



THE  
RESPONSIBILITY  
TO PROTECT



THE CHICAGO COUNCIL  
ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS



INTERNATIONAL HUMAN  
RIGHTS LAW INSTITUTE  
*DEPAUL UNIVERSITY*

CENTER FOR  
INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS  
*NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY- SCHOOL OF LAW*

## THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT: A STRATEGY FOR ENGAGING AMERICA

May 2007

---

---

### SUMMARY

The 15-17 November 2006 conference on “The Responsibility to Protect: Engaging America” (R2P) was the most in-depth discussion of the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect since the release of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty’s 2001 report in which the doctrine was first articulated. It was also the first conference in the United States to focus on this topic. Participants agreed that it is time to broaden awareness and support of R2P in the United States and call for efforts to place this new doctrine on the agenda and in the debates of the 2008 U.S. presidential campaign. Participants felt strongly that R2P offers a much needed, new direction for American foreign policy and that U.S. support for R2P is critical to fulfilling the doctrine’s promise to humanity. U.S. leadership will be essential for this new global moral compact to move from rhetoric to reality. In articulating a strategy for engaging America on R2P, conferees agreed that R2P should be framed as an empowering prophecy that puts America’s strengths to great purpose. Participants also agreed that acting on R2P calls, most importantly, for a shift in culture. Accordingly, America’s future relationship with the world needs to be guided by the principles of prevention, cooperation, multilateralism, burden sharing, fighting impunity, respect for the rule of law, and the use of force only as a last resort. Conferees identified key audiences for an R2P campaign—faith and religious communities, the U.S. military, and political leaders from both parties—and suggested that current efforts undertaken by the R2P Coalition in America should be brought to the next level. This paper summarizes the strategy agreed upon by the conferees and lists several additional steps that need to be taken in order to complete this strategy on engaging America on R2P.

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

On 16 September 2005 the United Nations General Assembly took an historic step on the issue of human rights. During the UN 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary World Summit, world leaders unanimously embraced the “Responsibility to Protect,” a new global, moral compact to put an end to the most egregious crimes that have repeatedly stained humanity. In the World Summit Outcome Document, the international community agreed that each individual state has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, (hereafter referred to as “atrocity crimes”). If a state fails to protect its populations, this responsibility must be borne by the international community. This new principle was reaffirmed by the United Nations Security Council, the body that can most decisively transform rhetoric into reality, on 28 April 2006.

Despite the endorsement of the Responsibility to Protect at the highest political level and the feeling among Americans that “something needs to be done” to prevent and stop atrocity crimes, the Responsibility to Protect is very much absent from public thinking and the political agenda in the United States.

The 2008 presidential election provides an opportunity to bring this new norm to light and enter it into the national discourse on American foreign policy. The issue is particularly timely given the heightened attention to foreign policy as a result of 9/11, the Iraq War, and the controversy over the nature of U.S. involvement in the world. The imperative of further exploring America’s role in implementing the Responsibility to Protect also stems from the ongoing atrocities wrecking Darfur, Northern Uganda, and various parts of the Democratic Republic of Congo, to name a few.

On 15-17 November 2006 The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, the International Crisis Group, the R2P Coalition, the International Human Rights Law Institute at DePaul University, and the Center for International Human Rights at Northwestern University School of Law convened the conference “The Responsibility to Protect: A Strategy for Engaging America.” The aim of the conference was to develop a strategy for putting the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) on the U.S. national agenda in order to turn rhetoric into action.

Forty-five leading experts from academia, nongovernmental organizations, foundations, and think tanks as well as communication strategists and heads of religious communities attended the conference. Keynote addresses were delivered by Gareth Evans, president and CEO of the International Crisis Group; Lloyd Axworthy, president of the University of Winnipeg; and Luis Moreno-Ocampo, chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Court.

The conference achieved its goal by focusing on three issues:

1. *Framing the Responsibility to Protect*—This identified the rationale for the U.S. public and its leaders to embrace the norm of R2P.
2. *Acting on the Responsibility to Protect*—This identified general principles for implementing the R2P norm.
3. *Increasing the Visibility of the Responsibility to Protect*—This defined communication goals and strategies for bringing R2P to the forefront of U.S. public and political discourse.

