

Mr. President,

Thank you for convening this informal dialogue to assess the report of the Secretary-General. Recent debates on R2P have overlooked the importance of international cooperation. The fact that this report focuses on Pillar II is a significant step towards fixing this imbalance and placing emphasis on the prevention aspects of the concept.

Brazil is firmly convinced that the most effective means for protecting civilians are non-coercive ones. The dynamics introduced by hastened resort to force are often much more pernicious than virtuous – and our first consideration in R2P situations should be not making matters worse.

Especially important for this end are efforts towards what the 2011 R2P report has dubbed “structural prevention”, including the promotion of development and food security and the eradication of poverty.

The UN should play a pivotal role in providing cooperation under Pillar II. However, the Organization’s capacity to work on structural prevention has been severely limited by the imbalances which define its current budgetary dynamics. Projects towards development and human rights are underfunded, while programs on the domain on international peace and security receive the bulk of available resources.

It is curious to observe that some influential member States continuously evoke the necessity of protecting civilians in conflict scenarios, but when it comes to the UN budget, raise difficulties to strengthen the development pillar. Brazil is firmly convinced that civilians are better protected in more prosperous and inclusive societies. An exclusively or excessively security-centered approach can be insufficient or even detrimental do R2P’s protective goal.

Non-discrimination is a principle that should guide international cooperation under Pillar II. When assisting States to fulfill their responsibility to protect, the international community must not permit the adoption of selective approaches or double standards. Civilians in one State are no less deserving of protection than civilians in other States, including in illegally occupied territories.

It is of paramount importance to draw a clear dividing line between prevention and response. The idea that consented resort to force lies under “prevention” would leave to “response” nothing but the resort to force without the consent of the State concerned, inadequately extending the importance of such extreme course of action within R2P.

As we approach the tenth anniversary of R2P, it becomes every day clearer that the UN should move from a culture of “reaction” to one of “prevention”. Unfortunately the XXI<sup>st</sup> Century, though still in its initial years, offers more examples of irresponsibility towards civilians than the opposite. We look forward to an objective 10-years evaluation of R2P in which a careful assessment of where we stand be made possible with the full regard given to the “responsibility while protecting” idea , which Brazil circulated in a joint note to the General Assembly and to the Security Council, when it comes to Pillar III.

Thank you.