Constructing Responsibility: Sovereignty and Intervention in the Wake of Libya

https://www.e-ir.info/2012/08/01/constructing-responsibility-sovereignty-and-intervention-in-the-wake-of-libya/

PAULO M. RODRIGUEZ, AUG 1 2012

Last year's debates regarding NATO's involvement in the 2011 Libyan Civil War raised questions throughout the international community as to the legality of what supporters called a mission "to prevent mass murder" and what its malcontents deemed a case of "imperial madness."[1] [2] Within the United States, legislators from both parties not only engage in debate about the constitutionality of President Obama's decision to commit to U.S. airpower towards establishing a no-fly-zone above Libya,[3] [4] but also disputed the scope of United States' interest, duty and responsibility in protecting people beyond America's borders.[5] It is interesting to note, that questions as to the legality of violating Libya's sovereignty were not raised to any significant effect within American policy-making and legislative circles.[6]

On March 28, 2011, President Obama presented his justification for U.S. involvement in Libya to the American public.[7] Inasmuch as heads of Western-style democracies are accountable to their population, a presidential address justifying military action was rather typical. However, it was the manner in which Obama advanced his argument that made the speech noteworthy. President Obama argued that U.S. involvement in Libya was grounded on the humanitarian needs of a foreign population under duress and that the common humanity shared by Americans and Libyans alike obliged the U.S. to respond to their calls for help. The president claimed that, "[t]o brush aside America's responsibility…would have been a betrayal of who [Americans] are."[8] Further claiming that it is incumbent upon the United States to employ military means not only when directly threatened, but also when its interests and values are under threat.[9] His speech begs the question: if states act according to self-interest and material capacity, as the dominant paradigm suggests,[10] why do values and common humanity even matter? The constructivist approach to foreign policy analysis may be better equipped to draw out an answer consistent with the president's rhetoric, namely the effect of the emerging international norm known as the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) on American foreign policy.

To effectively evaluate the potential of R2P to influence the decision-making process of the U.S. with regard to Libya, this paper will employ constructivist theory. With this pursuit in mind, this paper will attempt to answer the following four questions: 1) Are states obliged to act only in pursuit of their own citizenry's material interest? 2) Do norm-based values play a role in forming those interests? 3) What role, if any, do norms play within the realm of inter-state relations? 4) Can and do states have responsibilities to peoples beyond their borders? In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to establish the primary tenets of constructivism and its application to the field of international relations; then suitably define Responsibility to Protect and its origins; and finally, determine R2P's place within the foreign policy decision-making process by using the aforementioned constructivist framework.

Constructivist Foundation

Since the publication of Nicholas Onuf's seminal "World of Our Making" in 1989, his coined constructivist theory has gained an increasingly strong footing in the field of international relations (IR). Constructivist theory is based on the simple notion that humans are social beings and, as Onuf's book title suggests, the world is of our making (i.e. it is socially constructed).[11] [12]Agents (individuals, states, etc.) interact with other agents and structures (the physical world, society, institutions, etc.), thereby deriving meaning of themselves, one another and the world around

them.[13] [14]Agents and structures are mutually constitutive.

However, that is not to say that “brute facts” such as the atomic weight of gold, do not exist; rather, that the value of gold is resultant of both inter-agent and structural interactions like trade and culture. Agents interact autonomously with the world around them, limited only by the autonomy of other agents. The limited autonomy results in a mutually constitutive institution that limits and is limited by the behaviour of agents.[15] One example of this phenomenon is “the invisible hand” which pushes the value of commodities (in this case, gold) up or down. It does not exist objectively, but is a “social fact” drawn out of observed patterns of interaction that constrain the behaviour of agents.[16]

In order to avoid confusion, it is necessary to draw attention to the divergent schools of constructivism: the North American and European variants.[17] Both schools agree that the world is socially constructed, that there are brute and social facts, and that agents and structures are co-constitutive.[18] However, these schools differ in their focus. North American constructivists stress the role of social norms and identity in the construction of values, interests, institutions and other social facts. Their European counterparts emphasize the role of linguistic discourse in shaping the social facts outlined above.[19] This paper seeks to scrutinize the role of norms in shaping behaviour, specifically, R2P’s influence on the U.S. decision to intervene in Libya, so the North American variant is the most useful within this discussion.