This paper is the outcome of the conference. It lays out specific recommendations on how to increase acceptance of R2P in the United States.

## I. SETTING THE STAGE

### I.1. R2P: From an idea to an international norm

The Responsibility to Protect was first articulated by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in its 2001 report. Triggered by the failures to act in Rwanda and Srebrenica as well as the controversies generated by the action taken in Kosovo, the purpose of the report was to produce recommendations on how the international community should respond to internal, man-made, human-rights-violating catastrophes. In an attempt to end the deadlock between those in favor of and those opposed to so-called “humanitarian interventions,” the commission created a new way of talking about this issue and gave life to the “Responsibility to Protect.”

Conceptually, R2P builds on earlier efforts to strike a balance between 1) the system of nation-states that has prevailed since the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, whereby the essence of sovereignty is the control by the sovereign over its people, and 2) the vision of an international community bound by its common humanity and united in the promotion of common goals. The doctrine elaborated by the ICISS reconciles the attributes of state sovereignty and the duty to not interfere in the domestic matters of other states with the international community’s *raison d’être* to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The report clarifies the respective responsibilities of states and of the international community. It backs its redefinition of state sovereignty with a holistic approach to tackling the most outrageous human behavior, from prevention to reaction to rebuilding.

The Responsibility to Protect moved from a vision to an international doctrine when it was adopted by the international community at the UN General Assembly 2005 World Summit.

As unanimously endorsed, the core principles of the Responsibility to Protect are as follows:

- Each individual state has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing.
- This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes.
- The international community should help states exercise their individual Responsibility to Protect through capacity-building and other measures.
- The international community should support the UN in establishing an early warning capability.
- The international community, through the UN, also has the responsibility to use peaceful means to help protect populations.
- If a state relinquishes its Responsibility to Protect—whether by lack of will or lack of capacity—the international community is prepared to take collective action under UN Charter Chapter VII, including the use of force as a last resort.

This broad framework for addressing genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing was further elaborated upon by the Security Council. In its 28 April 2006 resolution on the protection of civilians in armed conflicts, the Security Council identified several measures intended to contribute to the implementation of R2P, including tackling the root causes of armed conflict; ratifying, implementing, and complying with international humanitarian law, human rights law, and refugee law; ending impunity for serious crimes; and reaffirming the Security Council’s practice of ensuring that the mandates of peacekeeping

missions include the protection of civilians, particularly those under imminent threat of physical danger.

Yet much needs to be done for R2P to fulfill its promise. For this norm to mature from a grand and noble principle to a fully fleshed-out doctrine whose implementation has true and decisive results, R2P needs to be further elaborated. The implementation of R2P is the challenge ahead.

## **I.2. The current U.S. position and public opinion on R2P**

Along with the other 191 members of the United Nations, the U.S. government adopted the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document and therein the Responsibility to Protect. The United States also formally signed onto this norm as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council on two occasions: in resolution 1674 (2006) on the protection of civilians in armed conflict and in resolution 1706 (2006) on the situation in the Sudan. Yet, the support expressed by the U.S. government for R2P is constrained by other political beliefs shared by politicians across the political spectrum. For example, the U.S. political leadership is reluctant to give a UN body the authority to determine that a situation falls under R2P. It also objects to being legally bound to act in a specific manner in R2P situations.

A majority of the American public, on the other hand, believes that the United States should play an active role in addressing international issues through multilateral processes. Large majorities have repeatedly supported the deployment of an international force—including the use of U.S. troops—to stop genocide and other severe humanitarian crises. Strong majorities also favor UN members each committing 1,000 troops to a rapid deployment force that the Security Council can call up on short notice when a crisis occurs. This stated support for stopping atrocities is, however, balanced with a reluctance for the United States to play the role of a global policeman and the concern that the United States should not have more than its “fair share” of the responsibility.

