

GREAT DECISIONS

GDTV 2010: Justified Force? Preventing Genocide in the 21st Century

Show Transcript

>> WHEN POST ELECTION RIOTING BROKE OUT IN KENYA IN 2007, THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOLLOWED A FAMILIAR SCRIPT. INCITEMENT OF VIOLENCE BASED ON TRIBAL RIVALRIES, ORCHESTRATED TERROR, POLITICAL DEADLOCK.

>> MEMBER STATES SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE TO PREVENT AND PROTECT THEIR OWN PEOPLE FROM SUCH A CRIMES AS GENOCIDE, WAR CRIMES, AND CRIMES AGAINST THE HUMANITY AND ETHNIC CLEANINGS.

>> BUT THIS TIME, THE GLOBAL COMMUNITY WAS READY TO ACT AND DIPLOMATS SUCCESSFULLY INTERVENED. BLOOD SHED ON A MASSIVE SCALE WAS AVERTED.

>> PEOPLE ACTED AS SOON AS THE CRISIS MANIFESTED ITSELF. THEY ACTED WITH THE RESOLVE TO STOP IT.

>> WHAT LESSONS CAN BE LEARNED FROM THE KENYA EXERCISE IN EARLY INTERVENTION? AND WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR AN EMERGING DOCTRINE AT THE UNITED NATIONS ON RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT... NEXT ON GREAT DECISIONS.

>> IN A DEMOCRACY AGREEMENT IS NOT ESSENTIAL, BUT PARTICIPATION IS. JOIN US AS WE DISCUSS TODAY'S MOST CRITICAL GLOBAL ISSUES. JOIN US FOR GREAT DECISIONS.

>> GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED BY THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION-INSPIRING AMERICANS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE WORLD. FUNDING FOR GREAT DECISIONS IS PROVIDED BY THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, THE STARR FOUNDATION, SHELL INTERNATIONAL, AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION. GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE.

>> AND NOW FROM OUR STUDIOS, HERE IS RALPH BEGLEITER.

>> WELCOME TO GREAT DECISIONS, I'M RALPH BEGLEITER. JOINING US TO DISCUSS ARMED INTERVENTION IN THE EFFORT TO PREVENT GENOCIDE AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, ARE JOE VOLK, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION IN WASHINGTON, AND MONICA SERRANO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE GLOBAL CENTER FOR RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, IN NEW YORK. WELCOME TO THE BOTH OF YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

>> JOE, LET ME ASK YOU THIS FIRST. AH, YOU KNOW, AH, IT, AH, PREEMPTIVE INTERVENTION GOT SORT OF A BAD NAME BACK IN 2003 GLOBALLY WHEN THE UNITED STATES DECLARED THAT IT WAS INTERVENING IN IRAQ PREVENTATIVELY, TO PREVENT PROBLEMS FROM OCCURRING THAT WERE, AH, THAT THE U.S. SAW UNDERWAY. WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THAT AND INTERVENING PREVENTATIVELY TO PROTECT INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS IN A COUNTRY?

>> I THINK THAT THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS BEEN VERY CLEAR THAT, SO-CALLED PREVENTIVE WAR WITH THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION SAID IT WAS DOING, IS A UNILATERAL ACTION AND CANNOT CONSTITUTE AN INTERVENTION UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF A RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT REGIME. AH, IF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS CONSENSUS, AH, THAT THERE IS MASS ATROCITY, GENOCIDE, AH, AND THAT, AH, THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY BELIEVES, AH, INTERVENTION BY FORCE IS NECESSARY. ONLY THEN, WOULD IT BE APPROPRIATE, AH, FOR NATIONS TO COOPERATE IN THAT KIND OF ACTIVITY.

>> AND MONICA WOULD THAT KIND OF INTERVENTION ALWAYS HAVE TO BE MULTINATIONAL?

>> ALTHOUGH THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT IS AGREED BY GOVERNMENTS AND HEADS OF THE STATE UNANIMOUSLY IN 2005 IT WOULD HAVE TO BE, UH, CONDUCTED IN A MULTILATERAL BASIS AND AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY COUNSEL. AND IF I MAY ADD ALSO THAT, UM, ONLY THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, WHEN WE GET TO THE MOMENT OF INTERVENTION, NOT ONLY IT HAS TO BE CONDUCTED UNDER MULTILATERAL, AH, CHANNELS, BUT IT ALSO HAS ONLY TO BE IN RELATION TO THE FULL CRIMES THAT HAVE BEEN AGREED BY THE HEADS OF STATES WHICH ARE: GENOCIDE, ETHNIC CLEANSING AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, AND WAR CRIMES. SO, THE ISSUE OF THE PRESENCE OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DOES NOT, AH, FALL WITHIN THE REALM OF THIS DOCTRINE.

