

Statement delivered by Bolivia – Informal Interactive Dialogue on R2P, 6 September 2016
[TRANSLATION]

Thank you Mr. Chair,

The Plurinational State of Bolivia is a pacific state, which promote peace culture and the right to peace, as well as cooperation among the populations of the region and the world to contribute to a mutual knowledge, equitable development and the promotion of interculturality with full respect to the States' sovereignty.

Thus, Bolivia always promotes dialogue between the parties to the conflict with full respect to international law. Bolivia reaffirms its condemnation of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, which were mentioned in paragraphs 138 and 139 of the 2005 World Summit. These crimes, wherever they take place and in whatever form they occur constitute atrocity crimes that we repudiate.

The primary responsibility for the protection of populations lies within the state, in particular in the prevention of those crimes. However, this prevention or protection cannot in any way be used as a pretext to disregard the principles of the UN Charter, of international law or to try to change or manipulate the basic principles of humanitarian assistance with hegemonic intent.

R2P has been used for coercive measures and interference in the internal affairs of States, which has nothing to do with protection of civilians. Sir, there is no intergovernmental agreement between Member States on the scope and possible ways of interpreting this concept of R2P. Therefore, Bolivia considers that no agreement was reached as it does not have the nod of the General Assembly. We cannot accept unilateral interpretations from any actor or group of actors.

Sir,

We are concerned that the R2P may be used as a justification for interference and the use of force against states. Among the questions on this topic that have yet to be clarified in reports yet are the following: who and what decides that there is an urgent need to intervene in a state under the R2P; who and what criterion decides that peaceful means have been exhausted in specific situations; how and where are limits established between R2P and interventions for political strategic reasons.

Regarding the promotion of prevention mentioned in the Secretary-General's report, we are concerned at the lack of definition on what is understood by "preventive measures", nor are we clear on who defines the moment of implementation of those measures.

The principal problem that we identify for the mobilization of collective action in cases of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity is that the decision of acting depends on a group of states in the Security Council. Measures of such magnitude should be taken with transparency and democratically by decision of the General Assembly, where all countries have the same weight on decision-making.

Thank you.