## **I.3. Current civil society efforts in the U.S. to engage America on R2P**

Many American NGOs, faith and religious communities, think tanks, foundations, and academics are actively engaged in addressing atrocity crimes and/or their various implications. A core group of international NGOs based in New York (Oxfam, International Crisis Group, Human Rights Watch, and the World Federalist Movement) is discussing possible strategies to advance R2P nationally and internationally. Within the World Federalist Movement, the “Responsibility to Protect—Engaging Civil Society” (R2PCS) project works to advance R2P around the world and to promote concrete policies to better enable governments, regional organizations, and the UN to protect vulnerable populations. At the domestic level, the R2P Coalition has focused on R2P since autumn 2005, working to convince the American people and its leaders to embrace the norm of R2P as a domestic and foreign policy priority.

# **II. ELEMENTS OF A STRATEGY FOR ENGAGING AMERICA ON R2P**

## **II.1. Framing the R2P message**

### **II.1.1 Definition**

*R2P is the responsibility of each state—and when it fails, the international community—to protect populations from genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and war crimes.*

R2P is a new and emerging framework grounded in the rule of law that builds on the international legal and judicial systems.

R2P is first and foremost the individual responsibility of each state to prevent and stop atrocity crimes against its populations. The international community should help states protect their populations, including through capacity-building. If a state fails to protect its populations from genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and war crimes, then the international community has the responsibility to protect those populations. The Responsibility to Protect borne by the international community calls for the establishment of multilateral processes based on the rule of law to prevent and stop atrocity crimes. *Prevention* includes the establishment of an early warning mechanism and indicators of atrocity crimes. Prevention also includes diplomatic, legal, judicial, economic, and consensual military steps to enhance the state's capacities to protect its populations. As the failure to protect becomes manifest and the crisis escalates, the international community has the responsibility to move from prevention to *reaction* by taking increasingly coercive and punitive measures falling short of the use of force. The use of military force should be subject to clear criteria, including last resort, right intention, proportionality, and reasonable prospects.

### II.1.2. Key messages

*"Because it is Right!"*

R2P is a moral/ethical imperative: It is a prophetic principle that will end atrocity crimes. R2P embodies fundamental universal and American values: freedom from tyranny, helping the oppressed, human rights for all, fairness, justice, common decency, living ethically.

R2P also puts America's strengths to great purpose. Most importantly, R2P has a profound *humanitarian* objective. Its purpose is to save lives, and R2P reminds us that we are indeed each others' keepers. Second, R2P improves *security*, whether local or regional, because atrocities causing local chaos and failed states can spill over borders and impact faraway regions—even distant countries such as the United States. Third, R2P addresses the shameful legacy of the Rwandan genocide by providing us with a framework that will, at last, fulfill the promise of *"never again."* R2P also has *economic benefits* since prevention costs much less than reaction and rebuilding. Even more importantly, stable societies offer better economic opportunities. Finally, R2P will help the United States restore its standing in the world because it provides a new vision of how America should act in the world.

In order for the benefits of R2P to be made more palatable, the campaign should publicize success stories. Macedonia is one example where the preventive deployment of troops, with the consent of the state, froze a volatile situation that could have turned into another Bosnia.

## II.2. Acting on R2P

### II.2.1 Underlying principles

R2P offers a full toolbox of diplomatic, legislative, economic, judicial, and military options that the United States can employ to implement its domestic and international Responsibility to Protect.

Acting on R2P calls, most importantly, for a shift in culture in multiple ways. The focus of R2P is on *multilateral* processes for helping states protect their populations and for preventing and responding to atrocity crimes. R2P also puts an emphasis on the *prevention* of atrocity crimes, directing efforts at measures designed to render such crimes obsolete. Consequently, R2P relegates the use of military force to a tool of last resort.

In the United States a new vision of our country's future relationship with the world has emerged that emphasizes *cooperation* with the international community and with international institutions. This includes avoiding double standards and unilateralism, burden sharing, fighting impunity, and respecting the rule of law. Therefore, the campaign to act on R2P must be associated with prevention, cooperation, multilateralism, burden sharing, fighting impunity, respect for the rule of law, and the use of force as a last resort.

