NAME: Adeyemi Gbenga Mayode

MATRIC NO:16/SMS10/001

DEPARTMENT: Peace and Conflict Studies

COLLEGE: Social and Management Sciences

LEVEL:400

COURSE TITLE: Conflict and Human. Displacement

COURSE CODE: PCS 402

 ASSIGMENT QUESTION

Discuss Responsibility to Protect (R2p) in relation to the Libyan and Syrian crises and give few narratives on the following:

a. Ethnic cleansing

b. Genocide

C. War crimes

d. Crimes against Humanity

 Responsibility to Protect known as R2P is an international norm that seeks to ensure that the international community never again fails to halt the mass atrocity crimes of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

The Responsibility to Protect was adopted in 2005 at the UN World Summit, the largest gathering of Heads of State and Government in history. It is articulated in paragraphs 138 and 139 of the World Summit Outcome Document.

Responsibility to protect emerged in response to the failure of the international community to adequately respond to mass atrocities committed in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia during the 1990s. The International Committee on Intervention and State Sovereignty developed the concept of R2P during 2001.

Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and necessary means. It accepts that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise this responsibility and support the United Nations in establishing an early warning capability.

The international community, through the United Nations, also has the responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context, they are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations as appropriate, should peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities manifestly fail to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

R2P stipulates three pillars of responsibility which are:

PILLAR ONE

Every state has the Responsibility to Protect its populations from four mass atrocity crimes: genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing.

PILLAR TWO

The wider international community has the responsibility to encourage and assist individual states in meeting that responsibility.

PILLAR THREE

If a state is manifestly failing to protect its populations, the international community must be prepared to take appropriate collective action, in a timely and decisive manner and in accordance with the UN Charter.

Responsibility to Protect (R2p) in relation to the Libyan Crisis.

 The case of the humanitarian intervention in Libya in 2011 is unique, as it marked the first full-blown test of the guiding principles of R2P. In March 2011, as uprisings erupted across the Arab world, the international community turned its attention to Libya, where Muammar Gaddafi’s forces appeared intent on carrying out a massacre on the city of Benghazi. In response to the swift escalation of violence in the Libyan uprising as well as growing demands for international action to prevent a massacre in Benghazi, the United Nations Security Council authorized armed intervention to protect civilians in Libya. Significantly, although R2P was previously invoked to highlight individual states’ responsibility to protect, this marked the first time that the UN Security Council explicitly invoked the R2P doctrine to authorize the international community to conduct an armed intervention to protect civilians. Security Council Resolution 1973 paved the way for a NATO-led operation to prevent the advance of Gaddafi’s forces into Benghazi and provide military support for the rebels. In October 2011, the operation ended with the death of Muammar Gaddafi and the fall of his regime, the establishment of a transitional government and the departure of foreign forces. Although the Libyan transitional government urged NATO to stay in Libya until the end of the year, NATO members decided to end the operation on October 31, claiming that the National Transitional Council could handle any security threats on its own.

Furthermore, Libya was lauded as a model case of how R2P should be applied. As the security situation deteriorated in the months following the end of the operation, however, observers began to question the wisdom of the intervention and the level of support for Libya’s postwar transition. The country is descending into civil war and experiencing a legitimacy crisis, with essentially two governments fighting for power. The Libyan government struggles to control powerful militias, there have been seven different prime ministers since 2011, the economy is crippled due to poor governance and attacks on oil ports and recent reports claim that the country is descending into civil war. The rapidly deteriorating security situation in Libya has led to a humanitarian crisis, with over 100,000 refugees and an estimated 287,000 internally displaced.

 The Arab Awakening of 2011 reached Libya on February 15, when security forces opened fire on a protest in Benghazi. Anti-government protests spread across Libya and quickly evolved into a violent movement to overthrow Muammar Gaddafi, who had ruled the country for 41 years. Although protests were erupting across the Arab world, the crisis in Libya seized the attention of the international community and became a focal point for action to prevent mass atrocities. In his speeches in February, Gaddafi used language reminiscent of the 1994 radio broadcasts calling for genocide in Rwanda; he referred to the protesters as “cockroaches” and “rats” and publicly told his forces to show “no mercy” to rebels and to “cleanse Libya house by house” until they surrendered. By that time, rebels had established a stronghold in Benghazi, and Gaddafi’s forces set their sights on overtaking the city. According to a report by Human Rights Watch on February 20, 2011, at least 233 people had been killed in the previous week, and government forces were indiscriminately targeting civilians.

