

Statement delivered on behalf of the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations

General Assembly informal, interactive dialogue on the “Responsibility to Protect: Timely and Decisive Response”

5 September 2012

(UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTION)

Thank you Moderator,

Russia reaffirms its commitment to political obligations to protect populations against genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity in the context of what was agreed at the 2005 summit. It is our belief that the paramount obligation for protecting the responsibility of one’s own population lies with the state. The role of the international community amounts, first and foremost, to providing the necessary assistance to the state in implementing this duty.

Using coercive measures is an extreme measure which should be implemented in strict compliance with the UN Charter, in so doing the main aim of such coercion should be to prompt the responsible state for implementing its obligations and not supplanting its role in so doing.

The Secretary-General’s report contains an interesting ideas and proposals with respect to launching the instruments in Chapter VI, on pacific settlement of disputes, and Chapter VIII, regional arrangements. Of the United Nations Charter, in order to implement Responsibility to Protect, we agree with the conclusion that priorities should be given to strengthening preventive mechanisms allowing one at an early stage to highlight/detect problematic situations and prevent large scale atrocities.

The third pillar of R2P, especially with respect to the use of armed force, is the most contradictory. Examples from practice confirm how likely the use or the application of R2P may be for distorted goals. And in this context with this in mind the Libyan issue not only didn’t reinforce faith in R2P but also harmed the image of this concept around the world. Once again we appeal for there to be an extremely cautious approach to implementing R2P. If there is interference, negative consequences may eviscerate the chances of a positive effect. And in this context we note the timeliness of the Brazilian idea, on the Responsibility while Protecting.

Moderator, we are seeing too much distraction with regards to the structure of R2P, very often we hear judgments about the relationship between the various components, the various pillars of R2P. While the sequence should be for applying the principle, does this exist in general? And so on and so forth. We’ve heard from the Secretary-General about the simultaneous application of all three pillars. Or the application of these principles and these pillars in different combinations and permutations. In respect of the same situation we think that all of these judgments distract us from a very useful discuss about the real problems of the Responsibility

to Protect. And here there are still serious differences of opinion. The question remains open of whether the proposed strategy for applying R2P actually enjoys widespread recognition among states. Has the concept achieved the level of maturity in general which would allow one without any doubt to put it into practice? Have the mechanisms been created which limit the possibilities of abuse? We do not have the confidence that in the world a consensus has been achieved on these issues. And only such a consensus, in our opinion, would create a sound basis for further steps in this area. We are ready to continue our discussion of these issues in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Thank you Sir.