

Genocide in Darfur: Theory and Practice in Genocide Response

Ramya Sekaran
St. John's University

Abstract:

This study argues that although the international community has established theories that support intervention in cases of genocide and mass atrocities, the practical implementation of these theoretical developments has been largely ineffective. The case of Darfur, where a lack of international political will and a failing peacekeeping mission have allowed the atrocities to continue, is a prime example of this inconsistency.

Evolving norms in international relations and trends in genocide response since World War II have had a significant affect on the current response to the genocide in Darfur. Although lawyer Raphael Lemkin created a framework in which the international system can recognize genocide, namely the Convention on Genocide of 1948, the ability to recognize genocide has not translated into an effective system of response.

As of 2008, the attacks and food shortages in Darfur have caused the death of at least 200,000 people and the displacement of over 2 million. In 2004, the United States declared the Darfur crisis genocide, the first time the U.S. has applied Lemkin's framework and declared genocide while the atrocities are still ongoing. (ENOUGH project 2008b, 4, Council on Foreign Relations 2008).

The failure to garner the support and resources necessary to respond to the genocide in Darfur has placed the very legitimacy of the international system at stake, as the theoretical support for genocide response is evident, and yet the practical response is lacking. The international community must muster the political will and resources necessary in order to ensure an end to the genocide in Darfur and the prevention of genocide in the future.

Research for this study was conducted using a range of sources, including books, United Nations documents and reports, non-governmental organizations' publications, news articles, and interviews with the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, the World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy, and the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies at the City University of New York Graduate Center.

Introduction/Argument

This study argues that although the international community has established theories that support intervention in cases of genocide and mass atrocities, the practical implementation of these theoretical developments has been largely ineffective. The case of Darfur is a prime example of this inconsistency. The international system currently recognizes genocide as a crime under international law. Lawyer Raphael Lemkin coined the term "genocide" in the 1940s and established the Convention on Genocide in 1948, providing a framework in which the international system can recognize genocide (Power 2003, 40-58). Nonetheless, as the situation in Darfur demonstrates, recognition still has not translated into a system for response to stop genocide. Thus, although progress has been made in developing theoretical support for Lemkin's legal advancements, advancements in practical methods are still lacking. The two major barriers to effective genocide response are state interest, which manifests itself as a lack of political will, and a lack of adequate peacekeeping capacities, namely the failing hybrid United Nations-African Union force in Darfur (UNAMID).

This paper examines evolving norms, trends in genocide response since World War II, and the way in which these norms and trends affect the current response to the genocide in Darfur. Changes in theory call for changes in practice. Thus, this study will also consider practical and procedural barriers to intervention in Darfur, and attempt to identify the intersection of theory and practice in genocide response in the 21st century. As the situation in Darfur demonstrates, recognition of genocide is no longer as problematic as ensuring an effective response on the ground.

Although the idea of intervention may imply military action alone, use of the term in this paper refers to a range of action, including political and economic sanctions, diplomacy, criminal prosecutions, and the deployment of peacekeeping forces. As an absolute last resort, intervention may also constitute military action. In short, intervention implies any action taken in a direct attempt to end the perpetration of violence against civilians and bring peace and security for the affected population. It is also important to note that use of the term "peacekeeping" in this paper is taken from the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations' (DPKO) description of the term and refers to a range of action, from the enforcement of peace agreements to the enforcement of peace itself, when no agreement is in existence or a previous agreement has failed (United Nations DPKO 2008).

Background on Darfur

The ongoing conflict in Darfur is the most apparent example of the inconsistency between theory and practice in genocide response in the 21st century. Despite a large-scale, mobilized, grassroots civil society movement for Darfur and recognition of the atrocities against civilians, the genocide has continued for over

five years.

The current crisis in Darfur has its roots in a long history of conflict and struggle in Sudan. The roots of the rebel movement in Darfur date back to a July 2001 meeting of the Fur and Zaghawa tribes in Abu Gamra, Darfur, where tribal leaders took an oath agreeing to work together to thwart Arab supremacy in the region. The rebel movement became apparent to the Sudanese government when insurgents attacked a police station in Golo, a rural district in Jebel Marra, Darfur, in June of 2002 (de Waal and Flint 2006, 3-5, 70-81).

In response to rebel attacks, the Sudanese government sent the Janjaweed, an Arab militia group, to suppress the rebellion and execute a scorched-earth campaign against the black civilians of Darfur, who shared the same ethnicity or tribal background as the rebel groups. The first major campaign against civilians in Darfur began in October of 2002, when the Janjaweed started attacking villages, killing men, raping women, abducting children, stealing livestock, and destroying fields and infrastructure. This first offensive against civilians in South Darfur quickly spread to other regions. The Sudanese government clearly supports the Janjaweed, as the militia faces no consequences for its actions. When other groups, such as the Zaghawa, attack the Arabs, they become targets of the government. In addition, the government uses the Sudanese Air Force to bomb villages and support the Janjaweed's land campaign (de Waal and Flint 2006, 64, 101-111).

In February of 2003, the rebel movement continued and launched widespread attacks on army posts, convoys, and police stations in Darfur. Finally, in April of 2003, a joint rebel force composed of members of the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) attacked a government air base in al Fasher, Darfur. The attack resulted in the destruction of four bombers and helicopter gunships, the death of 75 troops, technicians, and pilots, and the capture of 32, including the air base commander Major General Ibrahim Bushara Ismail, humiliating the Sudanese army and enraging the government in Khartoum. This attack only further aggravated the conflict and the government-sponsored attacks against civilians continued. In 2004, the United States declared the Darfur crisis genocide, the first time the U.S. has applied Lemkin's framework and declared genocide while the atrocities are still ongoing. (Council on Foreign Relations 2008, de Waal and Flint 2006, 99-115, Human Rights Watch 2006).

After a relatively brief lull in the violence in 2006, it escalated again in 2007. In 2008, the Khartoum government re-launched its offensive against the civilians of Darfur. The government of Sudan carried out a massive campaign of air strikes in areas under rebel control, once again supporting a land campaign of attacks by the government's militias (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 3).

