When the State and the International Community cannot Protect: Study of the Syrian Conflict and the Responsibility to Protect

By Stefanie de Wolff Olsen
Master's Thesis 2017
Aalborg University

Table of Contents

1. Abbreviations

AU	African Union
CCR	Centre for Critical Realism
CoI	UN Commission of Inquiry on Syria
DCR	Dialectical Critical Realism
FSA	Free Syrian Army
GA	General Assembly
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
Global R2P	Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect
HRC	Human Rights Council
HRW	Human Rights Watch
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICISS	International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty
ICRtoP	International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect
IR	International Relations
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
LAS	League of the Arab States
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NTC	National Transnational Council
PMR	Philosophy of MetaReality
R2P	Responsibility to Protect
RwP	Responsibility while Protecting
SCR	Security Council Report
SNC	Syrian National Coalition
SOHR	Syrian Observatory for Human Rights
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNOG	United Nations Office at Geneva
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSG	United Nations Secretary General
UNRIC	United Nations Regional Information Centre
US	United States

2. Appendix Reference List

3. Introduction

"1. The State carries the primary responsibility for the protection from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing. 2. The international community has a responsibility to assist States in fulfilling its responsibility. 3. The international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes. If a State fails to protect its populations or if in fact the perpetrator of crimes, the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council" (ICRtoP(1), 2017).

Since the onset of the Syrian Civil War in mid-March 2011, the United Nations (UN) and its member states have discussed the global responsibilities of protection when a single state cannot protect its civilians (UN(1), 2017). The violent actions in Syria have demonstrated how the Assad regime has attacked its civilians instead of protecting them. The crisis in Syria became a global crisis, as thousands of people fled from Syria to neighbouring countries and the West (UN(1), 2017). The international community recognised its responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians, demanding an immediate response to solve the humanitarian crisis. By means of various UN resolutions, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) sought to solve the crisis and provide humanitarian assistance to the war-torn civilians. However, these resolutions were insufficient and the humanitarian crisis in Syria demanded a more progressive initiative. This made UN reconsider a resolution from 2005, which focused on assisting states fulfilling their responsibility to protect. Namely the resolution of 'Responsibility to Protect' (R2P) (ICRtoP(1), 2017). The main idea behind R2P was

"[...] that sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from avoidable catastrophe – from mass murder and rape, from starvation – but that when they are unwilling or unable to do so, that responsibility must be borne by the broader community of states" (ICISS, 2001, p. VIII).

Hence, the international community would only interfere, when the state no longer fulfilled its role of protecting its citizens. The framework of R2P presented three stages for the international community to follow. 'The responsibility to prevent', addressing the root of the internal conflict, 'The responsibility to react', responding to humanitarian assistance, and 'The responsibility to rebuild', requiring full assistance with reconstruction and recovery after any humanitarian or military intervention (ICISS, 2001, p. XI).

However, the international community frequently discuss the concept, as the UN member states argue whether the intervened state's sovereignty was jeopardised by intervening forces. A previous study investigates how the concept and practice of R2P evolved during the crisis in Syria and influenced the actions of UN, United States (US), Russia and China, in the developments of the Syrian conflict. This study concludes, upon a statement analysis of relevant actors, how R2P and its use evolved in various directions from its employment in the Syrian Civil War, from 2011 until 2016 (Østergaard & de Wolff, 2016, p. 47). UN, US, Russia and China argue that the fundamental rules of R2P have diverse interpretations. Each of the analysed actors apply their own understanding and terminology of R2P, where each comprehension is based on political motives. The study suggests how different understandings of R2P and the use of it play a major role in the prolonging of the crisis in Syria. The lack of a common understanding of R2P and a shared desire to achieve individual political goals and motives impedes political solutions to end the humanitarian crisis (Østergaard & de Wolff, 2016, p. 47).

What then becomes significant to investigate is the international community's responsibility to comply with the R2P commitment, in order to protect the Syrian civilians. My personal drive to examine this issue is reasoned by the former study's results, of how the general understanding and use of R2P has evolves in various directions. According to R2P, the global responsibilities of protecting the civilians in Syria lies in the hands of the international community. The main challenges of this are striking, as the international community and the Syrian regime struggle to agree on a solution to protect the Syrians. Even though the international community agreed on employing R2P in Syria, a lack of a common comprehension complicates the solution and prolongs the crisis. When such difficulties occur, it challenges the protection of the civilians, as neither of the involved parties are capable of initiating R2P. Thus, the international community's (in)capability of fulfilling its responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians intrigues me, given how a common agreement of R2P is not yet secured.

> "Nearly all of us believe that this is a situation that demands remedy: Someone should provide the recourses to end the suffering and deprivation. The problem does not lie here, but in deciding which particular agent or agents should put the bad situation right" (Miller, 2005, p. 95).

The issue that I seek to raise is the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. I believe that a lack of a common agreement on the concept's use and understanding complicates the actual use of it; it complicates the protection of the Syrian

civilians. I aim to examine this issue by presenting relevant information, by various non-state- and state centric representatives. Representatives who enhance the knowledge about the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. Syrian civilians and the Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (HRW) represent the non-state centric actors, whereas UN, US and Russia represent the state centric actors. This research deals with a definition of three main theories, assisting in the examination of the given issue. The first theory, critical realism, functions as the overall mind-set, as it provides a critical approach to the analysed data. The two other theories, framing and game theory, provide analytical tools for the research, through which I detect the framing of the international community's actions and its strategic behaviour. Following this, I present an overview of R2P, in order to outline the core principles of the concept. This presentation demonstrates the core principles of R2P and the terms the international community agreed on, when the concept was endorsed in 2005. Furthermore, this section presents different views on R2P and its use in Syria, to illustrate previous thoughts on the concept. An illustration that shows a severe concern with R2P. Hereafter, I conduct an analysis revealing significant information regarding the international community's behaviour, in relation to R2P and the protection of the Syrians. Given how the analysis reveals an existing gap between the 'ideal' R2P and the 'actual' R2P, I base a discussion upon the thoughts on the core principles of R2P, the 'ideal' R2P, and the results gained in the analysis, the 'actual' R2P. The discussion then discovers and outlines the gap between the two comprehensions and presents a reforming of R2P, in order for the international community to meet its responsibility to protect. Lastly, I gather every result located in the analysis and discussion and conclude upon these. Hence, I seek to outline, analyse and discuss statements by Amnesty International, HRW, Syrians, UN, US and Russia to define the various conceptions of the international community's responsibility of protecting the people in Syria. This leads to a comprehension of the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians in compliance with the framework of R2P.

3.1. Thesis Statement

- To what extent has the international community fulfilled its role of protecting the people of Syria during the Syrian Civil War, on the basis of UN's concept of 'Responsibility to Protect'?

4. Approach

The purpose of this research is to understand the extent of the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. Hereto, pointing out UN, US and Russia's behaviour according to framing and game theory. Several theoretical considerations, relevant statements by Amnesty International, HRW, Syrian civilians and the international community, are included to gain a comprehensive knowledge about the given thesis statement. The reasons why the international community's responsibility to protect in agreement with R2P are of interest, are due to the major endorsement the concept received at the 2005 World Summit. Endorsement by UN, US and Russia, especially. However, as a previous study argues that, the general understanding of R2P evolved in various directions (Østergaard & de Wolff, 2016); it becomes interesting to examine the international community's actions to protect. In order to conduct a thorough analysis of this, I divide the analysis into two sections - the civil society and the civic society. I chose to include three actors for each section in the analysis, each presenting two or three views, to display an equal representation of each side. The civil society consists of representatives from NGOs and Syrian civilians, who represent the interest of the civilians. The civic society represents actors within the international community promoting states' interests. The civil society presents the non-state centric approach, wherein Syrian civilians and the NGOs; Amnesty International and HRW, represent the voice of the Syrian civilians. Both NGOs perform consistent humanitarian assistance in Syria. Amnesty international and HRW demonstrate a critical view upon the international community's actions by reporting on the development of the humanitarian crisis (ICRtoP(11), 2017) (Appendix I, p. 2). Even though NGOs are considered actors within the civic society, Amnesty International and HRW remain critical towards the state, whilst illustrating voices from the civil society (UNESCO, 2017) (Appendix I, p. 5). This makes these NGOs relevant representatives for the civil society. The civic society presents the state centric approach, as I analyse statements by UN, US and Russia. I deem UN, US and Russia as the most relevant actors for this research, as they have shown to be the most prominent actors in the Syrian crisis, whilst being permanent members of UNSC. Moreover, comments regarding the Syrian crisis primary revolve around these actors' actions and behaviour. Therefore, when focusing on UN, US and Russia it is possible to present an overall image of the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrians in agreement with R2P.

The non-state centric approach versus the state centric approach, a complex approach, enables a profound analysis of the given issue. The analysis presents various thoughts and opinions on the international community's responsibility to protect, hereby furthering a comparative case study.

4.1. Sources

The framework of this research begins with a presentation of three theories, to uncover the international community's responsibility towards Syrians. I consider each of the theoretical considerations the most relevant tools for this investigation, where to each theoretical presentation demonstrates profound considerations and literature reviews. Hereto I include the theories' fundamental aspects, their previous application in civil wars and the Syrian Civil War, and the theories' relevance for this research. The studies used for these illustrations, are carefully selected and compared with other studies, before deeming them as the most profound sources, given how they present a valid and extensive representation of each theory. The first theory presents Roy Bhaskar's notion of critical realism, founding the basic mind-set of the research. Notable in this regard, it was not possible to retrieve information regarding the critical realist approach's application in the Syrian Civil War, thereby solely enabling a demonstration of the theory's application in civil wars in general. Simultaneously, the critical realist theory presents dialectical critical realism and the philosophy of metaReality, to elaborate on Bhaskar's notion. The second theory introduces the theory of framing, by George Lakoff and Robert M. Entman. In this research, framing defines and uncovers the frames evident in the analysed material, whilst identifying the international community's compliance with R2P, to protect the Syrians. Within this theoretical presentation, I do only illustrate framing's use in the Syrian Civil War as I deem this ample proof for the theory's previous use. The third section presents theories of game theory. Alessandro Innocenti, Patrizia Sbriglia and Hervé Moulin elaborate on the basic game theory, where to Shaun P. Hargreaves Heap, Yanis Varoufakis, Colin F. Camerer add to the notions of prisoner's dilemma and behavioural game theory. Game theory assists in defining the structures of social world and the international community's strategy and behaviour. However, within this theoretical presentation I do introduce the theory's use in both civil wars and the Syrian Civil War. This is done, as I believe it is relevant to demonstrate a broader view of game

theory's previous use, as the theory consists of various elements that needs more extensive identification.

Hereafter, I establish a definition of R2P, in order to highlight the core principles of the concept. I retrieve the information for this presentation from UN, Global Responsibility to Protect (Global R2P), International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (ICRtoP) and the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). Within this section, I include thoughts by UN, US, Russia and several scholars to demonstrate early views on the concept and its future prospects. I retrieve the UN, US and Russian views from ICRtoP, whereas I retrieve the scholarly thoughts from different acknowledged publishers. I select the scholarly thoughts based on their comprehensive narrative about R2P and the international community. Furthermore, the latter adds to the discussion of the research, as I discuss the eight semi-conclusions by scholars and the international community with the results of the analysis.

In addition to this, I present a brief historical overview of the Libyan Civil War and the Syrian Civil War, as both civil wars share one specific similarity; the implementation of R2P. The historical overview illustrates the changes in R2P and the international community's responses to the two crises. However, I include the historical overview as an appendix, as it functions as supporting information to the analysed statements, by commenting on previous resolutions and actions. The information for the historical overview is mainly retrieved from Global R2P and ICRtoP, as they present a comprehensive historical overview, by including various actions, sanctions and resolutions.

Succeeding the theoretical considerations and R2P's definition, I initiate the analysis of the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. Before including any statements in the analysis, I carefully investigate and compare every chosen statement with other statements. This is done to purely include relevant data for the analysis. I divide the analysis into two sections, the civil society and the civic society, where each section addresses the international community's behaviour and compliance with R2P. The civil society represents the voice of the civilians, whereas the civic society represents the political voice in the Syrian Civil War. The first section analyses statements from the NGOs; Amnesty International and HRW, and secondary interviews with Syrian civilians. The second section analyses statements by UN, US and Russia; actors who maintain the power to veto resolutions put forward in the UN. Furthermore, US and Russia are competing world powers who actively respond to the Syrian Civil War. The inclusion of UN statements is based on UN being the primary endorser of R2P, making it relevant to include UN's

opinion on the matter. With the assistance of framing and game theory, I aim to analyse the frames of the international community's responsibility to protect, whilst defining its game strategic behaviour. With this, it is possible to detect any visible pattern in the international community's actions, in order to define the extent of its actions to protect the Syrians in agreement with R2P. The reason for conducting a content analysis, solely based on statements, is due to the significance in elucidating real words and thoughts. These are able to demonstrate a thorough and precise presentation of the situation. As I question the international community on its responsibility to fulfil its commitment to protect Syrians in agreement with R2P, it is relevant to include their voice to determine the extent of the protection in Syria.

Following the analysis, I conduct a discussion to explain the gap between the 'ideal' R2P, the definition of R2P, and the 'actual' R2P, the analytical results. The discussion does not employ any theories, but focuses on comparing and discussing the results found in the definition of R2P and the analysis. I seek to compare and discuss why the 'ideal' R2P does not fit the 'actual' R2P, to define UN, US and Russia's ulterior motives, all the while clarifying their compliance with R2P. The framework of the discussion is divided into three sections, wherein the first section I discuss and compare the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P. In here, the results from the scholarly thoughts and the analysis functions as additional information for explaining the gap, both in context and reality. In the second section, I define the gap discovered between these two comprehensions of R2P and in the third section; I present a 'new' alternative to the concept.

Finally, the conclusion of the research follows, wherein the findings of the analysis and discussion relates to the thesis statement.

4.2. Research Design

The research design applied is the qualitative comparative case study, as I aim to conduct an examination and comparison of one issue based on various statements by the civil society and the civic society. I employ the comparative case study design due to its intensive analysis of various cases. It aims to analyse changes and outcomes over time, hereafter comparing the outcome of the research (Bryman, 2012, p. 66). For the purpose of investigating and analysing the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P, I carefully select

various statements from the civil society and civic society. Qualitative comparative case study explains and understands aspects within several cases, providing a deeper comprehension of the intention of each case. This indicates that qualitative comparative case study enables me to investigate the various opinions and thoughts on the international community's responsibility to protect in the Syrian Civil War. A representation of supporting and opposing cases enables a broader understanding of the issue, as it illustrates various sides posing for an unbiased mind-set for completing the analysis (Bryman, 2012, pp. 66-67).

Furthermore, this research revolves around the epistemological notion of critical realism, which is further explained in the section of theoretical consideration. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this research, it serves as the guiding method. In regards to this research, an ontological stance is ambiguous given how critical realism is neither applying constructivism nor objectivism. Rather, critical realism recognises the social world as transformed and reproduced in daily life, through mechanisms that are real, but not directly available to observation (Bryman, 2012, p. 616). Thus, I aim to construct a hypothesis about these mechanisms, in order to investigate the international community's compliance with R2P to fulfil its responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians, since a gap on a collective agreement of R2P is evident. Therefore, the method of reasoning within this project is the deductive approach. I seek to evaluate the effect of the hypothesis, with guidance of frames and game theoretical behaviour, whilst discussing the analytical results with the assumption of a gap in the collective agreement of R2P.

4.3. Limitation and Justification

An essential aim for this research was to conduct personal interviews with Syrian refugees in Denmark, to let them explain and elaborate on their views about the international community's role of protecting the civilians in Syria. The intention with this was to include Syrian refugees' statements in the first part of the analysis, the civil society, to shed light on personal thoughts and experiences with the international community's work in Syria. By including personal interviews, I would be able to embrace vivid representations, as people who have experienced the crisis up close, would be able to elaborate on their experiences. Furthermore, when including such interviews it enhances the credibility of the research, as personal behaviour, experiences, norms, beliefs and values are included (Bryman, 2012, p. 209). Personal interviews, or face-to-face interviews, are sometimes able to reveal

additional information, as the interviewee is able to unfold thoughts, given how personal interviews offer an opportunity to deepen the questions asked, based on the answers given. Unfortunately, it was not possible to conduct personal interviews. Various local authorities, the municipality in Aalborg (Aalborg Kommune, 2017), The Language Center Aalborg (Language Center Aalborg, 2017) and 'Venligboerne' (Venligboerne, 2017) in Aalborg and Thisted, felt that it would be an unnecessary invasion of the Syrian refugees' lives, as they moved to Denmark to get away from the crisis in Syria. The local authorities stressed that they would not 'allow' such interviews, as they did not want the Syrians to recall the horrible circumstances they escaped. However, a second attempt was made to locate Syrian interviewees. I contacted Mohammad Mahfoud, from the Syrian Association in Denmark (Mahfoud, 2017), and he agreed on recruiting Syrian refugees for the interview. After I sent the interview questions, Mohammad Mahfoud never responded. Thus, I assume that no Syrian refugees agreed to explain about their experiences, which, of course, is understandable. Therefore, I will primarily apply secondary data for the investigation and analysis. Furthermore, in the search for US and Russian statements, the individual governmental homepages have granted limited access, thus restricting the choice of statements. Hence, the search for these statements became complicated and only revealed statements approved by US and Russia.

Even though I detect some limitations, it ought to be possible to answer the issue of this research. The examined statements and other relevant literature enables the investigation of the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. By analysing and discussing statements from relevant actors, within the civil society and civic society, it is possible to investigate the international community's compliance with R2P. I aim to display whether the investigated actors demonstrate any ulterior motives behind their actions by means of framing and game theory. In order to conduct a proper analysis, it is significant to include statements from actors from both the civil society and civic society, to illustrate detailed information of the given issue. These statements facilitate an advanced research, where the framing of the international community's responsibility and games evident within I analyse its behaviour. Set analysed frames and games contribute to the research with a vigilant insight into the given statements. This is done to discover the international community's compliance with the core responsibilities of R2P.

4.4. Data Collection

I have carefully chosen the data collected for this research, in order to provide a satisfying result. Previously mentioned, I aim to divide the analysis into two sections, the civil society and the civic society, where each section focuses on the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrians in agreement with R2P. Given how I solely include secondary data for this research, due to limited access, I aim to employ the Foucauldian method on problematisations. This data collection method suggests the use of critical thinking, complementing the epistemological notion of critical realism that functions as the guiding method for this research (Edkins & Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p. 167). Furthermore, problematisations questions how and why certain things become an issue, such as behaviour, processes and phenomena (Bacchi, 2012, p. 1). The latter facilitates an investigation of the international community's responsibility to protect, as the hypothesis of the research presumes that a gap in a collective agreement on R2P is evident.

