proceeding

INDONESIAN HUMANITARIAN ACTION FORUM 2012

PROGRAM ON HUMANITARIAN ACTION
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Proceeding

INDONESIAN HUMANITARIAN ACTION FORUM 2012

Copyright © 2012 by Institute of International Studies

ISSN 2302-74700

CONTENT

Disaster Management

Human Rights Protection

Humanitarian Diplomacy – 1

Humanitarian Diplomacy – 2

Humanitarian Protection and Humanitarian Intervention

Humanitarian Enterprise

RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT (R2P): COMPARING CONSTRUCTIVIST, CRITICAL THEORY AND POST COLONIAL THEORY

Aryanta Nugraha
Department of International Relations UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta

Abstract

The normative idea of R2P is that international community has a moral obligation to give protection to people from the threats of genocide, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity. The R2P is aimed to bring about international legitimacy for international community to conduct intervention if state is no longer willing or able to protect its citizen from severe humanitarian crisis. It however is also seen as liberal idea domination in international norms and practices. The adoption of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) norm in the 2005 World Summit has spurred debates in International Relations theory whether it represented norms in the making or it represented the domination of liberal view in international politics. Employing several non-mainstreams International Relations Theory, namely constructivism, critical theory and post-colonial theory, this paper tries to map-out the debate of R2P between these theories. This paper finds out that there are different picture and understanding regarding R2P if it is seen from different theoretical lens. Nevertheless, the three theories employed, highlighted the importance of non-military action while at the same time open a wider room for local-indigenous involvement and empowerment in resolving their own problems.

Keywords: R2P, constructivism, critical theory, post-colonial theory

Introduction: the emergence of the R2P

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has been growing prominence as an important framework for collective international security in the post-Cold War era. The basic idea of R2P is when a state is no longer willing or able to protect its citizen from the threats of genocide, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity, this responsibility will be assumed by the international community. The emergence of the R2P could be seen as an attempt to codify and win broader international legitimacy, since the liberalist peace idea of "the right to intervene" which was by the Western states has been criticised by realist proponents and non-western states as violated the sovereignty norm in world politics.[272]

---

[272] See for example, David Chandler, '*The Responsibility to Protect?* Imposing the 'Liberal Peace'', *International Peacekeeping,* vol. 11, no. 1 2005, pp. 59-81.

As a concept or international doctrine, the R2P is derived from the experience of NATO intervention in Kosovo war in 1999. The stimulus for the development of the R2P was a statement from Kofi Annan reflected the dilemma of humanitarian intervention in the wake of Kosovo crisis. He questioned, on the one hand, the legitimacy of regional organisation to use force without a UN mandate, and on the other hand, he also asked what the UN would do to prevent another case like Rwanda and Srebrenica (Kosovo).[273] The Rwanda and Srebrenica (Kosovo) cases showed the fail of international community to take a decisive action to protect genocide and mass murder from worsening. In his speech before the UN Assembly, Annan called for "responsibility to act in circumstances in which universally accepted human rights are being violated on a massive scale".[274]

The Annan contention was taken by Lloyd Axworthy (then, the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs) who established an international commission to find the solution of Annan question. Funded by Canadian government, the commission called as the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) which acted as independent panel to examine and develop a concept regarding the dilemma of human intervention and state sovereignty. As a result, the ICISS published a report entitled "The Responsibility to Protect". In its report, the ICISS stated, "state sovereignty implies responsibility and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lays with the state its self. Where a population is suffering serious harm and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to international responsibility to protect".[275] There are at least three stages of the "responsibility to protect". First, responsibility to prevent; the international community has an obligation to prevent in the case state's unwillingness or unable to protect its citizen. Second, responsibility to react; international community conducts a response in the case of heightened emergency such as mass killing and if necessary using force. Third, responsibility

---

[273] Kofi Annan, 'Two Concept of Sovereignty', *the Economist,* September 18, 1999.

[274] Kofi Annan cited from Alex J Bellamy, 'Wither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit', *International Affairs,* vol. 20, no. 2, 2006, p. 141

[275] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *The Responsibility to Protect,* Ottawa, 2001, p. Xi.

to rebuild; international community runs a follow-up program that considered essential for people protection.

