

Statement by the Spokesperson on the so-called Presidential elections and the referendum on amending the name of the Georgian

The European Union does not recognise the framework in which the so-called Presidential elections and the referendum on amending the name of the Georgian breakaway region of South Ossetia are due to take place on 9 April.

The European Union reaffirms its commitment to a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Georgia, including through its co-chairmanship of the Geneva International Discussions and the EU Monitoring Mission.

The European Union reiterates its firm support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally recognised borders.

Press release: Revenge Porn Helpline Given Further Funding

A helpline dedicated to supporting victims of revenge porn is to get additional funding, the Minister for Women, Equalities and Early Years, Caroline Dinenage announced today.

The Revenge Porn Helpline launched in 2015 to help tackle the problem of people sharing intimate images online as a way of seeking revenge, humiliating or blackmailing individuals.

The service has been funded by the Government since its launch and was given £178,000 to run for two years. The service will receive a further £80,000 in 2017-18 to ensure victims continue to receive the support they need.

Since its launch the helpline has taken over 6000 calls. The service supports men and women but is part of a wider government commitment to eliminate violence against women and girls, backed by £100 million funding.

Minister for Women, Equalities and Early Years, Caroline Dinenage said:

Intimate photos or videos should never be shared without a person's consent, let alone be posted online as an act of revenge.

For too long, people felt they had to face this problem on their own but we will not tolerate it. That's why we introduced new laws to make this an offence and set up this helpline to provide people with help and advice.

This funding means we can help hundreds more people to get these images taken down, as well as helping them get the emotional support they might need as victims of this awful crime.

The helpline – run by South West Grid for Learning – links callers with law enforcement and internet companies to get content taken down, as well as providing information on legal help available and their rights.

It was set-up alongside the introduction of a new offence in the Criminal Justice and Courts Act 2015, covering the sharing of images both online and offline. The offence carries a maximum sentence of up to two years in prison.

A breakdown of calls to the helpline since it was established shows that around 75 per cent seeking advice and support are female and 25 per cent of calls relating to men.

Laura Higgins, Online Safety Operations Manager for the helpline said:

We are absolutely delighted with the Minister's decision to provide continuation funding for the Revenge Porn Helpline. The service has seen an increase in calls in 2017 and there is clearly a need for our specialist advice and support.

Since launching in 2015 we have helped thousands of victims and have received incredible feedback from clients, we are glad that we can continue to do so.

The helpline is available on 0845 6000 459 from 10.00am – 4.00pm, Monday to Friday, and messages left outside these hours will be returned. Emails can be sent at any time to help@revengepornhelpline.org.uk

Notes to editors:

- For further information, please contact the GEO press office on 0207 783 8300.
 - For further information from the helpline or for media bids, please contact Laura Higgins on 07899 905638 or laura.higgins@swgfl.org.uk
-

Statement by the Spokesperson on the roadside explosion in South Central Somalia

Thursday's road side explosion in Lower Shabelle near Golweyn village taking a large number of civilian lives increased the already great suffering faced by Somalia. Our thoughts go to the families of the victims and to all Somali people.

Drought has caused significant deterioration of the humanitarian situation in the Horn of Africa and especially Somalia. As a result hundreds of thousands find themselves on the move.

The European Union remains strongly committed to Somalia and its people. Reconstruction of a stable and democratic country, benefitting its population, and a Somali owned security sector to combat terrorism is key for development and the security of the region.

Speech: "The United Kingdom supports the U.S. air strike on the Al Shayrat airfield because war crimes have consequences."

Thank you Madam President,

I deeply regret that the previous speaker showed more outrage against the United States than against the Asad regime that on Tuesday deliberately dropped chemical weapons, killing over a hundred men, women, and children in the most barbaric fashion.

More than three and a half years ago, the Syrian regime made a pledge. They would join the 189 countries who had already signed the Chemical Weapons Convention. They would reveal the full extent of their chemical arsenal and proceed with its full destruction.

What spurred this pledge was a chemical weapons attack. That time in Ghouta. Hundreds if not thousands were dead. There were images of men, women, and children choking, foaming at the mouth, clearly asphyxiated.