Constructivism’s focus on norms and values do not negate interests, nor is it the antithesis of rationality.[20] Notable constructivists, Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, note: “Agents strategize rationally to reconfigure preferences, identities or social context.”[21] Agent-agent and agent-structure interactions delineate and give interests their value. As agents are limited by one another and the norms of behaviour that they constitute, interest are likewise limited and shaped by interactions. Agents must consider the limits imposed by structure, norms and convention. The process of navigating through normative structures in pursuit of interests is a rational one.[22][23]

Constructivism and International Norms

Constructivism within IR holds that the international order has been socially constructed over time. Concepts like nations, states, borders, interests and other institutions that we now take for granted result from social construction.[24] The fact that we take such things for granted demonstrates that we have indeed been socialized into thinking that they are innate to humanity. While investigating normative development throughout history is outside of the scope of this essay, it is still worth mentioning how international norms in general take form.

States are just as constrained as individual agents by the mutual constitution of agentive and structural interaction. For instance, the sovereignty of one state has no meaning unless it is juxtaposed against the sovereignty of other states and–more importantly–without the mutual respect for sovereign territory stemming from such a recognition.[25] [26]This mutual constitution is what creates new actors, norms and institutions like states, anarchy, sovereignty, interests, and the international community.[27] Such norms establish a level of “*oughtness*” to behaviour according to repeated agentive and structural interaction.[28] A change in identity and interest consequently constitutes a change in the international structure by expanding the parameters of *oughtness*.[29] [30]In turn, *oughtness* or norms define who states are, what they want, and how they can get it.[31] [32]

Like the invisible hand, anarchy and sovereignty are not objective facts; they are merely social constructions manifested through interaction of states with one another.[33] [34]Nevertheless, states act as if these constructions are brute facts that are inviolable and pursue their interests accordingly.[35] However, the process of agent-structure co-constitution in no way establishes sovereignty (or any institution, for that matter) as monolithic.[36] In fact, this process points to an intriguing notion that the sovereignty of one will become the sovereignty of the other. Consequently, the anarchic structure of international relations constructed through mutual recognition, is only as valid as state behaviour renders it. In other words: “Anarchy is what states make of it.”[37]

Explaining certain state behaviour, such as the fact that states form alliances with some and rivalries with others solely through the realist prism of anarchy, egoism and material power, is insufficient at best.[38] [39]Alliances indeed

place actors that have similar interests in one group competing against those with opposing interests, but by applying realist logic, is it not more likely that states with similar interests compete rather than ally?[40] Constructivism notes that there is another component at play here. As stated above, interests much like anarchy are constructed through social interaction. Likewise, collective interests (from which alliances derive) are not inherent unto themselves. Groups with a shared experience and thus a shared identity construct collective interests.[41] Identities are consequently the locus of interest formation.[42] Agents evaluate the world through a certain identity, make value judgements, and derive interests.

Through this lens, Jutta Weldes posits that the recognition that states are not unitary actors allow one to evaluate state behaviour as the reflection of the identities of agents who act in its name.[43] Foreign policy decision makers are agents acting on the state's behalf according to their own identity i.e. the socialized conception of their place in the state and the state's place the world, "these state officials do not approach international politics with a blank slate on to which meanings are written only as a result of interactions among states."[44] States gain certain identities based on the historic interaction between agents within their own states *and* those abroad.[45] Therein we find relevance to the topic of international norms formation.

The realization that norms and institutions are socially constructed through interaction of not only states, but also agents *within* the state, allows for the possibility that agents can change and adjust to new forms of social and structural interaction.[46] A shift in the thinking of individual agents within a state can instigate a change in their state's behaviour. The fact that a sovereign state in the first half of the nineteenth century and a sovereign state in the twenty-first are almost two different creatures entirely indicates that the normative interpretation of what constitutes statehood and sovereignty evolved over time.

By reflecting upon three benchmarks, the Abolition movement, colonization and decolonization, Finnemore (1996) attributes much of the structural change within this period to the spread of liberal ideals conceived during the Enlightenment. For instance, Finnemore explains that the Enlightenment constructions of the universal equality of man and individual rights translated into self-determination and sovereignty.[47] These emerging norms also had the effect of expanding with whom states identified and thus on whose behalf they would intervene.[48]

Contingent on the validity of Finnemore's process tracing, this seems to confirm Weldes' assertion as to the capacity of the worldview of individual domestic agents to initiate norm transformation within the state. These individual domestic agents informed by their own identity and experiences within a state become, what Finnemore and Sikkink term, "norm entrepreneurs." Domestic norm entrepreneurs attempt to promote new norms within their state; states, in turn, become norm carriers once new domestic norms become internalized and begin to frame their interests and behaviour.[49] [50]By participating in agent-agent and agent-structure interactions, norm-carrying states passively or actively transmit new norms into the international system, becoming norm entrepreneurs themselves.

