YourLawArticle

Open Access Law Journal, ISSN (O): 3049-0057

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Amit Kashyap; Publisher – Reet Parihar

The Responsibility To Protect (R2P): A Comprehensive Analysis Of International Law, Implementation, And Challenges

Advocate Milind Singh, Masters of Law at Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Law University, Sonipat (Class of 2027)

Published on: 20th November 2025

Abstract

This paper examines the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine as a transformative development in international law that reconceptualizes state sovereignty in relation to human rights protection. Emerging from the international community's failure to prevent mass atrocities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, R2P establishes that when states fail to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, the international community has a responsibility to intervene. The study analyzes R2P's legal framework through existing international treaties including the UN Charter, Genocide Convention, Geneva Conventions, and Rome Statute, while examining its three-pillar structure of state responsibility, international assistance, and timely response. Through case studies of Libya (2011) and Syria, the paper evaluates R2P's implementation challenges, revealing tensions between protection mandates and sovereignty concerns, selective application driven by geopolitical interests, and Security Council paralysis. While R2P represents significant normative progress endorsed by the 2005 World Summit, its future depends on strengthening preventive capacities, clarifying intervention standards, and building broader international consensus.

Keywords*: Responsibility to Protect (R2P), mass atrocity crimes, state sovereignty, humanitarian intervention, international law, UN Security Council, genocide prevention, civilian protection, Libya intervention, Syrian crisis, three pillars of R2P, International Court of Justice, sovereignty as responsibility*

INTRODUCTION

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) represents one of the most significant normative developments in international law since the establishment of the United Nations. Emerging from the international community's failure to prevent mass atrocities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia during the 1990s, R2P fundamentally reconceptualizes the relationship between state sovereignty and human rights protection. At its core, R2P establishes that states must act to prevent mass atrocity crimes and protect all populations from risks related to their occurrence, and when states lack the capacity to take such measures, the international community has a responsibility to provide assistance.

The principle is premised on the understanding that sovereignty entails a responsibility to protect all populations from mass atrocity crimes and human rights violations. This marked a paradigm shift from traditional notions of absolute sovereignty towards what has been termed "sovereignty as responsibility." The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), established by the Canadian Government, introduced the concept of R2P in its 2001 report, focusing not on the legal or moral "right" of outsiders to intervene but on the responsibility of all states to protect people at risk.

At the 2005 World Summit, over 170 heads of state and government affirmed their responsibility to protect their own populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and accepted a collective responsibility to encourage and help each other uphold this commitment. This commitment, enshrined in paragraphs 138 and 139 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, represents the formal adoption of R2P into the international normative framework.

The principle addresses four specific mass atrocity crimes: genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Importantly, R2P does not apply to other violations and abuses of human rights or grave threats to human security, such as climate change, disease, or various harmful state policies including suspension of civil liberties, endemic poverty, or mass corruption. This narrow scope was deliberately chosen to maintain international consensus and prevent the doctrine's misuse.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A. International Treaties and Conventions

The R2P doctrine is firmly grounded in existing international legal obligations rather than creating entirely new law. The principle is based on respect for the norms and principles of international law, especially the underlying principles of law relating to sovereignty, peace and security, human rights, and

armed conflict.

1. The UN Charter

The United Nations Charter establishes the foundational framework for international peace and security.[1] Article 1(3) identifies one of the UN's purposes as "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all."[2] Article 2(7), however, enshrines the principle of non-intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of states.[3] This tension between sovereignty and human rights protection forms the backdrop against which R2P operates.

The 2005 World Summit Outcome Document declared states' preparedness to take timely and decisive action, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations, when national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations. Specifically, the document provides for action "through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis."[4]

2. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948)

The Genocide Convention imposes obligations on state parties to prevent and punish genocide.[5] Article I establishes that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or war, is a crime under international law that contracting parties undertake to prevent and punish. Article IX provides for the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice to adjudicate disputes relating to state responsibility for genocide.[6]

The Court's interpretation in the Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro case established that the obligation to prevent genocide extends beyond a state's own territory and applies to situations where a state becomes aware of serious risk that genocide will be committed.[7] This interpretation significantly reinforced the international dimension of R2P's first pillar.

