Abstract: The concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has been constantly criticised for the gap between words and deeds, namely due to the inadequate international response to the crisis in Syria. Does the failure mean the end of R2P and more importantly, an emergence of a post-liberal global order? The paper argues that the particular crisis did not bring any fundamental change and it rather reflects a pragmatic revisionism characterising the whole time period since the R2P concept was introduced (in 2001). Therefore, the inconsistent implementation in different cases – most strikingly in Libya and Syria - is corresponding with the compromised nature of the R2P. More generally, it reflects the pragmatic global order, which accommodates moral principles according to practical politics. The paper critically comments on the emergence of the R2P concept to demonstrate the false premise of its purely liberal universalist nature. Secondly, it provides a theoretical appraisal of pragmatic revisionism in global ethics while demonstrating its relevance within the emergence and implementation of the R2P concept. Finally it aims to assess the restrained international reaction to the Syrian crisis through the pragmatic ethics.
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