Change does not come easily. As norms and institutions constitute behaviour and vice versa, they become increasingly mutually reinforcing. Structural modification may threaten the interests of agents invested in the status quo and they may fight to preserve it.[51] [52]The process of normative change relies on the capacity of norm entrepreneurs to affect the rational or "strategic social construction" of states outlined by Finnemore and Sikkink in order to allow for such change.[53] Those norms consistent with existing normative structures are more likely to take hold; those that are not are lost to posterity.[54] If and when institutionalized, new norms and behaviour again become mutually reinforcing, enabling related norms to emerge while compelling other agents to conform as to avoid conflict or de-legitimization.[55] [56]

This compulsion to conform is best illustrated by the propensity of new states to apply for United Nations membership and accede to international treaties like the Geneva Conventions soon after declaring independence, even though such actions are not required by the Montevideo Convention. This applies domestically as well. President Obama's March 28th speech demonstrates the compulsory power of norms in framing behaviour. The push-pull dynamic of domestic and international norms explains why governments in general tend justify behaviour to their publics in terms of domestic norms.[57] When President Obama claimed that inaction would be an affront to American values, he was acknowledging and attempting to bridge the gap between international and domestic

norms. In accord with Weldes claim, his decision demonstrates state behaviour is informed by the socialization of domestic and international agents. This perspective stems from constructivism, which argues that state foreign policy decision-making is always guided and framed by norms. Since co-constitution is omnipresent, state behaviour also guides and frames the normative formation of domestic and international agents.

The credibility of norm carriers is also important to norm promotion. NATO's intervention in Kosovo posed a paradox based on the notion that states "have moral right to intervene to prevent mass atrocities, even absent UNSC approval."[58] NATO's mission had the effect of advancing humanitarian norms, whereas the 2003 invasion of Iraq had the opposite effect.[59] [60] Frequent contributors to R2P literature, Thomas G. Weiss and Alex J. Bellamy, claim the difference lay with the credibility of the norm carriers.[61] [62] [63] They argued that the "disingenuous" characterization of the Iraq War as a humanitarian mission hampered the ability of R2P to take root as an international norm.[64] Ironically, Bellamy notes that same invasion reduced the normative significance of sovereignty amongst Western States, which could explain why the question of sovereignty was all but absent during the American debates on Libya. [65] [66]

Constructing the Responsibility to Protect

In the wake of the NATO intervention in Kosovo, which was viewed later as an "illegal but legitimate" use of force, the international community was pressed to develop an appropriate response to gross violations of human rights that does not violate international law while upholding humanitarian principles.[67] Acknowledging the tension between the principle of non-interference and emerging humanitarian norms, Secretary General Kofi Annan, pleaded for a way forward.[68] It seems fitting that a middle power like Canada, which prides itself on its reputation as a good global citizen, responded to Annan's call. The report titled "The Responsibility to Protect" presented by the Canada-based International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), was clearly an attempt at creating new norms, if not reframing old ones.[69] The main principles proposed by R2P are as follows:

- State sovereignty implies responsibility, and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lies with the state itself.[70]

- 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 the international responsibility to protect.[71]

In an effort to reconcile the tension between sovereignty and humanitarian intervention, the ICISS attempted to redefine sovereignty as contingent, claiming that such an interpretation was a result of their evaluation of state practices, precedent, established norms, and customary law.[72] As a result, R2P established that states have a responsibility to prevent, react, and protect the populace of a state in response to situations of "compelling human need with appropriate measures," placing prevention, above all, in the hands of the state in question.[73]

The unanimous adoption of R2P by the UN General Assembly in the 2005 World Summit Outcome indicated an acknowledgement by the international community of their responsibility to protect–at least in principle.[74] By adopting the two paragraphs states implied that they "accept that responsibility" and agreed to "act in accordance with it."[75] However, some states like U.S. and China, were apprehensive about R2P because on the one hand, they perceived it to be a potential constraint on national security policy, and on the other, R2P threatened the principle of non-interference. [76] [77] This tension highlights the struggle faced by norm entrepreneurs in challenging the established normative order–in this case, against the principle of non-intervention.[78]

Although, the positive and negative constraints placed on states by R2P has been a point of contention since its adoption, normative pressures have had the effect of compelling states to frame and justify their behaviour according to the norms it advances.[79] [80] [81] Moreover, the adoption of R2P illustrates the effectiveness of norm carriers and entrepreneurs in discrediting the use of sovereignty as a shield for "anything goes" policies.[82] [83]However, the concern by some states that R2P and humanitarian intervention presents a means to justify the material interests of the Great Powers remains. Algerian President Abdelazia Bouteflika best summarized these reservations in 1999:

