



# Security Council

Fifty-ninth year

*Provisional*

**5041**<sup>st</sup> meeting

Wednesday, 22 September 2004, 10.45 a.m.

New York

---

<i>President:</i>	Mr. Moratinos Cuyaubé . . . . .	(Spain)
<i>Members:</i>	Algeria . . . . .	Mr. Benmehidi
	Angola . . . . .	Mr. Miranda
	Benin . . . . .	Mr. Adechi
	Brazil . . . . .	Mr. Amorim
	Chile . . . . .	Ms. Alvear Valenzuela
	China . . . . .	Mr. Wang Guangya
	France . . . . .	Mr. Barnier
	Germany . . . . .	Mr. Fischer
	Pakistan . . . . .	Mr. Bakhtyar
	Philippines . . . . .	Mr. Romulo
	Romania . . . . .	Mr. Geoana
	Russian Federation . . . . .	Mr. Denisov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . .	Mr. Straw
	United States of America . . . . .	Mrs. Patterson

## Agenda

Civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building

Letter dated 8 September 2004 from the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2004/722)

---

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

*The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.*

### **Adoption of the agenda**

*The agenda was adopted.*

### **Civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building**

#### **Letter dated 8 September 2004 from the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2004/722)**

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): on behalf of the Security Council, I welcome the presence of His Excellency Secretary-General Kofi Annan.

On behalf of the Security Council, I also welcome warmly, under rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, His Excellency Mr. Said Djinnit, Commissioner for Peace and Security of the African Union; His Excellency Mr. Javier Solana, High Representative for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy; and His Excellency Mr. Amre Moussa, Secretary-General of the League of Arab States.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

I should like to draw members' attention to document S/2004/722, which contains a letter dated 8 September 2004 from Spain addressed to the Secretary-General, transmitting a discussion paper on the present agenda item, "Civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building".

I now give the floor to the Secretary-General.

**The Secretary-General:** Let me start by commending you, Sir, for taking the initiative to hold this open debate on civilian aspects of crisis management. This debate is extremely timely and the presence of so many foreign ministers is very welcome.

Yesterday, in the General Assembly, I stressed the importance of the rule of law. Nowhere is its absence more keenly felt than in war-torn societies, and nowhere is its restoration more vital to the maintenance of international peace and security.

But that is far easier said than done. Peace-building is a complex business. It draws in many

actors: not just the operations mandated by the Security Council, but also the vital work of United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, of regional organizations, and of our non-governmental organization (NGO) partners. And its goal is to build durable peace in societies shattered by war. That is ambitious indeed.

We have learned from experience that international interventions, even those that carry the unique legitimacy provided by the United Nations, cannot quickly erase the noxious legacy of conflict. We therefore need to be realistic about what is achievable, and we must have a clear political strategy for success, based on a sophisticated understanding of the context and tailored to respond to it.

That strategy must include benchmarks for progress towards the goal, not just of holding elections, but of building legitimate and effective States. And, since we have comparatively scarce resources, we must prioritize. Without clear priorities, particularly in the areas of security, the rule of law and immediate economic opportunities, the best-laid plans for long-term reconstruction and recovery will fail.

I do not wish to sound pessimistic. On the contrary, peace-building can be truly successful, as we have seen in El Salvador, in Guatemala, in Mozambique and in Namibia, and more recently, in East Timor. I am also heartened that a number of our ongoing missions are making solid progress in helping peace to take root.

But I am very conscious that we face enormous challenges: in Africa, where the demand for United Nations peace operations is huge, and in other places, too, including some very dangerous ones. The tangible support of Council members, in a number of ways, will make the difference between success and failure for our current and future peace-building efforts.

First, the Council needs to sustain its interest and focus on each and every peace operation. The bit-by-bit building of peace, from the ground up, may not grab headlines, but it must command the Council's vigilant attention and long-term commitment. Lack of interest or division in the Council is a recipe for unfulfilled mandates and unresolved problems, leaving the root causes of a conflict to fester and blow up again some day. We saw the bitter consequences of failed peace-building in Haiti and Liberia, where we are now

engaged once more. We must not repeat those mistakes.

Secondly, we need more resources, and we need to get those resources more quickly than we do. I am pleased that there have been improvements in the delivery of resources to post-conflict reconstruction. But the needs remain very great. United Nations peace operations are an excellent investment. In the entire history of the United Nations, just over \$30 billion has been spent on our peacekeeping operations. That is just one thirtieth of the amount that was spent last year alone on global military expenditures.

Thirdly, we need to make sure that our efforts are well integrated, since the various elements of peace-building are interdependent, and failure in one sector can mean failure in the rest. To that end, the United Nations, other international organizations, regional organizations, bilateral donors and NGOs must strengthen their institutional links and work together on the basis of shared goals and shared priorities.

Fourthly, we must make sure that we have the best people available to carry out the tough assignments the Council gives them. I am speaking particularly of civilian staff. We need an international cadre of highly skilled civilians for peace-building, both technical experts and people with the ability to work closely with national actors and bring together the diverse perspectives of conflict management, State-building, development and transitional justice. I am proud of the unique expertise of the dedicated staff who support me in carrying out the Security Council's mandates. But, we need to be given the resources to enhance the quality and quantity of that expertise.

Finally, I cannot conclude this topic without mentioning the security of United Nations civilian staff. Risk is an unavoidable part of our work. But there must be a reasonable balance between the risk to be undertaken and the substantive contribution that civilians are called upon to make. I ask for the Council's full support in ensuring the security of our staff — both by the provision of troops, where appropriate, and politically — when I propose new measures to the General Assembly, as I shall very soon.

Peace-building requires a clear strategy, developed and executed by highly skilled professionals, grounded in local conditions and reflected in realistic mandates devised by the Council

and, of course, supported by all parts of the United Nations system and fully backed up by this Council and the membership of the Organization as a whole. With that support, our work can succeed, and the promise of peace-building can be realized.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Secretary-General for his important statement.

I now invite the African Union Commissioner for Peace and Security, His Excellency Mr. Said Djinnit, to take the floor.

**Mr. Djinnit**: I wish to congratulate you, Mr. President, on taking this important and timely initiative on the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building. My participation in this debate, on behalf of the African Union (AU) Commission, stems from the long-standing partnership for peace between the African Union and the United Nations. It is also a testimony to our vested interest in the present deliberations of the Security Council and the outcome of this meeting, as Africa, unfortunately, remains high on the peace-building agenda of the United Nations.

Moreover, the African Union, which is increasingly involved in peace support operations, is paying attention to this evolving debate, particularly since the adoption of the Brahimi report (S/2000/809).

The Commission of the African Union welcomes the observations and recommendations made in the background paper (S/2004/722, annex), and it will give them serious consideration as the African Union continues with its proactive agenda in response to crisis and conflict situations.

The African Union has had limited experience in peace support operations. As members are aware, under the Cairo Declaration of 1993, establishing the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, the OAU was not expected to undertake peacekeeping operations that were considered the exclusive responsibility of the Security Council. Rather, it was then required to deploy observation missions of limited scope and duration.

It was on the basis of that limited mandate that the OAU had deployed a number of observer missions in various conflict areas such as Rwanda, Burundi, the Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ethiopia-Eritrea. In some of those missions, the need to

deploy civilian personnel arose. For instance, the OAU deployed observer missions in the Comoros at various stages of the reconciliation process in that country, essentially for confidence-building. We deployed groups of gendarmerie elements that were better prepared than military observers to interact with the civilian population and authorities. That experience proved to be successful.

The situation has changed under the African Union. In the Protocol establishing the Peace and Security Council, the heads of State or Government expressed their strong determination to enhance the capacity of the African Union to bring about peace, security and stability on the continent.

Article 6 of the Protocol establishing the Peace and Security Council delineates its responsibilities in the following areas: promotion of peace, security and stability in Africa; early warning and preventive diplomacy; peacemaking; peace support operations and intervention, pursuant to article 4 of the Constitutive Act of the African Union; peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction; humanitarian action; and disaster management.

Furthermore, the Protocol recognizes the importance of an effective cooperative relationship between the civilian and military components of any mission. Article 13 of the Protocol provides for a stand-by force — “civilian and military components” to be “ready for rapid deployment at appropriate notice”.

Based on that mandate, the African Union, soon after its establishment, was called upon to demonstrate its resolve to respond to conflict situations and emerging crises. It had to do so despite the constraints inherited from the OAU, including the lack of the capacity to respond to crisis and conflict situations in a rapid, timely and effective manner. Against that background, the African Union had no alternative but to deploy peace-support operations in Burundi to pave the way for the deployment of a peacekeeping operation by the United Nations — which has been done since then — and, more recently, in Darfur, where the African Union is confronted with an immense challenge.

Our still-limited experience in the Darfur region of the Sudan, through the establishment of the Ceasefire Commission and the deployment of the African mission in the Sudan, revealed the need to

expand the composition of the mission to include civilian components in order to address the civilian, human rights and humanitarian aspects of the crisis, affecting, in particular, women, children and the elderly. It also revealed the need to include women in the AU mission to address the specific plight of women in that region. This, I believe, deserves special consideration in future peace-support operations. The linkage with civil society organizations also merits particular attention.

In deciding to deploy peace-support operations in Burundi and Darfur, the African Union was indeed aware of its limitations. However, it took up the challenge, in the expectation that the United Nations and other partners would provide the requisite support. In the process, the African Union gained valuable experience, which needs to be built upon.

I wish to seize this opportunity to pay tribute to the United Nations and its Secretary-General and to the Security Council for their commitment to peace in the continent and for their constant support of the efforts of the African Union and its regional communities.

I wish also to express gratitude and appreciation to our other partners, which provided the African Union with financial, logistical and material support that enabled our continental organization to assume its responsibility. Their support is all the more necessary now that our organization is called upon to assume a greater role in peace-support operations.

As I stated earlier, with the establishment of the African Union, our continental organization is engaged in building its peace and security architecture, at the core of which is the Peace and Security Council, provided with the mandate of authorizing the deployment of peace-support operations, including peacekeeping and intervention. Needless to say, as part of the process of enhancing the effectiveness of the Peace and Security Council, our efforts should be geared towards the establishment of the African standby force by 2010 as agreed upon, to provide the African Union with the tool to implement its decisions.

However, as we strive to achieve that goal, our continental organization is faced with the challenge of building a rapid-reaction capability that will enable it to bring a value-added element and have a comparative advantage in the context of the partnership for peace we want to strengthen with the United Nations and other partners within the international community. In

that endeavour, the African Union would rely on the continued support of the United Nations within the framework of Chapter VIII of its Charter. It would also count on the strong support of its partners to build its capacity effectively to plan, deploy and manage peace-support operations.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Djinnit for his excellent statement.

I now invite the High Representative for the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy, Mr. Javier Solana, to take the floor.

**Mr. Solana** (*spoke in Spanish*): Let me at the outset thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this public meeting on such an important issue in current times. I should like to express my gratitude for the presence of the Secretary-General and extend my thanks to the members of the Council.

Civilian aspects in recent years have taken on primary importance in crisis management. Until recently, conflicts were of an inter-State nature, and that was the main concern of the international community. Today internal conflicts are the most frequent. Although the deployment of forces may still be necessary in some cases, the objective is broader and more complex: restoring a legitimate Government and the defence of the rule of law, as was so eloquently stated yesterday by the Secretary-General.

