

IMPLEMENTING THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT:

New directions for international peace and security?

BRASILIA, 21-22 NOVEMBER 2012

A publication by the Igarapé Institute



CENTRO BRASILEIRO DE RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS
BRAZILIAN CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS



CONFERENCE REPORT

Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: New directions for international peace and security?

Brasilia, 21-22 November 2012

Introduction

The international peace and security architecture is undergoing a profound renovation in the twenty first century. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine, widely considered a powerful new normative contribution, is being re-evaluated from at least two perspectives. From a political perspective, it is being reconsidered in light of the paralysis of the UN Security Council (UNSC) during the Syrian crisis. From an operational perspective, the practice of R2P (particularly the use of force) is the subject of heated debate, inside and outside the corridors of the UNSC.

The stakes are high. Owing to the symbolic and material implications of R2P, the outcomes of these debates will likely (re)define the shape and direction of international interventions pursued under international humanitarian law and the protection of civilians (PoC) over the coming decades. These deliberations may also influence the spectrum of institutions, rules, mechanisms and responses that underpin understandings of and approaches to global collective security more generally.

Brazil is seeking to contribute productively to this debate. In response to the perceived disproportionality of UNSC Resolution 1973 and to allegations of the excessive use of force applied by NATO in Libya, Brazil presented a conceptual note in November 2011 that set out the “Responsibility while Protecting” (RwP). The term had previously been invoked in September of that year by Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff at the opening session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA).

The RwP concept has generated considerable discussion over

a short period of time. At the most general level, RwP consists of an organized proposal of principles, rules and parameters to better regulate the use of force to protect populations against crimes covered by the R2P: war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing and genocide. Since its introduction, a number of vigorous debates have taken place in New York and elsewhere on the Brazilian initiative.

To contribute to this discussion, the Igarapé Institute and the Brazilian Center for International Relations (CEBRI) hosted the event **Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: New Directions for International Peace and Security** from 21-22 November 2012. With support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, approximately 80 policy makers, practitioners, scholars and advocates from around the world gathered in Brasilia to review the conceptual and practical implications of R2P and RwP. It was the first time that these issues were openly debated with such a diverse group in the Brazilian capital.

The two-day event generated critical reflections on the opportunities and challenges presented by R2P and RwP. It was animated by the idea that both concepts introduced new challenges and raised difficult questions on how and when the international community should act to prevent and stop mass atrocities. Indeed, crises in Libya and Syria have exposed clear limitations when it comes to implementing R2P (and RwP). More discussion is needed to identify effective and legitimate alternatives to deal with twenty-first century wars.



PARTICIPANTS		COUNTRIES		AREAS OF EXPERTISE
Total	81	Brazil	57	10 Military: 9 from Brazil
Men	51	Canada	4	4 Police: 2 Military Police, 1 Civilian Police and 1 Federal Police
Women	30	USA	4	
		Norway	3	6 from the Brazilian government : 4 Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1 Institute of Applied Economic Research - IPEA, 1 Superior Court of Justice
		UK	3	
		Argentina	2	14 representatives of Embassies
		India	2	30 scholars and university students: 27 from Brazil
		South Korea	1	
		South Africa	1	14 academics from research centers: 10 from Brazil)
		Germany	1	
		Australia	1	2 practitioners: 1 from Brazil
		Finland	1	1 person from the private sector
		Holland	1	

The seminar was organized around six panels addressing the past, present and future of R2P and RwP, and this report considers the main findings and recommendations raised by panelists and participants in each session.

PANEL 1.

The new report by the UN Secretary-General on R2P

The first panel assessed the main characteristics and implications of the UN Secretary-General (UNSG) Ban Ki-Moon's report *Responsibility to Protect: Timely and Decisive Response*, released in July 2012 (A/66/874-S/2012/578), which focused on the implementation of R2P. Panelists identified a number of features of the UNSG report that deserve greater attention. These include the relevance of prevention in all pillars, the consolidation of a logical sequencing - and not necessarily chronological - among the pillars, and the fact that RWP has been integrated into the UN vocabulary.

First, *there is an intrinsic relationship between prevention and response*, and it is a mistake to treat pillars one and two as exclusively preventive and pillar three as responsive. Second, *the sequencing of the pillars should be logical* and there are no pre-defined steps to follow

when it comes to responding to the four R2P crimes: the use of force, in some cases, may be the most suitable option even if non-coercive measures have yet to be tried.

For Brazil, this was one of the most important issues and the country ended up withdrawing its earlier position which entailed the "political subordination" of the pillars.¹ Finally, the devotion of an entire section of the report to RWP indicates that this idea is gaining in UN circuits. In spite of lingering disagreements over its form and content, the Brazilian proposal was integrated into the UN agenda and has triggered important sets of reflections across the system.

The UNSG report also exposed aspects of RWP that require further development. While recalling principles, procedures and parameters of international law, the report does not prescribe how states and international bodies should act to effectively respect and promote them.

