

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

**INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PROSPERITY?
ECONOMIC PARADIGM IN RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT
BACHELOR THESIS**

Bratislava, 2023

Markus Formel

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PROSPERITY?
ECONOMIC PARADIGM IN RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT
BACHELOR THESIS

Study Programme: Liberal Arts

Study Field: 6718 Political Science

Thesis Advisor: Mgr. Clarissa do Nascimento Tabosa, PhD.

Degree of Qualification: Bachelor of Arts (abbrev. "BA")

Date of Submission of the Bachelor Thesis: February 15, 2023

Date of Defense: June 12, 2023

Bratislava, 2023

Markus Formel

Declaration of Originality

I hereby declare that this bachelor thesis is my own and has been not published in part or in whole elsewhere. All used literature and other sources are attributed and cited in references.

Bratislava, 15 February 2023

Markus Formel

Signed: _____

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks goes out to Clarissa Tabosa, my thesis adviser, for her tremendous guidance and tolerance throughout the completion of this project. This thesis would not be feasible without her direction and assistance. Last but not least, I would want to express my gratitude to my parents for their unwavering support throughout my academic life.

Abstract

Author: Markus Formel

Title: International Responsibility and Prosperity: Economic Paradigm in Responsibility to Protect

University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Thesis Advisor: Mgr. Clarissa do Nascimento Tabosa, PhD.

Chair of the Defense Committee: prof. František Novosád CSc.

Committee Members: prof. František Novosád CSc., doc. Samuel Abrahám, Mrg. Dagmar Kusá, PhD., prof. Silvia Miháliková

Place, year, scope of thesis: Bratislava, 2023, 31 pages, (61690 characters)

Degree of Qualification: Bachelor of Arts (abbrev- "BA")

This thesis analyzes core economic policies implemented in Venezuela and provides a theoretical reflection on a possible enlargement of the Responsibility to Protect norm to protect humans from harmful economic policies. It is argued that the international community must address serious violations of human rights and human suffering. The argument I build throughout the thesis is that we must expand the lenses through which we look at security and must also address the impact of implementing harmful economic policy on human well-being. Based on the analysis of the Venezuelan case, I will argue that to address human suffering, the concept of Responsibility to Protect should be expanded to Responsibility to Prosperity, following the solidaristic approach set out by the English School of International Relations.

Keywords: responsibility to protect, economics, humanitarian interventions, Venezuela, market economy, British School of International Relations

Abstrakt

Autor bakalárskej práce: Markus Formel

Názov práce: Medzinárodná Zodpovednosť a Prosperita ? Ekonomická Paradigma a Zodpovednosť Chrániť

Univerzita: Bratislavská medzinárodná škola liberálnych štúdií

Školiteľ: Mgr. Clarissa do Nascimento Tabosa, PhD.

Predseda komisie pre obhajoby bakalárskych prác: prof. František Novosád CSc.

Členstvo komisie pre obhajoby bakalárskych prác: prof. František Novosád CSc., doc. Samuel Abrahám, Mrg. Dagmar Kusá, PhD., prof. Silvia Miháliková

Miesto, rok a rozsah práce: Bratislava, 2023, 31 strán, (61690 znakov)

Stupeň kvalifikácie: Bakalár ("Bc.")

Táto práca analyzuje základné hospodárske politiky uplatňované vo Venezuele a poskytuje teoretickú reflexiu možného rozšírenia normy zodpovednosti za ochranu s cieľom chrániť ľudí pred škodlivými hospodárskymi politikami. Tvrdí sa, že medzinárodné spoločenstvo musí riešiť závažné porušovanie ľudských práv a utrpenie ľudí. Argument, na ktorom staviam celú prácu, je, že, musíme rozšíriť optiku, cez ktorú sa pozeráme na bezpečnosť, a musíme sa zaoberať aj vplyvom vykonávania škodlivej hospodárskej politiky na blaho ľudí. Na základe analýzy venezuelského prípadu budem tvrdiť, že na riešenie ľudského utrpenia by sa mala koncepcia zodpovednosti za ochranu rozšíriť na zodpovednosť za prosperitu, a to podľa solidárneho prístupu stanoveného Britskou školou medzinárodných vzťahov.

Kľúčové slová: Zodpovednosť chrániť, ekonomika, humanitárna intervencia, Venezuela, trhová ekonomika, Britská škola medzinárodných vzťahov

Table of Contents

Declaration of Originality	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Abstrakt	v
Introduction	7
Chapter 1: Philosophical Construction of Responsibility Towards the Vulnerable	9
Chapter 2: The Coming of Age of the Responsibility to Protect	14
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology	20
Chapter 4: The History of Joint Political and Economic Development of Venezuela	22
Chapter 5: Discussion - Responsibility to Prosperity	32
Conclusion	36
Resumé	38
Reference List	41

Introduction

The Holodomor in Ukraine counted four million deaths. The great leap forward and the Cultural Revolution killed dozens of millions of people. Sixty years later, we see images of Venezuelan refugees crossing with backpacks to Colombia, violent protests in Sri Lanka, and people queuing in Cuba just to get fed. The deprivation and death that stemmed from it could have been prevented if the international community had intervened upon reading the signals that countries are severely mismanaged. However, that did not happen, and the countries have been left to slowly decay, with their population being taken hostage by autocrats and authoritarian governments.

Unfortunately, no framework, legal norm, or custom prevents the implementation of destructive policies. An important principle emerged at the beginning of the 21st century; the responsibility to protect. Responsibility to Protect has emerged as a response of the international community towards the gravest crimes against humanity, seen in Srebrenica and Rwanda (Department of Public Information, 2014). It is designed to protect the civilian population - by breaching the sovereignty of the state - to protect civilians from genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Economic policies can also result in grave human suffering equal to the amount of anguish on which countries can react with the Responsibility to Protect principle. It is to be argued that these results have origins in the implementation of uneconomic policies, which result in an overall negative impact. Based on that claim, a claim arises that the international community shall act on severe human rights violations and human suffering. We must expand the lenses through which we look at security and must also address the impact of implementing harmful economic policies on human security. It is necessary to research the possibilities of extending the principle to avert humanitarian catastrophes together with preventing threats to global stability that are endangered by the financial crisis. And this is only possible with development, which combines sound economic policy.

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

Furthermore, the impact of economic policies and their result on human suffering will be studied in the case of Venezuela, where the economic policies have resulted in a massive outflux of citizens towards neighboring countries, income poverty, and lack of medical supplies (Hausmann, 2017). Increased mortality, together with severe malnutrition on the civilian side of the population. This bachelor's thesis aims to research the possible theoretical enlargement of the Responsibility to Protect - by utilizing the Solidaristic approach set out by the English School in International Relations - to consider human suffering originating in economic policies.

Chapter 1: Philosophical Construction of Responsibility Towards the Vulnerable

The responsibility to protect the civilian population can be traced as far as the Thomist thought, which is a philosophical thought spurring from the catholic-derived philosophy developed by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century. Spanish Thomists at the University of Salamanca and Alcalá were thinking about the following Spanish Conquest. They were not very convinced by the mode of governance being imported by the Spanish (Glenville, 2021). Thomas Aquinas considered protecting the vulnerable as a matter of justice. In contrast, the Thomists looked at the protection of the vulnerable as a matter of charity and of the “love thy neighbor” biblical principle. With the acts of charity and loving their neighbors, the Spanish colonizers were thought to have an obligation to such treatment of the native populations. Humanist philosopher - Alberico Gentili (Gentili, 2023) - proposed that war can be fought to protect civilians. Gentili posits the existence of a universal humanistic bond that transgresses the jurisdiction of one sovereign and the common bond between human beings. He states that sovereigns are obliged to defend their allies, neighbors, shared blood, and allies of similar religions and also protect these subjects of other sovereigns from cruel and unfair treatment. Hugo Grotius also contributed to expanding the well of thought of responsibility to others. He posited that for a state to protect others is commendable, but it should not be considered a duty. However, this act of protection shall be done without leaving its military power weakened to the extent that it can hurt the domestic population (Glenville, 2021).

The theoretical closest communion to the theoretical backbone of the Responsibility to Protect came with the perfectionists. Emer de Vattel (1797) connected the perfectionist views with their ideological parents - modernism and humanism. He transgresses from the morality of “help when you can” to “help if you can”. He claimed that states should always be prudent when balancing their commitments, but this does not excuse them from disregarding the needs of others in an unreasonable fashion. He uses the example of

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

Russia, which helped Sweden to put down famine, and he named it prudent performance when they helped Sweden, but they did not allow other nations to purchase corn for their own people. Vattel admitted that a greater sacrifice is needed to protect others, and an inconvenience should not stop us from assisting others. He anticipates a world where a truly perfect nation also helps develop others to be better able, in their autonomous sovereign capacity, to tackle their crisis independently. Glenville (2021), summarizes this idea in which a nation: “is bound not only to contribute to the perfection of other nations by providing for their necessities and helping them secure peace and justice within their territories but also to contribute, “occasionally, and according to its power,” to the capacities of these nations so that they are better able to procure such things for themselves” (p. 32).

In conclusion, the general thread of “love thy neighbor” has thus survived and developed from a biblical principle to a more crucial normative set of values and policies. From “love only if you can afford it” to “love if you can”. These ideas having their main lines drawn at the start of the previous millennium have also penetrated the theory of international relations and the idea of international justice in the school, which emerged right after the Second World War. That of the English School of International Relations.

1. 1. The Introduction of the English School of International Relation

The English School synthesized thomist, rationalist, perfectionist, humanist, viewpoints within its framework. Within the dimensions of International Relations thought, the English School combines the thought of neorealism and neoliberalism while extending the dimensional scope of thinking of international relations. Therefore, the English School is the third way in International Relations theory. The English School's actors are subdivided into three sublayers working simultaneously: the international system, international society, and world society (Stivachtis, 2018). The combination of liberalism and realism is represented in those concepts. The category of the international system follows the Hobbesian-Machiavellian paradigm of power. It draws parallel lines with realism in understanding the similarity of the

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

structures and processes of the international world order as an anarchical society. The counter-balancing liberal thought is represented in the subcategories - the international society and World society.

International society is a level of relation and systematic behavior that takes place under the umbrella of shared institutions, interests, norms, values, and identities. Buzan writes that the basic idea of this category is to see the reflections of: "individuals live in societies which they both shape and are shaped by, so also states live in an international society which they shape and are shaped by. This social element has to be put alongside realism's basic logic of anarchy if one is to get a meaningful picture of how systems of states operate" (Buzan, 2004, p.8). Which can be extrapolated to the comprehension of the international society on a greater level of analysis of the international realm. The last piece of the three layers is the World society, which detaches the understanding of the relation of the international system from the state towards the people and other non-state actors. Jackson (2003) simplifies these three categories and explains them through the lens of a statesman who has to balance foreign policy activities. Realism prioritizes national responsibility, rationalism to international responsibility, and revolutionism (his preferable term being cosmopolitanism) to humanitarian responsibility. All of these dimensions are well summarized by Robert Jackson, that the English School as follows:

a variety of theoretical inquiries which conceive of international relations as a world not merely of power or prudence or wealth or capability or domination but also one of recognition, association, membership, equality, equity, legitimate interests, rights, reciprocity, customs and conventions, agreements and disagreements, disputes, offenses, injuries, damages, reparations, and the rest: the normative vocabulary of human conduct. (Jackson, 1992, p. 271)

Nonetheless, the central area of the English School is centered around the combination of realism and rationalism. Bull and Watson (1985) explain this synthesis on the relationship of such kind between states. They maintain that states or a collection of politically autonomous entities not only function as a

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

system in that each state's actions affect the others but also have established through negotiation and consent common rules and institutions for conducting their relations and acknowledge their shared interest in upholding these arrangements.

All of the conducts mentioned earlier can be considered separate from the state via international trade, for example, or cultural consumption, and hence the concept of international society transforms into World society. The interplay of the three pillars of the English School is to be understood as a triangle. Where one side is missing, it collapses, and all the triangles can be moved from side to side - with different side sizes - to give us a comprehensive look at the international realm. Buzan writes that the "English school theory also transcends the assumption often made in the so-called inter-paradigm debate, that realist, liberal and Marxist approaches to IR theory are incommensurable" (Buzan, 2004, p.10).

The English School can be divided into two subcategories: the pluralists and the solidarists, as English School lies between realism and liberalism. The pluralists are more on the side, or realist views, and their counterparts are more leaning towards the liberalism spectrum. Pluralists believe that states make laws - they are proponents of positive law origination, while the Solidarists think of law as natural law. Moreover, they see states as the most crucial part of human society. With that, the idea of state sovereignty is undisputed.

Furthermore, they lean parallel to realism in terms of: "preservation and/or cultivation of the political and cultural difference and distinctness that are the legacy of human history" (Buzan, 2004, p.46). International Society is then, therefore, left to a minimum of shared causes of international magnitude, such as the retention of the international anarchy needed for existence itself. For example, sovereignty agreements, agreements for non-intervention, and general rules and principles for diplomatic conduct.

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

On the other hand, solidarists reverse the emphasis on the national state. They are concerned about the individual from a universalist, cosmopolitan perspective. The responsibility of an individual is rooted in the shared existence or being part of the human race (Jackson, 2003). The Solidarists consider the full employment of power forms originating from the international society to emphasize protecting human rights (Stivachtis, 2018). And with Solidarists, the revolutionary principle of Responsibility to Protect is connected. Which, first in human history, codified the reasons to intervene on a humanitarian level.

Chapter 2: The Coming of Age of the Responsibility to Protect

The idea of sovereignty from the absolute, having its origins in the Peace of Westphalia, changed after World War II. When the idea of the state as a passive sovereign changed to an active implementer of the rights of its subjects. Scholars argue that sovereignty “carries with it certain responsibilities for which governments must be held accountable. And they are accountable not only to their national constituencies but ultimately to the international community “ (Deng et al., 1996, as cited in Moses, 2012, 116). When the sovereign state fails, its sovereignty is weakened, and others can intervene because it no longer provides care for its citizens (Moses, 2012). Kofi Annan writes about the change of the idea of sovereignty from absolute to global and conditional as of the new millennia:

State sovereignty, in its most basic sense, is being redefined – not least by the forces of globalisation and international co-operation. States are now widely understood to be instruments at the service of their peoples, and not vice versa. At the same time individual sovereignty – by which I mean the fundamental freedom of each individual, enshrined in the charter of the UN and subsequent international treaties – has been enhanced by a renewed and spreading consciousness of individual rights. (The Economist, 1999, para.4)

Furthermore, there is an institutional door for possible action of a humanitarian kind, which references the UN Charter and the point where “armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest”. Kofi Annan (The Economist, 1999) names four points under which common interest shall be defined. Together with the systematic issues originating from “common interest”, such as the definition of the common interest, the actors, the description of the intervention and its forms, and who shall hold the authority to execute it. Firstly, an intervention needs not be just of the military kind and can take different forms, such as humanitarian support, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. It needs to be understood that every form of intervention is of a different kind and form, which varies on the country and the relevant

geopolitical context. Secondly, he argues that what is a national interest needs to be redefined to pursue common goals and values with its neighbors after the division of the Cold War. Right now, with many challenges being global, he states that: “collective interest is the national interest” (The Economist, 1999, para. 12). Thirdly, the authority to authorize an intervention - the United Nations - should have the ability to find unanimity in defending humanity. Moreover, the power of legal intervention - and subsequently the military power of the members of the security council - shall be a deterrent power for any country to act against collective interest. Additionally, Annan writes that there is a danger of inactive Security Council intervening because other actors mainly fill its place. Fourthly, the devotion to maintaining peace in a region of conflict shall continue as strong as the willingness to warfare. “The aftermath of war requires no less skill, no less sacrifice, no fewer resources than the war itself if lasting peace is to be secured” (The Economist, 1999, para. 15), Annan writes.

2.1 Emergence of Responsibility to Protect

The beginnings of the Responsibility to Protect as a norm in international relations can be traced to the Millennium Report of 2000 written by Kofi Annan describing the need of international community to react to genocides and to stop atrocities in within an effective framework. The ideas were codified by the Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty created by Canada; there, for the first time, the term “Responsibility to Protect” was mentioned. The report challenged the concept of sovereignty, stating that it:

not only gave a State the right to “control” its affairs, it also conferred on the State primary “responsibility” for protecting the people within its borders. It proposed that when a State fails to protect its people – either through lack of ability or a lack of willingness – the responsibility shifts to the broader international community. (Department of Public Information, 2014, p.1)

Afterward, a High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change was established by Kofi Annan. It lies a collective responsibility of all states, which

is to be authorized by the Security Council, to prevent grave violations of humanitarian law, together with crimes against humanity, war crimes and ethnic cleansing from happening, when the sovereign state is either not willing or not able to do prevent it. A year later, during the United Nations World Summit in 2005, all the states agreed to accept the following:

the responsibility of each State to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. At the Summit, world leaders also agreed that when any State fails to meet that responsibility, all States (the “international community”) are responsible for helping to protect people threatened with such crimes. (Department of Public Information, 2014, p.2)

2.3. The Case of Libya

The case of Libya demonstrates the ability of Responsibility to Protect to prevent atrocities and use military power for the benefit of the people while breaching sovereignty. However, at the same time, it illustrates some of the critiques of the R2P, mainly concerning justification and legalization of military use to mobilize political change within a subjected country. On March 19, an implementation of the resolution 1973 was carried on. A coalition of the United States, United Kingdom, and France started to bomb the position of Muhamar Gaddafi’s military outside the city of Benghazi. Seeing the atrocities of Gaddafi’s regime during the Arab Spring, where hundreds of civilians were shot while protesting against the regime Gaddafi stated that there will “cleanse Libya house by house“ (BBC News, 2011, para.16). As the conflict evolved, two actors emerged: the National Transitional Council - which was supported by NATO - and the Gaddafi forces. As the rebel troops advanced and later entered the city of Tripolis, an investigation of the Human Rights Watch revealed that the war crimes were systematic (Human Rights Watch, 2011, as cited in, Bellamy & Dunne, 2016). An example being resulted in the mass murder of prisoner, torture, unlawful detainment and sexual crimes in Tripolis and other cities. An Inquiry by the UNHRC conducted that Qaddafis’ military men attacked the civilian population, perpetrated murders and torture (Office

of the High Commissioner for Human Rights., 2012). Nevertheless, a critique of the enforcement of the R2P principle has been voiced by India's ambassador to the United Nations. Who stated that NATO acts like an "armed wing" of the Security Council. Also, he declared that there had been a change of priorities from protecting the individual within the state to a priority of regime change (Plett, 2011). His criticism has been reaffirmed by the statement of Liam Fox - then Minister of Defence - who stated that "the international community wants [Gadhafi's] regime to end" (Wintour & MacAskill, 2011).

Subsequently, the additional conflict has broken out in the regional neighbor of Syria, where the dysfunctionality of the institutional arrangement and possible downsides of enactment of the principle has led to massive atrocities. During the first years of the Syrian conflict, both Russia and China have prevented sanctions from being imposed on the Syrian government. Another three non-permanent security council members - Brazil, South Africa, and India - were also skeptical about another intervention, voicing concern over deepening the conflict towards sectarian lines (Plett, 2011). These two examples illustrate the possibility of misuse or non-use of the principle to the political goals of the actors. The intervention in Libya is considered to be a success on a humanitarian scale in preventing mass atrocities. Nonetheless, more than 80 resolutions were adopted by the Security Council with reference to the Responsibility to Protect in countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, Yemen, Mali, and Somalia (Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, 2021). They have adopted measures to prevent genocide and the dealing of arms. That is to say, the substantial ground use of the principle does not lie in intervention but in prevention.

2.4. The Critique of Responsibility to Protect

On the other hand, numerous critiques of the Responsibility to Protect exist. The most vocal criticism is derived from realist thought of international relations. They criticize that proponents of the principle do not provide a set of ideas to challenge the principle of sovereignty. Furthermore, the criticism focuses on the notion of a greater power above power - the international

community - to which proponents of R2P give the authority to override absolute sovereignty (Holmes, 2014). Realists insist that states will use their power to breach the sovereignty of another state if it suits their interests. Or will employ other means - such as a coalition of powers on a regional scale or by the use of their vote in the Security Council (Holmes, 2014). Additionally, such a codified norm, such as the R2P, is viewed as a means of legitimizer of intervention whenever it suits the power that wants to breach another state's sovereignty. Proponents of this argument state an example of: "2003 invasion of Iraq and, following the failure to find weapons of mass destruction, became the primary justification for the continued US occupation" (Moses, 2012, p. 134). Likewise, the Russian government justified their invasion into Georgia in 2008 as a human protection exercise (Global Centre for Responsibility to Protect, 2008). The last case of intervention based on the pretense of providing security for individuals in another state was the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022. Where Russian officials state committing genocide in the eastern part of Ukraine on the Russian-speaking population, and thus, it needed to intervene to protect them (The Diplomatic Service of the European Union, n.d.).

2.5. Common Concern

Nonetheless, the ground on which R2P could be acted remains limited. The theory of Schefer and Cottier (2012) offers an extension to the understanding of the responsibilities of actors in the international system. The origins of the concept of "Common Concern for Mankind" appeared in the 20th century. The idea of Common Concern for Humankind has been applied mainly in the case of environmental protection concerning environmental intergenerational equity. The first mention appeared 13 years before R2P, in UN General Assembly Resolution 43/53, where the delegation of Malta, has suggested that the entire World should take responsibility for mitigating climate change because the effects are applied to the world (Cottier & Matteotti-Berkutova, 2009).

Schefer and Cottier (2012) expand the categorical model of Common Concerns, which contains the category of international public goods. The authors claim that these public goods can be the “preservation of international peace, the rule of law, secured market access rights and non-discrimination, and the protection from genocide and hunger and fundamental human rights” (p. 14). The authors describe two conditions, which, when met, can be constituted that the sort of issue is an international problem; firstly, when the effects are distributed within the whole international community; secondly, when one state can not resolve the issue by its capacity. Those can be for example, transboundary pollution, unsustainable fishing, and space debris. They suggest that when the two conditions are met, “ the international community has a responsibility to protect, assist, and/or respond” (p. 14). Furthermore, they suggest that the principle of Common Concern could include reaction to economic policy; they write:

Flagrantly unresponsive government and chronic public corruption are also of concern to the broader international community, are also problems that cannot be resolved by the territorial authority. Common Concern could further extend to massive financial instability, extremely high levels of unemployment, perhaps even to unsustainable levels of public debt. Given the interconnectedness of the global financial network, such situations undoubtedly affect (or have the potential to affect) states and individuals anywhere on the planet. (Schefer & Cottier, 2012. p.15)

Also, Lucía Satragno (2022) argues that monetary stability should be included in the newly reemerging concept of Common Concern. She argues that the Great Depression has led to the collapse of international peace. And thus, it constitutes an area that transgresses national borders, and hence monetary stability is a concern that impacts the entire international community.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

This thesis is a case study on the historical development of economic policy and economic factors within Venezuela since the discovery of oil to its nationalization and subsequent nationalization of nearly every sector of the industry by Hugo Chavez. The examined economic metrics are the inflation measurements, amount of import and export, the diversification of the economy in terms of domestic production, and the debt ratio towards the size of Venezuela's economy. Furthermore, the policies that Venezuela adopted to intervene in the market are examined, as is the imposition of price controls, closing the regional trade with the neighboring countries, nationalization of the oil industry, and subsequent nationalization of various sectors of the economy.

Nevertheless, the connections between the economic policy and the general population are measured by the amount of nutrition per capita - connected with the involuntary weight loss computation, income poverty data, infant mortality, and migration outflow. The origins of which can be traced to the implementation of anti-market economic policies, together with the mismanagement of the country's natural wealth income. The impact of anti-market policies are examined by the research of Ricardo Hausmann and Kristian Niemnitz. The role of inflation and macroeconomic mismanagement is analyzed by the prize information theory of Friedrich von Hayek, together with his views on state interventions in the economy and the creation of state monopolies and price controls. These policies, which are connected with the Washington Consensus, are represented by temporal measurements in the Index of Economic Freedom, which provides the closest metrics relating to the Washington Consensus.

The analysis of the case of Venezuela allows me to claim that anti-market policies such as are: ad hoc nationalization, price controls, monetary stimulus, and excessive overregulation regulation resulted in human suffering, which is represented by increased poverty, massive emigration, increased mortality, and malnutrition. The scale of which was not accepted by the international

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

community - in order to respond - such as in the case of Libya. The issue can be further comprehended by the application of the concept of human suffering in historical thought, which incorporates the theoretical findings by Aquinas, Grotius, Gentili, de Vattel, and Kant. All of these are present in the International Relation theory known as English School or British Institutionalism. The research encompassed the implementation of the Solidarist perspective of the English School of International Relations in regard to intervention in other states; they are particularly interested in the principle of Responsibility to Protect and is also explored with another concept of Common Concern for Humankind.

On the other hand, within the scope of the thesis, I intend to make a theoretical revision of the principle of R2P to claim that human suffering, as can be acted on by the international community, needs to be extended to include human suffering originating from economic policies, which have a negative impact on the population of the state. The limitation of the collected data is the recent unavailability of data sets from Venezuela and the reliance on secondary collected data sets.

Chapter 4: The History of Joint Political and Economic Development of Venezuela

To examine the economic turmoil of Venezuela, it is necessary to look specifically at the year 1922. This year geologists from the Royal Dutch Shell have found a resourceful oil basin in Maracaibo, at La Rosa. By 1929, Venezuela had been the second biggest oil exporter, just below the United States. The production increased from one million barrels per year to 137 million. This change had, as a result, two things. The national currency had become very strong for other exports apart from oil, and oil accounted for 90% of the exports of Venezuela (Chaetham et. al, 2021).

In 1943, the government passed a Hydrocarbons Law, which imposed a 50% tax on the profits of oil extraction companies. In five years, the government coffers had increased six times. When the first democratic government was elected after the dictatorship in 1958, three coalition parties signed the Punto Fijo pact, which distributed state jobs and oil profits to the three parties according to the election result. The goal of this pact was to ensure democratic stability after the period of dictatorship and to guard against it. And on the same page was the guarantee of the revenue concentration within the state (Chetham et. al, 2021). After joining the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) in 1960, Venezuela established its first petrochemical state-owned company and increased the tax on profits by 15 percentage points, from 50% to 65% (2021). Thanks to the OPEC-Embargo on the states that supported Israel during the Yom Kippur War, Venezuela has become one of the wealthiest countries in the World and the richest in Latin America. The oil price increase resulted in an additional 10 billion dollars in the state's budget (2021). From that time onwards, rampant mismanagement and embezzlement have taken a large part in Venezuela. It is estimated that 100 billion dollars were embezzled from 1972 to 1997 (2021).

During the period of booming oil prices in the 1970s, the president of Venezuela - Carlos Andres Perez - nationalized the oil industry. That meant that the new company Petroleos de Venezuela, S.A. (PDVSA) was to oversee

all the stages of oil production (Chetham et. al, 2021). From the exploration of new oil fields to the production, refinement, and export of the finished product. The state company was designed to act like a standalone company with minimum government regulation. Nonetheless, it was allowed to create a joint venture with PDVSA with foreign companies, but the Venezuelan state was to hold a 60% stake in the joint entity (2021). In the 1980s, oil prices declined, and inflation soared, thanks to the lack of money coming from oil industries and purchases of foreign-owned refineries. The former president Perez had been reelected and started to enact an austerity package to stabilize the country's macroeconomic performance in exchange for help from the IMF.

During Chavez's first term, oil prices started to experience steady growth. It was the right mixture to again start large-scale public projects with extensive funding. Public spending increased by ten percentage points from 30% to 40% of its GDP (Niemietz, 2018). In other words, the period of lavish spending from the seventies was back in Venezuela. It was the second term, where the current turmoil originates from. Throughout the second electoral turn, the government became more active in the economy.

4.1. Economic Policy Literature Review

Research on the crisis in Venezuela is scarce because the government of Venezuela and its agencies have been significantly reducing the amount of data that could be studied and examined (Rodriguez & Guerro, 2020). Some research points to a high dependency on oil and aluminum production and rare earth mineral processing. Together with chemical production, it combines 98.5% of all exports. This export dependency on prices on international markets makes an economy extremely vulnerable to shocks of external origins. It is recommended that countries that depend on fossil fuels and have a large pool of government income based on export revenues allocate enough resources to savings and other forms of revenue diversification. This revenue is then recommended to be utilized against the economic cycle to bolster the economy with additional revenue during a time of crisis. Venezuela did not manage to adopt these precautionary measures during the last time of high oil

prices. Also, heavy reliance on oil makes the national currency appreciate, making the currency more expensive for other export industries and halting the diversification of the national economy. Rodriguez & Guerro (2020) argue that the decline of Venezuela can be attributed to a “massive reduction in imports generated by dwindling foreign exchange revenue” (p.336), which is connected with the underperformance in the international oil market.

Providing a more systematic understanding of the economic crisis in Venezuela is a school of thought which attributes the crisis in Venezuela to anti-market policies adopted by the left-wing governments. Ricardo Hausmann (2016) proposes a systematic thought which could be found in overturning market economy maxims. He states that examples of the policies are to be found in price controls and the subsidization of certain goods and services. Together with closed borders, this generates a large black market - in which inflation spurs. Because there is a lack of price information for competitors, together with the cost of reselling. With the government unable to follow the legal subsidies, the productivity of the subsidized sectors collapses, as was the case of energy and healthcare. Moreover, he criticized state-run enterprises because they can not run profitably and sustainably in an environment where there exist no real prices and real incentives to produce profit - because it is state-run (2016). All of this combined is underpinned by a macroeconomic argument. He argues that the fourfold increase in public debt during the economic boom of 2004 to 2013 has left Venezuela in a place of distrust with its fiscal health on the financial markets. This has resulted in the cut of imported goods combined with a collapse in interstate production output (2016).

On the other hand, left-wing scholars attribute the downfall of Venezuela to an intervention of the external states. Peter Bolton (2016) maintains that the interference of the West in the Venezuelan media has led to the liberalization of the oil market. He argues that foreign companies were avoiding taxation of their incomes and have focused on extraction for export focuses. The combination of those two has led to the stagnation of the national economy of oil production and has driven inflation. Another left-wing scholar Edgardo

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

Lander (2004) attributes the crisis to the market reforms, which liberalized currency rates and moved closer to international financial institutions. Another scholar, Steve Ellner (2015), attributes the crisis to speculators and hoarders, conducted by businessmen in opposition to the government.

4.2. Examination of the Economic Policies

During the presidency of Hugo Chavez, the vast majority of anti-market policies were adopted. Oil companies were seized, the companies that provided services to the oil industry were transferred to the state.

Nevertheless, more than 10 million of land for agricultural purposes were nationalized, as well as companies conducting business in steel, electrical distribution, cement, coffee processing, detergent making, ferry ship services, banking institutions, telecommunication services, and supermarkets. If the company was not nationalized, the business field was heavily regulated, or the products were put under price controls (Megias & Hausmann, 2016–present).

The effect of implementation of price controls changes the quality and money and internal market mechanism. The incentive to produce diminishes - with disruption of market mechanism, and the production collapses. It can result either in goods of lower quality, but most likely in scarcity (Hausmann, 2016, para. 8). Economics has shown that this is wrong because prices are the information system that creates incentives for suppliers and customers to decide what and how much to make or buy. The price includes the price of labor, capital in the product, its difficulty and scarcity on the market and all the additional information we can not have that together summarize the end value of the product. Without the free formation of prices, proper decision-making can not be made. The effect of which has a systematic reference to the functioning of the society, in terms of information dispersed within the society. The general theory of money as a trust and information system has been largely attributed to Fridrich August von Hayek, who thought that “the information that’s most valuable is information held in the hands of millions of individual actors. A central planner simply cannot have the information needed

to plan an economy well” (Henderson, 2010, para. 1). The combination of price controls and inflation - which has reached 1 million percentage points in 2018 (Stepman, 2018), together with exchange controls and import and export controls have left the country in perpetual shortage of necessary goods. The precarity of the situation is described by Natalie Obiko Pearson (2007), who writes:

Meat cuts vanished from Venezuelan supermarkets this week, leaving only unsavory bits like chicken feet, while costly artificial sweeteners have increasingly replaced sugar, and many staples sell far above government-fixed prices. President Hugo Chavez’s administration blames the food supply problems on unscrupulous speculators, but industry officials say government price controls that strangle profits are responsible. Authorities on Wednesday raided a warehouse in Caracas and seized seven tons of sugar hoarded by vendors unwilling to market the inventory at the official price. Major private supermarkets suspended sales of beef earlier this week after one chain was shut down for 48 hours for pricing meat above government-set levels (2007, para. 3)

On the labor market side, they imposed controls on the free movement of labor - by controlling the process of hiring and dismissals, which results in over-employment and a drop in productivity and innovation. As a result, a company either collapses or can survive just with some form of government intervention (Megias & Hausmann, 2016–present). All of these policies, he states, destroyed the market mechanism within Venezuela’s domestic market. He later describes the effects of these policies on the market mechanism, when these policies were implemented, and the results of them: “the rebalancing mechanisms that when something is in short supply, prices go up, they become more profitable, so somebody decides to supply them. That mechanism was broken” (Megias & Hausmann, 2016–present, para. 6). As a result, the production in agriculture and manufacturing has collapsed.

One of the critical economic policy frameworks that need to be implemented, apart from free-price formation, is a stable regulatory environment, including

foreseeable legislation and regulation. Without the much-needed stability of the business environment, proper business decisions can not be executed, capital can not be invested, and workers can not get employed. The risk is too high to do any of that, thus halting economic growth and innovation within an economy resulting in stagnation or decline (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2010).

As a result of nationalizations of industries and monopolization results to favor of state's businesses. The creation of national champions or large state champions puts the consumer in an unfavorable position. When a market exchange is done, the seller and the buyer leave the negotiating table with what they are satisfied with, providing, and paying. With the introduction of government-forced monopolization, the side of the individual or a business owner is left in an unfavorable position (Kirzner, 1978)

The result of all of the policies has been devastating. Income poverty was 48% in 2014 and increased to 82% in 2016. This means that the minimum wage has - due to inflation - collapsed from 295 dollars per month to 36 dollars in black currency market rates, accumulating a decline of 88% in five years (Hausmann, 2017). A measurement of the cheapest available calories declined from 52,854 calories to 7,005 calories per day - a number of calories that is not enough to feed a family. This has led to 8.6 kg of involuntary weight loss. Furthermore, the Venezuelan Health Observatory states that in-patient mortality has multiplied by ten folds (2017), and there has been a hundredfold spike in the death of newborn babies in 2016 (Casey, 2017). Additionally, Venezuela is second in the World in the number of displaced people, amounting to 4.1 million emigrés (Knotts, 2020). UNHCR plans that the other number of people in need of international protection - beyond the protection of concern to the UNHCR, which amounts to 3.2 million - is 6.23 million (UNHCR, n.d.).

4.3. Determining Economic Policies - Washington Consensus and Beyond

During the peak of Venezuela's economic performance in the 1960s, it had a size of its economy of four-fifths of the size of the economy of the United States of America (Restuccia, 2018). The growth was immense. From 30% of the GDP of the USA from the 1930s to the 1950s to 80% - which was its peak. How did Venezuela get rich and so poor afterward? The question lies in the luck and unluck of finding oil and the mismanagement of financial resources gathered from the sale of fossil fuels to political mismanagement of the economic policy in contrast to the Washington Consensus

A set of common denominator practices were developed during the 1990s by the IMF and United States Treasury, which were later popularized and labeled as the Washington Consensus (Santiso, 2004). Which posits the basic principles for a good functioning of a free market economy. The ten principles which were agreed upon by the world bank are: Fiscal Discipline, Reordering Public Expenditure Priorities, Tax Reform, Liberalizing Interest Rates, A Competitive Exchange Rate, Trade Liberalization, Liberalization of Inward Foreign Direct Investment, Privatization, Deregulation, Property Rights (Cohen-Setton, 2016).

The healthy balance sheet on the side of the government, a tax system that incentivizes businesses to produce goods, free interest rates, inclination towards the principles of free trade, and freedom of capital investment. These are the main points that a free market economy should take into account. Nevertheless, the principles of the Washington Consensus have gathered criticism of its principles over the last decades.

There are three schools of thought, each with a different view on how we shall approach the era after the Washington Consensus. On the left - it asserts that the Washington Consensus is flawed from the beginning because it is based on a strong pro-market orthodoxy. The shortcoming of this school of thought is that it does not offer a package of solutions for reforms or economic growth in emerging countries. In the middle lies a school of thought that maintains that

the basic assumptions of the Washington Consensus were defined narrowly and need to be expanded (Santiso, 2004). They also regard the social costs in the reform period while maintaining support for the earlier passed reforms and being critical of the simple logic of neoliberal market policy orthodoxy.

Kuczynski and Williamson argue that: “the way forward is to complete, correct and complement the decades of a decade ago, not to reverse them”

(Kuczynski & Williamson, 2004, p.18). The agenda of these scholars is to combine the first and the second generation of reforms while increasing the crisis-proofness of the countries and having in regard the aspect of social policy, such as income equity and the betterment of social conditions (Kuczynski & Williamson, 2004, p.18).

On the opposite side of the left-wing critique, is the school of thought that presupposes that the Washington Consensus is not flawed. But the principles were applied inconsistently and inadequately, and they emphasized the implementation mismanagement of the reforms by institutions. They name fiscal, macroeconomic, developmental, and infrastructure policy implementation failures as why the reform ideas failed. Also, they emphasize the necessity of institutional capacity to execute the laws. Vito Tanzani writes: “tax administration is tax policy because of the agents’ discretion. In other words, the administration of the law can, de facto, change the original content of the law, and the director of taxation has much power in deciding how a law will be applied” (Tanzani, n.d., as cited in Krueger, 2000, p.448). Therefore the institutional application lies on the agents with the bureaucracy to rightfully execute the policies. Generally, additional critique lies lacking additional policy adjustments to the reforms (Stallings & Peres, 2010) and also the position of an individual in the institutional framework (Haggard, n.d., as cited in Santiso, 2007). Nevertheless, Santiso (2001, as cited in Santiso, 2004) argues that reforms need a robust system of stable governmental bureaucracy and accountable institutions. However, this has been eroded by the first generation of reforms. What the Washington Consensus lacks is the focus on institutional arrangements after the market reforms - such as organizational reform - to create policies of greater quality in the future - and the mechanisms to maintain and strengthen the rule of law (Naim, 1994).

On the other hand, long-term research of the prolonged practices and policies of the Washington Consensus work. Research conducted by Grier and Grier (2020) on 49 cases shows that the criticism of the Washington Consensus-based policies was unreasonably early discarded as false due to the underperformance in Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa (Easterly, 2019). A comparative study of countries that have reformed with those that had not represented in the positive changes of the Economic Freedom Index, which measures countries on the size of the: “free trade, secure property rights, lower government, spending, fewer regulations, and sound money (Grier & Grier, 2020, p.2). The results show that the growth is 2.07 to 2.87 percentage points higher than in the countries that had not undergone reforms and over ten year period amounts to an additional 1.03 to 1.93 percentage point increase (Grier & Grier, 2020). The research of Estevadeordal and Taylor (2013) shows that liberalization in trade and capital amount to an additional one percent of GDP growth per year. The research of Easterly (2019) shows that although the short-term effect of reforms can lead to stagnation - due to the rebalancing of the market - afterward growth is resumed.

This has been reflected in the score of Economic Freedom conducted by the Fraser Institute. It was ranked as the 13th most free country to conduct business in 1970; by 1990, its position had worsened to 33rd place, and after 2002, Venezuela had never performed below 100th place (Fraser Institute, 1970 & 2002). In the last ten years, Venezuela’s ranking has been oscillating from 157th place to 165th place, making Venezuela one of the worst places to conduct business (Fraser Institute, 2012 & 2022).

In summary, Venezuela has adopted policies that were contrary to the basic principles of the Washington Consensus and market economy. It has destroyed the price information system and market mechanisms within its economy. Adopting price controls, import and export controls, nationalizing the industries of nearly every sector, and letting inflation ruin people’s money and perception of value has dramatically increased poverty, mortality, hunger

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

and has resulted in massive outflux of millions of citizens abroad. The clear connection between the implementation of core economic policy that went against the maxims of the market economy has resulted in a humanitarian crisis never seen in Latin America. Thus it is necessary to ponder the expansion of the scope of tools that can avert catastrophes so another Venezuela needs not to happen.

Chapter 5: Discussion - Responsibility to Prosperity

Since the 13th century, scholars have developed thinking that encompassed the affinity towards protecting others. Starting from the Thomists, that drew their inspiration from the bible and criticized the Spanish Colonization. Transforming towards the humanism of Gentili, where sovereigns were to help others subjected to cruel and inhuman treatment. Intertwining with the rationalists, who emphasized protection, but not over its domestic population, and not as a duty. This theory has been further extended by the perfectionists, who saw the act of aid as a duty to perfect others and regarded intervention as superior, regarding the negatives that stem from it. All of these theories combined aim to develop a framework of thought that postulates providing protection to others if a state that holds the sovereignty cannot do so or is a perpetrator of violating physical safety. All of these streams of thought escalated into the Solidarist perspective on International Relations by the English School, which sees the individual's interest as the core of their thought. Combined with seeing atrocities throughout the 20th has resulted in the adoption of the Responsibility to Protect norm, which can be acted upon if a state is committing the most horrendous acts on its population. The only time the Responsibility to Protect has seen military intervention was in the case of Libya. Together with the enactment, the criticism also reappeared; that the principal gives away too much power in the wide utilization of its means. This came to be true in the case of Libya, where apart from protecting civilians, political change also became a priority.

Apart from the gravest breaches of human security, economic policies can cause detrimental damage to the population of a country. Such an example is found in the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, where the income poverty rate rose from 48% in 2014 to 82% in 2016. Moreover, the amount of the cheapest available calorie decreased by 52,854 to 7,005 calories per day, resulting in an involuntary weight loss of 8.6 kg. In addition, the Venezuelan Health Observatory noted a 10-fold increase in inpatient mortality and a 100-fold increase in neonatal deaths in 2016 (2017). Additionally, Venezuela ranks

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

second in the World for the number of displaced persons, representing 4.1 million immigrants (Knotts, 2020). UNHCR estimates that the number of people needing international protection is 6.23 million. All of this is based on policies adopted during the last 25 years. When the government has shifted from the general principles, as described by the Washington Consensus, towards ad hoc statist economic policies - also described as revenge socialism, they have transformed from one of the best-ranked countries on the Index of Economic Freedom to one of the worst performing countries. Caused by the nationalization of key industries and their decline in performance, together with the nationalization of other industries such as mineral processing plants and food processing sectors, combined with sales, imposing price controls, causing hyperinflation, and adopting import and export controls. In other words, defecting from every principle set by the Washington Consensus.

Atrocities stemming from the governmental misuse of its regulatory and institutional power do not find their place in the normative understanding within the paradigm of the Responsibility to Protect. However, another concept can be applied - The Common Concern of Humankind. Cottier & Schefer (2012) define the criteria by which an international issue can be deemed as a problem under the principle of Common Concern: the first one being that the country is unable to resolve it by itself while having an impact on the entirety of the international realm. Supplying this theory, Lucia Satrango (2022) posits that macroeconomic stability shall also be a category within the Common Concern, given the reason that macroeconomic instability affects the regions and the whole World due to the interconnectedness of the international finance; and the breaking down of such complex system can lead towards the infringement on international peace. Thus I propose a new concept stemming from the Responsibility to Protect, it being the Responsibility to Prosperity.

Hence, a form of intervention is to be considered when there is a deep economic crisis or where all the economic indicators lead toward humanitarian catastrophe. The outcomes of anti-economic policies affect not only the

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

population inside a country but also the entire region and the World. Thus a shared responsibility toward prosperity emerges in both categories: shared responsibilities towards stability and shared duty towards the vulnerable. However, the level of international involvement can be separated into two groups of action. One being ex-ante and the second one ex-post. The ex-ante, being a set of actions, signals that the international actors would apply toward countries on a path to produce foreseeable negative internal and external outcomes. An example of this is the adoption of preventive Responsibility to Protect resolutions. Which serves as a warning, signaling to the international partners of events and provides diplomatic pressure. The second one, being of last resort, is a form of international military intervention, as took place in the case of Libya. This ultimate form of military use, breaching the sovereignty of a state, is only bound to happen if all the other resources of action have failed to provide a motion to change. However, in the case of Venezuela, where all levels of governance have been corrupted, and the opposition has lost political support, an intervention of this kind has the highest probability of enacting positive change for the country's future.

However, the use of any intervention posits institutional, political, and implementation challenges. One of the gravest being the agency of authority, which for R2P is the Security Council of the United Nations, in which the five countries have the veto power, and practically their vote can overrun the sovereignty of another country. Without its permission and the enlargement would give them more ability to breach the sovereignty of other states. This directly connects with the history of R2P, when the General Assembly adopted the four points of R2P because the scope was very limited. Thus it could be negotiated and accepted in this particular form. It is highly improbable that countries would vote on another set of principles that could breach their sovereignty and limit their ability to adopt their micro- and macro-economic policies.

Questions arise from determining policies with arguably adverse outcomes that shall be acted upon and which shall be left in the competence of a sovereign country. The challenges in determining the "right" set of policies

also occur. Furthermore, it is to be considered that the process of selecting the set of concrete policies that are to be determined as universally positive is impossible due to the variations of economic arguments. Also, as mentioned in the case of Libya, the owner of the perpetrating military force - in the case of Libya, the NATO-led coalition; after the approval and deployment, can change the objectives of the mission and add their own to the mission; as was the case in the regime change in Libya. On top of it, the enlargement shares the same institutional problem that is directly connected with the political dimension of intervention, where the countries that have a greater interest in the status quo have the ability to halt the use of the mechanism and hence block the help to civilians as is demonstrated by the case of Russian veto of R2P resolutions in Syria (Nichols, 2019). The posited difficulty that encompasses all the challenges mentioned above is that a single country can act without the authority of the Security Council but can utilize the arguments of saving civilians from inevitable harm one country would affect its population. Russia uses the parallel argument in the conflict in Ukraine by stating that there is a genocide and an ethnic cleansing of the Russian-speaking minority (The Diplomatic Service of the European Union, n.d.).

However, the argument favoring intervention based on economic parameters can not be dismissed. Policies with negative impact, economic policies going entirely against universal principles of market economy, cause a tremendous amount of human suffering that is comparative with genocide and ethnic cleansing. Thus the international actors and organizations shall regard it, similarly and with comparable concerns, as genocide and ethnic cleansing. Because the outcome is similar. Moreover, a successful reaction could not only avert a humanitarian catastrophe but also cause a positive change in the country regarding economic growth and stability. Since prosperity stems from security and security from prosperity, the time has come to rethink and expand its scope of sensitivity towards not only men with arms but also letters in law. Because they can both be devastating. Thus it is time for the international community and scholars to rethink the idea of sovereignty and Responsibility to Protect.

Conclusion

For more than five hundred years, scholars have argued what the scope of protecting civilians shall look like. As a result of this philosophical development, together with the atrocities the World experienced during the 20th century, the international community has developed and codified the principle of Responsibility to Protect. It is supposed to protect the civilian population - by breaching the sovereignty of the state - to protect civilians from genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

Venezuela has implemented import and export controls, price controls, and nationalizations of industries in all sectors of the economy causing hyperinflation and closing cross-border trade. In addition, it imposed import and export controls, and the closure of cross-border trade has resulted in increased inflation and scarcity of food and medical supplies. Price controls and nationalizations have resulted in worsening economic market conditions, with price controls resulting in scarcity and a lack of economic activity in the government-controlled sectors of the economy. These core economic policies had negative outcomes; all of these policies combined have resulted in massive immigration to the neighboring countries, famine, increased mortality, and poverty.

My thesis claims that to address human suffering, the concept of responsibility to protect should be expanded to Responsibility to Prosperity, which is centered around relating economic policies with human suffering akin to direct physical violence of a state. However, these conditions do not conform to the acting principles of the Responsibility to Protect, and hence no international action, apart from sanctions, can not be enacted. Thus it is necessary to explore a possible extension to the principle and amass concrete economic policies that are to serve as a base for action. The normative set of economic policies needs to be based on the Washington Consensus, which contains a normative base of values for free-market economies.

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

However, it can be argued that due to the institutional arrangement - together with the political and systemic aspects - of the principle yields the possibility of successful implementation nearly impossible to implement, and if even so, the activation of the protection mechanism might be used scarcely. Nevertheless, the lack of research demonstrates the shifting nature of thinking about international stability and human security in the context of a globalized World. Shifting of focus onto the economic roots of the humanitarian crisis is necessary in order to prevent future human suffering and international instability.

The main conclusion of this thesis is that national economic policies can result in massive human suffering, relatable to the principles, which can be reacted on by the international community by an enactment of the R2P principle. They can cause artificial hunger, increase mortality, and lead to massive emigration. The moral case for Responsibility to Prosperity, together with the effects that can be caused by national economic policies - as they can spill over to cause regional and international turmoil - make the argument to encompass economic criteria in the case of protecting civilians.

Resumé

Táto bakalárska práca sa zaoberá teoretickým rozšírením princípu zodpovednosti chrániť o ekonomické politiky, ktoré môžu spôsobiť rovnaké množstvo ujmy, ako už teraz kodifikované piliere zodpovednosti chrániť – ktorými sú vojnové zločiny, etnické čistky, genocída a zločiny proti ľudskosti. Táto práca argumentuje, že ekonomické politiky vedia byť rovnako nebezpečné, ako primárne fyzické ohrozenie života. Toto teoretické rozšírenie je skúmané na prípade Venezuely. Je analyzovaná hospodárska politika v kontexte historických zmien, od nájdenia ropy na začiatku 20. storočia, po posledné dve desaťročia od zvolenia prezidenta Huga Cháveza, počas ktorých sa hospodárska kríza pretavila do humanitárnej krízy. Táto humanitárna kríza bola spôsobená adoptovanými ekonomickými politikami Venezuelskej vlády, ktoré sú v priamom rozpore s princípmi zadefinovanými Washingovnským konsenzom, ktorý menuje desať kritérií pre transformujúce sa krajiny, aby boli úspešnými krajinami s fungujúcim trhovým hospodárstvom. Toto prepojenie je reprezentované v Indexe ekonomickej slobody od Frasierovho Inštitútu, ktorý meria ukazovatele najbližšie k princípom Washingtonského Konsenzu. Využívam teórie Richarda Hausmanna a Friedricha von Hayeka na vysvetlenie výsledkov adoptovaných politík.

V prvej kapitole je upriamená pozornosť na filozofický vývoj, ktorý je možno vysledovať až k myšlienkam tomistov, ktorí argumentovali za ochranu, derivujúc od biblických myšlienok. Humanistický filozof Alberico Gentili navrhol, že vojnu možno viesť na ochranu civilného obyvateľstva proti zlému zaobchádzaniu. To taktiež tvrdil Hugo Grotius, ktorý nad tým uvažoval, nie spôsobom podnecujúcim aktívne konanie zo strany iných štátov. Domnieval sa, že ochrana iných je chvályhodná, ale zároveň by sa nemala uskutočňovať bez toho, aby vojenská sila bola oslabená do takej miery, že môže poškodiť domáce obyvateľstvo štátu, ktorý ochraňuje. Na rozdiel od Huga Grotiusa, Emer de Vattel považoval ochranu obyvateľstva za natoľko dôležitú, že ju postavil nad oslabenie pomáhajúcej krajiny a domnieval sa, že aj keď ochrana

Formel: International Responsibility and Prosperity

spôsobí ujmu krajine, ktorá poskytuje ochranu, tak by intervencia nemala byť zavrhnutá, pretože ochrana trpiaceho obyvateľstva je dôležitejšia, ako krátkodobé oslabenie.

Horeuvedené myšlienky sú jedným z pilierom Britskej školy medzinárodných vzťahov, ktoré sa rozdeľujú na tri vrstvy: medzinárodný systém, medzinárodná spoločnosť a svetová spoločnosť, ktoré reprezentujú - štátny systém, neštátnych aktérov a kozmopolitné - ľudské rozdelenie. Britská Škola sa rozdeľuje na dve kategórie: pluralistov a solidaristov. Obaja vnímajú pojem suverenity štátov opozitne. Pluralizmus sa zastáva zachovania suverenity pochádzajúc z Vestfálskeho systému, zatiaľ čo solidarizmus pripúšťajú intervenciu s ohľadom na ľudský rozmer.

Dodatočne je popísaný vývoj princípu za ochraňovanie z historickej perspektívy. Je popísaná zmena postoja k suverenite, ktorého zmena je kulmináciou historických udalostí od druhej svetovej vojny, až po genocídu v Rwande a v Srebrenici. Podľa niektorých akademikov má mať presah k pozitívnemu právu, skôr než k absolútnemu chápaniu. Štát tak môže stratiť svoju suverenitu, ak nedostatočne bráni svojich občanov, alebo im spôsobuje ujmu. Vidiac genocídu v Rwande a v Srebrenici a neadekvátnu odozvu medzinárodnej komunity, vtedajší Generálny tajomník OSN - Kofi Annan - navrhol prijať princíp za ochraňovanie; ktorý má reagovať na úroveň globalizovanosti sveta a úrovne medzinárodnej spolupráce. V roku 2005 krajiny jednohlasne schválili adopciu tohto princípu počas Svetového Summitu OSN. Schválenie aktivácie princípu musí byť jednohlasne schválené v Bezpečnostnej rade OSN a použité iba v prípade genocídy, zločinom proti ľudskosti, vojenským zločinom a etnickému vyhladzovaniu. Vojenská intervencia bola schválená iba jedinýkrát v prípade Líbye; ktorá úspešne odvrátila humanitárnu katastrofu, ktorá by sa mohla udiať počas protestov proti Kaddáfího režimu. Navyše je zodpovednosť chrániť kritizovaný schopnosťou narúšať suverenitu iných štátov, piatimi štátmi pôsobiacimi v Bezpečnostnej rade OSN. Argumentujúc, že tieto štáty môžu narušiť suverenitu vo svoj prospech a taktiež môžu využiť menované princípy na jednostrannú intervenciu - ako v prípade Ruskej invázie na Ukrajinu. Taktiež

je kritizovaný vývoj v Líbyi, v ktorej sa humanitárna ochrana premenila na zmenu politického režimu. Následne je predstavený koncept spoločného záujmu pre ľudstvo, ktorý rozširuje vnímanie medzinárodnej reakcie v prípade širšieho spektra problémov jednotlivých štátov. Dodatočne je argumentované, že takáto reakcia, by sa mohla aplikovať aj v prípade makroekonomickej nestability, alebo krízy; pretože predstavuje možné rozšírenie problému na celý svet, čo má za následok globalizácia finančného sveta.

Ďalej sú popísaná hospodárska história Venezuely a adoptované politiky od nájdenia ropy v dvadsiatych rokoch dvadsiateho storočia. Hlavne zameraný je vývoj hospodárskych politík, počas prezidentského mandátu Huga Cháveza po dnešok. Počas jeho pôsobenia v prezidentskom úrade, boli znárodnené podniky v kľúčových sektoroch ekonomiky, od produkcie a spracovania ropy, až po supermarkety. Boli zavedené bariéry v importe a exporte, taktiež obmedzenia vo voľnej zameniteľnosti domácej meny, spolu s cenovými stropmi a rozľvolnenej monetárnej politiky. Výsledná kulminácia všetkých týchto politík je humanitárna kríza, ktorá ma za zodpovednosť 6.23 milióna obyvateľov, ktorí potrebujú podľa UNHCR ochranu, zvýšenie príjmovej chudoby z 48% - v roku 2014 - na 82 % v roku 2016. Taktiež najlacnejšie dostupné množstvo kalórií znížilo z 52 854 na 7 005 kalórií na deň, čo viedlo k nedobrovoľnému úbytku hmotnosti o 8,6 kg. Okrem toho bol nameraný desaťnásobný nárast úmrtnosti pacientov a stonásobný nárast úmrtnosti novorodencov.

V závere je argumentované, že je nutné, aby bola vyvinutá snaha o rozšírenie schopnosti intervencie zahraničných aktérov v prípade ekonomických politík, pretože dokážu spôsobiť ďaleko vážne následky na civilnom obyvateľstve, ako je demonštrované na prípade Venezuely. Taktiež sú menované teoretické výzvy, ktoré je nutné prekonať – ako je napríklad delimitácia politík a vážnosť nasledovnej reakcie, ako aj problémy vychádzajúce z už existujúceho Princípu za ochraňovanie.

Reference List

- BBC News. (2011, February 22). *Libya protests: Defiant Gaddafi refuses to quit*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-12544624>
- Bellamy, A. J., & Dunne, T. (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of the Responsibility to Protect*. Oxford University Press.
- Bolton, P. (2016). The other explanation for Venezuela's economic crisis. *Council on Hemispheric Affairs*.
- Bull, H., & Watson, A. (1985). *The Expansion of International Society*. Oxford University Press.
- Buzan, B. (2004). *From International to World Society?: English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Casey, N. (2016, May 15). *Dying Infants and No Medicine: Inside Venezuela's Failing Hospitals*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/16/world/americas/dying-infants-and-no-medicine-inside-venezuelas-failing-hospitals.html?_r=0
- Cheatham, A., Roy, D., & Cara Labrador, R. (2021, December 29). *Venezuela: The Rise and Fall of a Petrostate*. Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved January 13, 2022, from <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/venezuela-crisis>
- Cohen-Setton, J. (2016, August 29). *The new Washington Consensus*. Bruegel. <https://www.bruegel.org/blog-post/new-washington-consensus>
- Cottier, T., & Matteotti-Berkutova, S. (2009). International environmental law and the evolving concept of 'common concern of mankind'. In T. Cottier, O. Nartova, & S. Bigdeli (Eds.), *International Trade Regulation and the Mitigation of Climate Change: World Trade Forum* (pp. 21-47). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511757396.004
- Department of Public Information (2014). *The Responsibility to Protect. Who is responsible for protecting people from gross violations of human rights?: Background Note*. <https://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/rwanda/assets/pdf/Background%20R2P%202014.pdf>
- Easterly, W. (2019). *In search of reforms for growth: New stylized facts on policy and growth outcomes* (No. w26318). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Edgardo, L. (2004). Izquierda y populismo: alternativas al neoliberalismo en Venezuela. In *conferencia Nueva izquierda latinoamericana. Pasado y trayectoria futura*, Universidad de Wisconsin, Madison
- Ellner, S. (2015). After Chavez: The Maduro Government and the 'Economic War in Venezuela'. *LAP Exclusives*. <http://latinamericanperspectives.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/01.08>.
- Estevadeordal, A., & Taylor, A. M. (2013). Is the Washington consensus dead? Growth, openness, and the great liberalization, 1970s–2000s. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(5), 1669-1690.

- Fraser Institute. (1970). *Economic Freedom*.
<https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/map?year=1970&geozone=world&page=map&countries=VEN#country-info>
- Fraser Institute. (1990). *Economic Freedom*.
<https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/map?year=1990&geozone=world&page=map&countries=VEN#country-info>
- Fraser Institute. (2002). *Economic Freedom*.
<https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/map?year=2002&geozone=world&page=map&countries=VEN#country-info>
- Fraser Institute. (2012). *Economic Freedom*.
<https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/map?year=2012&geozone=world&page=map&countries=VEN#country-info>
- Fraser Institute. (2022). *Economic Freedom*.
<https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economic-freedom/map?year=2022&geozone=world&page=map&countries=VEN#country-info>
- Gentili, A. (2023). *De jure belli libri tres; 1877*. Generic.
- Glanville, L. (2021). *Sharing Responsibility: The History and Future of Protection from Atrocities*. Princeton University Press.
- Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (2021). *The Responsibility to Protect: A Background Briefing* (Brief). Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies. <https://www.globalr2p.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/R2P-Backgrounder-Updated-January-2021.pdf>
- Grier, K. B., & Grier, R. M. (2020). The Washington Consensus Works: Causal Effects of Reform, 1970-2015. *Journal of Comparative Economics*. doi:10.1016/j.jce.2020.09.001
- Hausmann, R. (2016, May 30). *Overdosing on Heterodoxy Can Kill You*. Project Syndicate. <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/heterodox-economics-venezuela-collapse-by-ricardo-hausmann-2016-05?barrier=accesspaylog>
- Hausmann, R. (2017, September 13). *Venezuela's Unprecedented Collapse*. Project Syndicate. <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/venezuela-unprecedented-economic-collapse-by-ricardo-hausmann-2017-07?barrier=accesspaylog>
- Hayek, D. F. A. (2005). *The Road to Serfdom*. Institute Of Economic Affairs.
- Henderson, D. (2010, January 15). *Hayek and Central Planning*. Econlib.
https://www.econlib.org/archives/2010/01/hayek_and_cent.html
- Holmes, K. (2014, January 7). *The Weakness of the Responsibility to Protect as an International Norm*. The Heritage Foundation.
<https://www.heritage.org/defense/commentary/the-weakness-the-responsibility-protect-international-norm>
- Jackson, R. H. (1992). Pluralism in international political theory. *Review of International Studies*, 18(3), 271-281.

Jackson, R. H. (2003). *The Global Covenant: Human Conduct in a World of States*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Kirzner, I. M. (1978). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. University of Chicago Press.

Knotts, R. (2020, April). *Venezuela: A Dying Country*. George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies.

<https://www.marshallcenter.org/en/publications/security-insights/venezuela-dying-country-0>

Krueger, A. O. (Ed.). (2000). *Economic policy reform: the second stage*. University of Chicago Press.

Kuczynski, P., & Williamson, J. (2003). *After the Washington Consensus: Restarting Growth and Reform in Latin America* (Illustrated). Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Santiso, C. (2004). The contentious Washington Consensus: reforming the reforms in emerging markets. *Review of International Political Economy*, 11(4), 828–844. doi:10.1080/0969229042000279810

Megias, M., & Hausmann, R. (Hosts). (2016–present). *Understanding the Venezuelan Crisis with Ricardo Hausmann* [Audio podcast].

Harvard Kennedy School. <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/wiener-conference-calls/ricardo-hausmann>

Moses, J. (2012). Sovereignty as irresponsibility? A Realist critique of the Responsibility to Protect. *Review of International Studies*, 39(1), 113–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210512000113>

Naím, M. (1994). Latin America: the second stage of reform. *Journal of democracy*, 5(4), 32-48.

Nichols, M. (2019, December 20). *Russia, backed by China, casts 14th U.N. veto on Syria to block cross-border aid*. Reuters.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-syria-security-un-idUSKBN1YO23V>

Niemietz, K. (2018, May 29). *Venezuela's Economic Collapse Is Linked to Its Socialist Policies*. Foundation for Economic Education.

<https://fee.org/articles/venezuelas-economic-collapse-is-linked-to-its-socialist-policies/>

Obiko Pearson, N. (2007, February 8). *Meat, Sugar Scarce in Venezuela Stores*. The Washington Post.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/02/08/AR2007020801240.html>

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2012, March 8). *Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Libya*.

<https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session19/A.HRC.19.68.pdf>

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2010). *Regulatory Policy and the Road to Sustainable Growth* [Draft Report].

<https://www.oecd.org/regreform/policyconference/46270065.pdf>

Plett, B. B. (2011, November 8). *UN Security Council middle powers' Arab Spring dilemma*. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-15628006>

Restuccia, D. (2018, August). *The Monetary and Fiscal History of Venezuela 1960–2016 (Working Paper)*. (Backer Friedman Institute).

<https://mafhola.uchicago.edu/wp-content/uploads/Venezuela-1.pdf>

- Rodríguez, F., & Guerrero, G. (2020). Toward Sustainable Human Development in Venezuela: Diagnosis, Challenges and Economic Strategy. *Revista tempo do mundo*, (23), 285-344.
- Satragno L. (2022). *Monetary Stability as a Common Concern in International Law*, 59–91. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004508736_005
- Schefer K. N., & Cottier T. (2012, June). *Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and the Emerging Principle of Common Concern* (Swiss National Science Foundation Working Paper No. 2012/29). https://www.wti.org/media/filer_public/9b/df/9bdf2080-37b0-460f-98bb-d63e418ad88a/responsibility_to_protect_and_common_concern_final.pdf
- Stallings, B., & Peres, W. (2010). *Growth, employment, and equity: The impact of the economic reforms in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Stepman, J. (2018, August 1). *As Venezuela Collapses, Inflation Careens Toward 1 Million Percent*. Foundation for Economic Education. <https://fee.org/articles/as-venezuela-collapses-inflation-careens-toward-1-million-percent/>
- Stivachtis, Y. (2018, August 6). *Introducing the English School in International Relations Theory*. E-International Relations. <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/02/23/introducing-the-english-school-in-international-relations-theory/>
- The Diplomatic Service of the European Union (n.d.). *Disinformation About Russia's invasion of Ukraine - Debunking Seven Myths spread by Russia* https://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/china/disinformation-about-russias-invasion-ukraine-debunking-seven-myths-spread-russia_en?s=166
- The Economist. (1999, September 16). *Two concepts of sovereignty*. <https://www.economist.com/international/1999/09/16/two-concepts-of-sovereignty>
- UNHCR. (n.d.). *Venezuela situation*. Venezuela Situation. <https://reporting.unhcr.org/venezuelasituation>
- Vattel, E. (1797). *The Law of Nations* (LF ed.). Liberty Fund.
- Wintour, P., & MacAskill, E. (2011, March 20). *Gaddafi may become target of air strikes, Liam Fox admits*. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/mar/20/coalition-criticism-arab-league-libya>