The ICISS result was endorsed in the World Summit of the UN General Assembly and the Security Council in 2005. The Summit outcome document was considered milder than the original concept, since the Summit document did not exclude vetoes of the UNSC member in the case of humanitarian crisis, while the role of regional organisations were subsume under the consent of the UNSC. It however, adopted the normative idea of R2P that international community has a moral obligation to give protection to people under severe humanitarian crisis.[276]

The acceptance of R2P concept to the UN system replaced the debate on 'the right to intervene' in the case of human rights violation to the degree of obligation/ responsibility of the states and the international community to protect the individual. It however, did not automatically win international acceptance. It was proven by the issued of the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon that published a report 'Implementing Responsibility to Protect'. This report called for a more effective implementation of the R2P. Parallel to the UN process, there has been a growing support from international NGOs such as the International Crisis Group (ICG), Oxfam, Human Right Watch, and other groups which founded the Global Centre for the Responsibility to protect in 2007 that wanted to further implementation of the R2P.

The recognition of the R2P in the UN system represents the attempt to institutionalise and to gain legitimacy of a new international security framework, namely the collective security action which stressed that democratic and peaceful states have a leading role to ensure the protection of individual rights for the sake of common humanity. From international relations theory, the prevalent of R2P signifies the dominance of liberal peace theory that intersects with solidarist view of the English School theory. However, it never escapes from criticisms. From realist point of view, for example, the emergence of R2P concept is not only a matter of the violation of sovereignty norm, but the R2P also embodies a realist politics of the major power. No international organisation could make a certain judgement whether a humanitarian intervention

---

[276] Alex J Bellamy, 'Wither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit', *International Affairs,* vol. 20, no. 2, 2006, p. 142-143.

based on R2P concept is truly motivated by humanitarian, moral or even an altruistic spirits.[277]

It is therefore very interesting to discuss how other international relations theory explain and interpret the emergence of the R2P as global principle of humanitarian intervention. This paper will use constructivism, critical theory, and post colonial theory as lenses of explanation.

Constructivism on the R2P: a Norm in the Making?

From constructivist point view the ultimate question regarding the emergence of the R2P is will it become a new legitimate norm in international security system. Constructivist theory would focus on the developing of norm rather than the behaviour of state in rationally responding the R2P. Constructivist will also take a deeper look on how the notion of responsibility and legitimacy, are attributed to the norm by the states in the discourse of the R2P.

Constructivism theory in international relation is regarded as a criticism to neoliberal and neorealist theory that are considered as too rational-materialistic in explaining the international relations phenomena.[278] Constructivism proposes several ontological bases about international relations.[279] First, constructivism argues that normative and ideational structures have significant role as important as power and interest to the behavior of social and political actors. The normative and ideational structures are also fundamental in shaping identity of the actors. Second, based on the first ontological base, the understanding of how normative and ideational factors shape identity is significantly needed to identify the interest and action of the actors. Different with neorealism and neoliberalism which argue that states' preferences (interests) are already settled when they relate with other states; constructivism asserts that states' preferences are shaped by their identity.[280] Norms are inter-

---

[277] David Chandler, '*The Responsibility to Protect?* Imposing the 'Liberal Peace'', *International Peacekeeping,* vol. 11, no. 1 2005, pp. 61-62.

[278] See Christian Reus-Smith, 'Constructivism', in Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Davetak, Jack Donelly, Mathew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit & Jacqui True (eds), *Theories of International Relations',* 3rd edition, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2005, pp. 195-196.

[279] The ontology of constructivism is summarised from Christian Reus-Smith. See footnote above.

[280] Identity is strongly related with a context of normative meaning which shapes who they (the actors) are and the possibilities that available to them.

subjective understanding that constitute actors interest and identities and create expectation as well as prescribe what appropriate behavior ought to be.[281] Put succinctly, the core argument of constructivism is that world politics has been influenced by ideas, norms, knowledge, culture, and arguments. Constructivism, therefore stress its analysis on the particular role of 'inter-subjective' idea in creating norms and identities of the actors.