The rebuilding of a State has a political as well as a security dimension. But it also requires — and this is a key point — the establishment of institutions in which the population can have confidence. Guaranteeing security is necessary for a State that has been ravaged by a conflict to move forward on the path towards development, making it very clear that security and development are two concepts that go hand in hand.

The European Union is convinced that it can and should make a significant contribution to this very important task for the international community. The European Union's security policy from the outset set out to give the European Union the means to enable it to deploy not only military but also civilian instruments, in order to help to substitute for, assist or strengthen — depending on the case — the capacities of the recipient country.

Over a very brief period we in the European Union have developed concepts and established

structures capable of sustaining the deployment of civilian elements. The member States of the European Union have committed capacities in various areas — in the civilian area, 5,000 police officers, more than 200 specialists in the strengthening of the rule of law, among others. We have carried out expert-training programmes, as noted in the statement just made by the Secretary-General.

Indeed, we have been making considerable efforts. In the past three years, the six operations that the European Union has undertaken have shown an operational capacity. Three of those six operations are civilian, and a seventh operation — also a police operation — in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is still at the planning stage.

But much remains to be done. As the Secretary-General has said, obtaining qualified civilian personnel for deployment in crisis-management operations is more difficult than in the case of military personnel. Thus, the international community must build up mechanisms to have civilian personnel properly trained and ready for rapid deployment. Our societies need to rethink the criteria used for the recruitment of properly trained staff, and be ready to deploy them rapidly in the civilian component of crisis management operations.

As the discussion paper prepared by the presidency of the Council rightly recognizes, we also need to develop new mechanisms — and I would even venture to say a new culture of coordination — between the civilian and military aspects of such operations. We need to make use of all the synergies that exist and avoid clashes owing to miscommunication.

The European Union takes the position that reconstruction teams should be set up before a conflict is resolved, covering all the necessary aspects, both military — acting in their security capacity — and civilian, to be used in policing and, as I said earlier, in order to secure the rule of law in the country requiring assistance.

For its part, the European Union, with the wide array of instruments that it possesses and its particular nature as an institution, is particularly well qualified to tackle these challenges. Bosnia and Herzegovina is perhaps the case in which the EU's capacity for action is most plainly evident: along with the cooperation programmes being developed and the dimension of a relationship of close partnership with the country, is

coupled the deployment of a police operation, replacing the one initiated by the United Nations. Soon we will be shouldering the responsibility for a military operation as well, replacing NATO.

Also, in order to give a more comprehensive response to the need for civilian-military coordination, the EU has set up a civilian-military planning cell, which, in the case of a crisis, can encompass the planning of both aspects: civilian and military. If we do a little analysis of recent conflicts, who knows? It may well be that from the outset there has been a lack of such planning among the civilian and military aspects and this analysis will show that that the need for such coordination is imperative.

The action taken by the European Union in recent years has as its prime objective the strengthening of effective multilateralism. Part of EU policy is to work effectively with the United Nations — the heart of this multilateral world and the framework within which we can work most effectively. Around this time last year, the European Union signed a Joint Declaration with the Secretary-General to make this cooperation yet more effective. The experience and resources of the European Union are ready to serve the international community.

Following the statement made by my friend Said Djinnit, I want to underscore more clearly the close partnership that we have with our good friends in the African Union. I am certain that that cooperation will continue and that there will be other needs as great as the need to make the Darfur operation a success. We are ready to offer the African Union any assistance and cooperation that it may require.

In conclusion, the challenges are enormous and we need to tackle them together. The EU is willing to do its utmost to make this world a safer and fairer place for all. I trust, and I am sure, that today's debate in the Council, which bears the highest responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, will assist us in continuing to make progress in that direction.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Solana for his important statement. The European Union's commitment to continue to work with other regional organizations, as well as the United Nations, in order to further reflect on these issues is well known.

I now give the floor to the Secretary General of the League of Arab States, Mr. Amre Moussa.

**Mr. Moussa** (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, Mr. President, I would like to express my great appreciation for the Spanish initiative that you lead as an able diplomat, innovative minister and colleague.

This important meeting falls under the item of peace-building — a most important and necessary item. The successive initiatives in the Security Council — the Mexican initiative to consider how to confront the new challenges to international peace and security; the Romanian initiative on cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations for stability; and, finally, the Spanish initiative on the consideration of civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building — all show the importance that the Security Council attaches to continuing dialogue to develop concepts and mechanisms of complementarity and partnership between the United Nations and international and regional organizations, under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations and in the service of the Charter itself — in other words, in the service of international peace and stability.

In previous dialogues, whether in this Chamber or in high-level meetings that the Secretary-General of the United Nations regularly holds with the leaders of regional organizations, we stressed the need for a collective, international security regime, the need for strengthening the multilateral regime and activating the role of the United Nations in finding solutions to current problems reflecting the true interests of different parties, based on a balance and on international legitimacy and justice that would gain international, regional and national support for such solutions.

Previous meetings stressed two fundamental principles that inform our debate and thinking today. The first principle is that cooperation between the United Nations and the Security Council on the one hand, and regional organizations on the other, is fundamentally governed by the Charter of the United Nations and, particularly, by the provisions of Chapter VIII. Solid norms have been established for those relations by General Assembly resolutions and agreements for cooperation, as well as periodic mechanisms that make up a matrix of relations of cooperation, partnership and complementarity. What is

needed is to operationalize that system of relations so that regional organizations may become one of the main organs of United Nations action in dealing with regional crises and conflicts, as well as world challenges, developments and changes. As the Permanent Representative of Spain said, in his letter to the Secretary-General of 8 September 2004, the complexity of present-day crisis management may also make it helpful to share the burden of crisis management between different actors, drawing on each of their particular strengths.

The second fundamental principle stressed in previous meetings is that threats and challenges in the international arena need to be dealt with collectively, in a multilateral manner, with a variety of instruments and mechanisms available for crisis management, dealing with both civilian and political aspects, and that political solutions, not military solutions, must be the first choice in dealing with crises. A military solution must be the last resort in the true sense of the phrase "having exhausted all other means available, clearly, objectively and in good will".

Coercive measures must, equally, be clearly authorized by the Security Council. I say this because the means to solve crises have a great role in the success of peace-building. If there is a rush to resort to force, peace-building will be fraught with danger and difficulties and could even engender a fatal reversal that would affect regional peace and stability and the maintenance of international peace and security in turn. That is, perhaps, one of the main reasons for the establishment by the Secretary-General of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. Many intellectuals throughout the world believe that such changes and developments are not the result of sudden events. Rather, they have their roots in economic, social and political problems that go back to the end of the cold war — problems that have led to destabilization and an increasing feeling of oppression and injustice — as well as in poverty, underdevelopment, disease, violence, armed conflicts, and terrorism. Hence, Mr. President, you chose the important theme of civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building for our debate today.

Recent experience shows that, following the end of hostilities, proper and serious preparation for the civilian and political aspects of an effective framework, authorized in all instances by the Security Council, is necessary if we are to help societies to

rebuild after conflict and to prevent the deterioration of the situation in such societies to levels worse than previous ones. Military victory in itself is not the final victory. It has also become obvious that the military aspect is but a part of a wider political process, and military operations must be evaluated by the degree of success of the peace-building process that follows. The Secretary-General and the Security Council and its organs must therefore have a role to play, just as they play a role in the authorization of military action within a clear and comprehensive framework.

I fully agree with the presidency's discussion paper that building peace is more complex than waging war. Indeed, it is always easier to destroy than to build. That may be obvious, but the Security Council must clearly acknowledge that the decision to go to war or to undertake a military operation in the context of a conflict must be clearly legitimate and must be based on the purposes and principles of the Charter, which permit the use of force only under Chapter VII, with the authority of the Security Council. Article 51 provides for the legitimate right of self-defence.

In order to ensure success and legitimacy, political and civilian operations must follow the end of hostilities. Ensuring public order and operation of government institutions and civil administration cannot be considered separately from the decision to go to war.

It is only logical that collective international security is strengthened by regional security. That is fully understood by the League of Arab States, and the principle has become entrenched in our organization over the past few years. Many changes are now taking place in our work. In particular, there is increased openness to civil society in the Arab world, and we are opening the doors of the League's Economic and Social Council to such organizations. We are moving towards creating an Arab parliament, which would be the basis of democratic regional order, and adopting a human rights charter for the Arab world, as well as a mechanism for the prevention, management and settlement of disputes in the region.

Because of our geographic position — we are at the crossroads between Asian and African concerns and close to Europe, on the other side of the Mediterranean Sea — the Arab League finds itself sharing in many of the crises and concerns of those regional organizations. Thus, we have cooperated

horizontally with many regional organizations, in particular the African Union, in the context of peace negotiations on Darfur, within a troika led by the African Union in cooperation and coordination with the United Nations and the League of Arab States, as well as with regard to the situation in Somalia, where we are following up and helping to stabilize the situation. Those issues are of concern to both the Arab and African regions. At the same time, we are attempting to continue to act within the Barcelona process for the security of the Mediterranean.

We agree with the Spanish discussion paper that the participation of the largest number of parties in the management of crises requires further coordination between those parties. We also agree with the need to designate a lead organization — the United Nations, or a regional organization, as agreed upon — to coordinate international efforts for crisis management. That will also require effective coordination between crisis management teams and the parties concerned as regards financing, development and reconstruction, and that in turn will require a professional strategic plan that is carefully adopted and implemented.

There is no disagreement whatsoever on the changing nature of the responsibilities that civilian parties have taken on in both civilian and military operations. However, the substance of the issue — dealing with incipient or current challenges — relates to the fundamental role of the Security Council in the wider issue of the maintenance of international peace and security within this unique forum, as the Secretary-General has characterized the United Nations.

We have a great deal to say in this regard, as we have witnessed the reluctance of the Security Council to face major issues. It has neglected some major crises, such as the Arab-Israeli conflict, the issue of Palestine and the continuing Israeli violations of international law and the principles of the Charter. The Security Council's approach to the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world must not be selective; it must not be subject to pressure or to special interests and lobbying. Here is the crux of the matter: if the Security Council is reformed and plays its proper role in the maintenance of international peace and security, we will be able to discuss the civilian aspects of conflict and peace-building more effectively.

The League of Arab States has made clear its view of regional stability and security in the Middle East. We have stressed the need to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction in the region, without exception. The issue of weapons of mass destruction must be dealt with from an integrated, regional perspective so it will not disturb the balance of regional security. Thus, over the past 30 years we have witnessed many initiatives by the Arab States calling for a zone free from nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. Paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991) stressed that disarming Iraq of weapons of mass destruction was a step towards the goal of ridding the entire Middle East region of all such weapons. That is a resolution that is enforceable, because it was adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter. The time has come for the Council to do its part in ensuring that all the paragraphs of that resolution are implemented, especially paragraph 14, as it is of major importance for collective security in the Middle East and throughout the world.

