



**PARAHYANGAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

Terakreditasi Unggul

SK BAN - PT NO: 2579/SK/BAN-PT/AK-ISK/S/IV/2022

**The United States Imperative of Military Intervention
Through Responsibility to Protect: Case Study of
Afghanistan and Syria**

Undergraduate Thesis

By

Jonathan

6091801035

Bandung

2022



**PARAHYANGAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

Terakreditasi Unggul

SK BAN - PT NO: 2579/SK/BAN-PT/AK-ISK/S/IV/2022

**The United States Imperative of Military Intervention
Through Responsibility to Protect: Case Study of
Afghanistan and Syria**

Undergraduate Thesis

By

Jonathan

6091801035

Advisor

Dr. I Nyoman Sudira, Drs., M. Si.

Bandung

2022

Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik
Jurusan Hubungan Internasional
Program Studi Hubungan Internasional Program Sarjana




Tanda Pengesahan Skripsi

Nama : Jonathan
Nomor Pokok : 6091801035
Judul : The United States Imperative of Military Intervention through
Responsibility to Protect: Case study of Afghanistan and Syria

Telah diuji dalam Ujian Sidang jenjang Sarjana
Pada Senin, 27 Juni 2022
Dan dinyatakan **LULUS**

Tim Penguji

Ketua sidang merangkap anggota

Adrianus Harsawaskita, S.IP., MA :  _____

Sekretaris

Dr. I Nyoman Sudira :  _____

Anggota

I'dil Syawfi, S.IP., M.Si :  _____

Mengesahkan,
Dekan Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik



Dr. Pius Sugeng Prasetyo, M.Si

STATEMENT LETTER

I, who signed below:

Name : Jonathan
Student ID : 6091801035
Department : International Relations
Title : The United States Imperative of Military Intervention Through Responsibility to Protect: Case Study of Afghanistan and Syria

Hereby state that this undergraduate thesis is the product of my own work and has not been previously proposed by any other party(ies) to attain an academic degree. Any work or opinion from other parties are cited and will be written with a valid writing method.

This statement is made with full responsibility and I am fully willing to accept the consequences if this statement is proven to be untrue in the future.

Bandung, 14 Juni 2022



Jonathan

ABSTRACT

Name : Jonathan

Student ID 6091801035

Title : The United States Imperative of Military Intervention through
Responsibility to Protect: Case Study of Afghanistan and Syria

The objective of this research is to understand The US military intervention in Afghanistan and Syria in the lens of Responsibility to Protect and Structural realism. The position that the US have over this case became of an importance in itself as the US has been known for its active and frequent participation towards intervention, both humanitarian and military, across the history. However, the continuity of US military intervention in Afghanistan and Syria leaves traces of indiscriminate killing which is frowned upon under the R2P. The phenomenon led this research to raise the question of ‘why would the United States continue conduction military intervention in Afghanistan and Syria despite its shortfall to fulfill the R2P principles?’ This research will use the theory of structural realism alongside with the concept of offensive realism to understand the continuity of US military intervention. The analysis shows that the utilization of military force by the US goes in line with the national interest concept as there were vital ‘defense of the homeland’ interest at stake from the situation given by both states. Also, with the existence of terrorism which present threats towards US survivability and the absence of higher authority in response to the usage of chemical weapon made the US to pursue military action. Thus, the shortfall of R2P conduct in Afghanistan and Syria becomes the expense for US survival.

Keywords: *United States, Military Intervention, Afghanistan, Syria, Responsibility to Protect, Structural Realism, National Interest, Survival*

ABSTRAK

Nama : Jonathan

NPM 6091801035

Judul : Kepentingan Amerika Serikat dalam Intervensi Militer Melalui
Responsibility to Protect: Studi Kasus Afghanistan dan Syria