Faced with what appeared to be an imminent bloodbath, a wide range of NGOs – including Libyan, European, African, Asian and American organizations – called on the United Nations to fulfill its responsibility to protect civilians and prevent Gaddafi’s forces from perpetrating a massacre and potential genocide. The Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect urged the UN Security Council to take steps to protect Libya’s population, including a no-fly zone to prevent aerial attacks on civilians, an arms embargo on Gaddafi’s regime, sanctions on the government and a commission of inquiry to investigate war crimes. The Centre also called for regional organizations to support such measures. The League of Arab States (LAS), Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) and African Union (AU) issued calls for action and condemnation of the violence, which were crucial in encouraging the international community to move forward with stronger measures.

Several United Nations bodies moved to respond to the crisis in Libya. The Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect issued a press release to remind the Libyan government of its responsibility to protect its population. The Human Rights Council adopted Resolution S-15/2 calling for the Libyan regime to cease human rights violations, for the establishment of a commission of inquiry and for the General Assembly to suspend Libya from the Council. On February 26, 2011, the Security Council responded to concerns from other UN bodies as well as the LAS, AU and OIC by unanimously adopting Resolution 1970. Resolution 1970 asserted Libya’s “responsibility to protect” its population, imposed an arms embargo and travel ban on the Gaddafi family and members of the government, froze the family’s assets and referred the situation to the International Criminal Court (ICC).  It marked the first time the Security Council had invoked the R2P framework since a 2006 resolution on the crisis in Darfur.

 The ethicality of the intervention under R2P extends beyond Gaddafi’s fall to the trends in post-war Libya, where there have been few positive developments. Since the end of the war in October 2011, Libya has been plagued by economic instability, widespread violence and insecurity and threats to political transition processes. Although the military intervention succeeded in its goals of protecting Libyan civilians, the lawlessness and instability of postwar Libya has placed civilians at the mercy of militias and terrorist groups, while the international community largely ignores the escalating violence.

  R2P emphasizes a three-fold responsibility: responsibility to prevent, responsibility to react and responsibility to rebuild. In the case of Libya, the fulfillment of the international responsibility to react is not in question, as the UN Security Council, regional bodies and individual countries reacted with an unprecedented efficiency to respond to the crisis. The responsibility to prevent has been called into question by the rejection of peaceful solutions before they were fully pursued. In Libya’s postwar period, however, the responsibility to rebuild represents the most obvious failure of R2P in the scope of the intervention in Libya. With regard to implications of Libya’s current unrest for the future of R2P, Hamid questions the parallel between Libya’s unrest and a failure of R2P: “Libya is in a very difficult situation right now… but we have to ask ourselves, is that tied to the original decision to intervene or to the failure to support the reconstruction of the Libyan state.

 Libya is sliding back into civil war, there is continued inaction in the Security Council on the tragic situation in Syria and many questions have arisen surrounding the justification and nature of the intervention under the Responsibility to Protect. R2P has been lauded as an emerging norm guiding concerted international action to prevent and respond to mass atrocities. However, two of its key elements – the responsibilities to prevent and rebuild – have been diminished, and the responsibility to react has become nearly synonymous with R2P in mainstream discussion of the doctrine. Support for the post-conflict transition of a state must be robust and address the needs of that particular state.  Libya in particular required sustained support in a range of areas including the security sector, delivery of public services, economic development, legal and political reforms and capacity-building for civil society. Although there were several initiatives to support Libya’s post-conflict transition, there was a need for far more robust support in a state that was almost completely devoid of institutions.