3. The Geneva Conventions (1949) and Additional Protocols

Common Article 1 of the four Geneva Conventions declares that "the High Contracting Parties undertake

[1] Charter of the United Nations (adopted 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945) 1 UNTS XVI.
[2] ibid art 1(3).
[3] ibid art 2(7)
[4] UN General Assembly (n 1) para 139.
[5] Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (adopted 9 December 1948, entered into force 12 January 1951) 78 UNTS 277.
[6] ibid art IX
[7] Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) (Judgment) [2007] ICJ Rep 43, paras 430-431 <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/91>.

to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances," establishing a two-fold obligation synonymous with R2P's formulation of primary responsibility and international responsibility. The Geneva Conventions establish extensive protections for civilians during armed conflict and create obligations that extend to all state parties regardless of their direct involvement in a particular conflict.[8]

The Additional Protocols of 1977 further elaborate protections for victims of international and non-international armed conflicts.[9] Protocol I, applicable to international armed conflicts, and Protocol II, applicable to non-international armed conflicts, both contain provisions protecting civilian populations against violence.

4. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998)

The Rome Statute established the International Criminal Court with jurisdiction over genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. The Rome Statute provides mechanisms for individual criminal accountability that complement the state-level responsibilities established under R2P.[10] Article 5 of the Statute defines the Court's jurisdiction over the core crimes that overlap with R2P's scope.

At the international level, some States parties to the Rome Statute have not been cooperating with the Court, or have even taken steps to withdraw from the Statute to avoid investigation and prosecution of atrocity crimes. This has undermined the complementarity between R2P and international criminal justice mechanisms.

B. The Three Pillars of R2P

The responsibility to protect consists of three important and mutually-reinforcing pillars: Pillar I establishes that each individual state has the responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity; Pillar II provides that the international community has a responsibility to assist states in their protection responsibilities; and Pillar III provides

[8] Geneva Convention (I) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (adopted 12 August 1949, entered into force 21 October 1950) 75 UNTS 31, art 1.
[9] Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I) (adopted 8 June 1977, entered into force 7 December 1978) 1125 UNTS 3; Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II) (adopted 8 June 1977, entered into force 7 December 1978) 1125 UNTS 609.
[10] Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (adopted 17 July 1998, entered into force 1 July 2002) 2187 UNTS 3.

that if a state is "manifestly failing" in its protection responsibilities, then states should take collective action to protect the population.[11]

Pillar I: State Responsibility

The primary responsibility for protecting populations rests with the state itself. This pillar reaffirms traditional principles of sovereignty while simultaneously conditioning sovereignty on the fulfillment of protection responsibilities. States must not only refrain from committing atrocity crimes themselves but must actively prevent such crimes from occurring within their territories.

Pillar II: International Assistance and Capacity Building

This pillar emphasizes helping states prevent atrocities through diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, including strengthening state capacity through economic assistance, rule-of-law reform and the building of inclusive political institutions.[12] The international community's role under Pillar II is fundamentally cooperative and preventive rather than coercive.

Pillar III: Timely and Decisive Response

When a state is manifestly failing to protect its population, Pillar III authorizes the international community to take collective action. While R2P emphasizes a range of measures to stem the risk of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity before the crimes are threatened or occur, the use of force may only be carried out as a measure of last resort, when all other non-coercive measures have failed, and only when authorized by the UN Security Council.

C. R2P as an Emerging Norm

R2P is not yet a rule of customary international law, but it builds upon existing legal foundations, including the Genocide Convention, and can be described as an international "norm." The 2005 World Summit Outcome Document represents an important new political commitment by Member States adopted at the level of Heads of State and Government, based on an underlying body of international legal obligations contained in international instruments or developing through State practice and case-

[11] UN General Assembly, 'Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: Report of the Secretary-General' (12 January 2009) UN Doc A/63/677 <https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/responsibility-protect>.
[12] UN General Assembly (n 1) para 138.

law of international courts and tribunals.[13]

The distinction between a political commitment and binding legal obligation remains significant. While R2P does not create new legally enforceable duties beyond those already existing in international law, it provides a normative framework for interpreting and applying existing obligations in the context of mass atrocities.

CASE LAW AND JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION

A. Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro)

The International Court of Justice's 2007 judgment in the Bosnia genocide case represents the most significant judicial examination of obligations to prevent mass atrocities, providing important precedents for understanding R2P's legal foundations.[14]

Facts and Proceedings

On 20 March 1993, Bosnia and Herzegovina filed an application with the ICJ alleging that Serbia had attempted to exterminate the Bosniak population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The case centered on events during the Bosnian War (1992-1995), particularly the Srebrenica massacre of July 1995.

