Do the Idea of Human Security and the Principle of the 'Responsibility to Protect' Lead to Each Other?

Mohamad Almohawes

Mtm.almohawes@gmail.com

Assistant Professor of Law
Al Yamamah University

Abstract

Human security is one of the main goals that the United Nations (UN) aims to protect. The UN Security Council has the right to discuss and legitimate the use of force, military intervention, to protect people's lives and to maintain peace. Human security was identified by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994, and it has seven dimensions. Economic security, food security, health security said to be at the 'vital core' of human security, environmental security, personal security, and political security. In the other hand and in 2001, the report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) was released with the principle of the responsibility to protect, known as R2P. This principle protects people in need. The question is whether R2P and human security lead to each other or why applying R2P is important to protect human security. This article shows that the R2P was mainly established to protect people from being abused but also it leads to maintain peace and protect human security in general.

Keywords: Human security, Responsibility to Protect, R2P, RtoP, peace, human rights, protection, crimes, refuges, immigrants, United Nations, UN.

المستخلص

الأمن البشري هو أحد الأهداف الرئيسية التي تهدف الأمم المتحدة إلى حمايتها ولمجلس الأمن التابع للأمم المتحدة الحق في مناقشة وإضفاء الشرعية على استخدام القوة والتدخل العسكري لحماية أرواح البشر والحفاظ على الأمن والسلام. برنامج الأمم المتحدة الإنمائي للأمن البشري لعام 1994 وله سبعة أهداف. الأمن الاقتصادي والأمن الغذائي والأمن الصحي وأمن المجتمع والأمن البيئي والأمن الشخصي والأمن السياسي. من ناحية أخرى وفي عام 2001 ، تم إصدار تقرير اللجنة الدولية للتدخل وسيادة الدولة مع مبدأ مسؤولية الحماية. هذا المبدأ يحمي البشر المحتاجين للحماية الدولية. السؤال هو ما إذا كان مبدأ مسؤولية الحماية والأمن البشري يؤديان لذات الهدف و لماذا تطبيق مبدا مسؤولية الحماية مهم لحماية الأمن البشري وتحقيق أهدافه. يوضح هذا المقال أن مبدأ مسؤولية الحماية قد أُنشئت أساسًا لحماية الأشخاص من التعرض في حالات مثل التعذيب وخلافه، ولكن بتطبيق هذا البمدأ فإنه يمكن تحقيق ليس الأمن الشخصي فحسب بل أهدافه الأمن البشري بشكل عام.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأمن البشري ، مسؤولية الحماية ، المسؤولية عن الحماية ، السلام ، حقوق الإنسان ، الحماية ، الجرائم ، اللاجئون ، المهاجرون ، الأمم المتحدة.

Introduction

Since the first and the second world wars (Archer, 2008, p. 20), in which more than 69 million people were killed (Denson, 2006, p. 17), the issue of human security has become one of the most important issues in the international community. Therefore, when the Second World War ended, the international community established the United Nations (UN) and international law in order to create a new world order that respects human rights, to help keep peace around the world and to avoid a new world war (Baral & Sharma, 2004, p. 109). After the end of the Cold War in 1991 (Lucarelli, & I Manners, 2006, p. 44), human rights and national security became the main issues for the UN (Matthew, Barnett, McDonald, & O'Brien, 2010, 238).

Nevertheless, cases of genocide, cleansing ethnic and abuse of human rights have been occurred since the Cold War, leading the UN to create measures like the principle of the responsibility to protect (R2P or RtoP), aimed at protecting populations when their governments are unable or unwilling to protect them from any serious threat (Badescu, 2011, p. 42). Moreover, the responsibility to protect was accepted by the General Assembly in October 2005, and indeed, resolution 1706 on Darfur was the first resolution to link the responsibility to protect to a specific case (Cooper, Heine, & Thakur, 2013, p. 770). This paper will explore the concepts of human security and the responsibility to protect, explain how the idea of human security leads to the responsibility to protect, and consider whether the responsibility to protect does indeed lead to human security.

