# The Connection and Distinction Between "Responsibility to Protect" and "Humanitarian Intervention" under International Law

## Haoxuan Yin[1,a,*]

[1]School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science, University of Leeds, Woodhouse, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

a. ml222hy@leeds.ac.uk

*corresponding author

*Abstract:* This paper explores the connection and distinction between the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) and "Humanitarian Intervention" within the framework of international law. R2P emphasizes limited international intervention in cases of severe human rights violations, while humanitarian intervention focuses on using coercive means to safeguard human well-being during crises and conflicts. Through case studies, we observe diverse applications and outcomes of R2P and humanitarian intervention in past international affairs, reflecting global community stances on human rights protection and maintaining global security. The paper also reveals challenges and controversies in the practical implementation of these concepts. Key findings of are follow. R2P emphasizes preventive measures, highlighting the importance of taking action before a human rights crisis escalates into a broader humanitarian crisis, with humanitarian intervention serving as a means to implement R2P. R2P provides a robust legal and ethical foundation for humanitarian intervention, integrating widely recognized legal and ethical principles into international consensus, ensuring the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention in specific contexts. R2P emphasizes multilateral decision-making and consultation in the decision-making process, minimizing controversies associated with unilateral actions and garnering broad international support for intervention efforts. In practice, R2P and humanitarian intervention complement each other, constituting essential tools for the international community to uphold human values and protect victims from widespread atrocities. These research findings lay the groundwork for a more comprehensive understanding and improvement of the principles of R2P and humanitarian intervention.

*Keywords:* International law, Responsibility to Protect, humanitarian intervention, connection, distinction

## 1. Introduction

Within the complex framework of international law, the concepts of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and humanitarian intervention have garnered widespread attention, involving issues of national sovereignty, human rights, and global societal responsibility. R2P emphasizes limited international intervention in cases of severe human rights violations, while humanitarian intervention focuses on

using coercive means to safeguard human well-being in times of crisis and conflict. These concepts have elicited profound reflections and intricate reactions from the international community. Through case studies, we can observe the diverse applications and outcomes of R2P and humanitarian intervention in past international affairs. These cases not only reflect the global community's stances on human rights protection and maintaining global security but also reveal challenges and controversies that may arise in the practical implementation of these concepts. Thus, this paper will delve into these cases, extracting key lessons and experiences related to R2P and humanitarian intervention. By comprehensively examining the distinctions and connections between these concepts within the framework of international law, as well as their impact on the international community, we aim to achieve a deeper understanding of their roles and influence.

## 2. Responsibility to Protect in International Law

### 2.1. Definition, Principles and Legal Documents of R2P

In World Summit Outcome Document（2005）, it is the duty of every State to defend its citizens against crimes against humanity, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and genocide. This duty comprises using suitable and necessary measures to avoid such crimes, including their provocation. We acknowledge that obligation and promise to uphold it. When necessary, the international community should support the United Nations in creating an early warning system and encourage and assist States in carrying out their obligation [1]. Therefore, the principle of "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) in international law pertains to the collective obligation of the global community to prevent and mitigate grave violations of human rights. One of its core tenets is that national governments have a primary duty to safeguard their citizens from external threats while they are inside their borders. The international community is called upon to take necessary action, including the employment of coercive measures, to maintain global human rights and stability when a country is unable or unwilling to fulfill this role. This principle places a strong emphasis on proactive action, highlighting how crucial it is for the world community to act before a crisis arises to avert disastrous outcomes. R2P also emphasizes respect for national sovereignty by mandating that intervention measures be reasonable, legal, and accepted as lawful by other countries. Within this paradigm, responsibility to protect (R2P) addresses the fine line between state sovereignty and humanitarian concerns and symbolizes the international community's commitment to jointly defending global security and human rights.

