



Asia-Pacific Centre for the
Responsibility to Protect

**Implementing the Responsibility to Protect at the United
Nations**

**Presentation by
Edward Luck
Special Adviser to the United Nations Secretary-General**

3 August 2009

University of Queensland

The Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, in partnership with the University of Queensland in Brisbane, was privileged to have Professor Edward Luck present the inaugural seminar on “The Future of the Responsibility to Protect” in the Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect 2009 Seminar Series. Professor Luck is currently a Special Adviser to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, as well as Senior Vice President and Director of Studies at the International Peace Institute and Professor of Practice at the School of International and Public Affairs of Columbia University. He is also a Patron for the Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. The following is an approved transcript of the lecture and the question and answer session that followed it.

In his presentation, Professor Luck began by arguing that the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is not entirely new, as there is not necessarily any incompatibility between

sovereignty and the responsibility to protect populations living within a state. He stated that protecting citizens was one of the fundamental purposes of sovereignty and that this protection should be a natural inclination for states. R2P has been created in order for the UN to help assist states in that responsibility. Luck claimed that R2P has built upon previous concepts. Furthermore, he argued that R2P is not imposed on states from one region of the world upon another, nor is it a western or northern concept. He stated it is preferable to resolve conflicts locally and move towards regional and global from there, as needed, as opposed to adopting a top-down approach from the global level.

Luck claimed that the roots of R2P lie primarily in Africa, which as a region has suffered more than others from the crimes that R2P refers to. In addition, African institutions have led the way in addressing these issues. While the Organisation of African Unity began with non-interference, the African Union has stressed non-indifference. Article 4h in the African Union charter is very much like R2P- there is a collective responsibility to respond to three grave circumstances (R2P added ethnic cleansing). Within both the African Union and the UN, non-interference still exists, but this refers to individual states, not collective groups. Indeed, there is nothing within the UN Charter that prohibits collective action by the member states; indeed the founding of the UN was to provide a legal basis for collective defense. According to Professor Luck, by and large states, particularly in Africa but in other regions as well, that have had experience with one of the four crimes have been in support of R2P.

Luck argued that, while R2P has roots in international law, the way it has been packaged is different from previous efforts. While international instruments and obligations exist, a system and strategy were needed to ensure protection. The mandate

to create these has come from the agreement of all of the heads of state and government at the 2005 World Summit in paragraphs 138, 139 and 140. R2P was not agreed to as another word for humanitarian intervention, where one state militarily involves itself in another, but has been agreed to in terms of a broader concept. All of these states agreed to protect their populations from the four crimes and to prevent the crimes and their incitement. Luck stressed that this is important, as incitement can often be heard or seen when mass violence is being organised. He further claimed that these problems have not occurred in just one part of the world or one type of state. Despite the argument that some state representatives have made, that excepting Africa, R2P does not apply, all regions have been affected at one point or another. Luck asserted that, as this is a global phenomenon, global standards are needed to address it.

Luck argued that governments placed conditions upon R2P in their agreement to it. These include multilateral action through the UN in responding to R2P situations, and adherence to the three pillars. The first pillar is state responsibility to populations, which refers not just to citizens but refugees, immigrants and others. The second pillar is assistance, in which the international community is called upon to assist states in their obligations. Although this concept needs further exploration, it seems as though some practices and policies do help and others don't, for example legislation or economic policies that favour one group over another. Furthermore, some claim that the best predictor of future genocide is past genocide in cycles of violence. Although ending these cycles can't all be done from the outside, the international community can help, particularly at the regional level. Luck claimed that certain African initiatives have been

an example of this, such as the emerging African convention on internally displaced people, on which there is currently no international law.

Luck continued to argue that it is not always the government that is committing violence, as it is often rebel groups or non-governmental organizations carrying out atrocities. He gives the example of the assistance to the government of Sierra Leone with the Revolutionary United Front. Another example is the conflict in Burundi, which Luck states was a situation in which international assistance helped to prevent further bloodshed. In such situations, governments need and may consent to military assistance from the international community, but this assistance falls under the second pillar. Luck argued that preventative deployment is another policy option under pillar two, for example in Macedonia, in which the government recognized that its neighbours were becoming violent, and the government chose to prevent this from happening by requesting a peacekeeping force, which gave stability to the country.