The Second World War caused the deaths of more than 60 million people around the world (Desonie, 2008, p. 12), which is about one percent of the global population, about seven billion people (Gilbert, 2005, p. 10). Therefore, most countries, including the winners and losers of the war, agreed to establish the UN in order to create peace around the world; hence, the first listed Purpose of the UN Charter is

> to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace (Lyall, & Larsen, 2009, 502).

In addition, the UN Charter established some other rules to achieve its main goal, spreading peace around the world, which is why Chapter VII of the UN Chapter allows states to take 'all necessary measures' to protect civilians (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2012, p. 214).

Chapter VII could show how human security, focusing on the security of people in addition to national security, is an important issue (MacLean, Black, & Shaw, 2006, p. 47). The definition of human security explained by the Commission on Human Security,

established in Jun 2001 (McIntosh, & Hunter, 2010, p. 125), is 'to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment' (Anand, 2012, pp. 9-10). Moreover, it was explained as 'freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, safety or lives' (MacLean, Black, & Shaw, 2006, p. 47). The concept of Human security has improved since the Cold War (Lucarelli, & I Manners, 2006, p. 44), from 'national security', protecting state borders from external aggression, to include protecting human rights and threats to livelihood, human dignity, and well-being (Matthew, Barnett, McDonald, & O'Brien, 2010, 238).

Human Security

The idea of human security, indeed, goes back many years to when Woodrow Wilson, the twenty-eighth president of the United States (Rumsch, 2009, p. 4.), said that all nations must improve 'the living standards and human circumstances' of their populations in 1918 (Guan, 2012, p. 220). Moreover, in 1941, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the thirty-second president of the United States (Woolley, 1997, p. 66), spoke of 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want', and these two terms are, in fact, usually used in definitions of human security (Guan, 2012, p. 220).

Human security was identified by The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as a new development issue in its *Human Development Report 1994*, and it has seven dimensions (McIntosh, & Hunter, 2010, p. 125). The first dimension is economic security, which is to improve the ability of states to provide a strong economy to survive in 'what is a hostile, competitive, capitalist environment.' (Collins, 2003, p. 112). Furthermore, food security 'is access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life' (Tangka, Emerson, & Jabbar, 2002, p. 16.). This accessibility could refer to the ability to produce or buy the needed basic food (Tangka, Emerson, & Jabbar, 2002, p. 16.). Health security is defined as 'the activities required, both proactive and reactive, to minimize vulnerability to acute public health events that endanger the collective health of populations living across geographical regions and international boundaries' (Bélanger, 2011, p. 98), and this was said to be at the 'vital core' of human security (Elbe, 2010, p. 101).

Environmental security, in addition, is one of the fundamentals of global security, and it includes all external circumstances and impacts that affect the life and development of organisms (Banerjea, 2005, p. 201). Personal security, thought to be a basic human need (Malan & Smit, 2001, p. 224.), is 'an active, positive right to possess and control one's own body' (Heyman, 2008, p. 49.). Also, community security is thought to be achieved by the safety of all people no matter what their ethnicity or religion is (Williams, & Viotti, 2012, p. 109). Finally, political security is explained as 'the ability of ethnic groups to influence relevant government policy' (Steinberg & Saideman, 2008, pp. 235-259), and it is the organizational stability of social order without any threats to state sovereignty (Stefan, 2009, p. 30).

These seven dimensions of human security are thought to be the typical areas in which human security is threatened (McIntosh, & Hunter, 2010, p. 112). It was, however, emphasised that human security is not limited to these dimensions as there are other problems, like employment and income, which are not only recognised as problems of development but are also problems of the basic security of individuals (McIntosh, & Hunter, 2010, p. 125).

The international system faces many challenges and human security basically seeks to address the challenges and ensure that countries do not harm their populations by abusing human rights (Anthony, & Cook, 2013, p. 4). Nevertheless, since the end of the Cold War and the beginning of human security, acts of genocide, considered a threat to human security, have been committed in the world, like the Rwandan genocide (Kavalski, 2010, p. 97).