>> OKAY, SO BOTH OF YOU SAID, IT HAS TO BE INTERNATIONALLY AGREED. AND JOE, YOU REFERRED TO CONSENSUS. HOW WOULD THAT BE, AH, MEASURED?

>> IT WOULD HAVE TO BE AGREEMENT, AH, AND I THINK MONICA REMARKED ON THIS AT THE U.N. SECURITY COUNSEL.

>> SO THE SECURITY COUNSEL WOULD HAVE TO VOTE ON IT?

>> THE SECURITY COUNSEL HAS BEEN ENTRUSTED WITH THE AUTHORITY AND THE RESPONSIBILITY TO DECIDE WHEN THESE CRIMES ARE TAKING PLACE, AND WHERE THE MAGNITUDE OF THESE CRIMES MERITS WHAT, AH, THE SECRETARY

GENERAL REFERRED TO AS, 209 IN HIS REPORT AS TIMELY AND DECISIVE ACTION, WHICH WOULD BE THE RESPONSE THAT WOULD BE CONDUCTED MULTILATERALLY.

>> ALL RIGHT. I THINK ONE OF THE PROBLEMS ABOUT THE WAY WE GET INTO THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, IS THAT VERY OFTEN THE CONVERSATION IS ENTERED ON THE QUESTION THAT YOU RAISE. WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE TO TAKE ACTION OF MILITARY FORCE? AH, BUT THE U.N, I THINK, HAS BEEN VERY CLEAR THAT RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, IS NOT ONLY ABOUT MILITARY INTERVENTION OR CHAPTER 7 KIND OF ACTION, BUT IS ACTUALLY MUCH MORE ABOUT PREVENTION. AH, THE BEST FORM OF PROTECTION FOR CIVILIANS WHO ARE AT RISK, IS PREVENTION LONG BEFORE YOU GET TO THE POINT WHERE A CONFLICT COULD TURN TO LETHAL OR DEADLY VIOLENCE.

>> LET'S COME BACK TO THAT IN A MINUTE, BUT WE SPOKE WITH SOME OTHER EXPERTS ON THIS TOPIC AT THE UNITED NATIONS AND ELSEWHERE. LET'S SEE WHAT THEY HAVE TO SAY ABOUT IT.

>> IF YOU LOOK BACK AT THE RWANDA GENOCIDE IN 1994, I MEAN TRAGEDY IN MANY, MANY WAYS. ONE OF THE TRAGEDIES WAS THAT INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS DID NOT RESPOND EFFECTIVELY.

>> THE LESSON THEN, IS THAT WE HAVE TO BE BETTER ORGANIZED, BETTER EQUIPPED, BETTER INFORMED, AND BE PROACTIVE IN PREVENTING POSSIBLE GENOCIDES WELL BEFORE THE SITUATION ESCALATES TO THE POINT OF DENIAL.

>> OFTEN TIMES IT'S ON A, UM, FORGOTTEN THAT, IN FACT, THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS INTERVENED. WE HAVE PEACE KEEPING TROOPS ALREADY ON SITE FOR EXAMPLE THAT WAS THE CASE IN RWANDA AND IN SREBRENICA AND BOSNIA, BUT THE, UH, INTERVENING TROOPS WERE TOO FEW. SO EVEN THOUGH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE HAD INTERVENED, MANY PEOPLE REMEMBER THAT AS A NON-INTERVENTION BECAUSE IT WAS SO INEFFECTIVE.

>> BOTH OF YOU TALKED ABOUT PREVENTION BEING IMPORTANT. AH, LET'S TALK ABOUT THAT FOR JUST A BIT MORE. HOW WOULD AN INTERNATIONAL INTERVENTION OCCUR TO PREVENT A GENOCIDE, AH, BEFORE YOU WERE ABLE TO DECLARE THAT THERE IS A GENOCIDE, FOR EXAMPLE?