Specific measures designed to implement R2P at the domestic and international levels should build upon and strengthen this new vision of America's relationship with the rest of the world. The following recommendations, which cover both the domestic and the international dimensions of R2P, should be further elaborated into a "strategic plan of action" for implementing R2P.

### **II.2.2. Domestic implementation of R2P**

At the domestic level, the United States should become a role model in implementing its own Responsibility to Protect its populations. The United States should be able to identify all the measures it takes to prevent the commission of atrocity crimes against its populations. These measures include the ratification, implementation, and compliance with relevant international legal instruments. These and other possible additional steps should become the elements of an "R2P index" that measures the level of domestic implementation of R2P.

### **II.2.3. The U.S. and the international community's Responsibility to Protect**

As a member of the international community, the United States' first responsibility is to help states protect their populations. The United States should assess how it should and how it actually is helping states, including through capacity-building, to exercise their individual Responsibility to Protect. Such a review should include the U.S. role in ensuring that the illegal transfers of small arms and light weapons do not fuel the commission atrocity crimes.

The United States' second responsibility as a member of the international community is to protect populations when a state manifestly fails to do so. The implementation of this responsibility requires many steps to be taken.

Implementing R2P requires institutional measures at the domestic level that will help the United States act more effectively and that involve both the executive branch and Congress. Among these measures are the following:

- The issuance of a *Presidential Decision Directive* (PPD) on R2P. Such a directive plays a major role in establishing policy, directing the implementation of policy, and/or authorizing the commitment of government resources.
- The establishment of a high-level, dedicated interagency team (including the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, and Justice along with the intelligence community, under National Security Council leadership) mandated with R2P situations. A roster of agency personnel with relevant R2P expertise should be established.
- Development of an early warning system about potential mass atrocities and a public listing of these highly suspect situations.
- Adoption of a "sense of Congress" resolution in Congress that puts the federal legislature behind R2P and identifies specific implementation measures. These include the appropriation of funds to enable the executive branch to respond quickly to prevent mass atrocities and the launching of Congressional hearings to support measures for preventing mass atrocities.

Once a country is listed as a potential crisis state, the United States should actively mobilize bilateral and multilateral resources and initiate a process for addressing the situation through multilateral and, particularly, UN actions. These actions would include sharing intelligence, briefing allies and the UN Secretariat, building relationships with Security Council members and others as appropriate, initiating action in the Security Council and in the Human Rights Council, mobilizing NGOs and civic organizations at home and abroad, in particular in the country concerned. Such a process will lead to a greater burden sharing with the international community.

The United States should be willing to support the development of a Security Council resolution elaborating the R2P principle and engage interested allies at an early date. The United States should also engage Russia and China on R2P and the drafting of an R2P resolution. The United States should approach the new United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon and express its clear support for R2P along with its commitment to strengthen the UN's capacity to act on R2P both through prevention and reaction.

On the prevention side, the United States should:

- Promote R2P in its diplomatic efforts.
- Make the development of a UN capacity for the prevention of atrocity crimes a top priority in its UN reform agenda. This early warning function could fall within the mandate of a special advisor on the Responsibility to Protect. For example, the mandate of the current special advisor on the Prevention of Genocide could be expanded, or the responsibility could be entrusted to another UN body.
- Signal a policy of voluntary self-restraint in using the veto in cases of atrocity crimes.
- Devise a strategy for quickly bringing financial measures into play to deter atrocity crimes (building on the techniques used recently in the Middle East).

The United States should strengthen its relationship with international and hybrid criminal justice institutions so that it can cooperate quickly and effectively with courts and tribunals in preventing of mass atrocities. The International Criminal Court deserves greater support from the United States since it operates within the realm of R2P. Moreover, the United States should promote the establishment of an international judicial police force mandated to arrest individuals indicted for atrocity crimes in order to strengthen deterrence and effectively fight against impunity.