In April 1994, Juvénal Habyarimana, a Hutu former president of Rwanda, was returning from a summit in Tanzania, and his plane was shot out of the sky by a surface-to-air missile over the capital of Rwanda, Kigali (Tucker, 2010, p. 2632). As a result, the president and all the other passengers were killed (Beigbeder, 2006, p. 276). This incident was the beginning of Rwanda's genocide in which Hutu, the tribe which represents the majority of the population (Oppong & Woodruff, 2007, p. 79), extremists took over the government and directly blamed Tutsis, who represent fourteen percent of the population (Oppong & Woodruff, 2007, p. 79), rebels for the assassination (Kuperman, 2001, p. 12).

A few hours after the attack on the president's plane, the Hutu extremists started the mass slaughter of Tutsis, in which it is estimated that about eight hundred thousand people, men, women and children, were murdered in less than four months (Beigbeder, 2006, p. 276). In addition to Tutsis, many Twas, representing one percent of the population (Oppong & Woodruff, 2007, p. 79) were killed (Caplan, 2003, p. 110) as were politically moderate Hutus (Cunningham, 201, p. 137). It was said that 'over three-quarters of the population registered as Tutsi were killed'(Beigbeder, 2006, p. 276). Not only were Tutsis tortured before being killed, but they were killed with machetes or clubs, hand weapons (Melvern, 2004, p. 253) and they had a chance to be killed by a bullet only if they could afford it (Waugh, 2004, p. 74.). Unfortunately, the UN 'did little to nothing' to stop this genocide, and it is said that the main reasons for not intervening in Rwanda are either the populations of states did not care about the situation in Rwanda, or states did not see anything in Rwanda worthy of intervening in (Totten, 2013, p. 157).

In July 1994, however, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), created in Uganda by a military group consisting of Tutsis who had been exiled to or had fled to Uganda (Debrix, 1999, p. 224) was able to take over the country and end the genocide (Frey, 2009, p. 262). The crimes against humanity committed there could have at least been limited if the UN and the international community had taken Rwanda's case seriously, as they did with the case of Srebrenica massacre, in which it is estimated that about eight thousand Muslims, boys and men, were killed by Bosnian Serb military forces in July 1995 (Lattimer & Sands, 2003, p. 20) and the NATO decided to intervene to protect people's lives and end the conflict (Cordell & Wolff, 2010, p. 12).

As genocide is against the principles of the UN Charter that call for peace and aim to save people's lives, the cases of genocide in Rwanda and Srebrenica led to a question posed by U.N when Secretary General Kofi Annan said that '[I]f humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica, to gross and systematic violations of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity?' (Harees, 2012, p. 186).

Annan's question was about saving people's lives and preventing genocide as the main goal of the UN is to keep the peace around the world. In addition, Chapter VII of the UN Charter says that 'the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security'(Yang, 2013, p. 80). In addition, Article 41 legalises non-military measures, like economic sanctions, and Article 42 legalises military measures if the non-military measures are "inadequate" (Baylis, Wirtz & Gray, 2013, p. 107). Chapter VII of the UN Charter, therefore, could take any needed measures 'to maintain or restore international peace and security'(Yang, 2013, p. 80).

The Principle of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

In 2001, the Government of Canada established the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) to explore the issue of the "right to humanitarian intervention" that was raised in cases like Rwanda's (Trent, 2007, p. 213). The ICISS focuses on the reasons for and the methods of humanitarian intervention, and how the decision to intervene could be taken and authorized (Trent, 2007, p. 213). In 2001, the report of ICISS was released with the principle of the responsibility to protect, established in order to answer the question posed by Annan (Harees, 2012, p. 186). By this principle, the ICISS has changed the traditional idea of humanitarian intervention to the 'responsibility to protect' (Nasu, 2009, p. 225).

The responsibility to protect, known as R2P (White, 2009, p. 236) was adopted by world leaders in paragraphs 138-140 of the UN World summit Outcome Document in 2005; then, it was reaffirmed in Resolution 1674 in 2006 (Davies, & Glanville, 2010, p. 137).