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk melihat intervensi militer Amerika Serikat di Afghanistan dan Suriah melalui pandangan *Responsibility to Protect* dan juga teori *structural realism*. Posisi yang dimiliki Amerika Serikat atas kasus ini menjadi penting dengan sendirinya karena AS dikenal aktif dan sering berpartisipasi dalam intervensi, baik kemanusiaan maupun militer, sepanjang sejarah. Namun, kontinuitas intervensi militer AS di Afghanistan dan Suriah meninggalkan jejak pembunuhan tanpa pandang bulu yang tidak disukai di bawah R2P. Fenomena tersebut mendorong penelitian ini untuk mengangkat pertanyaan 'mengapa Amerika Serikat terus melakukan intervensi militer di Afghanistan dan Suriah meskipun kekurangan untuk memenuhi prinsip-prinsip R2P? Penelitian ini akan menggunakan teori realisme struktural bersama dengan konsep realisme ofensif dan kepentingan nasional untuk memahami kelangsungan intervensi militer AS. Analisis menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan kekuatan militer oleh AS sejalan dengan konsep kepentingan nasional karena ada kepentingan vital '*Defense of the homeland*' yang dipertaruhkan dari situasi yang diberikan oleh kedua negara. Selain itu, dengan adanya terorisme yang menghadirkan ancaman terhadap kelangsungan hidup AS dan tidak adanya otoritas yang lebih tinggi dalam menanggapi penggunaan senjata kimia membuat AS melakukan tindakan militer. Dengan demikian, kekurangan perilaku R2P di Afghanistan dan Suriah menjadi beban bagi kelangsungan hidup AS

Keywords: Amerika Serikat, Intervensi Militer, Afghanistan, Suriah, Responsibility to Protect, Realisme Struktural, Kepentingan Nasional, Kelangsungan Hidup

PREFACE

Human rights atrocities continue to be one of the most challenging tasks for a state, and international community alike, to solve. The Responsibility to protect has been regarded as a solution by the international community and holds states accountable for it through the ‘sovereignty as responsibility’ idea. Nevertheless, the solution will not be seen as it is due to the dual notion of interest at stake, both national and humanitarian, when states are fulfilling their ‘responsibility’.

Viewing from a structural realism perspective, states act under an anarchical system which serves them no better and only able to rely upon themselves. In that sense, having to gain acknowledgement for its might and capability as the global superpower, this research will focus on The United States of America in their R2P conduct. Thus, this research is titled ‘The United States Imperative of Military Intervention through Responsibility to Protect: Case Study of Afghanistan and Syria’ to seek to figure the extent of US actions learning from the cases selected.

This undergraduate thesis serves as the requirement of acquiring the Bachelor degree of International Relations Department, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Parahyangan Catholic University. Nonetheless, the formality of this research does not minimize the author’s determination in contributing to the debate on the US pursuant over its national interests in the conduct of R2P. Regardless, the author acknowledges that this thesis is far from perfect and welcomes every input

for further improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like express its gratitude towards individuals who had helped in the completion for this undergraduate thesis. There are unprecedented amount of people which if the author makes a list out of it, it would create a global environmental crisis. However, these are some honorable mentions:

1. To my parents, brother and sister who had helped and assisted me through out my study. Not to mention, during the time which I needed the most, your presence will always bring peace and serenity to my mental state, and for such, there are no words that could've described the importance of your presence in my life;
2. To my friends, notably kinanti aristawidya, Patricia, Valen, Nathalie Michelle Kosasih, Ryu M. Reinald, Asyifa SK, and Tiflo who stick by my side through the worst of times and undoubtably helped me in discussing lots of things such as (redacted);
3. To my advisor, Mas Nyoman that consistently gave me encouragement and substantial amount of advice for this thesis, and for that I thank you dearly from the bottom of my heart;
4. To god, thanks;
5. To all of the colleagues which I have met during my four years study in UNPAR notably, Samuel Hendry Pangaribuan, Prajna Agnie, Raynard Christian, Jovita Komala, Inka, Sharon, Deandra, you guys are the best, and there will never be goodbyes;
6. To all 40 personals in WADEL GINTRE, you guys rock, never give up,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT LETTER.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK.....	v
PREFACE	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF PICTURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
LIST OF ATTACHMENTS	xiv
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Research Background.....	1
1.2. Problem Identification	3
1.2.1. Scope of Research	6
1.2.2. Research Question.....	6
1.3. Research Objective.....	7
1.4. Literature Review	7
1.5. Theoretical Framework.....	10
1.5.1. Structural Realism	10
1.5.2. National Interest, Robert J. Art.....	12
1.5.3. Responsibility to Protect.....	15
1.6. Research Methods	17
1.7. Thesis Structure	18
CHAPTER II	20
United States Responsibility to Protect Operation in the Afghanistan and Syria	20
2.1. The US Standpoint regarding Military Intervention	23

