Mr. Moderator,

We thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this interactive dialogue, which is another bold step towards the institutionalisation of the debate on the subject. We would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his remarks and the distinguished panellists for their insightful presentations.

We have read the Secretary-General’s report with great interest. It is a strongly reasoned report with specific set of recommendations. It should be considered in conjunction with all previous reports, which in their entirety provide solid methodological research on the subject.

Having said that, we tend to prioritise Pillar I, which provides for the primary responsibility of states to prevent atrocity crimes. The effective way to achieve this primarily depends on providing solid state foundations to address risks. Early prevention is all about effective and full use of structural tools to make state institutions functioning properly in all fields, which define measures of prevention.

In this respect, we value the consistent insistence on the non-sequential, mutually reinforcing and holistic nature of all three Pillars. We particularly underline the common principle of prioritising prevention in the collective responsibility to protect. By the same token, amongst the forms of international assistance, the encouragement to states to meet their protection obligations and assistance in capacity building stands out exactly in the context of deepening international co-operation in providing extensive and comprehensive structural measures of prevention by states.

Amongst the common set of principles of assistance there is reference to ensuring national ownership, which fully resonates with the approach of this delegation about the priority of primary responsibility of states to protect. The problem arises when the
state is the primary source of instability, the primary failing entity. It is also a known problem, when a state is in a position to refuse responsibility of addressing structural measures of prevention and subsequently to refuse admittance of existing and growing risks.

Failure of a state to protect generates reaction from populations at risk. Consistent and targeted discrimination, structural discrimination, incitement to hatred and other manifest failures of States to exercise their sovereignty responsibly gives rise to natural reaction of self-defence and aspiration for self-rule. When there is no prevention and protection, there may be self-protection. The application of the principle of self-determination in this respect is a matter of particular relevance, including as a measure of protection. We would encourage the Secretary-General to further explore this issue in the context of the present and on-going study.

We read with concern the conclusions in this report that there is still too little will to operationalize prevention. It is particularly disturbing from a perspective of a nation subjected to genocide nearly one hundred years ago, when the international community was miles away from institutionalised address to atrocities.

Finally, my Delegation has taken an interest in the Secretary-General’s focus on elaborating methodology of assessing prevention outcomes. We encourage the Secretary-General focusing more on this issue in his subsequent report.

Armenia deeply appreciates the work of the UN Secretary-General’s Special Advisers on the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect, strongly supports these deliberations and will continue to utilize its efforts aimed at advocating for preventive strategies, initiatives and mechanisms within the United Nations system and other international settings.

I thank you.