



MASTER'S THESIS
INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

The Responsibility to Protect in Syria

A Motive Analysis of "GIBSA"

Author: Joe Lahoud
Advisor: Henrik Friberg Fernros

23 May 2014

19393 Words



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the motives of emerging global powers in decision-making processes concerned with humanitarian crises, and whether the principle of “Responsibility to Protect” has influenced the decisions of GIBSA in UN-resolutions concerned with the Syrian Crisis. GIBSA is an unofficial group comprised of Germany, India, Brazil and South Africa, who were part of the UNSC during 2011-2012 (Brazil 2010-2011), and strive to gain UNSC permanent membership. The data assembled from first hand sources, such as UN-archives, describes the motivations and votes offered during UNSC and GA resolutions concerned with Syria in 2011-2012. The motives were assumed to build upon the three logics of human action: logic of consequence, characterized by national aspirations, logic of appropriateness described as role-playing and logic of arguing, accounting for norm-suasion. By categorizing the motivations and votes within these three logics, the conclusion suggested that although the actors account for all logics prior to their decisions, their arguments are mainly influenced by norm-suasion and national aspirations, as they argue for the fulfillment of R2P pillars, yet not exclusively for the sake of humanitarian reasons, rather to ensure the support needed for an eventual permanent membership at the UNSC. IBSA also focus on strategic arguing for sovereignty, which correspondingly is in their interests. Role-playing is mainly accounted for by Germany due to its closer affiliation to its allies, but only if peaceful measures are introduced. Hence R2P is accounted for by emerging global powers, but not necessarily for the right purpose.

Abbreviations

AU = African Union

EU = European Union

FSA = Free Syrian Army

GIBSA = Germany, India, Brazil and South Africa

GISA = Germany, India and South Africa

IBSA = India, Brazil and South Africa

ICISS = International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty

IR = International Relations

LAS = League of Arab States

MENA = Middle East and North Africa

NATO = North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NTC = National Transitional Council in Libya

P3 = UNSC permanent members, France, USA and UK

P5 = UNSC permanent members, P3, Russia and China

RC = Russia and China

R2P = Responsibility to Protect

SA = South Africa

SNC = Syrian National Council

UAE = United Arab Emirates

UK = United Kingdom

UNGA = United Nations General Assembly

UNSC = United Nations Security Council

UNSG = United Nations Secretary-General

UNSMIS = United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria

US = United States of America

WWII = World War Two

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	2
Introduction	4
Disposition.....	6
Background	6
The Syrian Crisis	6
Historic Reasons to the Conflict.....	6
The Syrian Civil War.....	7
Responsibility to Protect	7
R2P in Libya – Resolution 1973.....	9
GIBSA on R2P prior to Syria	10
The Federal Republic of Germany.....	10
The Republic of India.....	11
The Federative Republic of Brazil.....	11
The Republic of South Africa.....	12
Purpose	13
Literature Review	14
Theoretical Framework	16
Logic of Consequence.....	17
Logic of Appropriateness.....	18
Logic of Arguing.....	19
Method	20
Motive Analysis.....	21
Operationalization of the Three Logics.....	22
<i>Table 1: Analytical Framework without characteristics</i>	22
<i>Table 2: Analytical Framework with the characteristics</i>	25
Material	25
Delimitations.....	27
Quality Assurance of Study.....	28
Analysis	29
<i>Table 3: GIBSA votes in Resolutions concerned with Syria</i>	29
The German Motives.....	29
The Indian Motives.....	33
The Brazilian Motives.....	36
The South African Motives.....	39
Analyzing the GIBSA Motives.....	42
Conclusion & Reflections	46
References	49
Bibliography	53

Introduction

In the wake of the Arab public uprisings, the principle of “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) was revived at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to deter human rights violations through humanitarian, economic, diplomatic or even military interventions, if national governments are unable/unwilling to protect their citizens (Bellamy & Williams, 2011: 825). R2P was adopted at the World Summit in 2005, and embraced as a new tool by the international community to hinder any future Srebrenica or Rwanda, as a protection against mass atrocities committed on citizens (Offiong, 2013: 2f). The first R2P intervention, Resolution 1973, legitimized intervention in Libya yet its implementation was criticized widely leading to an on-going discussion regarding its relevance, especially in complicated cases as in Syria (Evans, 2013 & Bellamy et al., 2011).

Today, approximately 130 000 people have died in Syria (Hansson, 2014), renowned as a civil war due to increased division between ideological and ethnic factions, where the government is unable to protect its citizens from further atrocities, and also played a role in the killings (Skansholm, 2013: 1), which actualizes R2P intervention. Syria's strong allies in the UNSC, Russia and China (RC), vetoed against such measures; which is predictable since they share strategic and economic interests in Syria; while US, UK and France (P3) push for drastic measures (Skansholm, 2013 & Garcia, 2013). Yet in an increasingly multipolar world, after decades of bipolarism (Cold War) and unipolarism (after the downfall of the Soviet Union), the role of emerging global powers is gradually progressing, especially in shaping general opinion and maintaining international norms, such as R2P (Brosig, 2012: 4f). Emerging global powers such as the unofficial GIBSA group, comprised of Germany, India, Brazil and South Africa, were part of the UNSC during the uprising of the Syrian Crisis and played a role in the negotiations of resolutions aiming at solving the conflict. Hence the purpose of this paper is to analyze the potential influence of R2P on their decision-making process in resolutions concerned with Syria to ensure if the principle is still relevant. The group has arisen from mutual interests in becoming permanent UNSC members, and to share common norms and values, in order to challenge the international system's hegemony. GIBSA are leading democracies who support multilateral agreements and averse from aggression if possible, yet encourage UN peace missions in areas where the use of force is inevitable (Brosig, 2012: 3ff). Brosig (2012) describes GIBSA as supporters of R2P and important actors in its development and norm-construction process. Their perspectives in general are assumed to reflect the global opinion, where there is a clear support for R2P norms, yet unclear support

regarding its implementation (Evans, 2013). Post-conflict states are also assumed to respect the positioning of the GIBSA countries, which are more or less newly established democracies that underwent decades of internal conflicts for different reasons. In other words, Syria is likelier to share similarities in its conflict with India, who also had its fair share of ethnic and religious divisions and is a relatively newly established democracy, than with the US or France who have enjoyed democracy for centuries (Higashi, 2012).

Since GIBSA lack the power position and vetoes enjoyed by the five permanent members at the UNSC with vetoing rights (P5), and geopolitical interests in Syria, their perspectives are yet to be researched, hence the purpose of this paper. Although GIBSA's votes are not necessarily free from any personal gains, as they are aspiring global powers and in need of international recognition, they are assumed more likely to vote in accordance with institutional regulations that have been supported by the majority of countries (Brosig, 2012: 4f). Their motives may change in accordance with the votes, situation and arguments presented during resolution proposals. Hence, acting exclusively on behalf of national interests for aspiring global powers may harm their ambitions to become permanent members eventually, which is also in their interests (Brosig, 2012: 3f). Therefore, analyzing the motives of GIBSA will help in understanding whether R2P influences the decision-making process of emerging global powers or if it is solely a tool utilized once suitable to national aspirations. In addition to the possibility of affirming the pillars of R2P and/or attaining national interests, emerging powers may vote in accordance with their assumed obligations, by supporting their allies and/or maintaining their loyalties towards a certain notion, such as sovereignty etc. To conclude, this paper uses motive analysis of GIBSA's votes and arguments in resolutions concerned with Syria to extract the potential influences on their decisions, and comprehend whether international principles, such as R2P, are decisive in shaping the opinions of emerging global powers. Hence, if R2P is accounted for in their decision-making process, we can assume its relevance, but if not, the principle may be lost.

This paper argues that although supporting ones allies is contemplated; especially for Germany since it relies more on the EU than GISA rely on their allies; taking into consideration R2P and argue for the fulfillment of its pillars is crucial to gain support by the majority of states. Thus we may conclude that international principles influence emerging global powers, but only if the outcome benefits its aspirations; hence R2P is alive, but not exclusively for humanitarian reasons.

Disposition

This paper is organized in the following sequence: the first part covers the background of the situation in hand, with an understanding of R2P, its application in Libya and the positioning of GIBSA countries' on R2P prior to the Syrian Crisis etc. The second part accounts for the literature review, while the third part discusses the theoretical framework this paper is built on, which are the three logics of human action: logic of consequences, logic of appropriateness and logic of arguing. The fourth part covers the methods and materials used to conduct this paper. The fifth part covers the empirical analysis of this paper, which correlates the theories available with the material used. The last part concludes this paper with additional reflections about the research's contribution.

Background

This section will give a deeper insight into the Syrian Crisis, the principle of R2P, its application in Libya, the positioning of GIBSA on R2P prior to the Syrian Crisis, and the purpose of this paper.

The Syrian Crisis

Following the uprisings in many Middle Eastern and North African countries (MENA) in 2010 and 2011, known as the Arab Spring, protests spread to Syria in early 2011. The preliminary reasons for the protests are assumed related to the arrest of children painting revolutionary slogans (Zariouh, 2013: 65). However, the demonstration turned into a call from many thousands protestors demanding the resignation of the regime after the crackdown by security forces. The conflict escalated and turned soon into warfare between military forces and opposing rebel forces, united under the Free Syrian Army (FSA). The FSA encompassed different ideologies, religions and ethnic groupings, yet with common wish to ensure the resignation of the Syrian regime (Rodgers et. al, 2012).

Historic Background to the Conflict

Hafez al-Assad, the father of Bashar, was defense minister in 1966. In 1970, he overthrew the former Syrian president and imposed an authoritarian regime, with clear support from religious and ethnic minorities who felt threatened by the Sunni majority. Al-Assad was an Alawite, a sect within Shia-Islam, which have been historically fierce enemies with Sunnis. Al-Assad began his campaign by defeating rebellions in Sunni pre-dominated cities, such as Aleppo, Hama and Homs, which are also the main battlefields of today's conflict, and also by appointing mainly Alawites

in the security and intelligence sectors to safeguard his presidency (Gifkins, 2012). After his death in 2000, Bashar al-Assad succeeded him and was considered a reformist at start. Yet after the crackdown on the protests in 2011, people lost faith in him and old ideological and sectarian grudges resurfaced (Rodgers et. al, 2012).

The Syrian Civil War

Following the crackdown on protestors by military forces in 2011, Syria became a battlefield between governmental forces and rebels. In mid 2011, a political opposition group, Syrian National Council (SNC), was founded and demanded the resignation of the Ba'ath regime and the establishment of a democratic government. Since these demands were not encountered, SNC formed the FSA, including deserted military forces and rebellious civilians, with clear goal to overthrow the Ba'ath regime (ICRtoP, 2012). The formation of a military branch implied a loss of faith in dialogues, which spread throughout the entire country. By the end of 2011, the Syrian government lost control over many cities and what did emerge as peaceful protests turned into a Civil War between and among ethnic, sectarian and ideological groupings. The conflict was no longer a case between governmental forces and FSA; instead many partitions reappeared. Many different minorities, such as the Alawites, Christians and Kurds, took to arms in order to protect their villages in case of repercussions for historical reasons by other minorities, or even the Sunni majority, and/or to establish autonomous regions (Gifkins, 2012: 375-385).

Today, more than 130000 people lost their lives, 2.5 millions left the country and more than 5 millions are internally displaced, causing immense humanitarian crises in the country and among its neighbors (Hansson, 2014). Since the Syrian government is unable to stop mass atrocities, and committed much of it, and the humanitarian crisis is immense, R2P is eligible, not necessarily through military means, but most importantly through a reaction by the international community (HRC, 2012). Therefore, this paper is dedicated to understand the motives of emerging global powers, such as GIBSA, in resolution voting concerned with Syria, and whether R2P has influenced their decisions since it is highly actualized in this Crisis.

Responsibility to Protect

The principle of "Responsibility to Protect" was advocated by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in 2001 and recognized by the UN General Assembly (UNGA) at the 2005 UN World Summit. The acknowledgment signified a commitment by the international community to the norms and values of the principle (Bellamy, 2010: 158ff). The purpose of R2P is to

prevent mass atrocities and human rights violations from occurring again: such as genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, after the international arena stood by during the horrible events of Srebrenica and Rwanda (Offiong, 2013: 2f). The UNSC has advocated civilian protection ever since through various resolutions and memorandums that support international commitment to safeguard an endangered population, prosecute human rights violators and intervene if needed, diplomatically, economically and even militarily (Bellamy & Williams, 2011: 827f). The principle of R2P was reaffirmed at the UNSC in Resolution 1674, in 2006, and Resolution 1894, in 2009 (UNSC, 2009), along with a newly established joint office, Global Centre for R2P, for the maintenance of the principle.

R2P represents a conceptualization of the interaction between human rights and sovereignty, in which the latter is no longer recognized as absolute, as mandated in the Westphalian treaties. Instead, state sovereignty is recognized as a responsibility to maintain order and protection of the civilians, and if violated, the international community has the right to intervene under UNSC mandate. Thus, human rights are conceived more important than state sovereignty in R2P (Thakur, 2006: 251).