The Court's Findings on Genocide

After determining that massive killings and other atrocities were perpetrated during the conflict throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Court found that these acts were not accompanied by the specific intent that defines genocide, namely the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, the protected group.

The Court did, however, find that the killings in Srebrenica in July 1995 were committed with the specific intent to destroy in part the group of Bosnian Muslims in that area and that what happened there was indeed genocide.[15]

State Responsibility and the Duty to Prevent

The Court found that Serbia was neither directly responsible for the Srebrenica genocide, nor complicit in it, but ruled that Serbia had committed a breach of the Genocide Convention by failing to prevent the

[13] United Nations, 'About the Responsibility to Protect' <https://www.un.org/en/genocide-prevention/responsibility-protect/about>.

[14] Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Bosnia and Herzegovina v Serbia and Montenegro) (n 11).

[15] ibid para 297.

genocide from occurring and for not cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia in punishing the perpetrators.

The Court established important precedents regarding the extraterritorial application of the duty to prevent genocide. It held that the obligation extends to situations where a state has the capacity to influence those likely to commit genocide, even when such persons are not acting as state organs.[16] This interpretation significantly expanded the scope of preventive obligations and provided legal support for R2P's emphasis on prevention.

Reparations

The Court found that, since it had not been shown that the genocide at Srebrenica would in fact have been averted if Serbia had attempted to prevent it, financial compensation for the failure to prevent genocide at Srebrenica was not the appropriate form of reparation. Instead, the Court considered that the most appropriate satisfaction would be a declaration in the operative clause that Serbia had failed to comply with its obligation to prevent genocide.[17]

B. The Influence of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY)

The ICJ's decision relied extensively on factual findings and legal determinations made by the ICTY, demonstrating the complementary relationship between international criminal tribunals and the ICJ in addressing mass atrocities. The ICTY's conviction of numerous individuals for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in the former Yugoslavia established crucial factual records and legal precedents.[18]

C. Recent ICJ Cases and R2P Principles

By charging Israel with genocide in the International Court of Justice, South Africa has invoked the underlying principles and objectives of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, even if it does not formally reference it. While the original document defining R2P primarily envisaged a role for the UN Security Council, the use of international legal channels represents an alternative means of preventing and responding to mass atrocities.

The case demonstrates how R2P principles can inform state behavior and legal arguments even in

[16] ibid paras 430-431.
[17] ibid para 471.
[18] Real Instituto Elcano, 'The Limits of International Law: The Responsibility to Protect (R2P), Israel and the International Court of Justice' (1 March 2024) <https://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/en/commentaries/the-limits-of-international-law-the-responsibility-to-protect-r2p-israel-and-the-international-court-of-justice/>.

situations where Security Council action is unlikely or impossible. It reflects the doctrine's influence on how states conceptualize their obligations regarding mass atrocity prevention.

IMPLEMENTATION OF R2P

A. Libya (2011): The Paradigmatic Case

The international intervention in Libya represents the most prominent and controversial implementation of R2P through military force.[19]

Background and Security Council Authorization

From the start of Muammar al-Qaddafi's violent crackdown against protesters in February 2011, R2P informed the Security Council's response. On 26 February 2011, the Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1970, which imposed sanctions against the Libyan regime in the face of a mounting humanitarian crisis, and then followed it up with Resolution 1973 only 19 days later.

Resolution 1973 authorized Chapter VII measures for the protection of civilians in Libya, authorizing member states to take all necessary measures to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in Libya, and imposed both a no-fly zone over Libyan airspace and an arms embargo. Ten Security Council members voted in the affirmative while five (Brazil, Germany, India, and permanent members China and Russia) abstained, with none opposed.[20]

Implementation and Controversy

Military intervention in Libya began on 19 March, as fighter jets of the French Air Force destroyed several pro-Gaddafi vehicles advancing on rebel stronghold Benghazi. U.S. and British submarines then fired over 110 Tomahawk cruise missiles at targets throughout Libya, severely disabling the regime's air defense capability and allowing wider enforcement of the no-fly zone. NATO assumed command of the operation on 31 March.

Over the following months, debate regarding the meaning of the resolutions and their implementation became increasingly bitter, with some arguing that the Libyan intervention had been hijacked by partisans of "regime change," while others maintained that "all necessary measures" were being used to prevent atrocities and protect civilians.[21]

[19] Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, 'Libya and the Responsibility to Protect' <https://www.globalr2p.org/countries/libya/>.
[20] UN Security Council Resolution 1973 (n 42) para 4.
[21] Gareth Evans, 'The Responsibility to Protect After Libya and Syria' (2013) 24 Annual Review of Law and Social Science 407, 408.

Assessment and Implications

The real significance of the UN response to the Libyan crisis is that, for the first time, it represents and implements the responsibility to protect concept. The bright side is that R2P was applied against a government manifestly failing to protect their own citizens; the dark side is that consequences of this military action were not carefully thought through, with concerns about large-scale loss of civilian lives, danger of protracted military confrontation, and unintended effects of exacerbating tensions on the ground.[22]

Libya proved to be a bridge too far for powerful states including China and Russia, who had already grown sour on R2P as a tool of what they considered Western liberal imperialism. The perception that NATO exceeded its mandate by pursuing regime change rather than purely civilian protection has cast a long shadow over subsequent R2P discussions.

B. Syria: The Failure to Protect

The Syrian civil war represents R2P's most prominent failure and has fundamentally challenged the doctrine's credibility and future viability.

The Conflict and Atrocity Crimes

Since 2011, more than 13 million people have been displaced and over 580,000 have been killed in Syria. The Syrian conflict did not begin as a civil war, but with peaceful protests during March 2011 against dictatorship, corruption and abuses of human rights; as protests spread, the government responded first with bullets and then later with tanks, airstrikes and poison gas.[23]

The Syrian government has used chemical weapons, including weaponized sarin, chlorine and sulphur mustard gas, at least 32 times against civilians in Douma, Khan Shaykhun and other towns. The UN Human Rights Council-mandated Commission of Inquiry has reported more than 130,000 cases of arbitrary detention, abduction or disappearance in Syria, with the government being responsible for the overwhelming majority of cases.

Security Council Paralysis

Despite resolutions that led to the destruction of Syria's chemical weapons stockpile and improved access to suffering Syrian civilians, political divisions and partisan interests within the Security Council have been an insurmountable obstacle. Russia and China have on four separate occasions employed their vetoes to block action in response to mass atrocity crimes in Syria, including on a May 2014 draft

[22] Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (n 24).
[23] ibid.

resolution that would have referred the Syrian situation to the International Criminal Court.[24]

Impact on R2P

The principal norm that has been shattered in Syria is the doctrine of "responsibility to protect," with its death marking a moment of failure of the international system that was emerging at the end of the Cold War.[25] When Assad's forces used chemical weapons against Syrians in late August 2013, President Barack Obama hesitated and ultimately refused to act, setting in motion the abandonment of protecting Syrians from the worst forms of warfare.

The contradiction between protection of civilians and regime change has undermined international confidence in R2P and tarnished it as a tool for foreign policy agendas, with conceptual confusion and the Libyan experience breaking international consensus and paralyzing the United Nations in dealing with the humanitarian crisis in Syria.

CRITIQUES AND CHALLENGES

A. Selectivity and Political Interests

One of the most persistent criticisms of R2P concerns its selective application. The most notable invocation of R2P came during the Libyan crisis in 2011, but that same year, the Security Council did not invoke R2P in Syria despite severe civilian suffering; China and Russia both vetoed any intervention, highlighting the difficulty of attaining consensus, one of the biggest obstacles in implementing R2P.[26]

Permanent members China and Russia had reservations about the no-fly zone in Libya, including practicalities of enforcement and concerns about use of force when other measures might be available. These abstentions reflected deeper concerns about Western motivations and the potential for R2P to be instrumentalized for regime change purposes.

B. Sovereignty Concerns

Russia and China view R2P with suspicion as potentially undermining sovereignty and providing cover for Western intervention in the internal affairs of developing nations. This tension reflects broader

[24] ibid.
[25] David Rieff, 'R2P, R.I.P.' The New York Times (7 November 2011) <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/08/opinion/r2p-rip.html>.
[26] Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (n 24).

debates about the relationship between sovereignty and human rights in international law.[27]

Critics argue that R2P represents a form of neo-imperialism or neo-colonialism, with Western powers using humanitarian rhetoric to justify interventions that serve their strategic interests. India abstained from voting on Resolution 1973 because it perceived the resolution as being based on uncertain information and as being too open-ended, lacking clarity about details of enforcement measures.

C. The Question of Authorization and Legitimacy

The use of force under R2P may only be carried out as a measure of last resort, when all other non-coercive measures have failed, and only when authorized by the UN Security Council, in contrast to the principle of 'humanitarian intervention,' which claims to allow for the use of force as a humanitarian imperative without Security Council authorization.

However, the requirement for Security Council authorization creates a fundamental problem: when one or more permanent members oppose action for political reasons, populations at risk may be abandoned regardless of humanitarian need. The failure to end atrocities and protect civilians in Syria is not a failure of R2P itself, but of the imperfect actors and institutions charged with its implementation.[28]

D. Implementation Challenges and "Responsibility to Rebuild"

There was no detailed consideration of how military enforcement of the Security Council's mandate would be carried out in Libya, highlighting the absence of standing UN armed forces notwithstanding the original intent of the Charter's framers. The aftermath of the Libya intervention, with ongoing instability and conflict, demonstrates the challenges of post-intervention reconstruction.[29]

The original ICISS report included a "responsibility to rebuild" following intervention, but this aspect has received far less attention than prevention and reaction. Sustainable protection requires not only stopping immediate violence but also addressing root causes and building resilient institutions.

E. The Relationship Between R2P and Humanitarian Intervention

R2P differs from humanitarian intervention on several grounds: first, R2P's remit, focusing on

[27] Anne Peters, 'Humanity as the A and Ω of Sovereignty' (2009) 20(3) European Journal of International Law 513, 530-535.

[28] Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (n 53).

[29] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 'The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty' (December 2001) 39-45 <https://www.idrc.ca/en/book/responsibility-protect-report-international-commission-intervention-and-state-sovereignty>.

preventing four mass atrocity crimes, is narrower than humanitarian intervention's aim of preventing large-scale suffering; second, R2P emphasizes prevention and the full range of diplomatic, political and humanitarian measures, while humanitarian intervention automatically focuses on military force.

Rather than compromising sovereignty, as humanitarian intervention does, R2P harnesses the notion of "sovereignty as responsibility" and seeks to respond to extreme crises in a way that is both legitimate and legal. However, in practice, the distinction often becomes blurred, particularly when military force is employed.[30]

F. Early Warning and Prevention

The 2009 General Assembly debate on R2P highlighted the need for regional organizations like the African Union to play a strong role in implementing R2P, the need for stronger early warning mechanisms in the UN, and the need to clarify the roles UN bodies would play in implementing R2P.

Despite widespread agreement on prevention's centrality to R2P, implementation of preventive measures remains inadequate. Early warning systems exist but often fail to translate into early action. Political will for prevention is typically lacking until crises escalate to the point where more costly reactive measures become necessary.[31]

CONCLUSION

The Responsibility to Protect represents a significant evolution in international law and norms regarding sovereignty, human rights, and international intervention. At the 2005 World Summit, all Heads of State and Government affirmed the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, with R2P resting upon three pillars of equal standing.

The doctrine's strengths lie in its firm grounding in existing international law, its emphasis on prevention over reaction, and its multilateral framework requiring Security Council authorization for coercive measures. R2P sought to ensure that the international community never again fails to act in the face of genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity.

However, R2P faces formidable challenges. Given the current range and intensity of crises around the world, many feel compelled to say that R2P has failed, with deeply worrying developments threatening to widen the gap between the commitment expressed by Heads of State and Government and the daily

[30] United Nations, 'Early Warning, Assessment and the Responsibility to Protect: Report of the Secretary-General' (14 July 2010) UN Doc A/64/864.

[31] UN General Assembly (n 1) paras 138-139; UN General Assembly (n 19).

reality confronted by populations around the world. The Syrian conflict particularly demonstrates the limitations of R2P when faced with geopolitical divisions and the veto power of permanent Security Council members.

Despite these challenges, R2P has achieved important normative gains. There is agreement that prevention is at the core of R2P; that efforts to assist states should respect national ownership; that collective international action should employ the full range of diplomatic, political and humanitarian measures; and that military force should be considered only as a measure of last resort. All key intergovernmental bodies of the United Nations have deliberated on and referred to R2P, and the Security Council has referenced it in more than 50 resolutions and presidential statements.

With an overwhelming majority of states voting for the historic 2021 General Assembly Resolution A/75/277 on "The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity," UN member states decided to include R2P on the annual agenda of the General Assembly and to formally request that the Secretary-General reports annually on the topic. This demonstrates continued state support for R2P as a normative framework even amid implementation challenges.

As we move forward, the challenge is not to abandon R2P but to strengthen it: by improving preventive capacities, clarifying standards for intervention, ensuring accountability for implementation decisions, and building broader international consensus on when and how to act. Only through sustained commitment and honest assessment of past failures can R2P fulfill its promise of ensuring that the world never again stands idle while populations face genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.