In February of 2008, the government forces and militias attacked several villages in West Darfur, leading to the death of at least 100 civilians and the rape or sexual assault of at least 10 women. The violence and insecurity in Darfur since the

Critique

beginning of 2008 alone have displaced between 130,000 and 140,000, some for the second and third time. The entire region of Sudan became increasingly unstable. Rebel groups from Darfur launched a direct attack on the capital city of Khartoum in the summer of 2008. Furthermore, the destruction of the oil-rich town of Abyei by the Sudanese government troops and militias, the constant threats to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) that ended the North-South civil war in Sudan, and the ongoing proxy war between Sudan and Chad have all contributed to regional instability. The abuses of rebel and ex-rebel groups, such as those carried out by Minni Minawi, former leader of a SLA faction, have further exacerbated the crisis in Darfur. The increased integration of the Janjaweed into government security forces and conflict between armed Arab groups has also complicated the conflict (Human Rights Watch 2008, ENOUGH Project 2008a, 2-4). As of 2008, the attacks and food shortages in Darfur have caused the death of a total of at least 200,000 people. Many members of the international community describe the situation in Darfur as one of the worst humanitarian crises of our time (ENOUGH Project 2008b, 4).

Nonetheless, the international community's attempts at a practical response on the ground continue to be particularly weak and ineffective. Attempts at negotiations have been largely unsuccessful. In 2006, one of the factions of the rebel groups and the Sudanese government signed the Darfur Peace Agreement. A lack of participation by other key groups in the negotiations, however, rendered it ineffective, as many key provisions could not be implemented. Similarly, in 2007, peace talks in Libya suffered from a lack of participation on the part of key groups (Reeves 2008, Human Rights Watch 2008). As recent as April of 2008 only about one-third of the expected 26, 000 United Nations peacekeepers were on the ground in Darfur (Human Rights Watch 2008). The international community has failed to effectively pressure the Khartoum government to stop perpetrating violence against their own citizens, and peace in Darfur and Sudan overall continues to be threatened on a daily basis (Arnaud 2008). Evidence from past international interventions demonstrates the need to focus on practical preventive methods as opposed to waiting for a conflict to reach its peak before taking action. Prevention is far more cost-effective than intervention, in terms of both financial costs and the loss of human life (ICISS 2001, 21-26). Nonetheless, if genocide is allowed to happen, as in the case of Darfur, the international community must take the appropriate steps necessary to bring about peace and security.

Theoretical Framework and R2P Recommendations for Darfur

Although each individual case of genocide is unique to the circumstances in which it occurred, considering genocide from a historical perspective demonstrates the way in which international norms have evolved and sheds light on some of the challenges of responding to the genocide in Darfur today.

Raphael Lemkin, a Polish lawyer and American immigrant, fought a long battle in his efforts to gain recognition of the growing threat of Hitler and

acceptance for a law that became the Genocide Convention. This demonstrates the challenges presented by the circumstances of the interwar and World War II periods in responding to what the international community now knows of as genocide. As Lemkin tried to draw attention to the similarities between previous cases of genocide, such as the Armenian Genocide, to the growing threat of Hitler, international leaders failed to accept the relevance of past crimes to the present.

In the interwar period, most neither accepted nor rejected Lemkin's proposals for laws banning the crime of genocide, but instead set them aside, reluctant to accept the possibility of violence during peacetime. Lemkin continued to face challenges into the World War II period. The U.S. president Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, recognized the problem of the Nazi regime's abuses, but claimed that Lemkin's law could not be introduced at the time, and tried to quiet Lemkin by promising that he would issue a warning to the Nazis. In these periods of history, a strong sense of nationalism, isolationism, and economic struggles characterized most European nations and the United States. A system of collective security, under which allied nations agreed not to attack each other and to defend each other against attacks from other members of the collective group of nations, also characterized this period. Under the system of collective security, the international community upheld respect for state sovereignty as one of the highest principles in the international system. This system and the focus on national interests did not provide the political climate in which a law like Lemkin's proposal could be successfully integrated into the international system (Conflict Research Consortium 1998, Power 2003, 20-60).

Thus, Lemkin fought a long battle to change this and helped create a new theoretical framework within which the international community could attempt to find effective ways to respond to genocide. Lemkin's coinage of the term genocide in 1944 and his lobbying efforts for the passage of an international law banning the crime of genocide, resulting in the United Nations (U.N.) General Assembly's passage of the Convention in 1948, represented a shift, which continues today, towards human security as a central principle of the international system. The Genocide Convention was the first human rights treaty adopted by the U.N. Lemkin also introduced the idea of "universal repression," what is now known as "universal jurisdiction," and urges states to recognize genocide as an international crime, similar to slavery and piracy (19-20).

Genocide is most commonly committed by a state against its own people, and thus, the passage of the Genocide Convention challenges the traditionally understood Westphalian idea of sovereignty as the legal identity of a state and its right to control the affairs within its territory. The U.N. Charter and subsequent developments in international theory have reevaluated this definition of sovereignty. Recently, several international agreements and conventions, as well as a growing body of research and the opinions of many world leaders and non-government actors suggest that states do in fact have a responsibility to protect the civilians of other states when the government of that state is unwilling or unable to

Critique

do so, including cases in which the state itself is the perpetrator (ICISS 2001, 12-13).

Lemkin also understood that if political leaders alone decided how the world should respond to genocide, states would favor their short-term interests over morality and the long-term consequences of failing to intervene (Power 2002, 245). In his campaign for the passage of the Genocide Convention, Lemkin observed that states would only pursue justice in response to crimes against humanity if they came under political pressure from their citizens (Power 2003, 28). Today, with respect to the genocide in Darfur, it is evident that a mobilized grassroots movement of citizens in the international community plays an important role in genocide recognition. American policymakers and government officials have expressed that they are impressed with American advocacy efforts and insist that the advocacy community has had a significant influence on policymaking and the focus on Darfur (U.S. Government Official, U.S. Mission to the UN). Translating this recognition and focus on the genocide into action on the ground, however, has been problematic.

These newly developing norms and challenges are the focus of the 2001 International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty's (ICISS) report titled "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P). The R2P report reflects an emerging norm in favor of intervention for human protection, drawing from the opinions of various governments, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, civil society groups, universities, and research institutes. The principles set forth in R2P are reflected in various sources of international law, including natural law principles; the human rights provisions of the U.N. Charter; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the Genocide Convention; the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols on international humanitarian law; the statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC); and several other international human rights and human protection agreements and covenants (ICISS 2001, 11-18).