"We do not deny that the United Nations has the right and the duty to help suffering humanity, but we remain extremely sensitive to any undermining of our sovereignty, not only because sovereignty is our last defence against the rules of an unequal world, but because we are not taking part in the decision-making process of the Security Council."[84]

Finnemore (1996), among others (Bellamy: 2005; Weiss: 2004), admits that indeed "[h]umanitarian justifications have been used to disguise baser motives in more than one intervention," but asserts these motives are often mixed.[85] Humanitarian justification may be authentic, but also augmented by other material state interests.[86] Yet, as the onus of the state is first to its citizens, there is nothing necessarily malevolent in this. Every state action is responsive to the calculus balancing state interests and values derived from their domestic normative structure and those imposed on them by international community. To this point, notable international ethics scholar Chris Brown from the London School of Economics explains that agents "balance between different conceptions of the good for oneself and others, and between short-, medium- and long-term conceptions of one's own interests."[87] He denies that considerations of interest necessarily negate the morality of an action.[88] Furthermore, Weiss, states that adhering strictly to norms without concern for interests is, "to deny the relevance of politics, which proceeds on a case-by-case basis by evaluating interests and options, weighing costs, and mustering necessary resources."[89] To ignore the interest-based calculus and politics within states would be, in and of itself, a norm violation.

The justification of state behaviour in terms of norms and values such as those enshrined in R2P, indicates an acknowledgement by state agents of the "shared values and expectations held by other decision makers and other publics in other states," as well as an recognition of the "standards of appropriate and acceptable behaviour."[90] Weiss attests to the validity of this line of reasoning, arguing that the adoption of paragraphs 138 and 139, presented an "accurate snapshot of mainstream views of sovereignty as responsibility."[91] Obama's willingness to justify his decision using language provided by R2P supports this claim.

R2P, Libya and Obama

Senior Fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations, Stewart Patrick, framed the Libyan intervention, "[…] as the first unambiguous military enforcement of the Responsibility to Protect norm," and that "Qaddafi's utter defeat seemingly put new wind in the sails of humanitarian intervention."[92] Pending a good outcome in Libya, the continued promotion of the intervention in Libya through the lens of R2P by President Obama, his administration, and his NATO allies, may eventually lead to the internalization of R2P norms and prove them all to be credible norm promoters. A good outcome in Libya would allow policymakers to say, "no more Holocausts, Cambodias, and Rwandas—and occasionally mean it."[93] Bellamy (2011) attributes the world's response to the crisis in Libya, including that of the United States, to the spread of norms contained in R2P.[94] The language throughout UNSC Resolution 1973 is a clear testament to that fact.[95] However, Bellamy (2011) maintains the same pessimism of Weiss (2004), explaining that intervention in Libya should not be viewed as a bellwether for the success of R2P in shaping state behaviour as it came as a result of "clarity of threat," a short window of opportunity, and the fact that Gadhafi was disliked throughout the region.[96]

It may very well be as Bellamy (2011) and Weiss (2004) say, that finding morality within foreign policy decisions depends on the confluence of "humanitarian and strategic interests" and a "window of opportunity."[97] This may have been the case for the Obama Administration since Libya was a coincidence of time, opportunity and interests.[98] Nevertheless, the confluence of humanitarian values, strategic interests and opportunity does not negate the normative and structural forces driving his decisions. Weldes' acknowledgment of the ability of co-constitution of domestic-international agentive interaction and experiences in shaping behaviour resonates well here. The decision to intervene was clearly based on the calculus of values, interests, capacity and opportunity. President Obama admitted to this quite bluntly, stating, "[…] given the costs and risks of intervention, we must always measure our interests against the need for action." However, he immediately added a short but profoundly indicative normative marker: "But that cannot be an argument for never acting on behalf of what's right."[99]

Foreign policy decision-makers do not enter into international relations with a clean slate, as Weldes, Finnemore, and Sikkink argue to varying degrees. Americans having been borne out of the Enlightenment incorporated its ideals into

their self-proclaimed role as "Leader of the Free World" and the "Shining City Upon a Hill." By viewing themselves as a nation that defeated Fascism and Communism, Americans believe themselves a force for good and have experienced both faces of humanitarian intervention, including the consequences of inaction. All these factors and more may have contributed to the constructed self and world perceptions of agents within the Obama administration. Their conception of the world, including what states ought to do and how they should do it, all matter in shaping their interests and values. Absent this, normative judgments of right and wrong cannot exist. With this in mind, we can reasonably infer that norms indeed had an effect on the decision to intervene in Libya.