The responsibility to protect is a principle that justifies humanitarian intervention when a state has refused or failed to protect its population (Jackson, 2007, p. 130.). Furthermore, the principle asks for international deployment of military forces to protect unprotected populations facing 'grave danger' (Schulz, 2008, p. 57).

Humanitarian military intervention is, therefore, recognized to be 'an exceptional and extraordinary measure' (Jackson, 2007, p. 130.) of 'the principles of sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of State' (Roth, 2000, p. 342). The responsibility to protect was also thought to be a bridge between the international community and the sovereign state (Thakur, Cooper & English, 2005, p. 185). It is seen as an important measure for the peaceful continuation of international society; therefore, it has been more accepted in the international community (Haddad, 2008, p. 202).

In 2010, the 'Arab Spring' started in Tunisia when a young fruit seller, Mohammed Bouazizi, burned himself to death as a reaction to being harassed by the police (Young & Kent, 2013, p. 594). Then, the revolution spread across many Arab countries, including Libya, Egypt, Yemen, Bahrain, and Syria (Kochan & Goodyear, 2011, p. 2). Although the revolution in Tunisia ended without any need for humanitarian intervention by the UN as the leader of Tunisia, Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, fled and obtained political asylum in Saudi Arabia (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2011, p. 176) the leader of Libya, Muammar al-Gaddafi, the president of Libya from 1969 to 2011 (Johna, 1983, pp. 471-490) decided to stay in power and fight the protesters (Filiu, 2011, p. 85). Therefore, many of the protesters were killed, and al-Gaddafi aimed to destroy Benghazi, where the revolution of Libya had started and 'turn it into the world's biggest graveyard' (Al-Zubaidi, & Cassel, 2013, p. 89).

In 2011, the responsibility to protect was first practiced in Libyan case (Neier, 2012, p. 315) and it was considered a successful military intervention to protect the Libyan protesters from the killing that was committed by al-Gaddafi's army (Campbell, 2013, p. 194). The UN Security Council (UNSC) requested the government of Libya to 'meet its responsibility to protect its populations' (Goodhart, 2013, p. 53); however, the request of the UNSC was not accepted by al-Gaddafi (Dekker & Hey, 2012, p. 217).

The United States, the United Kingdom, France and Lebanon, consequently, asked the UNSC to authorize military intervention before al-Gaddafi forces could enter Benghazi (Dekker & Hey, 2012, p. 217). The request of those countries was accepted based on the principle of the responsibility to protect and on Chapter VII of the UN Charter, allowing states to take 'all necessary measures' to protect civilians (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2011, p. 214). It was then authorised in resolution 1973 in March 2011 (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2011, p. 176). Indeed, many countries and organisations, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) participated in the military intervention in Libya (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2011, p. 176).

This humanitarian military intervention helped to save many Libyan protesters and civilians, especially those who were in Benghazi, from being targets of al-Gaddafi forces, and it also helped to end al-Gaddafi's rule of Libya (Schechner, 2013, p. 272). Therefore, it is clear that applying the responsibility to protect lead to people's lives being saved in Libya, the main goal of human security (Garcia, 2011, p. 136). It would be clearer to recognise how the responsibility to protect can lead to human security if the case of Libya is compared with the current Syrian case.

The current issue of Syria started in March 2011 in Daraa, a city south of Damascus (Macqueen, 2013, p. 388) and indeed, Syria's case is an extension of the Arab Spring (Kelly & Breslin, 2010, p. 476). Bashar al-Assad, the leader of Syria, is being asked to leave power by Syrian protesters as Syria has been ruled by the al-Assad family since 1970 (Kelly & Breslin, 2010, p. 476). Al-Assad, however, did not accept the idea of leaving power; therefore, by using the Syrian army, al-Assad decided to fight the protesters (House, 2012, p. 619) just as al-Gaddafi did (Filiu, 2011, p. 85).