Thus, by employing the Foucauldian method on problematisations, I aim to question the actions and behaviour illustrated in the investigated statements. The significance of this data collection method is that it provides a critical mind-set when examining and selecting data for the research. The Foucauldian method on problematisations reconciles the non-state centric approach and the state centric approach, as the method facilitates critical thinking to the selected data. The model compliments the research as it questions the complex approach, whilst considering the concrete elements of the actions of the international community.

When conducting the analysis, there are five different aspects for the Foucauldian method on problematisations to consider. Each of the five methodological aspects demonstrate the given issue and the actions within, providing an in-depth insight into the international community's responsibility to protect. These aspects assists the analysis in providing a precise analysis, by investigating the following: rational, practice, agency, subjectivity and telos (Martson & McDonald, 2006, p. 21). These five aspects enable an examination of the identity of the civil society and civic society's statements regarding the international community responsibility towards Syrian civilians, whilst focusing on the different principles of R2P.

The framework for the Foucauldian method on problematisations within this research is as following:

- **Rational:** UN's concept of R2P was made to advance the protection of civilians facing a humanitarian crisis
- **Practices:** The international community demonstrated a lack of a common agreement in regard to R2P, complicating the use of the concept and the protection of civilians
- **Agency:** The civil society: Amnesty International, HRW and Syrian civilians. The civic society: The UN and its member states, more specifically; UN, US and Russia
- **Subjectivity:** The civilians in the Syrian Civil War
- **Telos:** The civil society and civic society seek to pursue the greatest and most sustainable outcome of the humanitarian crisis in Syria in commitment with R2P. Every state within the international community and actors in the civil society desire to end the Syrian Civil War

5. Theoretical Considerations

The core argument of investigating the extent of the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians emerge from the hypothesis, stressing the gap on a collective agreement of R2P. As previously demonstrated, the UN member states discussed the common understanding of the concept, making the use and conception of R2P move in different directions (Østergaard & de Wolff, 2016, p. 47). Even though UN, US and Russia endorse the core principles of R2P, the study shows how the use and understanding of the concept varies. Based on this, I include three theories to answer the hypothesis and thesis statement. Additionally, the primary purpose is to investigate the international community's compliance with the three core principles of R2P: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild (ICISS, 2001, p. XI). I employ multiple theories, given that the analysed case is complex and cannot be explained from only one theoretical perspective.

The following section introduces three carefully selected theoretical approaches, with the aim of answering the given thesis statement. I consider each framework and analytical tools useful in investigating the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians. The theoretical aspects provide various insights into the given situation, whilst also complementing each other. These analytical tools are further elaborated upon within each theoretical presentation. The theoretical approaches I apply are critical realism, framing and game theory. The first theory introduced is Roy Bhaskar's notion of critical realism and aspects of it: dialectical critical realism (DCR) and the philosophy of metaReality (PMR). Within this research, critical realism functions as the overall mind-set of investigation. I aim to provide a deeper meaning and understanding with the analysed statements, due to the theory's critical point of view. As I divide the analytical section into two sections, the civil society and civic society, I consider a critical mind-set highly relevant, as I analyse various supportive and critical statements regarding the international community. The second theory is George Lakoff and Robert M. Entman's theory of framing. The theory of framing adds to the theoretical framework of critical realism. Framing identifies the structures generating events, whilst defining and uncovering the frames evident in the analysed statements. By employing framing, it is possible to investigate the international community's compliance with R2P, as well as its responsibility to protect the civilians. The third theory is game theory. The scholars elaborating on the basic game theory are Alessandro Innocenti, Patrizia Sbriglia and Hervé Moulin. Furthermore, game theory consists of other significant aspects, relating to the thesis statement. These aspects are

prisoner's dilemma, explained by Shaun P. Hargreaves Heap and Yanis Varoufakis, and Alessandro Innocenti, Patrizia Sbriglia and Colin F. Camerer's notion of behavioural game theory. The overall use of the game theory compliments the aforementioned theories, as it assists in defining the structures of the social world and the international community's behaviour and strategic thinking. Every theoretical presentation illustrates literature reviews in civil wars and in the Syrian Civil War, to demonstrate the relevance of the theory. Hereto, I employ various studies to extend upon this.

5.1. Critical Realism

However, as I divide the analysis into sections of the civil society and the civic society, whilst employing the theoretical approaches of framing and game theory, it is important to have a critical mind-set for completing the analysis. The critical realist approach offers this. Critical realism is capable of providing a critical point of view to analyse material, and at the same time remain critical towards the other included theories. Critical realist theoretician Roy Bhaskar notes that "[…] the revindication of ontology (that is the study of being) is necessary, not only for providing a realist account of science, but for science itself to understand and sustain the grounds of its own intelligibility and practice" (CCR(1), 2017). Hence the employment of critical realism. To understand a specific issue Bhaskar argues that, the structures generating the events and discourses need identification. "[...] these structures are not spontaneously apparent in the observable pattern of events; they can only be identified through the practical and theoretical work of the social sciences" (Bryman, 2012, p. 29). Framing identifies these events and discourses, whereas game theory defines the structures of the social world, based on the division between the civil society and civic society.

Above all, critical realism was developed to investigate the relationship between the social and natural world. Over the years, scholars have found this theoretical framework relevant for international relations (IR) and national and international politics. Critical realism aims to determine social events and social issues by investigating the practical policy (CCR(1), 2017). For this, Bhaskar argues how critical realism revolutionises the field of IR, as the theory criticises the previous globalised and political mind-set (Bhaskar(2), 2008, pp. 7-8). Therefore, when employing the critical realist theory to analyse whether the international community has fulfilled its role of protecting the civilians in Syria, a more valid result appears. This shows how critical realism revolves around the

notion, "[...] that valid knowledge-claims reach beyond experiences to grasp the deeper generative causal properties that give rise to those experiences" (Jackson, 2011, p. 74). Furthermore, Bhaskar believes that, to maintain the scientific understanding of the human knowledge and its transformation, it is significant to separate ontology and epistemology (Bhaskar(1), 2014). Critical realism considers the separation between ontology and epistemology an important thought, referring this separation as "[…] the transitive (the changing knowledge of things) and the intransitive (the relatively unchanging things which we attempt to know)" (Bhaskar(1), 2014). Critical realism aims to display the distinction between the changing knowledge of certain issues and the relatively unchanging issues attempted to understand (CCR(1), 2017). Bhaskar argues for a specific critique of the implicit ontology of empiricists and idealists. The theoretical framework reasons ontology and advocates the "[...] structured and differentiated account of reality in which difference, stratification and change is central" (Bhaskar(3), 2017).

Therefore, when investigating the extent of the international community's role of protecting the Syrians, is becomes significant to keep this theory in mind, as critical realism questions and criticises the frames of the statements as well as the knowledge of it. The critical realist theory "[...] frames the differentiation of mechanisms from their exercise, and the occurrence of events apart from our experience (or knowledge) of them" (CCR(1), 2017). According to Bhaskar, the critical realist theory criticises already recognised methodological and theoretical positions just like idealism, realism and empiricists, by exemplifying how "[...] things exists apart from our experience and knowledge of those things" (Bhaskar(3), 2017).

5.1.1. Critical Realism in Civil Wars

Given that critical realism constitutes the basic mind-set of this research, it is significant to investigate the theory's application in other studies concerning civil wars. By exploring the previous use of critical realism, I am able to deepen the theory's relevance for this research. For example, a study about employing the critical realist approach to the study of civil conflicts, Keith O'Sullivan stresses the potential in applying this theory as a foundation for conflict research. O'Sullivan examines "[…] the current state of the literature on civil conflict and the barriers to greater pluralism within the field, outlining how the critical realist argument is being articulated elsewhere in the study of international

politics/relations" (O'Sullivan, 2010, p. 2). Within this, critical realism is able to outline how various approaches can be reconciled (O'Sullivan, 2010, p. 1). According to his study, critical realism enables an analysis of cooperation and communication in conflict studies, by offering an opportunity to "[…] overcome many of the barriers that have emerged in the recent calls for mixed-methods research designs within the study of civil conflict" (O'Sullivan, 2010, p. 18). O'Sullivan stresses that, critical realism offers an interesting approach when analysing conflict studies, as the theory presents a larger framework for understanding and analysing violence in societies.

Supplementing this, a second study presents the use of critical realism to explain the 'liberal war'. This study recognises critical realism for the investigation of the contemporary liberal-democratic state violence, whilst explaining such events (Whitham, n.d., p. 1). Critical realism facilitates this, as it "[…] suggests that 'the social' consists of three domains, not only the empirical (observable of the social events) and the actual (social practices, discourses) but also the 'real' – generally unobservable generative casual tendencies including social structures" (Whitham, n.d., p. 1). Within this study, critical realism has a potential in painting a more complex and plausible picture of any given event. Therefore, when employing the critical realist theory to explain the 'liberal war', the theory poses an opportunity for critically investigating and explaining events by revealing the social structures shaping the outcomes and events (Whitham, n.d., p. 8).

According to the abovementioned studies, I conclude that critical realism will be helpful in the examination and definition of aspects, when investigating studies of conflicts within IR. By utilising critical realism as the basic mind-set of the research to conduct an analysis of a conflict, is becomes possible to illustrate 'concealed' structures of cooperative and communicative manners. With a critical mind-set, it enables a more in-depth analysis of the structures that shapes the events. The aforementioned studies each employ critical realism differently. However, what both studies have in common are the general understanding that, the critical realist approach functions as an analytical tool for investigating societal issues. Critical realism focuses on the more unobservable aspects of a given issue, whilst addressing the analysed material with a critical point of view.

5.1.2. Dialectical Critical Realism

Additionally, there are two other movements within the critical realist framework, complementing the basic critical realism. The second movement is *dialectical critical realism* (DCR). DCR practices the thinking of change, totality and ethics, demonstrating the discourse of a given issue (Bhaskar(3), 2017). In this regard, it is the discussion between the civil society and civic society, on the international community's role of protecting the civilians in Syria in agreement with R2P, which is analysed. DCR is "[…] understood as a preservative generalisation and enrichment of the implicit dialectic within critical realism" (CCR(2), 2017), as it "[…] develops on the general logic and ontology of critical realism to encompass on one hand, negativity and the resources of critique, and on the other, the concept of totality including causation, space, temporality and ethics" (CCR(2), 2017). DCR aims to pursue the totality of the dialectic discourse, by pushing the dialectic device towards the *alethic truth*. The alethic truth is "[…] the undisclosed realisation of natural necessity as the power and liabilities of things" (CCR(2), 2017). Furthermore, in the pursuit of totality, Bhaskar argues that, universality and totality must be more concrete. In the end, this creates a "[…] possibility of moral realism and ethical naturalism proceeding from metacritical, theoretical, and practical critique coupled with a holistic understanding (an *open* totality) of human society" (CCR(2), 2017).

There are three main aims within Bhaskar's notion of DCR, in which he elaborates on the already existing nature of dialectical thinking. The main aims are: (1) "[…] the development of a general theory of dialectic […]" (CCR(2), 2017). (2) "[…] the dialectical enrichment and deepening of critical realism, viz. into the system of dialectical critical realism" (CCR(2), 2017). (3) "[…] the outline of the elements of a totalizing critique of Western philosophy" (CCR(2), 2017). In addition to Bhaskar's notion on DCR, the theory contains the concept of *real absence*. Real absence provides a solid and concrete foundation of the value and critique of the objectivity and reality (CCR(2), 2017). Within DCR, real absence develops a universal knowledge of ontology and logic of the basic framework of critical realism, wherein a discussion of negativity and resources of critique is evident.

5.1.3. The Philosophy of MetaReality

The third movement is the philosophy and practice of, identity, action and non-duality, or in short terms the *philosophy of metaReality* (PMR) (CCR(2), 2017). Bhaskar's notion on PMR builds on an analysis of society, human agency and the self.

> "The philosophy of meta-Reality describes the way in which this very world nevertheless depends upon, that is, is ultimately sustained by and exists only in virtue of the free, loving, creative, intelligent energy and activity of non-dual states of our being and phases of our activity" (CCR(3), 2013, p. vii).

PMR accepts and compliments the basic critical realist approach on duality. However, this movement goes beyond the basic framework, as "[…] it pinpoints the reality of non-dual states and phases of being, showing how they underpin md sustain the totality of all forms of human, and indeed all, life" (CCR(3), 2013, p. vii). Therefore, in order to understand the totality of PMR, it is significant to realise any limitations of the world of duality (CCR(3), 2013, p. viiii), as PMR "[…] moves from *thinking being*, to *being being* including (in its ethical form) *becoming our being* (realising the potential of being of emancipation)" (CCR(2), 2017).

5.1.4. Relevance of the Study

Critical realist Roy Bhaskar argues for the three movements within critical realism: the basic critical realism, dialectical critical realism and the philosophy of metaReality. In general, Bhaskar's notion on critical realism presents an analytical tool, as it provides a critical mind-set to the analysed material within the field of IR. The presented studies confirm Bhaskar's theory, as each study revolves around the notion of analysing conflictual behaviour in society. In spite of the theory's previous application in analysing studies of conflict and the scholarly view on critical realism, I will apply the theoretical approach differently within this research by utilising critical realism as the overall mind-set of this research. I do this to maintain an open-minded examination of the international community's responsibility to protect and comply with R2P. Instead of defining the structures that generate the events directly, I seek to employ critical realism to enable a critical research. By doing so, I develop an in-depth investigation for the outcomes of the international community's responsibility towards

the Syrians in agreement with R2P. Of course, I will address such structures and events; however, framing and game theory manage these aspects. Within this research, critical realism functions as a tool for displaying the distinction between the analysed statements from the civil society and civic society. Critical realism presents a more valid representation of the international community's protection of the Syrian civilians in agreement with the core principles of R2P.

5.2. Framing

Building on the theoretical framework of critical realism, a presentation of framing is relevant. Critical realism argues how any structures generating the events need identification through a theoretical work of social sciences, to understand the totality of a specific issue. Framing identifies such events and discourses. As I aim to analyse to what extent the international community has fulfilled its role of protection the civilians in the Syrian Civil War in agreement with R2P, framing defines and uncovers the understanding of the international community's role and respond in this crisis. According to relevant statements from the civil society and civic society, an examination of how relevant actors have frame the international community's responsibility is feasible. By employing such statements, framing is able to capture the various views on the international community's actions and assist me in producing an analysis revealing the protection of Syrian population. Framing exemplifies various perceptions of the international community's compliance with R2P to protect the population in Syria, whilst providing an insight into the different frames of the statements.

Framing scholar George Lakoff argues how ideas, ideologies, words and metaphors varies, as people have their own personal interpretation of things. According to Lakoff, frames are

"[…] the mental structures that shape the way we see the world. They shape the goals we seek, the plans we make, the way we act, what counts as a good or bad outcome of our actions. In politics our frames shape our social policies and the institutions we form to carry out policies. To change frames is to change all of this. Re-framing is social change" (Lakoff, 2004, p. xv).

Therefore, the basic aspects within framing becomes significant, as frames are based on individual interpretation. Underlying structures of beliefs and perception of the analysed statements become

relevant to investigate, to transform an exchange of the various ideologies and ideas. Robert M. Entman elaborates upon Lakoff's presentation, by stressing how

"[…] the concept of framing consistently offers a way to describe the power of a communicating text. Analysis of frames illuminates the precise way in which influence over a human consciousness is exerted by the transfer (or communication) of information from one location - such as a speech, utterance, news report, or novel-to that consciousness […]" (Entman, 1993, pp. 51-52).

In addition to this, Entman emphasises how frames have four locations within the communication process: the communicator, the text, the receiver and the culture (Entman, 1993, p. 53). When employing framing, it is important to consider the context of the given statement. By considering and identifying the giver of the statement, the way it is formulated, the way it is received and the forum/culture it is said in, it is possible to understand the specific framing.

Furthermore, Entman adds to Lakoff's idea of frames. Entman stresses how framing enhances knowledge within one specific issue, whilst providing an insight into numerous opinions and perceptions. However, Entman pinpoints that framing can conceal certain aspects, which are important for the utter understanding of a given issue or event. "Most frames are defined by what they omit as well as include, and the omissions of potential problem definitions, explanations, evaluations, and recommendations may be as critical as the inclusions in guiding the audience" (Entman, 1993, p. 54). Frames can divert attention from other parts of reality, thus frames solely clarify specific aspects through the communicative process. An example of this would be the analysis within this research, where the aim is to conduct an analysis of statements from relevant actors of civil society and civic society. Hence, various remarks are included to identify the international community's responsibility to the civilians in Syria. These statements display various opinions and thoughts on the matter. Each statement can make use of a stronger emphasis and wording, to stress the message of the statement. According to Entman, this will increase the recipient's perception of the given information, as powerful statements are noticed (Entman, 1993, p. 53). Therefore, it is important to keep a critical mind-set when analysing such statements by means of framing, to maintain an unprejudiced view on the analysed material. For that purpose, I include critical realism. However, Entman stresses that he does not guarantee that the communication of the statements affects the recipient. If the statements differ from the recipient's predetermined attitude towards the issue, it is impossible to anticipate if the frames are destined to be successful (Entman, 1993, p. 53).

Framing is not exclusively about the transformation and about exchanging of ideas, metaphors and words, and the underlying structures of beliefs and perception. Moreover, framing consists of two important aspects, selection and salience. Framing involves selecting "[…] aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described" (Entman, 1993, p. 52). Entman deepens this view with an example from the Cold War frame, dominating the US news of foreign affairs. "The cold war frame highlighted certain foreign events - say, civil wars - as problems, identified their source (communist rebels), offered moral judgments (atheistic aggression), and commended particular solutions (U.S. support for the other side)" (Entman, 1993, p. 52). Within this context, Entman argues how framing and frames assist in defining issue and determining the actions of the actors involved. Framing measures the costs and benefits of the involved actors within such an event "[…] in terms of common cultural values; diagnose causes-identify the forces creating the problem; make moral judgments-evaluate causal agents and their effects; and suggest remedies-offer and justify treatments for the problems and predict their likely effects" (Entman, 1993, p. 52). Entman demonstrates how framing offers a case study, wherein various opinions and ideas are shared, to clarify different comprehensions of a certain issue or event.

5.2.1. Framing in the Syrian Civil War

The fundamental understanding of framing demonstrated how framing defines the totality of the analysed material, in investigating the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians. In addition to this, framing has been employed previously to analyse issues in the Syrian Civil War. By demonstrating this information, relevance of framing in this research becomes evident. For example, in a study, Amélie Godefroidt demonstrates the use of framing in the Syrian Civil War, when analysing the frames of the Syrian War, by a comparative analysis of European, American and Russian newspapers. Godefroidt employs framing as a supplementary theoretical consideration to the theory of agenda setting, to research the public perception of the given issue (Godefroidt, 2014, p. 26). With a specific focus on five distinguished generic frames like conflict, human interest, economic consequences, responsibility and morality frames, she demonstrates how frames focus on what actually causes and enables solutions within a conflict. The study employs farming to question how

frames evolve during a rising against the Syrian regime (Godefroidt, 2014, p. 31). Godefroidt employs framing to describe the power of the media and its influence on the human perception of the crisis in Syria. "[…] the mass media may not only be successful in telling us *what* to think about, but they may also be successful in telling us *how* to think about it" (Godefroidt, 2014, p. 27). By employing framing in an analysis of changing frames in the Syrian Civil War, the theory enables the detection framing variations in newspapers during the Syrian Civil War.