Conclusion

Constructivism argues that the influence of norms on state behaviour is ubiquitous and unrelenting, succumbing only to the agent-structure interactions from which it manifests. If a given state developed norm-based interests of a moral character–like the ones mentioned by Obama–the foreign policy that results is not out of convenience or coincidence, but out of agent-structure interaction that guides and informs every action.

President Obama's March 28 and May 19, 2011 policy speeches, State Department press releases and others (Clinton 2011; Panetta 2011), demonstrate quite poignantly the influence that humanitarian norms had on American decision-making and how American interest assumed an increasingly normative form with complex considerations distinct of material interests alone.[100] [101]Nevertheless, due to the endogeneity of norms, it is almost unknowable whether the decision to intervene in Libya was because of R2P specifically, as claimed by its supporters, or a result of the compounded agent-structure interactions developed over time.

Works Cited

Albright, Madeline K. "The End of Intervention." *The New York Times.* New York Times. June 11, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/06/11/opinion/11albright.html?_r=1&ref=opinion&oref=slongin (accessed March 14, 2012).

Barnett, MIchael. "Duties Beyond Borders." In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne, 189-201. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Bellamy, Alex J. "Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The Exception and the Norm." *Ethics & International Affairs: FirstView Articles* (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs), 2011: 1-7.

Bellamy, Alex J. "Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq." *Ethics & International Affairs* (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs) 19, no. 2 (September 2005): 31-54.

Bellamy, Alex J. "The Responsibility to Protect- Five Years On." *Ethics & International Affairs* (Carnegie Council for Ethics and International Affairs) 24, no. 2 (2010): 143-169.

Biersteker, Thomas J. "State, Sovereignty and Territory." In *Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Walter E. Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons, 157-173. Sage Publications, 2002.

Brown, Chris. "On Morality, Self-Interest and Foreign Policy." *Government and Opposition* 37, no. 2 (2002): 173-189.

Carlsnaes, Walter. "The Agency-Structure Problem in Foreign Policy Analysis." *International Studies Quarterly* (Blackwell Publishing) 36, no. 3 (September 1992): 245-270.

Chavez, Hugo. "Chavez Says that Imperial Madness Affects U.S." *El Universal.* June 7, 2011.

http://www.eluniversal.com/2011/06/07/chavez-says-that-imperial-madness-affects-the-us.shtml (accessed March 14, 2012).

Checkel, Jeffrey T. "Constructivism and Foreign Policy." In *Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases*, edited by Steve Smith, Amelia Hadfield and Tim Dunne, 71-99. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Chesterman, Simon. ""Leading from Behind": The Responsibility to Protect, the Obama Doctrine, and Humanitarian Intervention after Libya." *Ethic & International Affairs* (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs), 2011: 1-7.

Clinton, Hillary. "Secretary Clinton: "Libya Has a Responsibility To Respect the Universal Rights of the People"." *www.state.gov.* US Department of State. February 21, 2011. http://blogs.state.gov/index.php/site/entry/clinton_libya_statement (accessed March 16, 2012).

Dunne, Tim, and Jess Gifkins. "Libya and the State of Intervention (forthcoming)." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* (Taylor & Francis) 65, no. 5 (2011): 1-15.

Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* (The IO Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 887-917.

Finnemore, Matha. "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention." In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, edited by Peter J. Katzenstein, 153-185. New York, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Holzgrefe, J.L., and Robert O. Keohane, . *Human Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Houghton, David Patrick. "Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach." *Foreign Policy Analysis* (International Studies Association), no. 2 (2007): 24-45.

Hurd, Ian. "Is Humanitarian Intervention Legal? The Rule of Law in an Incoherent World." *Ethics & International Affairs* (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs) 25, no. 3 (2011): 293-313.

Independent International Commission on Kosovo. "The Kosovo Report: Executive Summary- Main Findings." *University of Michigan.* www.reliefweb.int. June 21, 2006. http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/F62789D9FCC56FB3C1256C1700303E3B-thekosovoreport.htm (accessed March 16, 2012).

Kubalkova, Vendulka, Nicholas Onuf, and Paul Kowert. "Constructing Constructivism." In *International Relations in a Constructed World*, edited by Vendulka Kubalkova, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert, 3-24. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc, 1998.

Lergo, Jeffrey. "Which Norms Matter? Revisiting the "Failure" of Internationalism." *International Organization* (The MIT Press) 51, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 31-63.

Morgenthau, Hans J., and Kenneth W. Thompson. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace.* Fifth. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.

Nabers, Dirk. "Filling the Void of Meaning: Identity Construction in U.S. Foreign Policy After September 11, 2001." *Foreign Policy Analysis* (Wiley-Blackwell) 5, no. 2 (April 2009): 191-214.

