

EVAP Episode 45 Mô Bleeker

📅 Mon, Aug 18, 2025 9:49AM ⌚ 48:37

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Responsibility to Protect, atrocity prevention, human rights, conflict prevention, transitional justice, UN Security Council, genocide prevention, early warning, international norms, civil society, national commissions, regional cooperation, peaceful means, moral obligation, UN Charter.

SPEAKERS

Mô Bleeker, Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall



Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 00:00

Welcome to Expert Voices on Atrocity Prevention by the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. I'm Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall, Director of Policy and Research at the Global Centre. This podcast features one-on-one conversations with practitioners from the fields of human rights, conflict prevention and atrocity prevention. These conversations will give us a glimpse of the personal and professional side of how practitioners approach human rights protection and atrocity prevention, allowing us to explore challenges, identify best practices, and share lessons learned on how we can protect populations more effectively.



Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 00:44

Today, I'm joined by Mô Bleeker, who has been the UN Special Advisor on the Responsibility to Protect since March 2024. Previously, Mô served as Special Envoy for Dealing with the Past and Prevention of Atrocities at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland until 2022. We are interviewing Mô as part of our series commemorating the 20th anniversary of R2P. Thank you for joining us today.



Mô Bleeker 01:10

Thank you for inviting me, Jaclyn. Very pleased to be here.

J Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 01:14

Mô, you've had a long and interesting career in atrocity prevention and transitional justice. Can you give us a bit of an overview on how this led to you taking on the Special Advisor role?

M Mô Bleeker 01:25

Thank you, Jaclyn,- it's a long question, but I suppose you are wanting a short answer. Due to my childhood - I'm Dutch of origin, and I became Swiss much later - but my parents were both Dutch, and so everything which happened during the Second World War has touched our family very strongly, and hence a lot of discussions were taking place at home about what happened. In particular, I want to say, as a kind of confidence, it's the issue of the unnamed victims that were very present at home. And so I kept this question all my life, and quite young, I had the possibility to go as a volunteer in Chad, and then I engaged in, in particular, in human rights. And I was always very keen to understand what is really happening with victims and how do they stand up again as citizens, bearer of rights, and how can states actually fulfill their obligation. So in a nutshell, this has been my preoccupation until now, and this remains my main preoccupation. I was engaged in several foundations and in research on peace and conflict transformation and human rights, and at a certain point, I was invited to advise the Swiss Foreign Ministry, when in Switzerland, due also to the long story of Switzerland, also in the Second World War, Switzerland decided to basically design a new policy which meant that neutrality would be an active promotion of peace, human rights, international humanitarian law. In the wake of this development, they asked me to develop a specific approach. It coincided also with the time of the creation of the International Criminal Court. They asked me to develop a specific approach on transitional justice, which is a main name. I called it, dealing with the past, or dealing with the negative, with the legacy of past atrocity. But of course, when I began that, I also said very clearly that, why deal with the past if we are not capable to prevent, and I'm not talking only about the deterrent effect that criminal sanctions can have, but I'm really thinking in terms of what, at the end of the day, can help us, society, state, to prevent very early on, dynamics, patterns and situations which may lead to atrocity - what I call atrocity-prone situations. So I did that during many years, I was in touch with many continents, many people, many states, many processes. In particular have been very active in Colombia, in the Philippines, and the Balkans, in some regions of Africa. What came always to my mind was either a mediation process, where one would try to develop a mediation process with an agenda where transitional justice needed to be integrated. I always observed that the thinking about prevention was never there, actually explicitly convened as an agenda as such. So I kept it for myself, and I have always tried to re-inject this, for example, in transitional justice, how can transitional justice processes past, you know, the commission of atrocities? How can transitional justice strategies, for example, integrate a preventive aspect. And what would it mean? Would it mean only, you know, the famous word of guarantee of non-recurrence, or does it mean something more? You know that from now on, we adopt a culture, a state, and a society in the dialog between these two partners of prevention, namely, we are capable to see and understand what could affect some vulnerable communities, and what in certain fragilities of the state could really trigger some further discrimination, exclusion and politics that might, at the end of the day, be used to further or to create a conducive environment for atrocity crimes. So it was very natural, very, basically, tied together until I was asked to apply for this position. And of course, it was a difficult question. I just had left the Foreign Ministry and I was continuing to work on prevention, but I was asking myself two years ago, what is the role of this office, and how really can we strengthen this responsibility to