As the UN has not taken any serious reaction to stop the fighting between al-Assad's army and the protesters to save their lives, the core of human security, al-Assad's army has committed many serious crimes against the protesters and civilians (Lieber, 2012, p. 66). In addition, it is estimated that more than 100 thousand Syrians have been killed since the revolution against al-Assad started, and more than 1.5 million Syrians have fled to other countries as refugees (Taheri, 2013, pp. 217-220). Recently, the Vice President of the United States, Joe Biden, said that al-Assad's army has used chemical weapons against its population living in the south-western Damascus suburb of Mouadamiya, and he stated that 'there is no doubt who is responsible for this heinous use of chemical weapons attack in Syria: the Syrian regime' (Pearson, Pleitgen & Alkhshali, 2013). Many people were killed in this attack, including men, women, and children (Pearson, Pleitgen & Alkhshali, 2013).

The revolutions in Libya and Syria have the same basis: removing leaders who have ruled for too long; furthermore, both leaders decided to use their armies to suppress the protesters (Haas, 2012, p. 2). However, the responsibility to protect, applied in the Libyan case, was able to save many Libyan lives, achieving the goal of human security (Knight & Egerton, 2012, p. 266) whereas, people in Syria are still being killed by al-Assad's army, and this killing of people could have been avoided if the concept of the responsibility to protect was applied by the UN to Syria's case as it was with Libya's case (Pearson, Pleitgen & Alkhshali, 2013). Although the concept of the responsibility to protect is not considered a law, it is based on Chapter VII of the UN Charter, allowing nations to take 'all necessary measures' to protect civilians (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2011, p. 214).

The two concepts, human security and the responsibility to protect are interconnected, and both of them focus on individuals (Edwards & Ferstman, 2010, p. 122). As human security mainly focuses on people's lives, some measures should be taken in order to achieve the core goal of human security.

For instance, when a government of state commits genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes or crimes against humanity and shows an inability or unwillingness to protect its population, the UN Charter says that other states should not watch without taking any action to protect people's lives in that state (Newman, 2001, pp. 239–251). Therefore, in the report of ICISS, released with the principle of the responsibility to protect, the concept of human security was repeatedly referred, meaning that human security leads to the responsibility to protect (Nishikawa, 2010, p. 81). The concept of the responsibility to protect, in addition, includes protection from 'fear' and protection from 'want' (Boer & Wilde, 2008, p. 180); therefore, the theoretical traction of human security was increased by the responsibility to protect, and the responsibility to protect appends 'an operation code for attempting to achieve human security', meaning that the responsibility to protect leads to human security (Nishikawa, 2010, p. 24).

Conclusion

The concept of human security, aimed at protecting people's lives, leads to the responsibility to protect (Nishikawa, 2010, p. 81) and the responsibility to protect, allowing military intervention to protect people's lives, leads to human security as it aims to protect human security (Nishikawa, 2010, p. 24). The example of the genocide committed in Rwanda shows that without applying the principle of the responsibility to protect, it is difficult to achieve human security (Beigbeder, 2006, p. 276). On the other hand, the examples of Libya's case, in which the UN applied the responsibility to protect (Schmitt, & Arimatsu, 2011, p. 214), and the Syrian case, in which the UN has not applied the responsibility to protect, show how applying the responsibility to protect could save people's lives, the core of human security, and how it could help to avoid crimes, like in Syria, where the regime was not only caused more than one hundred thousand deaths, it has also used chemical weapons against civilians, men, women and children (Pearson, Pleitgen & Alkhshali, 2013).

References

Al-Zubaidi, L, & Cassel, M, (2013) *Writing Revolution: The Voices from Tunis to Damascus*, I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd.

Anand, S. (2012) 'Human security and universal health insurance', *Elsevier Limited*, vol. 379, no. 9810.

Anthony, M, & Cook, A. (2013). *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Issues, Challenges and Framework for Action,* Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Archer, C. (2008) *The European Union*, Routledge.

Baral, J, & Sharma, J. (2004). *United Nations, India and the New World Order*, Krishan Mittal of Mittal Publication.

Badescu, C. (2011). *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: Security and Human Rights*, Routledge.