Obama, Barack. "Barack Obama's speech on Middle East – full transcript." *barack-obama-speech-middle-east.* The Guardian. May 19, 2011. http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/may/19/barack-obama-speech-middle-east (accessed March 17, 2012).

Onuf, Nicholas. “Constructivism: A User’s Manual.” In *International Relations in a Constructed World*, by Vendulka Kubalkova, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert, 58-78. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharp, Inc, 1998.

Onuf, Nicholas.. *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations.* Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

Panetta, Leon E. “Remarks by Secretary Panetta at Carnegie Europe, Brussels, Belgium.” *US Department of Defense.* US Department of Defense. October 5, 2011. http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4895 (accessed March 16, 2012).

Patrick, Stewart. “Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention: How Qaddafi’s Fall Vindicated Obama and RtoP.” *Foreign Affairs.* Council on Foreign Relations. August 26, 2011. www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68233/stewart-patrick/libya-and-the-future-of-humanitarian-intervention?page=show (accessed March 14, 2012).

Paul, Rand. “Senator Rand Paul’s Response to President Obama’s Libya Address.” *Rand Paul U.S. Senate: Press Releases.* The Office of U.S. Senator Rand Paul. March 28, 2011. http://www.randpaul2010.com/2011/03/senator-rand-pauls-response-to-president-obamas-libya-address/ (accessed March 14, 2012).

Serwer, Daniel. “The Strikes on Libya: Humanitarian Intervention, Not Imperial Aggression.” *The Atlantic.* The Atlantic Monthly Group. March 19, 2011. www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/03/the-strikes-on-libya-humanitarian-intervention-not-imperial-aggression/72740 (accessed March 14, 2012).

Sonmez, Felicia. “Libya conflict sparks War Powers debate in Senate.” *The Washington Post.* The Washington Post Company. May 19, 2011. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/2chambers/post/libya-conflict-sparks-war-powers-debate-in-senate/2011/05/19/AFpb8I7G_blog.html (accessed March 14, 2012).

The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Responsibility to Protect.* Ottawa: International Development Research Center, 2001, 1-108.

United Nations General Assembly. “2005 World Summit Outcome.” *A/60/L/1: 2005 World Summit Outcome .* New York: United Nations , 2005.

Weiss, Thomas G. “RtoP Alive and Well after Libya.” *Ethics & International Affairs FirstView Articles* (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs), 2011: 1-6.

Weiss, Thomas G. “The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era.” *Security Dialogue* (International Peace Research Institute) 35 (2004): 135-153.

Weldes, Jutta. “Constructing National Interests.” *European Journal of International Relations* 2, no. 3 (1996): 275-318.

Wendt, Alexander. “Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics.” *International Organization* (The MIT Press), Spring 1992: 391-425.

Wendt, Alexander. “Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics.” *International Organization* (The World Peace Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 46, no. 2 (Spring 1992): 391-425.

Wheeler, Nicholas T., and Tim Dunne. “Good International Citizenship: A Third Way for British Policy.” *International Affairs* (Royal Institute of International Affairs) 74, no. 4 (October 1998): 847-870.

[1] Chavez, Hugo. "Chavez Says that Imperial Madness Affects U.S." *El Universal.* June 7, 2011. http://www.eluniversal.com/2011/06/07/chavez-says-that-imperial-madness-affects-the-us.shtml (accessed March 14, 2012).

[2] Serwer, Daniel. "The Strikes on Libya: Humanitarian Intervention, Not Imperial Aggression." The Atlantic. The Atlantic Monthly Group. March 19, 2011. www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/03/the-strikes-on-libya-humanitarian-intervention-not-imperial-aggression/72740 (accessed March 14, 2012).

[3] According to U.S. law under the War Powers Act of 1973, the president is legally required to inform the U.S. legislature within sixty-days of engaging in hostilities.

[4] Sonmez, Felicia. "Libya conflict sparks War Powers debate in Senate." The Washington Post. The Washington Post Company. May 19, 2011. http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/2chambers/post/libya-conflict-sparks-war-powers-debate-in-senate/2011/05/19/AFpb8I7G_blog.html (accessed March 14, 2012).

[5] Paul, Rand. "Senator Rand Paul's Response to President Obama's Libya Address." Rand Paul U.S. Senate: Press Releases. The Office of U.S. Senator Rand Paul. March 28, 2011. http://www.randpaul2010.com/2011/03/senator-rand-pauls-response-to-president-obamas-libya-address/ (accessed March 14, 2012).

[6] With the exception of the Heritage Foundation report on the use of R2P by the Obama Administration, which outlined that U.S. support for UNSC Resolution 1973 set a dangerous precedent limiting U.S. foreign policy (http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/03/libya-intervention-obama-wrongly-adopts-un-responsibility-to-protect); and the Justice Department's reference to the 12 March 2011 Outcome of the Council of the League of Arab States Meeting at the Ministerial Level in Its Extraordinary Session, Resolution 7360, which called on the UNSC "to take all necessary measures… to establish safe areas in places exposed to shelling as a precautionary measure that allows the protection of the Libyan people and foreign nationals residing in Libya, while respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighboring States," there was little serious talk within policy making and legislative circles concerning the violation of Libya's sovereignty (http://www.justice.gov/olc/2011/authority-military-use-in-libya.pdf).

[7] Obama, Barack. "Barack Obama's speech on Middle East – full transcript." barack-obama-speech-middle-east. The Guardian. May 19, 2011. http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/may/19/barack-obama-speech-middle-east (accessed March 17, 2012).

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Realism as defined by Hans J Morgenthau maintains "international politics is the concept of

interest defined in terms of power" (Morgenthau and Thompson 1985: 4)

[11] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User's Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 59.

[12] Onuf, Nicholas Greenwood. 1989. World of Our Making: Rule and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

[13] Checkel, Jeffrey. 2008. Constructivism in Foreign Policy. Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 71-99. p.72.

[14] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User's Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 59

[15] Ibid. 65.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Checkel, Jeffrey. 2008. Constructivism in Foreign Policy. Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 71-99. p.72.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid. p. 73

[20] Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." International Organization (The IO Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 887-917. p. 888

[21] Ibid.

[22] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User's Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 60.

[23] Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." International Organization (The IO Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 887-917. p. 888

[24] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 413.

[25] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 400.

[26] Ibid. p. 412

[27] Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” International Organization (The IO Foundation and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 52, no. 4 (Autumn 1998): 887-917. p. 891

[28] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User’s Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 59.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 393.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User’s Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 65

[33] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 400

[34] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User’s Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 65.

[35] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 407

[36] Ibid.

[37] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425

[38] Ibid. 397

[39] Ibid. p. 408

[40] Ibid.

[41] Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. J. Katzenstein (Ed.), The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (pp. 153-185). New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press.

[42] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 398.

[43] Weldes, Jutta. "Constructing National Interests." European Journal of International Relations 2, no. 3 (1996): 275-318. p. 280

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. J. Katzenstein (Ed.), The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (pp. 153-185). New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998, Autumn). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. International Organization, 52(4), 887-917. p.893.

[50] Ibid. p. 897

[51] Wendt, A. (1992, Spring). Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425. p. 411.

[52] Onuf, N. (1998). Constructivism: A User's Manual. In V. Kubalkova, N. Onuf, & P. Kowert, International Relations in a Constructed World (pp. 58-78). Armonk, New York, USA: M.E. Sharp, Inc. p. 67

[53] Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998, Autumn). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. International Organization, 52(4), 887-917. p.888.

[54] According to Finnemore, "[d]ecolonization norms benefited greatly from their logical kinship with core European norms about human equality." Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. J. Katzenstein (Ed.), The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (pp. 153-185). New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press

[55] Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998, Autumn). International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. International Organization, 52(4), 887-917. p. 892, 895

[56] Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. J. Katzenstein (Ed.), The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (pp. 153-185). New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press

[57] Ibid.

[58] Bellamy, Alex J. “Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq.” Ethics & International Affairs (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs) 19, no. 2 (September 2005): 31-54. p. 34

[59] Weiss, T. G. (2011). RtoP Alive and Well after Libya. Ethics & International Affairs FirstView Articles, 1-6. p.4

[60] Madeline Albright also acknowledged the damage caused by the decision to invade Iraq: “The invasion of Iraq, with the administration’s grandiose rhetoric about pre-emption…generated a negative reaction that has weakened support for cross-border interventions even for worthy purposes…Some governments will oppose any exceptions to the principle of sovereignty because they fear criticism of their own policies. Others will defend the sanctity of sovereignty unless and until they again have confidence in the judgment of those proposing exceptions” (Albright 2008)

[61] Weiss, Thomas G. “The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era.” Security Dialogue (International Peace Research Institute) 35 (2004): 135-153. p. 135

[62] Bellamy, Alex J. “Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq.” Ethics & International Affairs (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs) 19, no. 2 (September 2005): 31-54. p. 38

[63] Thomas G. Weiss is the former director of research for the ICISS and current director of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies at the City University of New York. Alex J. Bellamy is Professor of International Relations at The University of Queensland and serves on the editorial board of the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs.

