The Responsibility to Protect and the Plight of Afghan Refugees: Examining the Gaps in International Law

Rahat Ullah
Lecturer, Department of Law, Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat
Amina Iqbal
Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Capital University of Science and Technology, Islamabad/Corresponding Author at-amina.iqbal@cust.edu.pk
Umar Niaz Khan
Lecturer, Department of Law, Kohat University of Science and Technology, Kohat

Abstract
The events in Afghanistan in August 2021 concerning the Taliban's power led to one of the most urgent questions regarding the protection of refugees and forced displacement. Over this event, the principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P or IFR) has come to the agenda that focuses on the prevention of such acts and the protection of people who are potential targets of group violence. The Afghan case shows that despite the critical mission of R2P, there are significant shortcomings when it comes to applying it in practice, thus demonstrating the weaknesses and incoherencies in the international approach to the Afghan issue. The rushing fall of Afghan government and subsequent evacuation of residencies paved way for these shortcomings to be realized. R2P demands the international community to step in when a state is unable to protect its own people from genocide, war crimes, criminal expulsion, and crimes against humanity. In the IRAQ, constant insecurity existed and immediate dangers to the lives of millions of people were seen with the return of the Taliban government in Afghanistan, including women, children and minorities. Thus, the down side of this report embraces the fact that the international intervention of this crisis has been untidy and incoherent in physical terms owing to the R2P theoretical frameworks disconnect from its application. Some countries have had a hard time to grant asylum and the necessary support to Afghan refugees which explain real-life failures in the implementation of R2P principles in humanitarian crises. The situation of Afghan refugees has clearly revealed that there is a dire necessity for solid framework of international protection for the persecuted people. The faults of the present form of R2R approach, or the lack thereof in the context of evolving and diverse scenarios like Afghanistan, carry implications on the need for rethink and proper reform so that the international community will be prepared for timely and harmonized action. Therefore, ensuring that the realities on the ground, during conflicts of the future correspond to the commitments in the international legal instruments is a paramount necessity for preserving the notion of human rights and humanitarian protection. The study of Afghanistan presents a historical narrative that still raises the issue of the difference between coined perception and reality, which provides an opportunity to develop and improve ideas on the protection of the weak population in the future.
Keywords: Refuges, International Law, R2P Principles, Afghans, Human Rights

Introduction

The events of August 2021, when the Taliban took over Afghanistan, led to a large-scale refugee crisis, forcing the international community to address the problem of migration and refugees again. This event has brought out the contentious issue of the Responsibility to Protect or R2P doctrine, an international political commitment reached during the summit level talks in year 2005, aimed at preventing genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. The 'responsibility to protect' improves upon the idea of humanitarian intervention by underlining the global community's responsibility to avoid mass crimes and to protect those in desperate need; nonetheless, the Afghan case illustrates several deficiencies in this respect. These were the exploits of R2P in a manageable humanitarian crisis while the mass Lord of the Afghan people and the Taliban's forceful regaining of control over Afghanistan present numerous R2P's real-world difficulties and constraints.

As an offshoot of human rights and humanitarian intervention, R2P asserts the need for the global society to act in unison to hold a failing state accountable for not preserving its citizens' lives from acts of brutality. In Afghanistan, the alarming event was the extremely swift fall of the government and the subsequent takeover of the country by the Taliban, which posed concerns related to millions of people's security, including women and children and minorities. Even with the theoretical structure of R2P in place, the global reaction to the Afghan catastrophe has been rather disjointed and incongruous. Different countries have encountered multiple problems in the protection of refugees and provision of asylum and support for them, which contrasts with the concept of R2P and the liberal-democratic rhetoric in practice (Evans, 2021; Welsh, 2022).

The asylum seekers out of Afghanistan case is a grim wakeup call for the formation of a stronger and coherent global system to shield the affected groups and individuals at particular conditions. Thus, while R2P is an important principle which posits intervention in order to protect populations from violations of their rights or identities, or to prevent atrocities, it is evident that its utilisation in the case of Afghanistan has revealed several flaws. This pent-up revival of the Taliban exposed the flaws in the assessment and management of complex changes in the geopolitical map thus exposing millions of Afghan civilians to the brutalities of forced displacements and wars. The most glaring problem that the R2P doctrine suffers from and which is evident in the Afghan case is the absence of a central coordinating structure for responding to the populated communicated. This crisis was characterized by slow and an uncoordinated response by the international community hailing the challenges of coming up with timely

humanitarian assistance and protection. This 'split' response not only showed an inefficiency in protecting Afghan civilians' lives but also tarnished credibility for humanitarian supporters by demonstrating ignorance in protecting international human rights at the time of greatest need to some (Smith, 2022).

Furthermore, issues in the existing international law have been identified whereby a collective political will to reform international laws to support R2P, especially in dealing with dynamic and unpredictable transformations such as politically instable Afghanistan, has become apparent and evident. The case of Afghanistan is a vivid example to show how deep the difference between legal obligations at the global level, where states participate as members of the international community, can be in contrast to the actual situation on the international level. Hence, it underlines the need to work towards this end by means of exploring ways of filling this gap and striving to design and strengthen international institutions. Such reforms should embrace specific guidelines for intervention based on the current political realities, efficient methods of sharing burden with the host countries so as to reduce burden and appropriate measures of accountability in order to compensate the victims of human rights violations. By identifying these critical lacunas, the international society will be posited to enhance the implementation of R2P to enhance the ability of protection to future vulnerable groups of people in humanitarian calamities. Such an approach not only enhances international cooperation but also reminds the citizens of the world about common human obligations towards defending the dignity of the human person and easing conflicts in the context of globalization.

The R2P Framework and its Limitations

The R2P doctrine that the UN introduced in 2005 details how the international community should intervene in genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. It provides for the use of force as the final measure of intervention. However, the R2P framework faces limitations: However, the R2P framework faces limitations:

Sovereignty vs. Intervention

The principle of state sovereignty is in fact one of the basic characteristics of the modern international law which has a negative impact on the attempt to determine legal grounds for intervention in situation of gross human rights abuses. Sovereignty means the power and authority of a state to administer itself and this remains a major hindrance to interventional even when crimes are perpetrated. In this sense, a principle that reveals sovereignty as a responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity,

often interferes with the R2P doctrine. This tension becomes more apparent in such cases as the recent Taliban control of Afghanistan where sovereignty argument alone was used to justify minimal international intervention despite rampant human rights violation (Bellamy, 2022). The conflict between sovereignty and intervention reveals that the targeted approach should involve compliance with the principles of sovereignty but at the same time, the state should adopt measures to protect endangered people.

In both theoretical terms, its evaluation requires cross-case analysis, where R2P interventions took place such as in Libya, Syria, and Afghanistan. This approach assists in finding out patterns and processes of precautions or no precautions at all, which is useful in explaining successes and failures of R2P in practice (Thakur, 2021). Studying these cases, researchers have an opportunity to measure the task that the international community faces when operating between the concepts of sovereignty and responsibility, which are based on moral and legal obligations to save people's lives. The policy pursued by this analysis states that non-interference is a significant principle to be taken into consideration when measured against the need for reacting to and preventing more gross human rights abuses.

Lack of Enforcement Mechanism

R2P concept remains a problematic framework for intervention mainly due to its applications by the UNSC, which currently acts as its chief enforcer. The quasi-judicial body which is responsible for preserving international peace and security can sanction interventions under R2P. However, due to actions taken by the five permanent members: the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China, the action often seems to be restricted. This reliance on UNSC can make it inert, as observed in the case of the Syrian conflict, geopolitical interest and even application of vetoes hinders efforts to tackle humanitarian calamities (Evans, 2021). The lack of a proper means of enforcing R2P is the major shortcoming of this doctrine because it cannot be implemented at all times and in a consistent manner.

In an effort to counter this methodological shortcoming, scholars recommend change to the decision-making rules of the UNSC to preclude the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities. This could include developing mechanisms contained in the UN or forging new sub – regional organisation with jurisdiction to operate under R2P tenets (Hildebrand, 2022). Learning from situations in the past and the present when the UNSC has failed to respond is very informative in understanding the structural flaws of the modern enforcement system. Thus, studying these cases,

researchers may suggest that the reforms might help the international community perform better in cherishing the rightful rights and preventing human suffering.

Ambiguity in Defining Threats

The problem of threats to justify the use of force based on the principle of R2P also poses numerous difficulties for consensus as the subject of threats may be ambiguous. The types of the cases that call for intervention still are not well defined, therefore international actors continue to disagree about them. This has always made the judgement as far as response to crises is concerned as Machiavelli highlighted to be a tough call due to many decisions that are out in the field, like the struggles for the People of Sudan, Myanmar, and Afghanistan (Kuperman, 2021). This way, the Existing and LACK OF clear unambiguous global standards regarding what constitutes severe threat would be detrimental to the R2P doctrine cohesiveness.

Technically, it is about improving the criteria in defining and evaluating threats that call for intervention. Such factors could be establishing common examination and conceptual measures developed with reference to the scale of violations, the aggressors' purposes and motivations, as well as the potential of the state to ensure the citizens' security (Welsh, 2022). Sensitization of these criteria can therefore enable the international community to recognize greater measurability and consistency when identifying the need for intervention. Looking into the previous cases of interventions and non-interventions conducted in the frame of R2P will prove useful in terms of understanding how to articulate the threats and how to apply R2P more coherently.

Gaps in Addressing the Afghan Refugee Crisis

The Taliban's rapid capture of Afghanistan in 2021 exposed major shortcomings regarding the timely prevention of disasters. Even the signs that were given in terms of the poor security situation, the international intervention remained insufficient to prevent the Afghan Taliban from regaining power with astonishing swiftness. The intelligence reports and diplomatic relations showed an increasing risk, however, due to poorly coordinated and timely measures, this led to the disaster. This inability to act shows a more profound trend that the global society rarely over-emphasizes the worsening situation in failed states (Smith, 2022). Hence, the fall of the Afghan government created a displacement crisis whereby millions had to look for shelter across the border.

Failure in these regards signifies catastrophic flaws in the execution of the R2P doctrine, challenging one's confidence in the prevention of atrocities and the assertion of human rights

(Johnson, 2021). The consequences of the Taliban regaining power were not only the rapid humanitarian crises, but also the shortcomings of the existing structures of intervention for humanity. It was established that lack of efficient strategies to avert future threats to stability has never been witnessed as clearly as in the case of the failure to stop the takeover. Furthermore, this case shows that not only is the concept of R2P not implemented on the ground but also people remain unprotected, even if the principle is theoretically in their interest (Thompson, 2021). The Afghan crisis also makes the society aware that if no intervention and international cooperation takes place, then the cycle of violence and displacement persists, which will only worsen the peacebuilding plans in the future. In this fashion, it can be noted that existing models have failed to foresee and prevent such a crisis from reaching the level of a catastrophe, underlining the importance of developing a more effective early warning model in international relations.

Another approximate concern that arose after the Taliban uprising is a lack of opportunities for accepting refugees from Afghanistan. The current resettlement model that retreated to different global crises did not receive the large numbers of afghan citizens who were fleeing the Taliban regime. Pakistan and Iran, neighboring countries, for instance, had their own economic and security problems, which added to the difficulties for the incoming refugee (Ali, 2022). The inability to establish adequate resettlement options has forced many such persons into even more vulnerable situations, whereby they live in far from safe inhabitant camps or in cities with poor assistance (Khan, 2021). This is a typical feature of the general problems existing in the refugee resettlement models, which do not allow for an adequate response to quick adjustments in emergency large-scale displacements, mainly because of various political processes.

Moreover, there has been no focused plan of international policy towards forcible displacement; this has further compounded the challenges that Afghan refugees go through. Most are left with no any other chance other than migrating legally or getting a permanent citizenship and this comes with challenges like; restrictive asylum laws, inadequate funds (Oxfam, 2022). Due to lengthy processing of refugee claims and the inability of states of asylum to resettle large number of refugees, hopefulness becomes a causation for risking life for refugee's safety and get exposed to additional human rights abuses. By not addressing these gaps the international community is not only failing to uphold humanitarianism, but also violating the undertakings of the polity on protection and assistance to refugees under different international treaties.

In this regard, it can be said that without proper efforts to improve the resettlement programs, the issue of Afghan refugees remains open-ended and vulnerable. Another major

weakness in resolving the Afghan refugee issue is a lack of justice for the population for human rights violations by the Taliban. Though RtoP provides a way of preventing other such atrocities in the future, it lacks strongly developed ways of identifying and punishing the rats, especially when it comes to transitioning from war to peace. The Taliban also have a record of heinous acts against humanity, thus posing very serious questions and doubts about the group's political authority and government, as well as being culpable to international human rights law (Hossain, 2022). Despite voices being given to justice and accountability, there are legal means that do not provide means of properly prosecuting perpetrators of abuses. This absence not only threatens the future security of the Afghan people but also set a dangerous tone of what happens to violators of human rights, thus encouraging similar actions from other governments.

The lack of measures to call for justice within the framework of R2P demonstrates that this paradigm cannot be applied without considering the complex strategies for the provision of food, shelter, and other necessities for human beings in conflict-affected societies over the long run while also investigating matters of justice and reconciliation. Any attempt to build a peaceful Afghanistan will unfortunately not be devoid of certain hitches since the root causes of conflict, namely, historical injustices were not done away with (Zarif, 2021). The society of nation must see it as its precedent to ensure that a proper instrument of accountability such as truth panels or exceptional courts are set in place in Afghanistan in effort to addressing historical wounds enacted on the Afghan populace. Thus, the international society can not only help solve the problem of refugees and provide a chance for Afghanistan to build a better future but also contribute to the creation of a stable and fair future for all people.

Moving Forward: Strengthening the Legal Framework

The difficulty in implementing the R2P doctrine in Afghanistan means that the international community should seek another approach with which to address the issues faced by Afghan refugees. Potential areas for improvement include:

Developing Clearer Guidelines for Intervention

In order to put forth measures to overcome the problems related to R2P, it is necessary to outline more concrete norms of intervention. Specify the set of criteria that would appeal to the intervention in order to demarcate the cases which require the determined international reactions to emerging crises. Such an approach would entail the definition of specific characteristics as to when intervention will be deemed necessary, including the severity of the abuses and the degree of planning by the state and the level of the impending threat to innocent lives that are at risk.

Thus, by building up the initially more rigorous and clear system of authorization, the international community increases its chances to act preventively instead of reactively in relation to new threats (Williams, 2022). The following clarity could enable faster decision making and cooperation and even enhance more effective prevention of such disasters.

Furthermore, certain recommendation in this regard does not only make procedures for intervention clear and effective but also increases the chances of international actions legitimacy. The type of structure could be a diplomacy, then an economical measure such as a boycott, and finally a military action if necessary. This approach would enable a gradual response thus lowering the chances of acts that are considered as neo-colonialism or imperialism as far as Bassiouni (2021) suggests. It also can point a structured approach to addresses states' collaboration in preventing atrocities, thus strengthening the commitment to a global order based on peace and security and human rights.

Enhancing Burden-Sharing for Refugees

The Afghanistan refugee surge proves that there is a need for the improvement of Global Humanitarian Sharing Frameworks to improve assistance to refugees adequately. Neighboring Countries like Pakistan and Iran have been engulfed by a substantial number of refugees hence putting much pressure on their resources and infrastructure. The increasing refugee numbers also poses a burden to the developing nations that bear the brunt of accommodating the refugees, hence a better system of refugee resettlement that will benefit the host countries is called for by the international community aid organizations such as the UNHCR (2023).

In this way, the system of cooperation with refugees can be built, in which it is proposed to involve every interested country, primarily the countries of the Middle East that have taken millions of refugees, but also the economically developed countries that should play an active role in the resettlement of Afghan immigrants and the provision of humanitarian assistance to the refugees themselves. Some of the measures of multi-country burden-sharing could entail founding of regional association meant for the resettlement of the aliens also offering monetary support in the affected countries. It may comprise such steps as setting up particular shares for resettlement, granting fast-tracking of the refugee status applications, or guaranteeing sufficient financing for the host population to address the needs of refugees (Hansen, 2022). Increased cooperation between nations would assist the global society avoid leaving the highly affected regions normless and insecure, thus assisting in developing humane solutions to refugee problems.

Prioritizing Accountability Mechanisms

In prescriptive terms, to ensure that similar violations are not committed in the future, international law is required to focus on providing for method and mechanism for addressing the perpetrations of abuse. These frameworks lack the ability to provide justice to the victims as there is excessive impunity allowing the persons who are involved in these atrocities to go free which defeats the purpose of human rights (Mendez, 2021). To support the argument, it is possible to strengthen the mechanisms of international accountability, like international criminal tribunals or hybrid courts, which can serve as the means for prosecution of specific individuals for critical crimes, so helping in enhancing the focus on justice and pursuing the rule of law. The case of Afghanistan, where previous violations by the member of the opposition, namely the Taliban, pose relevant questions, requires the formation of solid policies of the international community to prevent the recurrence of such actions.

Implementing accountability mechanisms also serves a dual purpose: It doesn't only serve corrective justice in relation to previous violations but also serves as a preventive measure in as much as further breaches are concerned. If potential perpetrators believe that there are significant mechanisms that will punish the violators, they might not engage in genocides (Sikkink 2022). Moreover, the inclusion of local justice systems in addition to the international ones is beneficial for the promotion of legitimacy and building of the people's participation in the justice system. By focusing on such mechanisms, the international community will foster a culture of accountability that has an impact on all countries, thus, will enhance the goal of human rights protection and also the maintenance of long-lasting peace.

Conclusion

The fate of Afghan refugees can be used as an exemplary case of the essential flaws of the R2P policy, proving the necessity to develop a more efficient international law. Nevertheless, the lack of promise in fruition due to the untimely Taliban takeover, coupled with refugee crisis, involved with the doctrine's application tells a different story. Lack of clear bench marks for intervention has put the international counterpart in a lame position to act decisively at the time of real need. For RoP to be realized to the optimum, one cannot overemphasize the need to draw clear lines that would enable intervention at the right time or co-ordinate with other nations when televising the violation of human rights. What this clarity would have done was to assist in getting concrete actions and also rebuild confidence on international initiatives to safeguard the vulnerable. Third, it is also important and critical to improving ways and means through which burden sharing can be stepped up since neighboring countries that have accommodated Afghan refugees have been

burdened more than any other countries in the region. The existing global architecture on resettlement is not suited to cope with the large numbers of displaced people seeking resettlement, leading to vulnerability for many of them. In such a way, the international community may encourage the system of more equitable distribution of refugees, and save countries which are wounded by this process.

States should embark on effective partnerships and come up with well-coordinated policies that seek to enhance resettlement procedures to benefit both the refugees and dispensing societies. It is a collective humanitarian work that not only provides the most basic needs to the suffering people but also re-affirms the world's focus on humanitarianism and treatment of a fellow human being. Last but not least, the emphasis on accountability measures in the framework of international law can help prevent future violations of human rights and ensure justice. These two issues cut away at the heart of the R2P doctrine and deserve particular attention because of the lack of proper accountability for past abuses that perpetuates impunity. Promoting and establishing rating tribunals or supporting local justice systems will also contribute to the bestowal of justice upon those who committed severe crimes. Through these mechanisms of accountability, the international community will be able to let the violators of human rights realize that their actions are not acceptable. Altogether, the removal of clearance of the operational intercession, the policies of better shares of burdens, and strong accountability regimes are essential stapes for avoiding other humanitarian crises and making a world reconciled.

References

Ali, M. (2022). "The Afghan Refugee Crisis: Regional Challenges and Responses." Journal of Migration Studies.

Bassiouni, M. C. (2021). "Defining Intervention: Legal and Ethical Challenges." International Journal of Human Rights.

Bellamy, A. J. (2022). "The Responsibility to Protect and the Refugee Protection Regime." Global Responsibility to Protect.

Evans, G. (2021). "R2P and the Afghan Crisis: A Missed Opportunity." International Journal of Refugee Law.

Hansen, T. (2022). "Burden-Sharing and Refugee Resettlement: A Global Challenge." Refugee Studies Quarterly.

Hildebrand, J. (2022). "R2P and Humanitarian Crises: Lessons from Afghanistan." Human Rights Quarterly.

Hossain, M. (2022). "Accountability and the Taliban: Challenges Ahead." Human Rights Review.

Johnson, R. (2021). "Preventing the Taliban's Return: An Analysis of International Failures." International Affairs.

Khan, A. (2021). "Refugee Resettlement: The Afghan Dilemma." Refugee Studies Quarterly.

Kuperman, A. J. (2021). "The Limits of R2P: Case Studies from Afghanistan." Global Governance.

Mendez, J. E. (2021). "The Role of Accountability in Promoting Human Rights." Human Rights Law Review.

Oxfam. (2022). "The Humanitarian Impact of the Afghan Crisis." Oxfam Briefing Paper.

Sikkink, K. (2022). "Accountability for Human Rights Violations: A Global Perspective." Journal of International Relations.

Smith, J. (2022). "International Responses to Humanitarian Crises: Lessons from Afghanistan." Journal of Global Security Studies.

Smith, J. (2022). "The Consequences of Inaction: The Case of Afghanistan." Global Security Review.

Thakur, R. (2021). "Afghanistan, R2P, and International Law." Global Policy Journal.

Thompson, L. (2021). "R2P in Action: Lessons from Afghanistan." Peace and Conflict Studies Journal.

UNHCR. (2023). "Global Trends in Forced Displacement: A Comprehensive Overview." UNHCR Report.

Welsh, J. M. (2022). "R2P: Concept and Practice in the Afghan Context." Ethics & International Affairs.

Williams, P. D. (2022). "Clear Guidelines for R2P: A Framework for Action." Global Responsibility to Protect.

Zarif, S. (2021). "Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Taliban Afghanistan." Journal of Peacebuilding & Development.