A second study compliments this with an analysis of the sectarian framing in the Syrian Civil War. The study questions if the way a civil war is framed affects people fighting in it, suggesting how the public opinion shapes a possible solution to the crisis (Corstange & York, 2016, p. 1). Hereby, the study sought to explain how the

"[…] different and competing ways to explain the conflict affect how Syrians make sense of the conflict and how they see themselves, with potentially important ramifications for who they support in the war and the sort of Syria they expect to see when it ends (Corstange & York, 2016, pp. 7-8).

Thus, frames facilitate an examination of the war narratives amongst the Syrians. Furthermore, this study suggests that sectarian framing is able to increase the focus on sectarian differences, such as the different cause of fighting (Corstange & York, 2016, p. 17). Framing "[…] refers to the process by which people develop a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue" (Corstange & York, 2016, p. 4), enabling a broader view of the variety of perspectives.

In addition to this, a third study, Maya Bhardwaj analyses the development of conflict in Arab Spring in Libya and Syria, with the use of framing. Bhardwaj suggests that the conceptual framing of any civil war is sensitive to instrumental and rhetorical inputs, indicating how frames change based on the circumstances. Bhardwaj is able to define the different forms of communication and cross-national interconnectedness (Bhardwaj, 2012, p. 5). This study "[…] argues that in the wake of the Arab Spring the countries that frame their internal conflict as civil war were more successful in containing conflict and garnering international intervention and support in suppressing uprisings" (Bhardwaj, 2012, p. 5).

To sum up, I conclude that framing encodes different aspects of conflicts, as the theory detects various structures and discourses within a given situation. When employing framing, it is possible to reveal the power of the public and the media, whilst enabling an examination of how frames evolve

during a crisis. In relation to this research, framing facilitates an investigation of the human perception of the Syrian Civil War and the actions by the UN member states. What the abovementioned studies have in common are that they all seek to investigate how frames affect, change and shape the crisis in Syria, as well as the actions made by the international community and other relevant parties fighting in the war. According to these studies and the previous description of the theory, framing can function as a tool for analysing discourse and behaviour in a crisis. By examining communication and perception, framing defines the structures that generate the crisis in Syria.

5.2.2. Relevance of the Study

Lakoff and Entman argue for the different ways framing assists an analysis of events and discourses, where the theory demonstrates how personal interpretations are able to shape and affect a given situation. Furthermore, the studies employing the theoretical approach to investigate the more direct discourse of the event, also elaborate on the use of framing to analyse specific events in Syria. An aspect of framing that compliments Lakoff and Entman's idea of the theory. However, within this research I will not conduct a discourse analysis as shown in the demonstrated studies, as I aim to investigate the totality of the analysed statements. Within this research, I apply framing to analyse the extent of the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. Framing offers an immersion to the totality of the analysed statements, enabling a comparative case study of different opinions on the international community's compliance with R2P. I do not comply with every aspect of Lakoff and Entman's perception of framing, as I seek to investigate the overall understanding, rather than the changes of discursive frames. By employing framing to define the civil society and civic society's view on the international community's responsibility in Syria in agreement with R2P, the theory is able to clarify the issue of the research by exemplifying the frames of the analysed statements. Thus, framing assists in answering the hypothesis and thesis statement, as it illuminates actions by the international community, as well as how these actions compliment with the core principles of R2P. Generally seen, framing is able to detect how the international community has fulfilled its responsibility of protecting the civilians in Syria.

5.3. Game Theory

The aforementioned theories of critical realism and framing have shown how to keep a critical mind-set when conduction an analysis of various statements, especially in regards to analysing the protection of the Syrian civilians. The following theory, game theory, adds to the previous theories, by defining the structures of the social world through of the context of the analysed statements. First of all, game theory is "[…] intended as a formal language to represent social environments in which more than one individual is involved and where players are simply aware of their reciprocal interdependence" (Innocenti & Sbriglia, 2008, p. 1). The theory evolves from its mathematical framework, as it is widely used to analyse any behavioural relations within social sciences as well. Game theory functions as an analytical tool, the aim of which is to enhance the understanding of the way actors interact in a given situation. "The basic assumptions that underlie the theory are that decision-makers pursue well-defined exogenous objectives (they are rational) and take into account their knowledge or expectations of other decision-makers' behaviour (they reason strategically)" (Osborne & Rubinstein, 1994, p. 1). Game theory functions as a system for defining and analysing human behaviour in strategic situations, as it assumes how the analysed actors focus on strategic thinking, equilibrium and optimisation (Ho, Camerer, & Chong, 2008, p. 119). Hereby, the theory embraces the international community's responsibility to protect in terms of its actions.

Game theorists Hervé Moulin argues for the use of game theory in social sciences, due to the relevance of models of strategic considerations within the field.

> "Most contenders of the theory argue that, although the proposed equilibrium concept sounds plausible and give rise to nice interpretations in the examples, no empirical evidence is provided that the players in the [game described, follow] the rationale behind equilibrium concepts" (Moulin, 1986, p. ¶ Game Theory in Social Sciences).

Furthermore, Moulin suggests the use of game theory with the study of structure, development and functioning of human society, as sociologists embraces the theoretical framework of game theory. Game theory searches for the equilibrium concept, which idealises range from cooperative to non-cooperative behaviour (Moulin, 1986, p. ¶ Game Theory in Social Sciences). The theory sheds light on aspects of social interaction, which other theories disregard, but are important for social sciences. By investigating aspects of social interaction, game theory is capable of defining the structures of the

social world, more importantly the structures of the international community's responsibility to protect.

Moulin elaborates on this, describing the theory's core principles. According to Moulin, game theory revolves around the notion of answering following issues: "How will our players exercise their respective strategic freedom? Can we predict the deterministic outcome of a game among rational players? Can we at least eliminate most outcomes as irrational?" (Moulin, 1986, p. ¶ Introduction). However, such issue are challenging to investigate, as each of the issues varies in terms of the given situation and the actors involved. Moulin suggests that the interests of the actors is neither antagonism or identical, making the solution of an issue almost unpredictable. For example, Moulin argues how actors who agree on defeating an extremist in an election, however struggle to agree on which of the other candidates is a better choice (Moulin, 1986, p. ¶ Introduction). This example shows the cooperative and conflictual behaviour within a given situation, by demonstrating two actors agreeing on solving an issue, but still struggling to determine the course of action. The link between the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians and Moulin's clarification of game theory is illuminated by the aforementioned example about cooperation and conflicts. Even though the international community is obliged to act according to the concept of R2P, the member states have different opinions of the implementation of the concept and its use. Game theory defines the cooperative and conflictual behaviour within the international community.

5.3.1. Game Theory in Civil Wars

In addition to the general understanding of game theory, this theoretical approach is employed in civil wars or other conflicts as well. By gathering information on the theory's previous use and perception in civil wars and conflicts, the general idea of the theory becomes clearer, the theory then helps in answering the thesis statement.

Michael W. Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis use game theory in relation to analysing civil war conflicts. Their study pose the question on 'why do some transitions from civil war to civil peace succeed and others fail?', and is determined to employ game theory to provide an answer (Doyle & Sambanis, 2000, p. 35). By utilising the "[…] basic insights from game theory to explain the conditions under which different types of peacekeeping intervention can help promote peacemaking and peacebuilding" (Doyle & Sambanis, 2000, p. 35). Furthermore, by employing game theory "[…]

the interaction between peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding [highlighting] the importance of picking good strategies that develop out of a proper understanding of the conflict at hand" (Doyle & Sambanis, 2000, p. 36). A political strategy will then become evident. This study underlines how UN, throughout several years, have implemented different peacebuilding strategies, to solve various civil wars, complementing the abovementioned basic insights of game theory. "Peacebuilding is about what needs to happen in between" (Doyle & Sambanis, 2000, p. 36). Accordance to the study, game theory predicts the potential outcome of UN's peace strategies in civil wars or other humanitarian crises, by explaining the cause for intervention and political strategy.

In relation to this, a second study by Manus I. Midlarsky underlines how game theory functions as a helpful tool in analysing certain aspects of civil wars, and that "[…] game-theoretic models have improved our ability to access the evidence presented for and against different theories of war" (Morrow, 2000, p. 164). The study stresses how game theory is not be understood as a theory of war, but more or less as a valuable tool to analyse the logic of theories of war (Morrow, 2000, p. 165). "Game theory provides a way to examine the strategic interactions central to many theories of war" (Morrow, 2000, p. 166). The study emphasises how "Game theory is the best-developed tool we have to date for the study of purposive strategy" (Midlarsky, 2000, p. 191), as the theory provides particular advantages in the way wars and strategies are analysed. "The use of game theory is revolutionary in that it forces rigorous development of the logic of theory" (Midlarsky, 2000, p. 191).

Following study both compliments and contradicts the previous studies, as it keeps a critical view at mind in its examination of NATO's conflict with Serbia over Kosovo. This study utilises game theory to investigate the "[…] strategic [behaviour] among interacting and interdependent units" (Quackenbush & Zagare, 2014, p. 98). This study concluded that:

> "[…] it is clear that no definitive game theoretic interpretation of a sequence of real world events such as those that led up to the conflict in Kosovo could be developed. Nonetheless, a small set of critical assumptions and concepts would set any game theoretic treatment of Kosovo apart from that of other approaches […]" (Quackenbush & Zagare, 2014, p. 98).

Furthermore, this study keeps a critical mind-set when analysing the issue at hand, as it is stresses how some game theory models can be "[…] molded to fit the facts or almost any individual event […] (Quackenbush & Zagare, 2014, p. 100)". Despite the critical mind-set, the study stresses how the theoretical approach assist in explaining an individual case, due to "[…] its assumptions about the

motives of the players and other critical components of the model (i.e., the choices available to the players, the set of outcomes, and so on)" (Quackenbush & Zagare, 2014, p. 100).

Summing up, I conclude that game theory provides different points of view when engaging the theory to civil wars. By employing such theoretical approach, it becomes possible to clarify political- or peacekeeping strategies of the issue, whilst explaining the logic of interventions. The abovementioned studies express various opinions on the theory and its use in civil wars. However, one thing they all had in common was their assumption of, how game theory is able to explain the development of war strategies. The strategic behaviour of the analysed actors is illuminated by the theory, as it offers a view of the actors' motives. Game theory works as a tool for analysing the logic of actions in war, by explaining motives, strategies and decisions.

5.3.2. Game Theory in the Syrian Civil War

However, as this research revolves around analysing the implementation of R2P in the Syrian Civil War, this research investigates previous use of the game theory in relation to the Syrian case. For this, various examples present a connection between game theory and the Syrian Civil War, as it this theory is effective in explaining the UN and its member states' strategy (Zollman, 2013). Game theory has been demonstrable and discussed since the beginning of the Syrian Civil War in 2011.

A study, dealing with *prisoner's dilemma* in Syria, an aspect of the game theory, reveals an example of the application of game theory in the Syrian Civil War (Wier & Al Reshoud, 2014). Prisoner's dilemma revolves around the notion of "[…] the individual pursuit of what seems rational produces a collectively self-defeating result" (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, p. 146). This indicates how individual interests can disturb cooperation, even though it might not seem to benefit the involved parties and the result. Weir and Al Reshoud demonstrate that, despite "Most international observers believe there are no suitable solutions to the Syrian civil war. They are wrong" (Wier & Al Reshoud, 2014, p. v). Prisoner's dilemma assists in identifying the motivation force behind each actors' actions in the Syrian Civil War. Within their analysis they reveals an important aspect, namely how "[…] a military stalemate is the optimal circumstance for reaching a lasting peace in Syria" (Wier & Al Reshoud, 2014, p. v). By employing game theory to analyse the crisis in Syria, and to discuss what

the international community has missed in solving the crisis, it is possible to investigate pros and cons for the implementation of R2P in Syria.

A second study stresses its opinion on generally applying game theory to Syria. This study emphasises that, the international actors are supposed to act in accordance to international norms, requiring "[…] that governments occasionally act against their own self-interest" (Zollman, 2013). According to this study, such social norms are fragile within the mind-set of game theory, which becomes an issue for solving crises, as these norms must benefit every party involved in the end. Social norms are divided into the following three groups;

"Some people only follow the norm because they are afraid of being punished for not following the norm. Others want to follow the norm, but also they don't want to be "suckers." They don't want to follow the norm when their opponents won't either. The third group follows the norm whether or not others do, too" (Zollman, 2013).

Although the international actors are expected to follow the social norms, it can be argued how, in accordance to game theory, they do not follow such norms, as the involved parties focus more on other variables.

After exploring several views on the use of game theory in the Syrian Civil War, it is evident how the theory can assist an analysis of the crisis. The various studies suggest how the theoretical approach reveals how two actors might not cooperate, even though cooperation appears to be the most optimal solution. Cooperation can sometimes be uneased by the individual actors' interests and motivation. What the studies prove is it that the theory can identify and outline some of the motivational forces behind the actions made in Syria, simultaneously investigating potential pros and cons for the implementation of R2P. Even though, the studies mention that there are no correct way to determine the actors' motivation, game theory increases the understanding of the actions made. By combining an analysis of the actors' motivation and interests, it is possible to produce a result on the international community's behaviour in the Syrian Civil War. As the abovementioned studies suggest, the actors are expected to follow certain social norms, and if they do not follow such norms, then what are their motivation for this? This is what game theory explores.

5.3.3. Prisoner's Dilemma

Within this presentation of the game theory, an introduction of *prisoner's dilemma* and its use is evident. Prisoner's dilemma investigates the international community's compliance with the core principles of R2P to protect the civilians in Syria. The international community is measured on its willingness to cooperate to follow the concept of R2P. Generally seen, prisoner's dilemma focuses on the cooperative challenges between two actors, actors who might not cooperate even though it would be in their best interest (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, p. 148). Game theory scholars Shaun P. H. Heap and Yanis Varoufakis add to the definition of prisoner's dilemma. Heap and Varoufakis argue how

"[…] in the finitely repeated prisoners' dilemma both players will defect in the last play – the last play is, after all, just a one-shot version of the game and logic of defection for instrumentally rational agents in these circumstances seems impeccable" (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, pp. 168-169).

Heap and Varoufakis stress that prisoner's dilemma stems from an illustration of an interaction in the 1950s, where two robbers are presented with three options. Option one: if both robbers divulges each other, then they will both serve a two year prison sentence. Option two: if only one of the robbers divulges the other, while the other robber remains silent, then the first robber will gain freedom and the other will serve three years in prison. Option three: if both robbers remain silent, then both robbers will serve a one year prison sentence (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, pp. 146-147). The robbers are not able to communicate during this, which complicates their decision. If the robbers chose option three, they would comply with their own agreement of not confessing. However, as the robbers are not able to communicate they fear for the other's choice and chose to betray their agreement, in terms on the individual pay-offs (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, p. 148). Broadly, this is what prisoner's dilemma is about, as this theoretical aspect seeks to define and understand the will to cooperate based on pay-off games. Prisoner's dilemma deals with the issue of trust amongst actors.

Moreover, Heap and Varoufakis argue that, governments at some point face a choice between a 'corrupt' and 'upstanding' exercise for office, in order for their campaign to succeed (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, pp. 153-154). Even though the most profitable choice would be to choose to be upstanding, they sometimes choose the other option.

"Corruption by all reduces the chance of re-election for the government and this undermines the long term returns from holding office […] Nevertheless, each member of the government may act 'corruptly' in the short run because it is the best action […]" (Heap & Varoufakis, 1995, p. 154).

Governments seek to achieve the best possible outcome, despite the use of corruptive manners. According to Heap and Varoufakis, such decisions can result in a shortening the government's period in office, as the individual government attends to its own interests of a corruption strategy at first. This compliments the hypothesis and thesis statement due to its way of investigating the single states within the international community. Prisoner's dilemma demonstrates how the international community acts in accordance with R2P and to its responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians.

5.3.4. Behavioural Game Theory

An additional thought within game theory is relevant, as it analyses actors' strategic behaviour and decisions; *behavioural game theory*. Game theorists scholars Alessandro Innocenti and Patrizia Sbriglia stress how

"Game Theory models have been powerful theoretical instruments to explain the functioning and the evolution of markets, institutions and social groups. They have also captured the nature and the rules of individual decision making in strategic contexts, providing answers and predictions on what is to be expected when individuals interact in […] political games" (Innocenti & Sbriglia, 2008, p. 1).

Innocenti and Sbriglia present a 'new' approach to the theory; behavioural game theory. They stress how "[…] even the most fervent Game Theorist would admit that the rules and the method of standard Game Theory do not suffice to understand real […] contexts" (Innocenti & Sbriglia, 2008, p. 1). Behavioural game theory investigates and questions the international community's strategic behaviour and decisions, concerning the protection of the civilians in the Syria. By analysing upon the strategic behaviour and decisions, it is possible to define to what extent the international community has complied with the concept of R2P. Behavioural game theory contributes to the basic game theory, as it aims to analyse the behavioural and psychological aspects of the actions made in a

given situation, "[…] to identify more robust equilibrium outcomes and more realistic behavioural assumptions" (Innocenti & Sbriglia, 2008, p. 2).

Instead of focusing on the most preferable outcome for the analysed actors, behavioural game theory seeks to enhance the understanding of the actions made. When analysing the international community's behaviour in the Syrian Civil War, it is possible to analyse to what extent it has complied with the framework of R2P, and whether these behavioural decisions have made the international community fulfil its role. Colin F. Camerer, elaborates on behavioural game theory, indicating how it "[…] expands analytical theory by adding emotions, mistakes, limited foresight, doubts about how smart others are, and learning to analytical game theory […]" (Camerer, 2003, p. 3). Behavioural game theory goes even deeper into the actions of the international community. When analysing the international community's responsibility towards the civilians in Syria, behavioural game theory concentrates on the interactive strategic decisions, revealing how the relevant actors "[…] feel about the payoffs other players receive, limited strategic thinking, and learning" (Camerer, 2003, p. 7). Behavioural game theory emphasises the human behaviour in given situations, and illustrates the reason for such behaviour.