World politics, as constructivist argues, is not only composed by states that interact based on their perceived interests and strategy. In every interaction, not only material objects and subjective knowledge that are shaping the structure of interaction, but inter-subjective interaction should be also taken seriously. The famous statement of Alexander Wendt, 'anarchy is what states make of it' revealed that the reality of social world is not happened out there, but reality is basically constructed by concept, argument, and ideas that bring in communication process.[282] Constructivism also posits that agents and structures are mutually constituted.[283] Actors cannot be perceived as being outside societal structures. Both are involved in a complex interaction in a mutual process of constitution in which neither of the two is ontologically above the other. Based on this situation, actors are in a network of roles and expectation which will be protected through norms and identity. From this point of view, the logic for actors' motivation is not the logic of material-rationalism. The relationship of actors and structures are guided by the logic of appropriateness that the behavior of actors is a function of 'what we should do' related to the shared norms and values within institutions. Norms and values therefore not only constrain actors' behavior but also constitute the identity of actors.[284] This appropriateness is developed firstly in the perception of the actors, through their interpretation of the ongoing situation. Actors are guided by their

---

[281] Annika Bjorkdahl, 'Norms in International Relations, some conceptual and methodological Reflection', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs,* vol. 15 no. 1, 2002, pp. 9-23.

[282] Alexander Wendt, 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization,* vol. 46 no.2, p. 394

[283] It based on the concept of structuration built by Anthony Giddens that the relationship between structure and actors involves inter-subjective understanding and meaning. See Robert Jackson & Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2007, p. 163.

[284] K.M. Fierke, 'Constructivism', in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity,* Oxford University Press, New York, 2007, p. 181.

material interest, but more to their role of identity as well as norms as representation of societal convention and practices. It is because constructivism believes that the idea behind developing a norm is that norm can bring an effect to actors due to its content.

The recognition of binding norm is originated through the recognition of perceived legitimacy. As Ann Florini argued, every norm has an aura of legitimacy that different with other ideational factors or rules. This potency of legitimacy brings about effectual power. Norms therefore are complied because of their legitimacy not because they are enforced.[285] If the norms are legitimate it is likely to be obeyed. The legitimate norms will influence of the behavior of actors as normative guidance in which a network of roles and expectation will shape the identity of actors. One question that may rise is how norm can be perceived as legitimate. Constructivism argues that it cannot be only concluded based on actors' observation but also from the analysis of discourse and communication.[286]

Regarding the emergence of R2P, constructivism would argue that the R2P has normative potential to become a legitimate norm in international security. It could be answered from the process of norming of the R2P. Norm evolution can be divided into three phases: norm emergence (a concept that promoted by norms entrepreneurs), norm cascade (spread of the norm among other actors), internalisation (norm is taken for granted).[287] From this approach the map development of R2P and what level it has been adopted at international scene can be identified.

The first development of R2P has been started since the end of the Cold War triggered by a series of humanitarian crises whether caused by the silence of international community (the case of Rwanda), or there was unapproved action (the case of Kosovo). This situation then brought by the norm entrepreneur, the ICISS in 2001-2005 in form of the report Responsibility to Protect (2001). The spread of the norm among actors happened in the World Summit 2005. In the summit, arguments and ideas were brought in the discourse and the inter-subjective understanding between actors constituted the norm building. Agents and structure were mutually

---

[285] Ann Florini, 'The Evolution of International Norms', *International Studies Quarterly,* vol. 40, 1996, pp. 363-389.
[286] Robert Jackson & Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and Approaches*, p. 165.
[287] Veronika Bilkova, *Responsibility to Protect: New Hope or Old Hypocrisy?*, Charles University, Prague, 2010.

constituted. The summit then adopted the report along with various changes and shift of the report but the significant ideas of ICISS report were maintained. The Outcome Document o 2005 World Summit therefore represents the only consensually negotiated material related to R2P.

