

Abstract

The aim of this work is to analyze the relationship between R2P and violent regime change. The work gives an overview of the establishment of R2P on the international scene, and then deals with its problem of selectivity in its application in practice. Despite the formal adoption of R2P in 2005 by all UN member states, R2P has been since then applied to similar cases of humanitarian crises in different ways. The problem of selectivity of R2P is fuelling the criticism of its legitimacy, because it is according to many a mean for achieving regime change. The most important reason for R2P's criticism is the connection between R2P and violent regime change, and that is the central theme of this work. Based on an analysis of the documents which form R2P, the work concludes that military intervention under R2P must not be deliberately used for regime change. However, there may be situations, when regime change is necessary for the protection of civilians; which means that regime change can be regarded as legitimate only if it is as an indirect result of the intervention. Therefore regime change is an integral part of R2P. The work aims to explore this ambivalent relationship and find out, where lies the boundary between legitimate overthrowing of a régime for the protection of civilians, and regime change held for opportunistic reasons of intervening states. The final part of this study verifies, if was the legitimizing principles for intervention under R2P proposed by ICISS fulfilled during the intervention in Libya in 2011, and analyzes whether was the overthrowing of Gaddafi's government necessary for the protection of civilians in this country. Thus, the work also assesses whether was the regime change in Libya under R2P legal.