Open Access

Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE   **Section:** *Philosophy & Religion*

The doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect: Concept and scope of application

Alkayid Ola[1], Almanasa Ossama[2] & Almazaidah Ismail[3]* iD
[1]Language Center, The University of Jordan, Jordan
[2]Jordanian Armed Forces, Jordan
[3]Department of Arabic Language, The University of Jordan, Jordan
*Correspondence: i.mazaydah@ju.edu.jo

ABSTRACT

This study examines the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) as a transformative framework within contemporary international law, particularly in contexts marked by mass atrocity crimes such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. The research aims to examine the conceptual foundations of R2P, its legal and normative pillars, mechanisms of implementation, and the evolving relationship between national sovereignty and international responsibility.

It employs a qualitative legal analysis based on the study, which investigates primary sources including UN documents, international conventions, and judicial precedents, as well as secondary literature in Arabic and English. It critically analyzes the conditions under which R2P may be activated, including the occurrence of grave human rights violations and the inability or unwillingness of states to provide protection.

The findings reveal that R2P has shifted the paradigm of sovereignty from exclusive control to functional responsibility. While the doctrine has gained global legitimacy, its practical implementation faces persistent challenges such as politicization, resource limitations, and inconsistent application. The study concludes that effective operationalization of R2P requires institutional reform within the UN system, early warning mechanisms, and a balanced approach to its three pillars: prevention, response, and rebuilding. The paper offers actionable recommendations to enhance both national and international capacities in fulfilling the doctrine's protective mandate.

KEYWORDS: Responsibility to Protect (R2P), legal nature, pillars of protection, implementation mechanisms, international humanitarian law, state sovereignty

Introduction

Following the extensive international changes after the collapse of the Cold War and the emergence of a new global order in the early 1990s, and the accompanying shifts in international relations, a critical turning point emerged in the global governance of peace, security, and human rights. The recurrence of mass atrocities, including the Rwandan genocide, the Srebrenica massacre, and systematic violence in Kosovo, revealed the stark limitations of existing legal and institutional mechanisms in preventing the most egregious international crimes: war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, and crimes of aggression.

These failures, many of which unfolded under the watch of international institutions, demanded a new normative framework that could reconcile the traditional principle of non-intervention with the urgent moral and legal imperative to protect vulnerable populations. This tension culminated in a historic consensus at the 2005 United Nations World Summit, where global leaders endorsed the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine.

R2P is anchored in three foundational pillars: prevention, response, and rebuilding. It redefines the state's role not merely as a sovereign authority but as a custodian of fundamental human rights. Under this doctrine, the primary responsibility to protect populations from atrocity crimes lies with the state itself. However, if a state proves unwilling, unable, or demonstrably fails to discharge this obligation, the international community assumes a residual duty, operating through diplomatic, humanitarian, and, if necessary, military means under the auspices of the United Nations framework.

This doctrine signals a normative shift in international law and global ethics: from sovereignty as a shield to sovereignty as responsibility. The Responsibility to Protect not only redefines the state's internal obligations, but also empowers the international community to intervene legally and legitimately when states abdicate their duty to protect. Thus, R2P stands at the intersection of humanitarian concern, legal development, and political pragmatism, aiming to transform the tragic lessons of the 20th century into a robust architecture for global protection in the 21st.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant due to the urgent imperative to protect human rights, which lie at the heart of state sovereignty and are among the core duties and fundamental responsibilities of states toward their citizens and residents. Such protection calls for the adoption of innovative and suitable mechanisms that respond effectively to the emergence of new, severe, and systematic violations of human rights. This is particularly pressing in the Arab world, where the region has recently witnessed armed conflicts, civil wars, and internal unrest that have severely disrupted the human rights system. These developments have underscored the pressing need to embrace new protection mechanisms that are aligned with the essential principles of the Responsibility to Protect.

Research Problem

This study investigates the core of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine by examining its conceptual framework, legal pillars, and enforcement mechanisms. It aims to assess the degree to which the goals and applications of the doctrine are fully understood and implemented as a practical means for protecting human rights. The research further explores the actual reality of its implementation, along with a systematic and analytical observation of the nature and types of challenges and limitations that hinder its effectiveness and global legitimacy.