The United States should be prepared for cases in which prevention fails and help develop the international capability to respond with coercive measures. The use of such measures should be guided by multilateral processes that establish specific criteria for each type of action. Limited measures may include sanctions, no-fly zones, and the shutting down of radios. The capacity to use force must also be available. The development of such capacity should include the elaboration of a special doctrine for R2P operations, special training, and command and control capability at the UN for UN-led operations. In addition, the deployment of troops to protect refugees should also be considered.

Finally, the United States should be willing to commit to the rebuilding phase of R2P. The commitment to R2P should involve a transition to development, education, security sector reform, and good governance in countries that have been ravaged by atrocities.

### **II.3 Bringing R2P into the American public and political discourse**

The third element of a strategy for engaging America on R2P focuses on the communication and campaigning effort: What are the specific aims of the campaign, who should be targeted, and how.

### **II.3.1. The goals of the campaign**

For R2P advocates, the ultimate goal of the campaign is to ensure that the United States fully implements the domestic and international dimensions of R2P. The first step toward this objective, to be achieved throughout 2007, is to increase the awareness and the acceptance of R2P among the American public and political leadership. Specific benchmarks should be established—for example, the adoption of city-level and state-level resolutions—for measuring the increased acceptance of R2P. The second step, beginning in 2007 but carrying over into 2008 and beyond, will be to get the United States to act on R2P, both domestically and with the international community.

### **II.3.2. What audiences should be targeted**

An R2P campaign must seek to engage people at both the national and grassroots levels. The bottom-up approach will enable the establishment of an R2P constituency that has the legitimacy—and the power—to influence national policymakers. National policymakers, on the other hand, need to be familiar with R2P and its implications so they are more receptive to grassroots initiatives.

The campaign should target a broad audience. In addition to reaching out to NGOs, the media (including blogs), women, students, activist networks, and corporations, the campaign should focus on three specific audiences: 1) the religious and faith communities (because R2P is a moral imperative), 2) the U.S. military (because R2P may call for the military to collaborate with non-military actors role in pre-conflict and post-conflict environments, and also because in a worse case scenario actual protection at the field level will be provided by troops), and 3) political leaders from both parties (because R2P is a nonpartisan issue that brings together the American leadership and the public).

### **II.3.3. How should the campaign target its audiences**

A qualitative, cognitive public opinion study as well as a quantitative one should be conducted before launching any campaign. These studies will help in refining the message and the targeting. They will, in particular, help in providing answers to the public's questions. The R2P campaign should include answers to the following questions: What should the United States do to help the international community stop the atrocities in Darfur? Does R2P justify the war in Iraq? Does R2P mean the United States should maintain its troops in Iraq? Does R2P apply to the situation in the Palestinian territories? Does R2P mean the United States can no longer act unilaterally? What can I, as an American, do to help?

A “Press Tool Kit” should be developed to shape the presentation to the public. It should include a visual image to summarize the issue, suggested practical responses, success stories to show there is hope, and ways to empower those who want to act. The goal is to build a network that can spread a coherent message. The effort could include a monitoring system, such as a regular update on good news and potential trouble spots. This would be offered to NGOs and political staff with the goal of building a broad, if informal, coalition of groups using the same language and embedding it in the public consciousness.

There must also be an “Action Tool Kit” that offers a menu for action in crises, giving the public simple, identifiable actions that it can support. Areas for preventive, reactive, and rebuilding efforts are key.

Besides reaching out to the public, the campaign should develop strategies tailored to the three audiences previously identified: faith and religious communities, the U.S. military, and political leaders from both parties.

- *Faith and religious communities* should be actively engaged to relay the moral imperative of R2P. The Council of Religious Leaders of Metropolitan Chicago is a pioneer in this respect. Further efforts could build on and expand the existing network of such communities that are part of the “Save Darfur” campaign or other faith-based advocacy efforts.
- The *U.S. military* deserves special attention because R2P situations may require the military to play a supporting role in preconflict and postconflict situations. R2P may also call for a shift in the role of U.S. troops during a conflict, with an increased mandate to protect civilian populations. The U.S. military needs to understand what R2P means—in particular that this doctrine is diametrically opposed to unilateral social engineering at gunpoint—and what is at stake in the advancement of this doctrine. The U.S. military should take an active role in framing the various R2P mandates involving troops and in identifying how these mandates will be implemented.
- In targeting the *political leadership*, efforts include passing city-level and state-level resolutions endorsing R2P and calling upon the federal government and Congress to take the lead in implementing R2P. Other measures include reaching out to select members of Congress—in particular the appropriators—dedicated to bringing this issue forward. In order to influence the executive branch, campaign efforts should focus on getting R2P into the platforms of presidential candidates.