protect in a moment in which we already were seeing that there was a massive crisis of political will. If I can say it, I will unpack it later. I want to say that in the wake of these years past and in the Foreign Ministry, I was both focal point for genocide prevention and both focal point for R2P sometimes in the same years, and I became very aware that these different files sometimes were having difficulties, first, to connect with each other. And I think we have to build on what 40 years, or even more, of our research, scientific investigations from the genocide prevention community, and the Responsibility to Protect was mainly active in the UN in Geneva and New York. And I was very keen to try to see if we could basically reproach these two communities with each other, and reproach this, all this very important effort from the field, and this is what led to the creation of this global action against mass atrocity crimes, which is an effort led by states and by civil society organizations, among them the Global Centre for R2P. It still exists nowadays, and I think this alliance has brought some very good fruits, notably, for example, an African Working Group, which has a series of national commissions on prevention of atrocity crimes, as well as the Asia-Pacific Responsibility to Protect Center who has been very active all these years and does remarkable work, I think, to trigger the attention of states and engage in very concrete policies of prevention and protection.

 Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 09:01

Can you give us some insight into your work and mandate over the past year and how you've engaged with member states and the broader UN system?

Well, Jaclyn, it's as you know, it's a complicated setup, I would say. I'm working in the Joint Office for Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect, and I'm working, in particular now with Virginia Gamba, who is Acting Special Advisor on Prevention of Genocide, who is an Under-Secretary-General. Myself, I have the function, or the level, of Assistant-Secretary-General, and because of the history of this office, this position that I'm occupying, this full time work is not paid—\$1 a year, so I live with my pension. The issue at the very beginning was to say, okay, at the very beginning, I had to produce the report of the UN Secretary-General in no time, but thanks to the excellent cooperation with you and the Global Centre on R2P, it became possible to make, I think, a good report, which was paved the way for me of my work. That was last year, and the new report will be presented on the 25th of June in the General Assembly. So one big task of this, of my mandate, is to prepare this UN Secretary-General report. It sounds strange to say so, but it takes time. It takes time because it needs a lot of consultation. Foremost, not only it takes, but it's very interesting to consult it a lot because you want, or the person in my mandate, wants to make sure that such a report represents what the general UN at large can understand as the task of the responsibility to protect. What I mean by that is that I have been engaged in a lot of conversations with colleagues of the UN who are working in international humanitarian law, who are working in protection of civilians or humanitarian protection, and then in human rights, in women's issues, in gender issues, and in other fields, development, conflict prevention, and a lot of different issues where the UN is involved in. Basically, it's trying to mainstream, doesn't mean a lot for me, but trying to implant, I would say, a kind of atrocity prevention lens. What do I mean with that is that I think that certain peculiar situations are really known to become the ones who can very quickly, from one day to the other, and sometimes in unexpected speed and manner, develop as atrocity crimes, as the commission of atrocity crimes and these, not only in war context, this also in contexts of civilian tensions, I would say. And so my work in these one-and-a-half years has been to discuss with states, with member states, about that, and trying to encourage them also to be very consistent with the Responsibility to Protect and to make sure that they are reacting early enough when such dynamics are happening. We will talk later about the UN Security Council, but one of the main worries we have, of course, is that the Security Council of the United Nations is more the United Nations Security Council in the sense that it's informed about the potential of atrocities that can be committed, but it doesn't get to agreements, even in the wake of situations like Ukraine, Gaza, Sudan, or other contexts, and that's a very serious worry, while, and you know that better than I do, but the Responsibility to Protect has been heavily criticized after the intervention in Libya that led to the situation that we know about, and Brazil suggested a new approach with responsibility while protecting. But since then, there have been, I think, a lot of critics against the Responsibility to Protect. But I would say that when I began this job, I thought, let's talk about this critique, and let's really observe them. I would say my bigger critique is the problem of the inaction when member states are informed about the danger of atrocity crimes and are not taking the proper decisions. So we are more in a moment in which the Responsibility to Protect is not used enough, I would say, especially through peaceful means, and we have a big array of peaceful means that could be actually used. And the reproach of R2P being an interventionist agenda doesn't hold, actually, especially in these days where we see that in certain contexts or UN Security Council is not even up to date, capable or able to take certain decision to stop atrocities to be committed.

J Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 15:01

Since starting your role, you've issued joint statements with the Special Advisor on Genocide Prevention, on situations, specifically ones where the Security Council has either not responded at all or not responded as quickly or in the ways the international community would hope, such as the situations in Myanmar and Gaza, what is the significance of someone with your role and your title speaking out publicly on atrocity situations?

