



**PERMANENT MISSION OF THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS OFFICE  
AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AT GENEVA**

*Check against delivery*

**STATEMENT  
BY**

**H.E. MR. SERGEI ALEINIK  
AMBASSADOR, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS**

**AT THE**

**2d SESSION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL**

**Interactive dialogue with the special rapporteur  
on Belarus**

**Geneva  
27 September 2006**

Mr. President,  
Members of the Council,

Belarus has repeatedly stated its principle position of rejection of the mandate of this special rapporteur.

The content of his reports is a clear attempt to stigmatize and slander the Republic of Belarus. The special rapporteur is doing this in a clearly straightforward manner, in best traditions of a notorious “cold war” propaganda.

The special rapporteur makes an attempt to criticize Belarusian political and economic model, national system of education, healthcare and social protection. He is claiming to have used reports of international organizations for this purpose. In a paradoxical manner, however, his statements are in full contradiction with the conclusions contained in the reports he refers to.

For example, the special rapporteur notes that Belarus’ expenditures for education constitute 6 percent of GDP, drawing a conclusion about a low quality of education in our country. Complete absurdity! To compare, the United States spends 5.6 percent of its GDP for education, the United Kingdom – 4.6 and Romania – 3.5 percent.

In fact, the special rapporteur is trying to defame our country, which in 2005 UNCTAD’s “Trade and Development Index” report was placed 44<sup>th</sup> in the world. This index is based on 29 major indicators, including GDP per capita, quality of healthcare, education, level of corruption and gender development.

Moreover, the special rapporteur does not limit himself to a mere distortion of the facts. He completely steps over the line and develops a whole strategy of changing the existing political and socio-economic structure of a sovereign state. These are some examples of this strategy:

- “change of the country leadership”;
- “dramatic restructuring of the society”;
- “change of the socio-economic model”;
- “reformation of the people’s national identity”.

The special rapporteur makes the following recommendations as to how to achieve these goals:

- external intrusion in the country’s information space;
- provision of financial and technical assistance to “militant NGO’s”;
- trade restrictions;
- use of sanctions.

Just think about it! The so-called special rapporteur uses the UN procedure to call for the overthrow of a legitimate government of a UN member state. This is an evident discredit of the United Nations by the special rapporteur Severin. This is an apotheosis of absurdity!!!

It should be mentioned that one country had deemed it appropriate enough publishing 100,000 copies of the special rapporteur’s report and distributing them through its diplomatic mission in Belarus. Please, do not think it was the United States! It was done by the Czech Republic on the eve of the presidential elections

in Belarus, which, as concluded by over 250 international observers, were held under an unprecedented external political and information pressure.

Mr. President,

These are only some of the examples. They are multiple in Severin's reports and actions. Even a general analysis of all his insinuations will require several hours. We cannot afford mentioning all of them in today's statement.

In this connection, we would like to draw your attention to other, more important aspects.

**How did this mandate become possible?** The answer is evident. The special rapporteur on Belarus is a remnant of the atmosphere of politicization which marred the Commission on Human Rights and logically brought this body to a well-known end. This is indirectly confirmed by a confusion with the title of the special rapporteur. In the Commission's documents this mandate was referred to as "the special rapporteur on human rights in Belarus", whereas in the Council 1<sup>st</sup> session's decision it was dubbed "the special rapporteur to establish direct contacts with the Government and with the people of Belarus".

We have no idea what contacts this mandate was meant to establish. However, we do know that the special rapporteur has recommended replacing the government, and we also know that he has denounced the national identity of the Belarusian people.

**What are the motifs driving the special rapporteur?** The answer is also evident to us. Bluntly and primitively he fulfills a political order and is guided by the principle, typical of extremists: "the worse – the better".

Mr. President,  
Members of the Council,

In conclusion I would like to focus on the most important question: **What threat this remnant of confrontation poses for the future of the Council?**

The Member States are currently grappling with an immense and challenging task of developing the mechanisms that will constitute the basis for constructive and comprehensive interaction of all states on the issue of promotion of human rights. We have a unique opportunity to look at things in a new way, abandon senseless confrontation once and for all, create a new genuinely universal system of evaluation of human rights situations.

The Council's approach to the mandate of this special rapporteur will represent a clear sign of its efficiency and credibility. The Council should not miss this opportunity and clearly reject the mandates such as the one before us.

We expect this decision to be taken by consensus.

I thank you.