### III. OPERATIONALIZING THE CAMPAIGN

The execution of the campaign will require bringing current efforts undertaken by the R2P Coalition to the next level. The new organization, or a modified R2P Coalition, would become the institutional focal point (structural hub or secretariat with additional staff) for R2P campaign efforts in the United States and would work in partnership with other organizations sharing the same vision of the R2P campaign. These organizations would be represented in an executive body—a steering committee—that would plan and execute the campaign.

A national campaign should also be linked to international efforts to promote R2P. To that end, there is a need to study how such an international campaign could engage governments, international organizations, and the general public, while complementing domestic efforts to promote R2P.

### NEXT STEPS AND CONCLUSION

- Several steps, which have been outlined in this paper, still need to be taken to complete the strategy for engaging the American public and leadership on R2P. Specific tasks for refining the strategy include: Developing a strategic action plan for implementing the domestic and international dimensions of R2P. This will require identifying the R2P domestic implementation measures the United States is taking and should take, establishing an “R2P index” to measure results, and identifying a core set of actions that the United States should take to implement R2P at the international level.
- Conducting a qualitative, cognitive, and quantitative American public opinion study and on that basis providing answers to the most difficult questions about R2P (Darfur and Iraq).
- Developing specific strategies for engaging the three targeted audiences: 1) faith and religious communities, 2) the U.S. military, and 3) political leaders from both parties.
- Identifying specific benchmarks that evidence the increased acceptance of R2P within America.

Moreover, executing the strategy requires that the R2P Coalition and interested organizations formalize a broader and more inclusive structure.

The 15-17 November 2006 conference on “The Responsibility to Protect: Engaging America” was the most in-depth discussion on this subject since the release of the ICISS report in 2001. It was also the first such conference in the United States to focus on this topic. The conference was, by all standards, a great success. Its most visible contribution lies in this report: a strategy for engaging the American public and its leadership on R2P. This strategy needs to be completed and refined, building on past successful campaigning efforts, so that current efforts to bring R2P into American public and political discourse are further strengthened and so that R2P receives the attention it deserves both at the grassroots and national level.

Annexes:

Agenda for the conference “The Responsibility to Protect: Engaging America”

List of participants to the conference

## Annex I – Agenda for the Conference

**WEDNESDAY 15 NOVEMBER 2006** – *Women’s Athletic Club, Silver Room (4<sup>th</sup> floor)*  
626 North Michigan Avenue (at the corner of Michigan and Ontario)

- 6:00 – 9:00 p.m.      **Cocktail Reception and Opening Dinner** hosted by  
Richard H. Cooper and Juliette Voinov Kohler of The R2P Coalition
- 6:00 p.m.              *Cocktail reception*
- 6:30 – 7:00 p.m.      WELCOME REMARKS:  
• **Marshall M. Bouton** - *President, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*  
• **Donald Steinberg** - *Vice-President for Multilateral Affairs and Director of the New York Office, International Crisis Group*  
• **Richard H. Cooper** - *Convenor, R2P Coalition*
- 7:00 – 7:30 p.m.      **KEYNOTE ADDRESS** - “R2P: From an Idea to an International Norm”  
*given by Gareth Evans* - *President and CEO, International Crisis Group*
- 7:30 p.m.              *Opening dinner*
- 8:00 – 9:00 p.m.      Performance by comedian **Nancy Redman**
- 9:00 p.m.              Dinner adjourns