According to Camerer, behavioural game theory builds upon basic game theory, as its aim is not to disprove the theoretical framework of game theory, but merely to improve on the already existing knowledge. Behavioural game theory seeks to establish regularity, meaning that it explains results by combining the knowledge from game theory and theories of social utility (Camerer, 2003, pp. 20-21). Thus, Camerer's notion on behavioural game theory defines the international community's behaviour when investigating the chosen statements, by uniting game theory with other theories of social science. Camerer stresses the importance of having a broad set of data/facts/theories when conducting an analysis, as some approaches have almost no connection to the actual behaviour of the actors (Camerer, 2003, p. 21). "Data are particularly important for game theory because there is often more than one equilibrium and how equilibration occurs is not perfect understood" (Camerer, 2003, p. 21).

On the basis of Innocenti, Sbriglia and Camerer's thoughts on behavioural game theory, this theoretical framework is relevant as it provides an in depth analytical tool of the given issue. The theory compliments the basic principles of game theory, whilst adding to the framework of it with a profound approach of analysing the more accurate behaviour of the international community. By doing so, behavioural game theory provides a deeper understanding of analysed statements, in order to define the international community's responsibility to protect in agreement with R2P.

5.3.5. Relevance of the Study

The theoretician views on game theory suggest various ways of conducting an analysis with the assistance of game theory, prisoner's dilemma and behavioural game theory. Each complimenting different aspects of basic game theory. The difference between this research and the theoretician views is that, I wish to explore the strategic behaviour and cooperative aspects within the international community, when analysing its compliance with R2P and protection of the Syrian civilians. Whereas the theoreticians incline towards the view on gains and losses. Furthermore, the studies, on the use of game theory in the Syrian Civil War compliments this research, as each employs the theory to analyse on cooperative and behavioural actions in the crisis. Yet, I distance myself from these studies, as I seek to challenge the international community's actions to protect the Syrian civilians, by examining its behaviour, strategic decisions, social interaction and cooperative challenges or opportunities. I aim to explore the link between the international community's responsibility to protect the civilians in Syria and its compliance with the three core principles of R2P: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild. Therefore, game theory facilitates an investigation of cooperative and conflictual behaviour amongst the UN member states, in their attempt to protect the civilians in Syria. In accordance with R2P, the international community is obliged to follow certain rules and cooperate on solving the crisis in Syria, whilst protecting the civilians exposed to the humanitarian crisis. Notwithstanding the common endorsement of R2P, the international community is not agreeing on the actual implementation of the concept, leading to a conflictual behaviour, in a case where a cooperative solution would increase the chances for ending the crisis. Game theory deepens the understanding of the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians and its compliance with R2P.

6. The Concept of 'Responsibility to Protect'

"The notion of protecting human lives and preventing large scale massacres goes back a long way" (UNRIC, 2017). After the humanitarian crisis in Rwanda in 1994, the international community was determined to develop a concept, to better the protection of populations and minimise humanitarian crises. In 2000, United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG) Kofi Annan, stresses in his Millennium Report his dissatisfaction with the UNSC. He recalls the failures in Rwanda and former Yugoslavia. Annan challenges the international community to do more to prevent such mass atrocities. "If humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to Srebrenica, to gross and systematic violation of human rights that offend every percept of our common humanity?" (UN(2), 2017). A year later, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) presents the term 'Responsibility to Protect', as a "[…] response to Kofi Annan's question of when the international community must intervene for humanitarian purposes" (ICRtoP(1), 2017). Annan endorses R2P in 2004, "[…authorising] military intervention as a last resort, in event of genocide and other large-scale killing, cleansing and serious violations of humanitarian law which sovereign governments have proved powerless of unwilling to prevent" (UN(2), 2017). At the 2005 World Summit, all UN member states gathered to agree on such a political commitment. The 2005 World Summit revolved around the major reforms of the human rights system, where UN member states debated on the idea of R2P (ICRtoP(1), 2017). UN and its member states endorsed the concept of R2P, in order for the international community to "[…] prevent further mass atrocities […] (UNRIC, 2017).

The general idea of R2P was developed to follow these core principles: (1) "The State carries the primary responsibility for the protection of populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing" (ICRtoP(1), 2017). (2) "The international community has a responsibility to assist States in fulfilling this responsibility" (ICRtoP(1), 2017). (3) "The international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes. If a State fails to protect its populations or is in fact the perpetrator of crimes, the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council" (ICRtoP(1), 2017).

R2P holds more than just protecting a state and its population against humanitarian crimes. It also embraces three specific responsibilities: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild (ICISS, 2001, p. XI). The responsibility to prevent entails that the

international community must identify and address both the root of the causes, as well as the direct causes of the conflict, to determine on what level the population affected are in need of assistance. "Prevention is the single most important dimension of the responsibility to protect: prevention options should always be exhausted before intervention is contemplated, and more commitment and resources must be devoted to it" (ICISS, 2001, p. XI). In the second element, the responsibility to react, the international community is "[…] to respond to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures, which may include coercive measures like sanctions and international prosecution, and in extreme cases military intervention" (ICISS, 2001, p. XI). The third element is the responsibility to rebuild, which concerns the international community's responsibility to provide "[…] full assistance with recovery, reconstruction and reconciliation" (ICISS, 2001, p. XI). This is done in order for the intervened state and population to recover after a humanitarian crisis. According to R2P and the unity amongst the UN and its member states, the international community must respond to any humanitarian crisis and resolve the crisis in a peaceful manner, by employing each of the three elements.

In addition to this, the concept encompasses three aspects, referred to as 'Three Pillars of the Responsibility to Protect'. The 'Three Pillars' were introduced to the public in 2008 at UNSG Ban Ki-moon's Berlin Speech, as an attempt to improve the understanding of R2P, by outlining a theoretical framework for the implementation of the concept (ICRtoP(1), 2017). R2P "[…] refers to the obligation of states toward their populations and toward all populations at risk of genocide and other mass atrocity crimes" (GlobalR2P(1), 2017). Hereby, it becomes important to lay down certain guidelines, in order for the international community to respond to the situation correctly. Pillar one describes the individual state's responsibility to protect its population from mass atrocity crimes, such as war crimes, ethnic cleansing, genocide and crimes against humanity (GlobalR2P(1), 2017). Pillar two explains the responsibility of the international community. The international community must encourage or assist the individual state to meet its responsibility to protect its citizens (GlobalR2P(1), 2017). Pillar three emphasises the international community preparation for taking a collective action, if the individual state fails its responsibility. The international community is required only to take a collective action, in agreement with the UN Charter; a founding treaty signed by the UN membership states (GlobalR2P(1), 2017).

However, if military interventions are needed, the international community must follow the precautionary principles of R2P. This is done to ensure that the intervened state does not gain mistrust in the assistance provided by UN. Firstly, the international community must establish the primary

purpose for intervention, as well as an outline of "[…] whatever other motives intervening states may have, must be to halt or avert human suffering" (ICISS, 2001, p. XII). The international community has to ensure that there is a right intention for an intervention. Secondly, only if every non-military prevention or peaceful resolution has failed, then military interventions can be justified. This is considered as the last resort, as the international community must have reasonable grounds for implementing any military intervention (ICISS, 2001, p. XII). Thirdly, the international community must define the proportional means, so "The scale, duration and intensity of the planned military intervention should be the minimum necessary to secure the defined human protection objective" (ICISS, 2001, p. XII). Fourthly, reasonable prospects of a military intervention need identification and a "[…] chance of success in halting or averting the suffering which has justified the intervention, with the consequences of action not likely to be worse than the consequences of inaction" (ICISS, 2001, p. XII).

6.1. The International Community and R2P

The R2P overview presents the general idea of the concept, as well as the ideal implementation of it. However, it is significant to investigate what the international community expresses in regards to R2P in the early stages of the concept's lifespan. This is done to detect early thoughts and opinions about the concept. As the international community agreed on the terms of the concept, its point of view on the concept and its implementation is highly relevant for this research. I include statements by UN, US and Russia, who are parties under investigation, to elaborate on the matter. By including these thoughts in regards to R2P in general, it enhances the understanding of the concept's entity, as well as the understanding of the Syrian Civil War.

UN, who plays a valuable role in the progress and implementation of the concept, supported R2P since its origin. Since the endorsement of the concept at the 2005 World Summit, UN points out the progress and achievement of the concept. "The endorsement of the responsibility to protect was a milestone in transforming international concern about people facing mortal danger into a meaningful response" (Ki-moon, 2015). The general belief within UN in regards to R2P are that

"When a State fails to protect its population from serious international crimes, the international
community is responsible to step in by taking protective action in a collective, timely and

decisive manner. The international community must assume its responsibilities and act in unison to prevent further violations" (ICRtoP(2), 2012).

UNSG Ban Ki-moon "[…] highlights that the efforts at the regional and international levels have contributed towards atrocity prevention, most notably in preventive diplomacy, mediation, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, and women's empowerment" (ICRtoP(3), 2016). However, such progress can only continue if "[…] the international community takes more determined and consistent action to fulfil its Responsibility to Protect" (ICRtoP(3), 2016), or else atrocity crimes will keep on increasing.

Additionally, "The United States strongly supports effective UN human rights machinery" (ICRtoP(4), 2009). US often stresses the need for immediate actions, in order to solve a crisis like the Syrian Civil War. US urges UNSC to continue on solving such crises rapidly. UNSC, UN and its member states "[…] must work quickly and efficiently to repair the damage already done and to do everything within our means to ensure such conflict does not occur again" (ICRtoP(5), 2006). US argued that, the international community must "[…] respond effectively to early warning signs" (ICRtoP(4), 2009). States, who are facing a humanitarian crisis, need the support from the international community "[…] to become fully functioning democratic societies […]" (ICRtoP(5), 2006), without becoming dependent on the assistance from the international community. "The primary responsibility for protecting civilians lies with these nations and their governments and international efforts should only complement government efforts" (ICRtoP(5), 2006). Furthermore, US professes how the concept is evolving and improving; learning from previous mistakes in the attempt of solving a crisis. "The Responsibility to Protect complements principles of international humanitarian and human rights law to which we have all committed. It reflects our collective recognition of past failures to save the innocent from the worst forms of atrocity and abuse" (ICRtoP(4), 2009).

Russia, who also plays an active role in the Syrian Civil War and in the development of R2P, presents some significant statements in regards to R2P and its implementation. Russia shows its support and faith in R2P by stating, "The concept of the responsibility to protect has enormous potential for change. Its development and implementation could significantly shape key trends that will determine the future of the entire system of international relations and the international rule of law" (ICRtoP(6), 2009). Russia's opinion on the implementation of R2P is that, it is the international community's responsibility to provide "[…] comprehensive assistance to States in strengthening their

own capacity and on preventive diplomacy" (ICRtoP(6), 2009). Even though Russia supports R2P, Russia frequently stresses how the primary responsibility to prevent and protect lies in the hands of the individual state. "It is the states that primarily have responsibility for strengthening these preventative mechanisms" (ICRtoP(7), 2011). However, since the establishment of R2P, the Russian opinion towards the concept shifted. Despite the Russian endorsement, Russia expresses significant concerns with the implementation of R2P, as Russia fears for the countries intervened.

> "We warn against taking rash and hasty steps to apply that idea arbitrarily to specific countries and against interpreting it too broadly. That is not only counterproductive, but also dangerous in terms of harnessing international efforts to promote international peace and security" (ICRtoP(6), 2009).

A specific concern with an incorrect implementation of the concept, by, for example, the use of force to implement the 'Three Pillars' of the concept, are often mentioned in regards to the Russian concern. Russia doubts the implementation of such ideas to prevent mass atrocity crimes, as the international community must conform to the international law (ICRtoP(7), 2011).

The international community's thoughts and opinions in regards to R2P varies, complementing the hypothesis of the research. UN and US keep a positive approach to the concept and the implementation of it. They frequently emphasising how the concept worked towards bettering a humanitarian crises. However, UN and US stress that the international community must be responsible for assisting nations in need, by acting immediately in any crisis. They believe that by rapidly acting upon a crisis and implementing R2P, any crisis could be solved, without making the individual nation dependent on the international community's aid. However, Russia has a slightly different opinion. In spite of the Russian support, Russia professes discontent with R2P's implementation. According to Russia, the concept meets adversity, as the concept's core is misunderstood and hereby incorrectly implemented. The fundamental responsibility to protect lies in the hands of the individual nation. As a demonstration of respect for the individual nation's sovereignty, it is only if a nation fails protect that the international community takes action. Seemingly, there are different opinions towards R2P and its use, as each actor presents its argument with pros and cons of the implementation of R2P. Based on this, I can conclude that the general opinion concerning R2P is positive.

6.2. Scholarly Thought on R2P

In order to understand the fascination of further investigating the concept and its implementation, it is significant to examine what scholars express in regards R2P in general. This is relevant, due to the importance of pointing out every aspect of the resolution, both supporting and criticising. A study by Alex J. Bellamy states how the "[…] World leaders unanimously declared that all states have a responsibility to protect their citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity […]" (Bellamy(1), 2009, p. 2). Despite this agreement amongst the world leaders, Bellamy stresses that R2P must not be about having to choose between "[…] doing nothing and sending in the Marines" (Bellamy(1), 2009, p. 3), as "[…] by reducing the frequency of all-or-nothing decisions, more civilians will be better protected […]" (Bellamy(1), 2009, p. 3). As the 'Three Pillars' of R2P are: (I) The protection responsibilities of the state, (II) International assistance and capacity building and (III) Timely and decisive response (GlobalR2P(1), 2017), Bellamy suggests that how it becomes an issue for governments to enforce these regulations if they are 'stuck' with all-or-nothing decisions.

Yet another study expresses its concern with R2P, as it speculates on how such a concept, which so many have already embraced, still meets resistance. "A good part of the answer seems to lie in some serious misunderstanding which continues to exist about the intended scope and limits of the responsibility to protect norm" (Evans, 2008, p. 55). There is no doubt that, within politics and public policy debates, misunderstandings or misinterpretations occur. However, an important concept, like R2P, ought to be understood and implemented in one way. This study stresses that "[…] there are those who play into the hands of the ideological critics by being far too ready to think and talk of the application of R2P only in military terms […] (Evans, 2008, p. 55). "[…] and those who view R2P not in military terms at all but far more broadly, as a way of referring to most of the world's ills, from climate change to HIV/AIDS" (Evans, 2008, p. 55). This study expresses how the understanding of R2P varies, in contrast to what is actually the intended purpose of the concept.

Supporting this belief, a third study, focusing on the prevention of mass atrocity crimes, suggests that R2P is a complicated and "[…] emerging norm" of international law […]" (Williams, Ulbrick, & Worboys, 2012, p. 474). Since 2001 "[…] in the wake of humanitarian tragedies in Bosnia, Rwanda, Kosovo, and Darfur, R2P has been hailed as a way of resolving what one commentator called the "problem from hell" (Williams, Ulbrick, & Worboys, 2012, p. 474). Such views have become a general conception of the concept/norm, as the 'Three Pillars' can be discussed on their meaning and understanding. Hereby creating an enormous confusion of the 'ideal' use of R2P, as it

creates a distinction between those who simplify the concept and those who consider it complex. As the previous studies suggest, the concept of R2P should be understood as a new emerging norm, it is important to understand how there is not a consensus within this norm yet.

However, as I wish to focus on R2P in Syria, it is significant to notice the scholarly views on R2P in regards to the Syrian Civil War. By doing so, it will enhance the understanding of the implementation of the concept in real life. For instance, thoughts by Williams, Ulbrick and Worboys previously emphasise how R2P is a complicated concept/norm, indicating their discontent with R2P in general. Nevertheless, their opinion of an implementation of the concept in Syria indicate a failure too. "The international community has tried to resolve the Syria crisis through diplomatic overtures and sanctions, but its attempts have been unsuccessful" (Williams, Ulbrick, & Worboys, 2012, p. 475). They stress how the general understanding of the concept is bewildering and that the international community is ineffective in implementing the 'Three Pillars' of R2P. Even "[…] commentators have argued that R2P advocates must either "mobilize a coalition of the willing" to intervene in Syria or "let R2P . . . rest in peace"" (Williams, Ulbrick, & Worboys, 2012, p. 476). Williams, Ulbrick and Worboys believe that, instead of solving the crisis in Syria, the crisis merely "[…] highlights the current limitations of the R2P" (Williams, Ulbrick, & Worboys, 2012, p. 476). Williams, Ulbrick and Worboys stress how thousands of people are murdered in Syria, even though UNSC were 'actively' solving the humanitarian crisis. Hence, stressing how "[…] R2P lacks a framework for the limited use of force when the Security Council fails to act" (Williams, Ulbrick, & Worboys, 2012, pp. 474-476).

Yet another study by Mohammed Nuruzzaman reveals a significant opinion on R2P and its implementation in Syria. After the crisis in Libya and the international community's attempt to solve the humanitarian crisis, Nuruzzaman stresses that, "The death of R2P in Syria has been rendered inevitable by NATO's abuses in Libya, and the doctrine is doomed to a bleak future" (Nuruzzaman, 2013, p. 57). The implementation of R2P in Libya has damaged the concept as it is assumed to be "[…] the quick resort to military force, the double commission of war crimes and crimes against humanity, and the morally and ethically unacceptable post-intervention Western policy towards Libya" (Nuruzzaman, 2013, p. 63). Therefore, Nuruzzaman stresses that the Western countries discredit the concept. They 'handed over' the humanitarian crisis in Syria to the international community, solving the crisis with a concept that has already failed once. This argument suggests how previous NATO actions in Libya undermined the concept of R2P, entailing how a particular event changed the perception of the concept and its use.

Furthermore, Alex J. Bellamy supports the aforementioned studies by Williams, Ulbrick, Worboys and Nuruzzaman. His study exemplifies how "[…] the tragedy that has unfolded in Syria since 2011 has been widely touted as a "test case" for R2P" (Bellamy(2), 2015, p. 57), after the disaster seen in Libya. In this study, Bellamy points out how a UN Official wrote in 2012 that "Syria today seems to confirm the concern held by many that the R2P is the emperor's new clothes, unable to deal or cover even the most basic nakedness of an international system unable to deal with mass atrocities" (Bellamy(2), 2015, p. 57).

When looking at the general scholarly thought on R2P, a sceptical attitude towards the concept is evident. The studies indicate how misinterpretations flourish around the concept, making the international community implement R2P incorrectly. Reasoned by the aforementioned critique on R2P and the implementation on it, I seek to keep a critical thought of mind when analysing statements on R2P.

To sum up the scholarly thought on the implementation of R2P in Syria, there are still discontent with the concept. Seemingly, the general understanding of the concept it unclear, making it impossible to agree on a correct use of it. Former studies show how R2P was affected by its previous implementation in Libya, thereby damaging the concepts core values and ideas. Thereby indicating how the concept is deemed to fail in the Syrian conflict as well. The scholarly views on R2P in general and in Syria provide a solid background knowledge to continue an analysis of the given issue.