2.1.1.	The US Stance on Military Intervention	25
2.1.2.	The US Course of Actions Against Human Rights Atrocities.....	28
2.2.	The Conduct of US Military Intervention in Afghanistan	30
2.2.1.	The US Intervention as an Act of Self-defense	32
2.2.2.	The Application of The Three Pillars of Responsibility to Protect in Afghanistan.....	35
2.3.	The Conduct of US Military Intervention in Syria	41
2.3.1.	The US Intervention as Response towards the usage of CMW by Bashar Al-Assad	42
2.3.2.	The Application of The Three Pillars of Responsibility to Protect in Syria 51	
CHAPTER 3	55
3.1.	The Importance of Military Intervention for US' National Interest in Afghanistan and Syria	56
3.1.1.	The Possession of Offensive Capabilities from Afghanistan and Syria.....	57
3.1.2.	The Possibility of Threat towards the US 'defense of the homeland' interest	61
3.1.3.	The US Allocated Resource from its R2P Response in Afghanistan and Syria	63
.....	63
3.2.	The Enforcement of Self-help System upon the US Survivability	69
3.2.1.	Terrorism as the Grand Threat against the US' Vital Interest.....	70
3.2.2.	The Condition of Uncertainties from Afghanistan and Syria towards US National Interest.....	73
3.2.3.	Survivability as the end goal from US' Conduct of Military Intervention	74
3.3.	The Assurance for US Survivability <i>via</i> its Conduct on the R2P	75
CHAPTER IV	77
CONCLUSION	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79
ATTACHMENT	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 America National Interest.....	14
Table 1.2 The Three Pillars of Responsibility to Protect.....	16
Table 1.3 The Three Responsibility to Protect... ..	17
Table 2.1 Chemical Weapon Attacks in Syria.....	41
Table 3.1 Afghanistan Threats and US Interest.....	58
Table 3.2 Syria Threats and US Interest.....	59

LIST OF PICTURES

Picture 3.1 US' Economic and Military Spending for Afghanistan... ..	60
Picture 3.2 US Spending for ASFF	62
Picture 3.3 US and Syria Military Spending Comparison	63
Picture 3.4 Migration and Refugee Assistance Spending.....	64
Picture 3.5 Military Spending for Syria	65

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANDS Afghanistan National Development Strategy

AQ Al-Qaeda

ASSF Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

AUMF Authorisation for Use of Military Force

CW Chemical Weapon

CWC Chemical Weapon Convention

DoD Department of Defense

ESF Economic Support Funds (ESF)

FATA Federally Administered Tribal Areas

ICISS International Commission on Intervention an State Sovereignty

IS Islamic State

ISAF International Security Assistance Force

ISKP Islamic State-Khorasan Province

NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization

OECD Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

OFAC Office of Foreign Assets Control

OPCW Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapon

PSD Presidential Study Directives

R2P Responsibility to Protect

UDHR Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UN United Nations

UNHRC United Nations Human Rights Council

UNSC United Nations Security Council

UNSCR United Nation Security Council Resolution

US United States of America

USAID United States Agency for International Developmet

USSR the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1.1 The Distribution of US Economic and Military Aid for Afghanistan and Syria, 2001-2019.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Background

Humanitarian intervention has been a debatable notion for the act of intervening in another state territory or domestic affairs with the use of military force, as it compromises a sovereign government's control over its own assets.¹ States that have such conditions were called out by Francis Deng, who stated "sovereignty as responsibility" and explained that it is the responsibility of states to protect citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. However, after the event of the Security Council failure to respond to the Kosovo and Libya Crisis, the guarantor of the humanitarian values has been relocated from the United Nations Security Council to the 'International Community'.²

The recognition of it by the UNSC signals to the international community that to protect people from their own government's violence has become the responsibility of the global community.³ This notion later translate into the exercise of "responsibility to protect" which gives the imperatives of state members of

¹ Silverstone, Scott A., "Intervention and Use of Force", march 2011, Oxford Bibliographies, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199743292/obo-9780199743292-0047.xml#:~:text=Intervention%20is%20commonly%20defined%20as,its%20own%20territory%20and%20population.> (Accessed on 23 April 2021)

² Oxford, Anne, "Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and The Use of Force in International Law", 2003, Cambridge University Press, United States of America, isbn-10 0-511-06373-3

³ UN News, "Libya: Ban welcomes Security Council authorization of measures to protect civilians." UN New Center ,2011 <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=37809#.WB4UfTKZPBI>

United Nations to have ‘Responsibility’ as part of the ‘International Community’ to deliver a *‘practical protection for ordinary people, at risk of their lives, because their states are unwilling or unable to protect them’*.⁴ Consist of three pillars for its applicability, Ban Ki-Moon introduced them as being (a) responsibilities of the state to protect its own people from four major crimes, (b) the international community’s commitment for assistance and capacity-building in other states, and (c) a responsibility for a timely and decisive response by the international community in case a state fails to fulfill these responsibilities.