Luck describes the third pillar as response. As agreed to by the heads of state at the 2005 World Summit, if national authorities are manifestly failing to protect the population, then there is a collective obligation to respond through the UN Security Council or General Assembly. This does not necessarily mean a military response, as Chapter Six, Chapter Seven and Chapter Eight of the UN Charter provide a range of options. The most effective measures address incitement. For example, in Cote d'Ivoire, the UN through Juan Mendez engaged in diplomacy with the government to get them to stop inciting violence. It was explained that they would be held accountable if genocide occurred, as the international community no longer accepts this type of behaviour and

there are mechanisms in place to prevent it. Luck stated that in Cote d'Ivoire, the violence stopped.

Luck claimed that prevention is the most important part of R2P, as it is no longer morally acceptable to limit one's options to responding only after mass violence has occurred. Furthermore, it is not good public policy, as it is desirable to have as many options open as possible. He pointed out that the Secretary-General prefers "an early and flexible response tailored to the circumstances of each case". There is no one way of responding, as each case is different, thus the response that follows will be different. Luck discussed the situation in Kenya last year after a disputed election, in which 800 to 1200 people were murdered, and there was a recognised need to intervene diplomatically and politically. The AU became involved first with Kofi Annan engaged in mediation, and Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon talked to leaders and opposition leaders and discussed consequences of incitement with them, after which the incitement stopped. Further mediation and political work within Kenya was necessary, but at least the violence has stopped. Kenya is still a work in progress, but the situation has calmed down. Quiet diplomacy can be very effective. Luck went on to note that under Article 34 of the UN Charter, the Security Council may investigate the situation in a country if a dispute could lead to a threat to international peace and security. Although this provision is rarely used, the Security Council keeps track of developments all over the world.

Luck claimed that the current trajectory for R2P has been positive. He stated that when he began considering working for the Secretary-General, diplomatic colleagues tried to dissuade him from accepting his current post because R2P was "dead". He argued that what they were referring to was humanitarian intervention as a unilateral

action, and this occurred through the demand that it go through the charter and UN processes. He was told that the political climate was against R2P and the Non-Aligned Movement and others would never agree as they viewed it as a northern concept. The Secretary-General asked him to draft a report and explain what R2P was and why it was different. The report was published in January, and Luck claimed that, on the whole, states liked it.

Luck acknowledged that there has been some dissent about R2P. He said that even some countries in the Friends of R2P group had argued that it would be a mistake to have a General Assembly debate on it for fear that some states would recant on their support for it from 2005. But widespread consultations were undertaken with governments at the UN and in capitals on R2P, before and after the report, and their concerns were taken into account. Although some states have not come around on it, most have been quite positive. In the recent General Assembly debate on R2P, the then General Assembly President took a negative position on R2P, yet most states disagreed with him, including states that were originally sceptical about R2P in 2005. Although there are still important issues to be resolved, member states are, on the whole, supportive. Luck pointed out that most humanitarian interventions have been south-south, for example, India's involvement with East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), Tanzania in Uganda and Vietnam in Cambodia. Although humanitarian concerns may not be the only reason for these interventions, they were among the motivations. There are few cases where the North has intervened for humanitarian purposes. When discussing this with member states, they recognise this.

Luck further stated that the most recent debate ranged over three days with much interest, and included 94 states, which is the most on any issue this year. Many states and groups that are usually silent on such issues made their voice heard in the debate, such as CARICOM. Although not all states were supportive, a consensus was aimed for. This does not mean all states agree on all points, but he described it as “the point where no one wants to get up and say there is no consensus”, which Luck argued is pretty close at this point. Luck claimed that the positive response has been stronger than expected.

According to Luck, although the UN has no one working on this as a full time position and funding is not secured, there is movement forward. Luck argued that R2P is not a norm in the sense that a norm has a binding legal quality, as R2P is not a legal term. It is based on international law, but it doesn't add anything new to international law. Everything in the report is tied to the Outcome Document and the Charter. However, it does package these under a phrase that means something. It has created a strong public constituency all over the world, not just the north. People understand that statehood is not useful if there is no protection for people and sovereignty is useless if it provides an opportunity for governments to kill their own people. Luck ended his presentation by stating that there is much popular support for R2P, and that this offers promise for a substantive change in the way states and armed groups behave in the 21 century.

