



**Permanent Mission of the Bolivarian Republic of
Venezuela**

Informal Dialogue of the General Assembly:

**“The responsibility of States to protect their
populations through the prevention of genocide,
crimes of war, ethnic cleansing and crimes against
humanity through the appropriate and necessary
means”**

Monday, 8 September 2014

Mr. President,

Allow me to take this opportunity to express to you our most sincere congratulations for the arduous and successful work that you have undertaken as President of the General Assembly. We also extend our expressions of esteem and consideration to the Secretary General and to the members of the panel.

Mr. President,

Venezuela's position with regard to the third pillar of the Responsibility to Protect is well known. The use of force, in the context of the Responsibility to Protect, will always be controversial, and will continue to be, as long as we intervene selectively to protect some people but not others. There have been few instances, if any at all, where military force has been used strictly for humanitarian reasons. Moreover, the results of those interventions that have taken place without the

consent of the affected State have been, in a significant number of occasions, all but humanitarian, and have worsened the situation of the civilian population.

Now, Venezuela, sensitive to the suffering of people everywhere in the world is conscious that Member States, as well as the UN System, have a role to play in preventing those crimes that shock humanity and therefore welcomes the efforts of the Secretary General in putting together his latest Report on the Responsibility to Protect.

In the framework of his Report, the Secretary General speaks of common principles that may guide cooperation by the international community. The Report also presents a list of possible partnerships that may be established with a view to supporting States and the role that could be played in this regard by the different bodies and agencies of the UN System.

The Report also introduces a Roadmap centered in the “dissemination of norms and the creation and consolidation of institutions” that will lead States towards an “effective, legitimate and inclusive governance” with a view to ending violence.

This Roadmap, which gives the international community and civil society a central role, is focused on the implantation of a set of eminently liberal institutions that reflect the idealized product of what the West thinks of itself rather than the concrete practical history. The rule of law, judicial independence, free press and a robust civil society have not worked as perfectly as they are presented, not even in the West.

We need for it to be recognized that there are societies which are the product of different political processes and therefore should rely on a different set of institutions than those proposed by the Secretary General in his Roadmap. Are there no institutions whose origins are outside of Europe or the United States that we could include in the Roadmap that can help prevent violence in the developing world? We find it hard to believe that such is the case.

Mr. President,

My country shares what we believe to be the ultimate objective of the Secretary General's Roadmap: to consolidate a State, whose institutions and decisions are perceived as legitimate by the members of society; all with a view to preventing violence. But we consider that perhaps the top-down strategy of liberalizing State structures, ignoring not only social sub-national institutions, but also the political, ethnic, religious and cultural identities of the members of society, as well as their own historical processes, may not be the most adequate path to achieve such an objective, as it undermines every society's right to self-determination. If we force people to self-determine only with those methods and results that we want, can we really speak of self-determination?

Mr. President,

The international community is more sensitive than ever to grave and systematic violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Such a momentum to prevent atrocious crimes should lead us in the path of a broader and more comprehensive debate on the methods used to achieve such a noble and just objective.

In this regard, we call on the Secretary General, to set forth all his efforts, not to convince Member States that his methods are the most adequate, but to initiate a genuinely diverse consultation: multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multi-cultural, multi-ideological, on what should be the methods used to put an end to systematic and grave violations of human rights and international humanitarian law.

The consolidation of the dominant paradigm is not always the best solution to our problems; it is time to think beyond.

Thank you