The core of the issue remains the credibility of the multilateral international order. Challenges to the international order in the past few years have made it clear that the Council's credibility is based on two fundamental factors: its legitimacy and its effectiveness. The United Nations must expand the membership of the Council in order to make it more democratic and increase its effectiveness and legitimacy, on the basis of the purposes and principles of the Charter and in the common interest, crystallised through consensus. This world is our world. It will not be safe unless we are all safe and can all feel that our rights will be maintained through the legitimacy provided by the United Nations, as well as through respect for the principles of international law and the Charter.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Moussa for his kind words addressed to me.

**Ms. Alvear Valenzuela** (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like, first of all, to thank the Spanish presidency for its initiative in inviting us to reflect on the civilian aspects of conflict management. This provides an opportunity for us to consider a key issue that relates to the ongoing efforts of the Security Council to improve peacekeeping and peace-building instruments.

In order to tackle a crisis, we must first examine its root causes. A multi-dimensional approach must be adopted to conflict resolution. Once minimum security conditions have been restored, public order must be effectively strengthened and the groundwork laid for social, political and economic reconstruction. People need help to start a new life, to regain confidence and to participate in building the future of their communities. For that reason, it is essential for initiatives to focus on restoring the rights and hopes of men and women and on ensuring that their children can grow up as children.

A study of the civilian aspects of crisis management highlights the need for effective coordination between civilian and military actors. Successful civilian action is without doubt a precondition for guaranteeing the effective rehabilitation of a country in crisis, and depends, first of all, upon the existence of an adequate level of security to promote respect for the rule of law. It also requires an effective police force, judicial system and prison system. In that regard, an efficient civilian police force is particularly important. Those elements are the basis for the comprehensive post-conflict rehabilitation of individuals, a process that is necessarily linked to a strategy of long-term economic and social development.

We must consider effective coordination between crisis management mechanisms and the mechanisms for reconstruction and long-term development. The success of such initiatives will depend on our ability to develop a lasting commitment on the part of the international community to United Nations action.

The wide range of actors and agencies that increasingly participate in preventive diplomacy creates a special opportunity for civilians to contribute to crisis resolution. That involves action by Governments, regional organizations and non-governmental organizations. Preventive diplomacy today is not the exclusive preserve of the United Nations system. We must promote the effective engagement of the various actors and the development of flexible contacts among them and with the military elements, in order to create a pattern of mutual awareness and cooperation.

In that context, there is a need to recognize the experience of regional organizations in crisis management. The Security Council has shown interest

in making use of the capabilities of regional organizations in conflict management, which certainly includes a civilian dimension.

Working to promote good governance on the continent of the Americas is an aspiration on which the Governments of the region have agreed. Within the framework of the Organization of American States (OAS) the advances made in the Inter-American Democratic Charter of 2001 and in the Santiago Declaration on Democracy and Citizen Confidence of 2003 demonstrate a clear political will to strengthen democracy as an essential element of the hemisphere's identity and the basis for coexistence in peace and security. That endeavour in the field of democratic governance could be taken into account in the design of the multidimensional mandates of peacekeeping operations.

The crisis in Haiti marks a new challenge for the United Nations system and the international community to continue developing their capacities to manage the civilian aspects of conflicts. The United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) has been designed to rehabilitate a nation in political, economic and social terms, in order to achieve lasting peace and security. The operation's multidimensional mandate encompasses the essential elements of a strategy for managing the civilian aspects of the crisis. It is a matter of priority to restore the capacities of the Haitian national police and the rule of law.

I express my solidarity and sympathy with the victims of the recent natural disaster in Haiti, which has further compounded the difficulties facing the Haitian people. The action of MINUSTAH is associated with a political transition towards a system of full democracy. That approach requires the effective presence of the OAS, which can contribute its experience in the field of electoral assistance and the rebuilding of institutions. The United Nations would thus incorporate regional actors into the operation, while permitting the use of mechanisms established by the OAS in achieving a common objective.

We believe that an appropriate interrelationship between the regional and global spheres is an issue that cannot be ignored in a reform process that includes the various actors and approaches that contribute to conflict prevention and to post-conflict activities.

We believe that the United Nations has improved its conflict management capacity, both in theory and in

practice, but we think it is necessary to develop a doctrine that would enable us to make the multilateral system more active and efficient in the comprehensive management of conflicts.

To that end, we propose a number of concrete measures. First, Member States should develop their capabilities in the areas of the police, strengthening the rule of law, civil administration and promoting national reconciliation with a view to their possible use within the framework of the peacekeeping operations of United Nations or regional organizations. The idea is to establish a national register of the human and material resources that may be called upon in case of need, taking into account the gender perspective.

Secondly, we believe it is important to promote cooperation among the United Nations, its agencies and programmes, regional organizations and Member States in order to increase the availability of human and material resources for the management of the civilian aspects of peacekeeping operations.

Thirdly, we think it is important to promote the active participation of civil society — a key element that, on some occasions, would serve to supplement the actions of State actors.

Fourthly, consideration should be given to the establishment of a focal point within the Department for Peacekeeping Operations in order to design, coordinate and monitor the implementation of a multidimensional approach that would blend the civilian and military aspects of crisis management.

Lastly, the Secretariat should prepare a matrix of the elements to be considered for improving civilian-military coordination in the design of the mandates of peacekeeping operations.

We live in a world beset by a wide range of conflicts that demand increasing United Nations involvement. The response of the United Nations must focus, first of all, on promoting all the preventive mechanisms necessary to forestall crises. But, at the same time, as we renew our political commitment to United Nations action in crisis management and post-conflict situations, we need to work further in this area. What is at stake here is the effectiveness of a multilateral system, which is essential for maintaining order in a globalized world.

We are hopeful that the Council will succeed in structuring approaches that take account of both the

civilian and the military dimensions. We must ensure that peacekeeping operations make it possible to truly restore stability based upon the principles of the United Nations Charter, by creating conditions for restoring community life and the essential value of human dignity.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Chile for her specific proposals.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Joschka Fischer, Federal Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany.

**Mr. Fischer** (Germany): Sir, we welcome your initiative to hold this debate in the Security Council. In the past two years, we have seen a renaissance of multilateral conflict management. The worldwide growth of United Nations missions makes that plain. Regional organizations, such as the European Union and the African Union, are also making ever more significant independent contributions in the field. That is a development we very much welcome. It shows the growing readiness of the international community to effectively engage even in conflicts that have long been neglected. A central precondition here was the recognition — achieved, not least, thanks to the United Nations — that military stabilization has to go hand-in-hand with the reconstruction of shattered societies and State structures. Together with the Brahimi report (S/2000/809), it provided the decisive impetus — meaning that today, even in the earliest phase of conflict management, considerations and planning stretch beyond the political and military aspects. Our commitment in Afghanistan, in the Balkans and in many multidimensional peacekeeping missions around the world bears witness to that new comprehensive approach.

Peacekeeping that brings together military and civilian aspects means a much greater burden for the international community in terms of finance and personnel. But we must be ready to shoulder that burden. After all, only credible and long-term engagement can be successful; anything else only entails far greater risks.

But we must also be aware that each peace-building mission is a massive intrusion for the society concerned. Therefore, a high degree of experience and cultural awareness is needed. That is especially true of civilian components such as building State and judicial

structures, clearing up human rights violations, drawing up a new constitution or organizing and holding elections. We never start from scratch; we must respect and use local traditions and structures. At the same time, we must never lose sight of central United Nations standards such as the rule of law, democracy and human rights.

Here, I see a vast opportunity for cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations such as the African Union, the European Union (EU) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. They have more homogenous membership structures, are anchored in the same cultural areas and communities of values, and are thus essential partners when it comes to crisis management in their particular zones of interest — above all, to make a Security Council mandate more acceptable in a country and in the wider region. The EU is doing just that in the Balkans.

We need great persistence and much staying power if our peace-building is to have a sustainable impact. We have to give the young people in crisis regions hope for the future. We have to re-establish structures in the State and in society that can withstand the unavoidable strains following the withdrawal of a peace mission. But we must also live up to the people's expectations for a rapid and clear improvement in their situation. Those expectations may not always be realistic, but disappointments can greatly hamper the acceptance of peacekeeping missions. In Afghanistan, the Taliban, Al Qaeda and others opposed to the peace process systematically exploit the frustration of the population to discredit the peacekeepers as unwelcome occupiers. We have to find a happy medium between short-term expectations and long-term commitment to make clear the benefits of the mission as quickly as possible.

Here, we should make increased use of quick-impact projects. The United Nations has had positive experience with that instrument and has greatly increased the relevant financing. Take, for example, the United Nations Mission in Liberia. It is important that civilian and military experts be able to provide the people with rapid and visible assistance, even if it is too early for reconstruction efforts to bear real fruit. That is what we have seen in Afghanistan. We can win the people over by repairing a damaged bridge or school, digging a well, providing health advice or setting up a local radio station.

We have been working for some time to minimize the Organization's reaction time to crises and to coordinate and more efficiently implement our national contributions to military missions. The same is true of civilian components. We should thus develop and rapidly implement a coherent tool kit for civilian peacekeeping. The United Nations should assume the central task of coordination.

A challenge that we all need to tackle at home is the training and mobilization of civilian experts in crises and reconstruction. After all, we now need more and more civilian personnel for international peace missions. That is the only way to ensure that the United Nations can quickly fall back on urgently needed police trainers, judges or lawyers. And, unlike military personnel, those experts are not usually ready and waiting, but rather are employed by authorities and companies. That is particularly true of the police. Thus, here, we should, above all, push ahead with establishing a standby system as well as rapid-deployment units.

Finally, we must better coordinate the United Nations system's contribution to the civilian components of peace missions so that we can fully tap its potential. But, for that to work, financing must also be resolved. We need to break new ground here. A call also goes out to the Bretton Woods institutions. We should certainly treat the costs of civilian crisis management as a normal component of a peace mission.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Federal Vice-Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany for his vision and his presentation of the problems in civilian crisis management.

I now call on His Excellency Mr. Michel Barnier, Minister for Foreign Affairs of France.

**Mr. Barnier** (France) (*spoke in French*): Rarely in its history has the Organization had to confront and manage so many crises at the same time — managing them not only simultaneously, but in all their dimensions and aspects so that we can provide lasting solutions to them. At the same time, we have been increasingly capable of anticipating and preventing new conflicts. That is why, I believe — like all my colleagues — that your initiative today, Mr. President, to bring us together around this table is not only timely but necessary. Why? Because, as everyone knows, peace-building is a very difficult objective to attain.

Thirty per cent of countries emerging from conflict fall back into it. In Africa, that proportion is 60 per cent. A few moments ago, the Secretary-General rightly recalled that we have had success in Africa and elsewhere. Such success is encouraging and should prompt us to continue our discussions and our efforts to increase the effectiveness of United Nations interventions.

In reacting to crises, the work of Blue Helmets remains central. But, to restore confidence, rebuild institutions, restore economies and — as should be done everywhere — initiate a democratic electoral process, we need not only Blue Helmets on the ground, but also police officers, judges, human rights observers and public service specialists.

Like many here, I was able, on recent visits to Haiti and Kosovo, to observe such difficulties on the ground. And it is my feeling that we must face three main challenges.