The principle of R2P contains three founding pillars that should be respected prior to any R2P intervention (Badescu, 2010: 110):

- The state has the sole responsibility to protect its citizens from mass atrocities committed from either internal or external enemies
- The international community has the responsibility to offer assistance to a state which is unable to maintain its responsibilities towards its citizens
- If the responsible state is unable, or unwilling, to respect its responsibilities, the international community has the responsibility to intervene through humanitarian and/or diplomatic measures, or in last resort, militarily

R2P consists also of three distinct guidelines of implementation if mass atrocities are likely to occur, are occurring or have occurred, that differentiate it from humanitarian intervention. Although they share similar characteristics regarding non-sovereignty, they differ in that humanitarian intervention focuses mainly on the right for military interference, while R2P stresses the responsibility to intervene to protect citizens in danger, and military intervention is only used as last resort (Madsen & Selsbaek, 2012: 10ff):

- The responsibility to prevent: address root causes to an internal conflict through dialogue with the conflicting parties

- The responsibility to react: respond to human rights violations through appropriate means, such as diplomacy, sanctions and interventions
- The responsibility to rebuild: provide assistance for recovery, diplomatic talks between the conflicting sides and reconstruction in the aftermath of the crisis

This paper will focus on the second guideline, the responsibility to react, as it is the most relevant aspect of R2P in the case of the Syrian Crisis today. Since the Syrian Crisis is ongoing and a solution is yet to be found to hinder further mass atrocities, an analysis of the decision outcome made by the GIBSA countries can only be explained through the responsibility to react; whether the GIBSA countries are in support of diplomatic, humanitarian, economic and/or military intervention. Once again, it is crucial to pinpoint that military intervention is considered only as last resort in R2P, as identified in the ICISS report (2001), and also as a tool to protect civilians, and not to ensure regime change, as postulated during the Libyan intervention in Resolution 1973, which will be discussed in the following section (Roberts, 2011).

R2P in Libya - Resolution 1973

This section will offer a summary of the events that occurred prior, during and after the first R2P intervention. Both scholars and countries, including GIBSA and RC, criticized R2P intensely, and even presumed its death, in the aftermath of Libya since they assumed that P3 and NATO misused the principle (Evans, 2013). Hence it is important to clarify the historical application of R2P, in order to understand whether the intervention in Libya had any influence on the decisions of GIBSA in Syria.

Much like Syria, in the wake of the Arab Spring and the uprisings of civil societies in the MENA-region, Libyans took the streets, on 15th of February 2011, demanding the resignation of the Libyan dictator Muammar Kaddafi. The protests quickly expanded to different cities and shortly the "National Transitional Council" (NTC) was established as a replacement to the government once defeated. Kaddafi responded with brutal force and threats to "*chase the cockroaches*" and "*cleanse Libya house by house*", forcing the international community and regional organizations to condemn such actions and rhetoric (Madsen & Selsbaek, 2012: 14ff). Many countries and organizations reacted instantaneously, as France recognized the NTC as the legitimate government and called for intervention against the regime to stop further atrocities against the people; followed by the UK and League of Arab States (LAS). The situation quickly escalated to a civil war, with governmental and pro-Kaddafi regimes controlling most territories, while the NTC held others in East Libya. The EU imposed economic and diplomatic sanctions, yet more was anticipated to protect the

people on the ground, hence the proposal of Resolution 1970 (ibid: 15-18). Resolution 1970 was adopted by the UNSC on 26th of February 2011, only two weeks after the initial protests, following the demands of the Libyan civil society, LAS, African Union (AU), and Human Rights Council etc. It proposed the imposition of arms embargo and travel ban of members of the regime, along with freezing their assets. This proved non-sufficient and hence resolution 1973 was suggested in March 17th, demanding an immediate cease-fire and ending of mass atrocities, along with an imposition of a no-flight zone over Libyan territory to obstruct further use of airstrikes against the population. The critical part in the resolution specified the use of “*all necessary measures*” to protect the civilian, yet with no foreign boots on Libyan soil. NATO led this operation, known as “Operation Unified Protector”, assisted by Sweden, Jordan, UAE and Qatar (ibid: 40-45). The blurriness of “*all necessary measures*” lead to increased criticism against the misuse of R2P in Libya as many countries, especially GIBSA, felt that NATO overused force by supporting the NTC with arms and also striking pro-Kaddafi forces who did not cause any threats against civilians at the moments of the strikes. Some criticized NATO for misusing R2P to guarantee regime change, which is not in line with the principle since it only emphasizes the protection of citizens, and not agenda setting or regime removal (Evans, 2013). Resolution 1973 threatened the survival of R2P, as clear guidelines were lacking on procedural once military intervention is imposed, and the risk of overarching the principle ones voted through (Madsen & Selsbaek, 2012: 46-52).

GIBSA on R2P prior to Syria

This subsection will offer background descriptions for each GIBSA “member” regarding their positioning on the principle of R2P and its application in Libya.

The Federal Republic of Germany

Germany has since the end of World War Two (WWII) emphasized the importance of multilateral agreements and international regulations, mainly through non-military resolutions. Germany's first military participation since WWII came in the Kosovo War in 1999 due to NATO involvement, which Germany is a part of (Brozus, 2012: 53). This triggered the role and responsibilities of this former European superpower, which was keen to regain influence. Germany welcomed R2P since it assumes that sovereignty is entitled to nations who respect their responsibilities towards citizens, and also since the UNSC has the sole authorization to interfere with others' sovereignty. Germany was the first state to invite the newly appointed UN Secretary

General Special Adviser on R2P, Edward Luck, for an official consultation in 2008 (Brozus, 2012: 54-58).

In the case of R2P in Libya, Germany abstained from voting in Resolution 1973. This indicates that Germany refused to align itself with its natural allies, NATO, which it was criticized for. The decision was based on the likelihood of an increased loss of civilian lives, risk of spreading the war across the MENA-region and also due to possibility of military failure. Instead, Germany emphasized the importance in supporting democratic development through peaceful measures (Brozus, 2012: 60ff).

The Republic of India

India has since its colonial liberation from the UK maintained a good relation with the international community, through diplomatic and institutional cooperation. The Indian government criticized the proposal of R2P up until the 2005 World Summit, mainly due to its historical mistrust towards westernized norms, which it assumed was a disguise for pursuing national aspirations (Hall, 2013). India even attempted to disrupt the ratification of the principle during the World Summit in 2005, but eventually accepted its authorization, without losing its concerns (Bellamy, 2009). Although India accepted R2P in 2005, it kept its resistance, mainly towards the third pillar, which states that the international community has the responsibility to intervene in a sovereign state. India affirms the first and second pillar, that a state is responsible to protect its own populations and that the international community may offer assistance, yet the focus should be on capacity building and early warnings, instead of coercive measures included in the third pillar. India emphasizes the importance of sovereignty and non-intervention, unless military use is proposed as last resort and for genuine humanitarian reasons (Garwood-Gowers, 2013: 15). In the 2009 UNGA dialogue regarding R2P, the Indian ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri stated:

“The responsibility to protect should in no way provide a pretext for humanitarian intervention or unilateral action.”(24 July 2009)

India abstained in Resolution 1973, well aware of the Libyan situation. The abstention did not support military intervention per se, but did not hinder it either. India argued that not all peaceful measures were exhausted, thus R2P was unjustified. India later condemned NATO for supplying Libyan rebels with arms, which was not granted in the resolution, and the bombing of strategic targets, although they did not pose any threats to civilians. *“This gave R2P a bad name”*, said UN-ambassador Hardeep Puri at a seminar marking the tenth anniversary of R2P in 2012 (Banerjee, 2012).

The Federative Republic of Brazil

Brazil has also kept a good relation with the international community and has ratified treaties that correlate to R2P, including the Genocide Convention, Geneva Conventions and the Rome Statute (Hamann, 2012: 73). Yet Brazil always emphasized state sovereignty and diplomacy to solve external conflicts, and did therefore reject the notion of R2P completely at first in 2001, since it was acknowledged as another “*western tool for intervention*” (ibid). Brazil argued that even when R2P is approved on the grounds of justice and legitimacy, human and material costs of a military intervention will be too severe; therefore exhausting diplomatic solutions is the key. Furthermore, R2P is considered at risk of being misused for other purposes than humanitarian, such as national interests and regime change. The Brazilian stance changed in the aftermath of the UN peacekeeping mission in Haiti in 2004, where Brazil played a crucial role and recognized the necessity to intervene once needed through humanitarian means if it ever sought more influence on global scale (Kenkel, 2012). Brazil is a regional soft power, stressing the importance of sub-regional arrangements, socio-economic and political integration, and lacking adequate military capacity to act as hard power. Much like India, Brazil emphasized the importance of prevention and capacity building found in pillars 1 and 2 in R2P, during the 2005 UNGA summit. Although Brazil never rejected the third pillar, they argued that external intervention could only be seen as “*an exceptional course of action*” and that the pillars need a chronological sequence, indicating that Pillar II follows Pillar I, and Pillar III is only used as last resort (Permanent Mission of Brazil to the UN, 2011).

Brazil also abstained in Resolution 1973 by arguing against the misuse of R2P, since most measures were not exhausted and the military means were disproportionate. Brazil was also concerned with the risk of spreading the conflict to the entire region, along with the constant pressure for regime change by P3 (Hamann, 2012: 79).

The Republic of South Africa

South Africa played a big role in shaping an earlier version of R2P, specific to the African Union (AU), which upheld the shift from indifference to non-indifference towards crimes of mass atrocities occurring in Africa (Landsberg, 2010). SA embraced the principle once proposed by ICISS in 2001, yet emphasized the need to focus on country-specific cases through diplomatic processes, rather than coercive methods. Much like Brazil and India, the first two pillars were embraced, and although the third was not opposed, SA still emphasized the need of political dialogues between the conflicting parts, rather than creating further disagreements (ibid).

Opposing to the other GIBSA “members”, SA voted for Resolution 1973 after Libya failed to approve any non-coercive measures. SA followed the guidelines of the AU, along with two other African non-permanent members of the UNSC, Gabon and Nigeria. The decision was based on increased support by LAS for military intervention and the threat to civilians, yet SA regretted its vote once NATO misused its mandate to impose a regime change, and criticized the implementation in the aftermath of the intervention (Aboagye, 2012).

Purpose

The principle of R2P has been discussed vividly in the last years, both academically and in the international community, predominantly due to the Arab civil uprisings, yet most of the arguments and researches review the stance of the P5. Consequently, the purpose of this paper is to add to the debate and forge new light onto the role of GIBSA in such discussions and the reasons behind their voting behavior on R2P proposals in Syria. This paper will help in filling the gap that exists in the academic field concerning the motives of emerging global powers and whether norms of institutional agreements influence them in our ever-increasing multipolar world.

The paper aims at answering the following question: What motivates emerging global powers', such as GIBSA, decisions once confronted with humanitarian crises? Do international principles, such as R2P, influence their voting behavior?

The case of Syria was chosen since approximately 130000 people were killed in the on-going Crisis, which actualizes R2P as proposed by many in the international community. Since the P5 are assumed to pursue mainly national aspirations in Syria (Skansholm, 2013 & Garcia, 2013) and R2P was criticized severely in the aftermath of Libya, understanding the motives behind emerging global powers' decisions in Syria will help in explaining whether R2P is still alive and taken into consideration, or if we can assume its death, as argued by multiple authors, such as Western & Goldstein (2013). GIBSA were chosen since they are emerging global powers, and current regional powers, and were part of the UNSC during 2011-2012 (Brazil in 2010-2011), and formed an unofficial group to share common norms and values, hence their suitability for this paper. Also, four countries that cover all parts of the world, north, south, east and west, constitute GIBSA, hence this paper will not be another North-South or East-West discussion, which has been postulated in most R2P related articles. Other emerging powers could also be relevant, such as Australia, but were excluded since they were not in the UNSC during the Crisis. Since emerging global powers have the ability to influence the international community, mainly due

to their regional influence and other's perception of them as important democratic actors and an alternative to the biasedness of the P5; R2P's "life or death" may depend on whether it is accounted for or not by GIBSA in such humanitarian crisis.

Literature Review

This section will summarize few articles that may help in explaining the motives behind the decision outcome of the GIBSA countries in relation to the Syrian Crisis. Since this is an on-going conflict, there are no extensive researches specifically about it, instead some explain R2P after Libya and Syria from the perspectives of the P5 (Skansholm, 2013 & Garcia, 2013), while others describe the GIBSA positioning on R2P prior to 2012 (Brosig, 2012). Therefore, this section will help in identifying the missing gap in the academic field, which will later be evaluated further empirically in the analysis section.

Skansholm (2012) and Garcia (2013) have influenced this paper in their methods of analyzing the motives of actors; yet differ since they aimed at explaining the intentions behind R2P implementation in Libya and the lack of it in Syria through the perspectives of the P5. They both conclude that P5's motives behind the Syrian and Libyan resolutions are based primarily on national aspirations and only secondarily on humanitarian reasons, which may also explain the motives of GIBSA in this paper. However, concerning the role of emerging powers on institutional agreements, Ramesh Thakur (2013) explains it by offering two possible outcomes: either they become joint and responsible stakeholders in the emerging new world order and take into account institutional frameworks and resolutions, such as R2P, through clear engagement in global issues, or they lose their ability to develop norms and institutions for global governance, if maintaining focus on national aspirations and protectionist policies. The latter will only lead these emerging global powers to limited powers, restricted to their regional aspirations, instead of global, and "*with their material grasp longer than their normative reach*" (ibid: 72). This may help in differentiating GIBSA from the P5, as they are in need of international recognition to boost their global aspirations, which in turn benefits their national aspirations to become UNSC permanent members. Higashi (2012) mentions that emerging global powers are more flexible and balanced in their decisions, because of their newly established identities as leading democracies in their respective regions. They are also keener to account for the discussions offered at the UNSC or even during informal meetings, to offer a voice of rationality, which profits their ambitions in the long run. Furthermore, Evans (2013) mentions that emerging powers play a crucial role in

affirming the balance and impartiality of R2P. Their views represent the general views of the world, and if a consensus is to ever be achieved, their consent is needed. Evans (2013) argues further that the Libyan case did damage the credibility of R2P since the P3 stressed regime change although it is not a part of the doctrine, which may have influenced GIBSA in Syria. Bellamy & Williams (2011: 847ff) also agree to Evans' (2013) former statement and adds that the lack of consensus in regional organizations, such as LAS, could have been one distinct motive for the different outcomes between Libyan and Syrian resolutions. Gifkins (2012) recognized that India, Brazil and South Africa resisted R2P in Syria due to the overarching of NATO mandate in Libya, while Germany was in clear support of its allies. Gifkins noted further the importance of regional support in order to evoke R2P, and that emerging powers are likelier to vote for R2P implementation in Syria if that support was given by regional organizations. Regional groups act as "gatekeepers", as they influence the issues that are debated in the UNSC and other assemblies, the framing of the resolutions and the outcome and legitimacy of the decisions (Bellamy & Williams, 2011: 826). However, Gifkins only takes into account the first resolution concerned with Syria, therefore, to understand the overall motives, this paper will use all resolutions from 2011-2012 to strengthen the analysis.

Furthermore, Bellamy & Williams (2011) discuss that states are keen to accept agreements against human rights violations but there is a difference between what the countries affirm to be right and what they actually do, hence the concept may be affected by "risk of relevance". Risk of relevance indicates the willingness to accept norms against mass atrocities yet being unwilling or unable to find individual remedies to each case, which could be extrapolated to GIBSA since they are keener to use soft power than hard power, and therefore may hesitate if hard power intervention is proposed. However, Jon Western and Joshua Goldstein (2013) argue that R2P in Syria has failed since most countries focus on the perpetrators rather than on the victims, which is not in line with R2P. Instead, they argue that it is characterized by selectivity, and since the emerging powers may feel unaffected by the Syrian Crisis and the outcome of it, they may prefer to act accordingly. Aning & Okyere (2012) support that notion and add that the focus should always be on mass atrocities and how to hinder them rather than on regime change. If the principle of R2P is not applied evenly and impartially, R2P may be in risk to be misused as a tool for regime change against enemies of natural allies, which makes the entire concept loose relevance. Hence utilizing this reasoning, if GIBSA affirm that others are focusing on regime change, as proposed in Libya, they are assumed more likely to either abstain

from voting, or even vote against a resolution. At the same time, if an ally is for an intervention, they may vote accordingly.

Consequently, we can extrapolate from previous researches concerned with R2P in Libya and/or Syria, which account for the motives of P5 and/or emerging global powers, that their decisions are influenced by either national aspirations, institutional frameworks, gatekeepers, historical application of R2P, allies' decisions and/or the situation in hand. Combining these variables in relation to GIBSA will therefore fill the gap that exists in the academic field concerned with R2P in Syria, and help in describing the motives of emerging global powers and the role of international principles such as R2P in the decision-making process. If the latter is accounted for prior to GIBSA's voting, then we can strengthen the notion that R2P is still alive and relevant, which is in contrast to previous assumptions by other scholars, such as Western & Goldstein (2013).

Theoretical Framework

The following section offers the tools that may help in understanding the motives behind the voting behavior of the GIBSA countries on Syria's proposed resolutions, and whether R2P has influenced the outcome. This paper will use the three logics of human actions: logic of consequence, logic of appropriateness and logic of arguing, to help in describing the motives. Some researchers (Skansholm, 2013 & Garcia, 2013) have instead focused on three of the leading theories in international relations (IR): realism, liberalism and social constructivism. Realists stress the importance of competition and argue that states are rational and autonomous units that control international politics, since the latter is assumed anarchical; hence each decision made is based on self-interests (Keophane, 1986: 163). Social constructivism is characterized by social ontology, where cooperation and discussions are driven by rules and actors seek to fulfill their roles in a community or institutions (Ramirez, 2009). Liberalism specifies that the state is a rational actor, influenced by internal bargaining among and within bureaucracies, institutions etc., and willing to cooperate to ensure mutual benefits with other actors (Maessen, 2012). Although these perspectives may be suitable in this paper to help understand the point of departure of GIBSA in voting processes, they tend to be too vague and less comprehensive in extensive analysis of a certain event, which in this case is the specific case of Syria's proposed R2P resolutions. The three logics of human action are wide-ranging since they focus specifically on explaining the motives of the situation in hand, which may also be the case for the IR theories yet the latter tend to include other notions than the

motives, i.e. the worldviews of the actors etc. Hence the latter assumes a point of departure for all actions, while the logics assume that each action has its own motives, specific to that case. Furthermore, the IR theories do not necessarily cover the logic of arguing, which is an integral part of this paper since we assume that arguments and facts presented during resolution proposals may influence the outcome of an actor. Although the notion of logics of human action are used to understand the actions of human beings, the same framework could be used to explain the actions of states, since the latter is represented by human actors.

This paper will take the point of departure of Risse's (2000) article, *Let's Argue: Communicative Action in World Politics*, which describes the logics of human action. However, Risse's paper focuses primarily on logic of arguing, and how it makes the logics of human action theoretically more exhaustive. The framework will also be influenced by Checkel's (2005) article in *International Organization*, which explains the mechanisms behind the socializations of norms included in the three logics: strategic calculation, role-playing and normative suasion. The article by James March and Johan Olsen (1998), which focuses on the definition of the logic of appropriateness and adds rule-guided behavior to the theory, will also be helpful. These mechanisms will help in linking the gap that exists between the theoretical components of this subject and the empirical analysis. Hence logic of consequence includes the mechanism of socialization of norms, as strategic calculation; logic of appropriateness is derived from role-playing and rule-guided behavior, while logic of arguing is expressed as normative suasion. Brommesson & Friberg-Fernros (2012) have also used the theories of Risse and Checkel to understand the three logics of human actions, in relation to states, but they aimed at developing a predictability mechanism that foresees decision-making outcomes in R2P proposals and whether the use of force may be more feasible if the principle's norms were exhaustive, which differs from this paper that aims at explaining the motives of GIBSA and potential influence of R2P on them.

Logic of Consequence

Logic of consequence is constructed primarily on rational assumptions about pre-set interests and preferences. Thus, a state will always strive to maximize its utility, regardless of the situation or the discussions presented during resolution proposals. An actor will behave in accordance with its pre-set conditions; hence its behavior is guided by the outcome (Risse, 2000: 3). An actor performing under the logic of consequence strives to ensure that the rewards exceed the costs. Krasner (1999: 220) claims that due to the absence of any international authority, which can force

countries to apply to a given law, norms and values of international laws or principles are only second to national interests, hence a country will always ensure the maximization of its own utility rather than satisfying the norms of a given law or an institution. However, in order to reach a common stance in a decision-making process, other actors need to make their own strategic calculations that support their own ambitions while matching the latter's, which is an important mechanism of socialization of norms (Checkel, 2005). Hence, one country may strive to convince the other part by arguing for a certain notion to fulfill the pillars of an international principle, yet in reality, it argues for its own ideals. Therefore, a country may appear as fulfilling the norms of a certain international law, yet in reality, their argument is usually characterized by rallying the listener behind ones own position. Hence, the country may gain both international recognition and support if it succeeds with its strategic arguing (Checkel, 2005). Krasner (1999) denotes this as Organized Hypocrisy, as countries only claim to support a given international law due to its framework, but in reality, if any support is given, it is because they may maximize their utility, either politically, if international recognition is given, or economically, if it relates to a trade agreement etc. Strategic calculations can be explained in different terms, as some countries may stress the importance of geopolitics, sovereignty or intervention, international ambitions etc. Furthermore, Risse (2000: 4) argues that "*cooperation under anarchy*" is possible and that rational and self-interested actors may maintain their independence and cooperate, while enduring collective action dilemmas. This specifies that self-interest may be correlated with socialization, as one country may strive for international recognition and only achieves it by ensuring that other countries benefit from their decision; hence Country A benefitted by the decision of Country B in solving Conflict X, which ensures the recognition of Country B by Country A, hence it is a win-win situation, although Country B acted for the sole purpose of receiving international recognition; thus maximizing its own utility.

Logic of Appropriateness

Logic of appropriateness signifies that an actor, or state in this case, makes a decision based on pre-set rules and norms, hence its behavior is rule-guided (March & Olsen, 1998). These rules are based on what is socially and institutionally accepted; therefore the actor strives to do the "right" thing in accordance with pre-determined conditions. March & Olsen (1998: 3) best describe this logic in the following way:

"A vision of actors following internalized prescriptions of what is socially defined as normal, true, right or good, without, or in spite of,

calculation of consequences and expected utility.”

This logic can be contrasted to the logic of consequence, which assumes that the actors are self-interested and rationally calculating their decisions. Instead, given circumstances are neglected and the actor focuses on the norms of an institution or union that are pre-set and uninterested in the facts offered at the given negotiation. Therefore, an “*automatic relation*” (ibid: 7) between rules and action is required in order to safeguard the actor within the institutional framework. This means that the “right” thing is not necessarily the optimal solution, but it is what has been considered as the “right” thing in accordance with the norms and values of institutions and/or alliances. Brommesson & Friberg-Fernros (2013: 146) captures the former statement in this sentence:

“The norms and institutions define the proper behavior but, as Risse points out, also “define social identities” in that “good people do X”. The norm constitutes an identity of a belonging to a group that is guided by certain rules. To be seen as a trustworthy member of this group, the actor tries to play according to the rules of the group.”

Checkel (2005) offers another mechanisms to rule-guided behavior, namely role-playing. Checkel argues that actors may not be aware of all facts; therefore they use “*shortcuts, cues and buffers*” (ibid: 810) that represent their role-playing. If an actor unquestionably fulfills his role, by voting in accordance with its allies and/or union, the norms and rules that are included in its respective role will shape the identity of the actor.

Logic of Arguing

There is an increased debate regarding the suitability of social constructivism and rational choice in the field of international relations (Risse, 2000), in which the logic of appropriateness and logic of consequence respectively are derived from; yet Risse (2000) argues that these two logics are not exhaustive since:

“processes of argumentation, deliberation, and persuasion constitute a distinct mode of social interaction differentiated from both strategic bargaining... and rule-guided behavior.”(ibid: 1)

This indicates that this logic helps in clarifying the interaction between the former two logics by ensuring that the actors change their preferences depending on the situation in hand or the discussions offered. Furthermore, Risse argue that:

“Arguing is also relevant for problem solving in the sense of seeking

an optimal solution for a commonly perceived problem and for agreeing on a common normative framework” (ibid: 2),

Signifying that arguing is crucial in negotiation to reach a common stance that maximizes the utility for both parties. Also, Risse claims:

“Argumentative rationality appears to be crucially linked to the constitutive rather than the regulative role of norms and identities by providing actors with a mode of interaction that enables them to mutually challenge and explore the validity claims of those norms and identities. When actors engage in a truth-seeking discourse, they must be prepared to change their own views of the world, their interest, and sometimes even their identities.” (ibid: 2)

This specifies that once a state has engaged in argumentations, it should be prepared to bend its ideals and pre-set conditions that exists in role-playing, and instead adapt to the discussions, unless the state's own argumentation is strong enough to withstand or even to challenge, the other part's opinions. Also, mentioning historical success or failures of a certain action in an argument may be crucial in convincing the other part whether the same action is to be considered again (ibid: 5ff).

Concluding, logic of arguing specifies that rationality is not interest-based rather is adaptable to arguments and “search for truth” (Brommesson & Friberg-Fernros, 2013: 148), and actors strive to persuade others with the force of better argument. “The truth” can best be reached if the norms of a principle are fulfilled; hence normative suasion is the central mechanism in this logic (Checkel, 2005, Friberg & Brommesson, 2013).

Method

A deductive qualitative approach will be used in this paper to specify whether R2P has influenced the decisions of GIBSA in the Syrian crisis. A deductive research is characterized by a top-down approach where the paper starts by drawing on existing theoretical concepts, in this case the three logics of human action (Charmaz, 2006). The paper proceeds on developing an analytical framework that helps in explaining the potential outcome; whether one or more of the logics characterize the motives behind the decision of each country. The data will be explained thoroughly and guide the way to an in-depth analysis, which is the foundation of qualitative empirical research (Wolcott, 1994: 28). Flyvberg (2011: 304) explains that a qualitative case study is best applied if the collection of data and interpretation of the findings are explained simultaneously; hence every argument and decision made by GIBSA's

representatives during resolution discussions will be analyzed immediately once acknowledged as important data. Flyvberg (2011: 307) also states that a qualitative case study will give an in-depth understanding of an event and the environment in which it occurs. Therefore, explaining the situation in Syria and the discussions that followed it from the GIBSA countries, which are the multiple units of analysis, in the respective resolutions that cover the crises, may offer an adequate depiction of the events that surrounded proposed resolutions on Syria. The case study is also characterized by a nomothetic approach (Levy, 2008: 3ff), illustrated by a spatially bound event, in the form of the draft resolutions that followed the Crisis during 2011-2012 at the UNSC.

Motive Analysis

To understand the reasons behind the voting behavior of GIBSA in resolutions concerned with the Syrian Crisis, motive analysis is conducted on the discussions and the actual votes. Motive analysis is postulated by Axel Hadenius in his article, *The Verification of Motives* (1983) and is utilized as a tool in explaining the motives of an actor. Hadenius argues that the motives can best be extracted by understanding the action primarily. Signifying that clear depiction of the arguments and votes presented by GIBSA's respective UN ambassadors are needed to extract the real motives. These arguments and votes, known as indicators, which are the empirical data, will be matched with the three logics of human action, offering a satisfactory depiction of what might have caused the outcome of the voting procedures (Hadenius, 1983: 2ff). Hadenius mentions that a statement from a country's foreign policy representative, in our case the respective UN Ambassadors for each country, defines the country's attitude in principle towards a certain declaration or event, and could therefore be used as a framework to explain the motives (1983: 4f). A motive can best be justified if a country repeats specific motivations in different documents relating to the same topic; hence if Country A, in different resolution discussions, mentions its support towards its allies, then it most likely reflects its motives (ibid: 6). However, since not all motives are outspoken, as discussed in the theoretical framework and will be discussed further in the following section, some inferences need to be drawn to strengthen the arguments regarding the real motives (ibid: 4). Furthermore, statements from representatives can differ in proximity to different actions, since some may specify a certain action (such as the situation in Syria), while others postulate more general views or opinions, but not explicitly relating to that event (such as recognizing the necessity for world peace, sovereignty etc.). Hence, the latter requires inferences that lead to the depiction of the real motives. Consequently, the analytical framework

should be properly explained in order to match the indicators with the motives, but also to show the correlation between the inferences and GIBSA's motivations (De Vaus, 2001).

Operationalization of the Three Logics

This paper will use an analytical framework to link the indicators to the motives, by categorizing them within the three logics of human action: logic of appropriateness, logic of consequence and logic of arguing. The method is similar to the mechanisms of the three logics by Brommesson & Friberg-Fernros (2012), but instead of predicting an outcome, it is used to understand the motives behind the outcome. The criteria for interpreting the findings are divided into two subsections for each logic; where one helps in explaining the motivations, while the other specifies the indications of the votes in relation to the resolutions, as shown in Table 1:

	Logic of Consequence	Logic of Appropriateness	Logic of Arguing
Voting Behavior			
Motivations			

Table 1: Analytical Framework without characteristics

It is important to understand that these logics do not have to compete, and instead may be used to complement each other; hence one nation may act in accordance to one logic in an event, while embracing another logic in others, or even combining them (Risse, 2000: 4). Therefore, Country A does not exclusively rely on Logic A; instead, Logic A may dominate the decision process of Country A, but still is influenced by Logic B and C etc.

At first, this paper will offer the actual votes of GIBSA for each resolution. Secondly, each "member" will be analyzed separately, as we assume that they act individually and therefore do not always have common interests and votes. The GIBSA nations' motives may change from one resolution to another, or a specific logic may dominate more or less in a resolution than the other, therefore a conclusion of each nation's general positioning will be offered before proceeding to another. In the end of the analysis section, a conclusion to depict all nation's possible motives will be offered and analyze whether there are some common grounds to their behaviors. The arguments of each nation in the respective resolution will be presented and matched in accordance with the following criteria:

- Logic of Consequence:

The logic of consequence includes strategic calculations and maximization of utility; hence all actions are aimed to benefit the state primarily (Krasner, 1999). Therefore, any personal aspirations mentioned in the arguments are important indicators to highlight the motives. Since countries do not specifically pinpoint national interests as motives for their votes, clarifications of the characteristics in this logic are crucial. One feature may be if a country is indifferent to other's arguments and facts in all resolutions, since we assume that the actor is guided by the outcome; i.e. if Country A stresses the importance of intervention in its arguments, with no regards to the facts or discussions presented, we may assume that the intervention is in its interests (Risse, 2000: 3). This can also be achieved by arguing for a specific notion through the pillars of R2P, known as strategic arguing and organized hypocrisy (Krasner, 1999). Hence if Country A argues for the fulfillment of R2P while maintaining the same motivations, i.e. by relating to sovereignty, we may acknowledge a sense of strategic arguing as Country A may aim to preserve its pre-existing stance on the principle of sovereignty. Also, since GIBSA lack vetoing rights, their decisions are not as decisive as the P5, hence they may argue for the best outcome, although realistically, they are after international recognition. This may be understood as populist arguing since they present what is optimally assumed as the "right thing" by the international community, without any power to enforce it.

Furthermore, since emerging powers are pursuing support by other states, the socialization with gatekeepers is crucial for future backing, since the latter has a great influence on the outcome. Gatekeepers, in our case, LAS, can help in legitimizing all actions; if the latter acknowledges the necessity to intervene in Syria, then R2P has a green light, and an intervention will be more conventional and less likely to hit back against GIBSA. Instead, the gatekeepers will be responsible for any potential failure of the intervention. Hence if Country A recognizes the call for gatekeepers to intervene and votes accordingly, although it maintains the same motivations as earlier, it may be understood as pursuing the recognition of that gatekeeper and minimizing their personal risks.

Another important indicator is the voting itself and since this logic assumes that all actions are guided by the outcome, the voting behavior should not change, regardless of the motivations presented (Risse, 2000: 3). Therefore, if Country A requires intervention, then its vote will remain unchanged irrespective of the factual fluctuations. Furthermore, if Country A abstains from voting following the vetoing of some of the permanent members in fear of "bumping heads" with the latter, although they argue against/for any intervention, then we may assume that Country A seeks to

maximize its utility.

- Logic of Appropriateness:

This logic of human action follows the characteristics of role-playing and therefore, a nation strives to fulfill its role in a given union or alliance, and will always support its allies and/or fellow members, regardless of the outcome, the discussions and the facts given (March & Olsen, 1998). Therefore, if Country A specifically mention any support to its allies and/or its regional organization in the proposed resolution, and/or argues from a “We-perspective”, such as the EU, NATO, AU or GIBSA etc., then its actions is compatible with role-playing. The same logic follows the voting-behavior; hence if Country A votes in accordance with its allies in all resolutions, then we can assume the same. If it exclusively argues and votes against its allies, then we can rule out that Country A is influenced by logic of appropriateness, and instead other logics may dominate its motive.

- Logic of Arguing:

This logic indicates the flexibility of countries to change behavior and motives if the arguments for an intervention or non-intervention are strong enough and the facts given are in, or not in, regulation to the pillars of R2P. Hence, if a country's vote changes from one resolution to the other, it denotes a change in motivations and hence the country may be flexible to the facts and arguments presented (Risse, 2000).

Another indicator to this logic is whether the country claims that the situation fulfills the conditions for intervention. Thus, did the country argue that the discussions and evidence presented are exhaustive vs. non-exhaustive? I.e. if Country A considers the Syrian government solely responsible for the events occurring and argues that most options have been considered and an intervention may improve the situation and/or mentions the UNSC's responsibilities, then R2P is actualized and hence the evidence may be considered exhaustive; if not, then R2P is rejected. Furthermore, historical application of R2P may also influence the outcome of the decisions; hence did the country remark the failure/success in the Libyan intervention? If one or more of the former criteria are fulfilled, then the country may be categorized by norm-suasion, which exemplifies the logic of arguing.

Concluding, as mentioned in the theoretical framework, one country will most likely not rely exclusively on one single factor; rather will take into account more than one, yet a single logic may dominate its motive. Hence, any “member” of the GIBSA may have voted in accordance with Logic A, although they probably have been influenced by other Logics, such as B to a certain extent and C to a lesser. I.e. Country A may

vote for Action A to fulfill the pillars of R2P, which is in accordance with the logic of arguing, yet the action may grant Country A recognition by other states, and hence its motivation includes both the notion of norm-suasion and pursuing national aspirations. Therefore, it is important to clarify every argument presented and match it with more than one category, in order to depict the real motives. The following analytical framework will be used in the analysis section to ease the categorization of the votes and motivations offered by the GIBSA countries:

	Logic of Consequence	Logic of Appropriateness	Logic of Arguing
Voting Behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Unchanged Voting Behavior •Abstain from voting following vetoes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Voting in accordance with allies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Changed Voting Behavior due to factual fluctuation
Motivations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Strategic Arguing/Organized Hypocrisy •Indifference to facts and arguments •Recognizing the call by Gatekeepers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Argues on the basis of identity affiliation •Mentions its support to its allies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Change in motivations •Accounts for R2P pillars •Mentions historical application of R2P

Table 2: Analytical Framework with the characteristics

Material

This section discusses the resolutions used in this paper to understand the motives behind GIBSA's voting behavior. The arguments during the selected resolutions are important indicators to extract the motives of the countries, since they offer arguments to their actions, in accordance with Hadenius et.al. motive analysis (1984: 149).

Furthermore, the votes of the GIBSA countries are also important indicators and may also help in explaining the motives, since different outcome may be related to the questions raised within each resolution, or changes in motives.

Since GIBSA are non-permanent members of the UNSC, their mandate ended in late 2012 (Brazil by the end of 2011), yet the discussions continues in the UNGA until today regarding both the conflict of Syria and the principle of R2P. However, this paper will only take into account the discussions and votes prior to 2013, indicating the entire mandate period of GISA. Statements and votes at the UNGA regarding Syria will supplement the Brazilian motives in 2012. Keeping in mind that RC vetoed all resolutions regarding Syria at the UNSC; this paper will analyze UNSC draft resolutions (and GA resolutions from 2012). The arguments and votes were collected from first hand sources, such as the UN database and UNSC archival records.

The member states at the UNSC have proposed several resolutions dealing with the Syrian Crisis to end the violence and reach diplomatic solutions. The first of its kind was draft resolution SC/10403, sponsored by Germany, Portugal and the P3 in October 4th 2011. The draft aimed at “*condemning grave and systematic human rights violations in Syria*” along with warning “*of options for action to be considered against the Government of President Bashar al-Assad if the unfolding situation warranted*” and recognizing the government’s responsibility to protect its citizens (UNSC, 2011). The draft demanded immediate stop to the violence by both conflicting parties. It also called for a Syrian-led political process, with the inclusion of the Syrian opposition and the entire civil society, with freedom to express their opinions without fear from violence or extremism. RC vetoed the resolution, while 9 members voted in favor and 4 abstained.

The second draft proposed on February 4th 2012, SC/10536, by 20 countries, mostly Arabic, and included Germany and P3, emphasized the request by LAS to cease the violence by the Syrian government and resignation of Bashar el-Assad, and also the release of persons detained due to peaceful protests against the regime. The draft also stressed the necessity of a Syrian-led political transition to a democratic and pluralistic political system. It also required cease-fire by the armed groups against civilians and state institutions, and condemning all human rights violators. LAS required full access in Syria to monitor the crisis in firsthand. The draft also ruled out any military action under Article 42 of the Charter. The resolution failed once again, with 13 countries in favor and two against (RC) (UNSC, 2012a).

Brazil was not a part of the UNSC in 2012, after concluding its two-years mandate in 2010-2011. Instead, their opinion could be extracted from the UNGA resolution on February 16th 2012, GA/66/253A, which postulated similar questions proposed in SC/10536. This resolution condemned the systematic human rights violations by the Syrian authorities and demanded to cease all violence and protect the citizens. It also reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic, and stressed the importance of diplomacy and peaceful solutions. This resolution was passed by a vote of 137 in favor, 12 against and 17 abstentions (UNGA, 2012a). A Six-Point Plan, negotiated by former UNSG, Kofi Annan, was accepted in March 2012 by the UNSC and Syria since it excluded regime change. This six-point plan included a Syrian-led political process, ending violence and pulling back military from civilian areas, ensuring access for humanitarian workers and journalists, respecting the right to peacefully demonstrate and releasing those who are arbitrarily

detained (BBC, 2012). This plan is summarized since it influences the subsequent resolutions, but will not be analyzed further.

The third failed UNSC resolution regarding Syria came in July 19 2012, SC/10714, sponsored by Germany, Portugal, and P3. Apart from the previous requests for an immediate cease fire and condemnation of the mass atrocities committed, this resolution also aimed at extending the UN Supervision Mission in Syria (UNSMIS) for another 45 days, which was first implemented on April 21 2012, initially for a 90-day period. The resolution also threatened the Syrian regime with sanctions if it failed to follow the Six-Point Plan proposed by Kofi Annan. Once again, RC vetoed the draft (UNSC, 2012b).

On August 3rd 2012, a UNGA resolution, GA/66/253B, was proposed by Saudi-Arabia, which condemned the use of heavy weapons on civilian areas and called for ceasefire, while denouncing the failure of the UNSC to implement any measures. This resolution was approved after 133 votes in favor, 12 against and 31 abstentions (UNGA, 2012b).

Delimitations

Since this paper deals with the approaches of the GIBSA countries, which is an informal grouping of emerging global powers and aspiring permanent UNSC members, there is a risk that their influence on the Syrian crisis and the principle of R2P itself is overshadowed by the actions (or inactions) of the P5 at the UNSC. The latter have vetoing rights and hence one veto is enough to suspend a resolution, indicating that GIBSA are more or less powerless in the UNSC. Therefore, since their votes are non-decisive, it may have influenced the outcome and/or their arguments. Moreover, there exist many forums for discussions regarding Syria and/or R2P, while this paper is limited to the discussions and votes during draft resolutions, which extrapolate important point of views and official stance of the GIBSA countries, yet are not necessarily exhaustive. Many important arguments, especially from GIBSA's respective foreign departments, or unofficial statements by their respective UN ambassadors, may have strengthened the indicators to their motives, but due to time- and space constraints, they were avoided. Since the GIBSA countries are non-permanent members of the UNSC, their mandate finished in 2012 (Brazil in 2011), denoting that the material provided is time-limited to 2011-2012, with supplementary materials from the UNGA in 2012. Many clarifications regarding GIBSA's motives have been introduced in the aftermath of their UNSC membership. However, since this conflict is ongoing, events are likely to change; therefore it was crucial to

maintain the timeline 2011-2012 to ensure that the circumstances and materials correlate. Furthermore, since Brazil was not included in the UNSC in 2012, this paper could not relate solely on UNSC failed resolutions, which was the purpose from the start. Instead, we had to include GA resolutions to cover for it, but since not all countries offer motivations to their decisions at the GA, there is missing information to cover their true motives. Therefore, more emphasize is required on their existing speeches.

Taking into account the complexity of the Syrian Crisis, and diverse coverage reaching both domestic and foreign audience, this paper will not investigate any specific incident of the crisis, rather focus completely on the reactions of the GIBSA countries in relation to the supposed incidents mentioned in a resolution, and their motives to vote accordingly. Furthermore, since this paper analyzes national aspirations, which is usually not forthright and in disguise, there is a risk of over-analyzing or even misinterpreting a certain notion. Therefore, it is crucial to maintain consistency in explaining different outcomes, by affirming the categories included in the analytical framework, and offer alternatives to describe each motivation.

Quality Assurance of Study

Qualitative research has its critics like other methods if the research is conducted in a biased and sloppy way. Hence to ensure the reliability, validity and unbiasedness of the empirical analysis, each answer will be discussed and alternative views will be considered throughout the paper (Héritier, 2008). Héritier argues further that deductive qualitative studies are often biased since the materials depict the perspective of the researcher's subjectivity, but since this paper will use the scope of logics of human action to explain the positions of the GIBSA countries in relation to the Syrian Crisis, it allows the reader to understand the situation and the phenomena through different lenses, which increases the validity and reliability of the outcome. Also, since the analyzed data are official statements and votes made during the decision-making process of R2P in Syria, their quality and validity are credible since it reflects the country's official stance, according to both Esaiasson' et. al. (2012) and Hadenius' (1983: 4f) motive analysis. To avoid generalizations regarding R2P's many aspects, especially the role of the permanent members, problems of sovereignty vs. interventionist etc., the material collected relate completely to the topic and variables discussed. Once the variables are explained properly, extensive searches for official statements, that support or reject a certain notion, will be prioritized, and used as basis for the entire analysis. Furthermore, since we assume that the GIBSA countries are representing the emerging global powers, in accordance with Brosig (2012), the

analyzed data can be extrapolated to the bigger picture on whether R2P influences emerging countries. In addition, a nomothetic study helps in developing explanations of a certain event that could be generalizable to the bigger picture, if the case is strategically well chosen (George & Bennett, 2005 & Flyvberg, 2011); and since R2P is actualized in Syria and is considered one of the more complicated R2P cases, while sharing similar characteristics to Libya, it may be generalizable to the bigger application of R2P. Hence if norm-suasion influences the motives of GIBSA in resolutions concerned with Syria, we may assume that international principles affect emerging global powers, and R2P is alive.

Analysis

In the moment of writing, the UNSC has yet to reach a consensus on the measures required to stop the violence in Syria, mainly due to RC vetoes, while GIBSA dandle back and forth in their motivations regarding an intervention in Syria. As postulated in the table below, the GIBSA share in some resolutions the same positioning, while differ in others; especially Germany in comparison to IBSA, where the former has maintained its support to all resolutions, while the others have shifted in some. This section will analyze their motivations and votes to help in understanding their motives and whether international principles, such as R2P, influence their decisions. Each nation is analyzed individually along with their point of views for each resolution. Thereafter, a conclusion of the general motives will be offered before proceeding to another country. Once all are discussed in relation to each resolution, a general analysis will combine all motives of GIBSA and search for common grounds, or different aspects, to conclude this section.

	1st Draft Resolution SC/10403 4/10/2011	2nd Draft Resolution SC/10536 4/2/2012	General Assembly Resolution GA/66/253A 16/2/2012	3rd Draft Resolution SC/10714 19/7/2012	General Assembly GA/66/253B 3/8/2012
Germany	For	For	For	For	For
India	Abstain	For	For	For	Abstain
Brazil	Abstain	Not a member	For	Not a member	For
South Africa	Abstain	For	For	Abstain	For

Table 2: GIBSA votes in resolutions concerned with Syria

The German Motives

Resolution SC/10403

Supported by its EU and NATO allies at the UNSC, Portugal and P3, Germany drafted Resolution SC/10403 on October 4th 2011, which condemned the violence and mass atrocities committed by the Syrian regime. Germany's ambassador, Mr. Peter Wittig, argues:

“The Syrian security force – military and militias – have violently and indiscriminately crushed demonstrations that were overwhelmingly peaceful”(UNSC, 2011: 10)

and,

“For months now the international community has called on the Syrian authorities to end all violence, fully respect human rights and comply with their obligations under international law”(ibid)

This may indicate that since the regime has overused force against its population and the international community has called for an immediate stop to the violence, and since the conflict is still ongoing, all measures are considered exhausted and therefore, the international community has a responsibility to react. Furthermore, Germany mentions:

“the European sponsors of this draft resolution have been working eagerly towards a compromise among Council members in recent weeks.”(ibid)

and,

“The people in Syria and the Arab world should know that Germany, its partners and all those who cherish the values of freedom ... will not relent in their efforts to stand by them” (ibid)

The last statements may affirm Germany's support and unity with its allies and their role as freedom protectors, hence its latter motivation is characterized by role-playing. This notion is strengthened by their co-operation to draft the resolution and their similar votes.

Resolution SC/10536

Germany also helped in submitting draft Resolution SC/10536 with the support of many Arab states and P3. Mr. Wittig argued once again that an intervention is legitimate and the international community should react following the violence committed by the Syrian regime and since most peaceful measures have been exhausted:

“11 months of brutal violence and repression by the Syrian Government; after more than 5500 deaths; after the killing of almost 400 children... today the Security Council again failed to assume its responsibilities”(UNSC, 2012a: 4)

and,

“The Syrian Government agreed to the cessation of violence, to the release of all political prisoners, to the withdrawal of its armed forces... According to the LAS, however, none of those commitments was fully met by the Syrian Government”(ibid)

The UNSC responsibilities may refer to R2P and hence Germany argues for an intervention accordingly, which highlights norm-suasion. This is strengthened since the draft excluded regime change, which is not part of R2P, arguing:

“the draft did not call for regime change, as some maintained”(UNSC, 2012a: 5)

Germany also affirms the role of gatekeepers in this crisis:

“The LAS urged the Council not to let the Syrian people down... That was the second major element of our draft resolution – to answer the call from Arab states and large parts of the international community to fully support the initiative of the LAS” (ibid)

Germany voted for Resolution GA/66/253A in the UNGA, without motivating its decision, yet we assume that the motives reflected the former UNSC resolution, as it shared similar points. Once again, it voted similarly to its allies (UNGA, 2012a).

Resolution SC/10714

Germany submitted draft Resolution SC/10714, once again supported by P3 and Portugal. Mr. Wittig argued again:

“Together with our partners, we worked to have the Security Council act to stop the violence and human rights abuses at a time when such action could have prevented worse from happening.” (UNSC, 2012b: 5)

This may clarify its role-playing in supporting its allies and human rights, but it could also strengthen the conception of norm-suasion since an intervention may have *“prevented worse from happening”*, which is an important attribute in R2P. Furthermore, Germany puts the sole responsibility of this crisis on the Assad regime:

“But with every day that the Al-Assad regime escalated its violent repression....it became more difficult for those Syrian voices that promoted peaceful change to convince those who had lost hope for a political solution.... Let me be clear: responsibility for that lies fully with President Al-Assad and his regime.... The Security Council has a responsibility to help the Syrian People find a peaceful solution”(ibid)

also,

“The draft resolution would not have set the stage for military intervention”(ibid)

Germany argues that the UNSC has a responsibility to protect the citizens, probably referring to R2P, since all options for peaceful measures are considered deployed and hence an intervention, diplomatic and/or economic, should be conceived, without the possibility of military involvement, which may relate to the logic of arguing.

Germany also chose to vote for resolution GA/66/253B with similar motivations as earlier (UNGA, 2012b).

Concluding Germany's Motives

Germany always highlighted the violence committed by the Syrian regime, and the importance of respecting human rights and stopping all atrocities against citizens, indicating a motive to uphold the pillars of R2P, considered as norm-suasion. It also affirmed that the UNSC has a responsibility to protect the citizens several times, probably referring to R2P. It maintained its stance with its allies and drafted most proposed resolutions collectively and voted for them respectively, fulfilling the characteristics of role-playing. In addition, constant pressure on the Syrian government, although others blame the opposition for much of the violence, and the constant support for intervention strengthens the notion of role-playing as it shares similar arguments as the P3. Although Germany was in clear support of its allies throughout the Syrian Crisis, it suggested repeatedly that the resolutions should not set the stage for military intervention, and hence will probably abstain such measures if proposed, as in Libya, which strengthens the notion of norm-suasion. However, since Germany abstained from voting in Resolution 1973 for military intervention in Libya, the support and drafting of the failed resolutions on Syria may be explained as a way for Germany to re-align itself with its NATO and EU allies. Hence ensuring its role as protector of human rights and regaining respect by its allies will strategically benefit the country's willingness to become an important player on the international scene, as long as the resolutions propose soft power interventions, which may explain

its unchanged motivations throughout the Crisis. Furthermore, it has supported the calls by local gatekeepers, such as LAS, to react to the situation and support a Syrian-led political process, which may grant Germany recognition by LAS in future resolutions.

Therefore, we might conclude that Germany is mainly influenced by role-playing, followed by norm-suasion and national aspirations respectively; although fulfilling R2P pillars, “ensuring human rights in Syria” and answering the calls of gatekeepers without the possibility of military intervention will most likely benefit its interests. If military intervention is proposed, Germany will most likely neglect its role-playing, as was done in Libya.