Q & A Session with Professor Edward Luck

3/8/2009

University of Queensland

Professor Luck proceeded to answer a series of questions. The first question regarded the situation in Sri Lanka and the UN lack of effectiveness there. Luck stated that R2P is still a concept and a strategy that has yet to be formally endorsed by the General Assembly. Although Luck claimed no special knowledge to discuss specific circumstances, he claimed that R2P should apply to governments in their territory, governments occupying additional territory, and should apply to non-state actors controlling territory as well. Thus in this case both the government and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) had obligations under R2P, though these are not legal obligations and the LTTE is not party to international law. If a government occupies a territory with population, it has an obligation to that population. A lot of people are in a bad position in this case, and the UN has done much to highlight their plight to the Sri Lankan government and the LTTE. The Secretary-General, Under-Secretary-General John Holmes, and other top UN officials have visited. The Secretary-General received a number of commitments from the government in the post-conflict situation, but time will tell how those develop. Quiet diplomacy was used in this case, as the UN was not in a position to impose sanctions due to the many differing perspectives on the case. Much of this was framed in terms of counter terrorism. Furthermore, due to limited international access, it was difficult to assess the situation effectively. UN officials did their best to remind the parties of their obligations and that the world was watching. Although there is now an international presence on the ground, there are still difficulties with access and

worries about the population on the ground. However, Luck claimed that there was no point in his blaming anyone, at this point in time, as more information is needed.

Luck argued that while the UN is very good at providing broad principles and standards, as it is the only forum through which to get these things accepted globally, it rarely has the tools to be effective in carrying these out. The UN is much better at persuasion than coercion, as coercion is better provided by member states. However, this region has not been comfortable with international involvement there, particularly Sri Lanka, which has had a difficult relationship with international institutions. Sri Lanka has been very critical of R2P. Prevention would have been most effective here, and the policies that the UN used may have made some difference, but it is difficult to assess at this point.

The next question regarded whether or not there is a problem with the UN when big powers are involved. Luck argued that the organisation often seems inept, but in the longer run (decades) the UN has been extraordinary. Evidence of this can be seen in that the international community cares about the civilians caught in the crossfire in Sri Lanka, whereas this used to be accepted as part of war. Compared to the Rwandan genocide in 1994, when the Security Council ignored it, the excuses that were used then would no longer be acceptable. It is now recognised that there is a responsibility, although this does not mean that the tools and leverage are in place to ensure that R2P is always respected. But one has to look at these issues with a historical perspective. Human rights used to be ineffective, and took about 40 years to gain traction and influence. However, Luck claimed that standards have changed, and human rights now have enormous power.

Luck argued that the trajectory of R2P has been very rapid, given that it has only been four years since the acceptance of R2P as a summit declaration, and now there is a strategy being created. That doesn't mean that the concept is perfect and that there is an answer for every issue, but standards and expectations are being created. States are recognising that this is becoming a standard. Although this perhaps doesn't help the civilians in Sri Lanka at the moment, it does signify change. If there were to be another Rwanda situation, the international community would most likely respond differently. Even in Sri Lanka, the international community has paid much attention. However, with the long civil war and terrorism charges, this has not been an easy situation to effectively address.

The next question asked how the UN could avoid diluting the R2P principle. Luck stated that he supports a "narrow but deep" approach. He claimed that there is a tradition in the UN of trying to make specific concepts work for everything. If you move beyond these four crimes, it will be difficult to operationalise as these four are a fairly coherent spectrum. When you apply R2P to everything, it means nothing in terms of policy. Luck posed the question of 'how can R2P be limited to these four crimes'? Luck said that it is necessary to stick with prevention. According to him, prevention by definition means that these crimes are not occurring, thus it is difficult to know if you are successful. However, Luck argued that all countries have an interest in protecting their own population. No state would be in total disregard of the treatment of the population, as such situations have effects for decades on the economic structures, social structures and institutions. While there are cases of chronic, long-term violations, other mechanisms must be used to handle them. R2P is not suited to, for example, a situation

like North Korea, where long-term neglect is occurring as opposed to large-scale violence. But for most states, R2P will be viewed as a positive factor, as it will improve the post-conflict situation by creating stability and allowing the re-building of the economy. Luck also argued that Pillar 2 cannot be a condition for assistance, for example, denying foreign aid if a state refuses to accept help. Finally, Luck stated that the Secretary-General's broad approach to Pillar Three has been well received by the member states, with the exception of the need for more attention to the military aspects of it.