### 2.2. Relative Cases of R2P

Bosnian War (1992-1995): During the Bosnian War, there were large-scale ethnic cleansing and war crimes, including massacres and sexual violence [2]. The international community's awareness of these crimes led to international intervention, including the deployment of UN peacekeeping forces to protect Bosnian civilians [3]. Rwandan Genocide (1994): Rwanda experienced a massive genocide that resulted in the slaughter of millions of Tutsi people. The international community failed to act promptly in response to the genocide, prompting calls for the "Responsibility to Protect" to ensure that similar events do not recur [4]. Libyan Civil War (2011): In the Libyan civil war, the Muammar Gaddafi regime brutally suppressed opposition forces. The international community implemented an intervention action through a United Nations Security Council resolution to protect Libyan civilians and ultimately overthrow the Gaddafi regime [5]. These historical events reflect the core idea of "Responsibility to Protect," which is that the international community should take action to prevent or halt large-scale genocide, war crimes, and other serious atrocities to ensure the safety and well-being of people.

## 3. Exploring the International Legal Basis for Humanitarian Intervention

### 3.1. UN Charter and Principles of Humanitarian Intervention

As for the Definition of "Humanitarian Intervention", interventions carried out by an organization or organizations (often a state or coalition of states) with the goal of reducing severe human suffering inside the boundaries of a sovereign state are known as humanitarian interventions [6]. Such suffering typically results from a government encouraging, supporting, or choosing to ignore the mistreatment of populations under its control. Human rights are frequently violated intentionally and systematically through forced relocations, ethnic cleansing, and, in the worst situations, genocide. Within the broad context of international law, the legal basis for humanitarian intervention is a highly significant topic, principally derived from the United Nations Charter and the core tenets of international law [7]. The UN Charter clearly describes the circumstances in which member states may intervene, either with UN authority or in self-defense. It is a vital legal document that governs international relations. The Charter places strict restrictions on humanitarian intervention, such as limitations on the use of force and the proscription of threats or acts that infringe state sovereignty, even though it grants some legitimacy to such interventions. The core tenets of international law also have an impact on humanitarian action. International law, which places restrictions on humanitarian intervention, is based on fundamental values including respecting state sovereignty, refraining from interfering in domestic matters, and resolving disagreements amicably. These guidelines seek to provide humanitarian intervention the appropriate legal recognition by striking a careful balance between national autonomy and the interests of the international community. A more comprehensive understanding of the legal foundations of humanitarian intervention within the framework of international law is possible through a thorough examination of the nuances of these foundations, particularly the relationship between the United Nations Charter and principles of international law. This knowledge not only helps to resolve the moral and legal issues that come with humanitarian assistance, but it also offers vital information that international society needs to unite around. As such, a careful study of this topic contributes to a broader comprehension of humanitarian intervention in the international community and provides valuable information for well-informed policymaking.

### 3.2. Relative Cases of Humanitarian Intervention

The goal of NATO's 1999 intervention in the Kosovo Conflict was to save people from ethnic cleansing [8]. Peace negotiations in Equatorial Guinea (2008) were facilitated by coordination between the UN and AU. UN and AU forces were sent in to promote peace, safeguard civilians, and facilitate political resolution in response to the Ivorian Crisis of 2011. These incidents demonstrate how nations can work together to address emergencies and preserve humanitarian ideals.

## 4. Connection and Distinction between Responsibility to Protect and Humanitarian Intervention

### 4.1. Theoretical Foundation

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is the theoretical foundation of humanitarian intervention. The principle of Responsibility to Protect, or R2P, is an international agreement that requires the international community to intervene on behalf of victims of mass atrocities, genocide, war crimes, and other serious violations. This principle highlights that states have an obligation to protect their citizens. If a state neglects this responsibility, the international community ought to step in. In turn, humanitarian intervention is one way to carry out the Responsibility to Protect. It frequently entails outside intervention to stop or end humanitarian crises [9]. Here are some reasons. A key component

of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) theoretical framework is the emphasis on preventive measures or acting to stop serious crimes before they become a human rights crisis. This is consistent with the central tenet of humanitarian intervention, which emphasizes the importance of prompt intervention to prevent humanitarian catastrophes and shield innocent civilians from harm. Responsibility to Protect (R2P) emphasizes that states have an obligation to safeguard their citizens from grave harm; if a state is unable or unwilling to do so, the international community ought to step in. This idea of international intervention strikes a balance between state sovereignty and global humanitarian concerns by giving humanitarian intervention moral and legal validity. The United Nations has expressly acknowledged responsibility to protect in legal documents, such as resolutions from the General Assembly and Security Council. By providing a legal basis for humanitarian intervention and conferring legitimacy and compliance upon intervention actions, this recognition integrates Responsibility to Protect (R2P) into the broader international consensus. The real-world implementation of R2P emphasizes that multilateral decision-making and consultation are the processes by which international society determines whether to intervene humanitarianly. This minimizes the controversy and legal disputes that may result from unilateral actions by ensuring that humanitarian intervention efforts receive broad international support. Protection of Victims' Rights: Preserving the rights of marginalized individuals and groups is one of R2P's goals. This is in line with the goal of humanitarian intervention, which is to effectively protect civilians' rights and dignity by using coercive measures to stop or prevent violence against them. In conclusion, R2P provides the theoretical framework for humanitarian intervention because of its focus on victim rights, legal recognition, national accountability, international cooperation, and prevention. It gives the international community a sound moral and legal foundation on which to act decisively when humanitarian crises arise.

## 4.2. Complementation for each other

They are the complementary relationship. Responsibility to Protect (R2P) provides the legal and moral foundation for humanitarian intervention [10]. It emphasizes the balance between national sovereignty and the shared responsibility of the international community. In many instances, the international community's humanitarian intervention actions align with the principles of Responsibility to Protect, ensuring the protection of civilians from violent violations. Humanitarian intervention underscores the obligation of the international community to take measures, when necessary, to protect vulnerable groups. The reasons are described below. Responsibility to Protect (R2P) provides humanitarian intervention with a strong legal and ethical basis. R2P gives humanitarian interventions legitimacy and justification by putting the prevention of widespread human rights violations under the purview of shared international responsibility. This ethical and legal basis guarantees that humanitarian intervention is required by international law and ethical principles, not just a tool for politics. The concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) guarantees the acceptance of humanitarian intervention in international affairs by striking a balance between international responsibility and national sovereignty. International intervention becomes a justifiable way to stop human rights catastrophes when a country neglects its obligations or refuses to take decisive action. In handling complex international relations, this balance serves as a unifying factor and encourages support for humanitarian intervention on a global scale. Humanitarian intervention guarantees the substantive application of R2P as a useful tool for carrying out the principle. By averting or ending humanitarian crises, humanitarian intervention, in practice, enhances the content of the Responsibility to Protect. It is a concrete commitment to keeping the promises made under the Responsibility to Protect, not merely a reactionary measure. Humanitarian intervention emphasizes the need for the international community to act decisively to defend vulnerable groups that are under threat. This is in line with the primary goal of Responsibility to Protect, which is to safeguard those

who are most vulnerable during emergencies, especially civilians. In reality, humanitarian intervention serves as a tool to make sure that this duty is fulfilled, bolstering the international community's guarantee of the rights of marginalized groups. These enlarged features highlight the mutual support and synergy between Responsibility to Protect and humanitarian intervention, strengthening their complementary relationship. When it comes to handling complicated humanitarian crises, they give the international community a completer and more effective toolkit.

## 4.3. Legal Framework

Responsibility to Protect is the legal framework of humanitarian intervention. Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has been formally acknowledged in United Nations legal texts, including resolutions from the General Assembly and the Security Council. This recognition positions R2P as a guiding legal principle for the international community when confronting severe human rights violations and humanitarian crises, furnishing a distinct legal foundation for humanitarian intervention [11]. Established on the principle of protecting civilians from large-scale atrocities, R2P ensures the international community's authority to take action in situations involving genocide, war crimes, and similar circumstances, providing legal legitimacy to humanitarian intervention. The primary reasons why Responsibility to Protect serves as the legal framework for humanitarian intervention are as follows. Resolutions from the General Assembly and Security Council, among other UN legal documents, expressly recognize R2P. This means that in cases of grave human rights abuses and humanitarian emergencies, the responsibility to protect becomes a foundational legal principle for the international community, providing a solid legal foundation for humanitarian intervention. Responsibility to Protect (R2P) lays out global guidelines for shielding civilians from mass crimes. This principle gives humanitarian intervention legal legitimacy by guaranteeing the international community's right to intervene in cases involving war crimes, genocide, etc. R2P places a strong emphasis on states' obligations to defend their citizens. Nonetheless, international intervention is warranted when a state neglects this obligation. When local governments are incapable or unwilling to carry out their duties, international intervention is a reasonable option because this idea of striking a balance between national sovereignty and international responsibility creates a legal equilibrium. The foundation of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) legal framework is a strong distaste for extreme circumstances such as mass killings and humanitarian disasters. This legal basis gives the international community the authority to intervene on behalf of humanitarians to avert or mitigate possible humanitarian crises. In summary, Responsibility to Protect serves as the legal framework for humanitarian intervention, receiving formal recognition in international law and establishing legal and ethical principles for the protection of civilians from extreme harm. This legal foundation provides legitimacy and compliance for humanitarian intervention, making it a lawful basis for international action in specific contexts.

## 4.4. Decision-Making process of Humanitarian Intervention

Responsibility to Protect is the Decision-Making process of humanitarian intervention. Responsibility to Protect emphasizes the importance of the international community engaging in consultation and multilateral decision-making when facing potential humanitarian crises. In this decision-making process, countries actively participate in consultations to ensure that decisions are widely accepted, thereby reducing the risk of controversies that unilateral actions might provoke. The following are the main causes behind Responsibility to Protect (R2P) being the deciding factor in humanitarian intervention decisions. When it comes to possible humanitarian crises, Responsibility to Protect (R2P) emphasizes the significance of the international community reaching decisions through multilateral processes and consultation. Countries actively participate in consultations during this decision-

making process to guarantee that decisions are broadly accepted and lower the possibility of disputes arising from unilateral actions. The importance of broad international support is emphasized in the decision-making process because the Responsibility to Protect principle emphasizes the international community's shared responsibility to combat severe human rights abuses and humanitarian crises. This guarantees the support of various nations for humanitarian intervention efforts, thereby augmenting their efficacy throughout the implementation stage. The UN Security Council is a decision-making body with international legitimacy, and Responsibility to Protect emphasizes the significance of decision-making within this body. Potential conflicts with international law are avoided by the UN Security Council's involvement and decisions, which further guarantee the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention. The hazards involved with taking unilateral action are diminished by the multilateral structure of the decision-making process. Responsibility to Protect guarantees that decisions are based on generally recognized legal and ethical principles rather than the unique positions of nations or alliances by fostering consensus within the international community. The Responsibility to Protect decision-making process places a strong emphasis on multilateral decision-making and consultation in order to prevent hasty actions. This guarantees that the international community has enough time and opportunities to thoroughly assess the situation before launching humanitarian intervention efforts, ensuring that the decisions made are prudent and consistent with global agreement. As a result, Responsibility to Protect takes center stage in the decision-making process for humanitarian intervention, placing a strong emphasis on multilateral decision-making, international community consultation, and coordinated action. This lessens the dangers and controversies connected with unilateral actions while guaranteeing the legitimacy and compliance of humanitarian intervention.

In conclusion, the relationship between the Responsibility to Protect and humanitarian intervention is complementary. R2P provides the legal and moral basis for humanitarian intervention, which, in turn, serves as a practical means to implement the R2P principle. Together, they constitute essential tools for the international community to uphold human values and protect victims when confronted with large-scale atrocities.