Banerjea, D, (2005). *Central Police Organisations, Part 2*, Allied Publishers Private Limited.

Baylis, J, Wirtz, J, & Gray, C. (2013). *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, Oxford University Press.

Beigbeder, Y. (2006). *Judging War Crimes and Torture: French Justice and International Criminal Tribunals and Commissions (1940-2005)*, Martinus Nijhoff Publisher.

Bélanger, M. (2011). *Global Health Law: An Introduction*, Cambridge Scientific Publishers.

Boer, M, & Wilde, J. (2008). *The Viability of Human Security*, Amsterdam University Press.

Campbell, H. (2013). *Global NATO and the Catastrophic Failure in Libya*, Monthly Review Press.

Caplan, P. (2003). *The Ethics of Anthropology: Debates and Dilemmas*, Routledge.

Collins, A. (2003). *Security and Southeast Asia: Domestic, Regional, and Global Issues*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Cooper, A, Heine, J, & Thakur, R. (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*, Oxford University Press.

Cordell, K, & Wolff, S. (2010). *Ethnic Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Responses*, Polity Press.

Cunningham, D. (2011). *Barriers to Peace in Civil War*, Cambridge University Press.

Davies, S, & Glanville, L. (2010). *Protecting the Displaced: Deepening the Responsibility to Protect*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Debrix, F. (1999). *Re-envisioning Peacekeeping: The United Nations and the Mobilization of Ideology*, University of Minnesota Press.

Dekker, I, & Hey, E. (2012). *Netherlands yearbook of international law 2011: Agora: the case of Iraq: international law and politics*, T.M.C. Asser Press.

Denson, J. (2006). *A Century of War: Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt*, Ludwig von Mises Institute.

Desonie, D. (2008). *Humans and the Natural Environment: The Future of Our Planet*, Chelsea House.

Edwards, A, & Ferstman, C. (2010). *Human Security and Non-Citizens: Law, Policy and International Affairs*, Cambridge University Press.

Elbe, S. (2010). *Security and Global Health*, Polity Press.

Filiu, J. (2011). *The Arab revolution: ten lessons from the democratic uprising*, Oxford University Press.

Frey, R, (2009). *Genocide and International Justice*, Facts on File.

Garcia, D, 2011, *Disarmament Diplomacy and Human Security: Regimes, Norms and Moral Progress in International Relations*, Routledge.

Gilbert, G. (2005). *World Population: A Reference Handbook*, ABC-CLIO.

Goodhart, M. (2013). *Human rights: politics and practice*, Oxford University Press.

Guan, B. (2012). *Human Security: Securing East Asia's Future*, Springer.

Haas, L. (2012) *Sound the Trumpet: The United States and Human Rights Promotion*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Haddad, E. (2008). *The Refugee in International Society: Between Sovereigns*, Cambridge University Press.

Harees, L. (2012). *The Mirage of Dignity on the Highways of Human 'Progress': The bystanders' perspective*, Auother House.

Heyman, S. (2008). *Free Speech and Human Dignity*, Yale University Press.

House, F. (2012). *Countries at the crossroads 2011: an analysis of democratic governance*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Jackson, R. (2007). *Sovereignty: The Evolution of an Idea*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Johna R, The ideology of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi: theory and practice, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 15, no. 04, 1983.

Kavalski, E, (2010) *The New Central Asia: The Regional Impact of International Actors*, World Scientific Publishing Company.

Kelly, S, & Breslin, J. (2010). *Women's rights in the Middle East and North Africa: progress amid resistance*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Knight, W, & Egerton, F. (2012). *The Routledge Handbook of the Responsibility to Protect*, Routledge.

Kochan, N, & Goodyear, R. (2011). *Corruption: the new corporate challenge*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Kuperman, A. (2001). *The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention: Genocide in Rwanda*, Oakland Street Publishing.

Lattimer, M, & Sands, P. (2003). *Justice for Crimes Against Humanity*, Hart Publishing.

Lieber, R. (2012) *Power and willpower in the American future: why the United States is not destined to decline*, Cambridge University Press.