In the case of intervention, the United States (US) is known for its frequency of involvement for both humanitarian and military intervention across the world. Protection of fundamental human rights has always been the policy priority set up across the US presidencies.⁵ The protection of people under the threat of grave human rights violations within the R2P doctrine comes with a wide range of appropriate measures from the imposition of sanctions, to the point of costly military intervention to the failing states. The number of military interventions has become a trend to deal with the rising numbers of authoritarianism and civil wars which demand a complex approach for the protection from grave human rights violations. However, one approach which the US has referred to which always invokes controversies in the justification, conduct, and outcomes is the US military intervention.

⁴ ICISS, “The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty”, 2001, International Development Research Centre, Canada, ISBN 0-88936-960-7ibid.

⁵ United States Department of State. “Human Rights and Democracy - United States Department of State,” November 24, 2021. <https://www.state.gov/policy-issues/human-rights-and-democracy/>.

The US is in fact an active state in intervention considering its activity of intervention from the World War I, until the 9th of September 2001 which sparks the fight against terrorism globally. According to Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research studies on International Military Intervention, the US placed first as the country with most participation in military intervention, as it has participated in 8.5% out of 447 cases of intervention.⁶ Another study presents that throughout 1946-2002 there are 2285 cases of military intervention, and out of 809 cases (35%) were military interventions by major powers.⁷ Among the major powers, the US military intervention still represent the highest number which is responsible for 371 cases. The high number of the US involvement in international military interventions strongly suggest the US dedication to exercise military power. In order for a military intervention to be exercised, the intervener needs to provide justifications which are commonly based on the upsetting incident of human rights atrocities happening in the intervened state. Handling the situation, the international community has come to an agreement through the establishment of R2P submitted by the ICISS which was introduced in 2001 and later adopted by the General Assembly in 2005.

1.2. Problem Identification

⁶Umich.edu. “Variable Home Page,” 2017. https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/ICPSR/studies/21282/datasets/0001/variables/VAR_001?archive=ICPSR

⁷ Wolak, Pelin Eralp, ‘FOREIGN MILITARY INTERVENTIONS IN CIVIL CONFLICTS, 1946-2002’, https://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/handle/1903/15225/EralpWolak_umd_0117E_15020.pdf;jsessionid=4257B3EAF3F30ED1E9F05946CD0F826?sequence=1

Although the notion of R2P gained support for its means by the international community, the party that opposed the R2P are still delivering their concerns for there are possibilities for the misuse and abuse such as the selectivity, inconsistency and double standards by the great power in exercising the R2P.⁸ Those concerns drive mainly from the third pillar that deemed the international community to take collective action, which due to its implication can be seen as a continuation of global interventionism and lack of accountability. Such concerns were delivered by numbers of states believing that the US has manufactured artificial reasons in its intervention, one of which is in the case of Syria.⁹ Consequently, the thriving motivation for intervention by the US has led the Responsibility-to-protect framework into failure in responding to the humanitarian crisis faced by the citizens of Syria.

As the incorporation of human security, be it for their rights and from threats, is being seen as one part to sustain international peace, the use of exerting necessary means can justify such a claim. Necessary means such as military intervention has become part of 'sovereignty responsibility' and made significance on the way the military resources of a state can be deployed. Requiring the military as part for its response, the US still takes up as the world's largest military power. Militarily, the US has spent \$640 billion which constitutes over one third (36%) of

⁸ Erdogan, Birsan,"*Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect Turkish Foreign Policy Discourse* ", Palgrave Macmillan, Maastricht University,ISBN 978-3-319-47682-7 ISBN 978-3-319-47683-4 (eBook) DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-47683-4

⁹ Hannah Beech, China's View on Syria Crisis: America's "Hidden Motivations" Are Leading It Astray, TIME (Sept. 13, 2013), <http://world.time.com/2013/09/13/chinasview-on-syria-crisis-americas-hidden-motivations-are-leading-it-astray/>.

the total global military spending.¹⁰ Alongside its military occupancies in over 80 countries with around 750 military bases, this implies that it is expected of the US by the international community to have a rigid standing in the participation of the R2P.¹¹ Realizing its might in pursuing its policy, the US government assures the international community that they are indeed committed to uphold and support the R2P implementation.¹²

