

## Government statements on the Responsibility to Protect Asia-Pacific Region 2005-2007

Country	Speaker	Excerpt
Australia	Robert Hill, Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN	<p>“We recognized the <b>"responsibility to protect"</b> as a central tenet of our shared humanity. This <b>"responsibility to protect"</b> underpins the notion that States must protect their own populations. But if they should fail to do so, the international community has a responsibility to act; not to stand idly by in the face of atrocity, genocide or ethnic cleansing.</p> <p>For the international community, this means we must commit to prevent – and respond to - these most serious of crimes, wherever they occur. And after the immediate crisis has passed, we must support recovery efforts to help communities rebuild and reconcile by addressing the causes of the crisis.</p> <p>Last year the Security Council drew upon the <b>responsibility to protect</b> for the first time in a country-specific resolution, Resolution 1706 on Darfur. And under subsequent Resolution 1769 an African Union/United Nations hybrid peacekeeping operation was established with a robust mandate to protect civilians and humanitarian workers.</p> <p>The international community must now ensure the deployment of the hybrid force proceeds quickly. Active cooperation is needed across the international community if we are to keep our promise to the people of Darfur. The alternative - to fail – is unthinkable. (...) Those who have committed crimes in Darfur must be punished.”</p> <p><i>(Country statement to the 62<sup>nd</sup> United Nations General Assembly; The United Nations :Taking Action, 2 October 2007)</i></p>
John McNee	Permanent Representative of Canada to the UN, speaking on behalf of Canada, Australia and New Zealand	<p>“Finally, Mr. President, in its resolution 1674 on the protection of civilians, the Council stressed the importance of developing clear guidelines for civilian protection mandates. In the absence of such guidance, and a better evidence base through which we can gauge the effectiveness of protection mandates, it is not always obvious how well UN missions are doing in terms of interpreting and implementing their protection responsibilities and what supported is needed for troop contributing countries. CANZ partners urge OCHA and DPKO to make progress in this area and update member states on how resolution 1674 is being implemented in the next Secretary General’s report.</p>



		<p>All sides should continue to abide by the relevant agreed elements of the Summit Outcome in interpreting or applying this concept.”</p> <p><i>(Security Council Open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 4 December 2006)</i></p> <p>“[R]esolution 1674 (2006) reaffirmed a principle expressed in the outcome document of last year’s summit (General Assembly resolution 60/1): the <b>responsibility to protect</b> populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. China believes that that is not the same as the simple concept of the <b>responsibility to protect</b>, about which many countries continue to have concerns. The outcome document elaborated extensively on that concept. In-depth discussion of the issue should continue in the General Assembly so that differing opinions can be heard and doubts cleared up. In that role, the Security Council cannot and should not replace the General Assembly”.</p> <p><i>(Security Council Open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 28 June 2006)</i></p>
Indonesia	President Susilo Bambang Yudhuyono	<p>“We need a consensus on the responsibility to protect people from genocide, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. To this end, force should be used only when all other means have failed.”</p> <p><i>(World Summit, General Assembly, 14-16 September 2005)</i></p>
Japan	Mr. Kenzo Oshima, Permanent Representative of Japan to the UN	<p>“World leaders formally acknowledged the “<b>responsibility to protect</b> populations” at the 2005 Summit, and it was reaffirmed by the Security Council in its resolution 1674. Yet these words have not adequately been translated into action. We need to discuss in this body what other concrete measures we can take”.</p> <p><i>( Open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 22 June 2007, Security Council Chamber)</i></p> <p>“We regard as especially important [in the World Outcome Document] the reference to women and children in armed conflict, the acknowledgement - for the first time at the head-of-State level - of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the clear enunciation of the <b>responsibility to protect</b> populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We should anchor our discussion in the Council on those milestone agreements”.</p> <p><i>(Security Council Open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 9 December 2005)</i></p>

<p>Republic of Korea</p>	<p>Mr. Choi Young-jin, Permanent Representative to the UN</p>	<p>“Despite the continued efforts of the United Nations, however, it remains a sad reality that civilians continue to bear the brunt of armed conflict and terrorism. In both international and civil conflicts, the international community today has become increasingly aware of its <b>responsibility to protect</b> civilian populations. (...) We are still distant from translating our responsibility to protect into adequate action”.</p> <p><i>(Security Council Open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 22 June 2007)</i></p> <p>“[T]he role of neighboring countries is crucial to ensuring humanitarian access to civilians in regions of conflict. The protection of civilians in armed conflict therefore requires the further strengthening of regional cooperation. We welcome the efforts of regional organizations such as the African Union to protect civilians while peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts are ongoing. Regional organizations should be further supported to facilitate such efforts. In this regard, we welcome the inclusion of the concept of the <b>responsibility to protect</b> in the outcome document of the 2005 world summit (General Assembly resolution 60/1). The United Nations should continue to discuss ways to put it into practice.”</p> <p><i>(Security Council open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 9 December 2005)</i></p>
<p>Malaysia</p>	<p>Datuk Seri Syed Hamid Albar, Foreign Minister</p>	<p>“Actions must be in accordance with the respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states as well as observing the principle of non-interference. (...) Malaysia had made the decision to send troops to Cambodia, Congo, Somalia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and in Timor Leste primarily for the purpose of human protection. This is an example of the concrete type of intervention that helps to protect the life of countless ordinary people and communities”</p> <p><i>(“Malaysia Recognizes Need to Intercede on Humanitarian Grounds”, Bernama News, 13 June 2006)</i></p>
<p>Nepal</p>	<p>Mr. Acharya, Permanent Representative to the UN</p>	<p>“We share the view that national Governments should take primary responsibility for the protection of their civilian populations from violence and terrorist activities. Only recently, our leaders have agreed to devise methods of taking <b>responsibility to protect</b> innocent civilians from genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity. His Majesty’s Government is committed to taking the necessary measures to protect the lives and livelihoods of innocent civilians”.</p> <p><i>(Security Council open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 9 December 2005)</i></p>

Philippines	Mr. Leslie Gatan, Minister, Permanent Mission to the UN	<p>“My delegation, right up to this last stage of its term in the Council and as a member of the General Assembly, will continue to engage actively on the issue to ensure that the United Nations efforts aimed at protecting civilians are implemented in ways that balance effectiveness in achieving the desired results against possible adverse consequences. We therefore look forward to the adoption of the Council’s next resolution on the issue and will remain committed to its objectives”.</p> <p><i>(Security Council open debate on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, 9 December 2005)</i></p>
Singapore	Vanu Gopala Menon, Permanent Representative to the UN	<p>“[I]t is high time that massive killings and crimes against humanity be things of the past. Yet, these things continue to happen, and they continue to be protected by walls of an antiquated notion of absolute sovereignty”.</p> <p><i>(87<sup>th</sup> Plenary Meeting on the Report of the Secretary-General “In Larger Freedom: Toward Development, Security and Human Rights for All,” 7 April 2005)</i></p> <p>“On 19 April 2005, the Ambassador challenged the General Assembly to establish criteria on how to prevent and deal with the above crimes, so that there would be no abuse by states when force was needed, and stressed that if the GA was unable to conceive of such criteria, then the Security Council should be empowered to do so”.</p> <p><i>(Informal Thematic Consultations of the General Assembly to Discuss the Four Clusters Contained in the Secretary-General’s Report “In Larger Freedom: Toward Development, Security and Human Rights for All,” 7 April 2005).</i></p>