The next question asked of Professor Luck was how R2P related to the conflict in Darfur. He replied that Darfur is not a good test case for R2P. During the main period of violence in Darfur from 2002 - 2003, R2P did not yet exist as a concept recognised by states. In contrast, in the strategy responding to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, R2P must be included, and this is the second situation (after Kenya) in which this has been agreed to. Darfur is a piece of the bigger problem in Sudan, as there is a fragile peace agreement between the North and South. Although more people have been killed in the South, Darfur has gotten more attention. When one compares the response in Darfur to Rwanda, although the response in Darfur has been too little too late, it still far surpasses the response to the situation in Rwanda. For example, the US recognised that genocide occurred in Darfur, although the response has not been perhaps as strong as the rhetoric.

Luck contended that the situation in Darfur is strongly connected the south of Sudan, to Chad, and other neighbours as well. He further argued that there are overarching problems with Sudan as a country. This war has gone on for some time, and

Sudan is in need of national plan, identity, and sense of a common future to find a solution. R2P won't solve all of the political and social problems in Sudan. The size of territory and other issues matter from a logistical perspective. Moreover, the government and its allies are not the only ones committing atrocities, the rebels are committing them as well, and it is difficult to bring them to the negotiating table. There are many groups and it is difficult to determine who represents them. The UN and AU are currently working on humanitarian measures, peace mediations, and peacekeeping as best they can, given that they lack support such as helicopters and other necessary items. There are many limitations to the conduct of all of this. Manipulation of this situation from others is also occurring. Big powers have interests and leverage to influence events, and Sudan has lots of resources, in the South in particular. Luck stated that given all of this, there are a lot of issues to consider. Furthermore, it is not sufficient to consider Darfur alone, but how to keep the North-South peace agreement and factoring in neighbouring states as well. Considering the ICC indictment and arrest warrant for al-Bashir and the subsequent removal of aid groups from Sudan, it has been a major achievement that the humanitarian effort has continued. Luck stated that although collapse has not occurred, the situation is "hanging by a thread".

The next question asked Luck about how R2P relates to the Security Council. Luck responded that the report was submitted only to the General Assembly and not to the Security Council, as he was pushing for consensus. The Security Council has reaffirmed R2P twice, whereas the General Assembly had only agreed to it once in its adoption of the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document, which covered many other issues as well. Military measures would still have to be approved by the Security Council

under Chapter Seven, with the exception of the Uniting for Peace resolution through which the Security Council can refer issues to the General Assembly. Although this very rarely occurs, some of the largest peace operations in history were approved by the General Assembly. Furthermore, this referral cannot be vetoed, as it is a procedural issue. Luck stated that, while the General Assembly cannot take a Chapter Seven action, it can set up preventive deployments under Chapter Six.

Luck argued that, although enforcement action may not be taken by the General Assembly, a vote there could point to the direction of normative development. The veto power is still in existence in the Security Council, as the five permanent members do not want to give up this power. This is a reason to look carefully at adding more permanent members to the Security Council, as it might be easier for the Council to act with fewer states with veto power than more. On the other hand, it would be worse to have countries outside the system trying to apply R2P wherever they see fit. It is preferable to have states go through the process, whatever its current flaws. Luck contended that states should accept the UN Charter as a whole, and not attempt to pick it apart in order to accept some provisions and avoid others. Although it is not the most ideal situation, the UN would not have survived the Cold War if the five permanent members did not have the veto power. Furthermore, the veto is being used a lot less than it used to be. Another effect R2P can have on the Security Council is raising the political costs of casting a veto in cases of mass violence against populations. For instance, if a state were to veto an action on an impending genocide, that will be held against that state, including by its own people. Some particularly powerful states that may not be so enthusiastic about R2P nonetheless agreed to it in order to fulfil humanitarian standards, which R2P is becoming

in its own right, even if it is not a legal norm. What the permanent five are more likely to do is threaten to cast a veto than actually engage in doing so. Luck has cautioned the members of the General Assembly that if they did not take ownership of R2P, either the Security Council or Non-Governmental Organisations would take the lead instead. Furthermore, there is a clause in paragraph 139 of the World Summit Outcome Document stating that the General Assembly will continue its consideration of R2P.

Professor Luck was then asked about how to go about convincing reluctant states, such as China, Russia, Cuba and so on, to support the implementation of the concept. Luck responded to the question in two parts: big powers and others. He said that there had been more extensive discussions with Russia than China. It is expected that China will wait to make comments on the Secretary-General's report, perhaps wanting to postpone making a statement until other states had indicated their positions. Luck said he sensed that China was undergoing a generational change, whereby the younger leadership is sensing that supporting humanitarian types of norms is becoming a standard expected of global powers, while the older generation is clinging to a narrow conception of sovereignty. However, looking back at what was said during the Spring 2005 debate, it looked then as though there would have been no possibility for an agreement on R2P in September of that year, which nevertheless did materialise. Although China has asked tough questions, they have not been unreasonable ones. Neither China nor Russia has been overly enthusiastic, but they also have not stood in the way. Luck believes that both have made modest progress toward accepting the Secretary-General's proposals, but more work needs to be done on this. However, he suggested that these states have been pushed somewhat, as they cannot claim to stand up for the developing world if the

majority of the developing world supports the concept and they do not. Luck commented that in cases where there is no support for principles such as this from great powers, but where there is support coming from others, the motives of the powerful state are then questioned.

Luck went on to answer the second part of the question, arguing that states such as Cuba and Nicaragua still have reservations but that some progress has been made in discussions with them. Debates may be going on internally in states such as this. It was expected that Cuba would be chair of the Non-Aligned Movement when the General Assembly debate occurred. However, as the debate was postponed, Egypt was chair by that point. Some of the apprehensions these states have about R2P may come from their history and dealings with the United States, but Luck hoped that these relationships would change with the new administration in Washington. Furthermore, the statement by the Non-Aligned Movement at the debate was not bad, their questions were reasonable, and many of the Non-Aligned countries have moved in a more positive direction on R2P. Furthermore, during the debate no state recanted support for R2P.

Luck commented that he and others had intended to get a group of states that have undergone these types of traumas in the past to stand together with a supportive position. Although they did not have time to do this formally, these states argued anyway at the debate that their experiences underscored the need for R2P. They have contended that this type of help from the international community is needed and none called it outside interference. Luck suggested that some states were surprised at the level of support for R2P and had to revise or make statements at the last minute. Even CARICOM, which tends to avoid these debates, made a rather supportive statement. The General Assembly

President made a statement reflecting his own personal views, rather than those of the majority of states. Luck underscored that efforts should be made to convince states by good arguments and listening, but also one should recognize that they have to take positions that are sensible for them and their interests. Peer pressure from within a state's own region is vital, and he argued that on the whole, Latin America has been supportive, and some of this simply takes time. Luck claimed that the General Assembly debate on R2P in July was a very large and important one, both historic and positive in moving things forward.

The next question regarded the implications of the War on Terror and the issues counter-insurgency operations raise for R2P. Luck stated that there are problems regarding how the public dialogue is conducted, how issues are framed and which narratives take hold with the public. This may change over time. However, the UN has had a policy regarding terrorism since the 9/11 attacks in the US, with the General Assembly adopting a strategy that focuses on capacity building and other measures focusing on soft approaches to combating it. Luck argued that some of these soft measures are more effective, or at least that hard measures should be used in conjunction with them. Thus counter-terrorism and R2P are not necessarily incompatible. There may be cases of states using terrorism as an excuse, in which case, the UN must be candid with those leaders. Although, for the Secretary-General, there are times when being outspoken is helpful, often quiet diplomacy is more successful, which he recognises. Luck argued that if the international community recognises that R2P is a rising standard, these types of situations will occur less. Sri Lanka was fairly extreme case, as it has had

a long history with terrorism. Where these issues have occurred in other areas, they have not been quite as difficult to reconcile.

