

## National endorsements of Responsibility to Protect: policy papers, strategy documents and focal points

World leaders made a historic commitment to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity in their endorsement of the Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) at the United Nations 2005 World Summit. The Responsibility to Protect stipulates that: the State carries the primary responsibility to protect its populations from mass atrocities; the international community has the responsibility to assist States in fulfilling this responsibility; and the international community should use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means to protect populations from these crimes, including coercive measures, such as collective force through the UN Security Council.

Several states have begun to demonstrate their continued support for RtoP by including references to the norm in strategic policy papers, namely **France, Germany, Norway, the United States, and the United Kingdom**. Meanwhile **Ghana, Denmark, Argentina, Costa Rica, the Netherlands, Uruguay, Benin, Guatemala, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Switzerland, the Czech Republic and the United States** have appointed focal points who will serve as national coordinators on RtoP.

In the following chart, please find relevant excerpts referencing RtoP from the following documents:

- Germany's ***White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr*** (2006)
- France's White Papers entitled ***The White Paper on Defense and National Security*** and ***France and Europe in World Politics*** (2008);
- The United Kingdom's ***National Security Strategy of the United Kingdom*** (2008);
- Norway's White Papers entitled ***Norway's Humanitarian Policy*** and ***Climate, Conflict and Capital: Norwegian Development Policy Adapting to Change***, (2009);
- The United States' ***National Security Strategy***, (2010); adoption of ***Senate Resolution 71***, (2010); ***Presidential Study Directive*** on establishment of interagency Atrocities Prevention Board, (2011); ***Presidential Proclamation on The Suspension of Entry as Immigrants and Non-Immigrants of Persons who Participate in Serious Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Violations and Other Abuses***, (2011); United States ***National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security*** (2011);
- The **creation of national focal points** and the commitment to future dialogue on RtoP at the national level at the informal Conference of Foreign Ministers and Government Officials, co-chaired by the Foreign Ministers of Ghana and Denmark, (2010)

Country	Date/Department/Action	Title of Document / Forum	Description	Focal Point
Germany	10/2006  White Paper  Federal Ministry of Defence	<a href="#">White Paper on German Security Policy and the Future of the Bundeswehr</a>	(...) the debate about the <b>Responsibility to Protect</b> is increasingly impacting on the ways of thinking in western countries. In the long term, this will affect the mandating of international peace missions by the United Nations Security Council as legitimation under international law is crucial especially when military force is used. (...)	
France	06/2008  White Paper Commission est. by President's Office  White Paper	<a href="#">The White Paper on Defense and National Security</a>	(...) Consequently, the White Paper: - Gives priority to the reinforcement of multilateralism which, conversely to unilateralist temptations, remains the founding principle of international cooperation and security. - Reaffirms the central role of the United Nations and its institutions: the authorisation of the use of force by the Security Council is and must be the rule - Confirms France's support to Humanitarian law, The International Criminal Court, and the promotion of Human Rights. - Recalls that the international community as a whole has the " <b>responsibility to protect</b> " (...)  (...) The consideration, prior to the use of armed force, of other possible measures, without prejudice to emergency situations involving legitimate defence or the <b>responsibility to protect (R2P)</b> (...)	
France	06/2008  Ministry of Foreign & European Affairs  White Paper	<a href="#">France and Europe in World Politics</a>	(...) <b>The responsibility to protect.</b> Its endorsement at the UN 2005 World Summit should be regarded as a historical development, considering the deep ideological and political divisions surrounding the concept and its implementation. (...)  (...) <i>Claims of sovereignty.</i> Sovereignty remains as important, especially as an integral part of democracy and national independence. Violation of sovereignty is often used as a reason to oppose human rights universality and humanitarian intervention (...)  (...) Mass atrocities, in or outside of conflict, are now considered breaches to international peace and security. Nonetheless, there is no spontaneous harmony between peace and human rights: peace and stability are concepts based on mutual recognition of the interests of sovereign nation-states. Conversely, justice and human	

			<p>rights go beyond borders. The protection of human rights can come in conflict with other legitimate international agendas such as the need for cooperation between states, with the recognition of equal sovereignty of states and in extreme cases, with peace itself. Moreover, the protection of human rights is not necessarily compatible with the legitimate concern we all share, that is promoting our own interests, for instance of economic nature (...)</p> <p>(...) Implementing our agenda involves taking action at the national level, but also more systematically in the development of legal and political norms (an area in which this country has traditionally been invested) as well as in mobilizing the multilateral system on issues of human rights (Security Council, development bodies and agencies). Our agenda will also need to cover a wide spectrum of action: <b>the responsibility to protect</b>, far from being summarized as military intervention, comprises a triple dimension: the responsibility to prevent, the responsibility to react (with military force as last resort), and the responsibility to rebuild.(...)</p>	
United Kingdom	03/2008 Cabinet Office National Security Strategy	<a href="#">National Security Strategy of the United Kingdom</a>	<p>(...) In some circumstances the international community has a responsibility to help countries protect their populations. In most cases, that involves support for the countries' own security forces and agencies; but in some cases, where a government is unwilling or unable to protect its citizens from <b>genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing or crimes against humanity</b>, or is perpetrating these acts itself, the international '<b>Responsibility to Protect</b>' ultimately requires the international community to act. (...)</p>	Committed to Creating RtoP Focal Point
Norway	09/2008 Ministry of Foreign Affairs White Paper	<a href="#">Norway's Humanitarian Policy</a>	<p>(...) The agreement (2005 World Summit) in principle on the "<b>responsibility to protect</b>" raises new challenges when the international community is faced with concrete situations in which the principle proves difficult to apply in practice. It is paramount that the agreement achieved in 2005 is <b>consolidated and not undermined</b>. International law must be developed in order to establish an obligation for UN Member States to follow up these intentions in practice. (...)</p>	
Norway	02/2009 Ministry of Foreign Affairs White Paper	<a href="#">Climate, Conflict and Capital: Norwegian Development Policy Adapting to Change</a>	<p>(...) In 2005, the UN General Assembly adopted the concept of <b>responsibility to protect</b>. The international community – in the form of the UN – can assume this responsibility, and intervene when the civilian population's basic need for security is not being met by the national authorities. (...)</p> <p>(...) For a number of years, Norway has actively supported global</p>	

			efforts to prevent the perpetrators of <b>genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes</b> remaining at large. (...)	
United States	09/2009  US Department of State  Appointment of Ambassador at Large on War Crimes Issues		(...) The <a href="#">Office of War Crimes Issues</a> (S/WCI), led by <b>Ambassador-at-Large Stephen Rapp</b> , advises the Secretary of State directly and formulates U.S. policy responses to atrocities committed in areas of conflict and elsewhere throughout the world. (...)	
United States	2010  White House National Security Council  Creation of Security Council Director for War Crimes and Atrocities position		(...) The <a href="#">National Security Council</a> (NSC) is the President's principal forum for considering national security and foreign policy matters with his senior national security advisors and cabinet officials. (...)  (...) The White House has created a new dedicated position...to coordinate and support the administration's policies on <a href="#">genocide and mass atrocities</a> (...)  Appointed official: <b>Mr. David Pressman</b>	
United States	05/2010  White House  National Security Strategy	<a href="#">US National Security Strategy</a>	(...) The United States and all member states of the U.N. have endorsed the concept of the “ <b>Responsibility to Protect.</b> ” In so doing, we have recognized that the primary responsibility for preventing <b>genocide and mass atrocity</b> rests with sovereign governments, but that this responsibility passes to the broader international community when sovereign governments themselves commit <b>genocide or mass atrocities</b> , or when they prove unable or unwilling to take necessary action to prevent or respond to such crimes inside their borders. The United States is committed to working with our allies, and to strengthening our own internal capabilities, in order to ensure that the United States and the international community are proactively engaged in a strategic effort to prevent <b>mass atrocities and genocide</b> . In the event that prevention fails, the United States will work both <b>multilaterally and bilaterally</b> to mobilize diplomatic, humanitarian, financial, and—in certain instances—military means to <b>prevent and respond to genocide and mass atrocities</b> . (...)	RtoP Focal Point(s) Appointed

United States	22 December 2010  U.S. Senate	<a href="#">S. Con. Res 71</a>	<p>(...) Whereas, in 2005, the United States and all other members of the United Nations agreed that the international community has ‘a <b>responsibility</b> to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapter VI and VIII of the United Nations Charter, to help <b>protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity</b>’; (...)</p> <p>(...) urges the President: to direct relevant departments and agencies of the United States Government to review and evaluate existing capacities for <b>anticipating, preventing, and responding to genocide and other mass atrocities</b>, and to determine specific steps to coordinate and enhance those capacities; and to develop and communicate a whole of government approach and policy to anticipate, prevent, and mitigate acts of genocide and other mass atrocities; (...)</p>	
United States	4 August 2011  Presidential Study Directive	<a href="#">PSD</a>	<p>(...) I hereby direct the establishment of an interagency Atrocities Prevention Board within 120 days from the date of this Presidential Study Directive. The primary purpose of the Atrocities Prevention Board shall be to coordinate a whole-of-government approach to <b>preventing mass atrocities and genocide</b>. By institutionalizing the coordination of atrocity prevention, we can ensure: (1) that our national security apparatus <b>recognizes and is responsive to early indicators of potential atrocities</b>; (2) that departments and agencies develop and <b>implement comprehensive atrocity prevention and response strategies</b> in a manner that allows "red flags" and dissent to be raised to decision makers; (3) that we increase the capacity and develop doctrine for our foreign service, armed services, development professionals, and other actors to engage in the full spectrum of smart prevention activities; and (4) that we are optimally positioned to work with our allies in order to ensure that the burdens of atrocity prevention and response are appropriately shared. (...)</p>	

United States	August 4, 2011  Presidential Proclamation	<a href="#"><u>Suspension of Entry as Immigrants and Nonimmigrants of Persons Who Participate in Serious Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Violations and Other Abuses</u></a>	<p>(...) <b>The entry into the United States</b>, as immigrants or nonimmigrants, of the following persons <b>is hereby suspended</b>:</p> <p>(a) Any alien who <b>planned, ordered, assisted, aided and abetted, committed or otherwise participated in, including through command responsibility, widespread or systematic violence against any civilian</b> population based in whole or in part on race; color; descent; sex; disability; membership in an indigenous group; language; religion; political opinion; national origin; ethnicity; membership in a particular social group; birth; or sexual orientation or gender identity, or who attempted or conspired to do so.</p> <p>(b) Any alien who <b>planned, ordered, assisted, aided and abetted, committed or otherwise participated in, including through command responsibility, war crimes, crimes against humanity or other serious violations of human rights</b>, or who attempted or conspired to do so. (...)</p>	
United States	December 2011  National Action Plan	<a href="#"><u>United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security</u></a>	<p>(...) Section 1. Policy. (...)</p> <p>(...) (b) <b>The United States recognizes the responsibility of all nations to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, including when implemented by means of sexual violence.</b> The United States further recognizes that sexual violence, when used or commissioned as a tactic of war or as a part of a widespread or systematic attack against civilians, can exacerbate and prolong armed conflict and impede the restoration of peace and security. (...)</p>	

Denmark	2010 Ministry of Foreign Affairs Creation of Focal Point for RtoP		<p>(...) I have today, together with Ghana's Foreign Minister, gathered a number of ministerial colleagues to strengthen the work on <b>preventing and ending genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and war crimes.</b> (...)</p> <p>(...) Today I have appointed human rights ambassador Arnold Skibsted as the <b>national Danish focal point for R2P.</b> Several of my colleagues here today have also appointed <b>national focal points</b> aiming to strengthen coordination. I hope that many other countries will follow us and do the same. This would constitute a first step in the direction of making the R2P concept more operational – and thereby lessen the risk of gross violations occurring unheeded. (...)</p>	Human Rights Ambassador Arnold Skibsted
Ghana Argentina Costa Rica Netherlands Uruguay	2010 Creation of Focal Point for RtoP			Appointed
Benin Czech Republic Guatemala Sierra Leone Sweden Switzerland	2011 Creation of Focal Point for RtoP			Appointed