THREE CRITICAL ISSUES EMERGED DURING THE FIRST PANEL IN TERMS OF MOVING FORWARD WITH RWP. PARTICIPANTS STRESSED THE NEED FOR:

1. clear criteria to guide the decision-making process within the UNSC on the use of force;
2. agreed criteria to frame the implementation of UNSC resolutions authorizing the use of force by mandated states or coalitions of the willing; and
3. the development of a coherent monitoring and reviewing mechanism to ensure that UNSC mandates are respected.

In conclusion, the panel drew attention to the question of political will with respect to the implementation of R2P and RWP. As one of the speakers noted: "we cannot discuss these issues in the void; there is a political environment, correlations of forces and interests that shape reality along

with norms and principles." Indeed, both R2P and RWP convey a strong political message and, RWP in particular should also be perceived as a call for strengthened multilateralism, enhanced legality and accountability, and a reformed UN with a more representative UNSC.

¹ A concept note circulated in November 2011 set out Brazil's concerns (A/66/551-S/2011/701). Specifically, Brazilian officials used to interpret "use of force as a last resort" as a necessary call for exhausting all available means before coercive measures were put into practice.

PANEL 2.

Implementation of R2P in the vision of the military

The second panel addressed the military perspective on R2P and RwP, for the first time in Brazil. Panelists raised at least three relevant issues to the debate:

1. **R2P is not synonymous of military action or intervention;**
2. **military activities can prevent and/or bring an end to mass atrocities; and**
3. **military action implies a great deal of subjectivity, being, in many senses, a battle of perceptions.**

First, speakers made clear that equating R2P with military action or intervention creates resistance from several actors, and overlooks the relevance of non-military and non-coercive military actions to prevent or mitigate the four R2P crimes. Military activities entail high costs (political, human and material) and their damaging potential can produce serious consequences for future reconstruction efforts. It should really be the last resort.

Also, panelists observed how military activities, or the threat of military action, can potentially prevent or bring to an end mass atrocities. In other words, the military can play both a preventive and a reactive role along a progressive scale, and in conformity with mandates of civilian authorities. A review of possible interventions include forms of military action related to *direct prevention* (e.g. deployments, show of force, blockades, no-fly zones), *reaction* (e.g. area security, establishing safe areas, defeat perpetrators), *structural prevention* (e.g. security cooperation, joint exercises) and *rebuild* (e.g. enabling humanitarian assistance, supporting DDR², clearing landmines). In the current R2P terminology, these activities are comprised within pillars two and three.

Moreover, it was highlighted that military action, in real life, becomes a type of battle of perceptions, in which power, diverging views and opposing interests create different messages related to single crisis. This has implications

regarding RwP's proposals of oversight of the use of force. Although ambiguity works in diplomacy, it does not necessarily work when it comes to military planning or to the execution of coercive measures. Without clear instructions, there is a risk of confusing war-making with peacekeeping. Vagueness in definitions can also generate strategic contradictions and tactical mistakes.

Lastly, due to the complexities of the discussions, a number of questions were raised during and after the panel, such as how can sensitivity be achieved and how can control mechanisms be implemented if boundaries blur and uncertainty reigns in war-like scenarios? Is micromanagement of military activities feasible or desirable? These and other questions strongly suggest that the debate needs to be continued and deepened.



UN PHOTO/ESKINDER DEBEBE

² DDR stands for "Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration" of former-combatants.

PANEL 3.

Preventive and non-coercive measures: how to advance the debate and increase their impact?

The UN Charter and a variety of international treaties give explicit preference to preventive measures to deal with armed conflict. The third panel explored the ways in which non-coercive measures (Chapter VI of the Charter) and less coercive measures (art. 41, Chapter VII) were taken into consideration in contemporary conflicts.

The main issues raised by the panelists and afterwards discussions were that

1. prevention is in all pillars and there is a path of escalating measures before the effective use of force even in Pillar Three and the military can also contribute with several prevention activities, albeit this has been underestimated; and
2. there is a significant gap between rhetoric and action when it comes to prevention.

R2P is primarily a prevention document. It is a responsibility to protect and not a right to intervene. In this sense, it should be explored in all pillars, despite some understanding that is it not so evident in Pillar Three. In this sense, to preserve the spirit of prevention, there is a path of escalating measures that should be considered by the inter-

national community before deciding on the de facto use of force (see Table 1).

In terms of the actors, it was highlighted that, although many prevention activities are not undertaken by the military (highlighted in grey), they can provide a crucial role to their fulfillment (lighter grey).

TABLE 1. INTENSITY OF MEASURES UNDER R2P’S THIRD PILLAR



NON-COERCIVE Ch. VI and VIII	LESS COERCIVE Ch. VII (Art. 41)	COERCIVE / ROBUST Ch. VII (Art. 42)
Good offices Special Representatives Mediation Fact-finding missions Preventive troops Military observers Advisors to the field	Embargos Sanctions Freezing assets Ceasing diplomatic relations	No-fly zones Air strikes and raids Offensives by troops on the ground Establishment of safe zones



Furthermore, there is considerable rhetoric associated with prevention, but less evidence of systematic action. This is in fact one of the main challenges of R2P and Rwp. There is an assumption in R2P debates that prevention is easy and straight-forward, but there are several political implications when it comes to its implementation; monitoring and surveillance systems that are required for effective prevention often raise concerns about sovereignty and are considered intrusive by some actors. The lack of visible outcomes also leads to less funding,

thus complicating the prospects of adopting a robust and forward vision of prevention.