7. Analysis: The International Community's Responsibility

The following presents the analysis within this research. Here I seek to demonstrate the frame and strategic behaviour of the responsibility to protect to elaborate upon the hypothesis of the research, which indicates a gap within the collective agreement of R2P. A gap that leads the international community to neglect its responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians. It is important to have a greater understanding of whether or not the Syrian civilians are protected, this is what I seek to examine with the following analysis.

The structure of the analysis portrays a division between the civil society and the civic society by dividing the analysis into two sections. Each section addresses the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians and its compliance with R2P. To aid the analysis the theoretical considerations of critical realism, framing and game theory will each dissect said statements by the assistance of analytical tools. The first section analyses statements from relevant actors within the civil society. The civil society represents actors from the NGOs Amnesty International, HRW and secondary interviews with Syrian civilians. The secondary interviews with Syrian civilians include the 'civil voice' to the research, presenting the analysis with statements from people who have personally experienced the crisis. Hereto, the theories of framing and game theory seek to define the civil society's opinions and thoughts on the matter, whilst elaborating on the gap with R2P in context and in reality. The second section analyses statements from countries within the international community US and Russia, as well as statements from UN. In here, framing and game theory seek to demonstrate the international community's behaviour and thoughts on the protection of the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. The main idea of the analysis is to focus on how the actors from the civil society and civic society frame the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrian civilians, whilst defining strategy and behaviour. By doing so, I am able to detect the pattern within the actions of the international community to define the extent of the international community's actions to protect in agreement with R2P.

7.1. The Civil Society

The first part of the analysis investigates statements from Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and secondary interviews with Syrian civilians. As Amnesty International and HRW are actively involved in the Syrian Civil War, they are able to provide an insight into the international community's use of R2P, as well as their conception of the entity of the crisis. Hereby, it gets interesting to exemplify what these NGOs are doing and saying in relation to R2P and the international community's actions in Syria. Furthermore, to enhance the understanding of the international community's responsibility, I investigate statements from Syrian civilians to define what civilians, who are supposed to be protected by the international community, have to say about the given issue.

7.1.1. Amnesty International

The NGO Amnesty International has been involved in the crisis for several years, in which the NGO seeks to campaign for a world where human rights are enjoyed by all (Amnesty International(1), 2017). The NGO has shown its concern with the Syrian Civil War and the actions by the international community, as well as the implementation of R2P. Amnesty International argues for experiencing serious violations of the international humanitarian law by the Assad regime, and US and Russian forces as well. US and Russia have carried out airstrikes and indiscriminate attacks, causing the death of thousands of Syrian civilians (Amnesty International(2), 2017). Thus, making this NGO relevant for the research, as state critique is evident at its homepage.

Amnesty International's Crisis Response Manager Kristyan Benedict elaborates on his view regarding the international community's actions in Syria. In a campaign blog from September 16th 2013 at Amnesty International's homepage, Benedict argues for a decisive action in Syria. According to Benedict, UNSC needs "[…] to take decisive action to reverse the catastrophic human rights and humanitarian crisis in Syria […]. All efforts are needed to influence the content of a proposed UNSC resolution" (Benedict, 2013). Furthermore, Benedict suggests that Russia needs to end the blocking of UNSC's actions and resolutions, in order for Russia to comply with the core principles of R2P. Benedict urges UNSC to act upon this and to employ all efforts "[…] to ensure the US and others do

not retreat in the face of Russian counter offers designed to prevent the UNSC taking responsibility to protect civilians in Syria" (Benedict, 2013). Additionally, Benedict argues for a critical aspect within the Russian interference in Syria, by questioning why Russia assists the Syrian governmental forces by supplying them with weapons. Benedict expresses his concern with the Russian government, as it continues to provide "[…] the Assad regime [with] the tools and cover to kill civilians" (Benedict, 2013). Benedict stresses that UNSC needs to refer the situation in Syria to the International Criminal Court (ICC), as ICC would ensure that those who utilise chemical weapons and other crimes against humanity are held accountable. However, in order to do so Benedict stresses, "[… US] and Russia, need to move beyond their complicity in preventing accountability and let international law take its course, unhindered" (Benedict, 2013).

Within Kristyan Benedict's blog statement, he appeals to UNSC; an appeal for a more active response to the crisis. Considering UNSC as a state and power centric institution, it should be able to conform to the concept of R2P and end the humanitarian crisis in Syria. Benedict frames UNSC to bear the primary responsibility to enforce the R2P regulations and to ensure that the international community complies with these principles. Furthermore, as Benedict questions Russia's actions, he outlines certain aspects of behavioural game theory, given how he express a concern with the Russian behaviour. According to Benedict, the Russian behaviour in the Syrian Civil War shows how a UN member state behaviour complicates the protection of the Syrians. The Russian continuance of blocking sanctions and resolutions by UNSC and the supply of weapons to the Assad regime, demonstrate a breach on R2P's regulations. A violation of the Syrians' human rights disregarded by Russia. Even though Russia argues for conforming to the international law and not providing the Assad regime with weapons (Benedict, 2013), it appears as a strategic decision by Russia. When ensuring a continuation in Russian supplies to the regime forces, by vetoing solutions to end the crisis, it is possible for Russia to empower individual power relations and optimise material profit. An additional statement by Benedict states: "[…] if Russia really are more concerned with international law and not protecting the murderous and corrupt Assad regime then I hope journalists, activists and politicians challenge Putin and his government to explain why they would block such a call" (Benedict, 2013). The Russian game behaviour in the humanitarian crisis does, according to this statement, not comply with the principles of R2P, by framing an absolute failure to protect by a UN member state. Benedict arguments indicate that the Russian veto use conflicts with R2P's notion of how the international community must apply appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect civilians.

In addition to Benedict's statement, Head of Amnesty International's UN Office Sherine Tadros states her dissatisfaction with the international community in a press release from December 1st 2016. Here, Tadros argues how the international community does not meet its responsibility towards the Syrian population. Tadros stresses, "It is becoming clearer every day that the [UNSC] has failed the Syrian people" (Amnesty International(3), 2016). Even though UN and its member states stress how they are actively responding to the humanitarian crisis in Syria, Tadros emphasises the thousands of lives lost, brutally killed by the regime forces. Similar to Benedict's statement, Tadros points out how the international community must respond more rapidly to the crisis and employ diplomatic tools to end the atrocities in Syria. "[…] the inaction we have seen over the past five years is a shameful chapter in the history of the Security Council" (Amnesty International(3), 2016). Within this press release, Tadros urgently calls upon the international community to take immediate action in Syria, requesting UNSC for "[…] an Emergency Special Session of the [UNSG] to demand an end to all unlawful attacks in Aleppo and elsewhere in Syria" (Amnesty International(3), 2016). In order for the international community to end the humanitarian crisis and to regain a good reputation, "[… it] must call for immediate and unhindered humanitarian access so that life-saving aid can reach all those in need" (Amnesty International(3), 2016).

Sherine Tadros frames a failure in the actions by the international community, indicating a failure within the UN system, as the member states are not meeting the endorsed principles of R2P. According to R2P, the international community is obliged to respond to any humanitarian crisis violating the basic human rights. Tadros describes the international community as incapable of actively responding to the humanitarian crisis, in spite of the member states endorsement of R2P. Hereby, Tadros seeks to a higher degree, than Benedict did, to demand an active response by UNSC, with means utilising diplomatic tools to end the humanitarian crisis. Furthermore, Tadros stresses,

> "There have been almost half a million deaths, and each one is a stark rebuke of the Security Council, the supposed guardian of international peace and security, which has allowed a political deadlock to stand in the way of saving lives" (Amnesty International(3), 2016).

In here, Tadros pinpoints that the thousands of lives lost in the crisis are caused by the international community's inactiveness. A powerful statement by Tadros, framing UN and its member states to fail in protecting the Syrian civilians, as well as failing to comply with the core principles of R2P. Simply, the international community fails its responsibility to react timely and decisive to the humanitarian crisis the Syrian civilians face.

7.1.2. Human Rights Watch

Human Rights Watch (HRW), an NGO seeking to protect and defend human rights around the world (HRW(1), 2017), did before the beginning of the Syrian Civil War express its opinion on R2P concept. In December 2006, several years before the crisis in Syria broke out; HRW wrote a letter to UNSG Ban Ki-moon. HRW reminds UN and Ban Ki-moon that their "[…] role in human rights has never been more important" (HRW(2), 2006), as previous actions has stained UN's reputation, since "[…] The UN's greatest challenge and its best known failures involve its response to mass atrocities (HRW(2), 2006).

Following a chemical attack in Syria in 2013, which the Syrian regime was accused of conducting (Barnard & Gordon, 2017), HRW's Executive Director Kenneth Roth, comments on the situation. Roth argues that, instead of solving the crisis with military actions, "[…] the Security Council [must] refer the situation in Syria to [ICC] so that those implicated in serious violations of international law can be appropriately prosecuted, and should implement targeted sanctions against such individuals" (HRW(3), 2013). However, Russia vetoed this resolution in 2014, which would have made it possible for ICC to investigate crimes committed by the Syrian government (Appendix I, p. 7). Within this commentary, Roth further expresses his concern with actions by the international community. Roth accuses UNSC of being unable to help the civilians in Syria, as UNSC is 'paralysed' by the repeated vetoes by Russia (HRW(3), 2013). This statement compliments the previous argument by Kristyan Benedict from Amnesty International, as Benedict demands Russia ending of the continuous blocking of UNSC sanctions.

In addition to this, HRW conducted an interview with HRW's Syria researcher Hadeel al-Shalchi, about the situation in the Syrian town Aleppo. On December the 2nd 2016, al-Shalchi comments on the humanitarian assistance from the international community in Syria. She states how "The last aid delivery was in July [2016] and rations were due to run out in mid-November [2016]" (Daly, 2016). In this interview, al-Shalchi stresses that the humanitarian assistance is insufficient. UN and its member states do not consider what would happen with food supplies if the crisis in Aleppo worsened. Similar to Roth, al-Shalchi calls for an emergency session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA), given that Russia had vetoed the vital UNSC resolution, allowing ICC to intervene in Syria (Appendix I, p. 7). Therefore, in order to assist in solving the crisis in Aleppo and in Syria in general, al-Shalchi requests UNSC to take immediate action. "At least the UN Security Council could refer Syria to

[ICC] if only Russia would allow it – that threat might convince commanders to stop torturing [and] committing war crimes […]" (Daly, 2016).

The overall frame in the commentary by Kenneth Roth underlines a weakness within UNSC, by portraying UNSC as 'paralysed' due to the member states' veto powers. A weakness blaming others for not having solved the humanitarian crisis in Syria. The first frame evident within the interview with Hadeel al-Shalchi, regarding the humanitarian assistance by the international community in Aleppo, demonstrates a strong dissatisfaction with the provided aid. The international community is unaware of the situation's seriousness, thereby failing its responsibility to prevent. Due to the lack of awareness of the severity in Syria, the international community does not identify and address the root of the cause. The second frame of the interview is similar to the frame detected in Roth's statement. Here both call for an immediate response from Russia, in order for ICC to intervene in the Syrian crisis, as well as an active response from UNSC. The Russian veto power use compliments the theoretical consideration of prisoner's dilemma, with a choice between a 'corrupt' and 'upstanding'. Russia endorsed R2P in 2005, a concept condemning all violent attacks on civilians, enabling humanitarian assistance for countries in need, like Syria. R2P stresses

> "The international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes. If a State fails to protect its populations or is in fact the perpetrator of crimes, the international community must be prepared to take stronger measures, including the collective use of force through the UN Security Council" (ICRtoP(1), 2017).

The Assad regime has failed in protecting its civilians, whilst utilising violent actions towards the population. In spite of this and HRW statements addressing the beneficial outcome of involving the ICC, Russia stand by its veto use. Hereby, it is possible to question Russia's choice to veto the resolution, as ICC's interference could assist in solving the crisis, by investigating the mass atrocity crimes committed by the Syrian regime. Once again, the Russian behaviour contradicts the responsibility to react and prevent, as vetoing such resolutions complicates the compliance with the core principles of R2P. Thus, failing to protect the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P.

7.1.3. The Voice of the Syrian Civilians

I present the voice of the Syrian civilians to portray how people, living under the Assad regime, experience the humanitarian crisis and the actions by the international community. When demonstrating statements from civilians in Syria, the research reaches a deeper level of investigation, as those who have experienced the crisis up close present their opinion on the issue.

Syrian refugee Yassin Al-Haj Saleh presents his view on the Syrian crisis and the international community, in a personal interview October 26th 2016. Saleh stresses his concern with the 'leftists'', (referring to the international community) handling of the crisis, as the international community are more obsessed with "[…] establishment of powers of their own countries" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016). According to Saleh, Western states focus more on individual power relations, giving rise to a 'Palestinisation' of the people in Syria. They deal with the civilians "[…] as a people who will be annihilated politically" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016). The international community forgets that it is dealing with people and not historical narratives and ideologies. The Syrian Civil War moreover becomes a depopulated discourse with no regard for humanity. Saleh underlines that he does not expect much from the international community, after seeing how most Western countries side with the Assad regime (Hussain & Hisham, 2016). The international community must realise how the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) is the lesser evil. Assad must be held accountable for his actions of torturing, killing and despising the Syrian people. Saleh comments that he considers the Assad regime to be a sectarian regime, as the regime employs sectarianism as a strategy of control to maintain the control over Syria. "Both [ISIL] and Bashar al-Assad are the extremist powers that must be eradicated in order to build an inclusive Syria" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016). According to Saleh, the Assad regime's slogans for maintaining absolute power over the country says; "Assad or we burn the country" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016).

Further, Saleh emphasises that "[…] there is a corresponding "Israelization" of the Syrian regime. The same way that Israel relies on the [US] for [UNSC] vetoes to protect it internationally, the Syrian regime now relies on vetoes from Russia" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016). According to Saleh, US did not pay attention to the Syrian people, when they negotiated a chemical weapons deal with Russia in 2013. A deal whose aim was to destroy all Syrian chemical weapons (Urquhart, 2013). This deal solely benefited US, Russia, Israel and the Assad regime. Saleh stresses, "The United States helped create a situation in which Syria would be plunged into chaos, but the regime would remain in power" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016). The Western countries never intervened in Syria, but merely

prevented the Assad regime from falling apart, guaranteeing the destruction of the Syrian country. Saleh stresses, some states of the international community have no problem seeing how the regime crushes the Syrian revolution.

> "I don't expect much out of the international left, but I thought they would understand our situation and see us as a people who were struggling against a very despotic, very corrupt, and very sectarian regime. I thought they would see us and side with us" (Hussain & Hisham, 2016).

The main points within the interview with Yassin Al-Haj Saleh, first and foremost, frame the international community as being incapable of protecting the Syrian civilians. The Western states' main interest lies in attending to own power relations. The purpose of Saleh's statement is to evoke attention to the cooperation between the international community and the Assad regime, as he frames this relationship to disregard the civilians' needs. The underlying structures in Saleh's statement, regarding how the Syrian regimes relies on the Russian veto power, demonstrates aspects of behavioural game theory. In spite of conflictual behaviour towards the core principles of R2P, to encourage or assist the Syrian regime to meet its responsibility to protect, Russia's actions ensure that the Russian notion of state sovereignty is respected (Appendix I, p. 8). Hereby, Saleh deems the international community to be focusing on optimisation and self-protection, rather than actively responding to the humanitarian crisis in Syria. The political games displayed in this interview give rise to questioning the international community's strategic behaviour, as lefties respond incorrectly to the crisis. Prioritising politics and ideologies over humanitarian assistance.

A second interview represents the voice of Syrian Majd Lahham from the capitol of Syria, Damascus. Within this short interview by the Levant Report on February 13th 2014, Lahham is primary asked about the plight of Syria's Christians; however, Lahham utters significant opinions towards US's actions in Syria. Lahham argues that sanctions by US and other countries in the West have worsened the situation in Syria, as people are left starving in spite of the international community's attempt to provide humanitarian assistance (Levant Report, 2014). This compliments HRW's Hadeel al-Shalchi argument of the shortage of UN's humanitarian assistance. Lahham stresses that he and others in Damascus do not believe in President Obama's intentions. US is simply incapable of understanding the entity of the situation in Syria. Supplementing HRW's Kristyan Benedict, in his argument of how the Russian and US focus is mainly on their complicity in preventing accountability, Lahham stresses, "The problem is not whether we have a democracy or not. This is a clash between Russia and the United States – and the battlefield is Syria" (Levant Report, 2014).

According to Lahham, US does not consider the interests of the Syrian people when agreeing on resolutions to solve the crisis. "We do believe that when Americans and the Russians reach any possible agreement about the investment of gas and oil in the Middle East region, and especially in the coastal area, everything will be solved" (Levant Report, 2014).

Evident within Lahham's interview is the belief in selfish actions by the international community, US and Russia, especially. Lahham frames the general issue of solving the humanitarian crisis to be the lack of interests in the Syrian civilians, as the general theme of the international community's actions are placed in a pursuit for own interests. Lahham presents the international community's behaviour as an equilibrium of strategic decisions, wherein US and Russia seek to cooperate on solving the crisis, but struggle to agree on the solution. According to Lahham, the Syrian crisis is only solved when US and Russia agree on a solution with material advantages for both. Thus, the responsibility towards the Syrian civilians is replaced with a quest for optimising individual political interests. The latter demonstrates a clear violation of R2P, as the international community is obliged to ensure protection of civilians, whilst disregarding own interests.

Kassem Eid, a Syrian survivor of the 2013 sarin gas attack in Syria, elaborates on his experiences with the international community in an interview on April 5th 2017. This interview was only days after the chemical attack in Syria (BBC, 2017). The attack in Syria in April 2017 is closely connected with the attack in 2013, as civilians and states within the international community accuse the Assad regime of both attacks (Barnard & Gordon, 2017). Within this interview, Eid argues that his most painful memory with the gas attack in 2013 is not the attack itself, but it "[…] was watching President Obama failing to fulfil his promise about [crossing] the red line" (Street, 2017). This 2013 'red line' was Obama's attempt to condemn the Assad regime in utilising chemical weapons. If chemical weapons were used, then the international community had a justified reason for a military intervention in Syria (Appendix I, p. 7). However, according to Eid, US did not take a decisive action after thousands of people died after the Syrian regime used chemical weapons in 2013. Eid stresses, "[Obama] broke his promise […]. And he made a lot of people give up on any kind of help from the international community" (Street, 2017). With encouraging manners, Eid underlines that, the international community must help the civilians and must not "[…] make the same mistake President Obama did" (Street, 2017).