Luck was then asked if there was a link between states that have participated in past abuses and their reluctance to support R2P. Luck replied that the people working on R2P are interested in the future, not the past. There are not many countries that have not had experience with these issues at some point in their histories. Although it may be useful for historians to examine these issues, the UN has to look forward. It is also necessary to build coalitions around current issues and work with that. He further argued that standards change over time, and that the way countries in the past that were expanding their territories behaved would not be acceptable today. There are also issues of how far in the past one looks, and which version of history prevails. He also asserted that the UN has no interest and no independent way of judging these issues. This is something people think about, and he gave the example of Armenia's work on R2P, but noted Turkey has made strong statements in support as well. There were also strong exchanges between Georgia and Russia on the use of R2P at the conclusion of the Assembly debate. The UN is not there to inflame tensions or say who was right and who was wrong, as its interest lies in prevention. Luck claimed that the bigger issue is the narrative of genocide, in which people in some places are saying, "we will get them next time".

The next question regarded the incitement of genocide. The question asked if R2P has a mechanism in place to prevent this, citing Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's recent statements at the Durban II Conference as an example. Luck responded that at the Durban II Conference the Secretary-General responded publicly,

stating that those comments were inappropriate, which is fairly unusual. While there are implicit norms and standards about what state representatives can and cannot say in public, there is not much anyone can do to stop them from saying what they want to.

The next question asked Luck if and how R2P could be able to shape constitutions in post-conflict countries in order to reflect R2P values from within the country itself. Luck responded that, from an R2P perspective, hate speech that is used to incite violence is wrong, whereas others focus on issues regarding freedom of speech. In instances where countries are being recreated after a mass trauma, R2P perspectives and concerns should be taken into account. Two of the three big outcomes from the 2005 Summit (the other being changing the Human Rights Commission into the Human Rights Council), were R2P and the creation of the Peace-building Commission. The Peace-building Commission comes in after the country has gone through enormous conflict to help put it back together. At that point, the international community has enormous leverage. He gave the example of Namibia, which allowed the UN to help write and rewrite its constitution. Although the UN does not entirely understand how it works, there is a general understanding that the rule of law is extremely important, and that certain guarantees for minorities are important. Some of these issues could have a constitutional basis. Luck argued that the greater concern is whether or not these constitutional provisions are respected. Rule of law, institutions supporting the law and security sector reform are all necessary considerations. He further gave the example of a colleague who worked in South Africa to reform the policing sector post-apartheid, who is now in Kenya as vice-chair of a national task force on police reform, which hopefully will be part of the solution there. These issues return to constitutional concerns, as constitutional

and rule of law issues relate to matters of security sector reform. In the Kenyan crisis, the army could not be called upon to restore order, and in fact many thought that this would make things worse. Who will establish law and order is a very important question in R2P situations. Once a mediation agreement is worked out, creating a cabinet that works and is representative can be an unwieldy enterprise. In other instances, there are problems with succession, especially in cases where someone is determined to maintain power and there is no real process to turn power over. These are the types of cases that present problems. Luck stated that the UN has a lot of technical expertise on these post-conflict issues, and its track record is mixed but not bad. There are cases in which the UN has effectively helped states with their post-conflict constitutions and governmental structures. Angola, Namibia and Mozambique are all examples of this.

The final question asked in what way the ICC and issues of impunity relate to R2P. Luck responded that some references were made to the ICC in the Secretary-General's report, including the Rome Statute on the definition of crimes against humanity. It also made references to impunity and moving towards ending the age of impunity. This may have some value as a deterrent in persuading actors not to engage in these acts. Luck posed the question of "what tools and leverage are available to the Secretary-General"? One that is available, he said, is impunity and the ICC. The ICC is not a UN body, it is independent, but there is a close relationship. Some states have criticised the Secretary-General's report for referring to the ICC and the Rome Statute at all, particularly as not all UN member states are party to them. However, if this is an issue of common law, it can potentially be quite important. It is something the Secretary-General can talk about, in his quiet diplomacy with actors in R2P situations, as it is

something that member states pay attention to, as well as sometimes rebel leaders or leaders of armed groups. Politically, the indictment of and arrest warrant for al-Bashir was not especially helpful to the R2P efforts at the UN. However, in the end the sub-Saharan Africans were not split on the issue, and they continued to stand up for R2P, even though they had reservations about the application of the ICC in this particular case with a head of state in Africa. Luck emphasized that they have remained very supportive of R2P and made strong positive statements at the recent General Assembly debate.