The ICISS report suggests that active involvement in prevention or intervention in a state that is unable or unwilling to protect its citizens should not be viewed as a challenge to state sovereignty, but rather as an integral part of protecting and upholding the responsibilities associated with sovereignty (ICISS 2001, 7-8). The practical implementation of this newly emerging norm, however, has proven difficult. Although the report itself recognizes that there is not enough evidence suggesting that R2P has become customary international law, it does recognize that emerging state and regional practice, as well as Security Council precedent, suggest R2P has become a recognized principle in the international arena (ICISS 2001, 15-20). U.S. government officials working to end the genocide in Darfur have recognized the relevance of R2P to their work and have closely followed discussions about R2P (U.S. Government Official, U.S. Mission to the U.N.).

Concerns about state sovereignty still present a challenge in responding to

Spring 2009

threats to human security, as sovereignty is still a critical component of an orderly state system. At the same time, the ICISS committee found that even the strongest supporters of the concept of state sovereignty will not argue, publicly at least, that a state has unlimited power to do what it wants to its own people. This is the central idea of the R2P, that sovereignty implies a state's twofold responsibility to respect the sovereignty of other states and respect the rights of its own people. The signing of the UN Charter, particularly as reflected in Article 2.1 of the Charter and its assertion of sovereignty as equality, is part of the shift in the idea of sovereignty as control to sovereignty as responsibility (ICISS 2001, 7-10).

R2P attempts to bridge the gap between concerns for state sovereignty and concerns for threats to human security and sets forth recommendations detailing the ways in which the international community can most effectively deal with these threats. The report explicitly states that human security includes many areas of security beyond national or territorial security from an outside threat and includes internal threats. It defines human security as threats to the physical safety or economic and social well-being of the population, as well as respect for their dignity and worth as human beings, and the protection of their human rights and freedoms. The R2P report's definition of human security is not limited to genocide alone, and includes any threat to the well-being of a population, with or without genocidal intentions. Thus, although this study suggests that the crisis in Darfur does constitute genocide, the debates about whether or not genocide is occurring in Darfur should not be a barrier to intervention (ICISS 2001, 14-19).

The R2P report has provided a new theoretical framework within which the international system must attempt to respond to genocide and other threats to human security. One of the key problems with implementing the provisions of the Genocide Convention has been the ambiguity of the text of the Convention. For example, Article 8 states, "any Contracting Party may call upon the competent organs of the U.N. to take such action under the Charter of the U.N. as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide," but does not provide any details as to what type of action the U.N. may take (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 2007). The report provides the international community with detailed recommendations for the prevention and response to threats to human security.

One such recommendation is the need for the permanent members of the U.N., which include the United States, China, the United Kingdom, Russia, and France, to refrain from using their veto power to obstruct the passage of resolutions for human protection, when their critical state interests are not involved (ICISS 2001, 15). This has been problematic for China, with respect to Darfur, as the Chinese government is Sudan's largest foreign investor and one of its largest trading partners. China has abstained from voting on Security Council resolutions on Darfur, and although they have refrained from using their veto power to oppose these resolutions, failing to actively support the resolutions displays China's lack of commitment to ending the atrocities in Darfur (Council on Foreign Relations

Critique
2008).

The R2P report recognizes that a central problem to effective prevention and early response is the failure of the international community to heed early warnings and act in a timely manner. Although many non-governmental organizations have developed early warning systems for genocide and other mass atrocities, the U.N. continues to lack a strong system of intelligence gathering and analysis that would ensure effective action in the early stages of a conflict (ICISS 2001, 21-25). In the case of Darfur, however, recognition has not been the primary problem. The atrocities are evident, and yet the response has been ineffective.

In response to a case like Darfur, the international community may attempt several measures. Militarily, arms embargoes, including military equipment and spare parts, and ending military cooperation or training programs are all options for genocide response (ICISS 2001, 29-35). On March 29, 2005, the U.N. passed Security Council Resolution 1591, extending its arms embargo in Sudan to include the Government of Sudan in order to prevent the Janjaweed from acquiring arms. The text of this resolution is paradoxical, as although the Janjaweed militias are supposedly non-governmental actors, the government sponsors them. The resolution also authorized the creation of a committee to monitor the embargo and impose sanctions on violators (International Action Network on Small Arms). Nonetheless, the government-sponsored militias continue to operate in Darfur and perpetrate violence against civilians, demonstrating the ineffectiveness of the implementation of the embargo.

Economic sanctions are another way in which the international community can pressure a regime into stopping violence against its own people. Financial sanctions against rebel movements, foreign assets, or specific leader's assets, restrictions on income-generating activities, and aviation bans, such as the prohibition of international air traffic, are all recommendations listed in the R2P report (ICISS 2001, 29-35). U.N. Security Council resolution 1591 imposed an assets freeze on specific individuals considered responsible for the violence in Darfur (U.N. Department of Public Information 2008). The U.S. government has issued sanctions against seven individuals and over 160 companies owned or controlled by the Government of Sudan or involved with the militia. President Bush also signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act in October of 2006, seeking to reinforce the United States' economic sanctions against the Government of Sudan. In addition, President Bush signed the Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act into law on December 31, 2007, authorizing state and local governments to divest from companies doing business in sectors that may help fund the genocide (U.S. Department of State 2008b).

With respect to political and diplomatic sanctions, the R2P report recommends measures such as restricting diplomatic representation to prevent illicit transactions, restrictions on travel, particularly for specific individuals, and suspension or expulsion from regional or international organizations. In the case of

Spring 2009

Darfur, the international community has imposed some political sanctions, such as a travel ban on specific individuals authorized by U.N. Security Council Resolution 1591 (UN Department of Public Information 2008a).