Kassem Eid estimates that US fails in protecting the Syrian population from chemical attacks, in spite of Obama's 'red line'. As US was incapable of upholding this promise, Eid frames this failure as

having played a major role in the Syrian crisis's worsening. An appeal to the international community to do more and to take a decisive action in the Syrian Civil War, implying that the international needs to face its responsibility and improve the humanitarian assistance. Eid compliments Yassin Al-Haj Saleh's statement of US's lack of attention. However, Eid seeks to emphasise the underlying aspects of US's failure, by stressing how Obama broke his promise with the 'red line'. Hereby, US fails to follow the responsibility to react, as use of chemical weapons demands an immediate respond. According to Eid, US's behaviour shows how US is not responding to previous and current chemical attacks by the Syrian regime. Seemingly, something that is in their best interest to do. This illustrates the third movements within game theory, prisoner's dilemma, where US are choosing between the 'corrupt' and 'upstanding' exercise. In this regard, US have chosen the 'corrupt' exercise, by seeking the best possible solution by drawing the 'red line', but not upholding this responsibility due to attending own interests at first. What prisoner's dilemma refers to as corruptive manners.

7.1.4. Summary

The aforementioned investigation and analysis of statements from Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and voices from Syrian civilians show a number of shared opinions and thoughts, regarding the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. The universal characteristic found in all of the statements displays a strong dissatisfaction with the international community's actions, as Russia and US have shown a greater interest in pursuing individual goals. The international community must cooperate in agreement with R2P to solve the crisis in Syria. Regardless of the many actions made in Syria, the crisis continues and the international community has not fulfilled its obligation. Furthermore, both Amnesty International and HRW stress how the primary responsibility lies in the hands of the UN and UNSC.

7.2. The Civic Society

The previous part of the analysis demonstrated various opinions towards actions by UN, US and Russia. Therefore, in order to conduct a proper analysis, it is significant to include the voices from the three investigated/accused member states, as they portray their actions differently. The following analysis defines the voices from relevant actors within the international community, commenting on their responsibility towards the Syrian population. These actors are UN, US and Russia.

7.2.1. United Nations

Former UNSG Ban Ki-moon comments on the international community's responsibility, in a meeting with UNSC September 21st 2016. With his speech, Ki-moon underlines the international community's collective failure in ending the Syrian Civil War, a failure that "[…] should haunt the entire Security Council" (UN(4), 2016). Ki-moon stresses that he is certain that the international community can make a difference, since previous actions have proven successful. However, generally seen, the responds of the international community to the crisis are shameful, "[…] the Syrian tragedy shames us all" (UN(4), 2016) Ki-moon adds. According to Ki-moon, the international community "[… is] at a make-or-break moment" (UN(4), 2016). Complimenting Amnesty International's Sherine Tadros, Ki-moon emphasises that, in order to solve the crisis in Syria and for the international community to modify its shameful reputation, a more decisive action by the member states is required. Ki-moon stresses,

> "I challenge everyone to use their influence now to restore a cessation of hostilities, enable humanitarian assistance everywhere it is needed and support the United Nations in charting a political path for the Syrians to negotiate a way out of the hell in which they are trapped. You have now no higher responsibility in your service as members of the United Nations Security Council" (UN(4), 2016).

UNSG Ban Ki-moon evaluates that the international community's behaviour and actions in Syria fails in protecting the Syrians. Ki-moon frames the member states' responds to the crisis as shameful, given how the crisis is still worsening. Even though Ki-moon argues that, some sanctions and resolutions have proven successful, the international community needs to agree on a more decisive

solution, in order to fulfil its responsibility towards the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. In this speech, behavioural game theory compliments the argument of the failure within the international community's behaviour, as previous parts in the analyses demonstrate how the behaviour is affected by the pursuit of individual interests. Due to Ki-moon's frame of the UN member states' mistakes and the international community's previous strategic decisions, it is possible to argue for an increased focus on equilibrium and optimisation, before responding to humanitarian crisis in Syria with R2P procedures.

Shortly after UNSG Ki-moon's speech, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator Stephen O'Brien, from the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), professes his concern with the development of the crisis November 30th 2016 to the UNSC. O'Brien argues how UNOCHA, several times, requested "[…] the Security Council and the international community [to] come together to ensure civilians and civilian infrastructure is protected in accordance with basic humanity and international obligations […] (UNOCHA, 2016). In spite of UNOCHA's call, O'Brien argues that UNSC and international community ignores these requests. O'Brien expresses a deep concern with the protection of reaching the Government-controlled areas, where civilians are "[…] facing arbitrary arrests and detention or worse" (UNOCHA, 2016). O'Brien fears for the protection of the civilians and reminds the international community about its responsibility to protect. In order for UNSC and the international community to comply with the core principles of R2P, O'Brien calls on all involved parties to adhere and respect the endorsed international humanitarian law. O'Brien "[… reminds] all parties to the conflict that civilians and those *hors de combat* [outside the fight] must be respected and protected at all times" (UNOCHA, 2016).

In agreement with the previous statement by Ban Ki-Moon, Stephen O'Brien frames a shortage with the international community's respond to the crisis, by the lack of attention to humanitarian requests. UNSC and the international community ignore several requests by UNOCHA for a humanitarian response to the Syrian crisis, demonstrating a clear violation of the core principles of R2P. Here the concept "[…] refers to the obligation of states toward their populations and toward all populations at risk of genocide and other mass atrocity crimes" (GlobalR2P(1), 2017). Therefore, when the international community is ignoring set requests, it is not fulfilling its role of protecting the civilians affected by a humanitarian crisis. Thus, O'Brien's statement frames a deep concern with the political development in the Syrian Civil War.

UN Special Envoy for Syria Staffan de Mistura expresses his opinion on one specific action made in Syria; the Astana ceasefire. The Astana ceasefire represents the Russian, Turkish and Iranian agreement to monitor and improve the fragile ceasefire in Syria, also referred to as UNSC Resolution 2254 (UNOG, 2017). In a press remark from April 5th 2017, Mistura compliments the Astana ceasefire and the effort made by the three countries of the international community. Mistura thanks "[…] Iran, the Russian Federation and Turkey, for their determination to build on their achievements of last month [March 2017] when they assumed the responsibility of guarantors of a ceasefire regime in Syria" (UNOG, 2017). Mistura comments that UN stands ready to assist in strengthening the quality of the ceasefire, as a ceasefire can improve the international community's fight against terror and grant unimpeded humanitarian access (UNOG, 2017). However, in spite of the complimentary comments to the Astana ceasefire, Mistura stresses the importance of cooperation among the UN member states.

> "We cannot allow another ceasefire to dissolve because of a lack of a political process. Now is the time for the international community in all its dimensions to come together and support one integrated political negotiating process, as provided for in SCR 2254" (UNOG, 2017).

Within this press remark, Staffan de Mistura welcomes the Astana ceasefire initiative by Russia, Iran and Turkey, framing the three countries as actively responding to the humanitarian crisis. A respond facilitating an improvement of the international community's work in Syria. Furthermore, this initiative compliments R2P, as the concept values peaceful responses to solve a humanitarian crisis. When Mistura stresses this satisfaction with the Russian, Iranian and Turkish effort, he frames this initiative to fulfil the responsibility towards the Syrian civilians, as "The only way for peace to come to Syria is through a political solution brought about through intra-Syrian negotiations under the aegis the UN" (UNOG, 2017). However, in order for the rest of the international community to fulfil its role in the Syrian Civil War, the member states must reach a common political understanding, as lack of political process can dissolve the resolution. Thus, the member states need to set their individual political strategies and behaviour aside for the ceasefire to succeed. Moreover, this needs to be done in order to conform to the core principles of R2P.

7.2.2. United States

Supplementing the statements from UN, former US Secretary of State John Kerry expresses his concern with the Syrian crisis, in a speech at a UNSC meeting September 21st 2016. Kerry emphasises how all parties involved in the Syrian conflict, including Russia, seek a united Syria, "[…] respecting the rights of all people, in which the people of Syria can choose their leadership" (Walker, 2016). However, Kerry states that the international community is "[…] proving woefully inadequate in [its] ability to be able to get to the table and have that conversation and make it happen" (Walker, 2016). Kerry urges every member of the international community to be focused on such consequences "[…] and not engage in world games that duck the responsibility or avoid the choices that [UNSC] has in front of it […]" (Walker, 2016). Furthermore, Kerry questions the Russian involvement in the Syrian crisis, as he accuses Russia of being in a 'parallel universe' (Walker, 2016). Kerry argues that "There are only two countries that have airplanes that are flying during the night or flying at all in that particular area – Russia and Syria" (Walker, 2016), after reported airstrikes targeting a medical facility in Syria. According to Kerry, these attacks obstruct the international community's efforts to bring peace to Syria. He raises the question of whether "[…] Russia and the Assad regime can or will live up to the obligations that they agreed on […]" (Walker, 2016).

John Kerry aims to call upon actions by the international community, by framing the inadequate ability to end the crisis. However, the main goal with Kerry's speech is the demonstration of Russia's inability to uphold its obligations to protect the Syrian civilians. Kerry defines airstrikes to be by Russian forces, overruling Russian statements stressing their innocence (Walker, 2016). According to R2P, such airstrikes contradicts the core principles of the concept, as R2P only permits peaceful means to solve the crisis. Military interventions, comprising air strikes, are exclusively a last resort to solve a humanitarian crisis. With referral to behavioural game theory, Kerry aims to reduce the faith in Russia by indirectly accusing Russia of ignoring the principles of R2P. By displaying such behaviour, it is notable to question US's intention behind this message. It could be a strategic decision to patronise another member state, facilitating an opportunity to reduce the equilibrium within the international community, enabling a power enhancement for US.

In relation to the crisis in Syria and the international community's response, US Secretary of State Rex Tillerson utters his opinion April 6th 2017. Tillerson stresses his concern with the chemical attack in Syria in the beginning of April 2017 committed by the Syrian regime (Tillerson, 2017). Despite Tillerson's utterance that the Assad regime carried out these chemical attacks, he emphasises a more

interesting point of view, by stressing the Russian responsibility in relation to UNSC Resolution 2118 (Tillerson, 2017). The resolution enabled the destruction of all of Syria's chemical weapons under the supervision of Russia (Appendix I, p. 7). According to Tillerson, "Russia would locate these weapons, they would secure the weapons, and they would destroy the weapons, and that they would act as the guarantor that the weapons would no longer be present in Syria" (Tillerson, 2017). However, Tillerson argues that the Russian Government has not meet its responsibility to remove chemical weapons from the Assad regime. "Clearly, Russia has failed in its responsibility to deliver on that commitment from 2013, so either Russia has been complicit or Russia has been simply incompetent in its ability to deliver on its end of that agreement" (Tillerson, 2017). Tillerson contradicts UN's Staffan de Mistura's belief, as Mistura commended Russia's role and responses in the crisis. Nevertheless, Tillerson recognises that the international community has failed in responding to these attacks by the Syrian regime, demanding decisive actions from the international community. Tillerson underlines, in order for not 'normalising' the use of chemical weapons, the international community must take action, "[…] to make clear that the use of chemical weapons continues to be a violation of international norms" (Tillerson, 2017).

The overall frame within Tillerson's statements relies on the Russian obligation to remove all chemical weapons. Tillerson directly frames and accuses the Russian Government, by stressing the failure of upholding the promised responsibility towards the other UN member states and the Syrian civilians. It is evident that Tillerson mainly focuses on the Russian responsibility, to demonstrate a lack of trust in the Russian sanctions. Tillerson indicates that Russia fails in complying with R2P, as Russia neglects the responsibility to protect. In regards to the chemical attack in Syria, Tillerson demonstrates a critical view on the responses by the international community; since the Assad regime was able to, once again, carry out such violent attacks on civilians. Hence, the international community fails its responsibility to react.

President of US, Donald Trump, comments on the chemical attacks in Syria in brief statement April 7th 2017, shortly after ordering a missile strike on an airbase in Syria. Trump states that "There can be no dispute that Syria used banned chemical weapons, violated its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention and ignored the urging of the UN Security Council" (Backwith, 2017). A clear violation of Resolution 2118. Within Trump's statement, he calls for all 'civilised' nations to join, in order to end the crisis in Syria, especially after the chemical weapons use. However, Trump questions the previous actions by the international community in Syria. He states, "Years of previous attempts at changing Assad's behaviour have all failed and failed very dramatically"

(Backwith, 2017). According to Trump's statement, none of the previous sanctions and resolutions have bettered the situation in Syria, as "[…] the refugee crisis continues to deepen and the region continuous to destabilise, threatening the United States and its allies" (Backwith, 2017). Furthermore, Trump emphasises the importance of securing the national interests in US, therefore launching airstrikes in Syria to diminish the chances for endangering the civilians in US. Trump stresses, "It is in this vital national security interest of the United States to prevent and deter the spread and use of deadly chemical weapons" (Backwith, 2017).

In his statement, Donald Trump suggests that the international community needs to do more to solve the crisis in Syria, framing the previous actions as deficient. Trump frames the main issue of the crisis as a lack of timely response from actors within the international community, with an underlying belief in inadequate actions by the previous US Government. Furthermore, within Trump's statement regarding the protection of national security interest, he demonstrates certain aspects complimenting game theory. Game theory suggests that the basic assumptions of the theory underlie that actors pursue well-defined exogenous objectives, whilst taking their knowledge or expectations of other actors' behaviour into account (Osborne & Rubinstein, 1994, p. 1). Trump displays the pursuit of national interests before assisting the civilians in the Syrian Civil War. A strategic decision conflicting with the core principles of R2P. This strategic behaviour further compliments aspects within behavioural game theory, as Trump's statement indicates a prioritising of individual interests within a humanitarian crisis. Behavioural game theory suggests that his action to launch missile strikes is built on emotions towards the previous US Government, by exemplifying an immediate response to the chemical attacks in Syria.

7.2.3. Russia

Already in the first two years of the Syrian Civil War, Russian President Vladimir Putin stresses his concern with a US involvement. September 11th 2013, Putin spoke directly to the American people and political leaders, elaborating on his view of the development of the crisis and the 'insufficient communication' between the Russian and American societies (Putin, 2013). Within his speech, Putin stresses how a potential strike by US would potentially endanger spreading the Syrian conflict. Putin

argues that several countries and political and religious leaders all agree in condemning this potential strike, as it would worsen the crisis. Putin emphasises how

"A strike would increase violence and unleash a new wave of terrorism. It could undermine multilateral efforts to resolve the Iranian nuclear problem and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and further destabilize the Middle East and North Africa. It could throw the entire system of international law and order out of balance" (Putin, 2013).

In addition to this, Putin stresses that many people do not experience US as a model for democracy, but merely as a brutal force professing that "[… you are] either with us or against us" (Putin, 2013). Putin is alarmed by this, stressing how military interventions seemingly have become a more common practice for US (Putin, 2013). Furthermore, Putin comments on the many allegations about Russia's intentions in the Syrian crisis. Putin stresses that Russia is "[…] not protecting the Syrian government, but the international law" (Putin, 2013), which seeks to respect the single state's sovereignty and protect civilians in a humanitarian crisis.

The main purpose with Vladimir Putin's speech demonstrates an early concern with US's involvement in Syria. Putin aims to frame US's reputation as untrustworthy, as he stresses how several relevant actors have expressed their worry with a spread of the humanitarian crisis, in the case of an American intervention. According to R2P, the international community must solely utilise military interventions in extreme cases. Thus, Putin's allegation of an American 'normalisation' of military interventions contravenes R2P. By stressing how military interventions have become a 'commonplace' for US and suggesting a dictatorial plan of action by US, Putin incites the question of democratic cooperation. Hereto, Putin stresses following: "[…] we were also allies once, and defeated the Nazis together" (Putin, 2013). According to behavioural game theory, this exemplifies a strategic decision by Russia, as Russia creates a bad reputation for US, whilst complimenting own actions as respectful towards the international law. By doing so, Putin is able to illustrate the Russian behaviour as superior, while simultaneously emphasising an international concern with the US as a dictatorial actor.

Similar to Vladimir Putin's speech, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov comments on the crisis in Syria and his concern with US, in an interview by Amanpour program on CNN International October 12th 2016. The interview primary revolves around ending the fighting in the Syrian town Aleppo and separating the moderates from the terror organisation Al-Nusra Front (Nusra) (Russian Embassy(1), 2016). Within this interview, Lavrov argues for "[…] total inability of the United States

and those who are also members of the coalition led by the Americans to separate the moderates from Nusra" (Russian Embassy(1), 2016). According to Lavrov, US made a promise of separating the Nusra moderates within two weeks. However, Lavrov argues that this never happened. To the question of whether or not he suggests that US has an interest in empowering the Islamic terrorists, Lavrov answers:

> "[…] al-Qaeda was born from the American support of mujahideens [a struggling person with a praiseworthy aim] in Afghanistan. By the way, Nusra is another manifestation of al-Qaeda, according to the American list, according to the analysts. And ISIL was born after the American invasion of Iraq […]" (Russian Embassy(1), 2016).

Lavrov argues that he does not suspect US in encouraging terrorism, but their actions regarding separating the Nusra moderates is suspicious. Moreover, Lavrov underlines how previous US promises have disappointed, as "The violation of the [US-Russia] ceasefire happened by the American coalition, who attacked the Syrian government, which they were not supposed to and which they said would never plan" (Russian Embassy(1), 2016). According to Lavrov, the US disrespected a common ceasefire agreement.

Sergey Lavrov aims to frame US as incapable of resolving vital aspects of the humanitarian crisis in Syria, as they do not follow their own promises of separating Nusra moderators and respecting a UN-Russia endorsed ceasefire. However, the most striking comment Lavrov makes is his comparison of previous American intervention and the uprising of terrorist movements. Here, Lavrov indirectly frames US's actions of provoking the current situation in Syria, in such a way that regional groups have risen. Central to Lavrov's notion is the continuance in the disappointing US behaviour, a behaviour regardless of the humanitarian situation. In general, Lavrov's interview frames the US actions as worsening the crisis. The unaccented frame within Lavrov's interview is that US actions to protect the Syrian civilians have failed, since an increase in terrorist groups is detected after American interventions. Hence, an underlying allegation of US not complying with R2P.

In response to President Trump's airstrikes against Syrian regime forces, after the chemical gas attack on the Syrian civilians, the Russian Foreign Ministry announced its view April 7th 2017. Within this statement, the Russian Foreign Ministry expresses its concern with the 'irresponsible' behaviour, as "[…] US opted for a show of force, for military action against a country fighting international terrorism without taking the trouble to get the facts straight" (Russian Embassy(2), 2017). The Russian Foreign Ministry argues that it is not the first time the international community has

experienced such 'irresponsible' behaviour from US, behaviour resulting in threatening international security. According to Russia, the recent US's airstrikes demonstrate a clear violation of the international law, as US acts without consent from UNSC (Russian Embassy(2), 2017). In agreement with Sergey Lavrov, the Russian Foreign Ministry argues; "The US refuses to believe the evidence provided by certified documents confirming the use of chemical weapons by terrorists in Aleppo. In doing so, the US is abetting international terrorism and making it stronger" (Russian Embassy(2), 2017). The Russian Foreign Ministry calls upon UNSC to arrange an emergency meeting to discuss US's response to the chemical attacks. Furthermore, the Russian Foreign Ministry emphasises that the recent US military response is merely "[…] an attempt to divert attention from the situation in Mosul, where the campaign carried out among others by US-led coalition has resulted in hundreds of civilian casualties and an escalating humanitarian disaster" (Russian Embassy(2), 2017).

