

Statement of Ecuador
Unofficial Transcript from Webcast
11 September 2013

Thank you very much.

Sir, my delegation would like to express its pleasure at the holding of this event. My government believes that this allows us to express the position of our government and our country on a matter of great importance for the international community.

Resolution A/RES/60/1 of October 24th, 2005 put forth, with clarity, the Three Pillars, that should sustain the Responsibility to Protect, R2P. First it stated [that] the primary responsibility when it comes to protection its populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and the incitation to the commission of these crimes. Two, the international community is responsible for encouraging and helping States to uphold this responsibility in the limits of international public law. And third, the international community has the responsibility of using the diplomatic, humanitarian and other appropriate means, pursuant to Chapter 6 and 7 of the United Nations, to protect populations from these crimes when it is clear that a State is not protecting its own population.

The commitment of the international community to adopting the collective measures mentioned above can only come about through the Security Council and in step with the UN Charter. Any use of force outside of this framework is illegal and illegitimate, and is a mere act of aggression against a sovereign State, regardless of who commits it and the pretext used to justify it. We reaffirm, hence, that the unilateral participation and [participation] non-authorized [by the Security Council] in internal conflicts in a country, as well as possible regime change of a sovereign state, is outside of the concept of Responsibility to Protect and completely lacks legal standing.

For these reasons, we wish to underscore two substantial matters in this debate.

First, the Responsibility to Protect is a concept that is still being analyzed and discussed among the Member States of the organization and only the General Assembly of the United Nations has the legal [and moral] authority to move ahead in its definition. Unilateral interpretations undertaken by a State, or group of States, does not have any binding nature and are merely opinions of [those] States used to utilize these illegitimate aggressions against other States.

Secondly, in the Report's from Secretary-General in this topic, it is recognized clearly that the arrival of conflicts in the world are tied situations marked by discrimination, marginalization, exclusion and other inequalities. For this reason, Ecuador has set forth clear concepts to eliminate the progressive arrival of these situations. My country recognizes that the Responsibility to Protect is intrinsic to the notion of a sovereign State. For this reason, we categorically reject the intent of some States to reduce the

Statement of Ecuador
Unofficial Transcript from Webcast
11 September 2013

principle of national sovereignty to a mere anecdotal and casual element, particularly by those governments that are seeking to impose their own policies or to usurp the natural resources of a State in order to redistribute them to the members of aggressive coalitions. Equitably said, the prevention of conflicts through the use of peaceful dispute settlement is the only legal and efficacious manner of avoiding the crimes that are set forth in paragraphs 138 and 139 of Resolution 60/1 of 24 October 2005 come about. The best way to prevent conflicts and the most expeditious away of strengthening national capacity is in the building of trust and confidence in law and international public laws which are already in place. It is for that reason that it is inconsistent to move ahead with the stance of those whose actions undertake the bodies of the United Nations. My country firmly believes in the roles of regional and sub-regional organizations in the prevention of the aforementioned crimes. We agree then with that expressed in the Secretary-General's Report on the Responsibility to Protect, the responsibility of States and prevention. When there are early warnings of crimes such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes or crimes against humanity, when these crimes can be detected in a timely manner by neighboring States before a greater crisis arises. The delegation of Ecuador, as in previous occasions, reaffirms today that the legitimacy of the concept of Responsibility to Protect can only be based on the following elements...

1. The clear establishment of the motives that can be considered sufficient to legitimize international intervention.
2. The establishment of clear case-by-case support on the eventual intervention excluding the usurpation of a State or natural resources.
3. The use of force should be the last possible option after having exhausted all peaceful dispute settlement mechanisms and under the exclusive authorization of the Security Council under Chapter 7.
4. There must be a clear follow up on the mechanisms that are established in the Resolutions on the use of force, in order to avoid excesses as set by the Security Council.
5. There must be compliance with the provisions of the UN Charter on the way in which the military would act on behalf of the international community.

My delegation will continue to participate actively in the debates. That in the end can allow for a definition on the Responsibility to Protect. This concept is still in discussion, it is still being debated and until the UN General Assembly decided otherwise.

The recommendations of the Secretary-General include his Report of 9 July will be very welcome once an agreement is reached in the General Assembly on the definition of R2P including the scope, thereof, including the manner in which those motives can be

Statement of Ecuador
Unofficial Transcript from Webcast
11 September 2013

determined as sufficient for legitimizing intervention and the manner in which it would be used, it eventually being military strength.