The world summit 2005 acceptance of the R2P and the Security Council's endorsement of it with Resolution 1674 (Protection of Civilians and Armed Conflict), the UN appears not only to have accepted that a normative shift has occurred with regard to the protection of human rights. It has also affirmed that the UN as institutional mechanism holds the task to assure that these norms are enforced. The resolution 1674 particularly paragraph 4 stated '.. reaffirms the provision of paragraphs 138 and 139 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document regarding the Responsibility to Protect population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity".[288]

Critics may argue that there still some ambiguousness on the implementation of the R2P. The R2P has implemented in Kenya and Libya, but it failed to be implemented in several situation that were classified for R2P activation such as in Sudan, Myanmar, North Korea, DRC, Somalia, and Sri Lanka. Ironically, it misused to legitimise the use of force in Iraq and Georgia. Constructivism however would contend that norms may guide, inspire, rationalise and show mutual expectation of behaviour among actors, but norms are always contested in principal and are always in competition with other system of order. in the case of misused implementation, from constructivism point of view, should be analysed from the structure and working method of the Security Council, in which power and interests of the P-5. Although the UK and France morally support the R2P, the US remains silent While Russia and China keep reject it. This situation, from constructivism perspective, could be concluded that the R2P does not lose it validity but it seems that R2P is still a norm in the making.

Critical Theory on the R2P: does R2P have Emancipatory potential?

---

[288] Patrick F White, 'Normative Considerations Bearing on The Responsibility to Protect: Prospect and Implication in a Fracturing International System', *Canadian Military Journal,* vol. 9, no. 2, 2010, pp. 20.

From critical theory point of view, the questions that may rise from the emergence of the R2P are; could intervention from a group of states become a real emancipatory act for the purpose of human protection? Can emancipation be imposed by external agents?

Critical theory in general is a distinct tradition of thought which questions modern social and political life through a method of immanent critique. The ultimate objective of critical theory is to disclose the underlying social structure and various forms of domination in order to overcome them and engage in social transformation.[289] Critical theory challenges the ontology and epistemology of dominant theory in international relations and sparked the 'third debate' in the discipline of International Relations around the methodological approach. Using post-positivist methodology, critical theory rejects the postulate of positivism; objectivity of external reality, the separation of subject and object, and the qualify theory as a value-free.[290] By realising that theories are always set in social and political life, critical theory scrutinises the purpose and function performed by certain theory. As has been stated by Robert Cox that theory is always for someone and for some purpose, critical theory inquires the politic of production and reproduction of knowledge in international relations.[291]

According to critical theory, because of the influence of positivist methodology, the dominant theories of international relations have turned to become problem solving theory. The problem is that problem solving theories are prone to be politicised and have tendency to legitimise the established social and political structure of world order including the ideology and the inequalities in power and wealth.[292] As problem solving theories is always predisposed by certain interest, critical theory must bring awareness of the interest, ideology/ values and orientation of any other theories. Based on that, critical theory argues that theory is not only a tool to analyse day to day realities but also force to transform those realities. Critical theory thus featured by emancipatory principle.

---

[289] See Richard Davetak, 'Critical Theory', in Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Davetak, Jack Donelly, Mathew Paterson, Cristian Reus-Smit & Jacqui True (eds), *Theories of International Relations',* pp. 137-138.
[290] Robert Jackson & Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2007.pp. 292.
[291] Cited from Richard Davetak, 'Critical Theory', p. 140.
[292] Richard Davetak, 'Critical Theory', p. 141-142.

Emancipation broadly defined as freeing people from any socially constructed constraint to achieve autonomy.[293]

The issue of emancipation is very important according to critical theory, since the document of R2P stated that normatively, R2P focus on 'human needs and rights who seeking protection or assistance'.[294] At the surface, the ongoing discourse on R2P looks like that it could be easily subsumed into the rubric emancipation of critical theory. Such focus implies that R2P is important part of globalising human security by turning the focus to the universal needs and rights of individuals. The R2P also often seen as global effort to de-territorialising and stimulate a more holistic approaches to human security. The R2P however maintains state actors as the most important agents of insecurity. By R2P, a group of states (claimed as international community) seeks to enforce the 'freedom from fear' and emancipate the 'victims' from illegitimate and threatening state's action. This new paradigm of R2P differentiate it from traditional mode of intervention which prioritising order. Put order as first priority is not sufficient since states could commit violent and atrocities towards their citizen on behalf of order. R2P prioritising human needs, human rights, and justice of the individuals that need to be protected. Based on that, R2P claimed that emancipatory is implied on the effect of freeing individuals from political conflict and violence. Therefore, the use of military force by a state or a group of states on behalf of international community is well-suited with the emancipatory objectives since the purpose of the military force is to protect the individual from political violence by other groups or from the state.