## 5. Challenges in the International Consensus on Responsibility to Protect and Humanitarian Intervention

The principles of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and humanitarian intervention represent crucial aspects of the international community's commitment to preventing and addressing mass atrocities, human rights violations, and crises. However, the application of these principles in international affairs poses intricate challenges that revolve around the delicate balance between safeguarding sovereignty and protecting individual rights. This section explores the multifaceted challenges faced by these principles within the framework of international consensus.

Sovereignty vs. Intervention is one of the central challenges which lies in the conflict between the principle of sovereignty and the imperative to intervene in the face of severe human rights abuses. Nations assert their right to non-interference in internal affairs, presenting a complex dilemma when considering external intervention. Striking a balance between respecting sovereignty and preventing atrocities becomes a contentious issue, often requiring nuanced diplomatic solutions. The question of whether humanitarian intervention is legitimate is one that is frequently debated. A hazy view of the legality of such actions is exacerbated by the absence of a coherent international legal framework and precise guidelines regarding when intervention is acceptable. The difficulty is in coming up with widely recognized standards for legitimacy and negotiating the legal minefield that surrounds intervention. The difficulty of putting these principles into practice is exacerbated by differing opinions among states and areas about the appropriate time, mode, and party to intervene. To create consensus and coordination and promote a more cohesive international response to crises, bridging

these divides will require diplomatic efforts. Taking care of an intervention's aftermath presents important issues with regard to aiding in reconstruction and controlling consequences. Sustained support for local communities is necessary for effective intervention to prevent prolonged chaos and instability, in addition to stopping immediate crises. Ensuring long-term stability becomes contingent upon the development of comprehensive strategies for post-intervention scenarios.

In conclusion, navigating the challenges within the international consensus on responsibility to protect and humanitarian intervention demands a collective effort from the global community. Dialogues, negotiations, and the establishment of clear and actionable guidelines are imperative to address these challenges. By enhancing international cooperation and refining the principles guiding R2P and humanitarian intervention, the world can move toward a more cohesive and effective framework for preventing and responding to humanitarian crises.

## 6.    Conclusion

In summary, R2P and humanitarian intervention are closely related. Humanitarian intervention is a specific way to put the R2P concept into practice, but R2P offers the moral and legal foundation for it. When combined, they provide the international community with a vital instrument for defending humanitarian principles and shielding victims from widespread atrocities. However, concerns of sovereignty, selectivity, the UN's role, accountability, and consistency in implementation are central to the challenges in the domains of responsibility to protect and humanitarian intervention. The international community is striving for more comprehensive agreement and standards, but more work is required to resolve these problems.

## References

[1]    United Nations. (2005) World Summit Outcome Document, Paragraphs on the Responsibility to Protect.
[2]    Lampe, John R. (2023) Bosnian War. Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/event/Bosnian-War.
[3]    Campbell, D. (1998) MetaBosnia: Narratives of the Bosnian War. Review of International Studies, 24(2), 261-281.
[4]    BBC. (2019) Rwanda genocide: 100 days of slaughter. Retrieved from  https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-26875506.
[5]    Britannica. (2023) The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Libya Revolt of 2011". Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/event/Libya-Revolt-of-2011.
[6]    Bell, Duncan. (2023) Humanitarian intervention. Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/humanitarian-intervention.
[7]    Dhaliwal, Rohan. (2014) Using English School Theory to Determine Legitimate Humanitarian Intervention. January 30 , 2015.
[8]    Britannica (2023) The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Kosovo conflict". Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/event/Kosovo-conflict.
[9]    Chesterman, Simon. (2021) Responsibility to Protect and Humanitarian Intervention: From Apology to Utopia and Back Again, in Robin Geiß, and Nils Melzer (eds), The Oxford Handbook of the International Law of Global Security, Oxford Handbooks.
[10]  Evans, Gareth, et al. (2023)Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect. International Security, 37(4), 199-214.
[11]  Igun, O. (2023) Humanitarian intervention and responsibility to protect: Eglantine Staunton: France, humanitarian intervention, and the responsibility to protect. Manchester University Press.