Structure of the Study

This study is organized into three interconnected sections that explore key aspects of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine. The first section clarifies the concept and content of the doctrine. The second section examines its legal nature. The third section provides an in-depth analysis of the conditions necessary for its proper activation and implementation, as outlined below:

Section One: The Concept of the Responsibility to Protect (RP2)
Section Two: The Legal Nature of the Doctrine
Section Three: The Conditions for Implementing the Doctrine

Section One: The Concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P)
Branch One: Definition and Content

The literature of public international law has long established a number of principles, concepts, and orientations concerning international relations. One of the most prominent among these is the notion of protection in its traditional sense, which was understood as the duty of the state to protect individuals residing within its territory, regardless of their nationality. However, with the rise of systematic and grave violations of human rights, this understanding began to evolve. Protection came to encompass not only the acts of the state itself but also those of armed groups operating on its territory, or even the actions of other international or foreign entities (Shaaban, 2015, pp. 212–213).

During the 54th session of the UN General Assembly, and in the wake of repeated failures by the United Nations to maintain international peace and security—particularly in Rwanda, Kosovo, and other conflict zones—the Secretary-General (see UN Doc. A/HRC/10/25) acknowledged the need for a shared foundation among member states to confront common threats that could not be addressed without coordinated international action. The focus at the time was placed not on international wars, but on internal conflicts that result in systematic violations (Khuli, 2011, p. 215; UN Secretary-General's Report, 2006, para. 63; Al-Hadidi, n.d., p. 128).

In balancing national sovereignty and the imperative of human rights protection, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) emerged as a new paradigm. The doctrine asserts a collective right to prevent mass atrocities, rather than merely serving as a justification for intervention. Despite international efforts to develop and define the concept, the scope and application of R2P remain the subject of deep disagreement among states (Garwood, 2012, p. 93).

In his report titled "The Responsibility to Protect: Timely and Decisive Response" (UN Document A/66/874 – S/2012/578, 2005), UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan noted that the doctrine had significantly developed following the 2005 World Summit and continued to evolve through 2009. It appears that the development of the doctrine has been closely tied to changing field realities and the practices of various states. The General Assembly has led efforts to institutionalize R2P and endorsed further deliberations through Resolution No. 63/308 (UN Document A/65/643, 2010).

This raises a central question: what happens when the state is either unable or unwilling to protect its population (Bellamy, 2013)? The balance between sovereignty and protection is a relative one, not absolute. This prompted the search for a new approach that would allow the international community to protect civilians while maintaining the credibility and relevance of the UN Charter. However, it became clear that the provisions of the Charter were drafted for the challenges of another era. Today's challenges require different and more flexible mechanisms (UN Document A/36/677).

These international efforts have focused on two main objectives:

- **First:** Defining new mechanisms to confront systematic and grave human rights violations.
- **Second:** Guaranteeing that perpetrators do not enjoy impunity (Al-Far, 1996, p. 31), a role that international criminal justice has assumed by prosecuting those responsible for international crimes (UN Document A/58/1).

Accordingly, given that the traditional understanding of sovereignty has hindered the adoption of new mechanisms to protect human rights from mass atrocities, it became necessary to adopt a new concept of sovereignty. This new understanding views sovereignty not as domination or control, but as responsibility. Sovereignty is now understood as a duty that includes oversight, accountability, and care for populations within a defined territorial framework.

Legal scholar **Francis Deng** has noted that sovereignty today means that a state is responsible for protecting its citizens both domestically and externally. It is no longer merely an expression of power but a responsibility to ensure civilian safety and dignity (Deng, *Sovereignty as Responsibility*, 1996).

Sovereignty in this new form imposes **international obligations** on the nation-state. These obligations include respecting human rights to prevent international intervention in internal affairs and providing protection

to all individuals within its territory (www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser).

As this new understanding gained prominence, the concept and content of R2P also evolved. International criminal justice systems, particularly international courts and the International Criminal Court (ICC), have played a critical role in reinforcing and clarifying R2P. The threat of referral to the ICC has helped deter atrocity crimes and offered a preventive and responsive tool for protecting civilians (UN Document A/66/874 – S/2012/578).

The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) also contributes by preparing reports for key UN bodies, such as the General Assembly, the Secretariat, the Economic and Social Council, and the Human Rights Council. These reports raise awareness of humanitarian risks and support timely, coordinated responses, ultimately facilitating the prosecution of responsible individuals (http://oneresponse.info/GlobalClusters/Protection/Pages/default.aspx; Hamman & Ribeoro, 2003, p. 8).

The R2P doctrine is thus based on two main operational pillars: **prevention** and **response** (UN Document A/55/1, 2000). In practice, international intervention can serve both roles. For instance, dispatching a fact-finding mission to a conflict zone can serve as a deterrent and help prevent mass atrocities from occurring.

Despite this, the doctrine faces a number of serious challenges, including the following (Hamman & Ribeoro, 2003, p. 28):

1. **Ineffectiveness** due to limited resources or insufficient efforts.
2. **Delays in response**, as was the case in Rwanda.
3. **Escalation of violence** resulting from prolonged or poorly managed interventions.
4. **Manipulation of protection efforts** for unrelated political objectives, such as regime change.
5. **Collateral damage**, including unintended harm to civilians or infrastructure, particularly from economic sanctions.
6. **Politicization of intervention**, which undermines credibility and public trust (www.africanreview.org/docs/arms/lome.pdf).

Branch Two: The Development of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) Concept

The development of the concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) was not sudden, nor did it emerge fully formed. It evolved gradually as a response to political, legal, and humanitarian failures that plagued the international system in the latter part of the 20th century. Among the most prominent of these failures were the genocides in Rwanda (1994) and Srebrenica (1995), which left the global community facing a moral and political crisis. The inability of the United Nations to prevent or respond effectively to these atrocities prompted widespread criticism and led to deep reflection on the meaning of sovereignty, humanitarian protection, and the limits of non-intervention.

In 2001, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), established by the Canadian government, issued its landmark report entitled *The Responsibility to Protect*, which laid the foundation for what would become the modern R2P doctrine. The report introduced a three-pillar framework: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react, and the responsibility to rebuild. It argued that sovereignty entails not only rights but also duties, particularly the duty to protect populations from mass atrocities such as genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity (ICISS, 2001, pp. XI–XIII).

The ICISS report emphasized that when a state fails to protect its population, whether through incapacity or unwillingness, the international community has a residual responsibility to act, using diplomatic, humanitarian, or even military measures when necessary and appropriate, and in accordance with the UN Charter.

This framework was later endorsed by world leaders at the **2005 World Summit**, culminating in the formal adoption of the R2P principle in **paragraphs 138 and 139** of the Summit Outcome Document. These paragraphs established that:

- Each individual state has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.
- The international community should assist states in fulfilling this responsibility.

- The international community must be prepared to take collective action, through the Security Council and in accordance with the Charter, when national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations (UN General Assembly, 2005 World Summit Outcome, A/RES/60/1).

Following this, the UN Secretary-General issued several reports outlining how the R2P concept should be implemented. In his 2009 report, *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect* (A/63/677), he introduced the now widely accepted **three-pillar strategy**:

1. **Pillar One:** The state bears the primary responsibility for protecting its population.
2. **Pillar Two:** The international community should assist states in building capacity to prevent mass atrocities.
3. **Pillar Three:** If a state fails to protect its population, the international community must be prepared to take timely and decisive action in accordance with the Charter.

Further institutional developments ensued. In 2013, the UN Secretary-General appointed a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, who, along with the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide, assumed the responsibility of promoting the doctrine, monitoring situations at risk, and advising on preventive measures. This institutionalization reflects a growing normative shift in the international community toward viewing protection from mass atrocities as a shared global obligation.

Despite the progress, R2P has not been without criticism. Some states view it with suspicion, fearing that it could be used to justify military intervention under the guise of humanitarian concern. Others argue that the doctrine lacks clear legal enforcement mechanisms, and its application remains highly selective, often influenced by geopolitical interests.

Yet, R2P continues to evolve, driven by both normative developments and responses to real-world crises. Its integration into the UN framework, especially in resolutions and debates within the Security Council and the General Assembly, underscores its growing—though still contested—role in international law and global governance.

Section Two: Legal Basis and Mechanisms of Application

The legal foundation of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine remains one of the most debated issues in contemporary international law. Although the doctrine has gained increasing normative weight since its formal endorsement in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, it has not yet reached the status of a binding legal obligation under customary international law or treaty law.