The Indian Motives

Resolution SC/10403

India abstained from voting in Resolution SC/10403, which condemned the Syrian regime for its actions against its citizens. The Indian UN ambassador, Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri, motivated this decision by offering his concerns about the events in Syria:

*“with the deaths of hundreds of civilians and security force personnel.
We deplore all violence, irrespective of who its perpetrators are”
(UNSC, 2011: 6)*

moreover,

“states also have the obligation to protect their citizens from armed groups and militants”(ibid)

Hence India emphasizes that the authorities are not sole perpetrators in this crises, rather is responding to the militant forces and therefore are protecting their own population, which may affirm its willingness to uphold the principle of sovereignty. Furthermore, the ambassador mentions:

*“through the India-Brazil-South Africa initiative, we have urged them
(Syrian authority, writer's note) to exercise restraint, abjure violence
and pay heed to the aspirations of their people”(ibid)*

which highlights the IBSA co-operation, and may explain their similar voting behavior in this resolution. Moreover, India assumes:

*“the international community should facilitate engagement of the
Syrian Government and the opposition in a Syrian-led inclusive
political process, and not complicate the situation by threats of
sanctions, regime change as in Libya, et cetera”(ibid)*

This may postulate R2P as non-eligible, since other measures are yet to be exhausted and regime change is considered as in Libya, hence historical application is considered; which might confirm norm-suasion in their decisions.

Resolution SC/10536

India voted for draft Resolution SC/10536 while condemning the violence committed by both sides of the conflict and stressing the IBSA initiative:

“ensuring the stability and security of society. India has conveyed that message to the Syrian leadership, both bilaterally and with our partners Brazil and South Africa”(UNSC, 2012a: 8)

which may explain their common voting behavior as in the first resolution.

Additionally:

“We note that the draft resolution enjoins the Government to protect its population, indicating that it should have the capacity to do so. The LAS is an important regional organization and should play its required and historic role in promoting political dialogue among the Syrian parties. In that context, we welcome the deployment of the League’s observer missions”(ibid)

and,

“Our support for today’s draft resolution is in accordance with our support for the efforts of the Arab League for a peaceful resolution of the crisis... We note that the draft resolution expressly rules out any measures under Article 42 of the Charter.”(ibid)

Thus, India may have voted for this resolution mainly since it ruled out external intervention, especially military under Article 42 of the Charter, to ensure Syrian sovereignty. Furthermore, India acknowledges the role of gatekeepers in solving the crisis yet with limited tools, hence LAS should only act as a diplomatic bridge between the opposing sides in the conflict. Ensuring that LAS has a role to play in this conflict, while maintaining a peaceful approach, may ensure India support by these gatekeepers and others due to its neutrality.

India voted also for Resolution GA/66/253A in the General Assembly, offering similar motivations as in draft Resolution SC/10536 (UNGA, 2012a: 13).

Resolution SC/10714

India voted for Resolution SC/10714 and expressed its concerns for the violence occurring, especially the terrorist attack on high governmental officials in Damascus.

Mr. Puri argued:

“We voted in favour of the draft resolution today to facilitate united action by the Security Council in support of the efforts of the Joint Special Envoy” (UNSC, 2012b: 7)

India recognized the necessity to solve this situation peacefully to allow the Syrian authorities and opposition to recommit to the six-point plan. India focuses further on the impartiality of UNSMIS to offer information about the real occurrences:

“we have therefore supported action by the international community that addresses the Syrian crisis in a balanced and impartial manner” (ibid)

hence the unbiased evidence presented by the UNSMIS may transform its decisions; therefore norm-suasion is supposedly significant in its decision-making. Furthermore,

“We have called for the cessation of violence in all its forms and by all sides. We condemn all violence irrespective of who its perpetrators are” (ibid)

India chooses its words carefully without demonization, which may be understood as strategic calculation to safeguard its impartiality and not risk “bumping-heads” with any part in this conflict.

Resolution GA/66/253B

India abstained from voting in Resolution GA/66/253B although it recognized the increased violence and calling on all parties to condemn it, arguing:

“It was important that all parties fully abide by their obligations under Security Council resolutions. Unilateral actions of any kind would not help” (UNGA, 2012b: 9)

India believes that all sides need to be held responsible and the demonization of one part will send the wrong signals, hence the abstention, and another example of impartiality and rationality, which may be understood as norm-suasion, since it fulfills R2P, but also strategic calculation, since filling the gap that exists between the P5 may offer it support by unattached states.

Concluding India's Motives

In Resolution SC/10403, India argued that the focus on regime change as in Libya and sanctions without exhausting all measures, forced it to abstain to show its disapproval, since R2P was considered non-eligible. Furthermore, India's initiative, along with IBSA, to solve the crisis diplomatically, and the willingness to exhaust all tools before approving any intervention, highlights the role of norm-suasion in decisions. Since India mentioned the IBSA initiative twice, we can sense some role-playing, yet far from distinctive overall. Yet India still did not vote against the first resolution, probably indicating a fear of challenging the P3. In addition, India emphasized Syrian sovereignty several times and its responsibility to solve internal conflicts, which clarifies its own perspective regarding sovereignty and the importance of maintaining it. India changed its vote in the following resolutions, since they ruled out military intervention and regime change, and instead focused on the role of gatekeepers. It considered LAS as an impartial part that would offer a diplomatic bridge between the conflicting sides and solve the crisis peacefully, probably to ensure their support in the future, which will benefit its aspirations of becoming UNSC permanent member eventually. In Resolution GA/66/253B, India abstained from voting as a protest against the demonization of the Syrian regime, and stressed the importance of maintaining impartiality in solving the crisis. This could be seen as part of norm-suasion, since R2P pillars are not fulfilled and its voting behavior is constantly changing, but also as a strategic calculation to primarily, gain international recognition by LAS and the public by populist arguments and voting, and secondarily, to avoid clashes with either sides of the P5. Although its voting behavior differed, India still argued mainly from a sovereign perspective. Hence India's motives can be categorized in all logics, but mainly in logic of consequence, followed by norm suasion and lastly by role-playing.

The Brazilian Motives

Resolution SC/10403

The Brazilian UN ambassador, Ms. Maria Luiza Ribeiro Viotti, abstained from voting in draft Resolution SC/10403. Brazil reaffirmed its role-playing and common voice in the IBSA initiative by adding:

“Brazil has voiced this concern publicly and in our conversations with the Syrian authorities, ...alongside our India-Brazil-South Africa partners. We have called for violence to cease and humanitarian access to be granted”(UNSC, 2011: 11)

This may also indicate that most tools are yet to be used and therefore R2P is non-mandated, hence the abstention. Brazil mentioned the initiative announced by Syria to reform the political system and ensure ceasefire while adding:

“We appreciate the efforts made by the sponsors of this draft resolution to take different views into account, but we would have wished that further efforts had been made to muster broader support before it was put to the vote” (ibid)

and,

“We are convinced that more time would have allowed for differences to be bridged and for legitimate concerns to be accommodated, to prevent another accelerated intervention” (UNSC, 2011: 12)

This may postulate that the logic of arguing plays a bigger role in Brazil's voting procedure, since it takes into account arguments in bridging the differences between nations' diverse positioning, but also, since *“another accelerated intervention”* most likely conveys to the failed Libyan intervention.

Resolution GA/66/253A

Since Brazil was no longer a member of the UNSC in 2012, their positioning regarding R2P in Syria can be extrapolated from Resolution GA/66/253A, which covered merely the same points as postulated in resolution SC/10536. Brazil voted for this resolution (UNGA, 2012a) yet did not offer any motivations to their decision; instead, in resolution GA/66/253B, Brazil argues:

“The position we took today is coherent with Brazil's policy with regard to the Syrian crisis since its beginning” (UNGA, 2012b: 15)

By looking at the subsequent part, their decision were assumed based on LAS' willingness to intervene through peaceful measures, whilst affirming the Syrian authorities' responsibility to solve its own problems and by condemning the violence committed by both sides. Hence its coherent position may indicate a reluctance to change motivation, and instead focus on assuring Syria's sovereignty, human rights, while condemning both parties in the conflict.

Resolution GA/66/253B

Brazil's UN-ambassador voted in favor of this resolution arguing:

“we fully support the main message it conveys – the urgent need for a ceasefire, the cessation of violence in all its forms, and the full implementation of Security Council resolutions” (implementing six-

point plan and UNSMIS supervision, author's note) (UNGA, 2012b: 15)

and,

“message all parties to renounce the use of force, since there is no military solution to the conflict.”(ibid)

This could affirm Brazil's characteristic as a soft, impartial and rational power, which may be acknowledged by the international community, and specifically by the public. This response may benefit Brazil in the long run as an alternative voice to the P5, which suits its national aspirations. Yet Brazil recognized that the main responsibility to uphold the rule of law is by the state:

“The primary responsibility for ending violence, upholding the law – both domestic and international – and respecting human rights lies with the government of Syria... At the same time, we also insist that all parties fulfill their obligations to halt the violence....In that regard, international stakeholders must refrain from any action that might deepen or prolong the conflict... No legitimate purpose will be truly served by the further militarization of the conflict and increased destabilization of Syria”(ibid)

Hence, the international community can only ease the process by offering support for diplomatic efforts and to refrain from increased hostility or militarization of either sides of the conflict. Brazil stood therefore firm to the principle of sovereignty and peaceful measures and since Syria has the sole responsibility of upholding national and international law, no other party should intervene. Thus arguing for its own interests in upholding national sovereignty.

Concluding Brazil's Motives

In motivating its abstention in the first resolution, Brazil mentioned the willingness by the Syrian authorities to impose political reforms, and the IBSA-initiative for a diplomatic solution, hence all measures were not exhausted and therefore R2P was considered illegitimate. Furthermore, Brazil also mentioned that more time is needed to bridge the differences between UNSC members and avoid another military intervention as in Libya, pinpointing the necessity of argumentation and historical application in decision-making, which are also characteristics of norm-suasion. Brazil always emphasized the importance of supporting popular uprisings, and the condemnation of violence against them yet it also condemned the opposition for the violence and gave the government the sole responsibility to protect its citizens,

affirming its behavior as a soft power and sovereignty upholder. Brazil stood therefore firm to its principle of sovereignty, which influence its stance in the long run. Regarding proposed intervention, Brazil argued that the international community could only offer diplomatic means, through LAS, hence ensuring a peaceful solution to the crisis. Therefore, the recognition of gatekeepers as important players would benefit Brazil's national aspirations in the long run if a UNSC permanent membership was proposed. Hence Brazil changed its voting behavior from the first resolution yet still maintained the same motivations, by acknowledging the necessity to ensure Syria's sovereignty primarily, which are characteristics of the logic consequence. Also, Brazil mentioned the IBSA initiative yet its role-playing is not distinctive. Therefore, Brazil can be characterized mainly by the logics of consequence, followed by logic of arguing and barely by logic of appropriateness.

The South African Motives

Resolution SC/10403

The South African UN ambassador, Mr. Baso Sangqu, confirmed their concern regarding the political and humanitarian situation in Syria and called for immediate end of all violence by all parts of the conflict, yet chose to abstain from voting in draft Resolution SC/10403. Mr. Sangqu argued:

“This solution must also preserve the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria. Syria is integral to a wider resolution of the Middle East conflict...Any action on the part of the international community on Syria, therefore, including action by the Security Council, should be cognizant of the regional implications. We have seen recently that Security Council resolutions have been abused, and that their implementation has gone far beyond the mandate of what was intended”(UNSC, 2011: 11)

and,

“We are concerned that this draft resolution not be part of a hidden agenda aimed at once again instituting regime change, which has been an objective clearly stated by some.”(ibid)

This may be understood that historical application of R2P, e.g. in Libya, has raised suspicion towards the motives of the P3 and their allies, and regime change has once again been an integral part of the proposed resolution, which is not in line with R2P pillars, hence SA may have acted on behalf of norm-suasion. Furthermore, SA describes the threat to regional stability if Syria is demonized, since any intervention

may increase the loss of human lives instead of limiting it. SA also focuses on assuring Syria's sovereignty, which may be in its own interest. The motivations presented should probably be enough to reject this resolution, yet the abstention could be strategically chosen to safeguard its impartiality and unwillingness to challenge the P3.

Resolution SC/10536

SA voted for draft Resolution SC/10536 since the Syrian government failed in enforcing the reforms that it claimed willing to do. SA also declared:

“We are also satisfied that the final draft resolution was not aimed at imposing regime change on Syria, which would be against the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter” (UNSC, 2012a: 11)

This may explain the importance in fulfilling the pillars of international principles since it acknowledges the exclusion of regime change, which is not included in any, and specifically not in R2P, which is an important characteristic of logic of arguing. SA still condemns both sides of the conflict, the government and the opposition, to refrain from using force and end the violence. Furthermore:

“South Africa believes that the efforts of the League of Arab States, as the organization with knowledge of a proximity to the situation in Syria, should be supported and given the necessary political space to find a solution to the Syrian crisis. SA supports the efforts of the LAS to facilitate the Syrian-led political process, as stated in the draft resolution.” (ibid)

This affirms the role of gatekeepers in solving the Crisis through peaceful means, which may benefit SA's aspirations in the long run. However, respecting Syria's sovereignty is once again proposed as integral:

“Any solution must preserve the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria.” (ibid)

SA also voted for Resolution GA/66/253A in the UNGA, without presenting its motivations (UNGA, 2012a).

Resolution SC/10714

SA condemned the violence once again by all sides and called for an immediate ceasefire and implementation of the six-point plan presented by Kofi Annan and move towards a Syrian-led political transition:

“The suicide bombing in Damascus yesterday, which killed the Syrian Defense Minister and others, coupled with frequent horrific massacres in various parts of the country, clearly indicates that there’s more than one party to the conflict...” (UNSC, 2012b: 11)

Therefore, SA abstained from voting to mark its disappointment towards the division in the UNSC, claiming:

“South Africa is disappointed that, because of the divisions among the members of the Council, the Council has been prevented from executing its responsibilities. Differences within the Council should be addressed in a spirit of compromise and mutual respect, and with the Council’s broader responsibility in mind... We should have shown the utmost maturity in strategically executing these crucial tasks, taking into account the realities of the situation on the ground. Instead, we allowed narrow interests to destroy our unity of purpose...South Africa is therefore deeply disappointed that the future of UNSMIS is under threat because of the divisions in the Council. It is for these reasons that South Africa abstained in the voting”(ibid)

Hence, SA took the opportunity to raise a concerned voice and populist speech, while affirming itself to be free from pursuing national interests, although this speech most likely will benefit the outlook by the public and international community. Yet it mentioned the importance of bridging the differences through compromises and *“the broader responsibility in mind”*; probably referring to R2P; while taking into consideration the facts on the ground, which are all characteristics of the logic of arguing.

Resolution GA/66/253B

Although SA abstained in voting in the former UNSC resolution, they voted for Resolution GA/66/253B, arguing:

“Despite our misgivings about some aspects of the text...we believe that it is necessary for the United Nations to speak with one voice in taking action.”(UNGA, 2012b: 8)

SA argued that the resolution was imbalanced and should not favor any side, but since it is non-binding, and the urgent need to resolve the crises, SA supported it. Hence safeguarding once again its impartial position, while taking into account the situation on the ground, which may be characterized by both norm-suasion and national

interests. SA affirmed again that Syria has the main responsibility to solve the situation.

Concluding South Africa's Motives

SA abstained from voting in the first resolution due to historical application of R2P, arguing for a misuse of the principle and fearing that history will repeat itself in Syria, since other countries were focusing on regime change and military intervention, which is a characteristic of norm-suasion. Yet SA did not vote against the resolution since they felt the need to condemn mass atrocities committed by both parties in the conflict and probably to avoid challenging P3's decisions. In the second UNSC resolution, SA mentioned the lack of unity among regional organizations, yet voted for a diplomatic intervention, since LAS proposed a discussion and monitoring forum for both conflicting parties, probably to ensure their support. Also, since the Syrian government refused to impose the reforms that they agreed upon earlier, SA felt that most options of non-intervention were exhausted, and hence a reaction by the international community was needed, affirming once again norm suasion. In the third UNSC resolution, although they still condemned the violence committed, SA took a stance and abstained from voting, arguing its disappointment at the international community to base their votes on their national interests and picking parties in the conflict, instead of solving it. SA offered a populist speech against the unbalanced resolution and the importance of maintaining a strict guideline against all parties who use violence for political gains. The international community and the public applauded this stance, as SA maintained its impartiality and gave a sound of reason to the UNSC, which had been in deadlock since the crises began in early 2011; probably benefitting its national aspirations. In Resolution GA/66/253B, they voted for the resolution although they still recognized it to be imbalanced, yet felt the urge to condemn the violence and the UNSC lockdown. This shifting in position indicates that SA is willing to take into account different arguments and facts, hence its motives are mainly categorized with logic of arguing. Yet its abstention, although its motivations should lead to a rejection of the proposals, may indicate that SA avoids clashes with the P3 and its allies, hence it is also influenced by the logic of consequence. This is strengthened by the constant motivations to ensure Syria their sovereignty, which lies in SA's main interests. No signs of role-playing occurred, or mentioning of the IBSA-initiative, except from the similar votes in the first and second resolution.

Analyzing the GIBSA Motives

Given the arguments discussed earlier in this section, GIBSA's motivations and motives may correlate in some resolutions, while differ completely in others, especially between Germany and IBSA. These divergent perspectives offer a healthy discussion to R2P in Syria, instead of the self-centered perceptions of the permanent members in the UNSC, as RC veto everything related to Syria, while P3 push for all measures against the government. The positioning of GIBSA cannot be characterized under a united banner; rather each nation in this unofficial union argues for its own perspectives. However, the IBSA are more likely to react identically compared to Germany, since the former share many similar characteristics in relation to their history, and their connection with the RC in the BRICS-grouping, while the latter tend to lean towards its NATO and EU allies more often.

In the first proposal, Resolution SC/10403, co-authored by Germany, the IBSA, and especially South Africa, were in opposition due to historical application of R2P in Libya, blaming the west for an illegitimate military intervention and regime change, for overarching their mandate and therefore, undermining the principle of R2P. They feared that history would repeat itself, as P3 blamed the government for all violence, with no condemnation of oppositional atrocities, although there exist evidence of terrorist activities. IBSA also feared that intervention would lead to further escalation of the conflict and that not all diplomatic measures were exhausted; hence their motives were characterized by norm suasion. Yet the abstentions, rather than voting against the resolution, can be understood as a way to avoid confrontation with the West, indicating a strategic calculation to their decisions, since voting against P3 may risk their international recognition severely. On the other hand, Germany supported its allies and mentioned their eagerness to protect the freedom of the citizens and therefore maintained its role-playing as EU and NATO member, but also as freedom protector. While Germany opposed the Libyan intervention, mainly due to the military involvement, they did not relate to the historical application of R2P, since this resolution focused solely on condemnation and threatening with diplomatic and economic sanctions. Germany also focused on the atrocities committed by the Syrian authorities and hence argued that the latter promised reforms yet failed to impose them, hence norm-suasion did also play a role in its decision making.

Taking into account that IBSA were criticized severely in their positioning in unity with RC, known as the BRICS, following the first draft resolution, the voting behavior afterwards may have changed to avoid a "bad reputation" and additional loss to their international recognition. The IBSA kept pushing for condemning both sides of the party, to avoid clashes with the divided UNSC, and preserving Syrian

sovereignty, which can be understood through the logic of consequence, to safeguard their reputation as unattached to either sides. This may benefit how they are perceived by the public and unattached states, but also, it may preserve the principle of national sovereignty, which is in their interests.

The second UNSC resolution, SC/10536 (not including Brazil), and the GA resolution, GA/66/253A, showed a united front by the GIBSA countries as both resolutions focused less on the perpetrator and instead condemned the violence by both sides of the conflict, which was increasingly worsened, and the monitoring of LAS for a Syrian-led political process, and most importantly, ruled out any military intervention. This affirms GIBSA as considering gatekeepers crucial in the representation of public demand, and also, the fear of a military intervention. IBSA kept pushing for state sovereignty, while Germany kept its alliance and sole blaming of the Syrian regime, following the same patterns as its NATO and EU allies.

The third UNSC resolution, SC/10714, threatened sanctions against the Syrian authorities, and put the sole responsibility on the Syrian government. This was voted for by India and Germany, yet abstained by SA (Brazil was not included). Germany maintained its hard condemnation of the Syrian regime and support to human rights, while India voted for the resolution as it contained the monitoring of the UNSMIS, which was considered impartial, and recognized the necessity to respect Syria's sovereignty. South Africa took a stance arguing for the unbalanced resolution where the Syrian regime was demonized if the sanctions were imposed. SA gave a much-needed rational voice to the UNSC, where it had been on deadlock since the start of the Crisis.

Resolution GA/66/253B condemned the atrocities committed and the use of heavy weapons, while condemning the lack of action by the UNSC, where Germany, Brazil and SA voted for while India abstained. Germany followed the same lead as earlier, to condemn the Syrian authority and also RC for vetoing all proposed resolutions, as was done by its NATO and EU allies. Brazil argued for their consistency in supporting public uprisings and in the condemnation of both sides, yet emphasized the necessity of a peaceful approach through impartial gatekeepers, while respecting the territorial sovereignty of Syria, which confirms Brazil's strategic arguing for national sovereignty. SA argued for the necessity of one common voice by the international community, although the resolution favored one part over the other, to also safeguard its neutrality. India argued that the resolution was unbalanced and endorsed regime change, which is not in line with R2P and only demonizes one side of the conflict, hence it abstained from voting, strengthening its position as an impartial actor,

without risking to collide with the P3. Hence affirming the role of emerging global powers as an alternative to the “black and white” atmosphere dominating the UNSC. As postulated in the resolutions discussed, the decisions of the GIBSA countries may take into account all three mentioned logics of human action, as many factors may influence the decision outcome. For example, Germany’s motives are clearly dominated by its role-playing and rule-guided behavior, as it supports, votes and co-authors all drafts with its allies and mentions their eagerness to combat mass atrocities and impose human rights collectively. Yet Germany also argues for the fulfillment of R2P pillars, as they focus thoroughly on the violence committed by the Syrian government and the latter’s unwillingness to reform or stop such atrocities, which is in accordance with norm suasion. Also, since they take into account legal intervention and supports human rights and its allies, this will benefit Germany’s national ambitions to play a bigger role on the international scene. Therefore, a decision is mainly based on all three logics of human actions, yet no country will make a decision unless it benefits them more than does harm, through economical, diplomatic, or strategic means. This is clearer in the IBSA case, as they usually tend to offer more populist and strategic arguments to safeguard their interests, while are eager to listen to the arguments and facts given during or prior to resolution discussions, to analyze whether the situation fulfills the pillars of R2P, probably not only for the sake of norm-suasion, but possibly also to gain the recognition needed by the international community and avoid possible clashes with both parties in the conflict and at the UNSC. The importance and constant arguments for Syria’s sovereignty may affirm IBSA’s resistance of the third R2P pillar, which gives the international community the right to intervene in a sovereign state, especially in the aftermath of the Libyan intervention. Furthermore, GIBSA’s flexible stance, although Germany maintained its position in the resolutions concerned with Syria, may also be explained by their lack of interest in the regime itself, and therefore have less at stake if it fell or not, and therefore may chose the motivations and votes that benefits them mostly. Hence the principle may suffer from selectivity, as postulated by Western and Goldstein (2013). In addition to their lack of interest in Syria, their votes are not as decisive as the ones with vetoing rights, which will increase the possibility of arguing and voting in accordance with the swinging pendulum of the international community, to ensure the maximization of recognition and support.

Concluding, GIBSA’s decisions are assumed to focus primarily on how they are perceived by the international community, which correlates with their ambitions to become permanent members in the UNSC and important actors on global scale.

Therefore, they are anticipated to take into consideration international principles in their decision-making processes, such as R2P, or else, unattached states or the public may not grant them that. Also, IBSA's resistance towards the third pillar is much alive, especially in the aftermath of Libya, hence most of their arguments relate to sovereignty, known as strategic arguing or Organized Hypocrisy. Hence national ambitions may be the main motives for a decision, followed by norm suasion and role-playing. This characterizes mainly the overall approach by emerging global powers, but since Germany leans more towards its regional allies, its role-playing is highlighted more. However, logic of appropriateness may be less emphasized by Germany if military intervention is proposed, as was done in Libya.

Conclusion & Reflections

This paper has analyzed the motives of GIBSA countries in UN resolutions concerned with the Syrian crisis during the years 2011 and 2012, and whether R2P has influenced their decisions. Taking into account the three logics of human action; with logic of consequences characterized by pursuing national aspirations, logic of appropriateness depicted by role-playing, and lastly by logic of arguing, which denotes norm-suasion; GIBSA's motives can best be explained if all three logics are imposed, although some motives may dominate more than others. In all resolutions, GIBSA consider mainly the arguments and facts presented prior to a voting procedure, and thus argue for the "right" thing, hence their motivations appear to be characterized mainly by norm suasion. Yet, however we ideally place the emerging global powers as supporters of human rights and international principles; the "right" thing may only be argued for to ensure the maximization of utility received. This may be clarified by IBSA's skepticism towards the third pillar of R2P in most motivations, and their willingness to uphold the principle of sovereignty, hence affirming Checkel's (2005) and Krasner's (1999) theories of strategic arguing and Organized Hypocrisy respectively. Furthermore, role-playing seems to have a minor influence on IBSA, since they are not as attached to an alliance as Germany is with the EU and NATO. Germany is affected more by the decisions of its alliances and hence has formed an identity thereafter, yet it may still go against its allies if military intervention is proposed, as was done in Libya.

Therefore, the reality is that R2P intervention in other sovereign states will persist as a matter of choice of. Hence, R2P is characterized mainly by selectivity, as discussed by Goldstein & Western (2013). Before deciding whether to intervene or not, clear strategic, economic and political calculations are needed to calculate whether it is

worth it or not; and whether there is a likelihood of solving the crises if R2P is implemented. The selective behavior is considered the death of R2P, yet looking at the discussions that occur in the international community and taking into consideration that R2P is still a young principle, R2P is already rooted in the expectations of the behavior of democratic states when facing extreme humanitarian crises in other sovereign states. Therefore, R2P is alive.