The U.N. has authorized a peacekeeping mission for Darfur and the international community has provided humanitarian relief, with \$4 billion in humanitarian, peacekeeping and development assistance for Sudan and Chad from the United States alone. The United States appointed Richard Williamson as Special Envoy to Sudan on December 21, 2007, demonstrating commitment to resolving the conflict in Darfur. Williamson worked to bring peace, security, and stability to Darfur, as well as continuing humanitarian relief efforts and ensuring peace for the entire region of Sudan (U.S. Department of State 2008a; U.S. Government Official, U.S. Mission to the U.N.).

Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter authorizes the U.N. to use military force in situations that threaten international peace and security and when other means of securing peace, such as political or economic sanctions, have failed (U.N. Charter). According to R2P, the definition of threats to peace is not limited to activities that occur across borders. The R2P report also considers military intervention as a possible response to threats to human security, even if non-intervention would have no consequences for the rest of the world. The report also emphasizes, however, that military intervention is an absolute last resort and the crisis must meet specific threshold criteria before military intervention is considered. These criteria include just cause, right intention, last resort, proportional means, and reasonable prospects. Only if the criteria in each of these areas are met should the international community consider military intervention a reasonable option (ICISS 2001, 32-37).

In the case of Darfur, it is evident that there are many other options still available that have not been fully attempted, such as the proper deployment of the U.N. peacekeeping force and more focused diplomacy (Arnaud 2008). The international community has demonstrated some commitment towards implementing the recommendations of the ICISS report. The slowly emerging acceptance of the R2P concept began at the 2005 World Summit meeting. Paragraph 138 of the Outcome Document of this meeting states each individual state's responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. All states are responsible for supporting one another in this effort and for helping the U.N. develop an effective early warning system. Paragraph 139 of the Document states the international community's responsibility under Chapter VII and Chapter VIII of the U.N. Charter to protect people from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. In addition, the international community made an express commitment "to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII...should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities are manifestly failing to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and

Critique

crimes against humanity” (U.N. General Assembly 2005). Following the release of this report, in April of 2006 the Security Council referred to “responsibility to protect” in Resolution 1674 on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, which was unanimously adopted by the Security Council. On August 31, 2006, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1706, authorizing peacekeepers for Darfur and referring to the applicability of R2P in a specific region for the first time. In February of 2008, the U.N. announced the appointment of Edward Luck, Special Adviser at the Assistant-Secretary-General level, to help the General Assembly continue its consideration of R2P (U.N. Department of Public Information 2008b).

These developments are significant in that they demonstrate that R2P has begun to gain recognition on the international stage at least in terms of a theoretical framework. Nonetheless, although governments have expressed a commitment to the ICISS report’s concept of R2P, the situation in Darfur demonstrates how difficult it has been to implement. As the ICISS report notes, there is a need to ensure that both international norms and institutions meet global needs and expectations (ICISS 2001, 19). The expressed commitment to R2P has not translated into the development of doctrine, training, and rules of engagement to implement the recommendations put forth in the report. As the case studies below demonstrate, the political climate has a significant impact on the way in which the international community responds to new laws and doctrine. Although the widespread recognition of the genocide in Darfur demonstrates an important step towards the implementation of R2P, the United States-led intervention in Iraq and the use of humanitarian arguments to justify it have become damaging to R2P. The situation in Iraq has created fear that countries will use R2P to justify unilateral invasions of other countries for purposes other than solely human security (Mephram and Ramsbotham 2007, 46-49). Thus, the international community did not receive R2P well in its early stages, as the ICISS Committee published the report in December of 2001, shortly after the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States and not too long before the United States’ intervention in Iraq (Arnaud 2008).

Even as of 2005, there was debate over threshold criteria for coercive intervention. In spite of the adoption of two paragraphs of the R2P doctrine by 191 state’s governments at the 2005 World Summit, many states deny that they signed R2P as a concept. R2P still needs to become more institutionally advanced and gain acceptance by more groups to move towards becoming a recognized norm. Furthermore, opposition to R2P from countries like Egypt and Pakistan present a challenge to implementation of the recommendations of the report (Arnaud 2008).

In addition, although inaction on the part of the international community in matters of human security is problematic, involvement also carries risks. States that choose to become involved in conflicts in other states risk taking sides or having the parties in conflict view them as doing so, and causing further fragmentation of the international order. Thus, it is critical that action in the name

of R2P is multilateral and involves regional actors (ICISS 2001, 21). This is also problematic, as powerful states often fail to see intervention in the affairs of other states as relevant to their national interests and less powerful states are fearful of allowing such intervention out of concern of becoming victim to the imperialistic ambitions of the powerful states.

The struggle to find effective ways to implement the suggestions put forth in the R2P doctrine fit into a broader historical and theoretical framework. With respect to the United States' foreign policy in particular, there are many difficulties associated with sustaining the kind of international order that will allow for effective intervention in cases like Darfur.

G. John Ikenberry argues that the United States has reached a state of unipolar hegemony and the way in which the U.S. chooses to handle this status will be a determining factor in whether or not the world order is able to fall into a cooperative agreement between states, what he refers to as a constitutional settlement. In his view, either the hegemonic power will choose to gain dominance or it may realize that its power will eventually decline and it will face consequences for enforcing its way upon the international order. If the state chooses the latter, it will move towards a constitutional settlement. In exchange for the leading power entering a constitutional order, the secondary states agree to comply with the rules of the order. In essence, what Ikenberry refers to as constitutions are a check on power and reduce the "winning" element in politics. States become limited in what they can do if they gain an advantage, losses are temporary, do not give the winner a permanent advantage, and the acceptance of the loss does not come at high cost. According to Ikenberry, leading states would exercise strategic restraint, showing weaker states that there are limits on the exercise of state power. States that are more powerful can only gain cooperation if less powerful states do not have to worry about being dominated or abandoned. This type of international regime would be more legitimate and stronger than the more individualistic and self-interested order in which every state seeks to gain advantage and protection. Under Ikenberry's regime, states would likely be interdependent and cooperative. Thus, humanitarian intervention may be easier, as national interest would not be as exclusively defined (Ikenberry 2006, 111-113).