However, as presented in the case of US intervention in Syria, the recent investigation by *the New York Times* reveals that there are numerous civilian casualties resulting from the US military operation through the interventions. Contradicting reports from the Department of Defense (DoD) and the investigations also differs hugely in numbers due to expected causes such as misidentification of civilians, flawed intelligence and reasoning such as “sometimes bad things happened”.¹³ Another research on the matter also conducted by Watson Institute in their ‘Costs of War’ research that sum up the civilian casualties from direct and indirect US Military Operation in Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, Syria and Pakistan that reach an estimated 387,072 civilian deaths as of september 2021.¹⁴ Recalling again

¹⁰ BBC Bitesize. “The Role of the US as a World Power - the USA’s International Influence - Higher Modern Studies Revision - BBC Bitesize,” 2015. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/z6frqp3/revision/2>.

¹¹ Haddad, Mohammed. “Infographic: US Military Presence around the World.” Aljazeera.com. Al Jazeera, September 10, 2021. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/9/10/infographic-us-military-presence-around-the-world-interactive>.

¹² U.S. Mission Geneva. “The U.S. Strongly Supports the Concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P).” U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Geneva, June 19, 2012. <https://geneva.usmission.gov/2012/06/19/the-u-s-strong-supporter-of-the-concept-of-responsibility-to-protect-r2p/>.

¹³ The New York Times. “Hidden Pentagon Records Reveal Patterns of Failure in Deadly Airstrikes,” 2022. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/12/18/us/airstrikes-pentagon-records-civilian-deaths.html>.

¹⁴ The Costs of War. “Civilians Killed & Wounded | Costs of War,” 2021. <https://watson.brown.edu/costsofwar/costs/human/civilians>.

on the purpose of intervention by Responsibility to Protect, the end goal of an intervention should be human security, which is not in line with the US intervention. If the US focuses on civilian protection through its operation in correspondence to the R2P framework, the attack would not result in the high number of civilian casualties. The decision made by the US disregards the focus of human security in the R2P principle that supposedly addresses the civilians' physical safety. Hence, looking from the perspective from the R2P framework, the US Intervention does not present clear intent in resolving the matters which made the human security concerned in the intervened state.

1.2.1. Scope of Research

This research will focus on the cases of military operations in intervention that falls under the scope of Responsibility to Protect basis taking from the case study of Afghanistan and Syria. The main actor that will be of use for this research is the United States of America. This research acknowledges that there are different policy objectives following the presidency that led the United States in the conduct of their intervention, However this research will not focus on the changes and transition of it but will only see the US adherence to the R2P framework. The scope of this research will begin from the year of 2001-2019 but will still accept significant cases that surpass the designated time frame.

1.2.2. Research Question

This paper will be conducted with the research question being, **“Why Would the United States Continue Conducting Military Intervention in Afghanistan and Syria despite its Shortfall to fulfill the R2P principles?”**

1.3. Research Objective

The purpose of the research seeks to answer the proposed question brought up which seeks the reason for US Continuity on the conduct of military intervention in Afghanistan despite its shortfall in the practice of R2P. Using structural realism as theoretical framework, this paper will discuss the aspects of the theory in relations towards the condition that the US faces when responding towards the crisis in Afghanistan and Syria. The application of R2P and national interest will be used to see which one the US military intervention serves to.

1.4. Literature Review

In ‘What determines US Humanitarian Intervention?’ by Seung-Whan Choi, the article wonders about the motives of the United States for playing as a third-party intervener in responding to humanitarian crises. The article starts by stating that America has the ability as the third-party intervener due to its sublime power after winning the cold war.¹⁵ The action to intervene is being perceived as an effective means to limit the spread of a conflict and minimize suffering. The stronghold that made America able to advance their Intervention was the view of the US as the world’s sole military superpower, and that made the US to be at the

¹⁵ Choi, Seung-Whan, “What Determines US humanitarian Intervention?”, University of Illinois, Chicago, USA, Conflict Management and Peace Science, 2013, 30(2) Pg. 121-139

center of many future humanitarian actions. The argument for why the US intervened was viewed by the debate over liberalist against realist argument. From the realist perspective, the motives of US willing to sacrifice their soldiers for overseas interventions are driven to pursue its own national interest such as securing the supply of oil or extension of US interest. Differ from the realist perspective, liberalist stance for US interventions was purely for humanitarian motives and preservation of human security. After presenting a research model presenting a dataset over US interventions, the conclusion made was most of US declared humanitarian missions were purely to save innocent lives, minimize human suffering and prevent further human atrocities. That is due to the finding which presents no clear strategic value that the US could gain over their Humanitarian Mission deployments in the selected cases that Choi took.