The first challenge is to be able to react on time. Let us draw a lesson from a crisis that revealed the international community's inability to act pre-emptively to prevent its appearance. We therefore need to discuss our common action and sometimes our inaction, particularly in the area of development and human rights protection. Once a crisis has erupted, civilian actions must be carried out immediately. Why? First, it is in situations of extreme instability and uncertainty that, generally speaking, the most serious violence is committed against civilian populations and the most serious human rights violations occur, and it is at such times that crisis exit strategies are prepared. But, unfortunately — as the Secretary-General noted in his report on justice and the rule of law — our rapid reaction capability remain very insufficient when compared with our military capacities. That lack of means is compounded by procedural slowness, which increases the gap between the people's expectations and concrete actions — a situation that certain groups may exploit to prolong a state of war.

How can we respond to this? First, we can reinforce the human resources available to the United Nations by establishing a pool of jurists, police officers, judges and human rights experts who can quickly be made available. That is precisely the approach that the European Union has chosen, as Javier Solana has just explained very well.

To political and human crises, I would like to add those crises caused by natural disasters. It is an idea I have put forward in other circumstances. In the European Union, we need a civilian protection force that can be present as a whole on the ground when disasters and crises of this kind occur, as they also have human consequences.

We can respond by thinking about establishing financial instruments that can be rapidly mobilized. That way, we can hope to create without delay a virtuous circle that encompasses civilians. And finally, we can, of course, respond by increasing funding. In comparison to the \$4 billion budget for peacekeeping operations for 2004, financing for certain essential actions — for example, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants and the establishment of joint tribunals — is quite pathetic.

The second challenge we should underline is that of coordination. Given the complexity of crises, we have to act as a team. There is no shortage of actors. There are United Nations funds and agencies, the international financial institutions and the regional organizations. We have seen — and support — the role played by the African Union, non-governmental organizations and civilian, military and humanitarian stakeholders. Progress has been made, but the coordination among those numerous actors is inadequate, with the result being too much duplication and a certain lack of coherence on the ground.

Accordingly, we need to continue to strengthen the responsibilities of the special representatives of the Secretary-General and the resident coordinators of the United Nations Development Programme. Another practice that would be useful to expand in a pragmatic way is the creation of ad hoc contact groups consisting of the countries most concerned and interested in the settlement of a given crisis. They would help establish a shared analysis and priorities around which a coherent strategy for action could be based.

Finally, we hope that the high-level panel established by the Secretary-General will produce concrete proposals for the creation of permanent mechanisms to coordinate among world and regional institutions, non-governmental organizations and the private sector.

The third and last challenge is that of an exit strategy. It is a complex problem. How can we help a country without creating a long-term dependency on

external assistance? How can we move from an approach of substitution to one of ownership by the local people? How can we uproot crisis factors in the long term? First, we must stress men and women — human resources, training, education and assistance — the approach consistently favoured by the European Union, and we must respect the specific nature of a situation and the local cultural identity. We must more thoroughly involve civil society in international assistance. In that respect, I note the very important proposal contained in the Cardoso report on civil society and the United Nations, which we must carefully study in an open-minded and constructive manner.

Finally, I underline the linguistic requirements of peacekeeping operations, particularly for civilian police. As I myself have seen on the ground, French-speaking individuals are sorely lacking in Haiti, as well as in Côte d'Ivoire and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. France is undertaking to better respond to those needs. We hope to mobilize potential contributors, particular among the francophone community, to meet the appeals made by the Secretary-General.

Crisis management is no longer the preserve of the Security Council, nor even of the United Nations. It is the responsibility of the international community as a whole. Together, we must examine both the pre-emergency and post-emergency stages of crisis management. Before an emergency arises is the time for prevention. After an emergency is the time of transition. We must move towards an integration of those stages in our collective action. With its partners in the European Union and the United Nations, my country will work towards that goal.

I welcome once again the initiative you have taken, Mr. President, on this question, which is at once very political in nature and a very concrete one for our people.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France for his suggestions for responding to the challenges he mentioned.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Mircea Geoana, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania.

**Mr. Geoana** (Romania) (*spoke in French*): I and the Romanian delegation are pleased that the Spanish presidency convened this meeting. When Mr.

Moratinos visited Bucharest, I had the privilege of discussing this issue and the common steps taken in this regard by Romania and Spain.

I would also like to welcome the presence of Mr. Javier Solana and his colleagues, our friend Mr. Amre Moussa, and our friends from the African Union.

(*spoke in English*)

In the last couple of years, our debate has shifted from what we call costly contemplation to engagement. On this topic, we are now at the stage of defining the degree and the quality of our engagement. The breadth and diversity of that engagement can be addressed only once we adopt a broad concept of security and conflict management. We should not only look at the symptoms and the challenges but also establish benchmarks for the viability and durability of our effort. The time has indeed come for the Security Council, the United Nations family and all of us to deal with these issues.

The recent Mexican initiative and others, including our own in July, signal a new trend in Security Council activities and decisions on this issue. We acknowledge not only the multifaceted nature of security but also the need for a multifaceted response to security threats. The topic proposed by our Spanish friends also indicates a major challenge in avoiding placing dividing lines between the military and the civilian components, which are still too rigidly kept apart. We are aware of the major role of each component, but we should try to make the synergy between the two components real.

We find it only logical to start thinking of all operations as having two phases of deployment and two categories of staff in a mutually reinforcing relationship. We have learned from our experience in the Balkans and in other places where Romania has been engaged that another key to success in all post-conflict operations is to rapidly build up local capacity and ownership.

Interagency cooperation still needs to be improved. We have seen some progress, especially in cooperation among the United Nations, the European Union and the African Union. But more remains to be done in that respect.

Rapid reaction national units are a must, and my country is working on a national registry for experts and professionals that can be deployed at any time.

The expected outcome of the synergy between the military and the civilian components in conflict management and peace-building is our ability to prevent future armed conflicts. We are also looking at an aspect that is important to us and is important to the success of our endeavour — the functioning of the basic elements of good governance.

In that regard, the capacity of post-conflict societies to assimilate democratic values, especially competitive electoral politics, is of decisive importance. Here again, we should have a realistic approach, including with respect to the right balance between military and civilian instruments. Unfortunately, there continue to exist situations, such as the prolonged deadlock in the peace and transition process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which make the case for more substantial military resources from the international community.

I would urge all of us to look at and try to review the United Nations electoral assistance practices, whose understanding of the criteria for fair and free elections needs to be substantially broadened. We must also give more support to independent national electoral commissions; the concepts of freedom of organization, movement, assembly and expression by political parties; accurate electoral rolls; and freedom of access for election monitors from international organizations and non-governmental organizations.

Economics should not be missing from any toolbox of civilian instruments for conflict management and peace-building. We also look with great interest to the way in which the European Union has addressed some of these issues in a successful way.

Dealing with the challenges of conflict management and peace-building at the beginning of the twenty-first century requires, indeed, a multilayered and multi-institutional approach. The Security Council, including on the occasion of the thematic debate initiated by my country during our presidency in the month of July, acknowledged the important role played by regional organizations in this field and encouraged them to continue the development of their crisis management capabilities, including at the civilian level.

The African Union and the European Union are just two examples of organizations that play a truly effective role in conflict management and peace-building.

In conclusion, the tasks for civilians and the military in post-conflict situations are no longer simple, as they involve good coordination in the field and clearly stated goals. The role of the Security Council is decisive in this respect because, in most cases, it is the Council that lays down the framework for good civil-military interaction. Significant added value in this regard will undoubtedly be brought by today's open debate of the Council, and, again, we welcome the Spanish initiative in this regard.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania for his kind words addressed to me.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, His Excellency Mr. Alberto Gatmaitan Romulo.

**Mr. Romulo** (Philippines): Mr. President, I am very pleased to see you occupy the presidency of the Security Council. I also wish to congratulate your delegation on organizing an open meeting of the Council on this important topic.

The dangers to international peace these days are posed less by conflicts between countries and more by the deadly web of terrorism, weapons proliferation and the political turmoil brought about by dysfunctional or failed States. Old paradigms of conflict management and peace-building that were current in the era of bipolarity and major-Power rivalries do not prove useful anymore, since today's threats or breaches to peace emerge more from State weakness than strength. As experience over the last decade has shown, the attainment of sustainable peace in countries shattered by conflicts involves complex and multidimensional aspects calling for harmony of the efforts of the international community, through the United Nations.

For the Philippines, peace is an imperative. With over 7 million Filipinos overseas in over 180 countries and on ships passing through all the world's oceans and straits, the stakes are higher for the Philippines. Conflicts can and have had a direct impact on the safety of our nationals. As a nation, conventional notions of physical territory no longer solely define us. Our interests lie wherever events and developments bear upon the lives and futures of our Filipinos overseas. As a nation and as a people, we dream of peace in all lands and believe that the work of civilians can help build firm foundations for peace.

The Spanish concept paper for today's debate, emphasizing the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building, correctly builds on an element required to face the challenge for better and more collective efforts to address and resolve conflicts and to build an effective peace. The principles and doctrines of military readiness are well understood, but often neglected are the civilian or non-military aspects for achieving sustainable peace after these hostilities have ceased.

Sustainable peace demands that failed States and States recovering from debilitating conflicts develop their Governments and build their economies and civil society. However, without external help, this will be impossible to achieve. International assistance is required for these States to foster responsive, accountable institutions of governance, such as rule of law mechanisms, including the justice system, administrative bureaucracies, central banks and fiscal and financial rules and mechanisms, and to guard against a possible relapse into conflict.

The United Nations does not lack the structural mechanism for the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building. In fact, the United Nations has specific expertise in the most important areas of humanitarian assistance — conducting elections; disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration; strengthening of rule of law mechanisms; protection of human rights, and various aspects of civil affairs. The problem is not so much of capacity — even if this, also, is a genuine problem — but the effective harnessing of such capacity to reach the goal of stabilizing post-conflict States.

Fortunately, the horizon is far from bleak. The United Nations has been cognizant of — and responsive to — the strong trend towards synergistic approaches between the military and civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building. As early as 1992, then-Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali had introduced the concept of post-conflict peace-building to describe the range of civilian tasks, as it were, in modern-day United Nations peace operations. The United Nations mandates in Kosovo and East Timor in the 1990s were the benchmarks on how the nature of peacekeeping had evolved from a purely military dimension into civil administration, governance and even development-type tasks, or, in the context of today's debate, the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building.

Security Council mandates are now multidimensional in character, giving significance to human rights, economic and social factors and even health in peace operations. These realities have also been translated into concrete reform of the United Nations Secretariat conflict management structures, such as the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. The most recent of these reform exercises, which is still under way, was laid out in the August 2000 Brahimi Report.

At the working level, cross-sectoral mechanisms are now in place at United Nations Headquarters. This welcome trend in the way various United Nations bodies have been performing their mandate under the Charter has contributed to an environment in which military and civilian aspects are now seen as a seamless whole under the rubric of conflict management and peace-building.

While there has been a noticeable and qualitative improvement in the comprehensive approach to — and structures for — attaining sustainable peace in post-conflict States, it is critical to continue to re-energize our efforts for a more effective and coordinated response to complex crisis situations.

On a broader level, one factor that could improve the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building is to get the United Nations committed to peace missions for the period necessary to establish new and effectual governmental institutions in war-shattered States. To attain long-lasting peace in war-ravaged States, we should assist them for as long as necessary in establishing stable and functioning governmental institutions. The results, and not the contingencies of the length of a mission, would be the prime factor for effective conflict management and peace-building.

