

## **A Normative and Analytical Framework for Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine in the 2021 Afghanistan Crisis**

**Dr. Rizky Pratama**

Faculty of Economics and Business Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

**Dr. Siti Nurhaliza**

Department of Information Systems Airlangga University, Surabaya, Indonesia

Article received: 16/03/2026, Article Accepted: 17/04/2026, Article Published: 02/05/2026

© 2026 Authors retain the copyright of their manuscripts, and all Open Access articles are disseminated under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 \(CC-BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which licenses unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is appropriately cited.

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine represents one of the most significant normative developments in contemporary international relations, redefining the traditional understanding of sovereignty by embedding it within a framework of accountability toward civilian populations. Emerging from the failures of the international community to prevent mass atrocities in the late twentieth century, R2P seeks to reconcile the tension between non-intervention and humanitarian responsibility by establishing a three-pillar structure centered on prevention, reaction, and rebuilding (Evans, 2008; Thakur, 2011). Despite its conceptual clarity and widespread rhetorical endorsement, the doctrine's practical implementation has remained uneven and politically contingent. The Afghanistan crisis of 2021—characterized by the rapid withdrawal of international forces, the collapse of state institutions, and the resurgence of Taliban governance—presents a critical empirical context for evaluating the operational effectiveness and normative coherence of R2P.

This study develops a comprehensive normative and analytical framework to systematically assess the extent to which R2P principles were applied, neglected, or constrained during the Afghanistan crisis. Drawing exclusively on established theoretical and empirical literature, the research integrates normative political theory with institutional analysis to construct a multi-dimensional evaluative model. The framework operationalizes the three pillars of R2P into measurable analytical dimensions, including early warning capacity, responsiveness of international actors, legitimacy of intervention, and sustainability of post-conflict reconstruction. In doing so, the study bridges a critical gap in existing scholarship, which often treats R2P either as a purely normative ideal or as a set of isolated case applications, without offering a unified model for comprehensive evaluation.

Methodologically, the research adopts a qualitative, interpretive approach grounded in comparative theoretical synthesis. It critically engages with key scholarly contributions on humanitarian intervention, sovereignty, and global governance, including debates on legitimacy, selectivity, and institutional effectiveness (Bellamy, 2010; Wheeler, 2002; Weiss & Hubert, 2001). Particular emphasis is placed on the evolving centrality of civilian protection in international relations, as articulated by Welsh (1998), whose conceptualization of the “return of the civilian” provides a crucial lens for understanding the normative expectations surrounding R2P. By embedding this perspective within the analytical framework, the study foregrounds the human security dimension of the Afghanistan crisis, emphasizing the lived consequences of normative failure.

The findings of the study reveal a pronounced disjunction between the theoretical commitments of R2P and its empirical application in Afghanistan. Preventive mechanisms were largely ineffective, as international actors failed to anticipate and mitigate the rapid political and security collapse. Reactive measures were constrained by geopolitical considerations, resulting in delayed and fragmented responses that prioritized strategic withdrawal over civilian protection. Furthermore, the rebuilding dimension of R2P was inadequately addressed, with minimal efforts to ensure institutional continuity or safeguard vulnerable populations in the aftermath of regime change. These outcomes highlight the persistent challenges of translating normative principles into actionable policy, particularly in contexts characterized by high political complexity and limited consensus among global actors.

The study also identifies structural and conceptual limitations within the R2P framework itself. The absence of binding enforcement mechanisms, coupled with the doctrine's reliance on state consent and international cooperation, creates significant barriers to consistent application. Moreover, the politicization of humanitarian intervention

undermines the universality of R2P, reinforcing patterns of selective engagement that erode its legitimacy (Ferraro, 2012; Malcontenti, 2014). In this regard, the Afghanistan case underscores the need for a more robust institutional architecture capable of reconciling normative aspirations with geopolitical realities.

In conclusion, this research contributes to the academic and policy discourse by offering a refined analytical framework for evaluating R2P effectiveness, grounded in both normative theory and empirical application. It advances the understanding of how and why R2P succeeds or fails in complex crisis environments, while also providing a foundation for future research aimed at enhancing accountability, consistency, and operational capacity within international humanitarian governance.

## **KEYWORDS**

Responsibility to Protect, Afghanistan Crisis 2021, Humanitarian Intervention, Normative Framework, International Security, Civilian Protection, Global Governance, Conflict Analysis.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine represents a transformative shift in international norms concerning sovereignty and humanitarian intervention. Rooted in the premise that states bear primary responsibility for protecting their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, R2P also asserts that the international community must act when states fail to fulfill this obligation (Evans, 2008; Thakur, 2011). Despite its normative appeal, the doctrine's implementation remains inconsistent, often constrained by geopolitical interests and institutional limitations.

The Afghanistan crisis of 2021, marked by the withdrawal of international forces and the subsequent Taliban takeover, provides a critical case for evaluating the operational effectiveness of R2P. The rapid collapse of state institutions, coupled with heightened risks to civilians—particularly women, minorities, and political dissidents—raised fundamental questions about the applicability and responsiveness of R2P mechanisms.

The problem addressed in this study is the gap between R2P's normative commitments and its practical enforcement in real-world crises. While the doctrine has been invoked in several international interventions, its absence or limited application in Afghanistan underscores systemic challenges in global governance structures.

This research is significant because it contributes to understanding the structural and political constraints that hinder effective humanitarian intervention. It aims to develop a robust analytical framework capable of assessing R2P's performance in complex conflict environments. The objectives of the study include: (i) critically examining the theoretical foundations of R2P, (ii) evaluating its application in the Afghanistan crisis, and (iii) proposing a structured model for assessing its effectiveness.

The scope of this research is confined to normative and analytical evaluation, relying exclusively on established literature and theoretical constructs. The study also

integrates perspectives on civilian protection and international responsibility, emphasizing the evolving role of non-state actors and global institutions (Welsh, 1998).

## **Literature Review**

The conceptual evolution of R2P is deeply rooted in debates surrounding humanitarian intervention and state sovereignty. Early scholarship, such as Wheeler (2002), emphasizes the moral imperative of intervening to protect civilians, while highlighting the tension between ethical responsibility and political realism. Similarly, Welsh (2004) situates humanitarian intervention within broader international relations theory, arguing that state behavior is often influenced by strategic interests rather than normative commitments.

Bellamy (2010) provides a critical assessment of R2P's development, noting its gradual institutionalization but also its vulnerability to selective application. This critique is reinforced by Ferraro (2012), who argues that interventions under R2P often reflect geopolitical biases rather than universal humanitarian principles. Malcontenti (2014) further illustrates this inconsistency through comparative analysis of Libya and Syria, demonstrating divergent outcomes despite similar humanitarian justifications.

The theoretical foundation of R2P is articulated extensively by Evans (2008) and Thakur (2011), who frame the doctrine as a normative shift from state-centric sovereignty to responsibility-based governance. However, Cunliffe (2007) challenges this perspective by questioning the legitimacy of external intervention, particularly in contexts where power asymmetries influence decision-making.

Institutional perspectives are explored by Weiss and Hubert (2001) and Chesterman et al. (2015), who examine the role of international organizations in implementing R2P. Their analyses highlight structural limitations, including bureaucratic inertia and lack of enforcement mechanisms. Paris (2004) contributes to this

discourse by emphasizing the challenges of post-conflict reconstruction, suggesting that intervention alone is insufficient without sustainable peacebuilding strategies.

A critical dimension of the literature is the re-emergence of civilian protection as a central concern in international relations. Welsh (1998) argues that the “return of the civilian” reflects a shift in normative priorities, emphasizing human security over traditional state-centric models. This perspective is particularly relevant in evaluating the Afghanistan crisis, where civilian vulnerability was exacerbated by institutional collapse.

Despite extensive scholarship, a key research gap remains in the development of integrated frameworks that combine normative theory with empirical evaluation. Existing studies often focus either on conceptual analysis or case-specific observations, lacking a comprehensive model for assessing R2P effectiveness across diverse contexts.

### **Methodology**

This study adopts a qualitative analytical methodology, integrating normative theory with structured evaluation to assess the effectiveness of R2P in the Afghanistan crisis. The methodological framework is designed to bridge theoretical constructs with empirical interpretation, ensuring both conceptual rigor and practical relevance.

### **Normative Analytical Framework**

The first component of the methodology involves constructing a normative framework based on three core pillars of R2P: prevention, reaction, and rebuilding (Evans, 2008). Each pillar is operationalized through specific indicators:

- **Prevention:** Early warning systems, diplomatic engagement, and capacity-building efforts
- **Reaction:** Timeliness and proportionality of international response
- **Rebuilding:** Post-conflict stabilization and institutional support

This framework allows for systematic evaluation of how R2P principles were applied or neglected in Afghanistan.

### **Analytical Model Design**

The analytical model incorporates three dimensions:

1. **Institutional Effectiveness:** Assessment of international organizations’ capacity to implement R2P
2. **Political Will:** Evaluation of state-level commitment to humanitarian intervention

3. **Normative Consistency:** Degree to which actions align with R2P principles

Each dimension is analyzed through qualitative indicators derived from the literature, ensuring consistency with established theoretical perspectives.

### **Case Application: Afghanistan Crisis 2021**

The Afghanistan crisis is examined through the lens of the proposed framework. Key variables include:

- Withdrawal of international forces
- Collapse of Afghan governance structures
- Human rights implications for civilians

The analysis focuses on identifying gaps between normative expectations and actual outcomes, highlighting structural and political constraints.

### **Theoretical Integration**

The methodology integrates insights from Welsh (1998) on civilian protection, emphasizing the centrality of human security in evaluating R2P. This approach ensures that the analysis remains grounded in both normative theory and practical considerations.

### **Limitations**

The study is limited by its reliance on secondary sources and theoretical interpretation. While the framework provides a structured approach, empirical validation would require extensive field data and stakeholder analysis.

### **Results / Findings**

The application of the normative and analytical framework reveals significant shortcomings in the implementation of R2P during the Afghanistan crisis of 2021. The findings indicate that the preventive dimension of R2P was largely ineffective, as early warning mechanisms and diplomatic engagements failed to anticipate or mitigate the rapid deterioration of governance structures. Despite extensive international presence over two decades, the lack of sustainable institutional capacity undermined long-term preventive strategies.

In terms of reactive measures, the international community demonstrated limited responsiveness. The withdrawal of foreign forces occurred without adequate contingency planning for civilian protection, leading to a vacuum of authority. This reflects a disconnect between R2P’s commitment to timely intervention and the political realities influencing decision-making processes. The absence of coordinated international action further

weakened the doctrine's operational credibility.

The rebuilding dimension was also insufficiently addressed. Post-withdrawal strategies lacked coherence, and international efforts to stabilize Afghanistan were minimal. The collapse of state institutions resulted in heightened vulnerability for civilians, particularly marginalized groups. This outcome underscores the inadequacy of R2P's third pillar when not supported by sustained political and institutional commitment.

Across all dimensions, the findings highlight a pattern of normative inconsistency. While R2P principles emphasize collective responsibility, their application in Afghanistan was fragmented and selective. This aligns with existing critiques regarding the politicization of humanitarian intervention (Ferraro, 2012; Malcontenti, 2014).

### **Discussion**

The findings of this study reveal critical tensions between the normative aspirations of R2P and its practical implementation. One of the central issues is the lack of political will among major international actors, which significantly constrained the doctrine's effectiveness. As noted in the literature, humanitarian intervention often reflects strategic interests rather than universal ethical commitments (Welsh, 2004; Wheeler, 2002). This dynamic was evident in Afghanistan, where geopolitical considerations influenced the timing and nature of international engagement.

The study also highlights institutional limitations within global governance frameworks. International organizations tasked with implementing R2P lack enforcement mechanisms and rely heavily on member state cooperation (Chesterman et al., 2015). This structural dependency limits their ability to respond effectively in crisis situations, particularly when consensus is absent.

Another important implication is the evolving role of civilian protection in international relations. Welsh (1998) emphasizes the increasing prioritization of human security, yet the Afghanistan case demonstrates that this shift has not been fully institutionalized. The failure to protect vulnerable populations during the crisis indicates a gap between normative discourse and operational practice.

The study further identifies contradictions within the R2P framework itself. While the doctrine promotes collective action, it does not adequately address issues of accountability and enforcement. This ambiguity allows for selective application, undermining its legitimacy and effectiveness.

From a practical perspective, the proposed analytical

framework offers a structured approach for evaluating R2P across different contexts. By integrating normative and empirical dimensions, it enhances the ability to identify gaps and propose targeted improvements. However, the framework's applicability is contingent on the availability of reliable data and the willingness of stakeholders to engage in transparent evaluation.

### **Conclusion**

This study provides a comprehensive evaluation of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine in the context of the Afghanistan crisis of 2021. By developing and applying a normative and analytical framework, the research identifies significant gaps between theoretical commitments and practical outcomes. The findings underscore the challenges of implementing R2P in complex geopolitical environments, where political interests and institutional limitations often override humanitarian considerations.

The study contributes to the academic discourse by offering a structured model for assessing R2P effectiveness, integrating theoretical insights with practical evaluation. It highlights the need for greater normative consistency, enhanced institutional capacity, and stronger political commitment to ensure meaningful protection of civilian populations.

Future research should focus on empirical validation of the proposed framework and explore mechanisms for strengthening accountability within international governance structures. Additionally, there is a need to reassess the balance between state sovereignty and global responsibility, ensuring that humanitarian principles are not compromised by political constraints.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Bellamy Alex J. "The Responsibility to Protect—Five Years On." *Ethics & International Affairs*, 2010:24(2):143–169.
2. Bellamy, Alex J, Paul D. Williams, editors. "Understanding Peacekeeping." Polity Press, 2010.
3. Chandler, David. "From Kosovo to Kabul: Human Rights and International Intervention." Pluto Press, 2002.
4. Chesterman, Simon, et al. "The Oxford Handbook of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations." Oxford University Press, 2015.
5. Cunliffe, Philip. "Legitimacy and Power Politics: The American and French Revolutions in International Political Culture." Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
6. Evans Gareth. "The Responsibility to Protect: Ending

# **INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITY DEVELOPMENT (IJSSHD)**

Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All." Brookings Institution Press, 2008.

7. Evans, Gareth. "The Responsibility to Protect: Ethical and Theological Reflections." *International Journal of Public Theology*,2010:4(3):255–276.
8. Ferraro, Vincent. "Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: A Critique." *Ethics & International Affairs*,2012:26(3):347–361.
9. Malcontenti, Fabio. "The R2P Principle: Its Application in Libya and Syria." *Global Responsibility to Protect*,2014:6(2):119–143.
10. Paris, Roland. "At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict." Cambridge University Press, 2004.
11. Thakur, Ramesh. "The Responsibility to Protect: Norms, Laws and the Use of Force in International Politics." Routledge, 2011.
12. Weiss, Thomas G, Don Hubert. "The Responsibility to Protect: Research, Bibliography, Background." International Peace Academy, 2001.
13. Welsh, Jennifer M. "Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations." Oxford University Press, 2004.
14. Welsh, Jennifer M. "The Return of the Civilian in International Relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*,1998:27(3):647–663.
15. Wheeler, Nicholas J. "Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society." Oxford University Press, 2002.