First: The Legal Status of the R2P Doctrine

The principles underlying the R2P doctrine draw from various sources of international law, primarily:

1. **The UN Charter**, particularly Articles 1, 2, 24, 39, and 42, which address the responsibility of the international community to maintain international peace and security, and authorize the Security Council to take measures—including military intervention—when there is a threat to international peace.
2. **International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Law,** which impose obligations on states to prevent mass atrocities such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.
3. **International Criminal Law**, especially the statutes and jurisprudence of international criminal tribunals and the International Criminal Court (ICC), which provide frameworks for holding individuals accountable for such crimes.

While the R2P doctrine itself is not codified in a single legal instrument, it represents a reinterpretation of existing legal principles, particularly the evolving understanding of sovereignty as responsibility. This shift is supported by the **2004 Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change**, which emphasized that sovereignty entails accountability and that the international community has a duty to act when states fail to protect their populations (UN Doc. A/59/565, 2004).

In this context, the R2P doctrine builds upon the foundation laid by **international legal precedents**, such as the *ICJ ruling in the Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro* case (2007), which recognized the state's obligation to prevent genocide. It also draws from **UN Security Council resolutions**, especially those referencing R2P explicitly—such as Resolutions 1674 (2006), 1706 (2006), and 1970 and 1973 (2011) concerning Libya.

Despite these developments, the absence of a binding legal framework means that the application of R2P is ultimately subject to political will, particularly that of the Security Council's permanent members, whose veto power can paralyze any collective response.

Second: Mechanisms for Implementing the R2P Doctrine

The implementation of R2P relies on a wide array of tools, mechanisms, and institutional pathways. These mechanisms correspond to the **three pillars** of the doctrine:

1. Preventive Mechanisms (Pillar One and Two)

These mechanisms aim to assist states in fulfilling their primary responsibility to protect and include:
- Capacity-building assistance in governance, security sector reform, and rule of law.
- Support for civil society, early warning systems, and national human rights institutions.
- International monitoring missions and special envoys.
- Use of diplomatic channels and mediation efforts.

UN agencies, regional organizations (such as the African Union and the European Union), and international NGOs play a pivotal role in preventive diplomacy and support.

2. Responsive Mechanisms (Pillar Three)

If prevention fails, the international community must be prepared to take action through a spectrum of measures, including:

- Diplomatic pressure and political sanctions.
- Economic sanctions and arms embargoes.
- Referral to the International Criminal Court.
- Deployment of peacekeeping or protection missions.
- As a last resort, **collective military intervention**, authorized by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

The precedent-setting cases of Libya (2011) and Côte d'Ivoire (2011) illustrate how R2P has been invoked to justify robust international responses. However, the controversial aftermath of intervention in Libya has reignited debates over **selectivity, double standards, and unintended consequences**.

3. Post-Crisis Rebuilding Mechanisms

Reconstruction and rebuilding efforts are essential to ensure long-term protection. These mechanisms include:

- Assisting with transitional justice and accountability.
- Supporting disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) programs.
- Re-establishing state institutions and the rule of law.
- Promoting reconciliation and addressing root causes of conflict.

These efforts are closely tied to peace building mandates and must be guided by the needs and ownership of the affected population to avoid repeating cycles of violence.

Section Three: Conditions and Limits of Application of the R2P Doctrine

Despite its normative appeal and humanitarian underpinnings, the practical application of the Responsibility to

Protect (R2P) doctrine is subject to a complex set of legal, political, and ethical conditions that must be fulfilled before any action is taken.

First: Criteria for Activation

Before invoking R2P, certain thresholds must be met to ensure that its application aligns with international law and does not violate the principle of state sovereignty unnecessarily. These criteria include:

1. *Existence of Atrocity Crimes*

R2P applies only in cases involving genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity. The international community must have sufficient evidence that such crimes are occurring or are at imminent risk of occurring.

2. *Failure of the State to Protect*

The doctrine becomes operative only when the concerned state is either unwilling, unable, or manifestly failing to provide protection to its population in accordance with international norms.

3. *Legitimacy of Intent*

The primary purpose of invoking R2P must be to prevent or halt human suffering. The use of the doctrine must not be driven by ulterior motives such as regime change, geopolitical influence, or economic interests.

4. *Last Resort*

All peaceful means of resolution, including diplomacy, sanctions, and mediation, must have been tried and failed. Military intervention, if considered, must be the last resort.