On a national level, Member States may wish to revisit the White Helmets Initiative, introduced in the United Nations General Assembly almost a decade ago by Argentina. The White Helmets Initiative calls on Member States to establish corps of volunteers for humanitarian relief operations who may be deployed to other countries in need of such assistance, in coordination with the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. They are largely self-financed and/or supported by contributions and thus are not a burden to the limited United Nations budget or the official accounts of Member States.

This and similar voluntary endeavours and programmes, such as the United Nations Volunteers, are able to harness the noble spirit of volunteerism which fortunately continues to pervade much of our citizenry and civil society.

I began by emphasizing how important international peace is to a country that has more than one-tenth of its population in other lands. I have discussed our thoughts and our support for the theme of our debate and the specific ideas and mechanisms that will ensure a meaningful role for civilians in peace-building.

Our interest in this theme goes beyond our desire to ensure the safety of our nationals overseas. Our interest in this theme is also driven by the fact that the very nationals whose safety would be ensured by genuine peace are themselves deeply and meaningfully involved in building peace. Many of our nationals are directly involved in peace-building around the world through international organizations and non-government organizations. Some work on behalf of our Government, providing assistance to civilian authorities in post-conflict areas in the fields of governance, electoral process, judicial administration and the training of civilian police.

But many more, as migrant workers, are helping build the peace. They are the medical personnel who tend to the sick and wounded in post-conflict and even in conflict areas. They are the engineers who help build roads that link villages and tribes who are now at peace. They are the pilots and loadmasters who help bring sustenance to areas starved by war. They are the teachers who help foster knowledge, openness and tolerance. They are the field workers who help manage the natural resources that were once the cause of conflict. Though they are migrant and contract workers earning a living far from their land and loved ones, they often play significant roles in building peace, unheralded and sometimes at grave risk to themselves.

The quest for international peace and security is a multifaceted challenge. Peace requires a comprehensive, concerted and determined approach that addresses the root causes of conflicts, including their economic and social dimensions. To the extent that the goal of peace is indivisible, the approaches and efforts at achieving it must be holistic, well planned and well coordinated.

The strategy in responding to threats to and breaches of the peace requires the effective and efficient harnessing and use of all resources of the United Nations. It demands interdependence, cooperation and coordination among United Nations organs and agencies whose mandates impact the attainment of sustainable peace. It often also demands sacrifice.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines for the kind words he addressed to myself.

I now call on His Excellency Mr. Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil.

**Mr. Amorim** (Brazil) (*spoke in Spanish*): I feel honoured, Sir, to be here under your presidency. Although I know the Council is facing difficult times, I am glad to be here and to see so many friends in the Secretariat and in delegations with whom I worked here for many years. We worked with great dedication, although perhaps not always successfully, towards achieving peaceful results.

I wish to congratulate you, Foreign Minister Moratinos Cuyaubé, my friend, for promoting this very timely debate on the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building.

President Lula opened the general debate of the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly (see A/59/PV.3) with a wide-ranging presentation of Brazil's perception of the most pressing challenges facing the world today. The key element in this vision is the idea that the foundation of peace is social justice. As President Lula has said, a world in which hunger and poverty prevail cannot be a peaceful world.

I also wish to express Brazil's firm support for the Secretary-General's words yesterday in the General Assembly about the importance of the rule of law. Law, not power, should be the regulator of coexistence both domestically and internationally.

Recent experience has given us a number of examples of conflicts in countries with very low levels of development, illustrating the limitations of a purely or primarily military approach to peace-building. Without a broader perspective, without considering economic and social variables and without focusing on the well-being of civilians, we will fail in seeking lasting solutions. I heard from other speakers that this

is a broadly shared vision. The question, really, is how to achieve it.

In Brazil's opinion, the United Nations should develop instruments and mechanisms that translate this awareness into real strategies. Article 65 of the Charter of the United Nations offers us an opportunity to enhance cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, thereby broadening the scope of multilateral cooperation in conflict management and peace-building. Let us not forget that the Economic and Social Council, and not the Security Council, is the Charter organ with responsibility for matters relating to social development. And of what do we speak when we talk of efforts to build lasting peace or of reconstruction if not social and economic development? That was the focus when the World Bank was created for the reconstruction of Europe. It was a bank for reconstruction; development came later. Still, reconstruction and development go together, but they are matters that relate also to the Economic and Social Council. I think it is part of the work of the Security Council to promote the work of the Economic and Social Council in fulfilling its tasks, so as to ease the work of the Security Council and prevent it from interfering in its own work. I am well aware of the working methods of the Security Council, so I will not propose anything concrete, but I would have liked to see a reference to Article 65 of the Charter in the very specific context that the President has set for our discussion. I put this forward as food for thought for the future.

In the past, we have tried to use that provision of the Charter as a basis in situations such as Burundi and Guinea-Bissau. However, while those endeavours proved to be useful experiments, they have not yet represented a sufficiently well-defined response to the demands we face in many parts of Africa, in the Middle East, in Timor-Leste, in Haiti with its chronic violence and elsewhere.

Since I am referring to Haiti, I would like to say that Brazil has accepted the responsibility of commanding the forces of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti, with strong participation from other Latin American countries, including Chile, on the clear understanding that peace in that marginalized sister nation of our continent, will require a long-term commitment from the international community — a commitment not only to security, but also to socio-economic progress.

The United Nations has failed the people of Haiti in the past by interpreting its role too strictly and focusing it excessively on security issues. This time, in parallel with efforts to establish a more secure environment, we need to launch a sustained programme to assist Haitian society in the political, social and economic areas. Those are tasks that go beyond the purview of the Security Council. They need to be coordinated with it, but they require the participation of other agencies and organs.

We need to take advantage of the present atmosphere, which is favourable to United Nations reform, in order to begin to formulate new ways of addressing these situations. We need to ensure continuity among preventive action, peacekeeping efforts and the post-conflict peace-building phase. We also need to tackle the question of the duration and intensity of these efforts, as I believe was just mentioned by my colleague from the Philippines.

Of course, we must rapidly deploy all the troops required by Security Council resolutions. We are facing this need in Haiti at this very moment. But it is particularly important to provide all of the human, financial and material resources needed for physical and institutional reconstruction. We appreciate the generosity of donor countries and international financial institutions, but these need to be coordinated with the multilateral agencies, whose primary authority to define the general framework needs to be recognized.

Speaking of civilian aspects of peace-keeping means focusing attention on the fundamental importance of restoring human dignity, which is generally the first victim of conflict situations. I can easily foresee that some of today's discussions will explore certain specific technical aspects of peacekeeping operations and how they dovetail with the humanitarian agenda, the role of regional organizations and other matters. Those are all relevant aspects deserving of our consideration.

For my part, I wish to emphasize the need to develop new and better tools for addressing the structural problems at the root of tensions that lead to violence and conflict. Poverty, disease, lack of opportunity and inequality are some of the causes of conflicts, particularly those within countries, which, regrettably, are becoming ever more prevalent on our agenda.

In accordance with prevailing practice, once members of the Security Council have determined that a certain agenda item no longer represents a threat to the peace, that situation is sent into limbo, without any intergovernmental follow-up of the reconciliation and reconstruction processes. That flaw in our methods of work may allow a conflict to reignite, as the tragic example of Haiti underscores.

No matter how sophisticated our military peacekeeping actions may be, we will be able to meet the security challenges effectively only if we integrate the political, social and economic elements into our strategies. To that end, we can base our action on the wise provision of Article 65, drafted in 1945, which reminds us of the absolute need to address security issues in their socio-economic context and even provides guidance on how to do so from the institutional and multilateral standpoints.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil for his service in this Organization, and in particular for his efforts to enhance coordination among the various organs of the United Nations family.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Makhdum Khusro Bakhtyar, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan.

**Mr. Bakhtyar** (Pakistan): I would like to warmly felicitate the Spanish presidency for organizing today's debate on the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building. Your presence here, Sir, to preside over this ministerial meeting testifies to the importance of this theme.

I also wish to thank Secretary-General Kofi Annan, as well as Mr. Javier Solana, Mr. Amre Moussa and Mr. Saïd Djinnit for their important contributions to the debate.

The Security Council in recent months has reflected on various dimensions of conflict management and post-conflict peace-building. The Council's debates on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, complex crises and United Nations response, peacekeeping operations, justice and the rule of law, and post-conflict stabilization have contributed richly to our collective thinking on developing a coherent and effective response to these challenges. Today's discussion complements that ongoing discourse.

In the discharge of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council is frequently called upon to intervene in complex crisis situations. Those situations are often characterized by inter-linked military and security dimensions, as well as political, economic, social and humanitarian facets. The wide range of issues involved requires a comprehensive, multidimensional approach based on increased system-wide coordination.

Broadly speaking, there are three basic conditions for a successful transformation from conflict to sustainable peace: the restoration of security, a viable political process, and development and reconstruction. Effective coordination between military forces and civilian actors is required to meet those conditions.

Peacekeeping operations represent the most effective and widely used instrument for conflict management, but a peacekeeping operation is usually established when there is peace to keep. In the pre-conflict stage, there is always scope for civilian involvement through preventive diplomatic action. Early warning and early engagement, including through the Secretary-General's good offices and the United Nations system at large, could at times prevent conflicts from erupting. Early diplomatic engagement could also help contain the conflict if it indeed erupts. Conflict prevention must therefore be a priority goal.

During the conflict phase, the increasingly complex, multidimensional peacekeeping operations are instrumental in managing crises and creating an enabling environment for a smooth transition to the post-conflict or peace-building phase. However, the civilian aspects are important in several respects, such as humanitarian assistance, conflict resolution and dispute settlement, and implementation of the peace process. Access, the protection of the humanitarian community and adequate resources are crucial for an effective humanitarian response. Peaceful resolution of the conflict through the provisions of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter should remain a priority throughout.

The post-conflict phase relies more heavily on the civilian role when there is only a residual military presence, if required. The civilian component helps in the maintenance of public order, the reintegration of ex-combatants, the development of functioning public institutions, the protection and promotion of human rights, justice and the rule of law, electoral processes,

and economic reconstruction and development. The diversity of challenges in this phase requires the involvement of multiple actors, both within and outside the United Nations system.

A comprehensive policy response must, in our view, place the greatest premium at all stages of conflict on addressing the root causes. That is essential to preventing a relapse of conflict, with its attendant consequences. Equally, recognition of the inextricable link between peace and development would help us to develop strategies for longer-term stability and self-sustaining peace and security.

It is important to recognize that civilian conflict management and peace-building are a complex task, the nature and requirements of which vary from situation to situation. National and regional capacities also vary significantly. Accordingly, there can be no “one-size-fits-all” solution. Endeavours to develop any overarching guidelines must take those factors into account.

We support the emphasis on strengthening national civilian crisis management instruments and capabilities. If those are unavailable or inadequate at the national level, the logical first recourse to fill the capacity gaps should be the subregional or regional resources, where possible. The role of the regional and subregional organizations and their cooperation with the United Nations under Chapter VIII of the Charter are important as regards civilian and military capacities, both of which should be developed. Internal and external resources are required to develop those capacities. States and regional organizations in a position to do so should provide adequate assistance.