Also, Libya has often been touted as a successful case of the application of R2P. A number of non-military measures were adopted to protect Libyans and to stabilize the country in 2011. Diplomatic intervention, punitive sanctions and a no-fly zone were imposed on the Libyan regime. Yet when these measures failed to resolve the Libyan crisis, it led to broader interpretation and application of Pillar 3 which is,If a state is manifestly failing to protect its populations, the international community must be prepared to take appropriate collective action, in a timely and decisive manner and in accordance with the UN Charter.

In conclusion, instead of a blanket criticism of R2P and the Libya intervention, these challenges present an opportunity for the UN to critically examine the use of R2P to justify humanitarian intervention and address concerns that have prevented the UN Security Council from responding to other crises. A critical evaluation of R2P should consider options to develop and enhance UN procedures to achieve a nuanced understanding of how a conflict manifests in different areas and at different levels in an intrastate conflict, the capacity and legitimacy of existing institutions and the interests of all relevant actors. These procedures should inform an assessment of longer-term needs for peacebuilding and development and identify individuals and groups who derive legitimacy through nonviolent means and who can galvanize support for positive developments in the post-conflict transition. A re-evaluation of R2P should also incorporate the development of a framework to ensure that states abide by the requirements of a resolution’s mandate, uphold the principle of last resort and fulfill their responsibility to rebuild by working closely with development and relief organizations in the country’s transition. These requirements should be embedded into any resolution authorizing armed intervention.

Responsibility to Protect (R2p) in relation to the Syrian Crisis.

After four deadly years the Syrian conflict shows no sign of abating. As the civil war has dragged on its violence has become more widespread, systematic and extreme. The conflict has also become more intractable, threatening the peace and stability of the entire Middle East. It has already had devastating consequences for neighboring Iraq and poses an enduring threat to Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey.

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P), the global commitment adopted at the 2005 United Nations (UN) World Summit, has been central to the international discourse on how to respond to mass atrocity crimes in Syria. Despite the acrimonious debate surrounding the UN Security Council-mandated intervention in Libya in 2011, individual states, regional organizations and UN agencies have struggled to find ways and means of upholding their responsibility to protect the people of Syria.

 Public censure of atrocities committed by both government forces and armed opposition groups, as well as bilateral sanctions, investigations by the UN Human Rights Council and a Joint Monitoring Mission deployed during the failed 2012 ceasefire, stand as examples of international efforts to confront atrocities in Syria. But it has not been enough.

The Responsibility to Protect is an international norm, but it does not possess independent agency. The failure to end atrocities and protect civilians in Syria is not a failure of R2P, but of the imperfect actors and institutions charged with its implementation. Beyond the primary responsibility of the Syrian government to stop killing its own people, responsibility rests with the one body entrusted and mandated by the 193 members of the United Nations with the maintenance of international peace and security.

Despite resolutions that led to the destruction of Syria’s chemical weapons stockpile and improved access to the 12.2 million suffering Syrian civilians who remain in desperate need of humanitarian assistance, political divisions and partisan interests within the Security Council have been an insurmountable obstacle. In particular, Russia and China have on four separate occasions employed their vetoes to block action in response to mass atrocity crimes in Syria, including most recently on a May 2014 draft resolution that would have referred the Syrian situation to the International Criminal Court.

Although R2P is morally laudable, in reality it’s not a tool which can be applied in a world that is heavily vested in politics. Whilst the world continues to be divided among big and small powers, and the division between the Global North and South widens, the principle of state sovereignty will continue to be highly valued by smaller, weaker, or threatened powers.

The downward spiral of Syria and the gradual spreading of the conflict, notable comments have been made by diplomats on how ‘difficult’ and ‘different’ the Syrian case is, despite in principle support of R2P.

The Syrian government has failed in its responsibility to protect the Syrian population. Not only has the government failed to protect Syrian people from mass atrocities committed by opposition groups, but has committed mass atrocities itself. This makes the prospect of resolving the conflict more complex as peace negotiations with the Assad regime persistently fail.

The prevalence of many different opposition groups throughout Syria again complicates the resolution of the conflict.