5. *Proportional Means*

The scale, duration, and intensity of the proposed intervention must be the minimum necessary to secure humanitarian objectives.

6. *Reasonable Prospects of Success*

There must be a reasonable chance that the intervention will alleviate the suffering and not make the situation worse. Otherwise, intervention may cause more harm than good.

These criteria were detailed in the report of the **International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS)** in 2001, which laid the groundwork for the contemporary formulation of R2P.

Second: Legal and Political Challenges

Despite being recognized in high-level UN documents and embraced by many states, the doctrine faces numerous challenges:

- *Selective Application*
  Critics argue that R2P has been applied inconsistently, often influenced by the strategic interests of powerful states. While invoked in Libya and Côte d'Ivoire, it was notably absent in Syria, Myanmar, and other crises.

- *Security Council Deadlock*
  The use of veto by permanent members (P5) in the Security Council can obstruct timely and decisive responses, as evidenced in Syria where multiple resolutions invoking R2P failed.

- *Sovereignty Concerns*
  Many developing states view R2P with skepticism, fearing it could serve as a pretext for foreign interference or neocolonialism, undermining national sovereignty and self-determination.

- *Operational Complexities*

  Even when authorized, implementing R2P interventions raises logistical, legal, and ethical dilemmas. Ensuring civilian protection, preventing mission creep, and coordinating international responses are daunting tasks.

Third: Evolving Normative Landscape

The R2P doctrine continues to evolve through:

- *Annual Reports by the UN Secretary-General*, which track progress and recommend strategies for improved implementation.

- *State Practice and Regional Norms*, such as the African Union's principle of "non-indifference," which echoes R2P's ethos.

- *New Proposals*, like Brazil's initiative "Responsibility while Protecting" (RwP), which calls for greater accountability and transparency in the use of force under R2P mandates.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The R2P doctrine represents one of the most significant normative shifts in international relations since the end of the Cold War. It redefines sovereignty as responsibility, positioning the international community as a guarantor of fundamental human rights when states fail to uphold them.

However, for the doctrine to move from aspiration to application, certain structural and procedural reforms are imperative:

- The **UN Security Council** must adopt a voluntary code of conduct regarding veto use in mass atrocity situations.
- Regional organizations must be empowered to play a proactive role in early warning and crisis response.
- A clear, consistent framework for post-intervention accountability must be established.
- States must commit to **capacity-building and preventive diplomacy**, making R2P a tool of peace rather than a justification for force.

By addressing these challenges, the international community can transform R2P from a contested doctrine into a cornerstone of the 21st-century human protection regime.

