

They also expressed their support for the draft comprehensive convention on terrorism and the ongoing efforts to complete a draft international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism, proposed by the Russian Federation, and hoped that that work could be brought to completion as soon as possible.

While most delegations concurred that terrorism was never justifiable, for whatever purpose and by whomever committed, several representatives highlighted the need to distinguish between terrorism and the legitimate struggle of peoples exercising their right to self-determination.³ In that regard, the representative of Malaysia called for a clear and universally agreed definition of terrorism. He further believed that in taking security measures, States must be guided by the principle of proportionate response and not cross the threshold beyond which such security measures might descend to the level of terrorism.⁴ Although acknowledging that the fight against increasingly sophisticated terrorists might require increasingly harsher means, the representative of the Netherlands cautioned that the response to terrorism had to be proportionate and limited to the requirements of the maintenance of public order.⁵

The representative of the United States stressed that sanctions constituted the primary tool against terrorism, emphasizing the need for Member States to follow through on the commitments imposed on them by the Council.⁶ Similarly, the representative of the United Kingdom supported the imposition of measures by the Council against those who failed to bring to

justice those responsible for terrorist acts.⁷ Giving as an example the sanctions imposed against the Taliban and Osama bin Laden, the representative of Canada stressed that such measures demonstrated that there could be no impunity for terrorism and could also serve as a deterrent to future terrorist acts.⁸ The representative of China urged the Council to avoid or minimize resort to sanctions, which sometimes not only failed to resolve the problem satisfactorily, but could also have very serious humanitarian consequences.⁹

At the 4243rd meeting, on 6 December 2000, the President (Russian Federation) made a statement on behalf of the Council.¹⁰ by which the Council, *inter alia*:

Was deeply concerned by the increase, in many regions of the world, of acts of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations;

Reiterated its condemnation of all acts of terrorism, irrespective of motive, wherever and by whomever committed;

Welcomed the efforts of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations in the field of combating international terrorism;

Called on all States that had not done so to consider, as a matter of priority, becoming party to the existing anti-terrorism conventions;

Reaffirmed its resolution 1269 (1999) of 19 October 1999 and called upon all States to implement its provisions fully and expeditiously;

Reiterated its readiness to take necessary steps in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations in order to counter terrorist threats to international peace and security.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10 (Tunisia); p. 15 (Malaysia); and p. 20 (Namibia).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁰ S/PRST/2000/38.

B. Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peacebuilding

Decision of 23 March 2000 (4119th meeting): statement by the President

On 11 February 2000, the Secretary-General submitted to the Council the report on the role of United Nations peacekeeping in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.¹¹ The Secretary-

General presented an overview of the evolution of the involvement of United Nations peacekeeping in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, identifying key elements that favoured the success of those processes, highlighting ways in which peacekeeping had assisted in them in the past and suggesting ways in which the United Nations could better support future disarmament, demobilization and reintegration efforts.

¹¹ S/2000/101, submitted pursuant to the presidential statement of 8 July 1999 (S/PRST/1999/21).

The Secretary-General noted that past experience suggested that the basis for a successful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme should be laid within the peace agreement that provided for the end of a conflict. Where relevant, the role of children in armed conflict should be acknowledged and children's rights should be identified as an explicit priority in peacemaking, peacebuilding and conflict resolution processes, both in the peace agreement and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration plans. The Secretary-General announced that, where appropriate, future peacekeeping operations would include personnel with appropriate training in international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, including child- and gender-related provisions.

He observed that the process of disarmament might require access to considerable technical skills and institutional knowledge. Stressing the danger posed by the flow of weapons across borders, the Secretary-General noted that if disarmament was to be undertaken effectively, it might be necessary to impose local arms embargoes and targeted sanctions. In that respect, peacekeeping operations should be given the capacity to monitor and control regional arms traffic, while the international community should focus on the economic dimension of arms flows.

With regard to demobilization, the review revealed the importance of a strong political role and ample resources for peacekeeping operations, including, at times, a deterrent capacity. In addition, it had sometimes been useful to provide funding within the assessed budget of a peacekeeping operation to allow the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process to begin. He suggested that the Council might wish to consider demobilization exercises, or at least their initial stages, as an integral part of the mandate for peacekeeping operations, when such elements played a crucial part in ensuring peace, so that they could be supported by the assessed contributions for the operation.

With respect to reintegration, the Secretary-General observed that while a peacekeeping operation might make direct contributions to reintegration and assist in fostering an appropriate political and socio-economic framework, further efforts were necessary to enhance access by the United Nations to the skills and resources required in that regard. Moreover, the ability of peacekeeping operations to advance reintegration could also be strengthened

through the enhancement of institutional coordination within the international community.

The Secretary-General noted that the ultimate success of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process might require efforts long after the withdrawal of a multidisciplinary peacekeeping operation. The deployment of a follow-on mission, in the form of a peacekeeping operation organized around police or a political mission, might help to support advances made and enable further progress. Recalling that the role of a peacekeeping operation in post-conflict disarmament, demobilization and reintegration was rooted in and fed into a broader search for peace and development, the Secretary-General observed that that the international community's key role in the process was to provide clear, consistent and determined support to an overall peace process and to offer long-term assistance with development.

At its 4118th meeting, on 23 March 2000, the Council included in its agenda the above-mentioned report.¹¹ The Council was briefed by the Secretary-General and statements were made by all Council members and the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union¹²), Singapore and South Africa.

In his briefing, the Secretary-General emphasized that while primary responsibility for reintegration fell outside peacekeeping, peacekeeping operations could nonetheless play a key role in that element of post-conflict reconstruction by ensuring that all factions viewed the political process as fair and a legitimate alternative to violence. For peacekeeping operations to succeed in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, he believed that the range of tools available to them should be extended. For example, the focus on the needs of child soldiers should be strengthened, and a more flexible approach by the Council was needed in assessing funding for critical elements of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, so that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process could go ahead even while funding through voluntary sources was being

¹² Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey aligned themselves with the statement.

mobilized. Furthermore, the ability to locate experienced disarmament experts and trainers for service within peacekeeping operations in the field had to be improved. He concluded that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process was only one part of the multifaceted approach necessary for peacekeeping to be successful in the twenty-first century.¹³

In their statements, speakers, *inter alia*, expressed support for the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General; stressed the need for the Council to learn from its past experiences in peacekeeping and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and to continue to attach importance to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration as an important bridge from the cessation of hostilities to sustainable peace; and noted that the individual stages of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration were mutually supportive, with the overall success of the process depending on the success of each of its stages. They underscored the need for coordination among all the actors involved in the implementation of a disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process and the importance of the political will of the parties for the success of the process. Speakers also agreed on the need to incorporate disarmament, demobilization and reintegration into the planning of peacekeeping missions and peace agreements and pointed out the necessity for a clear mandate for peacekeeping missions. Representatives drew attention to the need to provide sufficient resources to peacekeeping operations, stem the flow of small arms and light weapons to an area of conflict and enhance the implementation of arms embargoes for an effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process.

Speakers, in general, stressed the need for guaranteeing sufficient resources. Several delegations stressed the need to strike a balance between assessed and voluntary contributions for an effective implementation of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, as well as the need for sustained support by the international community and financial institutions.¹⁴ Noting that a lack of financial resources too often caused the failure of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, the representative of France believed that, at least in the early stages, such

programmes should be able to draw on the budgets of peacekeeping operations. In that respect, the Secretary-General's initiatives regarding seed money for quick impact projects within the assessed budgets of peacekeeping operations deserved encouragement.¹⁵ The representative of Algeria held that reintegration should be given greater attention and in the future be financed through United Nations mission resources and no longer on the basis of voluntary contributions, which were unpredictable and often fell short of the requirements of operations.¹⁶

In the view of the representative of the United States, reintegration work was distinct from the traditional peacekeeping activities of disarmament and demobilization. While their implementation had been at times shared by humanitarian agencies, disarmament and demobilization fell within the purview of the Council and were often part of peacekeeping operations. Reintegration, however, had to be viewed as a post-conflict peacebuilding or development activity.¹⁷

Many speakers also touched upon the issue of former child soldiers and war-affected children in the context of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. Some delegations expressed appreciation for the inclusion of child protection advisers in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes of the United Nations missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone.¹⁸ A number of speakers called attention to similar needs of women ex-combatants, who were particularly vulnerable in the post-conflict phase.¹⁹ Several representatives believed that the commitment to guarantee the security of former combatants who decided to lay down their weapons should be an integral part of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes.²⁰

The representatives of Malaysia and Croatia stressed that all ex-combatants should be reintegrated,

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9 (Namibia); p. 18 (Ukraine); and p. 29 (Japan); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 10 (Singapore).

¹⁹ S/PV.4118, p. 7 (United States); p. 9 (Namibia); p. 19 (Bangladesh); and p. 24 (South Africa).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19 (Bangladesh); p. 24 (South Africa); and p. 28 (Norway); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 6 (Bahrain).

¹³ S/PV.4118, pp. 2-3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4 (China); p. 7 (United States); p. 10 (Malaysia); and p. 13 (Jamaica).

with the exception of those responsible for war crimes.²¹

The representative of New Zealand cautioned against defining detailed policy approaches to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration applicable to all situations, as no two post-conflict peacebuilding situations were the same. Nevertheless, drawing from his country's experience in East Timor, he stated that the timeliness of the response was one of the key principles that had general applicability.²² That view was shared by the representative of Canada, who advised that a swift and substantive United Nations peacekeeping action lent credibility to the Organization's efforts and to national initiatives, and that in order to include a meaningful disarmament, demobilization and reintegration component in the mandate of peacekeeping operations, the Council had to show a genuine will to build a capacity for rapid and adequate deployment.²³

In regard to the execution of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes, the representatives of Algeria and Mongolia highlighted the need to respect the principles of political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States concerned, as established in the Charter.²⁴ A number of delegations also drew attention to the role

played by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes.²⁵

At its 4119th meeting, on 23 March 2000, at which the Council again included in its agenda the above-mentioned report of the Secretary-General,²⁶ the President (Bangladesh) made a statement on behalf of the Council,²⁷ by which, the Council, *inter alia*:

Underlined that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants were mutually supportive;

Stressed that the political commitment of the parties involved in a peace process was a precondition for success of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes;

Reaffirmed that disarmament and demobilization must take place in a secure and safe environment, which would give ex-combatants the confidence to lay down their arms;

Underlined in particular the importance of disarming, demobilizing and reintegrating child soldiers, as well as taking into account the problems faced by war-affected children in mission areas;

Welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to include within all peacekeeping operations personnel with appropriate training in international, humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, including child-and gender-related provisions;

Recognized that adequate and timely funding for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration was critical to the successful implementation of a peace process.

²¹ S/PV.4118, p. 10 (Malaysia); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), pp. 5-6 (Croatia).

²² S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 2.

²³ S/PV.4118, p. 17.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23 (Algeria); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 4 (Mongolia).

²⁵ S/PV.4118, p. 5 (Russian Federation); and p. 23 (Algeria); S/PV.4118 (Resumption 1), p. 7 (Bahrain); and p. 14 (Egypt).

²⁶ S/2000/101.

²⁷ S/PRST/2000/10.

C. Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council

Initial proceedings

Decision of 9 March 2000 (4110th meeting): statement by the President

At its 4109th meeting, on 9 March 2000, the Council included in its agenda the item entitled "Maintaining peace and security: humanitarian aspects of issues before the Security Council". At the meeting, statements were made by the Secretary-General; by all Council members, the representatives of Austria (as Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe), Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria,

Colombia, Egypt, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal (on behalf of the European Union²⁸) and South Africa, as well as the Permanent Observer of Switzerland.

In his opening statement, the Secretary-General observed that the experiences of the past decade, from

²⁸ Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia aligned themselves with the statement.