From critical theory point of view, the emancipation language in the R2P concept is only partial and ontologically weak.[295] Embedded within the concept of liberal peace, the practice of R2P is very different with the emancipation concept of critical theory. Ken Booth conceptualises emancipation as security itself. According to Booth, emancipation should take precedence over the concern of states and militaries with power and order. Regarding emancipation

---

[293] Steve Smith, 'The Contested Concept of Security', in Ken Booth (ed), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics',* Lyenne-Rienner, Boulder Colorado, 2005, p.26.

[294] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *The Responsibility to Protect,* Ottawa, 2001, p. 15.

[295] See for example, Nicholas Glover, 'A Critique of the theory and Practice of R2P', <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/27/a-critque-of-theory-and-practice-of-r2p/> accessed, 25 June 2012.

(empowerment of the marginalised) and transformation of state and military power, Booth argues that emancipation produces more sustainable justice of the security than power and order.[296] Hence, the genuine emancipatory security must be driven and controlled by the activism of local non-state actors, civil society, and or social movements that become the 'victims' of the ongoing political violence. The R2P practice gives privilege to international community as the predominant agent to emancipate the 'victims'. Moreover, the R2P unavoidably accompanied by repressive action, militarisation and securitisation, in the process of re-state building in the recipient countries. By privileging external actors through state-based intervention, the R2P potentially marginalised indigenous process of consciousness of the individuals and civil society insurrection.

From the knowledge production view, the R2P also represents the tendency of the domination of neoliberal theory on peace.[297] After the debate on 'the rights to intervene' lack international support, the rise of R2P re-legitimised state-based international intervention. It is built by the reconstruction of new concept such as new humanitarian order, failed states, and good governance. All these liberal banners give power to the so-called (liberal) international community to inscribe peace upon the 'illiberal' states through hegemonic modes of global politics, by the construction of administrative and governance of the recipient states under the control of western-liberal states, International NGO's and International Financial Institutions. Without engaging 'the local' in the necessary emancipation process, the R2P will only become the emancipation of the Western from disorderly states. If it so, it will be very different with the truly emancipation of 'the victims' of global politics.

Postcolonial Theory on R2P: still Eurocentric?

From post colonial point of view, the questions that emerge from the debate on R2P are: does the R2P represent a new mode of colonialism? Is there any room to bring about rights protection by liberal alterity?

Postcolonial is a contested term with variety of cultural, economic and political practises. Postcolonial can be understood as

---

[296] Ken Booth, 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies,* vol. 18, no. 1, 1991.
[297] Nicholas Glover, 'A Critique of the theory and Practice of R2P',

two important meaning; as a condition (time after colonialism) and as a ethical and literary theory that dealing with issues such as identity, race, ethnicity, gender, power and knowledge that influenced by condition of colonialism.[298]

Postcolonial theory of international relations contends the deficiency of the existing global norms, values and institutions in distributing international justice, particularly towards post-colonial non-European countries. Postcolonial theory aspires to a new kind of international relation knowledge and practises that elude from colonial legacies such as hegemony and exploitation towards more inclusive, empathetic and deliberative by considering the significance of global South countries.[299] Postcolonial theory asserts that there is a separation or binary (between Europe/ non-Europe, strong/ weak, powerful/ powerless, the North/the South) in the knowledge of international relations. Today, Euro-centrism dominates the system of truth, values and institutions of international order. Samir Amin defines Euro-centrism as a complex idea with the core assumption of European centrality in the human past and present.[300] Although the concept of Europe is changed overtime both as geographical location or imagined system, Europe is envisaged as separate and distinct from the rest of the world with superiority in social, economic, political and cultural aspects.[301] The centrality of Europe generates difficulties to find the 'truth' in international relations since the conceptual, normative and narrative from the eye of Europe are taken for granted as universal.

Postcolonial theory also rejects the notion of universalism, cosmopolitanism, humanism and rationalism derived from Euro-centrism. Those modern ideas always pose the North as civilised, ethical, humanist and progressive by ignoring the history of imperial violence and genocide in the colonies. Conversely the South states are attributed with certain category as not modern yet, disorder, fragile

---

[298] Cheryl McEwan, *Postcolonialism and Development,* Routlegde, Oxon, 2009, pp. 17-22.

[299] Siba N. Grovogui, 'Postcolonialism', in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity,* p. 253-254.

[300] See Jean Franscois Fourny, 'Anatomi of Eurocentrism: On Samir Amin's Eurocentrism and Vasilis Lambropoulos's the Rise of Eurocentrism', *Research in African Literature,* vol. 25, no. 4, 1994.

[301] In this essay the concept of Europe often overlaps with the 'West' and the 'North' states.

states or even failed states.[302] It is clear that those categories that derived from modern North countries' history and sociological context will keep relations between the North and the South always in separation, discrete binary and unequal. The reproduction of those categories shows that there is a hierarchical relation between the North and the South without paying attention to the histories, values and point of view from the South. Postcolonial theory suspiciously contends this mode of reproduction of hegemonic knowledge becomes the continuity of preoccupation of Europe towards others. Postcolonial theory therefore seeks to involve in creation of truth by recovering the lost historical and significant voices of the South through reconstruction of knowledge production. It is because the European knowledge-based perspectives takes the South which is weak and powerless as the marginal element of global politics, the potential source of instability of global system, and the locus of human security policy, ultimately humanitarian intervention and the R2P .

Regarding R2P, postcolonial theory argues that rather than become the solution to South countries security problem, R2P reinforces the binary self/other, between North-develop and South-underdevelop countries. The target of the R2P is the populations from underdevelop-South countries, by bringing together the existing institutions, network and practises under the new global norms-R2P. Duffield and Waddell argue that R2P, rather than a policy tools to secure people through the protection of 'freedom from fear', it best understood as policy formation, as relational governance on how international institutions and other actors categorise and separate and act towards South people.[303] Similarly, David Chandler argues that R2P reflects the exaggeration of the new post-Cold War security threats and locates the threats in the South countries.[304]

Postcolonial theory would also argues that the R2P instead of natural in motives, is produced by standard Eurocentric through category such as fragile states, failed states, and 'new war' concept as the new security terrains. By those categories, Eurocentric literature

---

[302] Mark Duffiled, 'Liberal Interventionism and Fragile States', in Mark Duffield & Vernon Hewitt, *Empire, Development & Colonialism; the Past in the Present*, James Curry, New York, 2009.

[303] Mark Duffield & Nicholas Waddell, 'Securing Humans in dangerous World', *International Politics,* vol. 23, 2006.

[304] David Chandler, 'The Responsibility to Protect? Imposing the 'Liberal Peace', p. 61.

warns that in the post Cold War era there is a changing the nature of conflict that is more internal logic driven, particularly in the third world countries. This in turn will become the most lethal source of global security de-stabiliser when they decouple with other problems such as poverty, health, transnational crimes. These new sources of threat clearly show European heavy without further understanding to the nature of security predicament in the third world countries. More badly, when international human intervention under the R2P flag is used as a policy tools to meet the human security problems in the third countries, once again it reinforces the image of the North as the saviour from genocide and punisher the human rights perpetrator, while the native is the violator.[305]

The R2P debate, thus according to post colonial theory needs to be located in the sociological and historical context of the South countries. Oliver P. Richmond contends that in 'the post-liberal peace' there is a strong need to reunite both the liberal proponents and the local. The Liberal-local nexus can be a positive method of achieving international security since it potentially 'connects the complementary practices related to self determination and agency, democracy, human rights, and needs, and a rule of law with customary social support networks, and customary form of governance and political order'.[306]

Conclusion

Seeing R2P from constructivism, critical theory and postcolonial theory result in different pictures and understanding. From constructivism explanation, R2P is a norm in the making; evidently in the process and the development of R2P involving inter-subjective debate between agents and structure which are based on the logic of appropriateness and legitimacy. Critical theory and postcolonial theory on the other hand, criticise the R2P as '(neo)-liberal heavy' and the practice of R2P prone to be dominated by the Western states paradigm.