>> I WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT, AH, THAT THIS IDEA THAT, AH, THAT THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY RELIES ON THE STATE FIRST AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS A RESPONSIBILITY TO FOLLOW THESE THINGS AND INSURE THESE STATES ARE UPHOLDING THEIR RESPONSIBILITY, REALLY FITS WITH STUDIES OF CONFLICT CURVES. SO, WHEN YOU SEE A CONFLICT CURVE, AH, YOU SEE CONFLICTS DEVELOPING, AH, LIKE AN UPSIDE DOWN BELL JAR AND, UM, AH, AT THE TOP, YOU HAVE, LETHAL VIOLENCE. AH, WHAT THESE STUDIES INDICATE IS, THE MOST EFFECTIVE TIME TO INTERVENE, TO PREVENT LETHAL VIOLENCE, IS AT THE START OF THE CURVE UPWARD. THE LEAST EFFECTIVE TIME TO INTERVENE, EVEN WITH FORCE, IS AT THE TOP OF THAT

BELL CURVE. AND THEREFORE, THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY REALLY HAS A RESPONSIBILITY TO PREVENT THAT CURVE GETTING UP THERE. THAT MEANS LOOKING AT THINGS AHEAD OF TIME.

>> LET, LET ME TRY TO MAKE THIS A BIT MORE CONCRETE FOR A MOMENT. LET'S PICK A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE. ALL OF US ARE OLD ENOUGH TO HAVE LIVED THROUGH THE BREAKUP OF FORMER YUGOSLAVIA IN THE 1990'S, THE EARLY 1990'S. YOU SPOKE ABOUT IT'S, IT'S UP TO THE STATE PRIMARILY, INITIALLY, WOULD THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA HAVE QUALIFIED AS- SINCE IT WAS IN MANY WAYS RESPECTED, REGARDED BY MANY PARTIES, MANY NATIONS AROUND THE WORLD AS BEING A PERPETRATOR OF THE PROBLEM, WOULD IT HAVE BEEN HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR UPHOLDING THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT? COULD THAT HAVE BEEN DONE IN BOSNIA- IN SREBRENICA?

>> WELL THE, THE IDEA OF RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT IS PRECISELY TO ENTRUST OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO, TO IN THE, IN THE FIRST CHANCES TO STATE TACTICS, BUT IT ALSO...

>> SLOBADON MILOSEVIC WOULD HAVE BEEN HELD UP AS THE PERSON TO ENFORCE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT.

>> AH, AS THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE STATE UNDER, THE, THE PARADIGM SHIFT THAT WE HAVE NOW OF UNIVERSAL JURISDICTION, INDIVIDUALLY HE WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE. AS THE LEADER OF THAT ESTATE, TO GUARANTEE THAT ABUSES AGAINST THE CITIZENS AND THE POPULATION THAT WAS PART OF THE EX-YUGOSLAVIA, WAS NOT ABUSED IN THE WAY IT WAS. SO WE WOULD BE LOOKING AT THE WAYS IN WHICH ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS, MILOSEVIC CONDUCTED HIS DECISIONS IN A RECKLESS MANNER, AND THEREFORE EXACERBATED, OR AGGRAVATED, THE INSTABILITIES PRODUCED BY THE DYNAMICS, THE POLITICAL DYNAMICS, THAT CREATED THE UPROOTING, OR THE DISMEMBERMENT, OF, OF THAT ESTATE.

>> AND JOE, THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN DONE AT THE VERY BEGINNING OF THE BELL CURVE IN 1991, 1992?

>> AT THE, AH, COLLAPSE OF, AH, THE SOVIET UNION AT THE, THE CHANGE FROM ONE WORLD TO ANOTHER, AH, PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE BEEN WATCHING AND, AND SEEING THE POTENTIAL HERE FOR, AH, DANGER TO CIVILIAN POPULATIONS. TED ROBERTGER AND, AND OTHERS, HAVE DONE THIS, MINORITIES AT RISK, GLOBAL MINORITIES AT RISK, AND WHERE THEY SEE SOMETHING LIKE 200 ETHNIC GROUPS IN POLITICAL ACTIVITIES WHERE YOU HAVE SUBORDINATE MINORITIES OR, AH, MAJORITIES WHO ARE SUBORDINATED BY MINORITIES AND THIS CREATES POTENTIAL FOR CONFLICT. AND IN ANY ONE YEAR, AH, PERHAPS TWENTY OF THOSE CONFLICTS HAVE A POTENTIAL TO TURN VIOLENT. THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY NEEDS TO HAVE THE RESOURCES TO KNOW WHERE THOSE PLACES ARE, AND TO DEPLOY RESOURCES, PEOPLE TO ADDRESS THAT BEFORE IT GETS TO VIOLENCE.

>> OKAY, YOU'VE BOTH SPOKEN ABOUT CONSENSUS IN YUGOSLAVIA IN 1992

UNDER YOUR MODEL, THERE WAS NO CONSENSUS BETWEEN U.S. AND EUROPE AND NOT EVEN ANY CONSENSUS WITHIN EUROPE BETWEEN THE BRITS, FOR EXAMPLE, AND THE GERMANS, AND THE FRENCH, ON WHAT TO DO ABOUT YUGOSLAVIA. LET'S LISTEN TO A FEW MORE COMMENTS BY SOME OF OUR OTHER EXPERTS ON WHERE THIS RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT DOCTRINE STANDS RIGHT NOW. HOW MUCH AGREEMENT IS THERE ON IT? LET'S LISTEN.

>> THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT IS SOMETHING THAT'S BEEN ACCEPTED AT THE HEAD OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT LEVEL, AH, BY ALL U.N. MEMBER STATES AT THE SUMMIT IN 2005. AND BASICALLY, THE HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT PLEDGED, AH, THAT THEY WOULD PROTECT THEIR POPULATIONS. NOT JUST THEIR CITIZENS, BUT ALL THE PEOPLE ON THEIR TERRITORY FROM GENOCIDE, FROM WAR CRIMES, FROM ETHNIC CLEANSING AND FROM CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.

>> THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT RESTS ON THESE THREE PILLARS: THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STATE, SUPPORT FOR THE STATE, AND IN EXTREME CASES, A MORE ROBUST INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT.

>> EVEN SO, WE HAVE BEEN TRYING VERY HARD, AH, UNFORTUNATELY AT THIS TIME, AH, THIS HAS NOT BECOME A POLICY YET OF THE UNITED NATIONS. AH, IT IS STILL A CONCEPT, BUT THIS IS, AH, STILL REMAINING AS AN ASPIRATION, NOT A REALITY. SO MY COMMITMENT IS TO MAKE THIS CONCEPT INTO A POLICY AND TO MAKE THIS ASPIRATION INTO A REALITY AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

>> LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT, UM, WHAT EXPECTATIONS WE CAN HAVE OF THIS POLICY? SHOULD WE EXPECT THAT LEADERS IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA, AS WE'VE ALREADY DISCUSSED, OR BURMA, OR IRAN, OR KENYA EVEN, WOULD TAKE IT UPON THEMSELVES TO ACT UNDER THE KINDS OF GUIDELINES THAT YOU'VE BOTH SPOKEN ABOUT TODAY? IF NOT, BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T IN THE PAST, SHOULD WE EXPECT THAT THERE WOULD BE CONSENSUS DEVELOPED AMONG THE NATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THAT ACTION WOULD ACTUALLY BE TAKEN? MAYBE JOE, YOU WANNA COMMENT ON THAT?

>> YES, I THINK ONE OF THE, UM, AH, UNREALISTIC EXPECTATIONS IS TO THINK THAT AN INTERNATIONAL BODY CAN DESCRIBE SOMETHING LIKE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT AND SAY WE ENDORSE IT AND THEN THINK THAT THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS, AH, THE REPERTOIRE AND THE RESOURCES, TO ACTUALLY IMPLEMENT IT. AND IT'S, IT'S, IT'S, AH, GOING TO BE A LONG PROCESS. WE'RE MOVING FROM AN OLD COLD WAR WORLD TO SOMETHING NEW. WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT NEW THING IS AND WE WON'T KNOW FOR DECADES. DECADES FROM NOW SOME OF US WILL BE EXPERTS ON IT, AH, BUT, AH, NOT NOW. NO, I DON'T THINK YOU ARE GOING TO SEE, AH, AUTHORITARIAN OR DICTATOR HEADS OF STATE COMPLYING AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT THAT TELLS US, I THINK, IS THAT THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY IS IMMATURE. IMMATURE, IN THE SENSE THAT WE HAVE NOT YET DEVELOPED THE REGIONAL COOPERATION COUNSELS WITH THE, WITH THE REGIONAL SECURITY AND COOPERATION, UM, TOOLS TO ADDRESS THESE KINDS OF

PROBLEMS. WE STARTED TO SEE, FOR INSTANCE, IN KENYA, THE AFRICA UNION MAKING A GO OF PREVENTING DEADLY VIOLENCE AFTER THAT ELECTION OUT, OUTCOME THAT YOU MENTIONED.

>> IN THE SPRING.

>> IN THE SPRING, RIGHT. AH, THAT'S ENCOURAGING, BUT IT ALSO TELLS US, IF WE LOOK AT IT CAREFULLY, THAT IT'S UNDER RESOURCED AND THE COMMUNITY HAS NOT HAD ENOUGH PRACTICE AT HOW TO DO IT OVER A SUSTAINED PERIOD OF TIME TO MAKE IT WORK.

>> SADLY, I GUESS THAT WOULD MEAN THAT WE NEED SOME MORE INCIDENTS TO OCCUR IN ORDER TO GET THE PRACTICE NECESSARY. BUT MONICA, LET ME ASK YOU, UM, ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTABILITY OF THIS POLICY.

>> YES, WELL THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT DOES NOT NECESSARILY NOR AUTOMATICALLY LEAD US TO MILITARY INTERVENTION. THE SWIFT RESPONSE THAT WE SAW IN THE CONTEXT OF KENYA, INDICATES THAT MILITARY RESPONSE IS NOT NECESSARILY THE BEST INDICATED POLICY PRESCRIPTION TO ADDRESS TO A GIVEN SITUATION. MEDIATION WAS THE POLICY OPTION THERE AND MEDIATION SUCCEEDED IN BRINGING FROM THE BRICK, FROM THE BRINK, KENYA IN 2008. SO, WHETHER THAT INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE - IF YOU ASK ME, I THINK THAT'S WHERE I SEE THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE... THE SECOND CHANGE OF BEHAVIOR WHERE WE WOULD EXPECT THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ACTING THROUGH THE U.N. TO SWIFTLY RESPOND TO CRISIS, WHETHER THEY OCCUR IN BURMA OR KENYA OR BOLIVIA.

>> LET ME PICK UP ON THAT POINT AND CHOOSE AN EXAMPLE THAT IS NOT AN AUTHORITARIAN STATE. I MEAN, WE'VE, I'VE BEEN PICKING ON EXAMPLES NOW THAT, THAT IN SOME WAYS ARE AT THE EXTREME OF THE SITUATION THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. BUT LET'S CHOOSE ANOTHER ONE THAT IS VERY MUCH IN THE NEWS AND HAS BEEN TALKED ABOUT A LOT. UH, THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL HAS BEEN VERY WIDELY CRITICIZED NOT ONLY FROM OUTSIDE BUT ALSO FROM INSIDE IN SOME RESPECTS, FOR ITS TREATMENT OF THE ARABS GENERALLY, AND PARTICULARLY, ITS TREATMENT OF THE PALESTINIANS. BUT I DON'T THINK ANYBODY WOULD CHARACTERIZE, OR VERY FEW, WOULD CHARACTERIZE ISRAEL AS AN AUTHORITARIAN STATE, YOU KNOW, OUTSIDE THE RULE OF LAW OR ANY OF THAT SORT OF THING. IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT, WOULD RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT DOCTRINE, UH, COME INTO PLAY WHERE, UH, INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTS, THE UNITED NATIONS, PERHAPS WITH U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL, I GUESS WITH U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL APPROVAL, WOULD MEAN NO U.S. VETO. UMM, WOULD THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY STEP UP AND SAY, "WE'RE GOING TO INTERVENE." FIRST, MAYBE NON-MILITARILY BUT COULD YOU ENVISION A SITUATION IN WHICH THIS DOCTRINE MIGHT RESULT IN OTHER NATIONS INTERVENING PHYSICALLY OR MILITARILY IN ISRAEL?

>> YOU ARE REFERRING TO A SITUATION WHICH IS, UH, A TERRITORY IN WHICH ISRAEL AS AN OCCUPYING MILITARY PART...NON-MILITARY SORRY, AS AN OCCUPYING POWER, HAS CERTAIN RESPONSIBILITIES THAT ACCRUE TO THE

POPULATION ON THEIR, NOT IN JURISDICTION BUT ITS OCCUPYING REMNANT. AND EACH CAN THOSE, POTENTIALLY INCUR, IN A RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, IN RELATION TO HOW IT BEHAVES, NOT ONLY TOWARDS ITS OWN POPULATION OR ITS OWN CITIZENS, BUT ALSO THE POPULATION ON THEIR TERRITORIES, THAT IT, FOR ALL PURPOSES, EXERTS CONTROL OF.

>> SO, IN THAT SITUATION, ARE YOU SAYING, THAT'S A SPECIAL CASE. IT WOULD NOT FALL UNDER RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, BECAUSE OF THAT OCCUPATION SITUATION YOU JUST MENTIONED?

>> I WOULD SAY, AND THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE MAY SEE, IN TERMS OF HOW WE SEE THE CHANGE OF BEHAVIOR OF FACTORS. WE HAVE HEARD NOW REPEATEDLY, A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES SAYING... SORRY, NOT A NUMBER OF COUNTRIES, A NUMBER OF FACTORS, I WOULD SAY, A NUMBER OF FACTORS ASKING PRECISELY THE QUESTION YOU ARE ASKING. WHY IS IT THAT THIS DOCTRINE CANNOT APPLY TO A SITUATION LIKE THE ONE THAT WE HAVE, EH, EH, OBSERVED IN, BETWEEN... IN GAZA, OR, OR BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE POPULATION, THE PALESTINE POPULATION IN GAZA? AND IF, CIVIL SOCIETY CAN ALSO BE A CARRIER AND CAN ALSO BE ONE OF THE ENGINES TRYING TO TURN THIS DOCTRINE, WHICH IS STILL AN ASPIRATION, INTO, UMM, INTO PRACTICE. AND I THINK THAT THERE IS A POTENTIAL TO ARGUE THAT THIS DOCTRINE APPLIES, AS ONE OF THE EXPERTS SAID, IS NOT ONLY ABOUT THE CITIZENS, IT'S ALSO ABOUT THE POPULATION. SO IT COULD POTENTIALLY APPLY BEYOND THE BORDERS OF A GIVEN STATE.

>> OKAY, I WANT TO COME BACK TO SOME OF THEIR VIEWS AGAIN FOR JUST A MOMENT. THERE REALLY ARE A LOT OF CASES IN WHICH YOU MIGHT LOOK AROUND THE WORLD AND YOU MIGHT SAY, "IT'S HARD TO ENVISION HOW THIS, HOW THIS IS GOING TO HAVE AN EFFECT." LET'S HEAR WHAT THEY HAVE TO SAY ABOUT SOME OF THE MANY CASES THAT WE'VE SEEN AROUND THE WORLD."

>> WE HAVE TO RECOGNIZE THE "R TO P" IS, IS NOT A MIRACLE, UMM, WORKER. UH, IT'S A PHRASE; IT'S AN IDEA, IT'S A CONCEPT. EVEN IN A CASE LIKE DARFUR NOW, OR THE CHAOS IN SOMALIA, OR THE MUCH LARGER KILLING IN THE DRC, THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF, OF CONGO. PEOPLE FORGET THERE WAS EVEN GREATER KILLING IN THE, IN THE WAR IN THE SOUTH - IN SUDAN, MUCH MORE THAN THERE HAS BEEN IN DARFUR.

>> THERE ARE SOME 21 MILITIA GROUPS NOW, IN DARFUR, FIGHTING AGAINST THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT. HOW WILL WE HELP THAT SITUATION BY SENDING A MILITARY FORCE? BUT WE SHOULD DO WHAT WORKS. AND WHAT WORKS IS NEGOTIATION, DIPLOMACY. WE'VE HAD SOME WONDERFUL DIPLOMATS WHO HAVE GONE TO, UH, SITUATIONS OF CRISIS AND REALLY MADE THEM BETTER. KOFI ANNAN IN KENYA IN RECENT YEARS, SÉRGIO DE MELLO WHO WENT TO MOZAMBIQUE AND HELPED STOP A CIVIL WAR THERE, USING PEACEFUL MEANS. REMEMBERING THAT AT THE HEART OF THE U.N. CHARTER IS THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PEACE.

>> IN THE CASE OF KENYA, PEOPLE ACTED AS SOON AS THE CRISIS

MANIFESTED ITSELF. THEY ACTED WITH A RESOLVE TO STOP IT. HOW OFTEN WILL THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ACT WITH THE SAME RESOLVE AND IN CONCERT TO BRING ABOUT CHANGE?

>> SO LET ME MOVE FROM THOSE EXAMPLES TO ASKING YOU ABOUT NON-MILITARY MEANS FOR A MOMENT. YOU MEN...YOU BOTH MENTIONED THAT BEFORE. BUT JOE, UH, IS THERE ANY REASON TO IMAGINE THAT THE UNITED NATIONS COULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE IN, UNDER THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT DOCTRINE AT PROMOTING PEACE IN INDIVIDUAL NATIONS WHERE REPRESSION OR GENOCIDE OR WAR CRIMES AND SO ON, ARE, ARE BEING COMMITTED, OR ARE BEING THREATENED THAN IT HAS BEEN ALL THROUGH ITS LIFE? WHAT'S NEW ABOUT THIS POLICY THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM THE UN, THE UN'S GENERAL MANDATE.

>> I THINK THERE IS REASON TO THINK THAT THAT'S POSSIBLE AND BECAUSE WE ARE IN A DIFFERENT WORLD. WE ARE IN A WORLD IN WHICH, UMM, NOW, NATIONS ALL SHARE A PERCEPTION OF AN EXISTENTIAL THREAT FROM THE EFFECTS OF GLOBAL WARMING, FOR INSTANCE. UH, THEY ALL SHARE A, A, EXISTENTIAL THREAT FROM THE DANGERS OF GLOBAL FINANCIAL COLLAPSE. THEY HAVE A LOT OF REASONS TO WANT TO COOPERATE AND UH, PREVENT VIOLENCE. WE SEE A G-20 RATHER THAN A G-8 MEETING IN PITTSBURGH. UH, THE IDEA OF WHO IS ABLE TO MANAGE THIS GLOBAL ECONOMY IS GROWING. AND I'M SAYING THAT BECAUSE, IN REGARD TO RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT, UH, ONE OF THE THINGS FOR IT TO WORK IF IT'S EVER GOING TO DEVELOP AND GET IMPLEMENTED, IS A CHANGE IN THE INTERNATIONAL CULTURE, A CHANGE IN THE PERCEPTION OF WHAT ARE IN NATIONAL INTERESTS, AND WHAT THREATEN NATIONAL INTERESTS AND WE'RE MOVING IN THAT WAY BECAUSE OF FACTS, IN THE CLIMATE, FACTS IN THE ECONOMY. MARY ELLEN O'CONNELL SAID SOMETHING THAT I THINK IS IMPORTANT ABOUT THE, THE ILLUSTRATION OF SUDAN. UMM, YOU LOOK AT ALL THE FIGHTING FACTORS THERE AND YOU ASK YOURSELF HOW WOULD IT HELP IF YOU DID A MILITARY INTERVENTION THERE. AND YOU CAN SEE THAT IT COULD MAKE THINGS WORSE. I THINK A LOT OF PEOPLE UNTIL NOW HAVE THOUGHT, "WELL, IF ALL ELSE FAILS, THEN THE OPTION OF LAST RESORT WILL WORK." AND THE OPTION OF LAST RESORT IS MILITARY ACTION. ACTUALLY, THE OPTION OF LAST RESORT MIGHT NOT WORK, SO WE HAVE TO DEVELOP THESE OTHER REPERTOIRES THAT RELY, AS MONICA WAS SAYING, ON CAPACITIES OF CIVIL SOCIETY. THE U.N. IS IN, IS POSITIONED IN A WAY TO ENCOURAGE CIVIL SOCIETY TO BECOME A PARTNER IN THIS IN A WAY THAT IT HASN'T BEFORE. LET ME END ON THIS. I CO-CHAIR THE U.S. CAMPAIGN TO BAN LAND MINES. AND INITIALLY IN THAT CAMPAIGN, CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS WERE KEPT OUT, BUT EVENTUALLY, THEY DREW IN CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS AND THAT LED TO ACCOMPLISHING A GLOBAL BAN ON LAND MINES, A HUMANITARIAN CONCERN. I THINK THERE IS AN EVOLUTION OF UNDERSTANDING THAT IT ISN'T JUST GOVERNMENTS AND MILITARIES. THE CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS HAVE TO BE PARTNERS TOO.

>> MONICA? FROM YOU, MAYBE A LAST FEW WORDS ON THIS TOPIC. GO AHEAD.

>> CIVIL SOCIETY HAS NOW, I THINK, A ROLE TO PLAY THAT DIDN'T HAVE THREE, PERHAPS FOUR DECADES AGO, AND I THINK THIS IS SOMETHING THAT HEADS OF THE STATES, AND MEMBER STATES WITHIN THE U.N. HAVE REALIZED AND THAT MAYBE ONE OF THE REASONS WHY THEY WERE READY TO ENDORSE THE 2005 CONSENSUS AGAIN IN THE DEBATE IN 2008 AND THE FIRST RESOLUTION ON THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT WHICH WAS PASSED BY, AGAIN, CONSENSUS, ON THE 14TH OF SEPTEMBER, 2008. AND THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT, IF IT'S NOT THEM, IT'S GOING TO BE CIVIL SOCIETY. AND THEY'D RATHER TAKE CONTROL OVER THESE AGENDAS AND ALLOW CIVIL SOCIETY TO DETERMINE THE BOUNDARIES OF THIS DOCTRINE. BUT, AS IT WAS MENTIONED BEFORE, WE CANNOT EXPECT THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT OR THIS DOCTRINE TO BE A MIRACLE. IT'S GOING TO WORK IN SOME CASES. IT MAY NOT WORK IN SOME CASES. THERE MAY BE RESISTANCE TO APPLY IT IN SOME INSTANCES. THERE MIGHT BE OBSTACLES AND THE STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS IN THE WAY. NO DOCTRINE GETS OBSERVED HUNDRED PER CENT. BUT I THINK THAT THE CONSENSUS, AND FOR THE REASONS THAT WE'VE MENTIONED, IT WILL BE POTENTIALLY ADVANCED BOTH BY CIVIL SOCIETY AND BY BOTH THE STATES THAT NOW UNDERSTOOD AND RECOGNIZE THAT SOVEREIGNTY IS ABOUT RESPONSIBILITY AND THAT HUMAN DIGNITY HAS TO BE RESPECTED.

>> MONICA SERRANO, THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE GLOBAL CENTRE FOR THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT AND JOE VOLK, THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE FRIENDS' COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION. THANK YOU BOTH VERY MUCH FOR BEING WITH US ON GREAT DECISIONS. AND THANK YOU ALSO FOR WATCHING. I'M RALPH BEGLEITER.

>> TO LEARN MORE ABOUT TOPICS DISCUSSED ON GREAT DECISIONS, VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT GREATDECISIONS.ORG

>> GREAT DECISIONS IS AVAILABLE ON DVD. TO ORDER, VISIT SHOPPBS.ORG OR CALL 1-800-PLAYPBS.

>> FUNDING FOR GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY IS PROVIDED BY THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK, THE STARR FOUNDATION, SHELL INTERNATIONAL AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION. GREAT DECISIONS IS PRODUCED IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE.

>> NEXT TIME ON GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY...

>> IN THE SUMMER OF 2008, GEORGIAN TROOPS INVADED THE BREAKAWAY PROVINCE OF SOUTH OSSETIA, PROVOKING A STRONG AND HIGHLY CRITICIZED MILITARY RESPONSE FROM RUSSIA. HOW WILL RUSSIA'S INTERACTIONS WITH ITS NEIGHBORS AFFECT U.S. CALLS TO RESET RELATIONS WITH MOSCOW?

>> RUSSIA WILL NOT BE A SUCCESS IF IT DELUDES ITSELF INTO THINKING THAT IT CAN RECONSTRUCT ITS FORMER EMPIRE.

>> IS RUSSIA AIMING TO START A NEW CHAPTER IN WHAT WAS ONCE CALLED "THE GREAT GAME?"

>> NEXT TIME ON GREAT DECISIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY. CLOSED CAPTIONS BY
CAPTIONLINK WWW.CAPTIONLINK.COM

>> WHEN POST ELECTION RIOTING BROKE OUT IN KENYA IN 2007, THOSE
RESPONSIBLE FOLLOWED A FAMILIAR SCRIPT. INCITEMENT OF VIOLENCE BASED
ON TRIBAL RIVALRIES, ORCHESTRATED TERROR, POLITICAL DEADLOCK.

>> MEMBER STATES SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE TO PREVENT AND PROTECT
THEIR OWN PEOPLE FROM SUCH A CRIMES AS GENOCIDE, WAR CRIMES, AND
CRIMES AGAINST THE HUMANITY AND ETHNIC CLEANINGS.