The Russian Foreign Ministry echoes significant opinions towards US's response to the crisis in Syria. The US airstrikes are framed as an irresponsible act with no regard to international law and UNSC. However, it demonstrates a notable comment within its statement, as it accuses US of acting to divert attention from another situation, in which a US-led campaign resulted in a worsening of a humanitarian crisis. Thus indicating that US act on optimising individual defeat, by diverting attention away from previous failure and directing it towards an action of power. This compliments Lavrov's argument of how American interventions increase the amount of terrorist organisations. The latter supports the theoretical aspect of prisoner's dilemma, as the Russian Foreign Ministry frames the US behaviour 'corrupt', as it does not compliment the international law and the core principles of R2P. In this regard, US seeks to achieve the best possible outcome, by demonstrating an immediate response to the chemical attack in Syria, despite the accused use of corruptive manners, when trying to cover up previous mistakes. US attend to own personal interests by means of corruptive strategies before complying with the concept of R2P. The Russian Foreign Ministry demonstrates a deep concern with the US's actions in Syria, as these actions do not comply with international law.

7.2.4. Summary

In summary, the second part of the analysis shows a major critique with UN, US and Russian responses to the humanitarian crisis. Critique that stems from various representatives from UN, US and Russia. Different actors within the UN, UNSG Ban Ki-moon and Stephen O'Brien, illustrates their concern with UN and the international community, as they argued for a lack of attention towards R2P procedures. Whereas US and Russia primarily focus on criticising each other's responses to the crisis, suggesting other motivational factors for intervening, such as attending to own personal interests by pursuing individual goals. Overall, each of the analysed statements within this section portray a disbelief towards the commitment of the core principles of R2P.

8. Discussion

The research's identification of frames and game theoretical aspects, within the narratives of the international community's responsibility towards the Syrian civilians, have so far demonstrated various opinions on the international community's response to the crisis in Syria. The civil society demonstrates a strong dissatisfaction with the international community and its compliance with R2P. Amnesty International, HRW and selected Syrian civilians argue that the international community has not met its responsibility. Seemingly, the international community act based on optimising individual power relations and interests, whilst providing insufficient humanitarian assistance to the crisis-stricken Syrians. The civic society focuses more on criticising each other's actions in Syria. US and Russia illustrate powerful frames of the other state's incapability, contemporary with validating own actions. Whereas, UN argues for an overall concern with the international community's lack of attention towards R2P and the protection of the Syrian civilians.

To complete a thorough investigation of the international community's responsibility to protect the Syrians in agreement with R2P, I seek to discuss why the 'ideal' R2P does not fit the 'actual' R2P. In other words, by discussing and comparing the analytical results with the fundamental principles of R2P, it is possible to define the international community's ulterior motives for its actions and clarify its compliance with R2P. The 'ideal' R2P is the fundamental principles of the concept, described in section 6 'The Concept of 'Responsibility to Protect'. This section demonstrates the endorsed core principles of the concept, to show what the international community agrees on. The analysis reveals frames of the 'actual' R2P, by examining the international community's response and compliance with the concept. The analysis shows how the structures of the framed actions compliment the game theorist approach, wherein the actions are consistent with strategic decisions, behavioural relations and power equilibrium. Therefore, I posit that the 'actual' R2P and its use does not fit the 'ideal' R2P. This enables a discussion of what has gone wrong since the international community focuses more on establishing individual power relations, rather than fulfilling its role of protecting the Syrian civilians. By doing so, I seek to detect whether there are any visible patterns to explain this gap between the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P. Thereafter, proposing suggestion to overcome this gap, so that the international community can meet its responsibility to protect in the future. In order to conduct this discussion, following compares and discusses the eight semi-conclusions reflecting the eight R2P cases displayed in section 6.1 and 6.2, wherein UN, US, Russia and scholarly thoughts express their opinions concerning the fundamental principles of R2P.

8.1. The 'Ideal' and the 'Actual' R2P

In section 6.1, UN expresses its view on R2P in general. A view that displays UN's support of the concept. UN highly endorses R2P and considers the concept a 'milestone' in transforming the international concern into a timely and decisive response. Yet, the analysed statement by Stephen O'Brien stresses how UNSC continuously ignores requests, to promote the core principles of R2P to protect the Syrian civilians. O'Brien argues that UNSC should come together, as he fears for the protection of the civilians, indicating that, in spite of UN's endorsement of R2P, UN does not comply with the 'ideal' R2P. Furthermore, UNSG Ban Ki-moon argues for the concept's progress and achievements, enabling R2P to provide a fundamental framework for the international community to base its actions on, when solving a humanitarian crisis. Ki-moon's general opinion on the concept highlights the international community's actions as having contributed to preventing mass atrocity crimes. However, Ki-moon contradicts his own belief, as he, in his analysed statement, stresses his discontent with the international community's responsibility to protect in agreement with R2P. In the analysis, Ki-moon emphasises that the international community is facing a 'make-or-break' moment, demonstrating how UN's previous confidence in the concept contradicts the analysed perspective.

US also demonstrates a positive attitude towards the concept in section 6.1. US's general opinion on R2P is that the concept is evolving towards bettering the crisis in Syria. However, in order to solve the crisis with the assistance of R2P, the international community must act responsibly and timely to any crisis. Here, US compliments the concept for evolving and improving, as the international community learns from previous mistakes. Mistakes like the implementation of R2P in Libya. The latter contradicts the analysed statement by John Kerry, as he stresses how the international community, especially Russia, is failing to protect the Syrian civilians, in agreement with R2P. Kerry argues that Russia is not acting responsible in the Syrian crisis, as he blames Russia for bombing a medical facility, obstructing the protection of civilians. Furthermore, the analysed statement by Rex Tillerson underlines how the international community fails in responding to the crisis in Syria. US's general opinion towards the international community's responsibility is that, the involved parties must respond effectively and ensure that such conflict does not happen again. However, the analysed US statements conclude differently. The international community is not able to fulfil its responsibility and to provide a timely response. Despite this contradicting behaviour, one analysed US statement compliments the general opinion on how UN member states must act responsible and timely to any threat. US President Donald Trump demonstrates a decisive response to the crisis in Syria, when he

initiates US airstrikes against the Syrian regime, after the chemical gas attack. Trump's statement compliments US's general opinion on R2P, as Trump demonstrates a timely and efficient response, to show that US grants protection to the civilians in a humanitarian crisis. Noteworthy in this regard is that, the US airstrikes can be discussed on its intention for either protecting the Syrian civilians or securing national interests and power equilibrium.

Section 6.1 also presents the Russian support and faith in the concept, by stressing how R2P has an enormous potential for changing the process of the Syrian crisis. However, the Russian confidence in R2P shifted, as Russia warns against incorrect implementations of R2P. The general Russian opinion on R2P is that, the core of the concept is misunderstood and incorrectly implemented. For example, implementing the 'Three Pillars' of the concept with use of military force. The latter compliments the analysed statement by Russian President Vladimir Putin, as Putin argues how the actions by US are merely an act of brutal force and not an act to protect Syrian civilians. According to the general Russian opinion, the international community's responsibility is to provide comprehensive assistance to the affected civilians and with respect to the Syrian sovereignty. Yet, the analysed statement by Sergey Lavrov argues that US's actions contradict with the 'ideal' R2P, of providing comprehensive assistance in Syria. Lavrov stresses that, in spite of several US's promises, US is incapable of upholding its promises and responsibility. In addition to this, Putin's statement confirms this belief, as Putin suggests that US does not 'get the facts straight' before utilising military forces in the Syrian Civil War. The shift in Russia's general opinion on R2P confirms the analysed Russian statements, as the statements show a sceptical point of view towards the actions made by the international community, whilst questioning the compliance with the 'ideal' R2P.

The scholarly thoughts, in section 6.2, previously demonstrated a sceptical attitude towards R2P, as these studies argue how misinterpretations flourish around the concept, consequently complicating the general use and implementation of R2P. The overall argument with these five scholarly studies is that, the international community is not able to implement the concept fully. The general understanding of R2P is unclear, deeming the implementation of the concept to fail in Syria. Underlying structures of the scholarly studies estimate that, the international community fails in protecting the Syrian civilians. The scholarly views on the concept compliment the analysed statements in both sections of the analysis. As discovered in the analysis of the civil society, Sherine Tadros from Amnesty International argues that, the international community does not meet its responsibility to protect, failing to protect the Syrian civilians. The international community damages its reputation by its deviation from the core principles of the concept. Furthermore, the study by Alex

J. Bellamy advocates that the international community is unable to follow the 'Three Pillars' of R2P, which suggest international humanitarian assistance and timely and decisive response by the UN member states. Bellamy's study confirms the analysed statement by Hadeel al-Shalchi, as al-Shalchi stresses her concern with the insufficient humanitarian assistance by the international community, emphasising how the member states do not conform to 'Three Pillars' of R2P. The conclusion of the scholarly views moreover compliment Ban Ki-moon's statements, in which he underlines the international community's 'shameful' behaviour. Ki-moon stresses the international community's failure in taking a decisive action in Syria, which compliments Bellamy's previous concern.

8.2. The Gap

The discussed semi-conclusions shows a gap between the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P. As presented in section 6, the 'ideal' R2P focuses on the collective international responsibility to protect civilians, whose state fails in doing so. Whereas the 'actual' R2P demonstrates conflictual behaviour in the utilisation of the concept. UN's 'ideal' concept strictly emphasises that, the international community must only authorise military interventions as a last resort, if humanitarian interventions are unsuccessful. When considering the analysed statements it is possible to discuss that, based on the major critique the international community has received on its 'insufficient' humanitarian assistance, the international community has frequently sought to the last resort of military interventions. The international community's justification for military interventions, such a US's recent airstrikes in Syria, is a realisation of the member states' failure to conform to the 'ideal' core principles of R2P.

The 'ideal' and 'actual' use of R2P mainly confirms Russia's previous concern with an incorrect implementation of the concept. Within section 6.1 Russia expresses is concern with R2P. Russia believes that the general understanding and implementation varies, because the UN member states have different interpretations of how to understand the core principles of the concept. Thus, the Russian concern with the concept proves correct, as the analysis and discussion together demonstrate how the 'ideal' R2P does not fit with the 'actual' R2P. The pattern detected within the discussed semi-conclusions reveals that the international community's actions has, more or less, contradicted the 'ideal' use of R2P. The general opinion articulates that UN, US and Russia tend to ignore the consistent calls for humanitarian assistance. Instead of focusing on preventing mass atrocities and

crimes against humanity, whilst assisting the Syrian government to fulfil its responsibility to protect, the analysed actors place their focus elsewhere; individual power optimisation and political disagreements.

Based on this discussion, I conclude that the 'ideal' R2P does not fit the 'actual' R2P, as UN, US and Russia prove unsuccessful in their responsibility to prevent, responsibility to react and responsibility to rebuild during the crisis in Syria. The 'actual' use illustrates how the international community focuses more on individual relations and the establishment of power in Syria. Rather than complying with the 'ideal' R2P, requiring the international community to act in agreement with global commitment of protecting civilians. The international community has not conformed to the three core responsibilities of R2P, thereby failing to protect the civilians in Syria. The various comprehensions and utilisations of the concept complicate the 'ideal' implementation of R2P.

8.3. Reforming R2P

I propose a reforming of R2P, in order for the international community to fulfil its role of protecting the Syrian civilians. I seek to outline a 'new' alternative to the concept, as the analysis and discussion demonstrate a gap between the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P. In order for the international community to improve its reputation in Syria and to better the protection of the civilians in agreement with R2P, I recommend that the UN and its member states further explore the Brazilian normative evolution of R2P, with the proposal of 'Responsibility while Protecting' (RwP). Given how the international community sought to the use of military interventions, the Brazilian proposal of "RwP [articulates] the need for responsible means of protection, particularly when military force is used in the name of collective security and humanitarianism" (Tourinho, Stuenkel, & Brockmeier, 2015, p. 134). RwP seeks to improve the effectiveness of R2P, by carefully considering the methods and implementation of the 'ideal' concept. Even though the 'ideal' R2P argues how military interventions are a last resort, the international community utilised military forces in the Syrian Civil War. Facing the reality and the 'actual' use of R2P, RwP assists in the justification and reasoning of such military interventions. "RwP [assists in making] the political debate about the relative utility of military force for protections purposes more clear and nuanced" (Tourinho, Stuenkel, & Brockmeier, 2015, p. 135).

I do not consider the Brazilian proposal as a concept overruling the core principles of R2P. RwP functions as a "[…] contribution to organise the discussion about the use of force and collective security regarding R2P in a clearer way […]" (Tourinho, Stuenkel, & Brockmeier, 2015, p. 141). In order words, RwP serves as a 'code of conduct' for R2P, as it develops 'guidelines' and 'parameters' for optimising the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P. Instead of questioning the merits of R2P, the Brazilian proposal of RwP seeks to question UNSC's working methods (Tourinho, Stuenkel, & Brockmeier, 2015, p. 141). As the general debate within the analysed statement shows a concern with military interventions in Syria, RwP clarifies the use of military force. RwP is not a concept 'normalising' military intervention. However, it functions as a tool for balancing the consequences of a military intervention, before utilising this last resort to assist a humanitarian crisis. The latter improves the focus on protecting the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P, as RwP illustrates a framework for accounting for the purpose for military interventions if humanitarian interventions are deemed unsuccessful.

9. Conclusion

Within this research, I sought to answer to what extent the international community fulfilled its role of protecting the Syrian civilians in agreement with UN's concept of R2P, as statements regarding the international community's actions from the civil society and civic society were analysed. I found that the framing of the civil society were prone to argue for a failure to protect, within the international community. Thus neglecting the international responsibility to protect civilians in a humanitarian crisis. The statements from Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and Syrian civilians, demonstrated a strong dissatisfaction and critique with the international community's respond to the crisis. Moreover, a lack of attention towards protecting the Syrian civilians. According to the analysed statements by the civil society, the theoretical consideration of game theory suggested that both US and Russia demonstrated conflictual behaviour when cooperating. Both states agreed on solving the crisis, but did not agree on the method. Furthermore, the US and Russian behaviour were consistent with game theory's prisoner's dilemma, as both displayed the use of corruptive manners to succeed, by overruling Obama's 'red line' and the Russian continuous use of veto power. Behavioural game theory suggested how US and Russia based their actions on strategic decisions, to optimise individual power relations, rather than optimising the protection of civilians.

Similar to the civil society, UN illustrated its distress with the international community's work, as well as the lack of cooperation among the UN member states. UN suggested that by cooperating, the international community would able to implement R2P and protect the Syrian civilians. UN's statements solely presented their frame of the international community's actions. However, the analysed statements by US and Russia presented how their focuses were mainly on blaming the other parties for failing to protect, whilst glorifying own actions. For this, behavioural theory suggested that the US and Russian strategic behaviour illustrated a classical 'blame game', in which the actors focused on emphasising the others' mistakes. US and Russia blamed and accused each other's actions; they attempted to create a 'bad' reputation of the other party, whilst commending own actions. A game behaviour seeking to diminish the faith in the other party. In addition to the portrayed aspects of behavioural game theory, prisoner's dilemma confirms corruptive actions. The actions by US and Russia merely displayed an interest for optimising individual games and interests, wherein political and national interests were attended first.

Hereafter, I conducted a discussion based on the results discovered in the presentation of the 'ideal' R2P and the analysis of the 'actual' R2P. The discussion's foundation for comparing and discussing

the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P, was to examine the gap between the two comprehensions of the concept. This was done in order to illustrate whether any visible patterns, in the international community's behaviour, could clarify the lack of protection of the Syrian civilians. Here, I identified how the 'ideal' R2P did not fit the 'actual' R2P, as the international community demonstrated contradicting behaviour in correlation with the 'ideal' use of the concept. UN deemed R2P as a 'milestone' for advancing the international community's response to any humanitarian crisis. However, UN discovered that the 'actual' use of the concept was disappointing. The international community did not fulfil its responsibility to protect, as the 'actual' R2P revealed shameful results. Similar to this, the general opinion in US, in the beginning stages of R2P, endorsed the concept's use for its potential in ameliorating the humanitarian crisis in Syria. Yet, US's demonstration of the 'actual' use of R2P merely suggested that, the international community failed in its responsibility to protect. Whilst accusing Russia for acting irresponsible by bombing medical facilities and not fulfilling its promise of removing chemical weapons. UN member states established dominant behaviour, which complicated the protection of the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P.

However, the Russian and the scholarly opinion from the beginning stressed a concern with the concept. They suspected that, the international community would apply different comprehensions of R2P, in order to account for acting based on individual interests. A consequence of this, the crisis worsened due to incorrect use of R2P. Russia even expressed its concern with US's involvement in Syria, as US demonstrated brutal behaviour to maximise American security and power. Similar to Russia, the included studies deemed the R2P initiative to fail. The 'ideal' core principles of the concept were unclear, thus complicating the 'actual' use of R2P. Already from the beginning, Russia and the scholarly thoughts reckoned that the international community would fail to protect the Syrian civilians in agreement with R2P. The discussion exemplified how the 'ideal' R2P did not fit the 'actual' R2P, as the international community did not conform to the three core responsibilities of R2P. The responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild. Resulting this, I proposed a 'new' alternative to R2P, by suggesting the reestablishment of Brazil's proposal of RwP. By implementing RwP as a tool for articulating for the need responsible means of protecting the civilians, for example the initiating of military interventions, the international community would be able to consider the methods of the 'ideal' R2P. Thus facilitating a proper use of R2P and ensuring the protection of the civilians. RwP provides a tool for contributing to organising R2P, in order to optimise the use of the concept. An optimisation leading to bettering the international community's protection of the Syrian civilians.

Furthermore, the theoretical considerations presented various explanations of the gap between the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P, as well as the international community's behaviour to protect the Syrian civilians. As stated in the analysis, a battle of power is evident between US and Russia and the battlefield is Syria. This briefly sums up the results of the theory of framing, as framing has proven how US and Russia focused more on criticising the other's actions and behaviour, instead of focusing on the Syrians need for humanitarian assistance. Additionally, the application of framing suggested that UN focused more on criticising the actions of the international community, rather than communicating a stable solution. The overall frame evident in the analysis, called for an immediate response from the international community. Hitherto, Amnesty International, HRW and the Syrian civilians framed their dissatisfaction with the international community's actions. Complimenting these results, game theory revealed how US and Russia focused more on optimising individual power relations and creating mistrust in the other's actions. For example, the analysis displayed how US remarked that, Russia could not live up to its promises and disregarded peaceful sanctions. Whereas US's actions proved successful. Russia explained how the involvement of US in the Syrian crisis led to a rise of terror organisations, whilst Russia aimed to protect the civilians according to the international law. An attempt to create mistrust in other involved parties, demonstrated a quest for enhancing the faith in own actions. By questioning the other's actions, whilst glorifying own behaviour, game theory suggested that US and Russia aspired to appear as the superior actor in the Syrian conflict. The behaviour stems from a pursuit for optimising personal interests, something that UN agreed on.