As the R2P is getting world-wide accepted, it is important to pay a deeper attention to the criticism. The practice of R2P should reduce

---

[305] Tarak Barkawi & Mark Laffey, 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies', *Review of International Studies,* vol. 32, 2006.p. 341.
[306] Oliver P. Richmond, 'Resistance and the Post-Liberal Peace', *Millenium Journal of International Studies*, vol. 38. No. 3. P. 689.

the use of military force and as instead empowering the local-indigenous forces as much as possible to meet the truly emancipation. Moreover, R2P should give more room for compromise with the indigenous people the South to develop their own alternative to protect the rights of their citizen.

Bibliography

Annan, Kofi, 'Two Concept of Sovereignty', *the Economist,* September 18, 1999.

Barkawi, Tarak & Mark Laffey, 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies', *Review of International Studies,* vol. 32, 2006, pp. 329-352.

Bellamy, Alex J, 'Wither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit', *International Affairs,* vol. 20, no. 2, 2006, p. 143-169.

Bilkova, Veronika, *Responsibility to Protect: New Hope or Old Hypocrisy?* Charles University, Prague, 2010.

Bjorkdahl, Annika, 'Norms in International Relations, some conceptual and methodological Reflection', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs,* vol. 15 no. 1, 2002, pp. 9-23.

Booth, Ken, 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies,* vol. 18, no. 1, 1991, 313-332.

Chandler, David, '*The Responsibility to Protect?* Imposing the 'Liberal Peace", *International Peacekeeping,* vol. 11, no. 1 2005, pp. 59-81.

Davetak, Richard, 'Critical Theory', in Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Davetak, Jack Donelly, Mathew Paterson, Cristian Reus-Smit & Jacqui True (eds), *Theories of International Relations',* pp. 137-160.

Duffiled, Mark, 'Liberal Interventionism and Fragile States', in Mark Duffield & Vernon Hewitt*, Empire, Development & Colonialism; the Past in the Present*, James Curry, New York, 2009, pp.116-129

Fierke, K. M., 'Constructivism', in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories, Discipline and*

Diversity, Oxford University Press, New York, 2007, pp. 177-194.

Florini, Ann, 'The Evolution of International Norms', *International Studies Quarterly,* vol. 40, 1996, pp. 363-389.

Fourny, Jean Franscois, 'Anatomi of Eurocentrism: On Samir Amin's Eurocentrism and Vasilis Lambropoulos's the Rise of Eurocentrism', *Research in African Literature,* vol. 25, no. 4, 1994.

Glover, Nicholas, 'A Critique of the theory and Practice of R2P', <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/27/a-critque-of-theory-and-practice-of-r2p/> accessed, 25 June 2012.

Grovogui, Siba N., 'Postcolonialism', in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith, *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity,* pp. 238-256.

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

Jackson, Robert & Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2007.

McEwan, Cheryl, *Postcolonialism and Development,* Routlegde, Oxon, 2009, pp. 17-22.

Richmond, Oliver P., 'Resistance and the Post-Liberal Peace', *Millenium Journal of International Studies*, vol. 38. No. 3, pp. 665-692.

Robert Jackson & Georg Sorensen, *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, New York, 2007.

Smith, Steve, 'The Contested Concept of Security', in Ken Booth (ed), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics',* Lyenne-Rienner, Boulder Colorado, 2005, pp. 27-62.

Smith, Christian Reus-, 'Constructivism', in Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Davetak, Jack Donelly, Mathew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit & Jacqui True (eds), *Theories of International Relations',* 3rd edition, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2005, pp. 188-212.

Wendt, Alexander, 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization,* vol. 46 no.2, pp. 391-426.

White, Patrick F, 'Normative Considerations Bearing on The Responsibility to Protect: Prospect and Implication in a Fracturing International System', *Canadian Military Journal,* vol. 9, no. 2, 2010, pp. 16-26.