**THURSDAY 16 NOVEMBER 2006** - *The Mid-America Club, 80<sup>th</sup> floor, AON Building, 200 E. Randolph*

- 9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.    **PLENARY SESSION I—SETTING THE STAGE**
- 9:00 – 9:05 a.m.        INTRODUCTORY REMARKS: **Marshall M. Bouton**, *President, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*
- 9:05 – 10:15 a.m.        **Discussion I: R2P: WHERE ARE WE?**
- Presider: David Scheffer, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw/Robert A. Helman  
Professor of Law, Director, Center for International Human Rights,  
Northwestern University School of Law*
- **THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND FORTHCOMING STEPS**  
*Commentator: William Pace, Executive Director, Institute for Global Policy*
  - **THE U.S. POSITION AND PUBLIC OPINION ON R2P**  
*Commentator: Donald Steinberg, Vice-President for Multilateral Affairs and Director of the New York Office, International Crisis Group*

*\*\* Commentators are each given 10 minutes to summarize the international and domestic state of affairs on R2P, then the floor is open for general discussion.*

10:15 – 10:30 a.m.      *Coffee break*

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.    **Discussion II: ENGAGING AMERICA: COMPONENTS OF A STRATEGY**

*Presider: **Mary Page**, Director, Human Rights and International Justice  
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation*

- **FRAMING THE R2P MESSAGE: THE LEGAL, PHILOSOPHICAL, THEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF R2P**

*Commentator: **Cherif Bassiouni**, Distinguished Research Professor of Law at DePaul University College of Law and President Emeritus of its International Human Rights Law Institute*

- **ACTING ON R2P: APPROACHES TO IMPLEMENTING THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY’S R2P**

*Commentator: **David Scheffer**, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw/Robert A. Helman Professor of Law, Director, Center for International Human Rights, Northwestern University School of Law*

- **BRINGING R2P INTO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

*Commentator: **David Devlin-Foltz**, Director, Global Interdependence Initiative, the Aspen Institute*

*\*\* Commentators are each given 10 minutes to comment on the three components of a strategy, then the floor is open for general discussion.*

12:00 – 1:30 p.m.      *Lunch with Keynote Address – Open seating*

12:45 p.m.              **INTRODUCTION :** ***Cherif Bassiouni**, Distinguished Research Professor of Law at DePaul University College of Law and President Emeritus of its International Human Rights Law Institute*

**KEYNOTE ADDRESS - “Could R2P play a role in enforcing ICC arrest warrants“?**

*given by **Luis Moreno-Ocampo**, Prosecutor, International Criminal Court*

1:30 – 6:00 p.m.      **BREAKOUT GROUPS—DEVELOPING PROPOSALS**

- **FRAMING THE R2P MESSAGE**  
*Moderator: **Adele Simmons**, President, Global Philanthropy Partnership*
- **ACTING ON R2P**  
*Moderator: **Colin Keating**, Executive Director, Security Council Report*
- **BRINGING R2P INTO THE U.S. PUBLIC AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE**  
*Moderator: **Nancy Soderberg**, Distinguished Visiting Scholar at the University of Northern Florida*

*\*\*There will be a coffee break from 3:15pm to 3:45pm*

- 6:30 – 8:00 p.m. *Dinner at the Mid-America Club with Keynote address – Open seating*
- 6:00 – 6:30 p.m. *Cocktail reception*
- 6:30 p.m. **INTRODUCTION: Donald Steinberg**, *Vice-President for Multilateral Affairs and Director of the New York Office, International Crisis Group*
- KEYNOTE ADDRESS - “R2P: What one country can do – Canada’s leadership”** *given by Lloyd Axworthy, President, University of Winnipeg*
- 7:00 p.m. *Dinner*

