2000). A/55/305, 21 August 2000 and United Nations Security Council (2000). S/2000/809, 21 August 2000. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/docs/a_55_305.pdf

United Nations General Assembly (2001). Secretary-General's Report on the prevention of Armed Conflict. A/55/985, 7 June 2011 and United Nations Security Council (2001). Secretary-General's Report on the prevention of Armed Conflict. S/2001/574, 7 June 2011. Retrieved from <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/404/64/PDF/N0140464.pdf?OpenElement>

United Nations General Assembly (2005). *60/1 2005 World Summit Outcome*. October 24, 2005. Retrieved from <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/487/60/PDF/N0548760.pdf?OpenElement>

United Nations General Assembly (2009). A/RES/63/308 Responsibility to Protect, September 14, 2009, Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/63/308&Lang=E

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6490). 6490th Meeting on February 25, 2011. S/PV.6490. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6490

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6491). 6491th Meeting on February 26, 2011. S/PV.6491. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6491

United Nations Security Council (S/RES/1970). Resolution 1970 (2011). Security Council, 6491st Meeting on February 26, 2011. S/RES/1970 (2011). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1970 (2011)

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6498). 6498th Meeting on March 17, 2011. S/PV.6498. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6498

United Nations Security Council (S/RES/1973). Resolution 1973 (2011). Security Council, 6498th Meeting on March 17, 2011. S/RES/1973 (2011). Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1973 (2011)

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6520). 6520th Meeting on April 21, 2011. S/PV/6520. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6520

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6524). 6524th Meeting on April 27, 2011. S/PV/6524. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6524

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6531). 6531th Meeting on May 10, 2011. S/PV/6531. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6531

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6572). 6572th Meeting on June 30, 2011. S/PV/6572. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6572

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6590). 6590th Meeting on July 26, 2011. S/PV/6590. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6590

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6598). 6598th Meeting on August, 3 2011. S/PV/6598. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6598

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6627). 6627th Meeting on October 4, 2011. S/PV/6627. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6627

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6636). 6636th Meeting on October 24, 2011. S/PV/6636. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6636

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6650). 6650th Meeting on November 9, 2011. S/PV/6650. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6650

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6706). 6706th Meeting on January 24, 2012. S/PV/6706. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6706

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6710). 6710th Meeting on January 31, 2012. S/PV/6710. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6710

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6711). 6711th Meeting on February 4, 2012. S/PV/6711. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6711

United Nations Security Council (S/PV.6810). 6810th Meeting on July 19, 2012. S/PV/6810. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6810

United Nations Security Council (SC/10180). Security Council Press Statement on Libya. February 22, 2011. SC/10180. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10180.doc.htm>

USUN Press Release (2009). Remarks by Ambassador Rosemary A. DiCarlo, U.S. Alternate Representative for Special Political Affairs, at a General Assembly Debate on the Responsibility to Protect, in the General Assembly Hall, July 23, 2009. *United States Mission to the United Nations*. Retrieved from http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/USA_ENG-1.pdf

Verweij, D. (2013). Lecture War and Ethics. Ethics in Military Intervention. Utrecht University. 15 May 2013.

Vlasic, M. (2011). Europe and North America. Genser, J. Cotler, I., Tutu, D. and Havel, V. (eds.). The Responsibility to Protect. The Promise of Stopping Mass Atrocities in our Time. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com.proxy.ubn.ru.nl/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199797769.001.0001/acprof-9780199797769-chapter-008>

Wagenaar, H. (2011). *Meaning in Action. Interpretation and Dialogue in Policy Analysis*. New York

Walt, V. (2012). Why Syria Won't get the Libya treatment from the West. *Time*. March 18, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2109372,00.html>

Washington Post (2012). NATO's Blind Spot on Intervention in Syria. *Washington Post*. Opinions. May 21, 2012. Retrieved from http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-05-21/opinions/35455938_1_nato-leaders-nato-action-assad-regime

Welsh (2004). *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations*. Oxford University Press.

Zeegers, M. (2012). Lecture on Syria. CS Ubuntu Utrecht. November 28, 2012.