

Abstract

This study deals with attitude of three states – Brazil, India, and South Africa, towards the issue of humanitarian interventions and the principle of the Responsibility to Protect. The aim of this study is to assess what is the real motivation of selected states in the process of creation of their attitudes. Based on three main theoretical approaches – neorealism, liberalism, and constructivism, particular hypotheses are created in order to help determine explanation value of selected theories. All three selected theoretical approaches deal with different sets of variables with different importance. The main focus of the first half of the study is on introduction of humanitarian intervention, the principle of Responsibility to Protect, and selected theoretical approaches. In this part individual hypotheses are defined, and the methodological framework is also introduced. Second part of the study deals with actual analysis of attitudes of selected states and their consequential categorization. The individual variables are assessed, and conclusions are established.

Based on analysis Brazil and South Africa seem to be two cases with different understanding of security than India. These two states also have different perception of own state identity and thus their attitude toward intervention/R2P is different than that of India. The study also approved dependency between state power and this attitude. The degree of sensitivity to own colonial subordination, however, has become inconclusive. It was thus found that neorealism and liberalism have a higher degree of explanation value in relation to the established topic, however, there are differences in justifying why it is so. This finding is thus another contribution to debate on the applicability of different theories of international relations in specific cases.