Three and a half years after a historically heinous war crime was committed,

after the stockpiles were supposed to be destroyed, Assad on Tuesday, showed us yet again – this time in Idlib – that he is capable of redefining horror. Tuesday's attack must be fully investigated. Impunity cannot be the norm.

We will continue to work with our partners on this Security Council to ensure that those responsible are brought to justice.

The United Kingdom supports the U.S. air strike on the Al Shayrat airfield because war crimes have consequences. And the greatest war criminal of all, Bashar al Assad, has now been put on notice.

The US strike was a proportionate response to unspeakable acts that gave rise to overwhelming humanitarian distress. It was also a strong effort to save lives, by ensuring that such acts never happen again.

The resolution that we adopted three and a half years ago provided a framework for the destruction of chemical weapons in Syria. It had a clear author and a clear guarantor. At the time Russian assured us that Assad would fully declare his chemical arsenal and would continue to cooperate with international inspectors. Perhaps that was the assurance that Russia received from Assad.

And perhaps Russia has now learnt the hard lesson that backing a war criminal comes with its own consequence: humiliation.

Russia has barely any support from the Arab world for its policy of propping up the criminal Assad regime as it carries out chemical weapons attacks against its own people. Russia needs to listen to this Council, listen to the Arab world, listen to the rest of the international community, above all listen to the Syrian people. Their message is clear: end Assad's bombs, his use of chemical weapons, his torture dungeons.

Instead, Russia has given Assad everything he could dream of. Without Russia's seven vetoes in the Security Council defying the views of other members of this Council, Assad would now have faced sanctions and justice. And what did Russia get for its unconditional support?

Assad ignores Russia's requests for him to obey a ceasefire. Assad defies Russia's request for him not to gas his own people. Assad thumbs his nose at Russia's calls for Assad to join a peace process. Russia sits here today humiliated by its failure to bring to heel a puppet dictator entirely propped up by Russia itself, and Hizbollah, and Iran.

And let me bust some myths about our private negotiations over the last couple of days. We were seeking agreement on a draft resolution. I repeatedly asked the Russian Federation: why could you not support our draft resolution? If you want the truth why did you not want the United Nations and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to have access to the places, the people, and the information they need? What possible excuse do you have for keeping that information away from the investigators? What reason do you have to carry on protecting Assad? If you care about the UN Charter, why protect a dictator who has violated international law time and

time again? Answer came there none.

There is another way for Russia and I appeal to the Russian Federation to abandon its failed strategy. To join the rest of this Council in our call for justice and accountability. To end your protection of a war criminal. To join us, all of us, in supporting a genuine political progress that would lead to a transition to a more legitimate and representative government.

The only reason why we are here. Why these discussions are being had in this moment, in this chamber, is because the international community has not done enough.

Things can be different.

The difference that can be made. The difference that must be made, lies in a political solution. And that won't happen if we take the familiar route that has plagued this Council and the countries of the region, millions of Syrians looking for a future. The new road must see the Syrian regime engage. The new road must have Russia and Iran not only at the table, but negotiating in good faith.

We are sitting in the halls of the organisation that was built to guide us when peace seems out of reach. The United Nations has a vital role in convening those negotiations and helping the parties to resolve their disputes

The agenda has been set and it is long overdue that a proper negotiation on the future Syrian-led transition that meets the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people happens. Asad must engage in serious discussion about that future to meet those aspirations of all Syrians.

Madam President in conclusion,

The United Kingdom supports the U.S. action as an appropriate response to a heinous act by a brutal and uncaring dictator. By a dictator who thinks that gassing his people is somehow a legitimate step on the road to stability.

It is time now to get a genuine political process back up and running. Those discussions may be long and difficult. But the people of Syria deserve nothing less.

And if we want to ensure that the shocking images that have haunted us this week are truly confined to history, then this is our duty.

Thank you.

Speech: “Peacekeeping should exist alongside both conflict prevention and peace-building work.”

Thank you Madam President – I warmly welcoming the Secretary-General’s briefing and I agree with his nine point plan for reform and with every other word that he said.

I’d like to pay tribute to the brave men and women serving in UN Peacekeeping missions. For many around the world, they are all that stands between stability and chaos. Over 3,500 peacekeepers have lost their lives holding that line, including nine this year. We are humbled by their sacrifice.

We have a duty to those peacekeepers, to all those risking their lives today, and to all the people they protect, to ask tough, fundamental questions about peacekeeping deployments.

Peacekeeping is one of the best things this organisation has ever created. Peacekeeping is the jewel in the UN crown. Peacekeeping is the UN’s unique selling point. Peacekeeping is also a good investment. In human terms, UN peacekeeping saves lives. In terms of peace, it significantly increases the survival rate of peace agreements. We should continue to invest in this crucial tool that answers the call to help when no one else is coming. But like all investments, we should examine the market. In the first place, we must think long and hard before deploying missions, about whether peacekeeping is the right tool at the right moment.

Horizon scanning and early warning give us the opportunity to use other tools; preventative diplomacy, conflict prevention, mediation.

Early action to prevent conflict and mass human rights abuses remains vital. But that must start long before peacekeepers may be required.

Too often, that moment is missed so when a peacekeeping mission is required we must ask: does this mission have a clear objective, and does it have a clear exit strategy? Does it have the right mandate? The next question is: will the host government cooperate?

Now there’s at least two elements to that question. First, when a government opposes the very deployment of a mission, and secondly where the government hinders the mission’s ability to fulfil every part of its mandate once it has been deployed.

History has given us enough tragedies to support the deployment of peacekeepers when host governments are unwilling or unable to protect their own people. With or without the government’s consent.

Where the host government does not cooperate, this Council has a crucial role to play. We must ensure that States shoulder their primary responsibility to

prevent conflict, minimise suffering and ensure that cycles of conflict are not repeated.

Where there are spoilers to peace, including host governments who seek to stifle missions, we must use all the tools at our disposal to change that behaviour.

But time after time, the message sent by this Council is one of disunity and confusion. We had a chance last year to bring pressure to bear on the parties in South Sudan, but at the crucial moment we failed to deliver. We cannot complain now about the tragic status quo in that country if we aren't prepared to act ourselves.

Once deployed, we must recognise when a peacekeeping mission is no longer the right tool for the job, where other parts of the UN system are better placed to support development and peacebuilding needs, as in Haiti, Liberia and Cote d'Ivoire.

We know that peacekeeping is but one tool available to the UN. It cannot deliver every aspect of the UN's response to conflict; peacekeeping should exist alongside both conflict prevention and peace-building work.

And, where military force is necessary, the UN is not the only organisation capable of delivering it. We need only look to West Africa, where ECOWAS has demonstrated regional leadership through deployments in both Mali and in support of the political transition in the Gambia. Or in Somalia, where the African Union mission is degrading the threat from the terrorist group Al Shabaab.

But military operations can only create the space for the political process to progress. So we must redouble our efforts to address the political challenges to peace, not only the security ones, if we are to deliver the Secretary-General's agenda on sustaining peace.

My final point, Madam President, is that, if and when we deploy peacekeeping missions, we must make sure that they are effective.

This means better mission planning, more pledges of troops and equipment, and stronger mission performance.

Mandates must be limited, realistic, prioritised with a clear end goal and the benchmarks for getting there, building on and complementing the work of other parts of the UN, so that we can measure the impact of their activity and hand them over when peacekeeping's task is complete. We must robustly review missions regularly to establish where current situations sit on the spectrum of conflict, and ensure that we are responding and resourcing them appropriately.

Pledges of troops and equipment need to meet specific shortfalls identified by the UN, including the deployment of more women. We need to develop a greater breadth and depth of capabilities, so that the UN can deploy the most appropriate tools to deliver mission mandates.

But ultimately, peacekeeping must perform better. That means high quality training, appropriate equipment and medical provision, and skilled and courageous leadership. Missions are the human face of this organisation to so many people in the world, and they have to act to uphold the principles that we all represent, holding peacekeepers to account for underperformance or misconduct, including crucially, any allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse. Peacekeeper's successes save lives, and we owe it to them and the people they protect to ask these tough questions and find the right answers.

Thank you.