As a potential remedy, the international community, with the help of emerging global powers, need to focus on the first pillar of R2P primarily; to prevent atrocities from occurring; and in the case of the inevitable, clear structures and mechanisms of intervention need to be set regardless of strategic calculations. Furthermore, as mandated in the “Responsibility to Rebuild” in R2P, post-conflict reconstruction and mediation is crucial to make sure that atrocities do not re-occur. With regards to GIBSA’s traditional regional focus and foreign policy, it is clearly shifting to accommodate their willingness to become global actors, but mainly through a softer approach than the P5. Therefore, emerging global powers should push for the restraining of vetoing rights at the UNSC, as it is an old fashioned system that does not deserve the multipolarism that characterizes today’s international system. A softer approach to mass atrocities may ensure the de-escalation of a conflict, by guaranteeing a political dialogue between all parts, instead of the opposite that usually occurs once a regime is demonized.

This paper has thus modified the general claim that R2P is dead and hence argued for its relevance in the decision-making process of emerging global powers such as GIBSA, opposing to Western & Goldstein’s assumption (2013). However, its relevance is not exclusively aimed at ensuring human rights and protecting citizens, instead, it may be used as a pretext to ensure the support and recognition by other states and to safeguard a nation’s own interests, by voting in accordance with gatekeepers and offering a rational and impartial approach to a situation. Therefore, human rights and protecting citizens from mass atrocities goes hand in hand with their eagerness to ensure national aspirations, which is understandable since no actor wish to take any unnecessary risks. Consequently, since we presume that R2P is relevant in the decision-making process, we may assume that international principles in general are respected by emerging global powers, as long as it suits their ambitions. This is the case since no international authority can enforce these principles, hence most international norms and values will remain a matter of selectivity. This paper can hopefully motivate further research of the principle of R2P, and the discovery of clear guidelines for its implementation, to ensure that selectivity is minimized in future R2P

proposals. Also, since emerging global powers prefer soft power approaches to conflicts, our hope is to shed light on the international system's hegemony and instead offer a healthy alternative to the deadlock that usually occurs between the UNSC permanent members.

In addition to the empirical results relating to the influence of R2P on GIBSA; this study has yielded a methodological contribution that could explain the simpler motives of countries. Unfortunately, due to time and space constraints, I could not measure the exact correlation between international principles and the motives of GIBSA. Nor could I precise the most valued national interest and clarify the exact difference between arguing for R2P and arguing for international recognition. Since barely any of national interests are outspoken and much of the assumed aspirations are built on speculations and overanalyzing of the motives, there is always a risk of misinterpretation. However, this paper will hopefully raise the awareness concerned with the correlation between national interests and international norms and principles, and how they influence emerging powers and others. Although national interests may dominate the motives of GIBSA, this should not indicate that we should ignore the norms and principles that the actors base their arguments on; instead, we could develop this methodological approach to increase our understanding of that relation. I hope that future researcher can build on this study of the relationship between the three logics of human action through enhanced empirical data collection and further developing of the theoretical framework to ensure further mapping of the motives and offer a broader understanding of the relationship between an actor's motivations, motives and actions.

References

- Aboagye, Festus (2012). *South Africa and R2P: More State Sovereignty and Regime Security than Human Security? From Evasive to Reluctant Action? The Role of Global Middle Powers*
- Aning, Kwesi & Okyere, Frank (2013). *The Challenge and Usefulness of R2P in the Syrian Context*. Open Global Rights, 12 September 2013
- Badescu, Cristina (2010). *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: Security and Human Rights*. Taylor and Francis e-Library, New York, p.110
- Banerjee, Dipankar (2012). *India and R2P: Reconciling the Tension Between Intervention and State Sovereignty. From Evasive to Reluctant Action? The Role of Global Middle Powers*
- BBC (2012). *Syrian Government Accepts Annan Peace Plan*. BBC News Middle East. 27 March 2012
- Bellamy, Alex (2009). *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Effort to End Mass Atrocities*. Polity Press
- Bellamy, Alex (2010). *The Responsibility to Protect – Five Years On*. Ethics & International Affairs, Vol. 2, pp.143-169
- Bellamy, Alex & Williams, Paul (2011). *The New Politics of Protection? Cote d'Ivoire, Libya and the Responsibility to Protect*. International Affairs 87:4, pp.825-850
- Brommesson, Douglas & Friberg-Fernros, Henrik (2013). *The Feasibility of an Expanded Regime on the Use of Force: the Case of the Responsibility to Protect*. Journal of International Relations and Development, Vol. 16, pp.138-166
- Brosig, Malte (2012). *Responsibility to Protect: The GIBSA Perspective*. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
- Brozus, Lars (2012). *Germany and R2P: Common but Differentiated Responsibility. The R2P – From Evasive to Reluctant Action? The Role of Global Middle Powers*
- Charmaz, Kathy (2008). *The Power and Potential of Grounded Theory*. Sonoma State University, USA
- Checkel, Jeffrey (2005). *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework*. International Organization, Vol. 59, pp.801-826
- Cole, F.L. (1988). *Content Analysis: Process and Application*. Clinical Nurse Specialist, Vol. 2, pp.53-57

- De Vaus, David (2001). *Research Design in Social Research*. Sage Publications
- Esaiasson, P & Gilijam, M & Oscarsson, H & Wängnerud, L (2012). *Konsten att Studera Samhälle, Individ och Marknad*. Norstedts Juridik AB
- Evans, Gareth (2013). *R2P Down but not Out after Libya and Syria*. Open Global Rights, 9 September 2013. Visited at 4 January 2014, Available at: <http://www.globalr2p.org/publications/249>
- Flyvberg, Bent (2011). 'Case Study', in Norman, K, Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 4th Edition (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE), Chapter 17, pp.301-316
- Garcia, Jonathan (2013). *Libya, Syria, and the Responsibility to Protect: a Case Study to Determine what Accounted for the Different Outcomes*. Halmstad University, Sweden
- Garwood-Gowers, Andrew (2013). *The BRICS and the Responsibility to Protect: lessons from the Libyan and Syrian Crises*. Queensland University of Technology, Australia
- George, Alexander & Bennett, Andrew (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Belfar Center Studies in International Security
- Gifkins, Jess (2012). *Briefing, The UN Security Council divided: Syria in Crises*. Global Responsibility to Protect 4 2012, pp.375-385
- Hadenius, Axel (1983). *The Verification of Motives*. University of Uppsala, Sweden
- Hadenius, A & Henning, R & Holmström, B (1984). *Tre Studier I Politiskt Beslutsfattande*. University of Uppsala, Sweden
- Hall, Ian (2013). *Tilting at Windmills? The Indian Debate over the Responsibility to Protect after UNSC 1973*. Global Responsibility to Protect, Vol 84, 2013
- Hamann, Eduarda (2012). *Brazil and R2P: a Rising Global Player Struggles to Harmonise Discourse and Practice*. From Evasive to Reluctant Action? The Role of Global Middle Powers
- Hansson, Wolfgang (2014). *FN Räknar inte Längre Krigets Döda*. Aftonbladet, 9 January 2014
- Héritier, Adrienne (2008). *Causal Explanation, in Approaches in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press, 2008
- Higashi, Daisaku (2012). *Battle at the UN Security Council on Peace Enforcement in Libya and Syria: Focusing on the Strategies of BRICS*. University of Tokyo

Human Rights Council (HRC) (2012). *A/HRC/RES/20/22*. General Assembly of the United Nations, July 16 2012

International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (ICRtoP) (2012). *Crisis in Syria*. Visited 5 February 2014, Available at:

<http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crises/crisis-in-syria#I>.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) (2001). *The Responsibility to Protect*. International Development Research Centre, 2001

Kenkel, Kai (2012). *Brazil and R2P: Does Taking Responsibility Mean Using Force*. Global Responsibility to Protect, Vol. 5

Keohane, Robert (1986). *Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond*. Columbia University Press, p.163.

Krasner, Stephen (1999). *Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton University Press

Landsberg, Chris (2010). *Pax South Africana and the Responsibility to Protect*. Global Responsibility to Protect, Vol. 436

Levy, Jack (2008). *Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference*. Department of Political Science, Rutgers University, New Jersey, USA

Madsen, Marianne & Selsbaek, Simone (2012). *The Responsibility to Protect and the Intervention in Libya*. Roskilde University

Maessen, Jan (2012). *The Libyan Intervention, Triumph and Downfall of the Responsibility to Protect in One*. Universiteit Leiden

March, James & Olsen, Johan (1998). *The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders*. International Organization, Vol. 52, pp.729-757

Offiong, O.J (2013). *The Politics of the United Nations and the Reality of Responsibility to Protect: The Case Study in Libyan Crises*. International Affairs and Global Strategy, Vol.14, pp.2-3

Permanent Mission to the UN (India), Statement by Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri at the General Assembly Plenary Meeting on Implementing the Responsibility to Protect', 24 July 2009

Permanent Mission to the UN (India), Statement by Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri at a Seminar Marking the Tenth Anniversary of R2P, New York, January 2012

Permanent Mission to the UN (Brazil). *Nations Addressed to the Secretary-General – Responsibility While Protecting: Elements for the Development and Promotion of a Concept*. 9 November 2011

Ramirez, C. (2009) *Social-constructivism, a Theory to Study International Politics or a Scheme for the Analysis of States' Foreign Policy?*

Risse, Thomas (2000). *Let's Argue! – Communicative Action in World Politics*. International Organization, Vol. 54, pp.1-39

Roberts, Hume (2011). *Who Said Gaddafi had to go?* London Review of Books, Vol 33, Number 22, 17 November 2011

Rodgers, L & Longman, J & Gritten, D & Qurashi, S & Sears, H & Schukina, M (2012). *Syria: The Story of the Conflict*. BBC News Middle East, December 7 2012

Skansholm, Hanna (2013). *Veto – en Motivanalys av FN:s Säkerhetsråds fem Permanenta Medlemmars Agerande I Konflikten I Syrien*. Gothenburg University

Thakur, Ramesh (2006). *The United Nations, Peace and Security: From Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge University Press 2006, p.251

Thakur, Ramesh (2013). *R2P after Libya and Syria: Engaging Emerging Powers*. The Washington Quarterly, Spring 2013, Washington, USA

UNGA GA/66/253A (2012). *Verbatim Record A/66/PV.97*, 16 February 2012, Available at: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/66/PV.97

UNGA GA/66/253B (2012), *Verbatim Record A/66/PV.124*, 3 August 2012, Available at: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/66/PV.124

UNSC (2009). *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect, A/63/677*. 12 January 2009, New York

UNSC SC/10403 (2011). *Verbatim Record S/PV.6627*, 4 October 2011, Available at: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6627

UNSC SC/10536 (2012). *Verbatim Record S/PV.6711*, 4 February 2011, Available at: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6711

UNSC SC/10714 (2012). *Verbatim Record S/PV.6810*, 19 July 2011, Available at: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/PV.6810

Western, Jon & Goldstein, Joshua (2013). *R2P After Syria – To Save the Doctrine, Forget Regime Change*. Foreign Affairs March 23, 2013

Wolcott, Harry (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis and Interpretation*. Sage Publications, p.28

Zariouh, Leila (2013). *The Responsibility to Protect Doctrine and its Applicability in Libya and Syria*. University of Tilburg

Bibliography

- Allison, Graham (1971). *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Little Brown Publisher
- Bordner, Bruce (1997). *Rethinking Neorealist Theory: Order Within Anarchy*. University of Virginia
- Dalal, Nadir (2013). *The R2P is Dead. Long Live the R2P. Libya, Syria, and the Responsibility to Protect*. Seton Hall Law eRepository, Paper 208
- Evans, Gareth (2006). *From Humanitarian Intervention to the Responsibility to Protect*. Wisconsin International Law Journal, Vol. 3, p.710
- Hagebro, Matilde & Christensen, Gitte (2012). *Justice Versus Order – A Solidaristic and Pluralistic Discussion of Intervention in Libya and Syria*. The European Center, Copenhagen, Denmark
- Hasler, Stefan (2012). *Explaining Humanitarian Intervention in Libya and Non-Intervention in Syria*. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, USA
- Human Rights Council (HRC) (2014). *Syria Regional Refugee Response*. United Nations Refugee Agency. Visited 5 February 2014, Available at: <https://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/country.php?id=122>
- Jarvis, Samuel Andrew (2013). *Obama's Adoption of the Responsibility to Protect: A Constructivist Analysis*. Journal of Politics & International Studies, Vol. 9, 2013
- Morris, Justin (2013). *Libya and Syria: R2P and the Spectre of the Swinging Pendulum*. International Affairs, Vol. 89:5, 2013
- Ramirez, C. (2009) *Social-constructivism, a Theory to Study International Politics or a Scheme for the Analysis of States' Foreign Policy?*
- The Responsibility to Protect – Views from GIBSA Conference Report (2012). *Dialogue Meeting 07 June 2012*, Pretoria, South Africa
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage