

**Security Council Open Debate on Peacekeeping Operations: New Trends June 2014,  
Security Council Chamber**

*Statement by Mrs. Perceval Permanent Mission of Argentina to the United Nations.*

Mr. President, we congratulate you on the coming 40 years and on your effective and lucid diplomacy. Argentina would also particularly like to commend the Russian Federation because tomorrow, 12 June, is Russia Day. We very much hope that your delegation will enjoy an excellent day for the country's celebration.

In Argentina, the saying "Will the last one to leave please turn off the light" may perhaps be conveyed by the Secretariat to the Secretary-General. We very much appreciate his briefing and wish him a happy birthday on 13 June. May he have a pleasant trip inaugurating the World Cup in the sisterly Federative Republic of Brazil.

I would also request the Jordanian delegation to transmit to our dear colleague, Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein, that the opening ideas of his statement were, as usual, very good but that, when rituals are repeated, they frequently become myths. And myths, at a certain point, wind up more real than reality. Although we have myths about peacekeeping operations, I will address some of the realities mentioned by my colleague.

I would first like to acknowledge the stimulating concept note submitted by the Russian Presidency on new trends in peacekeeping operations (S/2014/384, annex), which runs along the same lines as what we have been discussing, both with respect to the various draft resolutions on peacekeeping operations and to the Council's Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, as well as in the broader realm of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations of the General Assembly (C-34).

With respect to the recent shift in the mandates of several African missions, in particular the creation of an intervention brigade within the framework of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), which was authorized in order to implement certain peacekeeping tasks, while the principles of peacekeeping are clearly defined and well known, my country is concerned, as are other Member States, that recent practice seems to contradict those principles.

To put it in more colloquial terms, we cannot use the United Nations to wage war through other means. Our responsibility is to maintain international peace and security. Let us recall the recent recognition of the growing need for peacekeeping missions to be endowed with effective mandates that enable them to act in operations involving increased risk and unconventional threats. Nonetheless, we understand that the peacekeeping system was not conceived to impose peace, nor is it prepared to do so. We therefore encourage this Organization and all its bodies to debate and clearly define what we mean by "robust mandates".

In that regard, while we view as positive the trend for the Organization to oversee the command, control and financing of missions that require, in exceptional cases, that peace be imposed, we believe that the characteristics of an appropriate and effective tool for such exceptional tasks should be derived from a broad, overdue debate involving all Member States on peacekeeping and the use of force by this Organization and should not be the result of a fait accompli.

We believe that we should not disregard the principles of the peacekeeping system that we have worked so hard to build and that we should not put at risk the safety of United Nations personnel deployed in our missions on the ground, to whom, as have others, I offer the homage and recognition of my country, Argentina.

In that regard, after listening to other statements, the point is that those of us from countries that contribute troops and police should not be afraid that our citizens from the military and police, whether male or female, might suffer harm. No. They have been trained as effective and solid

professionals to act in exceptional situations in which violence is very much part of the environment. So let us be clear. These are not physical education or kindergarten teachers. They are military and police professionals. But our Organization cannot deal with an increasing number of situations of risk and violence without taking care to be effective in designing its mandates, its rules of engagement and the security contexts in which the men and women of the countries that provide troops and police are being asked to exercise their profession as soldiers and police. In other words, let us not add further risks to the inherent risk. That, I believe, is the message that the countries that contribute troops and police have been saying all along.

With respect to unmanned drones and the use of new technologies in peacekeeping missions, we believe that these new technologies can bring important capabilities to peacekeeping operations, so long as they are evaluated, on a case by case basis, with a view to their use in observation under the control of the Organization with strict respect for the norms that guide us. In that context, I would like to reiterate the demand that was made in the framework of the C-34. We want and hope to receive further information from the Secretariat with regard to the use of such technologies, including lessons learned in the confidential treatment of the information obtained, as well as on improvements in the safety of deployed personnel, the understanding of the operational situation and the protection of civilians.

New technologies cannot be developed out of thin air. They cannot be allowed to proliferate without regulation. If in this Organization we managed to adopt a non-proliferation treaty as an international legal framework -- still not quite universal -- how could we not work out a regulatory agreement that obligates all States to agree on the ethical and legal bases that will enable the reliable, efficient use of new technologies?

We believe that inter-mission cooperation, to which the Presidency's brilliant concept note also refers, should not be a substitute for the appropriate implementation and planning of a peacekeeping mission. We should ensure that such cooperation does not affect the fulfilment of the sending mission's mandate, and that it should be appropriately integrated by the receiving mission. That includes the challenge of maintaining sufficient budgetary discipline, which is necessary in such cases, with particular regard for the principle that no loans between active missions are allowed, as well as the rule that stipulates that the costs of inter-mission cooperation should be borne by the receiving mission.

Such considerations lead us, in conclusion, to the issue of financing for peacekeeping missions. We have observed a negative tendency to broaden the complexity of mandates without providing them with the financial resources necessary for their appropriate implementation. We insist that the matter of financial allocations to peacekeeping missions constitutes a political issue and not a simple budgetary question, since it affects the effectiveness and the credibility of the whole Organization.

Argentina believes that the future of peacekeeping operations depends on their having clear and adequately financed mandates. For that to be the case, we need to continue to be able to count on the necessary consensus in the General Assembly, so that the efforts of the troop-contributing countries are met by an analogous commitment on the part of those countries with greater financial responsibilities. The successful implementation of the various tasks specified in the peacekeeping mandates shines a spotlight on the effectiveness of those expenditures, in particular if we compare the lean budget of around \$8 thousand million available for all peacekeeping operations with the enormous cost of global military expenditures.

Finally, the growing tendency to include aspects of peacebuilding in the mandates of our peacekeeping missions has transformed our peacekeepers into early peace builders. We consider that to be one of the most significant developments in peacekeeping operations in recent years. It is in fact essential in order to prevent countries from falling back into conflict and to enable peacekeeping operations to function with a platform that allows for the protection of human rights, development, gender equality, and the consolidation of democracy and the rule of law.

I cannot conclude my remarks without making an observation about the fact that we put ever more responsibility on specific sectors within the mandates of peacekeeping operations. Argentina agrees that they should cover the areas of human rights, the humanitarian efforts, the equality of women and the protection of children.

But what often happens when we are on the ground is that we come to see that we should look strategically at how to conduct operations. Instead of piling more responsibilities onto a particular area, we should think about how we can coordinate and articulate them so that they dovetail with the various agencies in the United Nations system and with the capacities we have in regional, subregional and national organizations. Because what happens? Superimposition and disconnectedness do not help promote peace, and what helps even less is competition between entities and organizations — competition for resources and a feudalization of their agendas. We should all work together cooperatively, not with the logic of the market but with a culture of peacekeeping.