[64] Weiss, T. G. (2011). RtoP Alive and Well after Libya. Ethics & International Affairs FirstView Articles, 1-6. p. 3

[65] Ibid. p. 37

[66] Ibid. p. 39

[67] Independent International Commission on Kosovo. “The Kosovo Report: Executive Summary- Main Findings.” University of Michigan. www.reliefweb.int. June 21, 2006. http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/F62789D9FCC56FB3C1256C1700303E3B-thekosovoreport.htm (accessed March 16, 2012)

[68] "…if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond …to gross and systematic violations of human rights that affect every precept of our common humanity? The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (2001). The Responsibility to Protect. Ottawa: International Development Research Center. p. VII

[69] Ibid. p. 3, § 1.11

[70] Ibid. p. XI

[71] Ibid. p. XI

[72] Ibid. p. 16, § 2.27

[73] Ibid.

[74] United Nations General Assembly. (2005). 2005 World Summit Outcome. A/60/L/1: 2005 World Summit Outcome. New York: United Nations. ¶ 138 & 139

[75] Ibid. ¶ 138

[76] Ibid. ¶ 138

[77] Bellamy, Alex J. "Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq." Ethics & International Affairs (Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs) 19, no. 2 (September 2005): 31-54. p. 36

[78] Ibid. p. 52

[79] Ibid. p. 44

[80] Ibid. p. 42

[81] Ibid. p. 43

[82] Ibid.

[83] Annan, Kofi as quoted in (Bellamy, Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq 2005: 25)

[84] Weiss, Thomas G. "The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era." Security Dialogue (International Peace Research Institute) 35 (2004): 135-153. p. 141

[85] Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. J. Katzenstein

(Ed.), The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (pp. 153-185). New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press

[86] Ibid.

[87] Brown, C. (2002). On Morality, Self-Interest and Foreign Policy. Government and Opposition, 37(2), 173-189. p. 181

[88] Ibid.

[89] Weiss, T. G. (2004). The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era. Security Dialogue, 35, 135-153. p. 147

[90] Finnemore, M. (1996). Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention. In P. J. Katzenstein (Ed.), The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics (pp. 153-185). New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press

[91] Weiss, T. G. (2004). The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era. Security Dialogue, 35, 135-153. p. 147

[92] Patrick, S. (2011, August 26). Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention: How Qaddafi's Fall Vindicated Obama and RtoP. Retrieved March 14, 2012, from Foreign Affairs: ww w.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68233/stewart-patrick/libya-and-the-future-of-humanitarian-intervention?page=show

[93] Weiss, T. G. (2011). RtoP Alive and Well after Libya. Ethics & International Affairs FirstView Articles, 1-6. p. 5.

[94] Bellamy, A. J. (2011). Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The Exception and the Norm. Ethics & International Affairs: FirstView Articles, 1-7. p. 1

[95] UN Security Council Resolution 1973 ¶ 4: "Authorizes Member States that have notified the Secretary-General, acting nationally or through regional organizations or arrangements, and acting in cooperation with the Secretary-General, to take all necessary measures, notwithstanding paragraph 9 of resolution 1970 (2011), to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, including Benghazi, while excluding a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory, and requests the Member States concerned to inform the Secretary-General immediately of the measures they take pursuant to the authorization conferred by this paragraph which shall be immediately reported to the Security Council"

[96] Bellamy, A. J. (2011). Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: The Exception and the Norm. Ethics & International Affairs: FirstView Articles, 1-7. p. 3-4

[97] Weiss, Thomas G. “The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era.” Security Dialogue (International Peace Research Institute) 35 (2004): 135-153. p. 147

[98] Obama, Barack. (2011, March 28). Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on Libya. Retrieved March 14, 2012, from The White House: http://www.whitehouse.gov/photos-and-video/video/2011/03/28/president-obama-s-speech-libya#transcript

[99] Ibid.

[100] “But when our interests and values are at stake, we have a responsibility to act…if we waited one more day, Benghazi, a city nearly the size of Charlotte, could suffer a massacre that would have reverberated across the region and stained the conscience of the world. It was not in our national interest to let that happen. I refused to let that happen.” (Obama 2011)

[101] “Yet we must acknowledge that a strategy based solely upon the narrow pursuit of these interests will not fill an empty stomach or allow someone to speak their mind. Moreover, failure to speak to the broader aspirations of ordinary people will only feed the suspicion that has festered for years that the United States pursues our own interests at their expense.” (Obama 2011)

—

Written by: Paulo M. Rodriguez
Written at: The London School of Economics and Political Science
Written for: B. Toby Dodge
Date written: March 2012