



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on October 13, 2012

Mali: Target of UN's Sovereignty-stealing "Responsibility to Protect" Doctrine

In a recent article, *The New American's* foreign correspondent Alex Newman reported on the [United Nations' plot to invade the West African nation of Mali](#).

Wrote Newman:

After having recently left thousands dead from overthrowing the governments ruling [Libya](#) and the [Ivory Coast](#), the United Nations is already plotting its next invasion to deal with the fallout. This time, Mali is in the UN's crosshairs.



Mali attracted UN attention when the northern part of the country was taken over by Islamists and nomadic rebels amid a military coup d'état that ousted the government in the South. The UN Security Council is currently considering [two resolutions](#) related to the country, a former colony of France. The first one calls for negotiations between armed rebels in the North and the supposed "interim" government operating in the capital. That measure is expected to be approved soon, according to officials involved in the negotiations.

The second resolution would purport to authorize international military intervention, a move being sought by the coalition of regimes making up the African Union, the [Economic Community of West African States](#) (ECOWAS), and the struggling "interim" government in Southern Mali. The French government is circulating a draft of the resolution this week.

Supporting Newman's report is the "[crisis alert](#)" issued by the International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect (ICRtoP). The notice says: "The humanitarian situation in northern Mali has worsened considerably since a coup in late March, with reports of human rights violations including murder, rape, robbery and forced displacement."

After rehearsing the calls for intervention made by various human rights groups and other "civil society organizations," ICRtoP closes its memo with a demand that the UN's Responsibility to Protect doctrine be applied to the "rapidly deteriorating humanitarian situation" in Mali.

A key to understanding the cause of the crescendo of clamors for international intervention in Mali is a familiarity with the Right to Protect doctrine as defined by the United Nations.

In an address given in September, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon reaffirmed the commitment of the global shadow government's ultimate goal of eradicating national sovereignty. The preferred weapon in this war on self-determination is the principle known as Responsibility to Protect (R2P).

Agreed to by the UN General Assembly at a summit of world leaders in 2005, R2P purports to grant the global government power to decide whether an individual nations are properly exercising their sovereignty.

UN literature describes R2P as the concept that holds "States responsible for shielding their own



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on October 13, 2012

populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and related crimes against humanity and requires the international community to step in if this obligation is not met.”

That is to say, if the UN determines that a national government is not voluntarily conforming to the UN’s idea of safety, then the “international community” will impose its will by force, all for the protection of that nation’s citizens.

Lest anyone believe that the globalists at the UN are simply pacifists whose desire is to meekly encourage regimes to treat their people kindly, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon took a more forceful posture at the conference held at the UN headquarters in New York.

“We all agree that sovereignty must not be a shield behind which States commit grave crimes against their people. But achieving prevention and protection can be difficult,” said Ban. “In recent years, we have shown how good offices, preventive diplomacy, mediation, commissions of inquiry and other peaceful means can help pull countries back from the brink of mass violence.”

“However, when non-coercive measures fail or are considered inadequate, enforcement under Chapter VII will need to be considered by the appropriate intergovernmental bodies,” he added. “This includes carefully crafted sanctions and, in extreme circumstances, the use of force.”

[Chapter VII of the UN Charter](#) authorizes the Security Council to use force in the face of a threat to peace or aggression, taking “such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.” As there is currently no UN military, all such interventions are carried out by the national armed forces of member nations.

Faithfully, the United States, as the chief financial engine of the international body, has not only signed on to promote the Responsibility to Protect scheme, but President Obama has created a federal agency to ensure that it is executed effectively.

The bureau is called the [White House Atrocities Prevention Board \(APB\)](#) and it will be headed by President Obama’s National Security Advisor, Samantha Power.

Exercising the powers he created for himself in Executive Order 13606, President Barack Obama demonstrated his support for the R2P program when he established the Atrocities Prevention Board.

The stated goal of the APB is to first formally recognize that genocide and other mass atrocities committed by foreign powers are a “core national security interest and core moral responsibility.”

Apart from the unconstitutionality of this use of the executive order, there is something sinister in the selection of Samantha Power to spearhead the search for atrocities.

One source claims that the very existence of the APB is due to Power’s own persistence in convincing the White House that discovering atrocities should be a “core national-security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States.” The statement released at the time of the signing of the executive order demonstrates Power’s remarkable power of persuasion.

Samantha Power rose to prominence in government circles as part of her campaign to promote the [Responsibility to Protect](#) scheme.

Responsibility to Protect is predicated on the proposition that sovereignty is a privilege not a right and that if any regime in any nation violates the UN-approved code of conduct, then the international community is morally obligated to revoke that nation’s sovereignty and assume command and control of the offending country.



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on October 13, 2012

The [three pillars of this UN sovereignty grab](#) explain the provenance of this presumed prerogative:

1. A state has a responsibility to protect its population from mass atrocities
2. The international community has a responsibility to assist the state if it is unable to protect its population on its own, and
3. If the state fails to protect its citizens from mass atrocities and peaceful measures have failed, the international community has the responsibility to intervene through coercive measures such as economic sanctions. Military intervention is considered the last resort.

It is the habitual recourse to this purported “last resort” that has cost countless American lives and has propelled our Republic closer to becoming a mere regional administrative unit of the global government of the United Nations. As Alex Newman wrote in his article on the situation in Mali:

As history shows, [armed UN intervention often leads to mass slaughter and complete chaos](#) that is later used to justify more international military intervention — [Libya](#) and the Ivory Coast being just two recent examples among many. There is little reason to suspect that invading Mali would turn out any better.

Indeed it won't. But using history as a guide, Americans know that the pseudo-pacifists running the United Nations believe that if the social contract fails, there's always the option of deploying blue-helmeted soldiers to impose “peace” at the point of a gun.

To that end, the newly appointed Special Advisor of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, Adama Dieng, recommended delegates work in their individual governments to contribute to an armed UN force under the command of the global government. Reciting the third point of R2P, Dieng pushed for more powerful tools to carry out the third pillar.

“It is our collective responsibility to study the implications of the use of each of them, and to understand the conditions under which the potential of each tool can be maximized,” Dieng said. “It is also our responsibility to establish and strengthen the structures that will make third-pillar tools actionable and effective.”

No matter the [frequency or ferocity of the moral outrage spewed by internationalists](#), the government of the United States does not have a constitutional responsibility to protect the citizens of the world from atrocities.

And nowhere in the Constitution is the president or Congress authorized to place the armed forces of the United States under the command of international bodies, regardless of treaty obligations or sovereignty-stealing “responsibilities” to the contrary.

Related articles:

[UN Plotting Invasion of Northern Mali](#)

[The United Nations: On the Brink of Becoming a World Government](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.