

"THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT" (R2P) CARE OR GREED? THE UNITED NATIONS DOCTRINE (2005)

NIHAL SHIMY ABDEL FATTAH EL-SHIMY

Research Scholar, Modern Sciences and Arts University, Egypt (MSA)

ABSTRACT

This study discusses a topic of great interest and importance to the world of politics and International Relations. It focuses on a somewhat new concept in politics called the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) or (RtoP) or simply put "Politics of Protection." This research argues that the R2P poses a great threat to the sovereignty of states only if it doesn't have the right mechanisms of implementation. However, since no involvement in a crisis should (theoretically) take place except after getting a UN mandate to legitimize the action, then there is no direct threat. Also, the veto power plays a major role in the implementation and limitation of R2P as it mainly balances the power of the U.S. and western states with that of Russia and China on issues of intervention.

Therefore, there is a special focus on the concept of "Sovereignty" as well as the two main approaches to human rights, basically relativism and universalism. Attempts will be made to answer a set of questions. For example: Do the issues of human rights and the protection of those rights pose a clear threat to the sovereignty of states and if so, what can be done to ensure humanitarianism on the one hand and the preservation of sovereignty of states on the other? In other words, how can governments maintain their sovereignty in the face of a continuous threat of intervention due to the idea of R2P? In the meantime, does the current UN mechanism prevent countries from using the R2P doctrine as a "convenient political tool" that may be used to justify an intervention and if so, to what extent? Or, Is the R2P used as a means of pursuing state interests? In other words, are the countries that supported and approved of the R2P are motivated by true intentions of care and support to protect civilians or are there unseen intentions and aims constituting the major reasons for intervention? That is, is the issue of protection used by some countries as a disguise for intervening in sovereign states for their own interests, and their interests alone? Does the international community really care for human beings in the absolute sense, or are they driven by greed and self interest?

KEYWORDS: "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) or (R to P) or Simply put "Politics of Protection."