Lucarelli, S, & Manners, I. (2006) *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy*, Routledge.

Lyall, F, & Larsen, P. (2009). *Space Law: A Treatise*, Ashgate Publishing Limited.

MacLean, S, Black, D, & Shaw, T. (2006). *A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms*, Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Macqueen, B. (2013). *An introduction to Middle East politics*, SAGE Publications Ltd.

Malan, F, & Smit, B. (2001). *Ethics and Leadership in Business and Politics*, Juta & Co.

Matthew, R, Barnett, J, McDonald, B, & O'Brien, K. (2010). *Global Environmental Change and Human Security*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

McIntosh, M, & Hunte, A. (2010). *New Perspectives on Human Security*, Greenleaf Publishing Limited.

Melvern, L. (2004). *Conspiracy to Murder: The Rwandan Genocide*, Verso.

Nasu, H. (2009). *International Law on Peacekeeping: A Study of Article 40 of the UN Charter*, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers,

Neier, A. (2012). *The International Human Rights Movement: A History*, Princeton University Press.

Newman, E, Human Security and Constructivism, *International Studies Perspectives*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2001.

Nishikawa, Y. (2010). *Human Security in Southeast Asia*, Routledge.

Oppong, J, & Woodruff, T. (2007). *Democratic Republic of the Congo*, Chelsea House.

Pearson, M, F Pleitgen, & Alkhshali, H, 'Biden: 'No doubt' Syria unleashed chemical attack, must pay a price', CNN, 2013, viewed 28 August 2013, http://edition.cnn.com/2013/08/27/world/meast/syria-civil-war/index.html?hpt=hp_t1

Roth, B. (2000). *Governmental Illegitimacy in International Law*, Oxford University Press.

Rumsch, B. (2009). *Woodrow Wilson*, ABDO Publishing Company.

Schechner, R. (2013). *Performance studies: an introduction*, Routledge.

Schmitt, M, & Arimatsu, L. (2011). *Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law 2011 - Volume 14*, T.M.C. Asser Press, The Hague.

Schmitt, M, & Arimatsu, L. (2012). *Yearbook of international humanitarian law*, T.M.C.

Schulz, W. (2008). *The Future of Human Rights: U.S. Policy for a New Era*, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stefan, A. (2009). *Democratization and Securitization: The Case of Romania*, Koninklijke Brill NV.

Steinberg, D, & Saideman, S, Laissez Fear: Assessing the Impact of Government Involvement in the Economy on Ethnic Violence, *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 2, 2008.

Taheri, A, Has the Time Come for Military Intervention in Syria?, *American Foreign Policy Interests*, vol. 35, no. 4, 2013.

Tangka, F, Emerson, R, & Jabbar, M. (2002). *Food Security Effects of Intensified Dairying: Evidence from the Ethiopian Highland*, International Livestock Research Institute.

Thakur, R, Cooper, A, & English, J. (2005). *International Commissions and the Power of Ideas*, United Nation University Press.

Totten, S. (2013). *Impediments to the Prevention and Intervention of Genocide*, Transaction Publishers.

Trent, J. (2007). *Modernizing the United Nations System: Civil Society's Role in Moving from International Relations to Global Governance*, Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Tucker, S. (2010). *A Global Chronology of Conflict: From the Ancient World to the Modern Middle East*, ABC-CLIO.

Waugh, C. (2004). *Paul Kagame and Rwanda: Power, Genocide and the Rwandan Patriotic Front,* McFarland & Company.

White, N. (2009). *Democracy Goes to War: British Military Deployments Under International Law*, Oxford University Press.

Williams, R, & Viotti, P. (2012). *Arms Control: History, Theory, and Policy*, Praeger Security International.

Woolley, S. (1997). *Writing Through the Year: Building Confident Writers One Month at a Time*, Dandy Lion publications.

Yang, S. (2013). *China in the UN Security Council Decision-making on Iraq*, Routledge.

Young, J, & Kent, J. (2013). *International relations since 1945*, Oxford University Press.