 The ongoing crisis in Syria is significant on a global level in how it is damaging the authority of the UN. Particularly, the Security Council’s resolutions are repeatedly ignored. Seemingly, the international community cannot put an end to the crisis, and many organizations take the view that the international community has failed in its responsibility to protect in Syria. That is, while the international community has played a significant role in attempting to solve the crisis, everything from initiating peace talks and enforcing sanctions, to military intervention and humanitarian missions, this is often viewed as ineffective. Crucially, the United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria was established in April 2012. It aimed to monitor armed violence in Syria and offer support for the Joint Special Envoy’s six-point plan to help end the conflict. However, the Supervision Mission was terminated in August 2012.

 Finally, there is limited space for political negotiations between the disputing parties, this possibility must be explored in the interest of the suffering masses. President Bashar al-Assad will have to step down sooner or later, but only a political process will facilitate a peaceful end to Syria’s escalating violence and rescue R2P from its state of it not being effective.

a. Ethnic cleansing

Ethnic cleansing can be defined as the attempt to get rid of through deportation, displacement or even mass killing members of an unwanted ethnic group in order to establish an ethnically homogenous geographic area. Though cleansing campaigns for ethnic or religious reasons have existed throughout history, the rise of extreme nationalist movements during the 20th century led to an unprecedented level of ethnically motivated brutality, including the Turkish massacre of Armenians during World War I; the Nazis’ annihilation of some 6 million European Jews in the Holocaust; and the forced displacement and mass killings carried out in the former Yugoslavia and the African country of Rwanda during the 1990s.

Ethnic cleansing came into wide usage in the 1990s, to describe the treatment suffered by particular ethnic groups during conflicts that erupted after the disintegration of the former Yugoslavia.

After the republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina declared its independence in March 1992, Bosnian Serb forces waged a systematic campaign including forced deportation, murder, torture and rape to expel Bosniak (Bosnian Muslim) and Croatian civilians from territory in eastern Bosnia. This violence culminated in the massacre of as many as 8,000 Bosniak men and boys at the town of Srebrenica in July 1995.

The term ethnic cleansing has also been used to refer to the treatment of Chechens who fled Grozny and other areas of Chechnya after Russia began military operations against separatists there during the 1990s, as well as the killing or forcible removal from their homes of refugees from East Timor by Indonesian militants after a vote for independence in 1999.

Most recently, it has been applied to the events that occurred beginning in 2003 in the Darfur region of Sudan, where brutal clashes between rebel groups and Sudanese military forces left hundreds of thousands of dead and more than 2 million displaced many of whom, like the rebels, are members of the Fur, Zaghawa and Masaalit ethnic groups.

Examples of ethnic cleansing movements in the 20th century include:

* Turkish Massacre of Armenians during WWI
* Nazi Holocaust during WWI
* Genocide in Bosnia during the 1990s
* Forced displacement and mass killings in Rwanda during the 1990s

Perhaps the most ill-famed example of extremist ethnic cleansing occurred in Nazi Germany, as Adolf Hitler engaged in a campaign to rid his world of what he considered to be subhumans. This malevolent crusade began with the forced deportation of Jews and other non-Aryan people from Germany, but Hitler’s plan did not end there. Hitler dreamed of a white, blond-haired, blue-eyed Master Race, believing that all other peoples were inferior. He engaged in a program of eugenics, which involved forced sterilization of those with impure genes, so that they could not breed; and segregation and extermination of millions of people.

During the 12 years of Hitler’s terrifying reign, he ordered the slaughter of 6 million Jews, as well as another half a million Gypsies and homosexuals, most of whom had first been herded like cattle into concentration camps and mass killing centers. Just who was set for extermination was determined by a racial hierarchy, in which Poles, Serbs, Romani, and persons of color were considered to be non-Aryan subhumans. In this hierarchy, the Jews occupied the bottom, being considered “inhuman,” rather than subhuman, which accounts for their horrific treatment, and animal-like slaughter.

The atrocities committed as a result of Hitler’s actions in Nazi Germany began as an attempt at ethnic cleansing, before the term had really been coined. People not considered to be of the Aryan race were segregated, then forced out of their homes, and across the borders.