More specifically, within the R2P discussion, participants were reminded that it is critical to separate R2P preventive activities from the wider conflict prevention agenda. The urgency imposed by mass atrocities require the identification of preventive tools under R2P that are not always aligned with the political and economic agendas of wider preventive efforts.

PANEL 4.

Use of force on behalf of the international community: principles and limitations

The effective use of force on behalf of the international community entails a series of complex decisions related to the intensity of the force to be applied and the doctrine and training of troops to protect populations. While addressing these issues, panelists raised additional critical issues such as

1. the limits of the use of force in military operations under an R2P mandate (R2P operations); and
2. the parallels between R2P operations and other types of dealing with international peace and security.

When it comes to the limits of the use of force, it has been argued that military operations under R2P need to conform to the spirit and letter of the mandate issued by the UNSC. Decision-makers, when authorizing these military activities, should be aware that accepting certain risks in the short-term can lead to improvements in the longer-term. Some panelists believed the ‘do no harm’ approach should guide these military operations. Others, however, argued that the ‘do no harm’ is essentially risk-averse and, in this sense, is very different from the use of force, which accepts temporary setbacks.

Panelists also noted the similarities and differences between the use of force in R2P operations and other military operations to maintain or restore international peace and security, such as peacekeeping and peace

enforcement operations, as well as military activities related to the protection of civilians (PoC).

Peace enforcement operations can provide important lessons to the use of force under Pillar Three of R2P, as they do require state consent. The routine application of the expression “all necessary means” in UNSC Resolutions may also cause alarm concerning R2P operations. This is because it gives space for applying force in excess of the mandate and has implications for the field, notably when it comes to translating diplomatic arrangements in New York into rules of engagement. Peacekeeping operations, for their part, seem to be more useful as a tool in Pillar Two since they have more restrictive mandates in terms of using the force. As such, they are not fitted for guiding the management of large-scale military operations to protect populations.

Panelists also argued that PoC can be useful to R2P operations, especially when it comes to the question of the right amount of force to be applied in conflicts where sovereignty is for all intents and purposes intact. PoC guidelines can help the military to define whether and how to act in these kinds of settings where the enemy is essentially blended with the population.



PANEL 5.

Responsibility while Protecting - reception at the centers of power and discussions about implementation by international organizations

The fifth panel was devoted to assessing the reception of R2P and RwP in capitals, with particular attention to the Global South. It also considered reception to R2P and RwP among the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and IBSA (India, Brazil and South Africa), and in international organizations such as the African Union, European Union, NATO, and the United Nations. At least two key ideas were highlighted by the speakers:

1. **the world is largely dominated by Western world visions but the current dynamics of global power is rapidly changing, with the emergence of new actors who wants to influence the norm making process; and**
2. **when it comes to RwP, more specifically, the reception in world capitals has produced mixed results, even in the Global South.**

First of all, it was noted that the world remains dominated by Western values, principles and concepts: in this context, there are just a few norm makers and a majority of norm takers. Ideas from the Global South have been missing from the debates on international security, but this is changing rapidly, together with the transformation of power dynamics. Emerging countries, especially the BRICS, are increasingly influencing the international agenda-setting process. It is a new process for many of these actors. Moreover, in addition to a lack of resources to create, defend, promote and consolidate their ideas, these countries also face strong resistance from traditional powers. It seems that certain traditional powers view new players, when challenging the status quo, as acting irresponsibly or even subversively.

The reception of RwP has been mixed. Most Western countries initially rejected the concept since they viewed the Brazilian initiative as an impediment to implementing R2P operations. They have also expressed concern about the fact that Brazil does not exhibit the capacity to promote the RwP idea effectively. In fact, Brazil had no clear strategy on how to promote the concept after its launch. It is also true that several developing countries have welcomed the concept especially because it preserves the sovereignty principle and tends to limit arbitrary actions. In order to

UN PHOTO/ALBERT GONZALEZ FARRAN



advance the debate, panelists highlighted the importance of the factors shaping critical debates on R2P and RwP around the world.

One panelist introduced a map of official statements of a sample of UN member states when it comes to their positions on R2P. Different sub-groups were identified, such as the “cautious supporters” and the “rejectionists”, and the arguments underlying in their positions include selectivity/misuse, aversion to the use of force, and UNSC illegitimacy, to mention just a few. In the end, panelists considered how the RwP proposal could be useful in addressing dissent from R2P and open up new avenues to bridge the widespread skepticism towards R2P in some quarters.

PANEL 6.