M Mô Bleeker 15:31

I would say that one should not measure our activities with the number of statements we make on our website. We do a lot of discrete talks and conversation with member states, where we try to promote ideas, exchange ideas about how reaction could be developed, early reaction. And in particular, also we are working as much as we can with our UN colleagues. I would say that in nearly all situations, my colleagues who are working on the ground, I can think about UNRWA, I can think about the people who are working in Myanmar, in Sudan, in South Sudan, and in other contexts, they are much better informed. So we heavily depend from them, which is a beautiful interdependence. And I think that reaching out to them, or them reaching out to us, asking us to make a statement, for example, is not so much, you know, to ring the red bell only, but it's also to sensitize with the language of atrocity prevention, and to make it evident for everyone that actually, what we are talking about is either the probability of atrocity crimes merely to be committed, or the existence of atrocity crimes beginning to be committed, and calling for a stop to that with concrete recommendations for prevention. I mean, there are actions on the road that can be taken to prevent it to continue. It can be mediation, it can be, you know, special envoys going there and talking and working to take decisions with parties, but in particular, also, I would say, recommendations for protection of the most vulnerable population. So this is what it means. It means, on one hand, an alert while I'm insisting on the fact that my colleagues on the ground and the specialized units such as UNRWA, OCHA, I think, have much more direct, you know, messaging coming from the ground. When we make a statement, it is really with the atrocity prevention lines to say, hey, pay attention, it's possible that this is going to happen. You can act. And these are the possibility of actions in a non-violent manner, or it might happen. And in that sense, it's a real call for prevention and/or concrete protection proposals.

J Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 18:24

I think you've just given such great examples of kind of the breadth of UN knowledge and the breadth of UN action that there's so many different people from OCHA, DPO and others, as well as the Human Rights structure in Geneva, that work on atrocity situations. Why do you think, with all the knowledge we have, with everything we can see, why do you think states have been more effective in meeting their international obligations under R2P, in some cases, like Kenya, in 2007-2008 versus others?

M Mô Bleeker 19:02

Let me maybe add something about the UN before I enter into into state. Jaclyn – it's a general

observation. First that I want to do, this is valid to say in the UN, I think that, you know, I'm an anthropologist. I'm not a jurist. And from my anthropological point of view, I understand that, in general matters, prevention is something very fuzzy for many people. I even have states or even UN colleagues, who tell me, well, but if something doesn't happen, how can we measure it? How can we, you know, imagine making prevention if it at the end of the day nothing happens, so you don't have indicators, etc. This is a technical question, but it shows how difficult it is for people to understand prevention much earlier than what we understand now. Actually, prevention is now used as a word we use when the house is already burning. So we say, okay, we should prevent the whole house to burn, right? But actually, we could have built anti-fire elements in the house before building it. So what I mean with that is accepting, and I think it's a challenge, if we are in civilization, and sometimes I wonder in the actual situation, if we were a civilization, we should have the intelligence to accept that every society is in transformation, and that this transformation permanently will trigger conflict. The issue there is not to prevent conflict. Issue is to prevent violent conflict, right? So it's the measurement of our democracy, or the quality of our democracy, to be able to deal with conflict, with unknown issues, with unexpected catastrophes, with political intelligence, with nonviolent means. So what I observe in the UN is that a lot of colleagues are also thinking in terms of prevention of conflict, rather than prevention as such. Understanding prevention of peaceful management of conflict. Vocabulary means, words mean something, right? So we also have to work on it. So I would say prevention of violent conflict. And then, of course, the UN has become such a huge machine that it's normal, and I hope that UN80 will bring some new elements, in that that every sector works pretty much in a silo. So what I have been observing is first, I was very warmly welcomed by people working in many different sectors, being humanitarian aid, development, mediation, peace, peacekeeping, etc, and the discussion we could have about the need to integrate in all these streams of work, an understanding of prevention at the earliest moment as a continuum, as an ongoing practice for prevention means that today, when I deal, for example, with a peace process, I integrate elements of prevention and I integrate in the discussion, or in the agenda, specific discussion on vulnerable groups in this society and specific weaknesses of the state, for example, that is involved in a peace conversation. So that's on one hand. So we have, I think, a lot of progress to do, and that's one of the main messages of my report last year, of the UN Secretary-General Report last year, and this year, to understand prevention and protection as permanent. On the other hand, to answer your question now about states, I think that first: consequences, a consequence of the lack of understanding of what prevention could mean on a very early stage, is precisely this one is that when we are faced with situations in which, and we know which context we are talking about in the UN Security Council, when it comes to the table of the Security Council, it's already that the situation is very alarming, even that the house is already on fire. At this moment of the conflict, the stakes are very high. The divides are the highest possible, so it's a worst moment to talk about solution and agree. We always say the United Nations Security Council has to find consensus, but it doesn't find it in many of the situations where, and I keep with this image, a house is already burning, and we shouldn't have done it much before, because that would have been the moment in which we could have used diplomacy, all kinds of mediation tools, incentives, and all kinds of tools that we have at disposal to change the course of events. So on one hand, I think we have a conceptual issue with early prevention and early protection. On the other hand, when we have to take a decision because the house is burning, it's very late, and the antagonism and the polarization is extremely high, so it takes a lot. I think that the last resolution on Gaza, where we had only one voice, again, too bad, it was one of the P5 who has a veto right, but it was, it showed actually the progress done right? And on the other hand, the engagement of many states to find alternative space, for example, in the UN General Assembly, to talk in a mandatory manner when a veto is being pronounced, to take the situation in the UN General Assembly and to continue talking about that, trying to create a