In 1993, the United Nations (U.N.) Commission of Experts defined ethnic cleansing as “rendering an area ethnically homogenous by using force or intimidation to remove persons of given groups from the area.” The Commission reported, to the U.N. Security Council, that the former Yugoslavia had undergone ethnic cleansing through the use of arbitrary arrests, torture, rape, murder, executions outside the judicial system, confinement of civilians, military attacks on civilians, and malicious destruction of public and private property.

In conclusion, leaders of certain nations have attempted to create an ethnically or religiously uniform people within the state. This is accomplished by engaging in cleansing campaigns, in which all of the people in a geographic region that do not meet a specific standard are forced out or killed. The term “ethnic cleansing” is a blanket term that does not refer to one specific crime. Rather, it refers to the act of forcing people from their homelands, through the use of fear, intimidation, violence, and murder.

 b. Genocide

Genocide is a term used to describe violence against members of a national, ethnic, racial or religious group with the intent to destroy the entire group. The word came into general usage only after World War II, when the full extent of the atrocities committed by the Nazi regime against European Jews during that conflict became known. In 1948, the United Nations declared genocide to be an international crime; the term would later be applied to the horrific acts of violence committed during conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and in the African country of Rwanda in the 1990s.

The word genocide owes its existence to Raphael Lemkin, a Polish-Jewish lawyer who fled the Nazi occupation of Poland and arrived in the United States in 1941. As a boy, Lemkin had been horrified when he learned of the Turkish massacre of hundreds of thousands of Armenians during World War1.

In 1944, he coined the term “genocide” by combining genos, the Greek word for race or tribe, with the Latin suffix cide (“to kill”).

In 1948, the United Nations approved its Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (CPPCG), which defined genocide as any of a number of acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.

This included killing or causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, inflicting conditions of life intended to bring about the group’s demise, imposing measures intended to prevent births (i.e., forced sterilization) or forcibly removing the group’s children.

Genocide’s “intent to destroy” separates it from other crimes of humanity such as ethic cleansing, which aims at forcibly expelling a group from a geographic area (by killing, forced deportation and other methods).

From April to mid-July 1994, members of the Hutu majority in Rwanda murdered some 500,000 to 800,000 people, mostly of the Tutsi minority, with horrifying brutality and speed. As with the former Yugoslavia, the international community did little to stop the Rwandan Genocide while it was occurring, but that fall the U.N. expanded the mandate of the ICTY to include the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), located in Tanzania.

For example, During the Rwandan genocide of 1994, members of the Hutu ethnic majority in the east-central African nation of Rwanda murdered as many as 800,000 people, mostly of the Tutsi minority. Started by Hutu nationalists in the capital of Kigali, the genocide spread throughout the country with shocking speed and brutality, as ordinary citizens were incited by local officials and the Hutu Power government to take up arms against their neighbors. By the time the Tutsi-led Rwandese Patriotic Front gained control of the country through a military offensive in early July, hundreds of thousands of Rwandans were dead and 2 million refugees (mainly Hutus) fled Rwanda, exacerbating what had already become a full-blown humanitarian crisis.

Finally, genocide is generally considered one of the worst moral crimes a government meaning any ruling authority, including that of a guerrilla group, a quasi state, a Soviet, a terrorist organization, or an occupation authority can commit against its citizens or those it controls. The major reason for this is what the world learned about the Holocaust, the systematic attempt of German authorities during World War II to kill all and every Jew no matter where found to destroy Jews as a group.

C. War crimes

 War crimes can be defined as unwarranted acts of violence or brutality, violations of treaties, or violating customs that govern military conflicts. War crimes are most often committed by military personnel but can also be committed by politicians and civilians.

War crimes can be divided into three categories:

Traditional war crimes - acts that violate customary war time practices

Crimes against peace - acts of hostile military action against a sovereign country that is not in self defense

Crimes against humanity - acts that involve the enslavement, persecution, brutality or murder of non-combatants or the extermination of certain groups of people.

 The trial of Peter von Hagenbach by an ad hoc tribunal of the Holy Roman Empire in 1474 was the first international war crimes trial, and also of command responsibility. He was convicted and beheaded for crimes that he as a knight was deemed to have a duty to prevent, although he had argued that he was "just following orders".

