

**EXCERPTED STATEMENTS FROM SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING
ON
THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL
ON
DARFUR**

11, September 2006

**Secretary General
Mr. Annan**

(...) We have all heard the latest deeply dismaying reports of renewed fighting — particularly in north Darfur — among the various factions. Thousands of Sudan Armed Forces troops have been deployed to the area in clear violation of the Darfur Peace Agreement. Even worse, the area has been subjected to renewed aerial bombing. I strongly condemn the escalation. The Government should stop its offensive immediately and refrain from any further such action.(...)

As access gets harder, the humanitarian gains of the past two years are being rolled back. Unless security improves, we face the prospect of having to drastically curtail an acutely needed humanitarian operation. Can we in conscience leave the people of Darfur to such a fate? Can the international community, having not done enough for the people of Rwanda in their time of need, just watch as this tragedy deepens? Having finally agreed — just one year ago — that there is a **responsibility to protect**, can we contemplate failing yet another test? Lessons either learned or not, principles either upheld or scorned, this is no time for the middle ground of half measures or further debate. (...)

As the Council made clear in resolution 1706 (2006), the Darfur Peace Agreement gives us a chance to achieve peace. In the coming days, we in the Secretariat will be meeting senior officials from the Commission of the African Union to finalize a support package for the African Union Mission in the Sudan (AMIS). The Department of Peacekeeping Operations

will also convene a meeting of potential troop and police contributors to discuss the expansion of the United Nations Mission in the Sudan to Darfur.

The African Union has been very clear about the need for the transition from AMIS to a United Nations peacekeeping operation, on which the Council has decided. The AU has been equally clear about the need for AMIS to continue until then, as well as about the need to resist any attempt to subvert decisions aimed at achieving those vital objectives. (...)

But let us be clear: we all know that the Government of the Sudan still refuses to accept the transition, and the Council has recognized that without the Government's consent the transition will not be possible. Once again, therefore, I urge the Government of the Sudan to embrace the spirit of resolution 1706 (2006), to give its consent to the transition and to pursue the political process with new energy and commitment.

The consequences of the Government's current attitude — yet more death and suffering, perhaps on a catastrophic scale — will be felt first and foremost by the people of Darfur. But the Government itself will also suffer if it fails in its sacred **responsibility to protect its own people**. It will suffer opprobrium and disgrace in the eyes of all Africa and the whole international community. Moreover, neither those who decide such policies nor those who carry them out should imagine that they will not be held accountable.

But my voice alone will not convince the Government.(...)It is time now for additional voices to make themselves

heard. We need Governments and individual leaders in Africa and beyond who are in a position to influence the Government of the Sudan to bring that pressure to bear without delay. There must also be a clear, strong and uniform message from this Council. (...)

Sudan

Mr. Abdelsalam (*spoke in Arabic*):

(...)First of all, I would like to confirm a basic truth, namely, that the Government of the Sudan has always been fully interested in establishing constructive cooperation and objective dialogue with the United Nations in order to ensure peace and stability, for the Sudan has been active and committed in this Organization since it became a member. (...)

It is clear that the Sudan is currently host to one of the largest United Nations peacekeeping missions, which was deployed in the Sudan on the basis of an agreement between the two parties within the context of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. The Government of the Sudan is the first party to that Agreement. Dialogue and interaction with the United Nations was, then, governed by the principles of the Charter and respect for sovereignty. At that time, there was no need for the Security Council to hold such continuous meetings. However, with regard to the Council's approach to the situation in Darfur, things have proceeded down a different path characterized by an imbalanced scale of justice and the lack of the criteria for credibility. (...)

In adopting resolution 1706 (2006), the Security Council deliberately took hasty measures without preparing the political context with all parties involved in the issue, foremost among them the Sudanese Government, which is the party principally concerned and which firmly believes that this dialogue is a oneway, unilateral dialogue. By acting hastily, the Council chose a confrontational approach, but the Government of the Sudan is always ready

to engage in dialogue on this issue, in which it is the main interested party. We will keep the doors open to unlimited and unconditional cooperation with the international community and all peace-loving countries, in conformity with all principles and practices that respect its sovereignty and independence and that take account of its people's specific characteristics, values and heritage. A lasting peace in Darfur is and will always be a strategic objective of our Government and the overriding will of our people. We will pursue our current efforts to implement the Darfur Peace Agreement and will not rest until peace and security are restored throughout Darfur. (...)

