

Statement delivered by Belarus – Informal Interactive Dialogue on R2P, 6 September 2017  
[UNOFFICIAL TRANSCRIPTION FROM WEBCAST]

Mr Moderator,

The Belarus delegation extends its gratitude to the SG for its report. We are somewhat surprised at the focus of this year's report on accountability in implementing R2P. Yes indeed, we can talk about accountability concerning upholding common UN principles and goals. For example, the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of states or of the non-use of force have been largely agreed upon by states and which have a clearly delineated legal border.

Yet, how can there be accountability for upholding a concept the content of which has yet to be defined. Hence, an expeditious operationalization of the concept whose main points of contentions are largely legal is simply not acceptable. And this also applies to attempts to manipulate its ideas to attain political aims, including issues around its links to the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of states. There is a blatant attempt to push through yet another premature idea to the detriment of what is most important, namely consent amongst all member states as to its content.

We all remember the issues in implementation of the concept by the Security Council in practice, the abstract nature of some provisions SC resolutions, and a certain one-sidedness in tackling issues of responsibility of certain parts of conflict for violations of human rights and of the norms of international law in domestic conflicts. This offered states opportunities in their actions to overstep Security Council mandates and which ultimately had a negative effect on development.

In this regard, we support the Secretary-General's conclusion about the need to support dialogue on content. The specificity of this issue requires discussion in this format without further formalization or the creation of new bodies at the UN. Other conclusions supported by our delegation include the primary responsibility of states for the protection of their people, including the responsibility of the Security Council which represents all member states, the importance to

further tapping into the potential of regional organizations in the operationalization of R2P and the importance of an effective and stable government in preventing such crimes.

We fully concur that there should be more in-depth consideration of other options in the implementation of the third pillar of the concept, options unrelated to military force. Nor must we overlook the parameters of forced implementation of the third component strictly in line with the UN Charter and there is a need here for a balanced and pragmatic consideration. Belarus consistently believes that the substance operationalization of this concept is in the purview of states.

In this regard, we would note that the legitimacy and full implementation of this concept directly hinges on positions and interests of all states being taken into account. That said, we are compelled to note some contentious issues of the report. In the context of a forced advancement of this notion, jointly with the HRUF initiative, we would stress the key significance of trust by states in the implementation of this body, including the UN. The double-standards in the advancement of confrontational and not-agreed upon initiatives by international bodies undermine prospects for the implementation of this notion and its legitimacy.

In this regard, we further doubt the proposal to introduce the Human Rights Council in this, a body that has clear double-standards in its work. In conclusion, we would like to call for caution against a hasty operationalization of this concept and against the temptation to further expand this approach. This can only widen the gap between states as to the content of R2P and can only lead us to a dead-end.