Increased system-wide coordination is essential to successfully integrating civilian aspects into the United Nations strategies to deal with complex crisis situations. Civilian elements are being progressively incorporated into the planning and operations of multidimensional peacekeeping missions. Steps are also under way to achieve better coordination of the civilian and military aspects, but solutions do not lie only in increasing the number or size of the civilian components of the peacekeeping missions. Corresponding steps should be taken at Headquarters to ensure an integrated and coherent response at the organizational level.

The crucial issue of resources must also receive due attention. Civilian aspects — particularly those

relating to humanitarian relief — are often dependent on voluntary contributions and therefore prone to perennial shortfalls. Consideration should be given to provide resources from assessed contributions, as is the case for the peacekeeping missions.

The multidimensional tasks in the post-conflict phase are not primarily the domain of the Security Council. Many lie within the purview of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The involvement and support of international financial institutions is equally important in effective conflict management and peace-building. A comprehensive approach presupposes a dynamic interface among the relevant United Nations organs and the broad range of national, regional and international actors and stakeholders, all working in synergy.

We believe that ideas on better coordinating mechanisms within the United Nations must be explored. Today’s debate would go a long way in this search. Pakistan’s proposal for establishing ad hoc composite committees of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council deserves careful consideration in this context.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan for his statement.

I now call on the Minister of External Relations of Angola, Mr. João Bernardo de Miranda.

**Mr. Miranda** (Angola) (*spoke in French*): We welcome your presence, Sir, and we commend the Spanish presidency on organizing this discussion on the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building. We also thank them for the excellent support document that we hope will be of benefit to all United Nations Members, in particular countries emerging from complex conflicts.

We wish to thank the Secretary-General for his important statement. We also welcome with satisfaction the presence of the High Representative for the European Union’s Common Foreign and Security Policy, Mr. Javier Solana, and the Commissioner for Peace and Security of the African Union, Mr. Said Djinnit, as well as the representatives of the Arab League, whose statements have made a remarkable contribution to today’s discussion.

By civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building, we understand the whole group of

decisions taken at the end of a conflict in order to consolidate peace and to prevent a further outbreak of hostilities. Peace-building does not replace humanitarian and development activities in the countries emerging from crisis. On the contrary, its purpose is to complement or redirect such activities so as to reduce the risk of further outbreak of conflict by helping to create the most favourable conditions for reconciliation, reconstruction and economic recovery.

Experience teaches us that post-conflict peace-building requires much more than purely diplomatic or military decision-making and that a consistent peace-building effort is required to eliminate the multiple causes of a conflict. According to the Secretary-General's report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development,

“Since 1970, more than 30 wars have been fought in Africa, the vast majority of them intra-State in origin. In 1996 alone, 14 of the 53 countries of Africa were afflicted by armed conflicts, accounting for more than half of all war-related deaths worldwide and resulting in more than 8 million refugees, returnees and displaced persons. The consequences of those conflicts have seriously undermined Africa's efforts to ensure long-term stability, prosperity and peace for its peoples.” (*S/1998/318, para. 4*)

The increase in missions, many of which address issues of a political nature, the building of national institutions, election monitoring, the organization of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, issues relating to refugees and displaced persons, respect for human rights and the rule of law, and the relaunching of development attest to the growing significance of the civilian component in peace-building. Given this cross-sectoral nature, the international community must necessarily take into account the link between peace and development. It thus must be able to rely on the cooperation, coordination and complementarity of the principal United Nations organs, including the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

Moreover, joint deployment with regional and subregional organizations, in keeping with the provisions of the United Nations Charter, has demonstrated that such partnerships are mutually

advantageous. In this regard, the response of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in Côte d'Ivoire and in Liberia before the deployment of peacekeeping forces attests to the value and the role of regional and subregional organizations.

In the case of armed conflict, the Security Council's role is clear. Nonetheless, in situations in which public order and the functioning of public institutions need to be restored at the end of a conflict, it is incumbent on the civilian component to play a more important role in peace-building in order to achieve its objectives. There are certain elements that are required and certain conditions that need to be met. In our view, the most important conditions are the following: first, diplomatic, political and economic action must be undertaken on several fronts. Secondly, the peace-building effort must be properly financed. Thirdly, the activities of multiple actors need to be coordinated at the highest level, in strategic and administrative terms, in a framework incorporating all United Nations partners, including the Bretton Woods institutions, national authorities, the private sector and civil society.

There is also the aspect of human rights and the rule of law, which are also very important and vital to the peace-building process.

The importance and the role of the private sector in peace-building is also a great challenge for countries emerging from conflict. The various resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the illicit exploitation of natural resources, in particular as regards the Kimberly process, eloquently demonstrate this.

As we encourage economic development, if we accept the rule of law, and if we give people the sense of being members of the community where these activities are being carried out, we are certain that the private sector can make a crucial contribution to peace-building.

In Africa as elsewhere, conflicts change in nature and therefore require for different forms of action in order to tackle their effects. Today, crises are much more complex. The protagonists involved are numerous, and so are their dimensions.

Keeping in mind the state of affairs in a country such as our own, we note that there is a growing gap between requests for assistance, which are increasingly

numerous, and the limited resources available; urgent solutions are therefore required that are based on clearly defined priorities.

We are therefore convinced that the international community will continue to follow up this very serious issue.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to once again express great appreciation to the presidency of the Security Council for having convened this important debate, and we would reiterate that we will support the presidential statement that the Council will shortly be issuing.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Minister of External Affairs of Angola for his statement.

I give the floor to Ms. Anne Patterson, Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States of America.

**Ms. Patterson** (United States of America): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your selection of the topic for your presidency's thematic discussion.

The United States agrees that today's complex emergencies and peace operations require the international community to develop civilian as well as military response capability. The United Nations and its Member States play a critical role in lessening and responding to such crises.

The post-cold-war experience teaches us that ad hoc responses are not enough. Individually and collectively, we must better organize ourselves to identify resources that can be readily accessed and rapidly deployed for reconstruction and stabilization.

There are several areas in which we want to work together, including transitional security and law enforcement, the rule of law, good governance and democratic participation, economic reconstruction and humanitarian responses.

We have often seen a sharp increase in social unrest and criminal activity take place in the immediate post-conflict period. While military peacekeepers can help stabilize a post-conflict country, the establishment of a competent, impartial and adequately resourced civilian police mission is crucial to maintaining security.

The United States is proud to be the second-largest contributor of civilian police to peacekeeping missions. The presence of civilian police enables military peacekeepers to draw down earlier than might otherwise be possible, leaving them available to be deployed elsewhere as necessary. In addition, civilian police are essential to re-establish local and national public security institutions to stop vigilantism and revenge-taking. That is our major component of crisis management in post-conflict reconstruction.

Civilian police are, in fact, a crucial bridge between a martial State and a functioning democracy. The deployment of civilian police will also set an example for the development of local police institutions. Let me mention one example. Many countries, but particularly the United States and Spain, worked together to establish the national police of El Salvador after that country's extended conflict. While the new police force was not perfect, it was vastly better than its predecessor and an essential element in that country's reconciliation and democratic transformation.

Several delegations here have outlined a number of ways to improve the international community's civilian police response, which we endorse. However, policing alone is not the answer. We must take an approach that incorporates the entire public security and justice system and indeed the broader issue of democracy-building and incorporating civil society into the process.

As such, we believe that civilian police must be linked with assistance to the judicial and penal systems. Without that integrated approach, policing becomes nothing more than a continuation of the peacekeeping function rather than a vital precursor to peace-building. To that end, and of paramount importance in managing post-conflict societies, is the rapid establishment of the rule of law in a post-conflict State. That is essential in order to prevent the emergence of political corruption, organized crime and other criminal and terrorist elements that wish to obstruct the peace process. We very much look forward to exploring the rule of law issue in greater detail next month during the United Kingdom presidency.

The role of international and regional organizations in responding to crises must also be further developed and improved. We appreciate the ongoing efforts of the various United Nations

departments, agencies and programmes to address the civilian dimensions of complex emergencies and peace operations. Democracy and governance issues are central to these responses, and President Bush announced yesterday our support of a democracy fund that would undertake the promotion of democracy and engagement with civil society — both critical in post-conflict environments. We look forward to hearing recommendations on all these matters from the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change.

Finally, we must continue to work with the international financial institutions to develop improved coordination and a shared understanding of responsibilities.

The United States will continue to support effective multilateral cooperation in confronting the challenges of internal conflict and State collapse. As the Spanish paper noted, civil and military planning, coordination and cooperation are central to the success of reconstruction and stabilization.

The United States Government is announcing today the formation of a new office within the State Department — the Office of the Special Coordinator for Stabilization and Reconstruction — which will, hopefully, improve our own domestic Government-wide capacity to respond to post-conflict situations.

My delegation supports examining how to improve the coordination of international civilian and military cooperation, as well as efforts to adopt supporting doctrines for reconstruction and stabilization. In that spirit, the United States will continue working to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of its own national reconstruction and stabilization capacities.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I give the floor to the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom, The Right Honourable Jack Straw.

**Mr. Straw** (United Kingdom): Let me begin by thanking the Government of Spain and in particular, if I may, my colleague and friend the Foreign Minister of Spain, Miguel Moratinos, for having organized today's debate.

Military peacekeeping and political peace agreements bring an end — or they should — to the hot war of conflict. But we can ensure lasting peace in

countries recovering from such conflicts only if we help to build civilian institutions and structures, capable government, a strong economy, a functioning civil society. So resolving today's conflicts, which often occur within States rather than between them, is more complex than in the past. It may involve stabilizing a fragile peace, restoring public order, reintegrating combatants, acting on women's issues, ending impunity, and rebuilding local institutions for security, governance, justice, democracy, economic growth and for social welfare.

Acting across all these areas presents us with big challenges, made all the more acute by the need to act quickly in the brief period following the end of the hot conflict. Acting quickly is vital, as we know, for success. But as well as being quick, we have to be coherent, across a range of issues and a range of actors.

I think that, over the last decade, we all have been on a very steep learning curve. We are agreeing more comprehensive mandates, for example for the operations that we have determined in Liberia, in Côte d'Ivoire, in Haiti and in Burundi. We are learning the importance of supporting programmes which originate locally and which reflect local cultures, such as the Loya Jirga in Afghanistan.

I think we are getting better at burden-sharing. Last year, for example, the European Union police mission in Bosnia took over from the United Nations-led International Police Task Force there. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a European Union-led force helped to prepare the way for United Nations troops.

Alongside that, we are working more closely across institutions, such as the United Nations and the World Bank are doing in Iraq, the Sudan and Liberia, and together with the Inter-American Bank and the European Commission in Haiti.

All those improvements show the direction in which we need to go in future. Let me suggest briefly five areas on which we need to focus: earlier action, better financing, stronger partnerships, local priorities and long-term engagement.

First, on earlier action, we have got to plan and implement civilian processes early so we are able quickly to lay the foundations for stability. To take the example of Iraq, Prime Minister Alawi has made clear that it cannot simply be a case of security first and

elections later. Elections are themselves vital to building security. We need to help the Secretariat deploy civilian staff more quickly and improve our own capacities — as the United Kingdom is doing through a new interdepartmental, post-conflict reconstruction unit between the British Foreign Office, the British Department for International Development and the British Ministry of Defence — so that we are better able to give civilian support to United Kingdom and international operations abroad.

