

## State-by-State Positions on the Responsibility to Protect

This information is based upon government statements given during the informal discussions of the General Assembly in advance of the September High-level Plenary (aka September Summit). WFM collected written statements, which are circulated by governments and sometimes made available on their mission’s websites, and analyzed oral statements delivered on behalf of governments during these deliberations. For the full text of available government statements please visit [www.reformtheun.org](http://www.reformtheun.org). A guide to the R2P text and abbreviations is available below.

Country / Group	Embraces the Responsibility to Protect	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Albania					EU
Algeria	No		R2P is not compatible with international law. Algeria suggests that R2P should not be included in the Outcome document because it does not have consensus support. Algeria supports further discussion in the GA.		NAM AG
Argentina	Yes -Also acknowledges and challenges reasons for dissent.	R2P is an appropriate normative framework for responding to situations such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity. Argentina supports Peru’s call to include a paragraph urging the Permanent Members of the Security Council to refrain from the use of the veto in situations of genocide.		Supports urging P5 to not use their veto in situations of genocide.	
Australia	Yes	Endorsement includes the following language: “unable or unwilling;” “including Chapter VI and VIII;” and reference to regional organizations. Australia urges leaders to strongly endorse R2P. Future discussion of R2P should not be limited to the GA. Australia suggests changing the text in DOD2 to reflect action through the Security Council <i>under Ch VII of the UN Charter</i> , not as authorizing cooperation with regional organizations.			
Bangladesh					NAM
Barbados					G-77

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Belarus	No		Shares concerns of NAM, Russia, Egypt, Syria and Cuba. R2P is contradictory to international law. Supports a framework for protecting civilians, but is uncomfortable with giving the Security Council the authority for collective measures to protect civilians.		
Brazil	Unclear	Supports R2P definition in Draft Outcome Document as a “basis for further improvement.” “Collective action... must be agreed by and implemented through the Security Council.” Brazil supports that the international community should play a positive role to support individual state’s responsibility.	The GA should examine R2P and its ramifications. Brazil believes the resort to Ch VII is not appropriate.		
Bulgaria					EU
Cameroon					NAM G-77 AG
Canada	Yes – no element of the outcome document is more important than R2P.	Endorsement includes: “sovereignty entails responsibility;” “unwilling or unable;” “including Chapter VI, VII, VIII” language. -There is consensus on the state’s first responsibility and the international community’s moral obligations in the face of grave crisis. -The Values and Principles section of DOD2 reaffirms sovereign equality and non-interference. - Canada joins Rwanda in emphasizing prevention.			
Chile	Yes – strong support.	-Supports the R2P paragraph of the DOD (72). - Embraces R2P as a continuum of responses. (reaffirmed in August) - R2P is in keeping with the Charter. - Notes the important role of regional organizations. - Would like to see R2P enshrined, including references to CH VI and VII so that force will not have to be used.			

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
China	No		Advocates for the status-quo by hedging on the international community's responsibilities, requesting further discussion and deferring to the Security Council.		
Colombia	Yes	Supports R2P DOD language. Feels that "participation of regional organizations is essential" Looks to para. 72 to "create legal framework in implementation of R2P"			
Costa Rica					EU
Cote D'Ivoire					NAM AG
Croatia	Yes	-Notes interconnectivity of human rights, security and development -Acknowledges the importance of the R2P.		Human security	EU
Cuba	No		-Rejects the attempt to impose the acceptance of R2P -"will only facilitate interference, pressure and intervention in the domestic affairs of our States by the superpowers and their allies" - Would like to change the heading in DOD2 to "Responsibility to Protect Civilian Populations." - Does not believe R2P should be referred to as a 'concept.'		NAM
Egypt	No		-There is no shared responsibility outside of the responsibility of the state to protect its own citizens and the responsibility of the Security Council to address matters of international peace and security. -Referred to a responsibility to prevent in the section on peace and security.		NAM G-77