In a book written by Julie A. Mertus titled “Bait and Switch: Human Rights and U.S Foreign Policy”, she explains that in the practice of Human Rights norms internationally, The US projects differentiation upon what Human Rights is to America. The book explains how the US has its own exceptionalism in the practice of Human Rights to induce its own desired behaviour upon others. It is proven by the writer on how the US reached its successes through using Human Rights as the basis of its foreign policy.¹⁶ However, The values of Human Rights discourse promoted by the US do not align with appropriate Human Rights culture or behaviour. The argument shown in the book showcased how the US has its double standard on human rights, the one which applies to them, and the other which is

¹⁶ Julie A. Mertus, “Bait and Switch: Human Rights and US Foreign Policy”. 2004, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, New York, London, ISBN 0-203-49174-2

imposed to the other states. The culture of US foreign policy is not one of human rights because the US deployment of human rights double standards is perceived as a choice which the US is privileged to.

In determining the success of an R2P principles and doctrine, Syria present as an unique case over it. This is due to the case of Syria being a country that faces constant humanitarian catastrophe and political stalemate. Despite of the overwhelming evidence on syria's continuing systemic oppression against its own civilian, R2P has not been able to solve it.

Thomas G. Weiss stated in his paper which highlighted that since the ICISS put into effect the three forms of responsibility (to prevent, react and rebuild), there has been a decrease in the number for humanitarian intervention.¹⁹ However, for The US, Humanitarian Intervention remains as part of its policy agenda by presenting how the threat abroad will have a direct effect towards the nation's stability. Despite the importance of humanitarian intervention depicted by the White House, politics and military capacity remains the decisive factor for whether, when, where and why to protect and assist war-affected populations. The reasons

¹⁷ United Nations, "Article II"

¹⁸ Scanlon, Helen, Elizabeth Myburgh, and Ahunna Eziakonwa. "Africa's Responsibility to Protect." Africa Portal. Centre For Conflict Resolution (CCR), April 2, 2007. <https://www.africaportal.org/publications/africas-responsibility-protect/>.

¹⁹ Weiss, Thomas G., "On R2P, America Takes the Lead", University of New York. Pg.322

behind it were the considerations of risk that will be pointed towards the US if the intervention fails.

1.5. Theoretical Framework

1.5.1. Structural Realism

It is understood that the normative core of realism is national security and state survival. The condition drives as the state is considered to be essential in relation to the life of its citizens making the state to be seen as a protector of its territory and populations.²⁰ The fact that all states must pursue their own national interest means that other countries and governments can never be relied upon or completely trusted. The state of distrust leads states to set aside laws, conventions, and all other agreements if their vital interests are at stake.²¹ In classical realism, Machiavelli explains that states should not wait for things to happen, but rather to take pre-emptive measures or action. Hobbes also provided insights in which the human condition dealt with insecurity. Morgenthau recognizes both Hobbes and Machiavelli assertions and translates that states are likely to trample on human rights or morality when their national interests are at stake.

Structural realism agrees that there is no higher authority above states and the condition suggests for states to pursue power in order to be able to protect

²⁰Jackson, Robert and GeorgSørensen, 2003. Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press pg.67

²¹ ibid. 67

themselves when threats are present.²² The states are led to achieve and compete for power in order to survive, different from classical realism that sees power as an end. For structural realists, states led to believe that having an overwhelming power is the best way to ensure their survival, hence under this perspective power is a means to survival.

There are five main assumptions in structural realism, first is that great powers are the main actors in world politics and they operate in an anarchic system.²³ Second assumption, is that states possess to some extent, offensive military capability to inflict harm to other states. Third assumption is that states can never be certain of the intentions of other states. Fourth assumption, states goal is survival. This point explains that for a state to have the ability to protect human rights, maintain territorial integrity, autonomy of their domestic political order can only be pursued when only the state survives. The fifth and last assumption is that states are rational actors which pin states tend to prospect for survival. The assumptions above cannot be singly used to explain the pursuit of power by states. It is agreed that only if all the five assumptions have been perceived it can explain states driving incentives to pursue power at other's country's expense.

The condition produces a self-help system which enforces states to only rely on themselves in ensuring their survival due to no higher authority that can protect them from external attacks. Thus, enabling states to put their own interest ahead of

²² Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, "International Relations Theories Discipline and Diversity THIRD EDITION", Oxford University Press, 2013.

²³ Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, "International Relations Theories Discipline and Diversity THIRD EDITION", Oxford University Press, 2013.

others as well as the broader norms and values in the international community.²⁴

Offensive realism explains the behavior in which states procure in order to gain as much power as possible as it is perceived as the best way to ensure one's survival. Offensive realists argue that states should always be looking for opportunities to gain more power because that is the best way to guarantee survival. Offensive realists believe that status quo is rarely found in world politics due to the tendency of states to gain their own power at the expense of others.²⁵ Offensive realism in this research will be used as a prescriptive theory which wishes to explain how states should behave according to the dictates of offensive realism because it outlines the best way to survive in a dangerous world. Mearsheimer answers on how states maximize security through maximizing their share of world power. However, the offensive military policies may at any time lead to self-defeating behaviour.

National Interests are fundamental to be identified as it can determine the direction and manner which a state must employ. As states should pursue their own national interest, realists thus argue that countries and governments can never be relied upon or completely trusted.²⁶ According to Robert J. Art, United States Interest which he categorized follows the criteria such as: The benefits if the interest is protected, The cost if it is not, The sequence in which interest can be achieved,

²⁴ Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, "International Relations Theories Discipline and Diversity THIRD EDITION", Oxford University Press, 2013.

²⁵ Mearsheimer, J.J. (2001). The tragedy of great power politics. New York: W.W. Norton & Company

²⁶ Sorensen, Jackson, "Introduction to International Relations, Theories and Approaches", Oxford University Press, 2013

and the manner in which military power can be used.²⁷ Thus, through the categorization of the importance, it can determine the resources used and allocated to secure the interest. The Categorization for the importance of interest was then divided into vital, highly important, and important. An interest considered to be Vital for when it's not achieved it will be costly or even nearly catastrophic for the state, such as security. The scope of security to a state means the protection of the homeland from attack, invasion, conquest and destruction.²⁸ Second, a highly important interest that will bring great benefits to the state. Lastly, is an important interest that if achieved will increase the state's economic well-being, potential value with moderate chance for loss.

²⁷ Art, Robert J., "*America's National Interests*", in "*A grand strategy for America*", A Century Foundation Book, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2003

²⁸ *ibid.* Pg45

Table 1.1 America National Interest

	Interest	Prime Threats	Ranking
1	Defense of the homeland	Grand terror attacks and spread of weapons of mass destruction to hard-to-deter state leaders and fanatical terrorists	Vital
2	Deep peace among the eurasian Great Powers	Aggressive great powers and hegemons	Highly Important
3	Secure access to Persian Gulf oil at a stable, reasonable price	A hegemonic Iran or Iraq	Highly Important
4	International economic openness	Great-power security competitions, wars	Important
5	Consolidation of democracy and spread and observance of Human Rights	Civil wars, Ruthless leaders	Important
6	No severe climate change	Unconstrained carbon emissions	Important

Source: America's National Interests, Robert J. Art.²⁹

The theory laid by Robert also has incorporated aspects of prime threats to each of America's national interests. The action that will follow suit in response to the threat is to keep the latent threat latent and if possible, to remove the threat. However, if not possible, then to lessen the threats which have manifested.³⁰ Those responses are inserted to secure the national interest. That idea itself is fulfilling the

Art, Robert J., *"America's National Interests"*, in *"A grand strategy for America"*, A Century Foundation Book, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 2003. Pg.46

³⁰ *ibid.*Pg48

realist basic assumption that to be self-centered, self-regarding, and self-interested are permanent and unchanging human nature in politics.³¹ As this theory has already laid out the United States national interest, it is purposely used to identify whether during the mission of military intervention the interest is achieved.

1.5.2. Responsibility to Protect

Responsibility to protect has derived from the concept on which responsibility for the protection of its people has become part of state sovereignty. The Responsibility to Protect framework which was formulated by the ICISS acknowledges the dual implication of sovereignty. Externally, states are to respect the sovereignty of other states, and internally, to respect the dignity and basic rights of all the people within the state.³² The concept of sovereignty adopted by the R2P was not to create a new understanding of Sovereignty but rather to imply the needs of a supreme and sovereign entity to be able to provide security to its own people. The situation then explains for the Responsibility to protect to be seen as to these three pillars as proposed by the Commission.

³¹Sorensen, Jackson, "Introduction to International Relations, Theories and Approaches", Oxford University Press, 2013

³² International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, "The Responsibility to Protect", the International Development Research Centre, National Library of Canada, December 2001

Table 1.2 The Three Pillars of Responsibility to Protect

Pillar One	Every state has the Responsibility to Protect its populations from four mass atrocity crimes: genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing.
Pillar Two	The wider international community has the responsibility to encourage and assist individual states in meeting that responsibility.
Pillar Three	If a state is manifestly failing to protect its populations, the international community must be prepared to take appropriate collective action, in a timely and decisive manner and in accordance with the UN Charter

Source: ICISS³³

The defence of state sovereignty does not imply for a state to have unlimited power to do whatever it wants to its own people.³⁴ The implications of sovereignty as responsibility comes threefold as prescribed in the table above. first, it implies that the state authorities are responsible for the functions of protecting the safety and lives of citizens and promotion of their welfare.³⁵ secondly, it suggests that the national political authorities are responsible to the citizens internally and to the international community through the UN. And thirdly, it means that the agents of state are responsible for their actions, they are accountable for their acts.

For the case of Pillar three, when states are to take action in defending other state populations whose security is not ensured by their host state, intervention can be in order. The nature of intervention which the Commission endorses are not to

³³ International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, “The Responsibility to Protect”, the International Development Research Centre, National Library of Canada, December 2001.17
³⁴ International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, “The Responsibility to Protect”, the International Development Research Centre, National Library of Canada, December 2001 pg.8
³⁵ International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, “The Responsibility to Protect”, the International Development Research Centre, National Library of Canada, December 2001. pg.13

be justified as ‘humanitarian intervention’ but are preferred to be labelled as ‘military interventions’ for humanitarian purposes. The Responsibility to protect not only discusses matters of the right for a state to intervene, it also provides the provision of the right to react, prevent and rebuild after the duty or responsibility are in order. The Responsibility to Protect embraces three responsibilities.

Table 1.3 The Three Responsibility to Protect

Responsibility to Prevent	to address both the root causes and direct causes of internal conflict and other man-made crises putting populations at risk.
Responsibility to React	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.
Responsibility to Rebuild	to provide, particularly after a military intervention, full assistance with recovery, reconstruction and reconciliation, addressing the causes of the harm the intervention was designed to halt or avert.

Source: ICISS

1.6. Research Methods

The research method for the purpose of this scientific paper is the qualitative method. According to John W. Cresswell, the qualitative method is an approach to explore and understand the meaning that exists in an interaction.³⁶ In the research plan, this qualitative method will be based on analysis, explanation and argument

³⁶ John W. Cresswell, “Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method

Approaches”, SADE Publications, 2014

which contains a comprehensive and data-based understanding.³⁷ Data collection in this research will be based on document or archive-based research and also internet-based research. The sources include media articles, scholarly journals, reports, and governmental documents. Thus, some data sources that can be used in this scientific paper are journals, books, official texts, and official websites.³⁸

1.7. Thesis Structure

This paper will consist of four chapters. **Chapter I** will serve as the introduction of the thesis which includes contextual background on the topic, research question, literature review, theoretical framework, research methodology, and purpose and utility of research that will be used in this research.

Chapter II titled *United States Responsibility to Protect Operation in Afghanistan and Syria*, will discuss the interventions which have been participated in by the US in Afghanistan and Syria. The discussion will render the US justifications for intervention, and the conduct of US military interventions operation. The discussion will serve to provide understanding on whether or not during those interventions the US was able to fulfill their obligations in accordance with the R2P principles.

Chapter III titled *The US Continuance for Military Intervention in Afghanistan and Syria* will focus on discussing the findings on Chapter II and analyze them in order to obtain factors for US continuity through military intervention in the case studies. The discussion will be further linked with the theory

³⁷ Jennifer Mason, "*Qualitative Researching: Second Edition*, London, SADE Publication

³⁸ Suryadi Bakry, Umar, "*Metode Penelitian Hubungan Internasional*, 2016, Yogyakarta, Pustaka Belajar.

of structural realism alongside with offensive realism and national interest that exists in the case of the Afghanistan and Syria crisis.

Chapter IV serves to provide a conclusion of the findings based on the previous chapters. This chapter provides direct answers on the research question and to fulfill the purpose of the research.