**FRIDAY 17 NOVEMBER 2006** - *The Mid-America Club, 80<sup>th</sup> fl, AON Building, 200 E. Randolph*

- 9:00 a.m. **PLENARY SESSION II—CRAFTING THE STRATEGY**
- 9:00 – 10:45 a.m. **GROUP SUMMARY PRESENTATIONS**
- Presider: Marshall Bouton, President, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*
- **FRAMING THE R2P MESSAGE**  
*Presenter: Adele Simmons, President, Global Philanthropy Partnership*
  - **ACTING ON R2P**  
*Presenter: Colin Keating, Executive Director, Security Council Report*
  - **BRINGING R2P INTO THE DISCOURSE**  
*Presenter: Nancy Soderberg, Distinguished Visiting Scholar at the University of Northern Florida*
- 10:45 – 11:15 a.m. *Coffee break*
- 11:15 – 12:00 p.m. **NEXT STEPS AND CONCLUSION**
- Presider: Marshall Bouton, President, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs*
- **NEXT STEPS: Overview and appraisal of the recommendations coming out of the conference**  
*Presenter: Lee Feinstein, Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy and International Law, Council on Foreign Relations*
  - **CONCLUDING REMARKS**  
*Speaker: Richard H. Cooper, Convenor, R2P Coalition*
- 12:00 p.m. *Adjourn Conference*

## Annex II - List of participants

### Keynote speakers:

1. Lloyd Axworthy President, University of Winnipeg
2. Gareth Evans President and CEO, International Crisis Group
3. Luis Moreno-Ocampo Prosecutor, International Criminal Court (VIDEO)

### Participants:

4. Edgar Bachrach Former President and Chairman, Bachrach Clothing Inc.
5. Cherif Bassiouni President Emeritus, International Human Rights Law Institute, DePaul University
6. Barbara Bodine Visiting Fellow, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
7. Marshall Bouton President, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs
8. Ben Brandzel Advocacy Director, MoveOn
9. Rachel Bronson Vice President for Programs and Studies, The Chicago Council on Global Affairs (as of January 2007)
10. Bartram Brown Professor, Kent College of Law, Chicago
11. Douglas Cassel Professor, Notre Dame Center for Human Rights
12. Purmina Chawla Executive Director, Center for non-profit strategies
13. Simon Chesterman Professor and Director, Institute for International Law and Justice, New York University
14. Richard Cooper Convenor, R2P Coalition
15. Camille Crittenden Executive Director, Human Rights Center, UC Berkeley
16. Nicole Deller Program Advisor, The Responsibility to Protect – Engaging Civil Society, The World Federalist Movement
17. David Devlin-Foltz Director, Global Interdependence Initiative, The Aspen Institute
18. Lee Feinstein Senior Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations
19. Dennis Frado Member of the Executive Board, National Council of Churches
20. Mark Hanis Chief Executive, Genocide Intervention Network
21. Heidi Hulan Counselor (Political), Permanent Mission of Canada to the UN
22. Heather Hulburt Writer and Consultant
23. Peggy Hicks Director, Global Advocacy, Human Rights Watch
24. Martin Janis Founder, Martin Janis & Co
25. Colin Keating Executive Director, Security Council Report
26. Don Kraus Executive Vice President, Citizens for Global Solutions
27. Susan Myers Executive Director, UN Foundation
28. William Pace Executive Director, Institute for Global Policy
29. Mary Page Director, Human Rights and International Justice, McArthur Foundation
30. Bernice Powell Jackson President, World Council of Churches – North America
31. Paul Rutgers Executive Director, Council of Religious Leaders of Metropolitan Chicago
32. Adele Simmons President, Global Philanthropy Partnership
33. David Scheffer Professor and Director, Northwestern University School of Law
34. Nancy Soderberg Ambassador, Visiting Scholar, University of Northern Florida in Jacksonville
35. Donald Steinberg Vice President and Director, Multilateral Affairs, International Crisis Group
36. Scott Straus Professor, University of Wisconsin School of Law

- 37. Juliette Voinov Kohler Deputy Convenor, R2P Coalition
- 38. Joe Volk Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation
- 39. Cora Weiss President, Hague Appeal for Peace
- 40. Gitta Zomorodi Senior Policy Associate, American Jewish World Service

Observers:

- 1. April Donnellan Executive Director, Global Philanthropy Partnership
- 2. Steven Gerber Program Officer, Human Rights and International Justice, McArthur Foundation