References

1. Books in Arabic (translated titles provided)

1. Khuli, M. F. (2011). *The United Nations and Humanitarian International Intervention*. Dar Al-Kutub, Cairo.
2. Al-Gharawi, F. A. (2013). *The Displaced and International Humanitarian Law*. Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut.
3. Al-Jumaili, A. R. (2015). *The Globalization of International Criminal Law and Its Impact on Maintaining International Peace and Security*. Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut.
4. Al-Jundi, G. (2009). *The Legal Status of States in Public International Law*. Dar Wael, Amman.
5. Al-Hadidi, T. (n.d.). *Principles of Public International Law in the Light of Global Changes*. Self-published.
6. Al-Subki, H. A. (2015). *Human Trafficking*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
7. Al-Shadhili, F. A. (2002). *International Criminal Law*. Dar Al-Matbouat Al-Jami'iyya, Alexandria.
8. Al-Shukri, A. Y. (2008). *International Criminal Justice in a Changing World*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
9. Al-Anbakki, N. (2010). *International Humanitarian Law*. Dar Wael, Amman.
10. Al-Far, A. M. (1996). *International Crimes and the Jurisdiction to Punish Them*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyya, Cairo.
11. Al-Fattalawi, S., & Rabee', I. M. (2013). *International Humanitarian Law*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
12. Al-Fattalawi, S. (2011). *International Criminal Justice*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
13. Al-Mahdi, M. A. (n.d.). *The Modern Emergence of International Criminal Justice*. ICRC Publications.
14. Al-Mayadani, M. A. (2015). *The State Behind Bars: Debating State Criminal Responsibility*. Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut.
15. Bekka, S. T. (2006). *Crimes Against Humanity*. Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut.
16. Hejazi, A. B. (2009). *The International Criminal Court: An In-Depth Study*. Self-published, Egypt.
17. Harb, A. J. (2010). *International Criminal Justice: The International Criminal Courts*. Dar Al-Manhal Al-Lubnani, Beirut.
18. Hammoudah, M. S. (2009). *The International Criminal Court: General Theory of International Crimes*. Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, Alexandria.
19. Deeb, A. W. (2015). *International Criminal Courts: Development and Role*. Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut.
20. Sabash, W. (2003). *The Relationship Between Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity*. ICRC Publications.
21. Si Ali, A. (2010). *Studies in Humanitarian Intervention*. Al-Academia Publishing, Algeria.
22. Shibl, B. M. (2011). *Substantive International Criminal Law*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
23. Shibl, B. M. (2011). *International Criminal Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
24. Shaaban, A. K. (2015). *International Protection and Legitimacy for Victims of Armed Conflict*. Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut.
25. Sadqi, A. R. (1984). *Principles of International Criminal Law*. Egyptian Journal of International Law, Vol. 40.
26. Amer, S. D. (2004). *War Crimes*, in: *The International Criminal Court*. ICRC Publications.
27. Alwan, M. Y., & Al-Mousa, M. K. (2014). *International Human Rights Law*. Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman.
28. Abdelkhaleq, M. A. (1989). *International Crimes*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Misriyya, Cairo.
29. Abdelmohsen, A. A. (2010). *Jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyya, Cairo.
30. Abdelghani, M. A. (2011). *International Crimes: A Study in International Criminal Law*. Dar Al-Jami'a Al-Jadida, Alexandria.
31. Obaid, H. (1994). *International Crime*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyya, Cairo.
32. Farajallah, S. B. (2000). *Crimes Against Humanity, Genocide, and War Crimes*. Dar Al-Mustaqbal Al-Arabi, Cairo.
33. Omar, H. H. (2006). *Immunities and Prosecutions of Rulers for War and Genocide Crimes*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiyya, Cairo.

34. Maher, M. (2004). *Genocide*, in: *The International Criminal Court*, ICRC Publications.
35. Mahmoud, D., & Youssef, B. (2008). *The International Criminal Court: Law Domination or Domination by Law?* Masha'at Al-Ma'arif, Alexandria.

2. Theses and Academic Conferences

1. Midoun, M. O. (2006). *Use of Force and Responsibility in International Law*. Master's Thesis, Omdurman University, Sudan.
2. Alwan, M. Y. (2001). *Crimes Against Humanity*. Paper presented at the symposium "The International Criminal Court and the Challenge of Impunity," ICRC Publications.

3. United Nations Documents (sample formatting)

1. UN General Assembly. (2005). *2005 World Summit Outcome Document*, A/RES/60/1.
2. UN General Assembly. (2009). *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit*, A/63/677.
3. UN Secretary-General. (2006). *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect*, Report A/66/874–S/2012/578.
4. UN Security Council Resolutions 1785 (2007), 1845 (2008), 2150 (2014).

(Additional documents can be added upon request using full official citations.)

4. References in English

1. Garwood, A. (2012). *China and the Responsibility to Protect*. Asia Journal of International Law.
2. Bellamy, A. J. (2013). *The Responsibility to Protect: Towards a "Living Reality"*. Report for the United Nations Association, UK.
3. Deng, F. M. (1996). *Sovereignty as Responsibility*. Washington, D.C.
4. Hamman, E., & Ribeoro, R. (2003). *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: New Avenues for Intervention and Security*. Garape Institute, Brazil.
5. Evans, G. (n.d.). *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All*. Brookings Institution Press.
6. Aljazy, I., & Aljaghoub, M. (2011–2012). *Libya and Syria: The Responsibility to Protect and the Politics of Power*. Yearbook of Islamic and Middle Eastern Law, Vol. 17.
7. Mamdani, M. (2010). *The Responsibility to Protect or the Right to Punish?*. Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 4(1).
8. Aljazy, I., Aljaghoub, M., & Bydoon, M. (2013). *The Arab League: An Institutional Approach to the Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge University.

5. Websites

1. www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser
2. http://oneresponse.info/GlobalClusters/Protection/Pages/default.aspx
3. www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/responsibility-while-protect
4. www.africanreview.org/docs/arms/lome.pdf