kind of way for consensus to be reached shows that states are not abandoning the idea that we should decide together, you know, according to the UN Charter. But my understanding is that we are much too late in putting this discussion on the table, and it's problematic from different sides, also, because when it comes at the UN Security Council, it's already seen as a problematic situation, right? So for many states to have their own situation presented in the UN Security Council can be even seen as problematic. So this is the broader landscape, but what I'm observing, and you will read it also in the report, that we see an intensification of mobilization of states with an enormous productivity to kind of overcome the negative impact of the veto in the UN Security Council and creativity and making resolutions in mobilizing the UN General Assembly, mobilizing other, you know, the Human Rights Council, early enough, often in and with different means, special procedures. I couldn't give you a black and white answer. I think it's discouraging for a lot, but we do see a lot of emerging, I would say, middle and little states, who are really understanding their own development and their own survival and future existence through a very consequential practice of international standards, rule of law, international humanitarian law, human rights, etc. And so they are claiming that their future is this one, and for that, they are very active in the whole of UN approach with an incredible creativity.

J Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 27:57

I know this year's report was the product of a very inclusive process. Could you give us a little insight into how the report was constructed this year?

M Mô Bleeker 28:06

To prepare this report, we made a series of surveys and consultation, and to be frank with you, I was expecting a lot of discouragement because it happened this year, and many people are discouraged or find it so difficult to see what we are seeing in so many contexts. And I'm not only speaking about Gaza, Ukraine, Myanmar, South Sudan, Yemen, and you name it, but people feel that the UN Security Council may have been perceived, or is perceived as having double standards, and this has huge consequences, because it destroys, or may destroy, or potentially destroy the face in the UN, which is our common architecture. It's our common house. We don't have any other UN to be invented. It's the Charter, it's the Charter on which we build, right? So I was expecting a lot of, you know, criticism, and actually, I've been very surprised. I've heard, maybe from the ground, I've heard people and even one I remember who was in a bus trying to get out of DRC saying, you know, in our communities, the fact that, and this is anthropologist speaking, that something exists as states. Who said, we have the responsibility to protect the population in front of these four crimes, people understand. And he was saying, people in my community understand. And that there are some states, some people, some experts, some whatever, NGO, CSOs, etc, that have taken this responsibility to protect us in danger, very seriously, and this is for us so important. I think this is morally, ethically, the most beautiful message about the responsibility to protect it exists. It says something that people have said, and you know, it's not because it doesn't work. It's not because human rights are still being violated. At least, should cease to fight for human rights. No, on the contrary, so it's not because the Responsibility to Protect is not always and sometimes it has been successful that we should cease. No, it means something for people who are in danger. Okay, so I think that's the first element. The second element is a little bit further.

Civil society organizations, civil society leadership, who says it means a lot to us, because when we go to our state and we say, listen, you were there in this meeting in 2005, you accepted it so you have obligations. Obligations which go beyond you know, your normal life, you have really serious obligation to which you have committed yourself. So let's work together. So they were saying, it's so important that we continue to elaborate on what could the Responsibility to Protect mean at a national level, at community based, at national level, regional level and international level, in the terms of, let's take this sentence very seriously. We are committed to protect and therefore also to prevent, right? So we had a series of civil society organization and leaders who are very active, and not only since one year, two years now, since 20 years, and the Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect has, for that, played an absolutely crucial role. And I'm a witness thereof. When I go in meetings that the Group of Friends, I think now you have 56 members in Geneva or in New York, at least 61 states have a Focal Point on the Responsibility to Protect, 56 member states are members of the Group of Friends. So it means that these 56 states are engaged very concretely, and they have other friends around, well, also in moments of emergency, acting with them, because they are very capable to build alliances. And I'm seeing this Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect having the power of convening them, having a supportive role. I mean, that's quite unique, and having also the capacity to generate agendas, where can we be creative and suggest to integrate this responsibility to protect lens in the UPR- Universal Periodic Review- to integrate this in the special procedure, to integrate this in the Peace Building Commission Review, and you name it. So what I want to say is that as much as community level and as civil society, at civil society level, you need this kind of leadership, and it exists, right? And now I pass through the state. And again, in the last meetings I have been invited to, I have seen many states. And again, I find it interesting to see that these are not emerging states, because they are there since a while, but they are not part of, you know, I would say the main European or North American or Asian states, or they are states who have decided that their future lies in observing and upholding the UN Charter. And these states consider that the Responsibility to Protect is very useful, because first it recalls, basically the UN Charter in its essence, which is, you know, at the crossroad from human rights peace and security, and furthermore, they are taking a series of initiatives. Think the new convention now in discussion about crimes against humanity. Think the participation in the Universal Periodic Review. Think in the engagement for the Peace Building Commission Review, also, so that would, you know, São Tomé, for example, very recently, has adopted a national prevention program. And I think all this for me, why it doesn't always, you know, capture the world of the Responsibility to Protect. But for me, this is a responsibility to protect an action. If a state says, well, we have decided to have our national program, right? So, and then I have been talking to you or giving you images of people who are not, you know, the main in charge of national prevention, for example, regional prevention. But let me come to them. You have nowadays around 12 or 15 national commissions on prevention of atrocities. Each of them have different names, right? They are mainly existing in Africa as a follow up of a decision, historical decision, in 2010 or 2011 from the International Conference of the Great Lake Region, we decided we want to pass from interference to non-indifference, meaning one of them told me in a beautiful manner. I said, what does it mean exactly? And she said, it's a wonderful Ambassador Mulamula, who was presiding the ICGLR-International Conference of the Great Lakes Region-at this time. She said, you know, it allows us to knock at the door of the neighbor and to say, hey neighbor, there might be some problematic issues now happening in your context, how can I help you? So it enables us to go to the neighbor and suggest that we can help, which is this absolute spirit of the Responsibility to Protect, actually in incarnation, right? And she said, you know, and then, because we have decided to do that, so it's not perceived as an intervention, you know, as a hostile intervention. It's perceived as a friendly understanding. I go further, again, with my lenses of a political anthropologist. I think it's recalling us that we are all interdependent, and if my neighbor has a problem, I better help

him or her in the way I can and she or he will accept so that we all feel better afterwards, so that that is another aspect. And these commissions, some have had a long existence, some have had moments of work and less work have realized, I would say, a lot of pioneering work, that they could actually teach us. I'm living in a northern country, and I would gladly invite, for example, the National Commission of Tanzania to give us lessons here in Switzerland, and I find this extremely interesting. So this is another group of people who participated in our survey. So what were they telling us? They were saying, it's great, it is absolutely indispensable that we have this national ownership and that it enables this dialog between civil society and state about what needs to be done, and furthermore, also with scientific fact of prognostic analysis, being able and capable to develop a specific analysis for early warning signals and early warning patterns that could lead to, you know, very far away, to atrocity crimes. During the survey, people said, listen, we need to talk. It's always good when people say we need to talk. We need to talk about the Responsibility to Protect at regional level. Because first, we have already made experiences on the responsibility to protect that we don't always label under that. We don't always label the strengthening of rule or law with, you know, a contribution to prevention. We just do it, right? So they have requested, there were many requests for regional conversations about how to anchor the responsibility to protect at national level, how to capture what has been done during these 20 years. Built on this archeology of successes, failures, good practices, lessons learned, etc. And also we want to have conversations with the regional level. How can we better articulate and there was a strong insistence about the weakness of the articulation between national and regional. And I think it's an interesting point, because if one says this, then the will is there already to first to talk about it, to make it a subject of an agenda, and then to try to find what would be the best way, respecting sovereignty, respecting national decisions to somehow, you know, work on a web of initiatives, on a web of procedures and protocols that could enhance the national plus regional capacity to act based on joint decisions. So that's for me, a very positive result of this survey, that people want to talk, people want to work on that. And they are saying we need regional conversation. And, you know, in respect of the different cultural setup, political setup, historical setup. So I think this is very good. The second element that people were very insisting on was the production of a guidance note. What is a guidance note? Basically, it's a very practical document, not only practical, but it is conceptual in the sense that it recalls what the Responsibility to Protect is, and in particular, I think it's very important to show the immense array of activities that can be developed under the Responsibility to Protect, which are absolutely peaceful, democratic. Basically, it's enhancing the capacity of state to be good states for their own society, and also the aspect of participation of society in, you know, in dialoguing on the measures. And I want to insist on that we are in constant transformation. We are in a globalized world, so we are constantly having new issues coming, and therefore producing a document that helps states who are willing, for example, to say, okay, I'm going to organize a national committee on prevention of atrocity, or I'm going to equip you know, you have 118 human rights national institutions in the world. So if this 118 national human rights institution would be equipped with, I don't know, one or two or three people who would read their reality, the national reality, with the atrocity prevention lens, you could make a series of proposals on very early times, and proposals for prevention, but also proposal for protection, meaning protection does not happen only when the house is burning. Protection can be a new law. Protection can be an institution that provides support for this or for that. So that has been the second, I would say, insistence coming from this survey, please produce a guidance note which is, you know, discussed and agreed upon by as many states as possible. And that becomes not our tool and reference to set up very concretely, you know, national policies and regional policies.

J Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 43:28

From your vantage point as the Special Advisor on R2P, what do you think R2P offers us as a framework for responding?

M Mô Bleeker 43:36

Your question is very important. First I was telling you that, and again, it's an anthropologist talking, words mean something. So the idea that all member states have taken the commitment to to protect their population against these four crimes, to cooperate with others if there are problems that are existing and so on and so forth, and the UN at the level of the UN Security Council to act timely and properly and efficiently when it happens is still, for me, a horizon for which we need to work every day so that it happens. So this kind of wording, the Responsibility to Protect as a commitment, is an Orientation Guide. The second is that it is, I would say, a principle, but also in this very troubled time where there are a lot of efforts, and the report speaks about this to basically attack and dismantle or weaken the international norms and standards that we have been building. Very carefully by consensus during several decades. It recalls us a moral obligation. We are an interdependent community, and therefore we take this commitment together. So it's recalling that. And I think that it's very important to recall our moral obligation in these dark times to, I think, to develop the language of the majority, but we are majority, and we have to recall that we might be a silent majority, we might be a weak majority. We might be not strong enough, or not vocal enough, or not decisive enough, but we are nevertheless the majority upholding the UN Charter and having decided to commit to protect our population and the most vulnerable from this kind of terrible attacks and deadly situations. So I think it provides us with that first of all, second, it provides us with a lot of instruments. And the Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect has been very active during these 20 years. Or read the 17th, it will be the 17th report now read all the report on the Responsibility to Protect since the first one by Edward Luck with the three pillars in 2009, it's amazing. It's amazing. It's a road map of sometimes too conceptual. It's okay, but nevertheless, it's a road map to act as a responsible state, it's a roadmap to dialog with your regional bodies, and it's a roadmap to talk with the P5 and within the UN Security Council and within the General Assembly and within other bodies we have solid references, and it recalls basically the importance of remaining committed to international norms and standards that we have built together and not letting anyone attack them without reacting. So I would say that it gives us a framework in which we can act today with responsibility and with morality and with ethics, and in the same time, I think it's absolutely essential to protect. The most important is the integrity of the UN Charter. And I think that this call for the Responsibility to Protect is, you know, at the very heart of the UN United Nation Charter, and for that, it has a lot of potential. For that, it means a lot for many people from the ground up to the Member States, who are very active in the General Assembly, in the in the UN Security Council, and also at regional level.



Jaclyn Streitfeld-Hall 48:03

Thank you for joining us for this episode of expert voices on atrocity prevention. If you enjoyed this episode, we encourage you to subscribe to the podcast on Apple podcasts, SoundCloud or Spotify, and we'd be grateful if you left us a review for more information on the Global Centre's work on R2P mass atrocity prevention and populations at risk of mass atrocities. Visit our website at www.globalr2p.org, and connect with us on Facebook, BlueSky or LinkedIn at GCR2P.