R2P in 2022

In this closing panel, speakers were invited to reflect on the trends that could shape the global conflict prevention scenario in the coming decade, including in relation to R2P and RwP. Panelists suggested that the world will likely be experiencing ever greater interdependence and multilateralism, and a stronger commitment to normative prescriptions regulating behavior. Speakers also introduced recommendations to extend the influence and impact of R2P and RwP, such as strengthening the focal points initiative, establishing certain criteria for the use of force on behalf of the international community, and reforming the UNSC.

In ten years, global governance should be highly influenced by a greater level of interdependence, whose structure will be improved through enhanced representativeness and political processes that are more inclusive and constructive.

One speaker even argued that this might be the transformation of the international system into a genuinely cosmopolitan international society. Since the end of World War II, the international community has evolved morally. At that time, civilians were systematically killed by today's supporters of R2P, so there are some grounds cautious optimism.

Moreover, normative prescriptions and proscriptions, as well as improved institutions, will play a key role in accelerating these changes. There is a need to create the political conditions to consolidate frameworks that are more robust and legitimate when dealing with human rights, and R2P should be included in this discussion.

The panel closed with three practical recommendations to expand the influence and outreach of R2P and RwP:

- **Strengthen R2P Focal Points** - this implies building institutional capacity within governments to prevent mass atrocities. At least 23 countries - such as Argentina, Botswana, Germany, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria, the United Kingdom and the United States - have already appointed senior representatives to serve as focal points. Brazil has not;
- **Establish sensible criteria regarding the use of force in R2P operations** - pre-established criteria or parameters (focused on measuring the seriousness of threat, purpose, last resort, proportionality, and others) can be useful to prevent unnecessary and illegitimate use of force;
- **Reform the working methods and the structure of the UNSC** - there are a number of candidates to take permanent seats at the UNSC, such as the IBSA countries, Indonesia, Nigeria and Turkey, in order to overcome the democratic deficit that permeates the body's structure. This process is inevitable and necessary.



Closing remarks

The event generated productive, provocative and substantial discussions on the past, present and future of R2P and RwP. It was a critical opportunity to clarify political positions and to explore current silences. In government positions, but also in academic and practitioner circles. Not surprisingly, there were points of convergence but also of divergence, with the seminar raising still more questions than answers. If nothing else, this unprecedented seminar in Brazil underlined the need for more debate on concepts that have the potential to change the world.

The conference highlighted the consensus on the underlying principles of R2P even if there are several differences of perspective when it comes to its implementation. These differences were aggravated after the recent interventions in Libya and Cote d'Ivoire. Indeed, in some ways, R2P and RwP seem even more controversial today than before, since they are linked not just to the "usual politics", as mentioned in the last panel, but to high politics, to processes of global governance and structural reforms - including the UNSC.

It is also worth repeating again the importance of Brazil's introduction of RwP: this represents a significant step for a non-permanent member of the UNSC to set the international peace and security agenda. But there are still a great many challenges - and some pessimism - related to the future of the RwP initiative, from both the West and South. There are some who are concerned that Brazil launched a process but is not able - or is unwilling - to follow-up. So how to strengthen the legitimacy and credibility of R2P and RwP and what is the particular role of Brazil? At a minimum, participants agreed about the importance of:

1. Better controlling the narrative on RwP, making sure it is compatible with R2P and, above all, continuing engaging with the concept;
2. Recognizing that while RwP is an important public good, it still needs backing (from the IBSA countries, for example) and this means constructively addressing changes from both proponents and dissenters;
3. Overcoming the gap between discourse and practice in relation to prevention. Prevention needs investment, not only funding but also in terms of political support;
4. Moving from anecdotal reporting to authoritative and credible mechanisms to analyze situations on the ground using solid empirical data and analytics. There are major gaps in knowledge about mass atrocities - both in terms of the impacts and the motivations of the actors. More research is needed, with more robust and rigorous methods - to determine what constitutes "systemic" and "organized" forms of violence;
5. Finally, South-South linkages need to be not only advocated but also practically strengthened. There is a need to move beyond spreading good practices to more proactive engagement from Brazil, India, South Africa, and also other R2P dissenters. Targeted lobbying, partnerships, norm development and more proactive engagement have funding and resource implications, but also have the capacity to effectively contribute to positive change.

Panelists



Captain (Brazilian Navy) Carlos Chagas Vianna Braga is a Marine Corps officer with considerable field experience, including a tour in Haiti, as Assistant to the UN Force Commander, and the coordination of the Brazilian Marines operation in support of state security forces for the retake of Vila Cruzeiro and Morro do Alemão slums in Rio. He holds a Master Degree in Military Studies from the United States Marine Corps University and is currently a PhD candidate at the Institute of International Relations, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro. He has published on defense, strategy and peacekeeping.