United States of America

Mr. Brencick

(...) In his whole lengthy intervention today, the one critical point that Sudanese chargé d'affaires left out was a stated commitment by the Government of National Unity to address the humanitarian situation —the suffering of the people of Darfur — by consenting to the deployment of United Nations forces and by cooperating with the implementation of resolution 1706 (2006). (...)

Aid agencies have consistently asserted that their work is impossible without a United Nations force on the ground to provide them with needed security. How many people need to describe the horror of the situation in Darfur, and how much worse must the situation become, before the Government of National Unity gets the message? (...)

We must support the African Union (AU) and AMIS at this critical point in maintaining their key role in addressing the Darfur crisis and the suffering of the people. If the AU Peace and Security Council decides to extend AMIS through the end of the year, everyone, including the Government of National Unity, must do everything possible to support it. This

includes immediately implementing resolution 1706 (2006), which calls for robust assistance to AMIS. The Council agreed that the transition of AMIS to a United Nations operation is the best option for all. We will circulate a draft presidential statement this afternoon, whose purpose is to allow the Council to speak for the international community with one strong clear voice, and to say to the Government of National Unity, “Work with us, because the situation in Darfur cannot stand”.

United Kingdom
Sir Emyr Jones Parry

The United Kingdom condemns the attacks that have taken place — attacks by the forces of the Government of the Sudan in Darfur, and attacks by bandits and rebel movements. We condemn both sides equally.

The fact is, as the Secretary-General has argued, Darfur faces a humanitarian catastrophe. It should be quite clear that the primary **responsibility of Governments is to protect their own citizens**. It follows that the primary responsibility for the security of the people in Darfur rests with the Government of National Unity, and that security needs to be delivered for the ordinary people.

The interest of the Security Council is straightforward — to avert a humanitarian crisis, to actually preserve and work with the Government of the Sudan so that its territorial integrity is maintained, and to make sure that Darfur does not become a threat to the unity of the State or to the stability of the region. It is a legitimate interest, an interest that, over the years, some members of the Council have disputed. But by today, we all understand what that interest is and why we should follow it. And it is an interest that the Government of the Sudan consistently failed to recognize. (...)

The protestations that this infringes national sovereignty, when UNMIS has been in the south working to consolidate the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, ring very hollow. The involvement of the United Nations is recognized by the African Union and by most Member States of the United Nations as being the logical step forward, so that the United Nations can help the Government of the Sudan to fulfill its **responsibility to protect its people**. It is as simple as that, and resolution 1706 (2006) provides for that clarity. (...)

The stark reality is that if this force is not deployed — just a year since we adopted the **responsibility to protect** in the General Assembly — we will face a real crisis, and we will face that because of the intransigence of the Government, not because the nations of the United Nations were not willing. We have made it clear we are willing. We have made it clear that the terms of the resolution reflect what was said to us in Khartoum and separately. We have put forward the most conciliatory resolution possible. That is why we ought to do everything possible now to ensure that the resolution is implemented.

I have three simple priorities for the moment. The first is to strengthen and extend the mandate of AMIS. Resolution 1706 (2006) provides for that, in part. Clearly, the other part is a decision by the Peace and Security Council of the African Union. But we cannot leave a vacuum in Darfur. A vacuum where the forces of the Government of the Sudan, the Janjaweed and the rebels are allowed to fight it out is bad for all of us, but it is particularly grim for the citizens living in Darfur. Providing the capabilities and the financing for the continuation of AMIS is basic. It is not enough to have pious declarations that if this force continues, the funding will be provided. It is time for words actually to lead to delivery, and delivery means strengthening AMIS.

Secondly, there are the problems in Chad. Chad, with no recognizable border with Darfur, has a real problem at the moment. But the need to provide adequate security for people in camps in Chad is obvious.

Thirdly, we should maintain our efforts to persuade President Al-Bashir. All of us — regional organizations, countries with particular influence that they can bring to bear in Khartoum — need to persuade the President that actually putting in place the provisions of resolution 1706 (2006) is good for the Sudan, because in the end, providing peace and security in Darfur is the best insurance for the integrity and stability of the Sudan. It is good for the region, and above all, it tackles one of the big humanitarian crises.

The United Nations has made it clear that it is ready to fulfill its part. The question is, is the Government of the Sudan prepared to fulfill its obligations to its own people?

Congo

Mr. Gayama (*spoke in French*):

(...)The plan submitted a few weeks ago by the Sudan, while it reflects an increased awareness of the responsibility of the Sudanese leaders to their people, remains insufficient. We would have merely taken note of it if the serious concerns flagged by Africa and the international community had elicited an appropriate response from the Sudanese Government, which was a signatory to the Abuja Peace Agreement.

However, the behaviour of the armed factions on the ground has not been in keeping with the spirit or the letter of that Agreement. The situation has gotten so bad that the activities of humanitarian agencies and organizations have been hampered and even obstructed, in a manner that appears deliberate. Every passing day is a lost opportunity for the civilian population, whose situation is becoming ever more precarious and whose health, security and even lives are threatened by the abuses and

heinous crimes committed against them by their own Sudanese compatriots. (...)

The situation in Darfur should have already, several months ago, elicited a specific, concrete response, given the willingness expressed by the international community, particularly in resolution 1679 (2006) of 16 May and resolution 1706 (2006) of 31 August. It is, to say the least, regrettable that, despite the contacts made in Khartoum by the Council and jointly by the African Union and the United Nations, the decisive agreement expected of the Sudanese Government has not yet been forthcoming. Khartoum has in recent times even adopted an attitude of conspicuous rejection of a United Nations operation.

We deem of great importance the debate planned for 20 September to discuss relations with the regional organizations and the United Nations. The Security Council will have to explore, advisedly, the possibilities for action entrusted to it by the Charter, in particular under Chapter VIII. It should be able to draw on other resources offered by bilateral or multilateral diplomacy involving the United Nations and Member States, or the United Nations and intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations, so as to use the full panoply of its capacities for prevention or action. (...)

If the strengthening of AMIS is at this stage the best way to assess the degree of commitment of the international community to Darfur, it would be wise to take this opportunity to strengthen AMIS. The African Union would welcome such a development. (...)

United Republic of Tanzania

Mr. Mahiga

(...)In our view, a military solution to the current situation can only add to the misery and suffering of the people and complicate the already fragile political and security situation in Darfur. It was the failure of a military approach to the Darfur crisis that

necessitated the N'Djamena Ceasefire Agreement and, subsequently, the peace process in Abuja. The Sudan should know better the futility of military approaches to political problems after the longest civil war in Africa, in southern Sudan. Sudan has actually taught us and demonstrated to us the value and virtue of negotiated peaceful solutions to protracted political crises with the Comprehensive Peace Agreement negotiated at Naivasha and Nairobi.

The deadline for the African peacekeeping mission is drawing near. Resources to keep the force there are drying up. The Sudanese Government has signalled that the African Union Mission in the Sudan (AMIS) can leave when its mandate expires later this month. That is a most frightening scenario. Never before has the international community abandoned a humanitarian and political crisis on the scale of what exists in Darfur. We cannot leave the people of Darfur alone. The situation demands international action with the full participation of the Sudan.

Slovakia
Mr. Burian

(...) We agree with the Secretary-General that the situation of civilians in Darfur is desperate and that there is an urgent need for immediate action by the international community to stop the violence and alleviate the suffering of the increasing number of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) to whom there is no humanitarian access.

When the Security Council visited IDP and refugee camps in Darfur and eastern Chad we witnessed the inhumane conditions in which refugees and IDPs were living and we heard horrific stories about their suffering. The people of Darfur desperately urged us to help them to end their plight. The international community is obliged to do this without further delay.

We believe that resolution 1706 (2006) provides a good basis for action by the international community to protect civilians on the ground and to facilitate the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement. The African Union Mission in the Sudan (AMIS) must urgently be strengthened. We also need to immediately start the preparations for the transfer to a United Nations-led operation, which will have a robust mandate, as envisaged in resolution 1706 (2006).

However, we are very concerned about the reaction of the Sudanese Government as regards resolution 1706 (2006), as well as about its statements threatening to eject African Union peacekeepers. We believe that the absence of AU forces would lead to the further deterioration of the security situation and to the escalation of the conflict in Darfur. In that regard, we agree with the Secretary-General that if there is no AU or United Nations presence and if the number of people suffering or being killed continues to grow, the Sudanese authorities will be placing themselves in a situation where the leadership may be held collectively and individually **responsible** for what happens to the population in Darfur.

The Government of the Sudan should understand that a United Nations-led operation in support of the effective implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement is the only viable option for reaching lasting and sustainable peace in Darfur. It should also understand, based on previous experience in dealing with the crisis situation in the South of Sudan, that the United Nations is not an invading or occupying force, but an impartial broker that is there to help the Sudanese people solve the conflict and to assist the Government in exercising its **responsibility to protect** all its citizens.

The United Nations has always respected the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its Members. It has, however, a **responsibility**, which was confirmed by

our leaders in last year's world summit outcome document, **to protect populations** from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We must not allow another Rwanda or Srebrenica, where the international community watched helplessly while innocent civilians were slaughtered, to happen again. (...)

Argentina
Mr. García Moritán

(...)Argentina wants the Government in Khartoum to understand that, along with the **responsibility of each individual State to protect** its own population, the international community has a **responsibility** to help States exercise that obligation. In the context of the crisis in Darfur, the only way to protect its civil population is through the presence of peacekeeping troops in the region — neutral and impartial troops that would neither constitute an occupation force nor limit the sovereignty or the territorial integrity of the Sudan. In other words, we are trying to protect the lives and security of millions of innocent civilians, since the Government of the Sudan cannot do so.(...)

We cannot and must not remain paralyzed in the face of a situation that calls for immediate action. Every passing day means more lives lost and greater suffering for a people who have already suffered too much. It is necessary to renew our commitment to finding a solution to the crisis if we do not want to continue to see the constant and persistent violation of human rights on a scale that the international community cannot tolerate without taking action to put an end to it. We urge all actors present here to cooperate in a constructive spirit in order collectively to put an end to the crisis in Darfur and to help establish the basis of a more just society in which all the Sudanese can live in freedom and peace. (...)

France
Mr. De La Sablière (*spoke in French*)

(...)The Council cannot resign itself to the continuation of a conflict that has given rise to the most serious violations of human rights which could destabilize neighbouring countries and which are forcing millions of people to rely on international assistance for their survival. (...)

The Sudan must now accept the deployment of the operation that we have decided to set up. It owes that to its population, which — as has been noted today several times — it has the **responsibility to protect**, if necessary with the assistance of the international community. I do not need to remind Council members that that **responsibility** is set out in the 2005 World Summit Outcome document and in resolution 1674 (2006).

The Sudan owes it to the African Union and to the United Nations, whose only objective is to help to restore peace to Darfur and to provide for the effective **protection of the civilian population** there, while respecting its sovereignty and territorial integrity. I believe it essential that the same language be used in communicating with the Government of National Unity of the Sudan by all Council members and by all of the regional organizations concerned. For its part, France will continue its efforts to make sure that that message — a message of **responsibility**, dialogue and cooperation — is fully understood by the Sudanese authorities. (...)

Denmark
Ms. Løj

(...)The international community — and indeed the Council — have shown exceptional patience with the Government of the Sudan. We have pursued dialogue, travelled to the Sudan, invited the Government to our meetings, and, not

least, provided assurances that any Government having good intentions for its citizens should readily be able to accept. Still, we are faced with Government rejection and uncertainty for the people of Darfur beyond 30 September.

We must spare no effort to prevent yet another genocide from taking place on the African continent. The horrors of Rwanda still haunt our minds and can only serve to strengthen our resolve. The moral credibility of the Security Council is indeed challenged by this extended crisis.

Let me put it simply: True friends will assist the Government — any Government — in fulfilling its most important purpose: to **protect** its own citizens from starvation, violence and death, regardless of ethnicity, cultural differences or religion. (...)

As an avid supporter of international justice and the rule of law, Denmark firmly believes that all those responsible must and

will be held accountable. The instrument of sanctions is still on the table, as underscored in resolution 1706 (2006). In our view, if the Sudanese Government presses on with its current plans in Darfur, broader political and economic sanctions should not be ruled out.

While sanctions are intended to encourage and push for wise political decisions that will respect and implement Security Council decisions, it should never be forgotten that, ultimately, accountability is also an aspect of this crisis. By adopting resolution 1593 (2005) and referring the situation in Darfur to the International Criminal Court, the Council has already shown that it will not accept impunity for serious crimes against humanity. Again, we must show that we have learned our lessons from Rwanda and that those responsible for the continuation of this crisis will eventually have to face the consequences of their actions. (...)

Full text (meeting record and press release) available:
<http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/scact2006.htm>