Given the abovementioned, I conclude that the international community has not fulfilled its role of protecting the Syrian civilians. The international community has not conformed to the 'ideal' R2P. The analysis and discussion showed a gap between the 'ideal' and 'actual' R2P. UN, US and Russia acted based on individual political motives, neglecting the protection of the Syrian civilians. The lack of common conception of R2P played a major part in prolonging the Syrian Civil War, as the Syrian civilians have not yet received the needed humanitarian assistance. US and Russia have focused more on blaming each other for the 'insufficient' and 'incompetent' behaviour, instead of focusing on bettering the crisis. This 'blame game' has resulted in them not attending to the 'ideal' R2P, which has resulted in failing to protect the Syrian civilians. The concept of R2P has not failed as reckoned by the international concern. Moreover, the international community's strategic behaviour caused the damage. Brazil's previous suggestion of RwP would hereto render a framework to optimise the implementation of R2P. In order for the international community to fulfil its responsibility towards

the Syrian civilians is to realise the actual needs of the civilians – the need for humanitarian assistance. The ongoing fight for power optimisation and increasement of individual interests need to cease. The actors in the international community need to compromise on their individual interests and focus on protecting the Syrian civilians. I believe that it is safe to say that the international community has protected the Syrian civilians rhetorically, instead of practically protected them.

10. List of References

Amnesty International(1). (2017, n.d.). *Who We Are.* Retrieved from Amnesty International: https://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/

Amnesty International(2). (2017, n.d.). *Syria: Overview.* Retrieved from Amnesty International: https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/middle-east-and-north-africa/syria/

Amnesty International(3). (2016, December 1). *Syria: over 200 civil society groups condemn United Nations for 'shameful' inaction.* Retrieved from Amnesty International UK: https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/syria-over-200-civil-society-groups-condemn-united-nations-shameful-inaction

Bacchi, C. (2012, April). *Why Study Problematizations? Making Politics Visible.* Retrieved from Scientific Research An Adademic Publisher: http://file.scirp.org/pdf/OJPS20120100003_72526218.pdf

Backwith, R. T. (2017, April 7). *Read President Trump's Remarks on the Syrian Missile Attack.* Retrieved from Time: http://time.com/4730215/syria-missile-strike-chemical-attack-trump-transcript/

Barnard, A., & Gordon, M. R. (2017, April 4). *Worst Chemical Attack in Years in Syria; U.S. Blames Assad.* Retrieved from New York Times: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/04/world/middleeast/syria-gas-attack.html?_r=0

BBC. (2017, April 20). *Syria 'chemical attack': What we know.* Retrieved from BBC: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-39500947

Bellamy(1), A. J. (2009). *Responsibility to Protect.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bellamy(2), A. J. (2015). *The Responsibility to Protect: A Defense.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benedict, K. (2013, September 16). *The UNSC has a responsibility to protect civilians in Syria - decisive action is needed now.* Retrieved from Amnesty International UK: https://www.amnesty.org.uk/blogs/campaigns/unsc-has-responsibility-protect-civilians-syria-decisive-action-needed-now

Bhardwaj, M. (2012, Spring). *Development of Conflict in Arab Spring Libya and Syria: From Revolution to Civil War.* Retrieved from The Washington University International Review: http://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/migration/wuir_spring_2012.pdf#page=76

Bhaskar(1), R. (2014, n.d.). *Biography.* Retrieved from Roy Bhaskar: https://roybhaskar.wordpress.com/

Bhaskar(2), R. (2008). *Dialectic: The Pulse of Freedom.* London and New York: Routledge.

Bhaskar(3), R. (2017, March). *What is critical realism?* Retrieved from Roy Bhaskar: https://roybhaskar.wordpress.com/what-is-critical-realism/

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Camerer, C. F. (2003). *Behavioral Game Theory: Experiments in Strategic Interaction.* New Jersey: Princeston University Press.

CCR(1). (2017, n.d.). *Critical Realism.* Retrieved from Centre for Critical Realism: https://centreforcriticalrealism.com/about-critical-realism/basic-critical-realism/

CCR(2). (2017, March). *Further developments within Critical Realism*. Retrieved from Centre for Critical Realism: https://centreforcriticalrealism.com/about-critical-realism/developments-critical-realism/

CCR(3). (2013, April 10). *From Science to Emancipation Manifesto of meta-Reality*. Retrieved from Centre for Critical Realism: https://internationalcentreforcriticalrealism.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/10-bhaskar-fse-vi-xv1.pdf

Corstange, D., & York, E. (2016, April 5). *Sectarian Framing in the Syrian Civil War.* Retrieved from Association for Analytical Learning about Islam and Muslim Societies: http://aalims.org/uploads/corstange-aalims-stanford.pdf

Daly, E. (2016, December 2). *Interview: What's Happening in Aleppo.* Retrieved from Human Rights Watch: https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/12/02/interview-whats-happening-aleppo

Doyle, M. W., & Sambanis, N. (2000). *Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives.* Retrieved from Georgetown University: http://faculty.georgetown.edu/jrv24/Doyle_&_Sambanis_Ch2.pdf

Edkins, J., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2009). *Critical Theorists and International Relations.* London and New York: Routledge.

Entman, R. M. (1993). *Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm.* Retrieved from https://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/cornwall/en/hearings/exhibits/Mary_Lynn_Young/pdf/05_Entman.pdf

Evans, G. J. (2008). *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Gifkins, J. (2014, n.d.). *R2P in the UN Security Council: Darfur, Libya and Beyond.* Retrieved from Leeds Beckett University: http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/2189/3/R2P%20in%20the%20UN%20Security%20Council%20_%20Darfur%20Libya%20and%20Beyond%20_%20Gifkins%20_%20Final.pdf

GlobalR2P(1). (2017, n.d.). *About R2P*. Retrieved from Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.globalr2p.org/about_r2p

GlobalR2P(2). (2012, October 18). *Timeline of International Response to the Situation in Syria.* Retrieved from Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.globalr2p.org/publications/135

Godefroidt, A. (2014). *What's in a Frame? Framing of the Syrian War.* Leuven: KU Leuven.

Heap, S. P., & Varoufakis, Y. (1995). *Game Theory: A Critical Introduction.* London and New York: Routledge.

Ho, T.-H., Camerer, C. F., & Chong, J. K. (2008, n.d.). *Behavioural Game Theory: Thinking, Learning and Teaching.* Retrieved from California Institute of Technology: https://people.hss.caltech.edu/~camerer/Ch08Pg_119-179.pdf

HRW(1). (2017, n.d.). *About.* Retrieved from Human Rights Watch: https://www.hrw.org/about

HRW(2). (2006, December 11). *Letter to UN Secretary-General-designate Ban Ki-moon.* Retrieved from Human Rights Watch: https://www.hrw.org/news/2006/12/11/letter-un-secretary-general-designate-ban-ki-moon

HRW(3). (2013, August 28). *Statement on Possible Intervention in Syria.* Retrieved from Human Rights Watch: https://www.hrw.org/news/2013/08/28/statement-possible-intervention-syria

Hussain, M., & Hisham, M. (2016, October 26). *Syria's "Voice of Conscience" has a Messseage for the West.* Retrieved from The Intercept: https://theintercept.com/2016/10/26/syria-yassin-al-haj-saleh-interview/

ICISS. (2001, December). *The Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty: http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf

ICRtoP(1). (2017, n.d.). *An Introduction to the Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop

ICRtoP(10). (2017, March). *The Crisis in Libya.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crises/crisis-in-libya

ICRtoP(11). (2017, March). *The Crisis in Syria.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crises/crisis-in-syria

ICRtoP(2). (2012, September 10). *Navi Pillay recalls the Responsibility to Protect in a statement about the crisis in Syria.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/crises/191-the-crisis-in-syria/4335-navi-pillay-recalls-the-responsibility-to-protect-in-a-statement-about-the-crisis-in-syria

ICRtoP(3). (2016, n.d.). *Summary of the Secretary-General's Report on the Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICRtoP's%202016%20SG%20Report%20Summary.pdf

ICRtoP(4). (2009, June 23). *U.S. Statement at 2009 Dialogue on Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/USA_ENG.pdf

ICRtoP(5). (2006, June 28). *U.S. Statement at June 2006 Security Council Debate on Protection of Civilians.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/US.pdf

ICRtoP(6). (2009, n.d.). *Russia's Statement at 2009 General Assembly Dialogue on Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/component/content/article/133-europe/5460-russias-statements-on-rtop-from-2009-present#09

ICRtoP(7). (2011, n.d.). *Russia's Statement at 2011 General Assembly Dialogue on the Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/Russia(2).pdf

Innocenti, A., & Sbriglia, P. (2008). *Games, Rationality and Behaviour: Essays in Behavioural Game Theory and Experiments.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York: palgrave macmillian.

Jackson, P. T. (2011). *The Conduct of Inquity in Interational Relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics.* London and New York: Routledge. Retrieved from The New International Relations Series .

Ki-moon, B. (2015, September 8). *Secretary-General's Remarks to General Assembly Informal Interactive Dialogue on " A Vital and Enduring Commitment: Implementing the Responsibility to Protect" [As delivered].* Retrieved from International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect: http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/SecretaryGeneral%20Statement(1).pdf

Lakoff, G. (2004). Don't Think of an Elephant. In G. Lakoff, *Framing 101: How to take back public discourse* (pp. 3-34). Chelsea Gree Publ.

Language Center Aalborg. (2017, n.d.). *About Us.* Retrieved from The Language Center Aalborg: http://www.sprogcenteraalborg.dk/en/about-us/

Levant Report. (2014, February 13). *Voice from Damascus: the plight of Syria's Christians – Interview with Majd Lahham.* Retrieved from Levant Report: https://levantreport.com/interviews/

Lopez, G. (2017, March). *Responsibility to Protect at a Crossroads: The Crisis in Libya.* Retrieved from Humanity in Action: http://www.humanityinaction.org/knowledgebase/580-responsibility-to-protect-at-a-crossroads-the-crisis-in-libya

Mahfoud. (2017, n.d.). *Velkommen.* Retrieved from Mahfoud: http://mahfoud.dk/

Martson, G., & McDonald, C. (2006). *Analysing Social Policy: A Governmental Approach.* Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Midlarsky, M. I. (2000). Conclusion. In M. I. Midlarsky, *Handbook of War Studies II* (pp. 190-191). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Miller, D. (2005). Chapter 5: Disstributing Responsibilities. In A. Kuper, *Global Responsibilities: Who Must Deliver on Human Rights?* (pp. 95-115). London and New York: Routledge.

Morrow, J. D. (2000). The Ongoing Game-Theoretic Revolution. In M. I. Midlarsky, *Handbook of War Studies II* (pp. 164-192). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Moulin, H. (1986, n.d.). *Game Theory for the Social Sciences.* Retrieved from Google Books: https://books.google.dk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=96ewJBssYKEC&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=game+theory+in+social+sciences&ots=K6is8havZD&sig=qUVzkKxaEtEV9xfmwob4kmUGRTY&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=game%20theory%20in%20social%20sciences&f=false

Nuruzzaman, M. (2013, Spring). *The "Responsibility to Protect" Doctrine: Revived in Libya, Buried in Syria.* Retrieved from SSRN: https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=5131031030091230001101060800931110740970420140480230251211140781170010971130990661240270120100410261210340890640301231191210080170090440150491030301180670810290910680650130831121210880810901010950041230741240260

Osborne, M. J., & Rubinstein, A. (1994). *A Course in Game Theory.* London: The MIT Press.

O'Sullivan, K. A. (2010, September 29). *Towards Deeper Engagement in Conflict Studies: A Critical Realist Approach to the Study of Civil Conflict.* Retrieved from Millennium: Journal of International Studies: https://millenniumjournal.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/keith-osullivan-draft-paper-millennium-conference-2010.pdf

Putin, V. (2013, September 11). *A Plea for Caution From Russia.* Retrieved from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/12/opinion/putin-plea-for-caution-from-russia-on-syria.html

Quackenbush, S. L., & Zagare, F. C. (2014, June 30). *Game Theory: Modeling Intrestate Conflict.* Retrieved from University at Buffalo: https://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~fczagare/Chapters/Kosovo.pdf

Reuters. (2012, April 4). *Text of Annan's six-point peace plan for Syria.* Retrieved from Reuters: http://www.reuters.com/article/us-syria-ceasefire-idUSBRE8330HJ20120404

Russian Embassy(1). (2016, October 12). *Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov's interview with Amanpour program on CNN International.* Retrieved from Embassy of the Russian Federation Washington DC: http://www.russianembassy.org/article/foreign-minister-sergey-lavrov%E2%80%99s-interview-with-amanpour-program-on-cnn-international

Russian Embassy(2). (2017, April 7). *Foreign Ministry statement on US military action in Syria on April 7, 2017.* Retrieved from Embassy of the Russian Federation Washington DC: http://www.russianembassy.org/article/foreign-ministry-statement-on-us-military-action-in-syria-on-april-7-2017

SCR. (2016, December 21). *Resolution 2332.* Retrieved from Security Council Report: http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2332.pdf

Siebens, J., & Case, B. (2012, August). *The Libyan Civil War: Context and Consequences.* Retrieved from Think: International and Human Security: http://www.thinkihs.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Siebens-Case-LibyaSReport-2012.pdf

Street, J. (2017, April 5). *In emotional interview, Syrian who survived 2013 chemical attack pleads with Trump, rips Obama.* Retrieved from The Blaze: http://www.theblaze.com/news/2017/04/05/in-emotional-interview-syrian-who-survived-2013-chemical-attack-pleads-with-trump-rips-obama/

Tillerson, R. (2017, April 6). *Statement by Secretary of State Rex Tillerson on Syria.* Retrieved from U.S. Embassy & Consultants in Russia: https://ru.usembassy.gov/statement-secretary-state-rex-tillerson-syria/

Tourinho, M., Stuenkel, O., & Brockmeier, S. (2015, November 5). *"Responsibility while Protecting": Reforming R2P Implementation.* Retrieved from Taylor & Francis Online: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13600826.2015.1094452#aHR0cDovL3d3dy50YW5kZm9ubGluZS5jb20vZG9pL3BkZi8xMC4xMDgwLzEzNjAwODI2LjIwMTUuMTA5NDQ1Mj9uZWVkQWNjZXNzPXRydWVAQEAw

UN(1). (2017, April). *News Focus: Syria.* Retrieved from United Nations News Centre: http://www.un.org/apps/news/infocusRel.asp?infocusID=146

UN(2). (2017, March). *Background Information on the Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from The United Nations: http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/rwanda/about/bgresponsibility.shtml

UN(3). (2011, March 1). *General Assembly Suspends Libya from Human Rights Council.* Retrieved from The United Nations: http://www.un.org/press/en/2011/ga11050.doc.htm

UN(4). (2016, September 21). *Syrian Tragedy 'Shames Us All', Secretary-General Tells Security Council, Saying that Failure to End Conflict Should Haunt Entire Membership.* Retrieved from United Nations: https://www.un.org/press/en/2016/sc12526.doc.htm

UNESCO. (2017, n.d.). *NGOs - Civil society.* Retrieved from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/partners/ngos-civil-society/

UNOCHA. (2016, November 30). *Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Stephen O'Brien Statement to the Security Council On Syria.* Retrieved from United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs: https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/ERC_USG%20Stephen_OBrien_Statement_onSyria_to_SecCo30NOV_2016_CAD.pdf

UNOG. (2017, April 5). *Transcript of Statement by Staffan de Mistura Special Envoy for Syria - Supporting the Future of Syria and the Region - Brussels Conference.* Retrieved from The United Nations Office at Geneva: http://www.unog.ch/unog/website/news_media.nsf/(httpPages)/5C6FE6978290BD24C12580F900559710?OpenDocument

UNRIC. (2017, March 14). *R2P - A Short History.* Retrieved from United Nations Regional Centre for Western Europe: http://www.unric.org/en/responsibility-to-protect/26981-r2p-a-short-history

Urquhart, C. (2013, September 14). *Syria crisis: US and Russia agree chemical weapons deal.* Retrieved from The Guardian: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/14/syris-crisis-us-russia-chemical-weapons-deal

Venligboerne. (2017, n.d.). *Om Os.* Retrieved from Venligboerne: http://www.venligboerne.org/venligboernes-organisation/

Walker, T. (2016, September 21). *Syria crisis: Read John Kerry's comments to the UN Security Council in full.* Retrieved from Independent: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/john-kerry-syria-russia-parallel-universe-un-security-council-comments-in-full-a7321801.html

Whitham, B. (n.d.). *Critical Realism and International Relations: Casual Explanations for Liberal War.* Retrieved from Academia: https://www.academia.edu/348746/Critical_Realism_and_International_Relations_Causal_Explanations_for_Liberal_War

Wier, J. S., & Al Reshoud, F. M. (2014, December). *Syrien Civil War: Solving the Prisoner's Dilemma.* Retrieved from Calhoun: Institutional Archive of the Naval Postgraduate School: http://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/44690/14Dec_Wier_AlReshoud.pdf?sequence=1

Williams, P. R., Ulbrick, J. T., & Worboys, J. (2012, Fall). *Preventing Mass Atrocity Crimes: The Responsibility to Protect and the Syria Crisis.* Retrieved from Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law: https://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=45609510611206700600309601002512207400600400402106303707211208410501710306710406808503612603805611002811808012112011402807912105008200502100611306506910909102900504708701900311508300509807011408307403102409902900

Williamson, R. S. (2013, August 28). *Syria and the Responsibility to Protect.* Retrieved from Center for a New American Security:

https://s3.amazonaws.com/files.cnas.org/documents/ResponsibilityToProtect_Williamson.pdf

Zollman, K. (2013, September 10). *Applying game theory to Syria: International norms tend to dissolve if they are not enforced.* Retrieved from Pittsburg Post-Gazette: http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2013/09/10/Applying-game-theory-to-Syria/stories/201309100131

Østergaard, M. U., & de Wolff, S. (2016). *The Framing Game of R2P: The Deployment in Syria.* Aalborg: Aalborg University.

Aalborg Kommune. (2017, n.d.). *Integration.* Retrieved from Aalborg Kommune: http://www.aalborg.dk/integration

Front page image retrieved from:

Tahir, F. (2017, April 8). *Syrian Civil War: An Overview & How You Can Help*. Retrieved from Affinity Magazine: http://affinitymagazine.us/2017/04/08/syrian-civil-war-an-overview-how-you-can-help/