Conor Foley has worked for a variety of organizations including UN DPKO, UNHCR, UN-Habitat and Amnesty International, in over twenty conflict and post-conflict zones. He is a Research Fellow at the Human Rights Law Centre, University of Nottingham and a Visiting Fellow at the University of Essex. He writes an occasional column in the Guardian. His latest book *Another system is possible: reforming Brazilian justice* was published by the International Bar Association and the Brazilian Ministry of Justice. Previous books include: *The Thin Blue Line: how humanitarianism went to war* (2010). *A Guide to Property Law in Afghanistan* (2005), *Combating Torture: a manual for judges and prosecutors* (2003) and *Human Rights, Human Wrongs: an alternative report to the UN Human Rights Committee* (1995).



Col (Ret) Dwight Raymond is with the Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute at the U.S. Army War College. He is one of the primary authors of the *Mass Atrocity Response Operations (MARO) Military Planning Handbook*, the *Mass Atrocity Prevention and Response Options (MAPRO) Policy Planning Handbook*, and the forthcoming *Protection of Civilians Military Reference Guide*.



Eduarda Hamann is a lawyer, and holds an MA and a PhD in international affairs. Her main areas of interest are peacekeeping/peacebuilding, Brazilian foreign policy, South-South Cooperation and international organizations. She is the coordinator of the International Cooperation Program of the Igarapé Institute, and has been a consultant to a variety of institutions, international and Brazilian. Recent publications are on civilian expertise in post-conflict contexts, Brazilian engagement in UN missions, “responsibility to protect” and “while protecting”, and the Brazilian presence in Africa.



Ilona Szabó de Carvalho is Instituto Igarapé's Executive Director and Program Coordinator for Drug Policy. She's an international and public security specialist, serves as the co-coordinator of the Global Commission on Drug Policy Secretariat and formerly on the secretariat of the Latin American Commission on Drugs and Democracy. Between 2008 and 2011 Ilona acted as the civil society liaison with the Quakers UN Office (Geneva) to the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development.



Leonardo Paz is a Political Scientist and Coordinator for Studies and Debates of the Brazilian Center for International Relations (CEBRI). He works as professor at the Department of International Relations of the Instituto Brasileiro de Mercado de Capitais (IBMEC). In addition, he worked together with the coordination of the civil affairs section of the Brazilian Peacekeeping Operations Joint Center (CCOPAB) and is former Executive Coordinator of the Group of Analysis on International Conflicts Prevention (GAPCon/UCAM). Professor Paz has experience in Political Science and International Relations, focusing on international conflicts, failed states/rogue states, security policies, peace operations, non-proliferation, democracy, South American energy integration, security policy in South America. Leonardo is PhD Candidate at the Institute of Economics of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ).



Dr Malte Brosig is a senior lecturer in International Relations at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, and holds a PhD from Portsmouth University. Brosig is co-chair of the working group on human rights at the German Political Science Association. He has published widely on the organizational overlap between international organizations in peacekeeping and norm promotion in Europe and Africa. Brosig is an editorial board member of the Journal on International Organization Studies and has recently edited a volume of R2P and Middle Powers.



Paula Wojcikiewicz Almeida holds a doctorate in International and European Law from the University of Paris I - Panthéon-Sorbonne and from the Univ. of the State of Rio de Janeiro. She is an Associate Researcher at the Institute of International and European Law at the Sorbonne (IREDIES), and Professor and Researcher in Public International Law and European Law at the Getúlio Vargas Foundation in Rio de Janeiro, where among others she coordinates the European Module of the Jean Monnet Program, funded by the European Commission.



Robert Muggah is the research director of the Igarapé Institute. A specialist in security and development studies, he is a professor at International Relations Institute (Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro), a visiting fellow at the University of Oxford, and a research affiliate of the Center for Conflict, Development and Peace at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, in Switzerland. Dr. Muggah is also a Principal of the SecDev Group and serves on a number of OECD, UN and World Bank advisory panels. Dr. Muggah received his PhD at the University of Oxford and his MPhil at IDS, University of Sussex.



Simon Adams is the Executive director of the Global Center for the Responsibility to Protect, he has previously worked with NGOs, governments and community organizations in South Africa, East Timor, Northern Ireland, Rwanda, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and elsewhere. He is a former anti-apartheid activist and member of the African National Congress. Dr. Adams is the author of four books and numerous academic articles with a focus on international conflict. He has also written for the Los Angeles Times, Chicago Tribune, Kuwait Times, The Australian, Huffington Post, New York Times and many other publications.



Min. Glivânia Maria de Oliveira heads the Department of International Organizations in the Brazilian Ministry of External Relations. She holds a Masters degree in Political Theory from the London School of Economics (LSE) and has worked in several Brazilian embassies and divisions of the Ministry. Her areas of focus have included arms control and disarmament, sensitive technologies, and international organizations.



Min. Norberto Moretti has been the Head of the International Peace and Security Division at the Brazilian Ministry of External Relations and member of the Advisory Group of the Peacebuilding Fund since March 2011. He holds degrees in Philosophy, History and Diplomacy and has held several positions at the Brazilian Ministry of External Relations, including postings in Washington, Buenos Aires, Ottawa and New York (where he served as Minister-Counselor for Political and Peacebuilding Affairs).



