



GENERAL ASSEMBLIES | 2014



2005 WORLD SUMMIT:  
THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT (R2P)



Honourable delegates,

I would like to welcome you to the 2005 World Summit on the Responsibility to Protect, also known as R2P.

My name is Elizabeth Tudor-Beziés and I am looking forward to working with all of you during this conference, as the director of this committee. I am a second year student studying Political Science and European Studies, with a minor in Spanish. This will be my first time working with UTMUN but I have participated in various MUN conferences in the past. R2P has been an interest of mine ever since I learned about it in high school. I became even more interested after meeting Romeo Dallaire, learning more about R2P and peacekeeping efforts in my first year courses, resulting in my deep passion and excitement for this committee, along with being an analyst for the Canadian Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. I hope you will all love this topic as much as I do and that you learn a bit more about this game-changing document.

As a delegate in this committee, it is your responsibility to stay in accordance with the foreign policy of your country at that specific period of time in which this committee took place. However, it is encouraged that you cooperate with other member states whenever possible, while still maintaining academic integrity and authenticity.

As director of this committee, it is one of my jobs to maintain the academic integrity of the committee. Therefore, I have written this background guide as a starting point for your research. It is strongly encouraged that you aim to add more to all I have described in this background guide and discover more research on your country's specific foreign policy in 2005 so that by the first day of the conference, you are extremely knowledgeable on the three discussed topics. I encourage you all to research as much as you can and find out more about the country you are representing, no matter how insignificant of an impact they make on world issues.

This guide contains a brief background of all three topics that will be discussed in the committee in February. Within each topic, the main issues have been summarized for you and include past debates and literature on the subject. In addition to this, under each topic is a brief description of the position of some relevant member states on each issue, as well as links to more information and suggestions for further research.

I cannot wait to see you all in February, and if you have anymore questions, let me know!

Elizabeth Tudor-Beziés  
Director of 2005 World Summit R2P  
[elizabeth.tudor.bezies@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:elizabeth.tudor.bezies@mail.utoronto.ca)



## Topic 1: Developing Pillar I of R2P, the Protection Responsibilities of the State

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CASE STUDY

The basic principle of developing Pillar I of R2P is to develop the protection of civilians within their own borders without impeding state sovereignty. There have been multiple incidences of states failing to protect their own civilians from different forms of discrimination and harm, including the failure to prevent genocide, ethnic cleansing and ethnic discrimination of any kind. This could be caused by social unrest, civil wars, religious divides or government corruption favouring a specific group of peoples. However, there is the constant issue of states exercising their legal right to sovereignty, which includes the right for the state to act the way it wants without being forced to stop by external powers or other states. In sum, other states do not have the right to interfere in other states' business. Therefore, there needs to be a way to intervene in a state involved with crimes against humanity while still respecting state sovereignty.

The very first example of inaction in a case of genocide was during the Holocaust. Ever since this tragic incident, the international community has felt guilty, thus shaping more demands for human rights and the protection for civilians. Some major modern examples of controversies involving external military intervention for protection purposes include the Somalia, Bosnia and Kosovo. These three military operations all have the common theme that they were a controversial decision made by either the Security Council or in Kosovo's case, NATO acting unilaterally without the consent of the Security Council. With the Rwanda case, it was controversial because there was a lack of inaction and no military intervention until very late in the conflict, resulting in many deaths that could have been prevented. This inaction was due to the international community's deadlock on how to approach the case without violating international laws for intervening in a sovereign state's affairs. In each case, nations had to struggle with the issue of sovereignty and the moral issue of allowing the state to continue harming its citizens.

After these horrifying events, Secretary Kofi Annan made pleas to the international community to try to find a solution on how to approach humanitarian issues that are tied with sovereignty, at the United Nations General Assembly in 1999 and 2000. His plea was followed by a document created in 2001 by the International Commission on the Intervention and State Sovereignty, led by Canada and involved other dignified persons including Gareth Evans from Australia and Mohamed Sahnoun of Algeria, entitled "The Responsibility to Protect." This document included the core principles of the responsibility to protect civilians even when sovereignty is a threat to intervening. This included the basic principle that while states are first and foremost responsible for protecting its own citizens, if "[A] population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect." The international community must step in to help civilians, regardless of sovereignty.



The international community must realize that many horrifying wars are becoming intrastate affairs, not interstate affairs, thus changing the nature of war, especially the targets.

Implications for the International Community:

Humanitarian intervention overriding sovereignty is starting to have major effects on the international community and its dealings with conflict. One example is Kosovo. In 1998, the Republic of Yugoslavia waged attacks on the autonomous province of Kosovo, a Serbian province and still a member of the Yugoslav Republic. There was overwhelming evidence of crimes against humanity occurring in that region and ethnic cleansing. This resulted in a massive refugee crisis in the area, with over 800 000 people seeking refugee status. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization decided to act as soon as possible to end this travesty. By 1999, after failed peace talks, NATO waged air strikes against Yugoslavia to force them to withdraw forces and troops from Kosovo along with ending all attacks on the Muslim community. This was the first time an institution composed of certain member states like the US, France, Canada, UK, Montenegro and Albania acted with force unilaterally, without any permission from the Security Council. Also, as Kosovo was still a part of Serbia and the Yugoslav Republic, it implied that sovereignty could be overridden by a major humanitarian crisis.

## KEY QUESTIONS

The concept of sovereignty is shifting to a blurry definition. With the Responsibility to Protect document in front of us, it asks of the international community to take part in state affairs in order to protect civilians.

This leads to some key questions. To what extent can the international community engage in state affairs? Is there and should there be a limit if it involves the lives of innocent civilians? How can we know when a state is incapable of taking care of its own citizens? How can the international community make humanitarian intervention and the deployment of troops in a state legal, especially when a state is arguing that the international community is breaching their sovereignty rights, a fundamental, legal right of a state? What specific actions of the state justify military action? When is the right time to act? When is force necessary?

What is sovereignty in an era of human rights? How are state rights shifting in this era? How can we find a proper balance between the priority of human rights and the legal rights of the state? Hopefully, all member states at the World Summit can find a solution to the evolving role of sovereignty along with its role in humanitarian intervention.



#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING:

- <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>
- <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/component/content/article/383>
- <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/component/content/article/136-latest-news/4145-kofi-annan-speech-preventin-promotion-and-protection-our-shared-responsibility>



## Topic 2: Developing Pillar II of R2P, International Assistance

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CASE STUDY

When a state is incapable of fulfilling its duties in protecting civilians, it is up to the international community to take on this responsibility. This is pillar II of the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine, first established in 2001 by ICISS, as discussed in the previous topic. Secretary-General Ban-Ki Moon describes the responsibility as follows: “This responsibility of the international community requires the cooperation of Member States, regional and subregional arrangements, civil society and the private sector, as well as on the institutional strengths and comparative advantages of the United Nations system.” ICISS also iterates that it is also the responsibility of the member states to follow three specific responsibilities while intervening. These three responsibilities are the responsibility to prevent, react and rebuild.

The responsibility to prevent addresses the fact that many deaths and conflicts could be avoided if the international community attempts to prevent it from happening in the first place. This includes “addressing both the root causes and direct causes of internal conflict and other man-made crises putting populations at risk.” The international community, according to ICISS, should take on this responsibility when the state and their internal institutions fail to reach a solution to prevent conflict. While the state is attempting to resolve conflict, the international may support the state through various methods, including supporting development in the state.

If the responsibility to prevent fails or it is past the prevention stage, the responsibility to react is the next step. This means “responding to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures, which may include coercive measures like sanctions and international prosecution, and only in extreme cases, military intervention” as stated by ICISS. Military action is required only in dire circumstances, when all other diplomatic measures have failed. With the responsibility to react, there needs to be the just cause criteria, meaning that in order to intervene militarily the international community must follow the just cause criteria created earlier. The criteria includes either the situation having either a large scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, and/or large scale “ethnic cleansing”, actual or apprehended. The international community must also have the right intention to intervene, meaning no ulterior motives. The military intervention must be a last resort when all other diplomatic and non-military options have failed. The intervention must be done through proportional means and it must have reasonable prospects.

The responsibility to rebuild deals with the post-intervention obligations of the international community. This includes the very important task of peace-building. The international community must commit to help build a durable peace and promote good governance along with sustainable development. The international efforts must work in partnership with local authorities with the “goal of progressively transferring to them authority and the responsibility to rebuild,” as outlined by ICISS. In order for the problem to not occur again, there needs to be a





strong commitment by everyone to build a solid foundation for development and to reconcile all parties involved.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

Pillar II of the Responsibility to Protect requires a lot of action and participation from the international community. It requires everyone to cooperate in the various ways to prevent conflict, with all nations being prepared to contribute financially and in other ways. The biggest suggestion through the responsibility to prevent includes the support in the development of the state, meaning international institutions, financial contributions and other forms of support needed in order for that development to be a success. The responsibility to react requires the cooperation of the international community, particularly those ready to intervene militarily. These nations require the right intention, last resort, proportional means and reasonable prospect in order for the military intervention to be legitimate. This implies that the international community is not intervening due to national interest, but instead humanitarian interest. Neutrality is key, but also the most difficult part of intervention to ensure. An example of the lack of neutrality in intervention is Rwanda. Rwanda is small, landlocked nation with barely any resources deemed important by the big decision makers. Therefore, the conflict in Rwanda was ignored mainly due to the lack of national interest for intervening. The responsibility to rebuild also requires a lot of participation and energy from the international community. It ensures that after intervening, states do not leave the nation in which they intervened in shambles. The international community must ensure that the conflict will not happen again by strengthening local forces and institutions. One example of this is Kosovo. After intervening in Kosovo, the UN ordered for the international community to rebuild the institutions in the new nation, and to this day, rebuilding and internationally-supported institutions are aiding Kosovo in developing their own strong government.

## KEY QUESTIONS

Pillar II leads us to some important questions. As Pillar II is specifically stating the responsibilities of the states intervening, it leads to questions regarding intervention. What are the best ways for the international community to prevent potential conflicts? What kind of resources do we the international community need in order to fulfill our responsibility to prevent? Are other diplomatic measures always better than military intervention? What do we do when there are states intervening with clear national interest at the top of their agendas? At what point does the international community stop using diplomatic measures and goes on to using military measures? What do we do when the just cause criteria is only semi-applicable to a dire situation? How long must the international community stay in the nation for the rebuilding phase, and how involved should we be? Is ICISS correct that we should be this involved in the state?



## SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

- <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>
- <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/component/content/article/383>





## Topic 3: Developing Pillar III of R2P, Timely, Decisive and Appropriate Response

The third pillar of R2P deals with a timely, decisive and appropriate response for conflict. When applying pillar II of R2P, which includes the international community assisting the state in fulfilling its responsibilities to protect its citizens, the international community must already be prepared to enact pillar III should the state fail in preventing conflict. The responsibility lies in the international community and the United Nations Security Council to find a solution to the conflict without using military intervention. This can include many different economic or diplomatic sanctions, but all with the main implication that military intervention will not happen unless all of these measures have failed and there is no other solution.

The first thing the international community must do when acting is to act in a timely matter, according to Secretary-General Ban-Ki Moon. This means that when intervening in a conflict, it must be done quickly and with a flexible strategy. The longer it takes to intervene, the more dire the situation will be in the state, with more lives at risk and more people displaced internally and externally. Timing is key, and therefore, the international community must not be deadlocked in one rigid procedure that may not work on the crisis they will be dealing with. Not every emergency crisis has the same criteria and all should be dealt with carefully and as an individual case. If the international community acts quickly with sanctions and other diplomatic measures, the conflict will be able to be resolved more quickly as well. One example of the international community lacking in a timely response is Rwanda. Romeo Dallaire, the Force Commander of UNAMIR, warned the UN that there will be a major conflict soon in the state, with the state doing nothing to stop it. The international community did not heed his warnings and remained unsure on what to do in Rwanda, even when violence was evidently used. Due to the international community taking its time in reaching a decision on how to act, the citizens of Rwanda suffered and many lives were lost. An example of how the international community's quick decision saved many lives is during Kosovo. When the international community saw the swarm of refugees leaving Kosovo, they acted quickly, even without permission from the Security Council, saving many lives.

The international community must also act in a decisive, appropriate manner. In an emergency situation that is rapidly unfolding, states must remain focused and look solely at the goal of saving lives. There is no time for a major debate on whether intervening is the best thing to do in many cases, therefore the international community must act decisively and without any wavering by member states. The mission in intervening is to help another state in a humanitarian manner, therefore the decisions must also be applicable to the humanitarian sphere of the decision-making realm. The decisive manners do not always mean being forceful and using extremely intrusive ways to intervene in a state. Instead, the international community can use peaceful persuasion and dialogue. The international community should also use appropriate measures for intervening in the conflict. This means not using measures harsher than the situation. The



international community must also remember to act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, being careful not to break any sections of the Charter.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

The responsibility of the international community for Pillar III is quite broad but places a lot of responsibility and importance on international organization and their member states, specifically those of the UN. The timely response lays the onus on the member states intervening. It condemns them from waiting for the situation to sort itself out. In many cases, the conflict does not sort itself out. Instead, it simply gets worse until the victims are all eliminated. However, there is still the problem of the international community not being able to do much without the blessing of the Security Council. NATO may have intervened without permission, but they were very much reprimanded by other states and the UN for doing so.

The responsibility to act in a decisive and appropriate manner also requires the full cooperation and support of member states. It requires the unanimous decision on one focused method and using the measures best for that specific conflict. This means no vetoing and no divisions.

## KEY QUESTIONS

Pillar III leads us to some major questions. What should be the correct time period in order to act? After what time is it too long to leave a conflict? How can the international community make a decisive, appropriate response to a conflict with a small time frame? What happens when there is a stalemate in the intervention debate? Can states serious about intervening have permission to intervene even without the clear permission from the UN Security Council when there is this stalemate? Should the international community intervene immediately after preventative measures for the conflict have failed?

When the international community is focused on forming a proper decision, should they look at other factors in the state besides the citizens? While human lives are extremely important, is there another factor causing the conflict, such as economic problems, that need to be addressed by the state? What happens when a member state or a group of member states are disrupting the attempt to form a decisive response? What should the UN do when states, agreeing on the main theme of intervening in a conflict, are divided by the methods on how to intervene? What is considered an appropriate reaction for all member states involved, especially allies of the state with the conflict? How can the international community measure how appropriate an action will be prior to implementing it? What can the international community or institutions do if an action is too harsh and/or not appropriate to the conflict at hand?



#### SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

- <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/component/content/article/383>
- <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>
- <http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser/responsibility.shtml>