Secondly, we need better financing for the civilian parts of peace-support operations. I am not necessarily arguing for an increase in the scope of assessed contributions, but we have to find ways to generate more funding for civilian peace-building activities, especially in the vital first year after the end of a conflict.

Thirdly, we have to build stronger partnerships. Regional organizations can often mobilize resources more quickly and have special, local legitimacy, which is why I greatly welcome the contribution made earlier this morning by the representative of the African Union. It is the African Union that is playing a crucial and leading role in the resolution of the conflict in Darfur.

The European Union's capacities and partnerships with the United Nations are growing, too, and our partnership also needs to be with civil society and non-governmental organizations. I welcome the recommendations of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations — the Cardoso panel — on this.

Linked to all of this is a need to better coordinate our actions. In post-conflict environments, competing, conflicting or inappropriate programmes can often do more harm than good. We have all seen examples of that, where well-meaning individuals and Governments take programmes down off the shelf, do not adapt them to local circumstances and end up creating more, not fewer, difficulties. There is much to be learned from the trust fund models that we have seen in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in Liberia and elsewhere.

My fourth point concerns local priorities, and it relates to the point I have just made. We can no longer impose structures that will collapse as soon as the international community leaves. Instead, we have to work to priorities agreed in and by the country concerned and develop the local capacity to implement

them. The Afghan Transitional Administration is a commendable example of that necessary local leadership.

Fifthly, and finally, there is the question of long-term engagement. We have to address the fact that international political attention for the financing of post-conflict countries tends to wane, or drop off, after three or four years, although studies show that that is precisely when countries are most vulnerable to relapsing into conflict. We therefore need to find better ways to mobilize long-term support for post-conflict countries in transition. I hope that the High-level Panel will propose some options for doing so.

It is also not just a matter for us; it is a matter for the world media, because as their attention drops off, so inevitably — in all the countries that we represent — does the attention of our voters and then the attention of our Governments. We have to try and turn that around.

Let me end by commending the report of the Secretary-General on the rule of law and transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict societies (S/2004/616). I look forward to discussing how we can follow-up on its excellent analysis and recommendations in the open debate on the report under the United Kingdom's Security Council presidency next month. These discussions are vitally important, and we need to keep working on building our capacities and partnerships, sharing expertise and continually reviewing our operations to ensure that we really do learn the lessons for the future and put them into practice.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Andrei Denisov, Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations.

**Mr. Denisov** (*spoke in Russian*): The item before us today is a topical one in the context of the activities of the Security Council and of the Organization as a whole. Experience has shown that attaining lasting peace and settling regional conflicts are possible only on the basis of a comprehensive approach; this has to combine traditional diplomatic and peacekeeping efforts with measures to achieve post-conflict recovery

in the States concerned. In other words, we need reliable guarantees for regional stabilization to prevent the re-emergence of conflicts.

Given those conditions, the peacekeeping operations conducted by the United Nations or under its auspices are becoming ever more complex and multidimensional in nature. The importance of civilian police and other non-military components is increasing. They are the ones that bear the responsibility for helping to establish legitimacy, the rule of law and a judicial system, as well as to strengthen effective governmental institutions in States emerging from the “hot” stage of a conflict. All of these are important intrinsic elements of peace-building.

In order to implement all the prescribed tasks, qualified international civilian staff — combining a high standard of professionalism with a sensitive regard for the political, cultural, social and other features of States undergoing a post-conflict stage — is required. The United Nations has some significant experience in this area, but, of course, the decisive factor is the willingness of Member States to make the needed personnel and resources available.

In a comparatively short period of time the United Nations has made significant progress in resolving a number of complex conflicts. Tajikistan, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Timor-Leste and Guatemala — these examples are but a partial list of the achievements of the productive combination of United Nations peacekeeping and peace-building instruments. In all of those instances, success was made possible to a large extent because of the close coordination among the military, political, civilian and rehabilitation components of those operations. This once again underscores the growing importance of strengthening interaction between the Security Council and the other principal organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations system.

Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations must be intensified in the peacekeeping area, in keeping with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations. In fact, a number of these structures have well-developed police and other civilian capacities which they could make available to the United Nations.

However, each crisis situation is unique, and there is no uniform peacekeeping model that can be

applied to all conflicts. In each specific case there is a need to choose the best set of peacekeeping instruments, whether it be a United Nations peacekeeping operation, a coalition or a regional operation. Such efforts must be organized in strict conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, which clearly stipulates the Security Council’s primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and in particular its key political role at all stages of peacekeeping operations, from the definition of their mandates to the transition towards peace-building.

A comprehensive approach to dealing with the consequences of crises requires a seamless, sequential transition from one stage of peacekeeping to the next. Here, the support of the Security Council for civilian peace-building efforts is of great importance, including at stages when the central implementation role is handed over to United Nations specialized agencies or to international and regional organizations.

Russia is fully cognizant of its responsibility, in the context of peacekeeping, in the efforts of the international community. It is our intention to constantly increase our contribution to United Nations peacekeeping, including by making available properly trained police contingents and civilian personnel.

We will continue to help broaden practical cooperation in the area of crisis management between the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Collective Security Treaty Organization.

We are prepared to work closely with all interested international partners in order to reinforce the lead role of the United Nations in conflict prevention and management and to enhance its effectiveness in the interests of strengthening global security and stability.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Joël Adechi, Permanent Representative of Benin to the United Nations.

**Mr. Adechi** (Benin) (*spoke in French*): I would like to express our appreciation for your initiative, Mr. President, in having organized this ministerial-level meeting of the Security Council on civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building. It is a very topical and relevant theme, given the increasing complexity of United Nations peacekeeping missions,

particularly when their mandate is simply to help a State to regenerate itself as an entity and when it covers a broad range of activities involving civilian stakeholders, as well as a military component.

Activities requiring a major civilian component include the setting up of a dialogue among former belligerent parties through transitional institutions; supervising and facilitating the implementation of peace agreements or political accords; the promotion of national reconciliation; combating impunity; and the rehabilitation and reintegration of former combatants, which are often the poor relations of disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and rehabilitation programmes.

A number of reforms are also necessary for the establishment of lasting democratic national institutions and for the creation of conditions to promote their development. This means preparing for and holding credible, transparent elections conducive to the establishment of a democratic political system based on the rule of law and respect for fundamental freedoms. It also means helping to restore the major macroeconomic sectors and reviving normal economic activities.

Preparing for and holding elections require the concomitant establishment of physical conditions for the voting process and an enabling environment so that people can give expression to their wishes — and that includes providing security guarantees. Hence, there is a need for close coordination between the military and civilian components of peacekeeping operations. In general, we are all in agreement today that an environment made safe by the military and the civilian police is absolutely essential for civilian reconstruction and rehabilitation activities undertaken by civilians. Security is therefore a condition for peace and development.

The success of peacekeeping operations depends not only on the parties to a conflict, but also on a careful calibration of the human resources made available to a United Nations mission, particularly the military and civil police component, and the civilian component itself, with a view to carrying out the tasks set out in the mandate.

We believe that the question of the political supervision of peacekeeping operations has been resolved very effectively by means of the Secretary-General's Special Representatives. We unreservedly

support that approach, because it is consistent with the interface between civilian authorities and military institutions. We should reaffirm the prerogatives of the Special Representative, as head of the mission, in his supervisory capacity over the utilization on the ground of the resources and forces at his disposal.

Our goals should be to define the conditions necessary for establishing a bridge between security, recovery and development and to maximize the synergy of the United Nations, regional organizations, national Governments and civil society, according to a division of labour based on complementarity and comparative advantage.

In the light of those comments, we believe that there is a need to plan, organize, mobilize and finance civilian capacities at a level greater than at any time in the past, and to clearly define the objectives of the civilian components of missions, giving them precise mandates that include, right from the outset, various options for a viable and credible exit strategy.

Thus the rebuilding of a State should henceforth be viewed as the main goal of conflict management and peace-building, and be placed on an equal footing with the restoration of security conditions. Clearly, restoring security is not enough to ensure that the peace will be lasting. Haiti is a graphic example in that respect.

In the past, a number of studies and proposals have dealt with this issue in the context of the United Nations. According to a recent study, when the post-conflict reconciliation phase fails, 40 per cent of countries emerging from conflict relapse into violence. In the case of Africa, those figures are even higher — as high as 60 per cent. Preventing such a relapse should be the abiding concern of all stakeholders.

The mandates of operations must be defined very carefully. They must be precise and must include a complete range of civilian activities essential for the effectiveness of peacekeeping. It is important that stakeholders be given greater latitude on the ground, but they also need sufficient elements to facilitate planned financing. The civilian aspects of crisis management must be given the same priority as that accorded to the military aspect so that civilian achievements can provide proper support for the military element in the long term.

That situation also represents a challenge to individual States that provide troops and civilian

personnel and that are required to deploy agents that have the necessary expertise and competence in crisis management. That also applies to regional and even subregional organizations, which are assuming greater responsibilities in the area of post-conflict management.

Exchange of training programmes and experience among various countries and institutions that participate in peacekeeping operations should make it possible to strengthen and consolidate know-how and to develop a network of people with the best possible qualifications that is extensive enough to meet existing needs in good time.

Once they are on the ground, civilian personnel must constantly endeavour to carry out their activities in close coordination, acting strictly within the parameters of their role so as not to put themselves at risk unnecessarily or cause difficulties that could jeopardize the results of their efforts. Civilian personnel must be trained to manage stress. They need to work in a team and must be able to work under difficult conditions. They must also have a degree of knowledge of the local cultural realities so that they can adapt to them.

From the standpoint of the duration of operations, it should be stressed that the activities of the civilian component must be designed and conducted in such a way as to ensure that they can hand over to their counterparts in the countries concerned. They must gradually evolve and allow an increased role for local people as they take over essential functions, and help them to develop the necessary capacity for a gradual transfer of responsibility to local stakeholders. That is the only way in which it will be possible in the long term to create conditions for the United Nations to disengage and leave behind solid democratic institutions and a national economy that can become part of the global economy.

In conclusion, I would like stress the very important question of the necessary financing needed for peacekeeping operations. They should avoid complicated procedures. Funding must be made available, and it should be disbursed within a reasonable time period so that the work can be carried out in effective manner.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Wang Guangya, Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations.

**Mr. Wang Guangya** (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation welcomes you to the Council, Mr. President, to preside over this meeting. We also wish to thank Secretary-General Kofi Annan, Mr. Solana, Mr. Moussa and Mr. Djinnit for their presence and for their statements.

In recent years, United Nations peacekeeping operations have proven that the civilian component is playing a greater role than ever in peace-building. Strengthening the effectiveness of the civilian component is of great importance to the success of peacekeeping operations and to endeavours to assist the parties concerned in making a smooth transition from conflict to peace-building. The issue deserves serious attention from the Security Council, therefore, the convening of this meeting is of urgent necessity and timeliness.

I would like here to make four observations. First, in conflict management, the roles of military action and that of the civilian elements are closely interrelated and predicated on one another. There can be no reconstruction without peace and no stability without reconstruction. Military success guarantees the presence of a civilian role, which is an essential and indispensable element in any post-conflict reconstruction.

Secondly, civilian assistance should be provided in accordance with specific circumstances and needs. Conflicts in various parts of the world vary greatly as do actual needs in the field of reconstruction. When providing civilian assistance, the international community should focus its measures and avoid activities which should be performed by others.

Thirdly, the role of existing United Nations mechanisms must be brought into full play with increased efficiency. The various parties of the United Nations system have accumulated a wealth of experience in post-conflict reconstruction and have established specific practices and mechanisms. In strengthening the role of the civilian element, we must summarize and draw upon past successes and make full use of available resources so that existing parties can each do their part and avoid duplicating their actions.

Fourthly, priority must be given to assisting regional and subregional organizations to enhance their capacities. In recent years, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States and others are increasingly active in peacekeeping and

reconstruction. However, due to their limited capacities, they have yet to tap potentials in civilian and other areas. Increasing the assistance of relevant organizations in the civilian sector and enhancing capacities should be one of the priorities of the next phase of work of the United Nations.

In recent years, China has played an active role in the military sector of peacekeeping operations and has, at the same time, increased its participation in the civilian sector. This month, China will send a team of civilian police — for the first time — to Haiti, to help maintain public order.

China is ready to work with the relevant parties to carry out exchanges and jointly promote and strengthen the role of the civilian sector in reconstruction and sustainable development.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to Mr. Mourad Benmehidi, Deputy Permanent Representative of Algeria to the United Nations.

**Mr. Benmehidi** (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Allow me first to say how delighted my delegation is to see you presiding over the work of our Council, and to congratulate you on the choice of the topic which is crucial to the work of the Council, given the challenges it needs to meet.

For several years now we have witnessed efforts that seek to move the United Nations from a culture reacting to conflicts, towards becoming a culture that prevents conflicts. The result is that the multidisciplinary nature of United Nations peacekeeping missions has become an absolute necessity worldwide.

Improved planning and improved execution of the military aspect of peacekeeping operations has required, in particular, that exit strategies be defined. This has shown that stressing the military aspect in order to attain lasting peace is not sufficient. The concept of multidimensional action by the international community in order to achieve lasting peace has gained ground and has gradually given way to a more complex form of peacekeeping and peace-building operations.

Although international military operations have proven their effectiveness in stabilizing the situation on the ground, their ability to restore law and order and the normal functioning of institutions based on the rule of law, to rehabilitate basic public and social services, or to initiate the socio-economic recovery of a country,

has remained limited in the absence of a dedicated civilian component.

The importance of the civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building has gradually come to the fore in light of the experience of the international community. This has been graphically demonstrated by the successful transition in Timor-Leste, and — we can say today — in Liberia where, despite the presence of a very strong military component and of satisfactory results obtained in stabilizing the situation, the Security Council surely cannot consider a withdrawal from that country for several years to come.

Indeed, the phase following the end of hostilities — which includes the deployment of a civilian component that includes a police force of an appropriate size; a rule of law component dedicated to disseminating the values of democracy, tolerance and human rights; the rehabilitation of the judiciary and penitentiary system; and civilian administration and electoral assistance components — is an essential stage for returning to normalcy before tackling the critical stage of reconciliation, reconstruction and the initial stages of development.

The multitude of civilian and military stakeholders working for various international and regional organizations, in addition to the increasingly significant contributions provided by humanitarian non-governmental organizations, make the existence of a correct exit strategy absolutely essential.

Improving interagency coordination within the United Nations system can provide a model for complex international operations. From our standpoint, the same concerns relating to the need for exit strategies for military operations should lead us to define exit strategies for the civilian components of international operations. The success of the civilian aspects should, in fact, be gauged by the strength of the institutional capacities of the country concerned and the links they have established with the stakeholders in reconstruction and development partners in the long term — particularly companies and development institutions which are set to take over after the conflict.

The increasing number of crises and the many demands made on the international community have shown how great the needs for conflict resolution are. More than 56,000 blue helmets and about 11,000 civilians are now involved in various international operations at an annual cost equivalent to \$3.5 billion.

It is foreseeable that the trend will increase, particularly when it comes to the size of the civilian component of the operations. That means we must think about planning for the human and material resources to meet those needs.

We are seeing a marked tendency in the Organization to have recourse to the possibilities outlined in Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, including increasing the involvement of regional and other international organizations in preventing conflicts and managing crises. My delegation supports that approach since it is unanimously acknowledged that the regional organizations have a definite comparative advantage for carrying out the civilian tasks of missions where the cultural dimension is decisive and when it comes to working closely with the local people and facing the sociological realities of a situation.

I would like to stress two principles that we deem to be essential to make that international cooperation a success. First, reliance on regional pillars should not be understood as any neglect by the United Nations — or in particular, the Security Council — of any of its obligations to maintain international peace and security or neglect in its cooperation for development.

Secondly, we need to take account of the clear disparity that exists between the various regional organizations concerning financial resources, expertise and capacities, with a view to giving them assistance at the appropriate level, but without diverting resources from development. We believe that the support in the area of peace and security that the European Union has provided to the African Union's new structure through the African Peace Facility fund — which we welcome — meets that concern. That kind of initiative could advance the cherished goal of planning and setting up standby civilian crisis management capacities at the national level that could be mobilized at the regional level if necessary.

Moreover, the civilian dimension of international operations raises institutional issues that should be examined. From that perspective, a greater role should be given to the Economic and Social Council, which is directly concerned by several aspects and has gained some experience in that area through its Ad Hoc Advisory Group on African countries emerging from conflict.

Finally, I should like to emphasize that the increased importance given by the international

community to civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building is fully in keeping with the priorities defined by Africa in the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development — particularly the strengthening of reliable institutions and governance to ensure successful economic development. I should also like to reiterate our conviction that support from the international community in that area before conflict erupts would be far less costly and have greater chances for success.

**The President** (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain. For the sake of brevity and in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall try to condense part of my statement so that we can move forward and conclude this thematic debate, which I believe has been a great success. Copies of the full text will be provided to delegations.

Allow me to begin by thanking the Secretary-General, the regional organizations — the African Union, the League of Arab States and the European Union — and all the ministers and representatives who have spoken this morning for having participated in this debate.

I believe I can summarize the discussion and part of my statement by highlighting various points. First, restoring security is an essential prerequisite for undertaking activities of a civilian nature. Secondly, after security, re-establishing the rule of law is the most urgent task. Thirdly, we also need to devote attention to issues related to the judicial system — a matter to which Spain has been devoted greater attention and interest in recent years. To that end, our country recently hosted a criminal justice workshop in Madrid, under the sponsorship of the European Commission, precisely to improve training in that area for peace mission participants. Along the same lines, our Government believes that the penitentiary system is also an essential part of a general strategy aimed at re-establishing the rule of law. All of that is related to the promotion and strengthening of institution-building.

Similarly — as indicated in various statements this morning — the holding of free and fair elections is key to achieving democracy and good governance. But, above all, I believe that a number of speakers have stressed the urgency and necessity of swift deployment in crisis management operations. Such swift

deployment would be much facilitated if immediately available reserves of personnel and resources could be established at the national and regional or international levels. We should also promote the development of a doctrine on procedures for setting up crisis management operations. Likewise, I would like to stress that I agree with the statements of many speakers on the need to improve and strengthen coordination mechanisms.

In conclusion, the relevance of the civilian component in peace missions is being increasingly appreciated. But, as is the case with military personnel, we need to increase their numbers so that they can carry out their tasks properly. In that connection, the Spanish Government is promoting the creation of a civilian guard unit of approximately 1,000 personnel, which we hope will be operational in two years and capable of responding immediately to the possible needs of the international community. Therefore, we will need sufficient institutional capacity in the system, which could be achieved by creating a coordination mechanism responsible for accomplishing that purpose, hewing closely to the objectives of the Security Council.

Finally, we would like the most significant aspects of today's discussion — a discussion that I believe has greatly enriched our debate — to have continuity and follow-up. I am sure that, in the future in this Chamber, there will be further consideration of the need to expand our thinking on civilian aspects of conflict management.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

“The Security Council met at the ministerial level on 22 September 2004 to consider ‘Civilian aspects of conflict management and peace-building’. Ministers recognized the increasing importance of civilian aspects of conflict management in addressing complex crisis situations and in preventing the recurrence of conflict. They affirmed the importance of conflict resolution in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

“Ministers also acknowledged the importance of civilian-military cooperation in crisis management. Military and police components are essential to address and stabilize certain serious crisis situations and to guarantee security. Moreover, the participation of a strong civilian component is key to the provision of humanitarian assistance, the re-establishment of public order, functioning public institutions, reconstruction, rehabilitation and peace-building for longer-term sustainable development. Substantial civilian participation in crisis management is also essential for a strategy of military disengagement and plays a crucial role in the phase of post-conflict peace building. In this context, it is important that there be coordination between the civilian and military components in crisis management from the first phase of integrated mission planning. In addition, there should be significant coordination with actors involved in longer-term reconstruction and development, including in particular the other organs of the United Nations system, in accordance with their respective mandates, and the international financial institutions, as well as cooperation with the business sector.

“Ministers recognized the increasing role of some regional and subregional and other international organizations in crisis management. They also recalled that Articles 52 and 53 of the United Nations Charter set forth the contribution of regional organizations to conflict management, as well as the relationship between the United Nations and regional organizations. They encouraged these organizations, whenever possible, to continue to develop their crisis management capabilities, including in the civilian field, in close coordination with the United Nations and in accordance with the provisions of Article 54 of the United Nations Charter. When applicable, clear schemes for joint operations should be developed. Also, greater coordination and interoperability among those organizations, as well as developing and sharing common strategies, operational policies and best practices in civilian crisis management would enhance efficiency and coherence in crisis management. Continued internal coordination in this field among all relevant United Nations organs and agencies should also be strengthened.

“Ministers supported the efforts by Member States to continue to develop, as appropriate, their own civilian crisis management capabilities, including, inter alia, rapid civilian response teams, and they also supported their initiatives to make these capabilities available to the United Nations and other relevant regional or subregional organizations, as a contribution to their efforts in the maintenance of international peace and security. Adequate capabilities should be developed in key areas of civilian crisis management, such as police, justice and the rule of law, preparation of electoral processes and electoral observation, civil protection and public administration. The Security Council should consider the nature and availability of these capabilities when approving the necessary mandates for United Nations operations.

“Adequate and flexible means for transitional peace support and crisis management activities, such as protection of civilians, including United Nations and humanitarian personnel, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, the end of impunity, public institution-building and

transitional justice, as well as the promotion and protection of human rights and the integration of a gender perspective are essential to ensure lasting peace after a conflict. Also, the involvement of local actors in the policy-making process and a fruitful relationship with civil society should be among the priorities of any post-conflict strategy.

“The Security Council commends the efforts of the Secretary-General in addressing all relevant issues relating to the civilian aspects of crisis management and invites him, other institutions and agencies of the United Nations system, regional and subregional organizations and Member States to continue to give serious consideration to this matter, with a view to making further progress in this field.”

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2004/33.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

*The meeting rose at 2.10 p.m.*