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Egypt Cont'd	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would like to change the heading in DOD2 to “Responsibility to Protect Civilian Populations.”</li> <li>- Does not believe R2P should be referred to as a ‘concept.’</li> <li>- While the protection of civilians is a moral obligation, it must be measured against sovereignty.</li> </ul>		
El Salvador	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Agrees that responsibility rests first with the state.</li> <li>- Supports to continued dialogue in the GA.</li> </ul>		
Fiji	No comment on R2P (Para on peacekeeping includes R2P-like language)				
Finland	Delighted with DOD2 in its entirety. No specific comment on R2P.				
France	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Embraces language of R2P</li> <li>-It should highlight the international community’s duty to step in through the Security Council.</li> <li>- France respects the issue of sovereignty, but believes that there must be limits on the scope of state sovereignty.</li> <li>- R2P must be robust. Sometimes talking is not enough and we should consider the use of force as a last resort.</li> </ul>			EU
Germany	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The R2P text in DOD2 is the minimum to which states must agree on the protection of civilians.</li> <li>- The use of force must be carefully circumscribed.</li> <li>- Supports the elements of prevention and assistance to states in R2P.</li> </ul>			EU
Holy See	Unclear	Addresses R2P and ‘use of force’ in the same paragraph, with no elaboration on their position with respect to R2P. Suggests that the ‘criteria for the use of force’ from the SG report be reinserted into these paragraphs.			

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Iceland	Yes	-Supports R2P -Concept of urgency should be added to text -Agrees with Canada's statement			
India	No		- The role of the international community is limited to encouraging states to use peaceful means. - The reference to Ch VI is sufficient. - The failure of the Security Council to act is due to a lack of political will and not due to a lack of authority.		NAM G-77
Indonesia	Unclear/ No		- Supports the first and foremost responsibility of states. - Supports the responsibility to help states, using Ch VI and Ch VIII - There should be due diligence with respect to CH VII and Indonesia welcomes further discussions on improving the text.		G-77 NAM
Iran	No		- R2P is too vague - Endorses changing the heading in DOD2 to "Responsibility to Protect Civilian Populations." - Sovereignty and territorial integrity cannot be undermined.		NAM G-77 & China
Ireland	Yes – very strong statement	- Supports an elaboration of R2P. - Failures to react in the past have been appalling and R2P gives acceptance to the general understanding of an obligation to act and is reassurance in exceptional circumstances.			
Israel	Yes				
Italy	No comment on R2P				EU
Jamaica	Spoke on behalf of G-77 and China (see below)				
Japan	Yes (reaffirmed)	-Supports R2P -Text should go further to represent R2P as a continuum- "prevention, response, development, assistance, and capacity-building, and only as a last resort, to the use of force."			
Jordan	Yes				

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Kazakhstan	No comment on R2P				
Kenya	No comment on R2P				G77, China, AG
Korea	Yes – urges members to come to an agreement on R2P	<p>“We should establish concrete mechanisms and modalities for carrying out this responsibility, which must be properly defined and delimited in order to alleviate concerns over encroachment of sovereignty.”</p> <p>- The text in DOD2 is much improved.</p> <p>- Suggests adding “as a last resort” to the text regarding the use of force.</p>			
Libya					NAM AG
Liechtenstein	Yes	<p>-Supports explicit language in draft outcome document</p> <p>-Language should not be diluted in final draft</p>			
Macedonia					EU
Malaysia	Unclear/No	<p>Malaysia agrees with some aspects of the responsibility to protect.</p>	<p>Recommends further discussion on R2P by the GA (reaffirmed). In order to reflect urgency in this matter, Malaysia recommends that there be a commitment to take this up in the 60<sup>th</sup> session of the GA.</p>		NAM G-77
Mexico	Yes – proposes additional language to strengthen R2P	<p>- “...emphasizing that the concept is a continuum and that it therefore includes prevention and international assistance, including development and capacity building” (reaffirmed).</p> <p>- Suggests including a reference to prevention in the R2P paragraph.</p>			
Moldova					EU
Mongolia	No comment on R2P				NAM G-77
New Zealand	Yes – <b>very strong</b>	<p>-Emphasizes that protection is within the parameters of international law and provisions of UN Charter</p> <p>- The DOD2 R2P paragraph is the minimum acceptable commitment by states.</p> <p>- The DOD2 text is carefully crafted.</p>			

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
New Zealand Cont'd	Yes – <b>very strong</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports a focus on prevention and believes much of the DOD addresses root-cause issues.</li> <li>- The text is clear that the use of force is a last resort.</li> <li>- R2P is not a blank check and exists within the parameters of international law.</li> </ul>			
Nigeria	No comment on R2P				NAM AG
Norway	Yes	<b>R2P is essential. The DOD2 text should not be weakened.</b>			
Pakistan	No		<p>-“...measures to promote protection of civilians should not become a basis to contravene the principles of non-interference and non-intervention or question the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of States”</p> <p>-Suggests that the section be retitled “Protection of Civilians” (reaffirmed).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should further emphasis on the responsibility of individual states.</li> <li>- The text should include affirmation of non interference, national sovereignty and territorial integrity.</li> <li>- Notes failures in political will.</li> <li>-Suggests that conflict prevention is best supported with the right to development.</li> </ul>		
Palestine	No comment on R2P				NAM G-77
Panama	Yes	Clearly supports the principles of R2P, however, does propose that there be some continued dialogue in the GA on criteria.			

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Peru	Yes – <b>very strong</b> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intervention can only occur when there is no other alternative</li> <li>- "...regimes that violate the Geneva Convention, the Convention against Genocide and the international humanitarian law, also violate the international law and can be intervened by the United Nations"</li> <li>- <b>Recommends that the P5 should commit to not use their veto in circumstances of genocide.</b></li> <li>- <b>Supports including the setting up of a UN strategic military reserve in the R2P text.</b></li> </ul>			
Poland	No comment on R2P				
Portugal	<b>Yes</b>	<b>R2P must be supported.</b>			EU
Qatar					NAM
Romania					EU
Russia	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is not sufficient understanding of the concept of R2P</li> <li>- The UN is capable of responding to crises under current situation.</li> <li>- <b>R2P undermines the Charter</b></li> <li>- <b>Endorses changing the heading in DOD2 to "Responsibility to Protect Civilian Populations."</b></li> </ul>		
Rwanda	<b>Yes – very strong</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Strong, impassioned speech on the moral duty to embrace R2P.</b></li> <li>- <b>Submitted new text to be considered on R2P.</b></li> <li>- <b>Please see the full text of this proposal: <a href="http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/pages/7">http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/pages/7</a>.</b></li> <li>- <b>Emphasis on prevention, including addressing incitement.</b></li> <li>- <b>R2P is not a concept to benefit the powerful, but a set of principles to protect the most vulnerable.</b></li> <li>- <b>Does not support changing the heading of the section.</b></li> </ul>			
Senegal					NAM
Serbia and Montenegro					EU

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
Singapore	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports more discussion, but expresses desire to have these discussions to discuss clear criteria urgently.</li> <li>- Indicates strong support for the principles of R2P.</li> <li>- Strongly supports Rwanda's statement.</li> <li>- Urges leaders to reflect on Srebrenica and Rwanda.</li> </ul>			
South Africa	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The text should be linked to exceptional circumstances so as not to be misused.</li> <li>- R2P is very important to Africa.</li> <li>- The situations R2P addresses are not theoretical, but a reality, particularly in Africa.</li> <li>- The 60<sup>th</sup> GA should discuss R2P, but this does not prevent world leaders from taking action at the Summit.</li> </ul>			NAM G77 & China
Spain	Yes (reaffirmed)				EU
Sri Lanka	Yes	Would like very clear language on the appropriate use of action.			EU
Sweden	Yes – strong support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- R2P should address the population as whole, not just have text on the civilian population.</li> <li>- Supports a focus on prevention and believes much of the DOD addresses root-cause issues.</li> </ul>			EU
Switzerland	Yes	Satisfied with the text on R2P in DOD2.			
Syria	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No basis for R2P in the Charter.</li> <li>- Endorses changing the heading in DOD2 to “Responsibility to Protect Civilian Populations.”</li> </ul>		
Tanzania	Yes - Very strong, enumerated support. -Directly challenged the NAM position	Commends the delicate balance proposed by Australia.			AG G-77
Tunisia					NAM AG
Turkey	No comment on R2P – fully aligns with EU (Y)				EU

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
U.K.	Yes	-We need internationally agreed framework to protect vulnerable -Only in extreme cases would military force be used -Fulfill responsibilities to weak on case-by-case basis -This is not about the West trying to find excuses to intervene			EU
Ukraine					EU
U.S.	Yes/no	Supportive language of the principles of R2P, however, the statement never refers to 'responsibility' and uses weak language with respect to considering reaction.			
Venezuela	No		R2P will only serve the interests of powerful states ( <b>reaffirmed</b> ).		
Vietnam	No		R2P is a reincarnation of humanitarian intervention. <b>The DOD2 text should only maintain the first, second and last sentences of the R2P text.</b>		NAM G-77
<b>GROUPS</b>					
African Group (Mauritania)	<b>Unclear/Yes</b>	<b>We must be certain that R2P is not open to subjective interpretation.</b>			AG G-77
CARICOM	Unclear / No		Welcomes "the opportunity to discuss concept further." Could give support for R2P if "necessary safeguards are put in place to ensure respect for the principles set forth in Charter and international law."		Jamaica of behalf of G77 and China
European Union (Luxembourg)	Yes -Strong, enumerated support ( <b>reaffirmed</b> ).				EU

Country / Group	Embraces R2P	Clarifications in Endorsement	Rejects R2P	Other Issue Links	Group (if noted)
EU – European Parliament Resolution	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports R2P as presented in the HLP report.</li> <li>- Addressed R2P in the same paragraph as ‘use of force.’</li> <li>- R2P is long overdue</li> <li>- R2P flows from the Universal Declaration on Human Rights</li> <li>- Explanation of R2P included a continuum of measures.</li> </ul>			
GUAMM (Azerbaijan)	No comment on R2P				
G-77 and China (Jamaica)	No comment on R2P. Proposes a new paragraph 2 for the Values and Principles section of the report that emphasizes strict adherence to the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity.				
IUCNNR					
Non-Aligned Movement (Malaysia)	No		<p>R2P is a reincarnation of humanitarian intervention. No basis for ‘humanitarian intervention’ in the Charter or Law.</p> <p>NAM has noted the divergence of views on R2P and is studying the concept and its implications. NAM hopes to conclude these studies soon.</p>		
Tuvalu (Alliance of Small Island States)					
Rio Group	No comment on R2P				

**Abbreviations:**

DOD: Draft Outcome Document released by the GA President on 03 June 2005.

DOD2: Revised Draft Outcome Document released by the GA President on 22 July 2005.

**Red Text:** New Comments from the July-August informal discussions of the General Assembly on the Revised Draft Outcome Document.

**Draft Outcome Document – 03 June 2005**

**Responsibility to protect**

72. We agree that the responsibility to protect civilian populations lies first and foremost with each individual State. The international community should, as necessary, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility. The international community has also the responsibility to use

diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means under Chapter VI and VIII of the UN Charter to help protect civilian populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. If such peaceful means appear insufficient, we recognize our shared responsibility to take collective action, through the Security Council and, as appropriate, in cooperation with relevant regional organizations under Chapter VII of the Charter.

73. We support the implementation of the United Nations Action Plan to prevent genocide.

74. We stress the need to continue consideration of the concept of the responsibility to protect within the General Assembly.

**Excerpted Text from the Draft Outcome Documents:  
Revised Draft Outcome Document – 22 July 2005**

**Responsibility to protect**

113. We agree that the responsibility to protect civilian populations lies first and foremost with each individual State and we accept that responsibility and agree to act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility. The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, including under Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter to help protect civilian populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, we recognize our shared responsibility to take collective action, through the Security Council and, as appropriate, in cooperation with relevant regional arrangements, under Chapter VII of the Charter, should peaceful means proved insufficient and national authorities be unwilling or unable to protect their populations. We stress the need to continue consideration of the concept of the responsibility to protect within the sixtieth session of the General Assembly.

114. We support the implementation of the United Nations Action Plan to Prevent Genocide and the work of the Secretariat to this end.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Revised Draft Outcome Document – 05 August 2005**

**Responsibility to Protect**

118. We agree that the protection of populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity lies first and foremost with each individual State. We also agree that this responsibility to protect entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement. We accept this responsibility and agree to act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility and support the efforts of the United Nations to establish an early-warning capability. The international community, through the United Nations, also has the obligation to use diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, including under Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, we recognize our shared responsibility to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter and in co-operation with relevant regional organizations, should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities be unwilling or unable to protect their populations. We stress the need to continue consideration of the concept of the responsibility to protect within the sixtieth session of the General Assembly.

119. We invite the permanent members of the Security Council to refrain from using the veto in cases of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

120. We support the implementation of the United Nations Action Plan to Prevent Genocide and the work of the Secretariat to this end.