 War crimes are defined in the statute that established the International Criminal Court, which includes:

1. Grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, such as:
	1. Willful killing, or causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health
	2. Torture or inhumane treatment
	3. Unlawful wanton destruction or appropriation of property
	4. Forcing a prisoner of war to serve in the forces of a hostile power
	5. Depriving a prisoner of war of a fair trial
	6. Unlawful deportation, confinement or transfer
	7. Taking hostages
	8. Directing attacks against civilians
	9. Directing attacks against humanitarian workers or UN peacekeepers
	10. Killing a surrendered combatant
	11. Misusing a flag of truce
	12. Settlement of occupied territory
	13. Deportation of inhabitants of occupied territory
	14. Using poison weapons
	15. Using civilians as shields
	16. Using child soldiers
	17. Firing upon a Combat Medic with clear insignia.
2. The following acts as part of a non-international conflict:
	1. Murder, cruel or degrading treatment and torture
	2. Directing attacks against civilians, humanitarian workers or UN peacekeepers
3. The following acts as part of an international conflict:
	1. Taking hostages
	2. Summary execution
	3. Pillage
	4. Rape, sexual slavery, forced prostitution or forced pregnancy

##

In 2008, former Bosnian President Radovan Karadzic, known as the Butcher of Bosnia, was arrested and charged with war crimes for allegedly trying to exterminate Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croat civilians during the Bosnian war from 1992-1995. The attempted extermination of these individuals, also known as genocide, is considered a crime against humanity.

In 2007, Dustin Heard, Evan Liberty, Nicholas Slatten and Paul Slough, four privately contracted security guards, engaged a group of Iraqi civilians who they claimed were armed. In the end, 14 civilians were dead and the guards were tried in the United States Federal court system for murdering non-combatants, a crime against humanity.

d. Crimes against Humanity

 Crimes against humanity are certain acts that are purposely committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian or an identifiable part of a civilian population. The first prosecution for crimes against humanity took place at the Nuremberg trials. Crimes against humanity have since been prosecuted by other international courts (for example, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Criminal Court) as well as in domestic prosecutions. The law of crimes against humanity has primarily developed through the evolution of customary international law. Crimes against humanity are not codified in an international convention, although there is currently an international effort to establish such a treaty, led by the Crimes Against Humanity Initiative.

 Crimes against humanity can be committed during peace or war. They are not isolated or sporadic events, but are part either of a government policy although the perpetrators need not identify themselves with this policy or of a wide practice of atrocities tolerated or condoned by a government or a de facto authority.

Crimes against humanity have been committed by a wide range of people. The accused could be a foot soldier or a high-level government official. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), for example, has indicted former Serbian president Slobodan Milosevic for a variety of crimes, as well as police commanders and prison guards for murder and torture, and common soldiers for rape, among other crimes. International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) indictees include former prime minister Jean Kambanda for inciting genocide, among other crimes, newspaper editor Hassan Ngeze for propagating hate media, and Mayor Jean-Paul Akayesu for his part in widespread killings and in the systematic rape of Tutsi women.

The term crimes against humanity also includes actions by members of paramilitary organizations these groups are typically unofficial or quasi-official and are often funded by the government, warlords, rebel leaders, and members of rebel militias.

In northern Uganda, for example, government forces have been accused of numerous abductions, killings, and torture as they have battled the rebel Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), which in turn has been accused of kidnapping as many as 20,000 children for use as child soldiers and slaves. In 2005, the head of the LRA, Joseph Kony, was indicted by the ICC on 33 counts; 12 of those counts were for crimes against The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia also known by the Spanish abbreviation FARC have also been accused of kidnappings and widespread use of child soldiers, as have other paramilitary groups humanity, including murder, enslavement, sexual enslavement, and rape. supported by Colombian army units.

In conclusion, **Crime against humanity**, an offense in international criminal law, adopted in the Charter of the International Military Tribunal Nürnberg Charter, which tried surviving Nazi leaders in 1945, and was, in 1998, incorporated into the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC).