

[Research Notes]

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P): The International Community and Responsibility¹

Mariko SHOJI *

Who is the subject of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P)? Who has the responsibility? The ICISS report's central theme is that sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own citizens from avoidable catastrophe, but when they are unwilling or unable to do so, the responsibility must be borne by the broader community of states. The main subject of the ICISS report is the "international community."² And the intention of the ICISS report is that the international community takes responsibility. In this paper, the following 4 questions will be discussed. (1) What is the international community? Actors relating to the notion of R2P are examined. (2) Does the international community have international ownership? (3) What is international responsibility? (4) Can the international community take responsibility?

Preface

The notion of "Responsibility to Protect (R2P)" is introduced by the following report: The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), *The Responsibility to Protect, The Report of the International Commission on Intervention*

* 庄司真理子 しょうじ・まりこ：敬愛大学国際学部教授 国際機構論・国際関係法・国際関係論

Professor of International Studies, Faculty of International Studies, Keiai University; theory of international organizations, law of international relations, theory of international relations.

and State Sovereignty, December 2001 (ICISS report).

Basic Principles of ICISS report is following:

- A. State sovereignty implies responsibility, and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lies with the state itself.
- B. Where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect.

The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) is not an organ of the United Nations, but the notion of R2P was taken up by the outcome document of the World Summit in 2005 which was convened as the United Nations General Assembly. This outcome document was adopted by consensus of the heads of state and heads of government from 191 member states of the UN. The UN Secretary-General examined the notion of R2P and publicized a report of the Secretary-General on 12 January 2009 titled "Implementing the responsibility to protect: Report of the Secretary-General."³

We can say that the notion of R2P is a critical normative notion in the field of peace and security by the United Nations.

The United Nations has invented many new international norms.⁴ Some of these new norms are certainly international law, but other new norms are not positive international law in the strict sense.

Nowadays, in the field of UN activities, there must be some necessity to seek new type of norms. Traditionally, international society has sought international law among sovereign states. But the notion of R2P cannot be explained in a purely international legal context. We can explain the usefulness and validity of the notion of R2P, without any international legal implication. Today, not only international law but also global norms have to be considered in the context of global

governance. The notion of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is not a notion of international law, but we can say that it is a global norm. And these global norms, which are at a chaotic stage of law or international expectation, are supporting global governance and the international community.

The report of the ICISS stated, "Above all, the issue of international intervention for human protection purposes is a clear and compelling example of concerted action urgently being needed to bring international norms and institutions in line with international needs and expectations."⁵

The notion of R2P can not be explained clearly by an exact theory of international law, but this notion reflects international needs and expectations. How can international law explain international needs and expectations theoretically? It is necessary to explain and analyze the notion of R2P not only from the viewpoint of the theory of international law but also from the viewpoint of the theory of international politics.

We can analyze the notion of R2P from many angles such as the legal problems of R2P,⁶ the norm creating process of R2P,⁷ and so on. This paper focuses on the relationship between the notion of responsibility and the international community.

I. The International Community

In the first place, let us examine the subject of the notion of R2P, and then the notion of the international community will be examined.

Dr. Ramesh Thakur, who is one of the main members of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, tells that there must be some questions about the notion of R2P. One of these questions is who takes responsibility, and he mentions that the international community takes responsibility. But there must be another question: what is the international community? Is the United

Nations the subject of responsibility? Dr.Thakur answered, “States community, regional organizations, international organizations, NGOs, the UN and so on. Various actors are included in the international community.”⁸

How can the international community take responsibility?

(1) New actors: what is the international community?

The report of the ICISS mentions “With new actors . . . has come a wide range of new voices, perspectives, interests, experiences and aspirations . . . Prominent among the range of important new actors are a number of institutional actors and mechanisms, especially in the areas of human rights and human security.”⁹

But, what is the international community? The ICSS report says that a number of institutional actors and mechanisms and many new non-state actors are also included in the international community. The report mentions examples. According to the ICISS report, such mechanisms as the UNHCHR, UNHCR, ICTY and ICC, as well as many new non-state actors, such as NGOs, and the growing number of media and academic institutions are included as international actors. Furthermore, armed non-state actors ranging from national and international terrorists to traditional rebel movements and various organized criminal groupings are included in the category of non-state actors, too.¹⁰

In conclusion, the international community includes many new international actors.

(2) Does the international community have international ownership?

How can we analyze such new actors? If an actor is recognized as an international actor, such an actor must have international ownership.¹¹ Next, let us examine the definitions of international actor not only from the theory of international law but also from that of international politics.

(a) International law

The logic of international law provides a useful approach to

realize some theoretical problems. What is the international community from the viewpoint of international law? And what are actors from the viewpoint of international law? When we study actors in the field of international law, if these actors have the nature of legal subjects are examined.

The International Court of Justice, reports 1949 say: A subject of the law is an entity capable of possessing international rights and duties and having the capacity to maintain its rights by bringing international claims.¹²

Hersch Lauterpacht says: "As in any other legal system, so also in the international sphere the subjects of law are the persons, national and juridical, upon whom the law confers rights and imposes duties. In international law these persons are normally States."¹³

And he continues: "However, the view that entities other than States can be subject of international law has been denied by many; and although opposition to it has receded under the impact of modern developments it cannot, as yet, be said that it has been generally accepted."¹⁴

In the field of international law, states are principal subjects of international law. And in the field of international law, rights and obligations are vital elements for the subjects of international law.

What about the other actors on the earth? For example, international organizations such as the UN have the right to conclude treaties with other international actors.

Rebecca Wallace says: "Their [international organizations] legal personality may to some extent parallel that of states." And she continues, "The constituent document may expressly provide that an organization is to have international legal personality."¹⁵

To this extent, the UN has the nature of an international legal actor. But how about individual, do they have the nature of international legal actors in the international arena?

Wallace says: "Individuals have limited international legal personality, although contemporary international law increasingly recognizes that an individual may possess both

rights and duties.”¹⁶

In proportion to the number of rights and obligations, international actors have ownership or subject-ability of international law. When we consider the subject of international norms, there must be a difference between the notion of legal personality and the notion of international legal actor. What is a legal personality?

A business dictionary offers the following definition:

“Entity (such as a firm) other than a natural person (human being) created by law and recognized as a legal entity having distinct identity, legal personality, and duties and rights. Also called artificial person, juridical entity, juristic person, or legal person. See also body corporate.”¹⁷

A legal personality or juristic or juridical person is a legal entity through which the law allows a group of natural persons to act as if it were a single composite for certain purposes, or in some jurisdictions, for a single person to have a separate legal personality other than their own.¹⁸

There must be some difference between an international subject and an international personality. For example, an incompetent person has full rights and obligation.¹⁹ He or she is a fully legal actor or subject. But I think that an incompetent person has limited legal responsibility within his ability or capacity. From this consideration, on the one hand, a legal subject or actor has rights and obligations, and on the other hand, a legal personality has power or ability and responsibility.

Although the legal ownership of the international community as a whole cannot be explained, not only states but also many international actors can have international legal rights and obligations.

(b) International politics

Next, let us examine the international community and the many new actors in the international arena from the viewpoint of international politics.

Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi explain the actor as follows: “A participant or player. The state is considered by realists to

be the principal actor in international relations; other non-state actors include transnational actors such as multinational corporations and banks.”²⁰

Sovereign states are the principal actors on the earth. The other actors, non-state actors, are just kind of participants or players on the earth.

Professor Ryo Oshiba says international actors have:

- “1. The nature of independence: The actor has the ability to decide its purpose and interest. And it has the ability to take responsibility for its deed.
2. The ability of mobilization: The actor has the ability to mobilize the people and other resources.
3. The nature of internationality: The actor has the ability to exert an important influence on the international relations or other actors.”²¹

From these considerations, three points are mentioned for the definition of international actors in the context of global norms. (i) the nature of internationality, (ii) legally: rights and obligations, and (iii) politically: power and responsibility.

- (i) The nature of internationality: An actor that can move or influence internationally. International actors have the ability to influence other actors trans-boundarily.
- (ii) From the viewpoint of international law, international actors have to have rights and obligations to some extent. These rights and obligations are not necessarily full rights and obligations like those of a sovereign state.
- (iii) From the viewpoint of international politics, political scientists analyzed how much power international actors or non-state actors have.

But from the viewpoint of responsibility and accountability, we have to analyze international actors.

II. Responsibility

(1) What is international responsibility?

Next, the meaning of responsibility is considered. Can non-state actors have an ability to take a responsibility? Can the international community take responsibility? Can they, new actors, be punished internationally?

The Oxford dictionary explains the meaning of responsibility as follows:

- “1. a duty to deal with or take care of sb/sth, so that you may be blamed if sth goes wrong.
2. blame for sth bad that has happened.
3. a duty to help or take care of sb because of your job, position, etc.”²²

(a) International law

The theory of international law explains the meaning of international responsibility from the viewpoint of the international legal context.

Professor Ian Brownlie says: “International responsibility is commonly considered in relation to states as the normal subjects of the law.”²³

If a state violates international law, that state is alleged to be in breach of an international legal obligation and has a legal responsibility.

How can the state take responsibility? There are three ways: reparations, restitution, and satisfaction. Satisfaction means all the release acts for responsibility without reparations and restitution. Apology is one of the main release acts for responsibility.

And the subjects of responsibility in international law are mainly states and international organizations. Individuals can take responsibility restrictedly in the field of international law such as responsibility for war. The notion of responsibility in international law is closely related to the violation of law.

How can we explain the notion of R2P in this international

legal sense? Does the international community violate international law? The idea of responsibility used in the notion of R2P is somehow related to the idea of power.

The famous legal scholar Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld categorizes legal notions as follows. He suggests that there are counterpart relationships among some legal notions, and there are some pairs of counterpart legal notions.

Categorization by Hohfeld²⁴

Jural Correlatives

Right	privilege (liberty)	power	immunity
Duty (Obligation)	no-right	liability (responsibility)	disability

From Hohfeld’s famous categorization, we can see that the notion of right is the counterpart of the notion of obligation, and the notion of responsibility (liability) is the counterpart of the notion of power. And we can see that obligation and responsibility have a different meaning. Hohfeld explains, “A duty or a legal obligation is that which one ought or ought not to do. ‘Duty’ and ‘right’ are correlative terms. When a right is invaded, a duty is violated.”²⁵ The word “duty” in this context, is as the same meaning as the word “obligation.” And he continues, “*Powers and Liabilities*. As indicated in the preliminary scheme of jural relations, a legal power (as distinguished, of course, from a mental or physical power) is the opposite of legal disability, and the correlative of legal liability.”²⁶ The word “liability,” in this context, is as the same meaning as the word “responsibility.”

And the notion of “right” and “obligation (duty)” is closely related to the theory of international subjectivity. On the other hand, the notion of “power” and “liability (responsibility)” is closely related to the theory of international personality. This is the difference between the theory of international subjectivity and that of international personality. From the viewpoint of international law, it is an important element for international actors if the actors-subjects have rights and obligations, which is the explanation of international subjec-

tivity. In contrast, it is important for international personality if the person has power and responsibility. There must be some difference between international subject and international personality. For example, an incompetent person has rights and obligations. He or she is a fully legal actor or subject. But an incompetent person has limited legal responsibility within his ability or capacity. From this consideration, on the one hand, a legal subject or actor has right and obligations, and on the other hand, legal personality has power or ability and responsibility.

Following this logic, there is a possibility these international actors will take responsibility, although international actors do not have any obligation. Because the notion of responsibility and the notion of obligation have a different meaning, we have to use these two notions in a different context.

The notion of R2P (responsibility to protect) demands that international actors protect human security. This act of protection is not an obligation of the international community but a responsibility of the international community.

(b) International politics

Now we have to examine the notion of responsibility in the political sense. New actors in the context of global governance have to be explained not only from the viewpoint of the nature of international legal subjects but also from the viewpoint of the nature of international political actors.

Professor Oshiba explains that the nature of independence is the first element of an international actor: "1. The nature of independence: The actor has the ability to decide its purpose and interest. And it has the ability to take responsibility for its deed."²⁷

There are a few research papers that examined the notion of responsibility in the field of international politics.

Robert Jackson and George Sørensen categorize the notion of responsibility into the following three parts: "We can discern at least three distinctive dimensions or levels of responsibility which correspond to Wright's three traditions noted above; (1) devotion to one's own nation and the well-being

of its citizens; (2) respect for human rights, rights of other states and for international law; and (3) respect for human rights.”²⁸

They classify (1) national responsibility, (2) international responsibility, and (3) humanitarian responsibility. Regarding the third one, “humanitarian responsibility has the cosmopolitan standard for evaluating foreign policies which gives rise to Kantian precepts”²⁹ This third category of responsibility, humanitarian responsibility, produces a drastic change in the notion of responsibility. The notion of R2P falls in this category of humanitarian responsibility. In the future, the theory of international norms will have to exploit how to analyze not only rights and obligations but also power and responsibility of international actors.

(2) Can the international community take responsibility?

As mentioned before,³⁰ the ICISS report on R2P requests the international community to take responsibility to protect. Can the international community take this responsibility?

(a) The Westphalian approach

From the viewpoint of the Westphalian approach, sovereign states have a primary responsibility not only in the legal sense but also in the political sense in the international arena.

(i) International politics

It must be easy to take a political realist approach to take a Westphalian perspective. It is important for the Westphalian approach to focus on the relationship between sovereign states and to stress a power politics by sovereign states; this is a political realist approach. It is simple to understand, and it is simple to keep order on the earth, if we follow the political realist approach, sovereign states have to take all the responsibilities on the earth.

There is an old Japanese saying, “I have to take responsibilities for all matters. If a telephone pole is tall, if the color of mailbox is red, any problems, I have to take responsibility.”

Do sovereign states have to take such a broad responsibility? Do sovereign states have responsibility for all the prob-

lems on the earth? It must be too much of a burden for sovereign states to take all responsibility on the earth.

(ii) *International law*

From the viewpoint of traditional international law, sovereign states have a primary responsibility in the international arena.

Professor I. A. Shearer says: "The wrongs or injuries which give rise to state responsibility may be of various kinds. Thus a state may become responsible for breach of treaty, in respect of the non-performance of contractual obligations, for injuries to citizens of another state, and so on."³¹

If there are some wrong acts on the earth, sovereign states have to take responsibility for them. But what country can take responsibility for her wrongdoings of Al-Qaida? It is reasonable to take responsibility if a state violates international law. But if Al-Qaida commits a terrorist attack in the United States or in other countries, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, or the UK, which country should take responsibility? It is reasonable that Al-quaida itself has to be responsible for its deeds.

In the international arena, sovereign states do not have to take all the responsibilities on the earth. It is natural that every actor has to accept its own responsibility not only in domestic society but also in the international arena.

(b) The international community: new actors

We cannot ignore the trend of globalization. There are multiple actors on the earth that operate trans-boundarily. Every actor has to take its responsibility in the international arena.

We cannot ignore the trend of globalization. There are multiple actors on the earth that operate trans-boundarily. Every actor has to take its responsibility in the international arena.

Nowadays, not only sovereign states but also non-state actors can take responsibility through economic sanctions by the UN Security Council. Hereinafter, we will analyze economic sanctions by the UN Security Council. Through this analysis of economic sanctions by the UN Security Council,

we can see if every actor can take responsibility in the international arena.

Sanctions are penalties or other means of enforcement used to provide incentives for obedience with the law, or with rules and regulations.³² In the sense of criminal law, sanctions and punishment mean atonement by a person who violates law. A person who violates law takes responsibility by this kind of atonement being received sanctions. Of course, the sanctions by the UN Security Council are not always judicial ones but they are legitimately authorized by the Security Council. The analysis of sanctions by the UN Security Council demonstrates if new actors can take responsibility in the international arena.

In this context, resolutions by the UN Security Council that decide sanctions are analyzed. If new actors are the object of sanctions or the subject of sanctions of the resolution by the Security Council, we can recognize such new actors have the ability to take responsibility not only in domestic arena but also in international arena. I analyze all resolutions for economic sanctions by the Security Council from 1945 to September 2009.

(i) *The object of sanctions*

(1) State:

4 cases Res. 232 (1968), Res. 418 (1977), Res. 1683 (2006), Res. 1689 (2006), Res. 1696 (2006), Res. 1718 (2006), Res. 1737 (2006), Res. 1744 (2007), Res. 1747 (2007), Res. 1753 (2007), Res. 1731 (2006), Res. 1874 (2009)

(2) Both conflicting parties:

On the occasion of sanctions, it can not be identified which party is the aggressor, so all parties in the conflict become the object of sanctions.

Res. 1072 (1996), Res. 733 (1992), Res. 1298 (2000), Res. 1701 (2006), Res. 1591 (2005), Res. 1616 (2005), Res. 1654 (2006), Res. 1676 (2006), Res. 1679 (2006), Res. 1698 (2006), Res. 1708 (2006), Res. 1713 (2006), Res. 1724 (2006), Res. 1727 (2006), Res. 1749 (2007)

(3) Rebels:

Obviously rebels are non-state actors. Such non-state actors become the object of sanctions.

Res. 1343 (2001), Res. 864 (1993), Res. 1533 (2004)

(4) Terrorism:

Sanctions against terrorism are an important issue for the UN.

Res. 784 (1992), Res. 1070 (1996), Res. 1373 (2001), Res. 1368 (2001), Res. 1535 (2004), Res. 1624 (2005), Res. 1636 (2005)

(5) Blame by individual name:

In need of targeted sanctions, the target of sanctions has to be clarified by individual name.

Res. 1993 (1998), Res. 1221 (1999), Res. 1267 (1999), Res. 1333 (2000), Res. 1338 (2002), Res. 1526 (2004), Res. 1617 (2005), Res. 1672 (2006), Res. 1735 (2006)

Precisely defined object of sanctions: The person who is the target of sanction is eliminated by his vocation, status, or crime.

Res. 917 (1994), Res. 1636 (2005), Res. 1698 (2006)

Carefully targeted in support of clear objectives and implemented in ways.

Res. 1617 (2005), Res. 1730 (2006), Res. 1735 (2006)

From this analysis, we can see that the objects of sanctions are not always United Nations' member states. Essentially the Charter of the United Nations is a multinational treaty and is ratified by the UN member states. An international treaty has legal binding force upon its contracting states. Theoretically, the UN Security Council is permitted to decide sanctions solely against UN member states. This is because one of the most important international legal principles is *pacta tertiis nec nocent nec prosunt* (a treaty does not create either obligations or rights for a third state without its consent). The UN member states conclude the UN Charter under the agreement that the member states would be sanctioned if the state is acknowledged to be an aggressor state by the Security

Council. From this context, the Security Council is authorized to decide sanctions only against member states in a legal strict sense.

But in this analysis of the Security Council resolution, we can see that not only member states but also a variety of non-state actors can be the object of sanctions.³³ The objects of sanctions are expanded horizontally and vertically. Horizontally they expand from the UN member states to non-member states or to both parties in a conflict. Vertically they expand from state actors to non-state actors, such as rebels, individuals, and terrorists. This means that new actors should take international responsibility because the new actors become the object of economic sanctions by the United Nations.

(ii) The subject of sanctions

The UN Charter, Article 41, stipulates: “The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures.”

It is the member states that should obey decisions by the UN Security Council. There is no obligation for non-member states and non-state actors to obey the decisions. In this section, the subjects of sanctions will be examined.

(1) All member States:

Around 30 cases

(2) All the member states and non member states: All States

More than 60 cases

(3) All the states, international organizations, regional organizations and specialized agencies. In some cases, such humanitarian organs as the WFP, UNICEF, and UNHCR are exceptions, because weak people in the sanctioned state are in danger of becoming the victims of sanctions. International organizations join the sanctions, case by case basis.

More than 30 cases

- (4) A specific country by name (especially adjacent countries):

The boundaries of African countries have been arbitrarily drawn by the colonial powers, so it is meaningless to exercise sanctions against African countries by name. The security system in Africa needs measures against not one country but surrounding countries as well.

Res. 820 (1993), Res. 833 (1993), Res. 1584 (2004), Res. 1649 (2005), Res. 1744 (2007), Res. 1749 (2007)

- (5) Including conflicting parties:

The various conflicting parties are coexisting, and it is difficult to separate the subject of sanctions from the object of sanctions and to exercise the sanctions. Strict sanctions in total are demanded with the both sides.

Res. 1455 (2003), Res. 727 (1992)

- (6) People:

For the effective economic sanctions, people, who goes across the border of sanctioned state with trading commodities, has to be blocked out.

Res. 1596 (2005)

- (7) Others:

Res. 1368 (1995)

Oil for food project

Only Turkey is permitted sanctions cancellation.

- (8) The international community:

The first time for a resolution of the UN Security Council to use the term “international community” was in Resolution 1368, paragraph 4, on the occasion of September 11, 2001 terrorist attack.

The Security Council “4. Calls also on the international community to redouble their efforts to prevent and suppress terrorist acts”³⁴

And the word “international community” was also used in Res. 1674 (2006). This resolution was adopted for endorsing the validity of the Report of the Secretary-General of 28 November 2005.

There were urgent needs and expectations for the international community to cope with such a terrible terrorist attack. In this sense, the international community was perceived as participants in the UN sanctions. And the Security Council's Resolution 1368 on the occasion of September 11, 2001, it has the legal binding force. The term "international community" is prescribed on this legal binding decision. For this reason, we can recognize the term "international community" as the keyword for international legal document.

Against a strict international legal theory, already non-state actors and the international community are included together with member states in the context of economic sanctions by the Security Council. The objects of sanctions and the subjects of sanctions have been expanded. In this sense, the notion of R2P has some meaning in global governance.

III. Global Governance and the Notion of R2P

(1) A valid connotation for global governance or global public sphere

The notion of R2P cannot be explained in the pure legal context, but we can explain the usefulness and validity of the notion of R2P. If the notion of R2P presents a valid meaning for global governance or global public sphere, in the first place, we have to discuss what the subject of R2P is. It is very important for the study of global governance to clarify subjects and actors. And as mentioned above, the subjects of R2P is "international community" including international organizations, non-state actors and so on. For the theory of international law, sovereign states are most important actor. On the other hand, for the theory of global governance, various actors on the earth are important elements.

We can see similar type of notions such as the notion of peace-building and preventive diplomacy (conflict prevention). Comparing the notion of R2P with the notion of peace-building and preventive diplomacy, the notion of R2P

has some special features, that is, the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react and the responsibility to rebuild. This sequence has already been discussed. Why should we discuss the notion of R2P as a new notion?

In his book “Anarchical Society,” the famous scholar of international politics, Hedley Bull poses three basic questions: (i) What is order in world politics? (ii) How is order maintained within the present system of sovereign states? (iii) Does the system of sovereign states still provide a viable path to world order?³⁵

If we take the Westphalian approach, the state-to-state relationship and the sovereign states system is most important for the world order today. We can keep order by the sovereign states system. But is it appropriate for the world today? There are various kinds of international and transnational actors on the earth today. In the age of globalization, the global system is more complex than the sovereign state system. What should we do?

It is realistic to think that sovereign states have primary responsibility for the world order today. We cannot deny the importance of the role of sovereign states today, but it is unreasonable for sovereign states to take all the responsibilities for all global problems. It must be reasonable that not only sovereign states but also various international actors on the earth have to take responsibility in proportion to their ability. Various international actors have the ability to take responsibility in proportion to their ability.

Not only top-down governance but also a bottom-up governance perspective is needed today. We can construct a global order based on every actor’s every responsibility. This is bottom-up governance and bottom-up order. As shown by the case of Grameen Bank, poor people and weak people are trust worthy. Poor and weak people can take responsibility.

Accumulating of this kind of small power and small responsibility from the bottom, we can construct a global order for twenty-first century.

And the meaning of R2P is that not only sovereign states

but also the international community can take responsibility. As for us, we are used to having a sense that order comes down from the top. Top-down security is useful. But in addition to top-down security, we can construct bottom-up security through responsibility of the international community and new actors.

(2) The challenge of the notion of R2P

Finally, I will discuss the challenge of the notion of R2P. How can we secure the deliberative public sphere for the international community? As far as the subject of R2P is the international community, some kind of democratic implication is needed for R2P. This is a big problem for the notion of R2P in the context of global governance.

As many researchers point out, R2P has a danger of abuse by the big powers. Several parts of the notion of R2P cannot be explained logically in the context of international law. How should we make the international community participate? There is a lack of a mechanism in the international community. It is necessary for the discussion of various actors' governance or multi-stakeholder governance to secure some processes for them, such as the participation process, deliberative process, executive process and checking process.

Some scholars, Anthony Giddens,³⁶ Terry Macdonald,³⁷ and Minu Hemmati,³⁸ propose multi-stakeholder initiatives. This kind of proposal has a nice mechanism for global governance, but there is a danger of the dispersion of responsibility in the global arena.

A serious problem for the notion of "international community" of R2P is to secure responsibility of the international community.

Conclusion

In this paper, following four points are examined. The subject of

R2P is the international community. (1) What is the international community? (2) Does the international community have international ownership? (3) What is international responsibility? (4) Can the international community take responsibility?

In the context of R2P, the international community includes many new international actors such as international organizations, many new non-state actors and furthermore, armed non-state actors.

Does the international community have international ownership? If an actor is recognized as international actor, such an actor must have international ownership. What is international actor? Three points are mentioned for the definition of international actors in the context of global norm. (i) The nature of Internationality, (ii) Legally: Rights and Obligations and (iii) Politically: Power and Responsibility.

What is international responsibility? We can't explain the notion of R2P from the viewpoint of international law, because the notion of international responsibility is closely related to the right and the obligation. The notion of "responsibility" in R2P is closely related to the notion of the power and responsibility. It is different thing from taking international legal responsibility to taking humanitarian responsibility in the context of R2P. In the future, theory of international norm have to exploit how to analyze not only right and obligation but also power and responsibility of international actors.

Can the international community take responsibility? In this paper, the sanction by the UN Security Council is analyzed. In this analysis, many new international actors can be not only the subject of the sanction but also the subject of the sanction.

Nowadays, various international actors have the ability to take the responsibilities in proportion to their ability. R2P shows us the way how to construct not only top down security but also bottom up security by the international community.

Notes

1. This paper is based on my speech at a workshop of Waseda University held on 22 June 2009. The main title of the workshop was “The Responsibility to Protect: Japan’s Role in Translating the Principle from Words to Deeds.” It was organized by the Global Institute for Asian Regional Integration (GIARI), the Asia-Pacific Center for the Responsibility to Protect, and Asia Human Community (AHC).
2. What is the definition of “international community”? Please see next page.
3. “Implementing the responsibility to protect: Report of the Secretary-General” 12 January 2009, UNGA official document (A/63/677).
4. What is the definition of a norm? Please see Mariko Shoji “Research Notes: Normative Role of the United Nations Secretary-General,” *The Keia Journal of International Studies*, No. 23, pp. 117–118.
5. The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001), *The Responsibility to Protect*, The Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, December, p. 3, para. 1.11.
6. Legal analysis of R2P was examined in the following paper: Mariko Shoji, “Kokuren ni okeru Ningen no Anzen Hoshō Gainen no Igi—Kihan toshiteno Ichizuke wo megutte” (The Connotation of the Notion of Human Security within the United Nation—Concerning its Status as a Norm—) *The Journal of International Law and Diplomacy*, Vol. 105, No. 2, August 2006.
7. Mariko Shoji, “Kokuren ni okeru Kihan Souzou no Shinkyokumen” (A New Aspects of the Norm Creating Process in the United Nations), *Journal of World Affairs*, September 2006.
8. Interview with Dr. Ramesh Thakur in March 2005. Dr. Ramesh Takur was the vice rector of the United Nations University, Tokyo, since 1998, and was in charge of the university’s Peace and Governance Programme.
9. *The Responsibility to Protect*, *op. cit.*, p. 3, para. 1.13.
10. *Ibid.* pp. 3–4.
11. I define the notion of “ownership” in this paper as the same as the term “subject ability.” From the viewpoint of law, the notion of “ownership” is defined as follows: “The bundle of rights allowing one to use, manage, and enjoy property, including the right to convey it to others” *Black’s Law Dictionary* (3rd ed., 2006, p. 512).

In this paper, the notion of “ownership” is used not only from the viewpoint of international law but also from the viewpoint of international politics. From the viewpoint of international law, the main subject of international law is “states.” And Professor Wallace mentioned “A subject of international law owes responsibilities to the international community and enjoys rights, the benefits of which may be claimed, and which, if denied, may be enforced to the extent recognized by the international legal system, via legal procedures, that is, the entity will have procedural capacity” (Rebecca M. M. Wallace, *International Law*, Sweet & Maxwell, 1997, p. 59). And she continues, “Today, however, although they [states] remain its primary subjects, they are no longer the exclusive subjects of international legal system” (Wallace, *ibid.*, p. 60).

This paper questioned whether states have exclusive ownership or subject ability in international society. Professor Young mentioned, “A combination of forces, including rising levels of international interdependence, the growing role of non-state actors and the emergence of the global change agenda, is now raising profound questions about some of the intellectual underpinnings of the states system” (James N. Rosenau & Ernst-Otto Czempiel, *Governance without government: order and change in world politics*, Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 192–193).

“Subject ability” in this paper is used not only in the context of international law but also in the context of international politics. From this interdisciplinary context, not only states but also non-state actors have “subject ability” in international society.

12. International Court of Justice, Reports (1949), "Reparations for injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations," p. 173.
13. Hersch Lauterpacht (1970), *International Law: collected papers*, Cambridge University Press, p. 136.
14. Ibid.
15. Rebecca M. M. Wallace, *International Law*, Sweet & Maxwell, 1997, pp. 68–69.
16. Ibid., p. 74.
17. *Business Dictionary*, <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/juridical-person.html>
18. A juristic or juridical person is a legal entity through which the law allows a group of natural persons to act as if it were a single composite individual for certain purposes, or in some jurisdictions, for a single person to have a separate legal personality other than their own. This legal fiction does not mean these entities are human beings, but rather means that the law allows them to act as persons for certain limited purposes—most commonly lawsuits, property ownership, and contracts. This concept is separate from and should *not* be confused with limited liability or the joint stock principle. Also note that basic rights (like the rights to free speech and due process of law) do not necessarily follow from juristic personhood. A juristic person is sometimes called a legal person, artificial person, or legal entity (although the last term is sometimes understood to include natural persons as well). Although the concept of a juristic person is more central to Western law as well as common law and civil law countries, it is also found in virtually every legal system.
 In the United Kingdom and the United States, the use of this terminology does not mean that juristic persons are considered human beings. It's simply a "technical legal meaning" where "a 'person' is any subject of legal rights and duties." Because these entities may have legal rights and duties, they are considered 'juristic persons' to distinguish them from natural persons.
19. The word "incompetent" is also used to describe persons who lack mental capacity to make contracts, handle their financial and other personal matters such as consenting to medical treatment, etc. and need a legal guardian to handle their affairs.
 Law: (a) being unable or legally unqualified to perform specified acts or to be held legally responsible for such acts.
 (b) inadmissible, as evidence.
20. Paul R. Viotti & Mark V. Kauppi (1998), *International Relations Theory*, Longman Publishers.
21. Ryo Oshiba (1998), "Introduction: reconsidering international actors of international relations," *International Relations*, Vol. 119, pp. 4–5.
22. Oxford University (2000), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Oxford University Press.
23. Ian Brownlie (2000), *Principles of Public International Law*, Oxford University Press.
24. Wesley Newcomb Hohfeld (2005), Walter Wheeler Cook ed., *Fundamental Legal Conceptions: As Applied in Judicial Reasoning*, Lawbook Exchange Ltd., New Jersey, p. 36.
25. Ibid., p. 38 & (1883) 8 App. Cas., at p. 597.
26. Ibid., p. 50.
27. Oshiba, *op. cit.*
28. Robert Jackson, George Sørensen (2003), *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and approaches*, Oxford University Press, pp. 158–170.
29. Ibid., p. 158.
30. See the preface of this article.
31. I. A. Shearer, *Stark's International Law*, Butterworths, 1994, p. 265

32. Henry Campbell Black (1990). *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., St. Paul, MN.: West Publishing, p. 1341.
33. Please see following table "The Resolutions of Sanctions by the UN Security Council."
34. The Resolution of the UN Security Council.
35. Hedley Bull (1995), *The Anarchical Society*, 1977, Columbia University Press, p. xv.
36. Pal Dragos (2006/7/30), *The Structure of Global Capitalism: The Stakeholder/Shareholder Relationship and Corporate Governance from the Viewpoint of Anthony Giddens Structuration Theory*, Ciando.
37. Terry Macdonald, *Global Stakeholder Democracy: Power and Representation Beyond Liberal States*, Oxford University Press, Published 2008.
38. Minu Hemmati, Felix Dodds, Jasmin Enayati, Jan McHarry, *Multi Stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability: Beyond Deadlock and Conflict*, Earthscan Pubns Ltd. (2002/03).

Table 1 Resolutions on Sanctions by the UN Security Council

Resolution number	Object of sanction	Subject of sanction	Note
Southern Rhodesia			
S/RES/232 (16 December 1966)	The present situation in Southern Rhodesia (para. 1)	All States Members of the United Nations (para. 2)	
S/RES/253 (29 May 1968)	The illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia (pre.), the present situation in Southern Rhodesia (pre.)	All States Members of the United Nations (para. 5)	
S/RES/277 (18 March 1970)	The illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia (pre. c), the present situation in Southern Rhodesia (pre.)	Member States (para. 2), member States of any international or regional organizations (para. 13)	
S/RES/388 (6 April 1976)	The present situation in Southern Rhodesia (pre.)	All Member States (para. 1), States not members of the United Nations (para. 3)	
S/RES/409 (27 May 1977)	The illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia (para. 1)	All Member States (para. 1)	
S/RES/460 (21 December 1979)	South Rhodesia (para. 2)	Member States (para. 2)	
South Africa			
S/RES/418 (4 November 1977)	South Africa (pre.), the South African Government (pre.)	All States (para. 2), all States, including States non-members of the United Nations (para. 5)	
S/RES/421 (9 December 1977)	The South African Government (pre.)	All States (para. 1 c)	
S/RES/919 (26 May 1994)	South Africa (para. 2)	All States (para. 4)	
Iraq			
S/RES/661 (6 August 1990)	Iraq (para. 2)	All States, including States non-members of the United Nations (para. 5)	

S/RES/662 (9 August 1990)	Iraq (para. 1)	All States, international organizations and specialized agencies (para. 2)	
S/RES/687 (3 April 1991)	Iraq (para. 24)	All States and international organizations (para. 25)	
S/RES/986 (14 April 1995)		Turkey (para. 2) to permit the import of petroleum	To provide for humanitarian needs
S/RES/1051 (27 March 1996)			Same as res. 661
S/RES/1137 (12 November 1997)	All Iraqi officials and members of the Iraqi armed forces (pre.), Iraq (para. 1)	All Member States (pre.)	
S/RES/1284 (17 December 1999)	Hajji pilgrimage flights (para. 26)	All Member States (pre.)	
S/RES/1409 (14 May 2002)			Commodity lists by oil for foods
S/RES/1483 (22 May 2003)		Member States and concerned organizations (para. 1)	Termination of sanction
Yugoslavia			
S/RES/713 (25 September 1991)	The fighting in Yugoslavia (pre.)	All States (para. 6)	There is no entity of the object of sanction but the fighting in Yugoslavia (pre.)
S/RES/724 (15 December 1991)		All States (para. 5 a)	
S/RES/727 (8 January 1992)			All parties to take all necessary measures
S/RES/757 (30 May 1992)	The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in other parts of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (pre.)	All States (para. 4), including States not members of the United Nations, and all international organizations (para. 11)	
S/RES/787 (16 November 1992)	All parties in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in particular the Bosnian Serb paramilitary forces (para. 4)	All States (para. 11)	All States to take all necessary steps

S/RES/820 (17 April 1993)	Persons and entities violating the measures imposed by resolutions 713 (1991), 757 (1992), 787 (1992) and the present resolution (para. 19)	All States (para. 13), each State neighbouring the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (para. 23)	The case of ethnic cleansing
S/RES/942 (23 September 1994)	The situation in the former Yugoslavia (pre.), the Bosnian Serb party (para. 3)	States (para. 5,7)	Accused by name, the Bosnian Serb party
S/RES/943 (23 September 1994)	The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (para. 5)		
S/RES/1021 (22 November 1995)			Termination of sanction
S/RES/1022 (22 November 1995)	The situation in the region (pre.), the Bosnian Serb party (para. 2)	All States (para. 7)	
S/RES/1074 (1 October 1996)	Any party fails significantly to meet its obligations under the Peace Agreement (para. 5)		Any party fails significantly to meet its obligations under the Peace Agreement
Somalia			
S/RES/733 (23 January 1992)	All parties to the conflict (para. 4)	All States (para. 5)	
S/RES/751 (24 April 1992)	The situation in Somalia (para. 1)		
S/RES/1676 (10 May 2006)	Somalia	All Member States	
S/RES/1724 (29 November 2006)	Somalia	All Member States	
S/RES/1744 (21 February 2007)	Somalia's Transitional Federal Institutions	Member States of the African Union	
Libya			
S/RES/748 (31 March 1992)	The suppression of acts of international terrorism, including those in which States are directly or indirectly involved (pre.), terrorism (pre.)	All States (para. 4), including States not members of the United Nations, and all international organizations (para. 7)	

S/RES/883 (11 November 1993)	The suppression of acts of international terrorism (pre.)	All States in which there are funds or other financial resources owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by the Government or public authorities of Libya, or any Libyan undertaking (para. 3 a,b), all States (para. 5), all States, and the Government of Libya (para. 8), all States, including States not members of the United Nations, and all international organizations (para. 12)	Two persons charged with the bombing of Pan Am flight 103
S/RES/1192 (27 August 1998)	"the two accused" (para. 2)	All States (para. 4)	
S/PRST/1999/10 (8 April 1999)			
S/RES/1506 (12 September 2003)			Termination of sanction
Liberia			
S/RES/788 (19 November 1992)	The deterioration of the situation in Liberia (pre.)	All States (para. 8)	
S/RES/985 (13 April 1995)		All States, and in particular all neighbouring States (para. 4)	
S/RES/1343 (7 March 2001)	The Government of Liberia, the RUF in Sierra Leone, and other armed rebel groups (para. 2), all RUF members from Liberia (para. 2 a)	All States (para. 5 a), all States and all relevant international and regional organizations (para. 22)	Termination of sanction
S/RES/1521 (22 December 2003)	The situation in Liberia and the proliferation of arms and armed non-States actors, including mercenaries (pre.)	All States (para. 2 a)	

S/RES/1532 (12 March 2004)	Former Liberian President Charles Taylor, his immediate family members, in particular Jewell Howard Taylor and Charles Taylor, Jr., senior officials of the former Taylor regime, or other close allies or associates (para. 1)	All States (para. 1)	Partial termination of sanction
S/RES/1683 (13 June 2006)	The situation there continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security (pre.)	The United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)	Partial termination of sanction
S/RES/1689 (20 June 2006)	The situation in Liberia (pre.)	Member States (para. 1)	Help the new government establish its authority throughout the country, particularly in the diamond and timber-producing regions and border areas
S/RES/1731 (20 December 2006)	The Government of Liberia	UNMIL	UNMIL supports the Government of Liberia
S/RES/1753 (20 April 2007)	Liberia	The Government of Liberia	Encourages the Kimberley Process
Haiti			
S/RES/841 (16 June 1993)	The crisis in Haiti (para. 1), funds of the Government of Haiti or of the de facto authorities in Haiti (para. 8)	All States (para. 5), all States, and all international organizations (para. 9)	Request of the permanent representative of Haiti
S/RES/861 (27 August 1993)		All States (para. 1)	
S/RES/873 (13 October 1993)			Partial termination of sanction

S/RES/917 (6 May 1994)	The military authorities in Haiti (pre.), all officers of the Haitian military, including the police, and their immediate families (para. 3 a), the major participants in the coup d'etat, and their immediate families (para. 3 b), those employed by or acting on behalf of the Haitian military, and their immediate families (para. 3 c)	All States (para. 2), all States, including States not members of the United Nations, and all international organizations (para. 12)	Termination of sanction
Angola			
S/RES/944 (29 September 1994)	the de facto authorities (pre.)		
S/RES/864 (15 September 1993)	UNITA (para. 7), UNITA's military actions (para. 16 B)	All States (para. 16 B), all States, and all international organizations (para. 20)	Prohibiting all sale or supply to UNITA of arms and related material and military assistance, as well as petroleum and petroleum products
S/RES/1127 (28 August 1997)	All senior officials of UNITA and adult members of their immediate families (para. 4 a)	All States and international and regional organizations (para. 6), Member States (para. 12)	To suspend or cancel all travel documents, visas or residence permits
S/RES/1173 (12 June 1998)	UNITA (para. 1)	All States and all international and regional organizations (para. 17)	Take the necessary measures to prohibit the import of all diamonds
S/RES/1221 (12 January 1999)		Member States (para. 7)	Accused by the individual name, Mr. Jonas Savimbi; Member States to comply with the measures
S/RES/1237 (7 May 1999)	UNITA (para. 2), UNITA, under the leadership of Mr. Jonas Savimbi (para. 3)	All Member States (para. 5)	To cooperate with expert panels

S/RES/1295 (18 April 2000)	UNITA (para. 6)	All Member States (para. 1)	The obligation of all Member States to comply fully with the measures
S/RES/1448 (9 December 2002)			The object of the termination of sanction → the Government of Angola and Uniao Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola (UNITA) (pre.)
Rwanda			
S/RES/918 (17 May 1994)	The situation in Rwanda (pre.), the continuation of the situation in Rwanda (pre.)	All States (para. 13), all States, including States not members of the United Nations, and international organizations (para. 52)	
S/RES/1011 (16 August 1995)	The Government of Rwanda (para. 10)	All States (para. 9)	
S/RES/1013 (7 September 1995)	Former Rwandan government (pre.)		
S/RES/1749 (2007)	Rwanda and the Great Lakes region	The States of the region	Termination of sanction
Sudan			
S/RES/1054 (26 April 1996)	The Government of Sudan (pre.), the staff at Sudanese diplomatic missions and consular posts (para. 3 a), members of the Government of Sudan, officials of that Government and members of the Sudanese armed forces (para. 3 b)	All States (para. 3), all international and regional organizations (para. 4)	
S/RES/1070 (16 August 1996)	International terrorism (pre.)	All States (para. 3)	
S/RES/1372 (28 September 2001)			
S/RES/1556 (30 July 2004)	The Government of Sudan, the situation in Sudan (pre.)	All States (para. 7)	

S/RES/1591 (29 March 2005)	The situation in Sudan (pre.), the Government of Sudan and rebel forces and all other armed groups in Darfur (para. 1)	All States (para. 3 d)	
S/RES/1672 (25 April 2006)	Major General Gaffar Mohamed Elhassan (Commander of the Western Military Region for the Sudanese Armed Forces), Sheikh Musa Hilal (Paramount Chief of the Jalul Tribe in North Darfur), Adam Yacub Shant (Sudanese Liberation Army Commander), Gabril Abdul Kareem Badri (National Movement for Reform and Development Field Commander)	All States	
S/RES/1679 (16 May 2006)	The situation in Sudan (pre.), the parties to the Darfur Peace Agreement	The African Union to agree with the United Nations, regional and international organizations and Member States	
S/RES/1713 (29 September 2006)	Sudan	Relevant United Nations bodies, the African Union and other interested parties	
Sierra Leone			
S/RES/1132 (8 October 1997)	The situation in Sierra Leone (pre.), the military junta (para. 1), Sierra Leone (para. 6)	All States (para. 5), ECOWAS, cooperating with the democratically-elected Government of Sierra Leone (para. 8), all States and all international and regional organizations (para. 11)	
S/RES/1156 (16 March 1998)			Termination of sanction

S/RES/1171 (5 June 1998)	The continued resistance to the authority of the legitimate Government of Sierra Leone (pre.), non-governmental forces in Sierra Leone (para. 2)	All States	Sanction does not apply to the sale or supply of arms and materiel for sole use in Sierra Leone of the Military Observer Group of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOMOG) or the United Nations (para. 3)
S/RES/1306 (5 July 2000)	The situation in Sierra Leone (pre.), the diamond-producing areas (para. 6)	All States (para. 1), States, relevant international organizations and other bodies (para. 3), the International Diamond Manufacturers Association, the World Federation of Diamond Bourses, the Diamond High Council and all other representatives of the diamond industry (para. 10)	By name, Diamond Manufacturers
S/RES/1385 (19 December 2001)	Illicit trade in rough diamonds (pre.), the diamond-producing areas (para. 3)	All Member States, including diamond importing countries (pre.)	
S/RES/1446 (4 December 2002)	Illicit trade in diamonds (pre.), the situation in the region (pre.)	All member States, including diamond importing countries (pre.)	
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia			
S/RES/1160 (31 March 1998)	The use of excessive force by Serbian police forces against civilians and peaceful demonstrators in Kosovo, as well as all acts of terrorism by the Kosovo Liberation Army or any other group or individual and all external support for terrorist activity in Kosovo (pre.)	All States (para. 8), all States and all international and regional organizations (para. 10)	

S/RES/1199 (23 September 1998)	The deterioration of the situation in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (pre.)	All States (para. 7)	Reference of the object of sanction: all acts of violence by any party, terrorism in pursuit of political goals by any group or individual, and all external support for such activities in Kosovo (pre.)
S/RES/1244 (10 June 1999)	The situation in the region (pre.), all acts of violence against the Kosovo population as well as all terrorist acts by any party (pre.)		
S/RES/1367 (10 September 2001)			Termination of sanction
Afghan Taliban			
S/RES/1267 (15 October 1999)	The Afghan faction known as the Taliban (para. 1), Usama bin Laden and his associates (para. 5)	The International Air Transport Association (IATA) (para. 6 f), all States (para. 7)	The establish a committee of the Security Council
S/RES/1333 (19 December 2000)	The Afghan faction known as the Taliban (pre.), Usama bin Laden and his associates (pre.), the Al-Qaida organization (para. 7 c), individuals and entities designated as being associated with Usama bin Laden (para. 15 b)	All States and all international and regional organizations, including the United Nations and its specialized agencies (para. 17)	
S/RES/1363 (30 July 2001)		All States (para. 8)	Decides the composition of monitoring mechanism
S/RES/1388 (15 January 2002)			The object of the termination of sanction→Ariana Afghan Airlines aircraft or Ariana Afghan Airlines funds and other financial resources (para. 1)

S/RES/1390 (28 January 2002)	Usama bin Laden and his associates (pre.), the Taliban (pre.), Al-Qaida network and other associated terrorist groups (pre.), Usama bin Laden, members of the Al-Qaida organization and the Taliban and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them (para. 2), these individuals (para. 2 b)	All States (para. 2), all Member States (para. 4)	
S/RES/1455 (17 January 2003)	Members of the Al-Qaida organization and the Taliban and other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them (para. 4)	All States, relevant United Nations bodies, and, as appropriate, other organizations and interested parties (para. 7)	
S/RES/1526 (30 January 2004)	The Al-Qaida network and other associated terrorist groups (pre.), the Al-Qaida organization and members of the Taliban, and any individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with them (pre.), Usama bin Laden (para. 1)	All States, international bodies, and regional organizations (pre.), all States, and encourages regional organizations, relevant United Nations bodies, and as appropriate, other organizations and interested parties (para. 14)	
S/RES/1617 (29 July 2005)	Al-Qaida, Usama bin Laden and the Taliban, and individuals, group, undertakings and entities associated with them	All States	
S/RES/1735 (22 December 2006)	Al-Qaida, Usama bin Laden, and the Taliban and other individuals	All States	
Eritrea and Ethiopia			
S/RES/1298 (17 May 2000)	Eritrea and Ethiopia (para. 1), both parties (para. 3)	All States (para. 6), all States and all international and regional organizations (para. 9)	
S/RPRST/2001/14 (15 May 2001)			

Terrorist Attacks			
S/RES/1368 (12 September 2001)	The horrifying terrorist attacks which took place on 11 September 2001 in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania (para. 1)	All States (para. 3), the international community (para. 4)	
S/RES/1373 (28 September 2001)	The terrorist attacks which took place in New York, Washington, D.C. and Pennsylvania on 11 September 2001, any act of international terrorism (pre.)	All States (para. 1)	
S/RES/1535 (26 March 2004)	Terrorism in all its forms and manifestations (pre.), terrorism (pre.)		
S/RES/1624 (14 September 2005)	All acts of terrorism (pre.)	All States (para. 1)	
S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005)	Terrorism in all its forms and manifestations (pre.), this terrorist act and its implications (pre.)	All States (para. 3 a)	Explanation of the contents of the object of sanction: terrorist bombing in Beirut, Lebanon, that killed former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and others, and caused injury to dozens of people (pre.); explanation of terrorist act: the involvement of both Lebanese and Syrian officials in this terrorist act (para. 2)
Congo			
S/RES/1493 (28 July 2003)	The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (pre.), the movements and armed groups (para. 18)	All States and in particular those in the region, including the Democratic Republic of the Congo (para. 18)	
S/RES/1533 (12 March 2004)	The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (pre.), armed groups operating in North and South Kivu and in Ituri (para. 1)	All States (para. 1)	

S/RES/1596 (3 May 2005)	The Democratic Republic of the Congo (pre.)	All governments in the region, and in particular those of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and of States bordering Ituri and the Kivus (para. 6), all States (para. 13)	
S/RES/1616 (29 July 2005)	Armed groups and militias in the eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	The Group of Experts	
S/RES/1636 (31 October 2005)	Lebanese and Syrian officials in this terrorist act	All States	
S/RES/1649 (21 December 2005)	The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (pre.)	MONUC (para. 11), the Governments of Uganda, Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi (para. 15), all States neighbouring the Democratic Republic of the Congo as well as the Government of National Unity and Transition (para. 16)	
S/RES/1654 (31 January 2006)	1533, 1596, 1649 repeat		
S/RES/1698 (31 July 2006)	The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (pre.), the following individuals, operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, political and military leaders recruiting or using children in armed conflict, individuals committing serious violations of international law involving the targeting of children in situations of armed conflict, including killing and maiming, sexual violence, abduction and forced displacement (para. 13)	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Broaden the object of sanction

Cote d'Ivoire				
S/RES/1572 (15 November 2004)	The situation in Cote d'Ivoire (pre.), all Ivorian parties, the Government of Cote d'Ivoire, the Forces Nouvelles (pre.), the national armed forces of Cote d'Ivoire (FANCI) (para. 1)	All States (para. 7)	To establish a committee of the Security Council	
S/RES/1584 (1 February 2005)	Cote d'Ivoire (pre.)	All States, particularly those bordering Cote d'Ivoire (para. 1)	To cooperate with committee, group of experts and UNOCI	
S/RES/1643 (15 December 2005)	The situation in Cote d'Ivoire (pre.), all Ivorian parties, the Government of Cote d'Ivoire, the Forces Nouvelles (pre.)	All States (para. 6)	Request all States to report to the committee	
S/RES/1708 (14 September 2006)	Cote d'Ivoire	The group of experts		
S/RES/1727 (15 December 2006)	Cote d'Ivoire	All Ivorian parties		
Terrorist Bombing that Killed Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri				
S/RES/1373 (28 September 2001)	Terrorist act	All States		
S/RES/1624 (14 September 2005)	Terrorist act	All States		
S/RES/1701 (11 August 2006)	The situation in Lebanon (pre.), Hizbollah, Israel (pre.)	All States (para. 15)		
DPRK				
S/RES/1718 (14 October 2006)	The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) (pre.)	All Member States (para. 8 a)	Explanation of aggressor: the nuclear test proclaimed by the DPRK on 9 October 2006 (para. 1)	
S/RES/1874 (12 June 2009)	The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)	All Member States		
Iran				
S/RES/1696 (31 July 2006)	Iran	All States		

S/RES/1737 (27 December 2006)	Iran	All States	
S/RES/1747 (24 March 2007)	Iran	All States	
The Method of Sanction			
S/RES/1673 (27 April 2006)	Proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons	All States	
S/RES/1674 (28 April 2006)		All States, the international community	The Report of the Secretary-General of 28 November 2005
S/RES/1730 (19 December 2006)	Carefully targeted in support of clear objectives and implemented in ways	All Member States	
S/RES/1732 (21 December 2006)			The Informal Working Group on General Issues of Sanctions