The domestic government of the states involved is significant. It is easier for democracies to enter into what Ikenberry calls "co-binding institutions" with one another, or at least states with similar systems, even if not democratic, than those with different systems of government (Ikenberry 2006, 134). Democratization and attempts by powerful democracies to change the regimes of other states is highly controversial. Instead, it is important for powerful states to stay engaged in the affairs of smaller states, investing time and resources in sustainable development and efforts to ensure the rule of law. This type of engagement also serves as an effort to prevent mass atrocities and genocide from occurring. In turn, the establishment of Ikenberry's proposed international system will provide an environment in which R2P can be more successful in the future.

Critique

When one considers the Darfur case in light of Lemkin and Ikenberry's theoretical frameworks for intervention, it becomes evident that the nature of the international order at any given time has a significant impact on the way in which the international community responds to genocide. In Darfur, both the issues of national interest and the subsequent lack of political will and problems with operational capacities have inhibited a rapid and effective response to genocide. Thus, although there is an emerging norm in favor of intervention in cases of genocide, these two problems have persisted since the passage of the Genocide Convention, preventing the transition from norm to practice.

Darfur and Cambodia

Similar to the way in which the atrocities in Darfur are apparent to the international community, yet action has been slow and ineffective, the international community saw early signs of the impending crisis in Cambodia in the 1970s, yet failed to respond with action. State interests frequently prevent effective preventive response to genocide. This was the case in both Cambodia and Darfur.

Between 1975 and 1979, the Khmer Rouge regime killed 500,000 and displaced 1,500,000 Cambodians in a campaign of forced resettlement, forced labor, and mass starvation and execution (Shawcross 1979, 374-375, 394). Prior to World War II, a system of *real politik* dominated international politics. In general, state sovereignty was valued and states sought to preserve sovereignty from external and internal influences. This began to change with the end of World War II, but the Cold War's domination of international politics made this change slow. Although events like the establishment of the Genocide Convention and the other conventions that followed reflected an emerging norm towards human rights and intervention for human protection, the dominance of the United States and the Soviet Union shifted the focus away from this norm. The interests of these two superpowers dominated the global stage. The United States and the Soviet Union focused solely on thwarting one another's efforts to spread their respective ideologies to other areas of the world and gain global dominance. Thus, they were unconcerned with humanitarian crises that were unrelated to their national interests, like the atrocities committed by the Khmer Rouge against the people of Cambodia. As a result, the Khmer Rouge was able to commit genocide without fear of punishment (Alvarez 2008, 7).

As in Darfur today, a great deal of evidence suggests that the Western world had a sense of the imminent danger in Cambodia. Several reporters and government officials recognized signs of the violence in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, but they were in the minority and their warnings went ignored. During the time of the Cambodian genocide, the U.S. government relied on official government-to-government sources for information, and thus did not seriously consider scattered reports from refugees, as told to reporters or other observers. Initially, the U.S. government widely accepted the idea that the Khmer Rouge was associated with the communists of North Vietnam and the National Liberation

Front and failed to recognize the Khmer Rouge as an independent threat (Power 2003, 95-100, 121-140).

The Vietnam War, a product of the Cold War, was the longest war in American history, with thousands of casualties on both sides. The war was very significant events in terms of the Western perception of involvement in the region and consequently the failure to intervene in Cambodia. The United States even aided the Khmer Rouge by bombing Vietnamese bases in Cambodia in 1969 and sending troops to the area in 1970 (Alvarez 2008, 16). U.S. General Creighton Abrams, commander of U.S. forces in South Vietnam, wanted to attack the newly suspected headquarters of the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in one of Cambodia's border states. At the request of U.S. President Richard Nixon, the bombing of Cambodia, code-named "Operation Breakfast," was undertaken in secret and the Nixon administration took the necessary steps to hide the fact that the United States deliberately directed the bombings of the neutral state. When the first mission was successful, the United States continued to bomb suspected Communist bases on Cambodia's border for fourteen months, ignoring the fact that many Cambodian civilians lived in these areas. The United States not only conducted these missions in secret, but also recorded them as having occurred in Vietnam, erasing the bombings of Cambodia from official records (Shawcross 1979, 19-35). The bombing of Cambodia set the stage for the United States' failure to intervene when the Khmer Rouge regime perpetrated genocide against Cambodian civilians. Clearly, the United States had no interest in human security in Cambodia, as their strong national interest in preventing the spread of communism was the primary focus of their foreign policy.

Furthermore, the Vietnam War left Americans wary of future United States interventions in the affairs of other countries. The war resulted in massive losses of life on both the sides of the United States and the South Vietnamese. Thus, the political climate in the United States did not allow for intervention and likely would have lacked the backing of civil society (Shawcross 1979, 108, 172-173).

This is similar to the situation in Darfur, in that although the United States has recognized the genocide in Darfur, the focus on other issues of national interest, such as the war on terrorism, preoccupies United States foreign policy. The United States is unable to commit troops or equipment to peacekeeping operations in Darfur, as its resources are overstretched in other regions of the world, such as Iraq and Afghanistan. The use of humanitarian justifications for the war in Iraq also complicates the United States' involvement in Darfur, as many Americans are wary of intervention in the internal affairs of any other state (Mephram and Ramsbotham 2007, 44, 58-59).

The United States failed to ask China to use its influence with the Khmer Rouge to help end the genocide, as it was in the U.S.'s interest at the time to maintain positive relations with China (Alvarez 2008, 16). The Soviet-backed

Critique

Vietnamese overthrew the Khmer Rouge regime, and thus the United States and the European powers refused to side with them, and continued to recognize Pol Pot's regime. Thus, the Khmer Rouge represented Cambodia at the U.N. for ten years after the genocide (Power 2002, 249).

Similarly, today, recognizing that China is rapidly developing economically and technologically, the United States has worked to try to maintain positive relations with the Chinese government. The United States has attempted to pressure China to use its leverage with the Sudanese government to bring peace to Darfur, but has not done enough to ensure this thus far.

It is evident that recognition of the genocide and the attempted response in Darfur represents a significant improvement in genocide response since the Cambodian case. Nonetheless, the response in Darfur still has not been effective enough to bring any significant change on the ground. The international community has made many commitments to the people of Darfur through the passage of various resolutions and statements made by international leaders, but the international community has yet to fulfill these commitments. This represents a lack of political will and a lack of willingness to invest the time and resources in human security efforts.

Darfur and Bosnia

The end of the Cold War brought new opportunities for the fulfillment of the ideas set forth in the U.N. Charter, particularly with respect to UN Security Council action. Since the 1990s, the Security Council authorized approximately 40 peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations. Nonetheless, as the cases of Bosnia and Darfur illustrate, effectively implementing these operations has been a challenge (ICISS 2001, 1-2). Both Bosnia and Darfur represent cases in which the international community explicitly recognizes mass atrocities in an area of the world and attempts to take action, but fails to do so effectively.

Between 1992 and 1995, Bosnian Serbs launched a campaign of ethnic cleansing and mass murder of the Muslims in Bosnia, in an effort to consolidate their power in the region. The government issued edicts and decrees against the Bosnian Muslims, forced them to evacuate from their homes, and used various tactics including rape and torture to degrade them. Over 200,000 Muslims were killed, 2,000,000 displaced, and the territory was split into three separate areas by the time the genocide ended (Power 2003, 248-255).

The U.N. Security Council spoke out against those responsible for the atrocities, imposed economic sanctions, offered humanitarian aid, and sent peacekeepers to the area (Power 2003, 281-288). The powerful nations of North America and Europe contributed to humanitarian relief efforts through the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees and attempted diplomatic negotiations, but never with the express purpose of ending the atrocities against the Bosnian Muslims.

Instead, the West's efforts sought to contain the crisis. The humanitarian efforts in Bosnia allowed the international community to appear as though they were doing something to end the suffering but avoid coercive intervention, claiming such intervention would hinder humanitarian efforts (Rieff 1995, 13-15, 138-152).

On June 8, 1992, the U.N. Security Council authorized the expansion of the U.N. Protection Force in Croatia, to include the deployment of forces to Bosnia. The force was authorized to ensure that the U.N. was able to continue to provide humanitarian relief to the area, which was problematic, as it did not address the primary cause of the violence in Bosnia, namely the perpetration of genocide by the Serbs. Although some U.N. resolutions for Bosnia addressed those responsible for the violence and demanded an end to ethnic cleansing, the U.N. Secretariat feared taking sides in the conflict and was thus unwilling to take steps towards ending the perpetration of violence against the Bosnian Muslims. Thus, even after the establishment of a no-fly zone over Bosnia and the declaration of "Safe Areas" in several Bosnian towns, Serbs continued to attack the Bosnian Muslims (Rieff 1995, 120, 162).

Perhaps the clearest evidence of the weakness of the U.N. efforts in Bosnia is the attack on the Safe Area of Srebrenica in 1995. The United States refused to send troops to Bosnia and by 1995 European nations were unwilling to send any additional troops, making the work of the deployed peacekeepers extremely difficult. As a result, even though Srebrenica was under U.N. protection, the 600 peacekeepers were unable to prevent the murder of 7,000 Bosnian Muslims in the Safe Area. It is evident that the U.N. Department of Peacekeeping Operations was poorly equipped, operationally and politically, to address the threats to human security in Bosnia (Power 2003, 391-393, 401-411).

Although the international community has made efforts to engage all parties to the conflict in Darfur and take action against the genocidal regime, the peacekeeping efforts have not succeeded in effectively protecting the victims of the genocide. As the current state of the mission demonstrates, this is due to a lack of resources and capabilities for civilian protection.

In March 2005, U.N. Security Council Resolution 1590 created the United Nations Mission in Sudan UNMIS). The mission was created to ensure the enforcement of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, the peace agreement that helped end the North-South civil war in Sudan (U.N. Security Council 2005). The U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1706 in 2006, expanding UNMIS to include Darfur, to ensure the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement and creating a hybrid U.N.-African Union (UNAMID) peacekeeping force. The resolution authorized a Chapter VII mandate for Darfur, allowing peacekeepers to use "all necessary means" to protect U.N. personnel, facilities, equipment, and civilians who are under the threat of violence (U.N. Security Council Resolution 2006). The Security Council authorized 20,000 military personnel and 6,000 police officers for Darfur. UNAMID took over authority for the operation from the

Critique

Africa Union on December 31, 2007. Despite the strong mandate authorized for Darfur, UNAMID has faced several critical challenges that have weakened its response to the genocide (U.S. Department of State 2008a).

The ground operation in Darfur would fit what David Mephram and Alexander Ramsbotham of the Institute for Public Policy Research describe as a “semi-consensual” mission, under a Chapter VII mandate, which is a mission that has the formal consent of the government of the state in which the intervention is taking place and in which internal conflict or civil war is taking place. In general, there are three obstacles to the effective deployment of “semi-consensual” missions. One is that these types of operations typically lack the ability to protect civilians on the ground. Peacekeepers are prepared to deal with more local, small-scale violence and do not generally have the resources or capacity to deal with more intense levels of conflict. In addition, most of the countries that contribute troops to U.N. peacekeeping operations in Africa are from developing countries and their militaries often do not have the capacity or training to protect civilians in extremely violent situations. These troops lack training in civilian protection, as most military training programs do not identify civilian protection as a priority in their programs. Troops must be trained in activities such as protecting and demilitarizing camps, establishing safe havens, forcibly disbanding and disarming militias, and intervening on behalf of threatened civilians. This is particularly problematic in Darfur, where the Sudanese government has been resistant to admitting non-African peacekeepers and the situation is extremely volatile and in need of expertise from all over the world. The U.N.’s training for peacekeepers on supporting human rights and the rule of law are inadequate if they do not explain how mandates should be interpreted by countries to protect civilians and how to prepare for civilian protection (Mephram and Ramsbotham 2007, 45-48, 50-51).

The U.N. unanimously authorized the UNAMID peacekeeping force, but even as recent as June of 2008, only a few hundred additional troops were deployed, a total of only 1/3 of the originally authorized force deployed. Although the U.N. Secretary General has reported that confidence-building patrols now cover more than 80% of camps in Darfur and patrol times have been extended, some camps still have little or no protection from UNAMID, particularly remote areas that need it the most. The force lacks the resources it needs to patrol all the camps in every area. The patrols are essential, as they make civilians feel secure and allow the UNAMID force to work with community leaders on security concerns (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 2-3).

The force is sorely lacking equipment and logistical support and has suffered from frequent attacks that make civilian protection extremely difficult. As of the summer of 2008, UNAMID was in need of at least eighteen medium transport helicopters and at least four more tactical helicopters, aerial reconnaissance so the force could monitor and verify events on the ground and respond accordingly, and medium and heavy transport trucks to move personnel and materials through the rough landscape. The force would also benefit from additional engineers to build

and expand installations necessary for troop deployment and logistical support units to help ensure the effective deployment and sustainability of infantry battalions. UNAMID must continue to train African battalions and police units must receive additional training in gender sensitivity and sexual violence (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 4-5).

In addition to the logistical problems and lack of resources, the U.N. faces several bureaucratic hurdles that prevent the force from operating effectively. The DPKO must show a great commitment to ensuring the success of the operation in Darfur. DPKO must ensure that they have a contract to be able to support UNAMID with the resources and logistical support it needs to ensure that the battalions can leave their bases. Additionally, DPKO must be flexible with respect to technical specifications for helicopters, as current plans are such that only Russian helicopters are suitable. If non-Russian helicopters are made available, DPKO should revise its plans. Furthermore, DPKO must build camps and barracks for additional troops (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 5-6).

Another critical problem in ensuring the effective deployment of a peacekeeping force in cases of genocide and mass atrocities is obtaining the support of the state responsible for the violence. Although the Sudanese government accepted the peacekeeping force authorized by U.N. Security Council Resolution 1769, it continues to prevent the full deployment of the force in several ways. One obstruction has been the delay in releasing equipment from Port Sudan so it can begin its journey to Darfur. Customs often holds up critical equipment. Furthermore, the government has failed to provide adequate security for equipment traveling to Darfur, leaving the convoys vulnerable to attacks and delaying the arrival of equipment in Darfur. As of June of 2008, the Sudanese government had also failed to approve the African Union and U.N.'s lists of troop contributions, which was submitted in October of 2007. Furthermore, the Sudanese government pressured UNAMID into expelling a British general who was working assertively to implement the full peacekeeping mandate (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 3-4).

In addition, the UNAMID force has suffered from a lack of land on which to build necessary facilities. The government of Sudan must provide UNAMID with the land necessary to expand their bases and build new ones, especially in locations with access to water. Finally, the Government of Sudan signed a Statute of Forces Agreement (S.O.F.A) to allow UNAMID to move freely by land and air, but U.N. reports indicate that they have been prohibiting flights at night. Flight privileges are crucial to ensuring that the small force is able to reach areas of need immediately and monitor violations of the militias. The U.N. must hold the Government of Sudan accountable for violations of S.O.F.A. In order for peacekeeping to be a success in Sudan, the international community must create a cost for the Sudanese government's obstruction of UNAMID (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 3-4).

The broader international community can take several additional steps to

Critique

ensure the fulfillment of the mandate for civilian protection in Darfur. The ENOUGH project report makes several essential recommendations in this regard. The U.N. Security Council should pass another resolution for UNAMID to set specific targets for deployment. The Security Council should also impose sanctions on any individuals who attempt to impede deployment and it should more carefully monitor DPKO to resolve any bureaucratic obstacles to the full deployment of UNAMID. Furthermore, UNAMID should appoint a military attorney to monitor the realization of the S.O.F.A and monitor any violations by the Sudanese government, proxy militias, rebels, and others. Finally, due to the regional nature of the problem, the international community must ensure that the proper enforcement of UNAMID includes a peace process for all of Sudan. The signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005 demonstrates that there is a way in which the international community can reach a peace agreement in Sudan, through strong diplomacy, coordinated leverage, and strong leadership (ENOUGH Project 2008a, 6). Peacekeepers and peace builders must work together, with the former working to secure the environment and the latter working to ensure this security is sustainable (Panel on U.N. Peace Operations 2000).

Ensuring an effective response in Darfur has become increasingly difficult as the conflict has become increasingly complex. U.N. Peacekeeping operations typically adhere to a principle of impartiality, often relying on the consent of local parties, and use force only in self-defense. The U.N. must make a concerted effort to distinguish perpetrators of violence from victims (Panel on U.N. Peace Operations 2000). This is especially problematic in Darfur, where there are multiple parties to the conflict, each with different motives. Unlike the earlier stages of the conflict when the international community believed that the conflict was primarily between the government and the rebel groups, the division between these two sides is no longer clear. The causes of the conflict have also changed since the rebels first launched attacks against the Sudanese government in 2003. Factionalism within the rebel groups also presents a challenge as far as bringing all parties to the table to broker a lasting peace. Furthermore, the conflict has become a regional one, with continuously shifting alliances that span across the borders into neighboring Chad (The Economist 2008). These dynamics make the work of peacekeepers particularly difficult.

The lack of time and resources invested in developing an effective system for peacekeeping operations was problematic in the Bosnian case and continues to be problematic today in Darfur. U.N. peacekeepers are typically trained in monitoring and reinforcing ceasefires, but lack training in civilian protection. The R2P report emphasizes that the primary objective of intervention should be the protection of the population at risk and securing a lasting peace, not defeating a state. Thus, human security must become a central concern of international institutions and states must be willing to invest the time and resources necessary to better equip the international system to respond to genocide (ICISS 2001, 15-16).

Conclusion

Spring 2009

After the Holocaust of World War II, the world vowed never to allow genocide to happen again. Yet genocide has continued into the 21st century and the international community continues to fail to intervene effectively, diplomatically or militarily, to protect innocent civilians. Despite significant grassroots pressure for intervention in Darfur and an emerging legal framework in favor of intervention, the response to the genocide on the part of the international community has remained weak and ineffective. This suggests that the problem is intrinsic to the nature of the international political system.

Peacekeeping operations require financial, operational, and political support from member states to be successful. The struggle to make U.N. peacekeeping operations more effective has caused many of the U.N.'s member states to lose faith in the U.N. peacekeeping system. Without a credible and legitimate system of peacekeeping, it is difficult to gain political support and resources from Member States to fulfill a peacekeeping mandate. Thus, peacekeeping reform is an essential component of ensuring a more effective response to genocide and mass atrocities in the future. Although a lack of resources is also problematic, a lack of political will is the root cause for this lack of resources. Resources will always be limited and it is the responsibility of states in the international community to make them available when necessary. U.N. member states and the member states of regional organizations, like the African Union, must be willing to invest time and resources for the cause of human security.

It is evident that cases of genocide and mass atrocities threaten not only the victims of the violence, but the very stability of the region and at times the entire international system. The problems caused by the genocide in Darfur are not isolated to the Darfur region alone. The Darfur conflict has implications for the entire region in several ways. The Janjaweed militia that has led the campaign against the civilians of Darfur has sought volunteers from several other countries in the region, including Chad, Nigeria, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Senegal, Niger, and Mali, and a reported 20,000 volunteers accepted. Over 2,000,000 refugees have fled to neighboring Chad and tensions have spilled over the borders into both Chad and the Central African Republic (de Waal and Flint 2006, 64, 112-115).

In addition, with respect to the United States' concerns about terrorism, it has become evident that states plagued by poverty, marginalization, and instability are prime candidates for becoming a haven for terrorists. Thus, it is in the national interest of states like the United States to invest time and resources in places like Darfur.

Finally, the very legitimacy of the international system is at stake. If the international community is unable to bring peace to Darfur, how can future generations have faith in the system and its ability to ensure human security? The international community must muster the political will and resources necessary to ensure an end to the conflict in Darfur and the prevention of genocide and mass

Critique
atrocities in the future.

Works Cited

Books

Alvarez, Alex. 2008. "The Prevention and Intervention of Genocide-Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review." Ed. Samuel Totten. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Daly, M.W. 2007. *Darfur's Sorrow: A History of Destruction and Genocide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

de Waal, Alex and Julie Flint. 2006. *Darfur: A Short History of a Long War*. United Kingdom: Zed Books.

Ikenberry, G. John. 2006. *Liberal order and imperial ambition: essays on American power and world politics*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Mills, Nicolaus. 2002. *The New Killing Fields: Massacre and the Politics of Intervention*. Ed. Kira Brunner and Nicolaus Mills. New York: Basic Books.

Power, Samantha. 2002. *The New Killing Fields: Massacre and the Politics of Intervention*. Ed. Kira Brunner and Nicolaus Mills. New York: Basic Books.

Power, Samantha. 2003. *A Problem From Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Basic Books.

Prunier, Gerard. 2005. *Darfur: the Ambiguous Genocide*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rieff, David. 1996. *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Shawcross, William. 1979. *Sideshow: Kissinger, Nixon, and the Destruction of Cambodia*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Government and United Nations documents and publications

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 2007. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide." <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/genocide.htm>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

Panel on United Nations Peace Operations. 2000. "Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations: Executive Summary." http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations. (Accessed August 1, 2008).

United Nations. 1968. United Nations Charter. <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

Critique

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping. 2008. "United Nations Peacekeeping." <http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko>. (Accessed January 1, 2008).

United Nations Department of Public Information (a). 2008. "The Sudan Sanctions Committee." <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1591/index.shtml>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

United Nations Department of Public Information (b). 2008. "Secretary-General Appoints Edward C. Luck of United States Special Adviser." <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2008/sga1120.doc.htm>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

United Nations General Assembly. 2005. "World Summit Outcome."

United Nations Security Council. 2005. "Security Council Establishes UN Mission in Sudan for Initial Period of Six Months, Unanimously Adopting Resolution 1590." <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2005/sc8343.doc.htm>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

United Nations Security Council. 2006. "Security Council Expands Mandate of UN Mission in Sudan to Include Darfur Adopting Resolution 1706 by Vote of 12 in Favour and 3 Abstaining." <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8821.doc.htm>. (Accessed August 1, 2007).

United States Department of State (a). 2008. "U.S. Response to the Situation in Darfur." <http://www.state.gov/p/af/rls/fs/2008/103967.htm>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

United States Department of State (b). 2008. "U.S. Sanctions on Sudan." <http://www.state.gov/p/af/rls/fs/2008/103970.htm>. (Accessed July 15, 2008).

Non-governmental organizations' reports and publications

Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado. 1998. "Collective Security." <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/treatment/collsec.htm>. (Accessed July 10, 2008).

Council on Foreign Relations. 2008. "Crisis Guide: Darfur." <http://www.cfr.org/publication/13129>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

Spring 2009

Fowler, Jerry and John Prendergast. 2008. "Keeping Our Word: Fulfilling the Mandate to Protect Civilians in Darfur." ENOUGH Project (a). http://www.enoughproject.org/reports/sudan_darfur_civilians_June_2008. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

Human Rights Watch. 2006. "Humanitarian Access in the Context of Increasing Fighting and Insecurity." <http://www.hrw.org/backgrounder/africa/sudan0506/4.htm>. (Accessed July 15, 2008).

Human Rights Watch. 2008. "Crisis in Darfur." <http://www.hrw.org/english/docs/2004/05/05/darfur8536.htm>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

International Action Network on Small Arms. 2006. "Sudan: Tougher UN Arms Embargo." <http://www.iansa.org/regions/cafrica/sudan-embargo.htm>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). 2001. "The Responsibility to Protect."

Mepham, David and Alexander Ramsbotham. 2007. "Safeguarding Civilians: Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect in Africa." Institute for Public Policy Research.

Prendergast, John and Lisa Rogoff. 2008. "R2P, The ICC, and Stopping Atrocities in the Real World." ENOUGH Project (b). <http://www.enoughproject.org/publications/r2p-icc-and-stopping-atrocities-real-world>. (Accessed February 28, 2009).

Reeves, Eric. 2008. "Darfur Peace Talks in Libya Produce Only an Emboldened Khartoum." Sudan Reeves. 11 November 2007. <http://www.sudanreeves.org/Article192.html>. (Accessed August 27, 2008).

News Articles

The Economist. 2008. "Peacekeepers into the fray." http://www.economist.com/world/mideast-africa/displaystory.cfm?story_id=10853987. (Accessed July 25, 2008).

Interviews

Arnaud, Marion. 2008. Project Consultant. Responsibility to Protect - Engaging Civil Society Project. Institute for Global Policy.

U.S. Government Official. 2008. U.S. Mission to the United Nations.

Critique

Director of Programs. 2008. Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect-
Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies. CUNY Graduate Center.