Luiz Augusto Castro Neves is the Chairman of the Board of Trustees at the Brazilian Center for International Relations (CEBRI). He graduated in Economics from Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ) and holds a Master degree in Economics from the University College of University of London. Formed by the Rio Branco Institute since 1968 with his thesis “The Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy - Policy Instrument Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”. Mr. Castro Neves is a career diplomat since 1968, he served in Embassies in Buenos Aires, London, Ottawa and at the Organization of American States (OAS) in Washington D.C. He was Ambassador of Brazil in Paraguay (2000-2004), China (2004-2008) and Japan (2008-2010).



Per M. Norheim-Martinsen is a senior researcher at the Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies, where he currently heads the research program on Conflict and Belonging. He has a PhD from Cambridge University and is a former officer of the Norwegian Army, having served in UNIFIL/Lebanon. Norheim-Martinsen has published extensively on issues of European security and international peace operations. His most recent publication is the “The European Union and Military Force” (Cambridge University Press, 2013, out now). His current research interests include Brazilian engagement in UN peace operations.



Patrick Quinton-Brown is Co-Chairperson of the Canadian Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. Patrick is a recipient of both the University of Toronto National Scholarship and the National TD Canada Trust Scholarship for Community Leadership, one of the most prestigious scholarships of its kind in Canada. He is a student in the International Relations Specialist program at Trinity College in the University of Toronto.



Ambassador Aud Marit Wiig works for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1983. Having served in several Norwegian Embassies in Europe and Africa, she has also served as an Ambassador in Pakistan and has been working with issues related to economic development as the Nordic Executive Director of the African Development Bank (equivalent to the Inter-American Development Bank). In the last four years, she has worked as the head of the regional department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is responsible for issues related to Latin America, among others.

Agenda

NOVEMBER 21

1:45-2:00pm **Welcome coffee**

2:00-2:15pm **Opening session**

Ilona Szabó de Carvalho,
Director, Igarapé Institute

Luiz Augusto de Castro
Neves, President, CEBRI



KENIA RIBEIRO

2:15-3:45pm **Panel 1**

The new report by the United Nations Secretary-General on R2P

Min. Glivânia Oliveira, Head of the Department of International Organizations, Brazilian Ministry of External Relations

Paula Wojcikiewicz Almeida, Law School, Fundação Getúlio Vargas - RJ

Simon Adams, Global Centre for R2P

Moderator: Leonardo Paz Neves (CEBRI)

3:45-4:00pm **Coffee break**

4:00-5:30pm **Panel 2**

Implementation of R2P in the vision of the military

Col (Ret) A. Dwight Raymond, US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute

Lieut. Col. Godoy, Land Operations Command (COTER), Peace Missions Division, Brazilian Army

Capt. (Brazilian Navy) Carlos Chagas V. Braga, Escola Superior de Guerra and PUC-Rio

Moderator: Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Igarapé Institute

5:30-6:00pm **Closing session**

Robert Muggah, Research Director, Igarapé Institute

6:00-7:00pm **Cocktail**

NOVEMBER 22

8:30-9:30am **Welcome coffee**9:30-10:00am **Opening session**

Ilona Szabó de Carvalho,
Director, Instituto Igarapé

Luiz Augusto de Castro
Neves, President, CEBRI



KENIA RIBEIRO

10:00-11:30am **Panel 1**

Preventive and non-coercive measures: how to advance the debate and increase their impact?

The UN Charter and a variety of international treaties give explicit preference to preventive measures to deal with armed conflict. Have non-coercive measures (Chapter VI of the UN Charter) and less coercive measures (art. 41, Chapter VII) been taken into consideration in contemporary conflicts? What can be improved? What are the difficulties? How can these be overcome?

Jennifer Welsh, Oxford Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict

Conor Foley, Research Fellow University of Essex

Moderator: Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Igarapé Institute

11:30-11:45am **Coffee break**11:45-1:15pm **Panel 2**

Use of force on behalf of the international community: principles and limitations

How should we deal with the different ways to use force on behalf of the international community? What is the effective level of force to apply, in general, in robust peacekeeping missions? And in peace enforcement missions? In this case, how is it during R2P operations, including with regards to doctrine and training of troops to protect populations? Is it possible to learn something with “protection of civilians” (PoC) or peacekeeping, or there are no intersections?

Maxwell Kelly, Research Fellow, Center for Complex Operations, National Defense University

Capt. (Brazilian Navy) Carlos Chagas V. Braga, Escola Superior de Guerra and PUC-Rio

Lieut. Col. Godoy, Land Operations Command (COTER), Peace Missions Division, Brazilian Army
Per Martin Norheim-Martinsen, Research Director, Conflict and Belonging, FAFO Institute for Applied International Studies

Moderation: Robert Muggah, Igarapé Institute

1:15-2:30pm **Lunch**

2:30-4:00pm **Panel 3**

Responsibility while Protecting – reception at the centers of power and discussions about implementation by international organizations

How has the reception been (acceptance/rejection) of the RWP in the principal capitals? And in arrangements such as BRICS and IBSA? And in international security frameworks or institutions, like the UN, NATO, the European Union, African Union and the Organization of the American States?

Oliver Stuenkel, Fundação Getúlio Vargas

Malte Brosig, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

Patrick Quinton-Brown, Canadian Centre for the R2P

Moderation: Leonardo Paz Neves, CEBRI

4:00-4:15pm **Coffee break**

4:15-5:45pm **Panel 4**

R2P in 2022

In ten years, where will the debate be about the use of force to protect populations? There will probably be few cases until then, as has occurred so far. But how will the rules and principles that regulate the use of force for specific cases of R2P be? Will the Security Council have been reformed, even if it is only in regards to its procedures?

Min Norberto Moretti, Head of the International Peace and Security Division, Brazilian Ministry of External Relations

Simon Adams, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect

Antonio Jorge Ramalho, Instituto Pandiá Calógeras, Brazilian Ministry of Defense

Moderation: Eduarda Passarelli Hamann, Igarape Institute

5:45-6:30pm **Closing remarks**

Mrs. Aud Marit Wiig, Ambassador of Norway in Brasilia

Robert Muggah, Research Director, Igarapé Institute

List of participants

	TITLE	NAME	AFFILIATION	COUNTRY
1	Col (Ret.)	A. Dwight Raymond	US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute	USA
2		Amit Shukla	Indian Embassy in Brasilia	India
3		Antonio Jorge Ramalho	Brazilian Ministry of Defense	Brazil
4	Col (Ret.)	Átila Torres Jr	Brazilian Army	Brazil
5		Camille Ruest	Canadian Embassy in Brasilia	Canada
6	Lieut Col	Carlos Augusto Godoy Jr.	Brazilian Army	Brazil
7	Capt (Navy)	Carlos Chagas V. Braga	Brazilian Navy	Brazil
8		Conor Foley	University of Essex	United Kingdom
9	Col	Dinesh Kumar Singh	Indian Embassy in Brasilia	India
10		Eduarda Passarelli Hamann	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
11	Min.	Glivânia de Oliveira	Brazilian Ministry of External Relations	Brazil
12		Gustavo Diniz	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
13		Ilona Szabó de Carvalho	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
14	Couns.	João Marcos Paes Leme	Brazilian Ministry of External Relations	Brazil
15	Capt	Jório Correa de Cunha Filho	Brazilian Army	Brazil
16		Kim Schaap	Dutch Embassy in Brasilia	Netherlands
17	Lieut Col	Kleber do Amaral Ferreira	Brazilian Army	Brazil
18		Leonardo Paz Neves	CEBRI	Brazil
19	Amb.	Luiz Augusto de Castro Neves	CEBRI	Brazil
20		Malte Brosig	University of Witwatersrand (ZA)	South Africa
21	Sec.	Maria Clara de Paula	Brazilian Ministry of External Relations	Brazil
22		Marina Motta	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
23		Maxwell Kelly	National Defense University	USA
24		Michael Ellis	British Embassy in Brasilia	United Kingdom
25		Monica Rafael	NOREF	Norway
26		Oliver Stuenkel	FGV - Fundação Getúlio Vargas	Brazil
27		Patrick Quinton-Brown	Canadian Center for R2P	Canada

28		Paula Almeida	FGV - Fundação Getúlio Vargas	Brazil
29		Per Martin Norheim-Martinsen	FAFO	Norway
30		Robert Muggah	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
31		Simon Adams	Global Centre for R2P	
32		Sissel Hodne Steen	Norwegian Embassy in Brasilia	Brazil
33		Thiago Costa	CEBRI	Brazil
34		Victor MacDiarmid	Canadian Center for R2P	
1		Aletheia de Almeida Machado	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
2	Col (Ret)	A. Dwight Raymond	US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute	USA
3	Col	Alan Sampaio Santos	Brazilian Army	Brazil
4		Alexandre Michiles da Silva	University of Brasilia	Brazil
5		Amit Shukla	Indian Embassy in Brasilia	India
6	Col	André Luis Novaes Miranda	Brazilian Army	Brazil
7		Andréa Fernanda Rodrigues Britto	University of Brasilia	Brazil
8	Col (Ret)	Átila Gonçalves Torres	Brazilian Army	Brazil
9	Amb.	Aud Marit Wiig	Norwegian Embassy in Brasilia	Norway
10		Barbara Mendes Muanda	University of Brasilia	Brazil
11		Caio Cesar Paccola Jacon	University of Brasilia	Brazil
12		Camille Ruest	Canadian Embassy in Brasilia	Canada
13	Capt (Navy)	Carlos Chagas V. Braga	Brazilian Navy	Brazil
14		Carlos Frederico Freitas de Abreu	Brazilian Navy	Brazil
15		Celia Regina Barbalho	UNIP – University	Brazil
16		Celso Mattheus Catntanhede Silva	University of Brasilia	Brazil
17		Charles Pintat	University of Amazonia	Brazil
18		Christopher Jester	US Embassy in Brasilia	USA
19		Conor Foley	University of Essex	United Kingdom
20		Eduarda Passarelli Hamann	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
21		Fabian Oddone	Argentinian Embassy in Brasilia	Argentina
22		Fabiane Cristine Almeida Freiras	University of Brasilia	Brazil
23		Fabricio Lima Galvao	South Korean Embassy in Brasilia	South Korea

24		Fatima Berardinelli	CEBRI	Brazil
25		Gabriel Pablo Valladares	International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	Global
26		Gabriela Cilda C. Cruz	-	Brazil
27		Gabriela de Campos Fontenelle	US Embassy in Brasilia	USA
28	Lieut Col	Godoy	Brazilian Army	Brazil
29		Gustavo Diniz	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
30		Henrique Barbosa	University of Brasilia	Brazil
31		Hyun Cheol Jang	South Korean Embassy in Brasilia	South Korea
32		Igor Moreno Pessoa	Geneva School of Diplomacy	Brazil
33		Iлона Szabó de Carvalho	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
34		Israella Schultz Barbalho	UNIP – University	Brazil
35		Jaime Flammarion Santos Costa	Brazilian Army	Brazil
36		Juan Bourito	Argentinian Embassy in Brasilia	Argentina
37		Katja Karppinen-Njock	Finnish Embassy in Brasilia	Finland
38	Lieut Col	Kleber do Amaral	Brazilian Army	Brazil
39		Leonardo Paz Neves	CEBRI	Brazil
40		Luciana Peres	University of Brasilia	Brazil
41		Luisa Malagoni	University of Brasilia	Brazil
42	Amb.	Luiz Augusto de Castro Neves	CEBRI	Brazil
43		Luiz Gustavo Aversa Franco	University of Brasilia	Brazil
44		Malte Brosig	University of Witwatersrand	South Africa
45	Sec.	Maria Clara de Paula	Brazilian Ministry of External Relations	Brazil
46		Maria Isabela Rodrigues Plá	University of Brasilia	Brazil
47		Marina Motta	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
48		Maxwell Kelly	National Defense University	USA
49		Michael Ellis	UK Embassy in Brasilia / DfID	United Kingdom
50	Min.	Norberto Moretti	Ministry of External Relations	Brazil
51		Oliver Stuenkel	FGV	Brazil
52		Patrick Quinton-Brown	Canadian Centre for the R2P	Canada

53	Paulo Laurentino Barbalho	Superior Court of Justice (STJ)	Brazil
54	Paulo Yoshimoto	University of Brasilia	Brazil
55	Pedro Henrique de Souza Netto	University of Brasilia	Brazil
56	Per Martin Norheim-Martinsen	FAFO	Norway
57	Rafael Carvalho	University of Brasilia	Brazil
58	Raissa Pereira	University of Brasilia	Brazil
59	Renata Cavalcanti Muniz	Geneva School of Diplomacy	Brazil
60	Robert Muggah	Igarapé Institute	Brazil
61	Rodrigo Constantino Gaspar de Oliveira	Military Police of the Federal District (PMDF)	Brazil
62	Rodrigo Fracalossi de Moraes	Brazilian Presidency / IPEA	Brazil
63	Saul Mendes de Arruda	Civilian Police of the Federal District (PCDF)	Brazil
64	Capt Sergio Carrera	Military Police of the Federal District (PMDF)	Brazil
65	Simon Adams	Global Center for R2P	Global
66	Sissel Hodne Steen	Norwegian Embassy in Brasilia	Norway
67	Stephen Lewis Champlin Junior	Federal University of Rio de Janeiro	Brazil
68	Tamara Gregol de Farias	University of Brasilia	Brazil
69	Tayna Morais	University of Brasilia	Brazil
70	Thiago Costa	CEBRI	Brazil
71	Victor MacDiarmid	Canadian Center for R2P	Canada
72	Vivian Krause	University of São Paulo	Brazil
73	Yashaku Kimugawa Junior	Federal Police	Brazil
74	Yasminn de Carvalho Filiú Braga	University Estácio de Sá	Brazil

Editors

Eduarda Passarelli Hamann

Robert Muggah

Design

Kenia Ribeiro

Cover photo

UN Photo/Albert Gonzalez Farran

Brasilia, Brazil - March 2013



The event, this report and the follow-up publication on R2P, in both English and Portuguese, would not have been possible without the generous support of the Norwegian government - in particular, the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Brasilia, represented by Ambassador Aud Marit Wiig, together with Minister Councillor Sissel Hodne Steen and their staff.

Our special thanks also go to the Brazilian Center for International Relations (CEBRI) for co-organizing the event in Brasilia.

Igarapé Institute

Visconde de Caravelas 111
Botafogo Rio de Janeiro/RJ
Brazil 22271-030

www.igarape.org.br



CENTRO BRASILEIRO DE RELAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS
BRAZILIAN CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS