



Security Council

Seventy-eighth year

Provisional

9448th

meeting

Friday, 20 October 2023, 3 p.m.

New York

<i>President:</i>	Mr. Moretti/Mr. França Danese	(Brazil)
<i>Members:</i>	Albania	Mr. Stastoli
	China	Mr. Tian Bingxu
	Ecuador	Mr. Escobar Ullauri
	France	Mrs. Meyer
	Gabon	Ms. Oye
	Ghana	Ms. Williams
	Japan	Mr. Nagano
	Malta	Mr. De Bono Sant Cassia
	Mozambique	Ms. Trigo
	Russian Federation.	Mr. Shulgin
	Switzerland	Mr. Hauri
	United Arab Emirates	Ms. Alshamsi
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . .	Mr. Rogers
	United States of America.	Mr. Baez

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security

Peace through dialogue: the contribution of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes

Letter dated 3 October 2023 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2023/732)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in 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 AB-0601 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



The meeting was resumed at 3.10 p.m.

The President: I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Flashing lights on the collars of the microphones will prompt speakers to bring their remarks to a close after four minutes.

I now give the floor to the representative of Chile.

Mr. Ruidíaz Pérez (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile thanks Brazil for convening this open debate, and we have taken note of the statements delivered so far.

According to Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, which we all adopted at San Francisco, regional organizations whose activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations may act in support of the maintenance of international peace and security. Strengthening regional bodies is also part of the Secretary-General's New Agenda for Peace, in connection with our preparations to ensure that next year's Summit of the Future is transformational. In that regard, we value the crucial role that regional organizations can play in the maintenance of international peace and security by functioning as natural platforms for meetings, cooperation and exchanges among their members. That fosters trust among the members of those organizations and promotes institutionalized and predictable behaviours, which reduces uncertainty and the risks of confrontation.

In the face of current world events, we need innovative measures to address the dangers of war and threats to security, many of which are transnational in nature, such as organized crime and its various ramifications. We think the most useful way to address them is by learning from the existing regional and subregional mechanisms for cooperation, mutual trust, knowledge and assistance. Specifically, we believe that when we engage in cooperation and exchanges within regional organizations on areas of mutual interest, such as disarmament, crisis management, environmental protection and economic development, we contribute to building stability within regions, establishing positive long-term relations, fostering the peaceful resolution of disputes and discouraging the use of violence to settle disputes.

In the same vein, we believe that the Security Council can actively promote the development and strengthening of regional agreements aimed at fostering

peace and security by offering political and diplomatic support to the parties involved in negotiating and realizing those agreements. At the same time, in the context of regional agreements, the Council can also act as a mediator and facilitator in the resolution of disputes by promoting the effective implementation of agreements and encouraging the parties to fulfil their commitments. That role can include providing good offices and visiting areas affected by conflict. In that context, my own region, together with the efforts of the United Nations, has participated, as required, in initiatives that have led to important peace agreements. I would therefore like to highlight what my country's former Head of State and other speakers mentioned this morning with regard to the signing of the Presidential Act of Brasilia. In that regard, it is notable that historically speaking, the Council has shown us that it is capable of coordinating its action with relevant regional and subregional bodies, such as the African Union, to jointly address conflicts and threats to peace.

On the other hand, it should also be noted that ad hoc and thematic mechanisms, such as the various groups of friends and working groups involved in promoting the agenda on women and peace and security, can also serve as a driving force for promoting significant change and consolidating peace. Those entities have shed light on the root causes of the discrimination and oppression of women in many parts of the world, providing guidelines for the various actors involved to establish action plans aimed at appointing women to relevant decision-making positions.

In conclusion, in the context of the gravity of the tragic situation currently unfolding in the Gaza Strip, we hope that regional bodies will have an opportunity to demonstrate their crucial role in safeguarding international law and the principles of the Charter.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Italy.

Mr. Massari (Italy): Italy aligns itself with the statement to be delivered on behalf of the European Union, and I would like to add the following comments in my national capacity.

The current devastating crisis scenarios confirm the urgency of finding a way to change the paradigm from crisis management to conflict prevention. They also show the importance of working on three levels of trust in relations — between States, between institutions and citizens and between the United Nations and Member

States. Regional organizations are able to strengthen the circle of trust on all those levels, filling the gaps between societies, national authorities and the United Nations system. I would like to highlight four points.

First, solid partnerships between the United Nations and regional organizations are essential to effective multilateralism. Engaging regional organizations in the prevention and peaceful settlement of disputes is in the interests of the United Nations and the Security Council. Italy therefore fully supports the vision of the New Agenda for Peace — a bottom-up, widespread system of conflict prevention based on the development of national strategies that are anchored in human rights and the rule of law, that take advantage of the role of regional organizations and receive effective and concrete support from the United Nations, acting in solidarity and complementarity.

Secondly, regional organizations can make a difference in all the building blocks of crisis prevention and sustainable peace, including development, the rule of law, inclusiveness, human rights, gender equality and empowerment. Coordination among regional organizations makes that action even more effective. The cooperation between the European Union and African Union is a leading example in that regard.

Thirdly, the Peacebuilding Commission is in a unique position to support the United Nations and regional organizations. To untap that potential, the Peacebuilding Fund must be able to offer concrete help and solutions to the regional organizations that turn to it, including adequate funding for peacebuilding activities. Italy has just doubled its annual contribution to the Fund and is committed to ensuring adequate, predictable and sustained financing for peacebuilding, including through its United Nations-assessed contributions.

Fourthly, regional and subregional organizations' contribution to peace must be recognized and supported. African countries that participate in peacebuilding and peacekeeping are assuming increasing responsibility for international peace and security. Italy will continue to support the African Peace and Security Architecture through financial assistance, training and capacity-building programmes, as well as to stress the importance of securing predictable resources for African-led peace operations.

Finally, the issue of Africa's presence within the United Nations institutions should be addressed with specific reference to the Security Council, as part of

the overarching objective of making the Council more representative, democratic, accountable, transparent and effective.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Iravani (Islamic Republic of Iran): We congratulate Brazil on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October, and we thank the briefers for their insights.

In our ever-changing world, in which the repercussions of armed conflict continue to grow both in scope and intensity, the tools of diplomacy and dialogue stand out as the most effective instruments we have for conflict resolution. Ensuring peace through dialogue hinges on a steadfast commitment to international law and an unwavering dedication to the principles outlined in the Charter of the United Nations.

The foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran is anchored in a deep commitment to international law and the Charter. We prioritize mutual respect, cultivating neighbourly relations, fostering collaboration and, importantly, positioning dialogue as a cornerstone in safeguarding international and regional peace and security. Iran's proactive engagement in diplomatic affairs, particularly its meaningful participation in the negotiations on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), is a testament to our unwavering commitment in that regard. However, the unlawful and irresponsible withdrawal of the United States from the JCPOA, followed by the subsequent actions of the United States and Germany, France and the United Kingdom (E3), in violation of their obligations under the JCPOA and resolution 2231 (2015), presented a significant and fundamental challenge to the agreement. That challenge has sadly endured, owing to the Western parties' excessive demands and introduction of unrelated issues. However, a return to the full implementation of the agreement is still possible if the United States and the E3 can demonstrate responsibility and a pragmatic approach.

We are pleased to announce that as of two days ago, all the remaining restrictions on missile activities, the export and import of weapons and financial transactions involving certain Iranian individuals and entities have been completely terminated and are no longer subject to any restrictions by the Council. We trust that Member States will diligently fulfil their commitments under

Article 25 of the Charter and honour the termination of the restrictions, as laid out in resolution 2231 (2015).

The Palestinian situation demands urgent international attention. For decades Palestinians have suffered occupation, aggression, discrimination and apartheid policies at the hands of the Israeli regime. Today the international community is witnessing yet another horrific surge in atrocities and collective punishment of the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip by the Israeli regime, particularly the heinous terrorist attack on the Al Ahli Hospital. The deliberate targeting of a hospital, in clear violation of international humanitarian law, is nothing short of a war crime. Equally, the indiscriminate killing of innocent people in Gaza, including women and children, during the 14-day aerial bombardment, which has devastated critical and civilian infrastructure, amounts to war crimes of the gravest nature.

We are very disappointed by the Council's inability to adopt a basic draft resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire and addressing the catastrophic humanitarian situation in Palestine. We urge the United Nations and the Security Council to take urgent action to end to the unfolding tragedy, which amounts to genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. After seven decades of inertia, the Security Council must now shoulder its responsibility and take decisive action to address the ongoing plight of the Palestinian people.

In conclusion, the Security Council must ensure that its decisions comply with international law and the Charter and reflect the best interests of the international community as a whole. It is essential to ensure that the Council's measures, especially those under Chapter VII, are utilized as a last resort and are safeguarded from political exploitation and manipulation. Those measures should be invoked only when genuinely necessary to preserve international peace and security, in the pursuit of the peaceful resolution of disputes, as outlined in Chapter VI of the Charter.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia.

Mr. Sabo (Ethiopia): We thank Brazil for organizing this important open debate on the topic of the contributions of regional mechanisms to peace and security. I would also like to thank the briefers and representatives who spoke before us this morning.

We appreciate the framing of today's topic in a manner that encompasses a wide range of activities covering peace and security. With regard to the role of regional mechanisms in peace and security, I would like primarily to mention the fundamental feature that distinguishes regional mechanisms and organizations. Regional organizations and their decision-making processes are mainly guided by solidarity and equal participation. In addition, regional organizations allow for sufficient consideration of local contexts and relevant policies and programmes. Concerning the specific aspects of peace and security, we believe that the eradication of poverty and a governance system that is rooted in basic freedoms and the principles of inclusivity and equal participation are the foundation for peace and security. Peace endures when development is sustainable and all segments of society, in particular women and young people, are involved in the affairs of their countries.

Turning to our region, the African Peace and Security Architecture has been set up with the African Union (AU) Peace and Security Council at its core and with both diplomatic and military components, including the African Standby Force. That architecture is also underpinned by treaties that encompass normative frameworks, including regional instruments on subversion, mercenaries, terrorism, cybersecurity, refugees and displacement-related problems. The African Peace and Security Architecture incorporates the Continental Early Warning System, the Mediation Support Unit and the Panel of the Wise. On that basis, the architecture sets forth the continent's plans to enhance regional capacity to prevent and resolve conflicts in the continent.

It is important to note that the African Union Peace and Security Council was established in compliance with the normative requirements of the Charter of the United Nations. As acknowledged by the United Nations in several instances, the African Union, through those mechanisms, has demonstrated a clear comparative advantage in peace enforcement. With adequate financial and other resources, that mechanism can further excel in conflict prevention, peacemaking, peace support operations, peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction. Therefore, the United Nations, in particular the Security Council, which is responsible for global peace and security, should assume its rightful role and responsibility to help bridge the resource gap by making financing available from assessed

contributions. That is a position that is long overdue. Supporting regional mechanisms such as the African Union Peace and Security Council, which adopts its decisions with the full ownership and participation of its member States, will help the Security Council achieve its lofty objective of maintaining international peace and security.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Spain.

Ms. Jimenez de la Hoz (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): We are grateful to Brazil for convening this open debate on the role of regional and subregional institutions and organizations and bilateral agreements in conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

Organizations and agreements at the regional and subregional levels, as well as bilateral agreements, are complementary to efforts in the multilateral arena and can provide a platform from which to accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in order to address the underlying causes of violence and insecurity, as well as the links among climate, peace and security. The comprehensive approach to conflict prevention and peacebuilding that underpins the New Agenda for Peace also has ramifications at the regional and subregional levels. With regard to the Security Council, we appreciate the ongoing efforts to strengthen cooperation with regional organizations. Moreover, an enlarged Security Council, with a larger number of elected members, would be more legitimate and would better represent the strategic, regional and subregional realities and concerns of the day.

In line with Spain's foreign policy, its 2021–2024 Foreign Action Strategy and its recently adopted Humanitarian Diplomacy Strategy, conflict prevention and mediation are given priority in our actions abroad. In addition, Spain is committed to the reform and strengthening of multilateralism and regional integration in order to improve global governance. In recent years, Spain has been working on developing regional projects for mediation focused on the role of women. At the Ibero-American level, together with Mexico and a dozen other countries in the region, we have established the Ibero-American network of women mediators, which seeks to provide training and set up a committee of women mediation experts. Similarly, we have been working with the Economic Community of West African States and the African Union Peace

and Security Council. I would also like to mention the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations, the founding of which was co-sponsored by Spain and Türkiye, and which in its 2019–2023 action plan highlights the importance of intercultural and interfaith dialogue in conflict prevention, as well as the role of women mediators in that context.

We therefore believe that the issues discussed at today's debate provide an important opportunity for defining the contributions that can be made at the regional, subregional and bilateral levels to underpin the multilateral architecture, which in past decades has proven to be an indispensable framework for ensuring stability, peace and development.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mr. Chindawongse (Thailand): As I take the floor on behalf of Thailand for the first time this month, I would like to congratulate Brazil on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October and thank Albania for its presidency last month.

As we look forward to reinvigorating the United Nations through *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982), the New Agenda for Peace and the Summit of the Future, and against the backdrop of conflicts and confrontation in various regions, my delegation welcomes this important open debate to discuss how regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements can further contribute to peace and security, as part of our efforts to strengthen multilateralism. The Charter of the United Nations envisages such roles for regional arrangements. We need only look at Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter. How, therefore, do we take those roles forward? Let me make three points.

First and foremost, the fundamental cornerstone of peace and security and stability in any region — and indeed in the global system — is peaceful and mutually beneficial bilateral relations, especially among neighbours. It is often said that good fences make good neighbours, but it is actually peaceful and friendly relations among States, peoples and stakeholders that generate mutual benefit, trust and stability. That is what makes good neighbours in the long term. The primary focus of Thai diplomacy has therefore always been the promotion of friendly relations with all States — and especially our neighbours — being friends to all and enemies to none. Beyond our region, it is our sincere hope that friendly neighbourly relations will continue

to be nurtured where they already exist and cultivated where they may be lacking.

Secondly, the voices, views and vision of the region matter. The countries of the region understand very well the reasons for their common challenges and the appropriate solutions to them, and their wisdom should be heeded. The added value of regional organizations cannot be underestimated, whether we are talking about the African Union, the Caribbean Community or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Their experience should be taken into account. Let me touch briefly on ASEAN. Forged in the time of the Cold War and of conflict in South-East Asia, ASEAN was born in Bangkok and has become a foundation for peace, stability and progress. It is based on shared norms and values, anchored in the ASEAN Charter and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, among other things. At the same time, ASEAN is driven by pragmatic and shared interests. We believe in a comprehensive approach to security where economic and social progress are just as vital as political stability to our peoples' well-being, from which derive the three pillars of the ASEAN community. We respect our diversity as we build consensus. All of that has contributed to peace, security and stability in South-East Asia. We therefore respect and welcome any region charting its own path to achieving regional peace, security and stability through peaceful means, and we see great value in closer engagement between regional organizations, not only to generate mutual benefit but also to contribute to global stability and prosperity. The ASEAN-Gulf Cooperation Council Summit in Saudi Arabia is a significant example of that.

Thirdly and lastly, a strong multilateral regional interface anchored in close partnerships between the United Nations and regional organizations can make important contributions to international peace, security and stability. We welcome the strong ASEAN-United Nations comprehensive partnership, as we welcome closer partnerships between the United Nations and other regional organizations. But more needs to be done. The United Nations, especially the Security Council, should reinforce regionally driven processes by engaging the countries and regions affected as well as other relevant stakeholders, including host countries and troop- and police-contributing countries, for example. We welcome the recommendations of the High-level Advisory Board for Effective Multilateralism on more effective and multi-pillared cooperation between

the United Nations and regional bodies, although not necessarily within a strict collective-security framework and mindset. And while we had hoped to see the role of regional organizations elaborated on further in the Secretary-General's New Agenda for Peace, we look forward to developing ideas within the United Nations on how to bring together global and regional actors to design new models for diplomatic engagement that can address the interests of all actors and deliver mutually beneficial outcomes.

In conclusion, promoting international peace, security and stability requires an all-out effort. We have no choice. Regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements can make a difference. Let us embrace their ideas and contributions.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Margaryan (Armenia): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting. I would also like to express my appreciation to the briefers for their contribution to today's debate. Regional arrangements can play an essential role in the maintenance of international peace and security, as prescribed in Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, by acting in support of the peaceful resolution of disputes and addressing and preventing conflict situations. Such arrangements often have a better understanding of the historical context, root causes and complexities of the conflicts in their respective regions, where their access and proximity can offer more immediate and customized tools for dialogue and mediation.

It was in line with those very principles that in 1992 the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which became the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), proposed a specific initiative aimed at resolving the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh, with the endorsement of the Security Council. Co-chaired by France, Russia and the United States, the OSCE Minsk Group was established with an international mandate for conducting mediation and negotiations in a regional arrangement, as prescribed by the Charter. The OSCE Minsk Group co-chairmanship has been essential since its inception in mobilizing diplomacy, skills and expertise for a peaceful settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. That internationally mandated arrangement came under major attack when Azerbaijan chose to launch a destructive war amid a

global pandemic in September 2020, in grave violation of the existing ceasefire agreements of 1994 and 1995 and of the Charter. Despite Azerbaijan's efforts to justify the military aggression it had unleashed, it was in reality the product of an intentional decision to walk away from the negotiations under the Minsk Group co-chairmanship, opting instead for unprovoked, large-scale violence with multiple verified reports of atrocities, including against civilians.

In his policy brief on the New Agenda for Peace, the Secretary-General stresses that

“some States have embraced the uncertainties of the moment as an opportunity to reassert their influence or to address long-standing disputes through coercive means”.

That is indeed what has happened in our region. We had been consistently warning the United Nations and the Security Council itself that Azerbaijan, emboldened by the results of its use of force in the past, had been seeking to normalize violence and aggression in order to impose unilateral solutions and finalize its policy of ethnic cleansing in Nagorno-Karabakh. In December 2022, Azerbaijan deliberately disrupted the movement of people, goods and vehicles along the Lachin corridor, effectively imposing medieval siege conditions on the entire Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh and using starvation as a method of warfare. In a manifest violation of its obligations under the legally binding orders of the International Court of Justice — including a provisional measure to ensure unimpeded movement along the Lachin corridor, as well as the preeminent obligation not to aggravate the dispute — Azerbaijan carried out a premeditated act of ethnic cleansing involving the imposition of a 10-month blockade targeting a population of 120,000 people, with the subsequent use of large-scale military force that took the lives of innocent civilians, including children, and eventually drove the entire population of Nagorno-Karabakh into mass displacement. Notably, it was only after the area was completely depopulated that Azerbaijan allowed the United Nations to conduct its first visit to Nagorno-Karabakh, obviously with the sole purpose of manipulating the United Nations mission in its work, in an effort to whitewash the massive violations of the rights of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh, who have been starved, bombed and forcibly displaced.

The major representative bodies of Europe, the European Parliament and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, have all adopted resolutions strongly condemning the recent military aggression by Azerbaijan against Nagorno-Karabakh, referring to the use of coercive practices to remove civilian populations from their territory as amounting to a crime against humanity. In the face of a situation where regional and bilateral security arrangements have regrettably failed to prevent military aggression or protect the lives of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh from devastation, the United Nations and the Security Council have a particular responsibility to live up to their mandate to uphold justice and accountability and to establish an effective international framework for the safe and dignified return of the displaced population in line with the norms and principles of international law.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Portugal.

Ms. Zacarias (Portugal): I would like to thank Brazil for convening this very important debate, which is even more timely now in the light of the recent developments in the Middle East, as well as other geopolitical tensions and conflicts around the world. I would also like to thank the briefers that we heard this morning for their valuable inputs and views.

Portugal aligns itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of the European Union, and I would like to add the following remarks in my national capacity.

For my country, the contribution of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes is glaringly evident. From the centuries of peace and genuine friendship with our neighbours, to our membership in the European Union, to the growing vitality of the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries, we know and cherish the value of such arrangements — because regional and subregional integration processes are themselves key drivers of peace and security that promote dialogue, trust, cooperation, development, social stability and democracy, reinforcing global governance and effective multilateralism.

In a moment when conflicts have become more numerous and deadly and harder to resolve, the need to reinforce cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations in order to foster peace and security is obvious. The complexity of the

integrated crisis we are facing renders the need for such cooperation even more evident. Those organizations provide fundamental insights from the ground, help to address the root causes of conflict in a preventive manner and operationalize the links between peace, development and human rights.

The Secretary-General's New Agenda for Peace outlines an extensive and ambitious set of recommendations that recognize the interlinked nature of those many challenges. Subscribing to those recommendations, we would like to underline four points.

First, regional and subregional arrangements should take up the recommendations of the New Agenda for Peace on the development of their own prevention strategies with cross-regional dimensions to address transboundary threats. We need more complementarity and coordination of preventive peace efforts.

Secondly, both in this endeavour and in helping Member States establish and strengthen national infrastructure for peace, we believe that the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) can play a very important role. On the other hand, we would encourage regional and subregional arrangements to consider the possibility of engaging with the PBC to share best practices and present their strategies, as a way to also identify how the United Nations can best support those efforts.

Thirdly, we once again highlight the need to strengthen cooperation between the Council and the PBC. Making that a priority means ensuring, in practice, the predictability and sustainable financing of the PBC.

Fourthly, as the guardian of international law and the guarantor of international peace and security, the Council should more systematically address the questions of early warning, prevention, mediation and peacebuilding. Alongside the security implications of climate change and the intrinsic value of respect for human rights, other issues like institutional capacity-building, both at the national and regional level, merit greater attention from the Council.

Finally, at the level of peacekeeping, the Council should look into ways of authorizing peace-enforcement actions by regional and subregional organizations.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that we fully concur with you, Mr. President — we need dialogue among

national, regional and subregional organizations, as well as dialogue between them and the United Nations, in addition to the much-needed involvement of civil society. It is through dialogue, indeed, that we can build trust and, thus, hope for lasting peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Zahneisen (Germany): I want to thank my colleagues from Portugal and Brazil for organizing this timely and important debate. I would also like to echo other delegations in thanking today's briefers for their insights and thoughts.

Germany is a strong and long-time supporter of United Nations-led prevention and mediation efforts. Over the past years, we have consistently contributed to the Organization's work in this field as a major — often the biggest — donor, be it to the United Nations Mediation Support Unit, the Peacebuilding Commission and its Fund or the Secretary-General's good offices.

I would like to briefly make three points with regard to today's debate.

First, I would like to touch upon peaceful dispute resolution, under Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations. In his New Agenda for Peace, the Secretary-General is very explicit. He calls for a better utilization of Chapter VI tools by the Security Council. This comprehensive toolbox is already in place, but it must be more systematically and frequently reflected in Security Council mandates. We hope that today's debate is a starting point of an in-depth collective reflection on how to achieve that collective objective.

Of course, regional organizations play a pivotal role in that connection. The Security Council should explore new avenues to foster cooperation and dialogue with regional organizations in order to make the best use of their experience with regard to regional and subnational mediation and dialogue facilitation, as well as prevention efforts.

Secondly, Germany firmly believes, that we will not explore the full potential of peaceful conflict resolution unless we start collectively investing more in the development of national and regional prevention plans. For that purpose, we support the deployment by the Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme of Peace and Development Advisors, who assist national Governments on prevention, including the development

and implementation of national prevention strategies. Germany was an early supporter of that idea and has been a top contributor in this field for many years.

That approach, however, cannot and should not focus exclusively on Governments. We must also look at societies at large, especially minorities and marginalized groups. Inclusion, ownership and effectiveness go hand in hand, and those affected by conflict should definitely be participating in its resolution.

Naturally, that includes women. That is why the German Government strives to use 100 per cent of its funding for conflict prevention, peace consolidation and stabilization in a gender-sensitive and — where appropriate — gender-targeted manner. That is also an integral part of our feminist foreign policy approach.

Thirdly, we are of the firm conviction that the Peacebuilding Commission is one of the most adequate forums to implement inclusive, nationally owned and regionally supported conflict prevention and resolution. We would welcome a more systematic exchange between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission in that field. However, to be effective, United Nations peacebuilding efforts require adequate, predictable and sustained funding. We therefore call on all Member States to listen to the great majority of the United Nations membership, especially to countries from conflict-stricken regions, and to stop blocking consensus in the Fifth Committee on assessed contributions for the Peacebuilding Fund.

Let me conclude by saying that, as co-facilitator of the Summit of the Future process, Germany is looking forward to hearing the ideas of Member States on the topic being discussed today in the Security Council. I have no doubt that this will help us to hammer out what, we believe, is our common objective — an ambitious peace and security chapter in the Pact for the Future.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Hilale (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Allow me, at the outset, to congratulate you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on the role of regional and subregional mechanisms, under Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter of the United Nations. This theme once again requires the ongoing commitment of Brazil to the maintenance of international peace and security. I would also like to thank the briefers for their statements.

The holding of this open debate is part and parcel of the third priority of the New Agenda for Peace. It offers the Member States a unique opportunity to adapt multilateral peace efforts to today's world by considering the realities of current conflicts. Recourse to Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter for the pacific settlement of disputes, specifically through prevention, mediation and negotiation, must remain at the heart of international efforts to maintain international peace and security. In that connection, we reiterate our support for the absolute priority afforded by the United Nations Secretary-General to promoting the primacy of political solutions to conflicts and disputes.

Furthermore, the international community is working to find complementary solutions for the maintenance of peace and security, bringing together, among others, regional and subregional mechanisms, in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations — all while recognizing the primary responsibility of the Security Council in terms of peace and security. Indeed, regional and subregional arrangements can, when necessary, provide support to the efforts of the United Nations. However, to ensure the effectiveness of the international community's efforts, regional and subregional mechanisms must in no way replace or collide with the efforts of the Security Council and must obtain the prior agreement of the parties involved in the process.

The Kingdom of Morocco has always made the maintenance of international peace and security a priority of its efforts at the regional and international level. In that context, and in accordance with the instructions of His Majesty King Mohammed VI, the Kingdom of Morocco is currently deploying more than 1,700 soldiers and police officers in United Nations peacekeeping operations, thereby demonstrating its firm and lasting commitment to peace and security and to the promotion of universal values of solidarity and dignity, as well as humanitarian assistance, particularly in Africa. In addition, Morocco has undertaken and continues to undertake specific mediation initiatives, particularly on the African continent, which have yielded fruitful results for conflict prevention and peacebuilding.

On the humanitarian track, Morocco continually contributes to humanitarian appeals around the world, including through the deployment of medical and surgical hospitals in the field, at the instruction of His Majesty the King. A total of 19 field hospitals

have thus far provided 2.065 million medical services for the benefit of local populations and refugees in 14 countries, across four continents. That is in addition to continual financial humanitarian support, which reached \$1.5 million throughout 2022.

The Kingdom of Morocco is an active member of the African Union Peace and Security Council. As part of its Peace and Security Council presidency, the Kingdom of Morocco hosted the first session of the Tangier process in October 2022, under the auspices of the African Union and in collaboration with regional partners, to promote the peace and security and development nexus in Africa in order to combat the root causes of conflicts on the continent.

Moreover, the Kingdom of Morocco works tirelessly to promote the roles of and cooperation within and between regional and subregional organizations. We contributed to the revitalization of the Community of Sahelo-Saharan States by organizing the twenty-first ordinary session of its Executive Council in March 2022, with the participation of 25 member States, to tackle security challenges in the Sahel region.

Furthermore, and under the leadership of His Majesty King Mohammed VI, Morocco has made the African Atlantic into an identity, an opportunity, a place of introspection and an area of projection. Morocco initiated the process of Atlantic African States — a regional grouping to support the integration and joint development of the African Atlantic coast and to promote political and security dialogue around the fight against terrorism, transnational organized crime, maritime piracy and illegal migration. That partnership framework establishes synergies with other cooperation initiatives and processes in the South and North Atlantic countries.

Before concluding, I would like to say that the Kingdom of Morocco, under the leadership of His Majesty the King, is committed to strengthening regional and subregional spaces for cooperation and dialogue and the primacy of peaceful means in the settlement of disputes, in strict respect for the principles of State sovereignty and territorial integrity, good-neighbourliness and non-interference — cardinal principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Confidence in international and regional multilateralism will be rebuilt through the maintenance of peace and security, but also through the promotion of development and respect for human rights.

The President: I now give the floor to Mr. Skoog.

Mr. Skoog: I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries North Macedonia, Montenegro, Albania, the Republic of Moldova and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Georgia and Andorra, align themselves with this statement.

I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to speak this afternoon.

We are unfortunately witnessing an era in which conflicts and crises are on the rise on all continents. Political dynamics are more unpredictable and tensions between countries more palpable. The United Nations is often sidelined, and mediation efforts are discarded. Against that background, the international community needs to do more to prevent crises, strengthen efforts towards peaceful resolutions and avoid that conflicts spiral out of control. Regional organizations can play a key role in that regard. The European Union, as a regional organization, has contributed and is still contributing to many mediation efforts on the ground across the world, and we would like to share a few thoughts based on our experience. Let me also highlight that this topic is all the more relevant in the light of the Secretary-General's New Agenda for Peace, which we strongly support. We need to protect and reinvigorate multilateral efforts and recall the unique legitimacy of the United Nations.

First of all, complementarity and the coordination of peace efforts is of paramount importance. There is no predetermined format — most of the time, mediation on the ground involves a number of different actors, be they national, subregional or regional, and/or the United Nations. The coherence, coordination and complementarity of initiatives are key for peace efforts to be successful. The diversity of actors can be an asset if the division of tasks between the various actors is clear. However, it can also jeopardize the prospects for peace if those efforts are competing with each other.

Regional organizations can provide space for dialogue and compromise and should be the first ones to ring the alarm bell, take prevention measures and facilitate mediation. Thanks to their geographical proximity and culture, they are more likely to be familiar with local issues, the situation and the parties to conflict. They also have the greatest interest in managing or mitigating a conflict to avoid a spillover into the region. We have seen during the past decades

an increased number of regionally led mediation initiatives, some of which were successful — among them are the mediation efforts led by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in Liberia and Sierra Leone.

But as said before, regional initiatives are not exclusive and can be complemented or supported by the United Nations when needed. Very often, regional organizations are reluctant to have a country of their region discussed at the Security Council, as they fear it would diminish their control over the situation. We see it differently: sometimes regional efforts struggle to be heard by the parties and need additional support from the international community. That does not mean that the Security Council is substituting regional efforts — on the contrary, it reinforces them.

Cooperation between regional organizations is also key. The EU enjoys strong cooperation with the main regional and subregional organizations, including the African Union (AU), the League of Arab States, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Gulf Cooperation Council, et cetera. On African crises, for instance, we cooperate closely with the AU, ECOWAS and the Southern African Development Community on the situations in Somalia, Mozambique, Mali and the Niger, et cetera. Such cooperation is important to exchange information, assess the situation and join efforts in the same direction, for instance to put pressure on the parties.

Finally, regional organizations can play an important role, even in countries that are not part of their constituencies. The EU is a major supporter of conflict prevention and peacebuilding efforts outside of Europe, and we do that based on our peacebuilding experience at home. Our network of special envoys and mediators is working around the world to enhance trust between local populations and national authorities. In Somalia, for example, we support communities that have been liberated from Al-Shabaab and have suffered from its punitive actions and drought. In the Central African Republic, our mission there supported the Government in creating a reliable legal framework to restructure the police and gendarmerie to better meet the needs of the population. We are also supporting international peace efforts in Yemen and Libya.

Some of our support is channelled through the United Nations, for example, to the United Nations Standby Team of Senior Mediation Advisers and the

United Nations Peacebuilding Fund. One concrete example of operational United Nations-EU collaboration is Yemen, where the EU — at the request of the United Nations — is coordinating Track II mediation in support of the ceasefire. Another example is the EU-United Nations Development Programme partnership on Insider Mediation, which has enabled building and piloting critical insider mediation capacities in 14 countries. In Afghanistan, we support the Afghan Women Leaders Forum to raise women's voices in peacebuilding, as an inclusive approach is paramount for sustainable peace.

I believe Mozambique's peacebuilding efforts can serve as inspiration, as a process characterized by strong national ownership, continued and open dialogue between the parties, effective community engagement and support from regional and international partners, while mainstreaming a gender perspective throughout. The promotion of development and community resilience to prevent violent extremism is commendable and demonstrates the importance of building peace from the bottom up, promoting a positive rights-based agenda based on inclusion, and the benefits of working closely with United Nations agencies and regional organizations.

I can assure the Council of the European Union's continued support for conflict prevention, peacebuilding and sustaining peace. We will continue to work to strengthen those aspects of the Security Council's work and of the United Nations system more broadly, including by accelerating the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals and engaging actively in the Peacebuilding Commission and in the formulation of a new agenda for peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mr. Rakhmetullin (Kazakhstan): I thank the Brazilian presidency for convening today's open debate.

The urgency of today's global problems threatens all of us and our civilization. Therefore, we must create the conditions to unite efforts aimed at ensuring universal security, stability and sustainable development across the world. Kazakhstan holds the deep conviction that regional and subregional organizations, of which it is an integral and dependable member, are well placed to understand the root causes of conflicts; the unique and specific histories, cultures and politics; and the material circumstances of development in individual countries.

In times of global crisis and sweeping paradigm shifts in the area of security, multilateralism and inclusiveness have become the only possible approaches to peace and security at the regional and global levels. In that context, Kazakhstan would like to highlight the emerging role of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia (CICA), which it established in 1992 here at the United Nations, as an important partner of the Organization.

The principles enshrined in CICA's founding document, the Almaty Act, converge with those of the Charter of the United Nations. Those principles include respect for sovereign equality and rights; territorial integrity; the peaceful settlement of conflicts; and economic, social and cultural cooperation. The second founding document is the CICA Catalogue of Confidence-building Measures, which is updated regularly by its member States to address newly emerging tensions, such as epidemiological security, climate change, food and water insecurity, public health, information and communications technology, money-laundering and counter-terrorism, to mention a few. There is thus a great commonality of mutually reinforcing goals and direction. In addition, CICA covers key security baskets — addressing the military-political dimension to ensure lasting stability and to strengthen mutual confidence through information exchange, inviting observers to military exercises and holding consultations on unexpected and hazardous incidents of a military nature, along with other forms of cooperation that the member States deem necessary.

Another distinctive aspect of CICA lies in its membership. CICA today unites 28 countries. As such, it is the only pan-Asian organization that covers a vast territory from the Pacific Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea and from the Ural Mountains to the Indian Ocean. It is the only institution where both Israel and Palestine have a seat at the table as full and equal members. It also brings together countries that do not have diplomatic relations.

The growing engagement of member States has been a positive driver behind CICA's transformation into a full-fledged international organization capable of contributing to continental mediation and peacemaking. The last meeting of the Ministerial Council of CICA, held on 21 September in New York, endorsed the Road Map for CICA Transformation, which outlines eight areas of reform. CICA therefore offers an excellent platform

for addressing current issues with bold, innovative, interlocking and multidimensional solutions.

To conclude, I wish to stress the importance of ensuring dynamic synergy between the United Nations system and regional organizations, in particular with transcontinental organizations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Türkiye.

Mr. Önal (Türkiye): We thank the Brazilian presidency for organizing this timely debate.

Peace through dialogue is indeed a pertinent topic to tackle, especially in view of recent developments. At a time of multiple crises in the world, there is an urgent need for the international community to act, and to do so with reason, common sense and integrity. Such an attitude requires dialogue and diplomacy to be prioritized in order to achieve the de-escalation of tensions and pave the way for durable solutions. In that connection, allowing conflict dynamics to run their full course and making believe that elements of peace will naturally emerge after military means have been exhausted is a fundamentally wrong and untenable proposition.

Our contemporary multilateral system and its heart, the United Nations, were created to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. It is difficult to say that we have succeeded in fulfilling that objective. Obviously, we need to analyse the underlying reasons for that difficulty well. One of the basic conclusions such an analysis might yield is that no crisis can be resolved sustainably without addressing its root causes. There is a growing need to emphasize conflict resolution instead of having to contend with crisis management. Respect for the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and human rights should serve as our compass at all times. In doing so, it is equally important to avoid double standards and to ensure that rights and laws are applied equally and equitably to all.

As the saying goes, geography determines destiny. Situated in a geostrategic location, Türkiye has been a strong advocate of regional ownership and proactive diplomacy as important components of multilateralism. Accordingly, we have launched regional initiatives and peace mediation efforts aimed at bringing about peaceful resolutions to conflicts. Together with Russia and Iran, we established the Astana platform, which helped

de-escalate the Syrian crisis and made meaningful contributions to the political process. As an active member of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, we are now exerting efforts with other member States to help de-escalate the situation in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by prioritizing an immediate and unconditional ceasefire, sustainable humanitarian access to Gaza and the revitalization of the peace process based on a two-State vision.

In Ukraine, we continue to be an honest broker between the parties. We have facilitated prisoner exchanges and hosted peace talks and negotiations on humanitarian issues in Türkiye, demonstrating our commitment to helping to end to that war at an early stage. Our dialogue with the parties allowed us to launch and implement the Black Sea Grain Initiative, in partnership with the United Nations.

In the South Caucasus, we have initiated various trilateral mechanisms to enhance regional cooperation. The 3+3 regional consultative platform proposed by Türkiye and Azerbaijan aims to strengthen dialogue, confidence-building and mutually beneficial cooperation in the South Caucasus. We continue to fully support the peace process launched between Azerbaijan and Armenia, in addition to our own normalization process with Armenia. A window of opportunity for sustainable peace and cooperation has opened in the Caucasus, and it is the responsibility of all stakeholders to seize it now.

At the global scale, Security Council reform is an absolute and urgent necessity. We support the United Nations reinvigorated multilateralism efforts and welcome the Secretary-General's call for a New Agenda for Peace. Its objectives require a United Nations that is strong, effective and compatible with today's realities. Türkiye will continue its active cooperation with the United Nations and other partners towards those objectives.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Poland.

Mr. Szczerski (Poland): Let me begin by thanking Brazil for organizing today's debate on such an important topic as the contributions of regional mechanisms to international peace and security.

Poland attaches great importance to conflict prevention and mediation through the activities of regional frameworks, echoing the words of the

Secretary-General, who named them the critical building blocks for networked multilateralism. Poland fully subscribes to the tasks enumerated for regional arrangements in Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations. We firmly support the complementarity of their efforts with the efforts of the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, in maintaining international peace and security.

Taking all the aforementioned into consideration, Poland is very active in multiple regional cooperation formats. Those include not only the European Union and NATO, but also the Three Seas Initiative, the Visegrad Group and the Central European Initiative, to name just a few. We believe that regional groupings around the world should be attractive partners for each other, bringing their region-specific expertise on development and resilience issues together. We encourage regional organizations from around the globe to become interested in each other's work.

With regard to the specific topics of peacebuilding and peacekeeping, I would like to touch upon the following three aspects.

First, as has been mentioned today, regional security arrangements have great expertise in pinpointing the root causes of instabilities in their constituent areas. Their narrower scope of operation and hence more detailed understanding often allows for early detection of brewing disputes before they erupt into open conflicts. That significantly enhances the chances of conflict prevention, which is always more desirable than conflict resolution. In the latter case, intimate knowledge of the background of the conflict lends itself to finding a more tailor-made approach to a peace enforcement action when such a necessity arises, which is also very productive.

On the other hand, it is worth underlining that some regional groupings may lack the required resources and capabilities, making the task of peacekeeping or peace enforcement too burdensome for some of them. That is important to keep it in mind when discussing the current trend of "outsourcing" peace operations to regional organizations and country groupings. Having said that, vital contributions of organizations such as the African Union, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Caribbean Community, the Economic Community of West African States or the Southern African Development Community, to name just a few,

when dealing with numerous political and humanitarian crises in their statutory areas, are undeniable.

Secondly, regional organizations and partnerships' contributions can be very constructive in mitigating the contemporary drivers of conflict. Climate change, scarcity of water, human trafficking, illicit weapons trade, terrorism and many others are usually of a transboundary nature. Regional and subregional organizations have the mandate to flag them and then pool national and regional perspectives and expertise together to tackle them effectively, thus neutralizing their potential as eventual triggers of destabilization.

Finally, let me share with participants some points from the recent Polish chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), which ended only last year. Owing to its comprehensive security concept and a special set of confidence-building measures, the OSCE has a great potential for meaningful contribution to the European security architecture. One of the greatest achievements of Poland's OSCE chairmanship was the mobilization of supraregional public opinion on conflicts in the organization's statutory area by clearly defining who is the aggressor and who is the aggrieved. We were successful despite Moscow's continuous violation of OSCE rules, including the constant abuse of the consensus principle, aimed at paralysing the organization's decision-making process — which we have all witnessed here in the Security Council as well.

Poland strongly believes that regional organizations are capable of preventing, deterring and responding to armed conflict, in supporting the Security Council in its main task of maintaining international peace and security. In order to do so, there is a need for better coordination between the Council and regional arrangements in addressing potential and current conflicts. For that collective task to be fulfilled, it is necessary that all peace enforcement actions are fully in line with the Charter of the United Nations and international humanitarian and human rights law.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Liechtenstein.

Ms. Oehri (Liechtenstein): I thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's open debate.

While much of the reputation of the Security Council, for better or worse, rests on the actual or potential use of its Chapter VII powers, the acid test

of its performance is how well it is able to exercise its functions under Chapters VI and VIII. The Council's strong relationships with regional organizations, including with the aim of reinforcing preventive diplomacy, exemplifies the ideal of a healthy multilateral system that addresses issues of peace and security at the source and in such a way that prevents and ends violence at the earliest possible juncture. We therefore believe that today's debate can reinforce the call of the Secretary-General in the New Agenda for Peace to support preventive diplomacy.

A quick look at the Charter of the United Nations demonstrates the mutually reinforcing nature of Chapters VI and VIII. Article 52, paragraph 3, requests the Security Council to encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through regional arrangements. It is clear, taking into account paragraph 4 of the same Article, that Chapters VI and VIII must be read together.

The question for the Council, of course, is how to apply that normative framework in practice. We see lessons for the implementation of both Chapter VI and Chapter VIII. The Council must continue to strengthen the implementation of Chapter VIII by strengthening its relationships with regional organizations, including and in particular their peacemaking, peacebuilding and mediation capacities, and in so doing, making clear that the Council should be seen as a credible backstop to regional efforts.

As one example, we were pleased to see appreciation for United Nations support in the most recent review of the leaders of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) on the implementation of the five-point consensus relating to Myanmar. While the situation on the ground in Myanmar has deteriorated, the ongoing crisis illustrates the importance of the two organizations working together, including through the support expressed for ASEAN in resolution 2669 (2022) last year. A complementary approach between the Security Council and regional organizations should include Council action as appropriate, in particular where its authority can bolster regional efforts to mediate disputes. We also note the strong relationship between the Security Council and the African Union Peace and Security Council, as exemplified by the Councils' trip to Addis Ababa earlier this month.

As for Chapter VI, the Council should clarify when it acts under that Chapter, as opposed to under

Chapter VII. At the same time, we note in that respect that Article 25, key to the understanding that Council decisions are legally binding on Member States at large, does not specify whether relevant decisions should be taken under Chapter VI or Chapter VII of the Charter. More relevant to that determination must be that the Council takes a decision.

Finally, the Council's practice under Chapters VI and VIII should faithfully reflect Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter. That article clearly establishes a limitation to a Council member participating in a vote in the Security Council, by stating that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under Article 52, paragraph 3, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting. Although that limitation applies in equal measure to all Council members, it is notable that the very article that enshrines the veto for permanent members also institutes an explicit restriction on its use.

A Council member carrying out an aggression against another Member State of the United Nations is clearly a party to a dispute for the purposes of Article 27, paragraph 3. The effectiveness of the Council would greatly benefit from the practical application of that provision, which is legally accurate and in line with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as a whole.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia.

Mr. Nasir (Indonesia): I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Let me begin by conveying ASEAN's grave concern about the recent escalation of armed conflicts in the Middle East region. We call for the immediate end of violence to avoid further human casualties.

Fifty-six years since its establishment, ASEAN shares the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, stability and security and the promotion of economic growth, social progress and prosperity in the region. However, nothing is to be taken for granted. ASEAN has made great efforts to overcome challenges to pursue common goals towards a peaceful, stable and prosperous ASEAN community.

Through our transformative journey, we have continued to build strategic trust and mutual confidence through continued dialogue, win-win cooperation and practical confidence-building measures to create a

peaceful environment conducive to sustainable growth. In that regard, the Security Council has underscored the role of States, regional and subregional organizations and relevant stakeholders in promoting confidence-building measures and dialogue at various levels, while ensuring synergy, coherence and the complementarity of such efforts. We reaffirm our strong commitment to upholding regionalism and multilateralism and emphasize the importance of adhering to key principles and shared values and norms enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations; the ASEAN Charter; the Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality Declaration; the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia; the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone and the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific. We recognize the strategic importance of our region for our peace, security, stability and prosperity, as well as that of our external partners.

Given the increasingly complex and cross-cutting challenges, including challenges to the rule of law among nations, the need to uphold the rule of law has never been more urgent. Therefore, ASEAN and ASEAN-led mechanisms shall remain inclusive and open avenues that facilitate constructive dialogue and constructive cooperation that will contribute to the development of the evolving regional architecture.

Closer to home, ASEAN is committed to assisting Myanmar through the implementation of the five-point consensus in finding a peaceful and durable solution to the ongoing crisis, as Myanmar remains an integral part of the ASEAN family. We are united in our position to put forward the five-point consensus as our main reference in addressing the political crisis in Myanmar. We are committed to intensifying engagement with all relevant stakeholders in Myanmar to build trust and confidence, create a conducive environment and bridge gaps and differences leading towards an inclusive dialogue for a comprehensive political solution.

ASEAN remains concerned about the intensifying geopolitical tension in the region. We further underline the value and relevance of the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific to ASEAN's peace, security, stability and prosperity. We are determined to promote the implementation of the ASEAN Outlook on the Indo-Pacific through concrete projects and activities, particularly in four key areas, namely, maritime cooperation, connectivity, the Sustainable Development Goals and economic and other possible areas of

cooperation. Such principles have been manifested most prominently through the East Asia Summit (EAS), the ASEAN Plus Three and the ASEAN Regional Forum.

Through the East Asia Summit, ASEAN underscored the need for the East Asian region to promote an enabling environment for peace, stability and prosperous development for all through a culture of dialogue and cooperation, instead of rivalry, and by enhancing mutual trust and confidence and respect for international law with ASEAN as the driving force. ASEAN is committed to working together with EAS participating countries in promoting common goals and interests and maintaining the region at the epicentre of growth by building resilience against emerging challenges and future shocks. ASEAN reaffirms the important role of the ASEAN Plus Three cooperation framework in promoting peace, stability and prosperity in the East Asian region with ASEAN as the driving force.

Meanwhile, the ASEAN Regional Forum, as a key platform for building mutual trust and confidence, continues to foster constructive dialogue and consultation on political and security issues of common interest and concern in the Asia-Pacific region. Going forward, ASEAN looks forward to working together to revitalizing the ASEAN Regional Forum so that it continues to function as the leading regional security forum in the Indo-Pacific region.

For such regional efforts to reach their full potential, stronger cooperation with United Nations bodies is paramount. It is time that the United Nations strengthen the role of regional and subregional mechanisms by actively supporting and collaborating with them. In that context, ASEAN underlines the significance of ASEAN-United Nations comprehensive partnership towards ASEAN community-building efforts and in our collective efforts in addressing global and regional concerns.

With the support of all partners, including the United Nations, ASEAN will continue to contribute as an important building block for global peace, stability and prosperity.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan) The delegation of Pakistan thanks you, Mr. President, and the Brazilian presidency for organizing this timely debate. We also thank

Assistant Secretary-General Khiari, Ms. Michelle Bachelet, Mr. Thabo Mbeki and Ms. Josefina Echavarría Álvarez for their insights.

We are living in dangerous times. International peace and security are confronted with multiple threats, marked by violations of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, unilateral use or threat of use of force, foreign interventions, foreign occupation, the suppression of legitimate freedom struggles, proliferating conflicts and disputes, new manifestations of terrorism, rising great Power tensions, expanding military alliances, a new nuclear and conventional arms race and the resurgence of fascist ideologies of hate and Islamophobia. We must respond to those challenges collectively and effectively within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations.

The primary responsibility to promote peace through dialogue rests with the Security Council. The General Assembly shares that responsibility, especially when the Security Council is unable to act.

It is widely felt that the Security Council has failed to perform the role envisaged for it under the Charter of the United Nations. And we have heard of the Council's paralysis on Ukraine, and now the Security Council has failed again to stop the slaughter in Gaza. Pakistan hopes that the General Assembly will take action and demand an immediate ceasefire in Gaza and full, unhindered and sustainable humanitarian access to the suffering people of Gaza and ensure that they are not displaced within or outside Gaza. Thereafter, we should seek to resuscitate the two-State solution, the only option for a durable peace in the Holy Land.

There are of course several other instances in which the Security Council has failed to live up to the Charter's vision, such as in the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir. The Council's resolutions, which call for a plebiscite to enable the people of Jammu and Kashmir to determine their own political destiny, remain to be implemented. Like Israel in occupied Palestine, India's massive occupation army of 900,000 troops has sought to brutally suppress the freedom struggle of the Kashmiri people and to impose what its extremist leaders ominously call a final solution for Kashmir.

The Council's failures must be addressed. Pakistan believes that can be done by making the Council more representative of the United Nations membership, more democratic by enlarging the voice of the majority of small and medium-sized States and more accountable

through the democratic method of holding periodic elections. It is crystal clear that the main source of Council's shortcomings is the veto power of its five permanent members, whether exercised directly or indirectly. It is therefore difficult to comprehend the logic of those who advocate for the expansion of the number of the Council's permanent members. The problem cannot be the solution.

Regional and subregional organizations can play a role in promoting peace and security and resolving disputes. However, their role remains subsidiary to that of the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and other relevant United Nations entities, and their actions must remain consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations. The role of those organizations varies in each region. Some regions, such as the European Union, have developed advanced political, legislative and judicial mechanisms to address regional, security and economic issues. The African Union, too, has established important mechanisms, including through the African Union Peace and Security Council, to address issues of peace and security. Those regional organizations could effectively represent their members on the Council as they do in the Group of 20 now and are a model for other regions as well. The Uniting for Consensus Group has consistently proposed that regional representation could offer the basis for an agreement on the issue of Security Council reform.

In our region, it is unfortunate that the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation has been prevented by its largest member from realizing its potential. But fortunately, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization has established itself as a credible platform for Eurasian regional cooperation, including on security issues — as has the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, as we just heard. There are also promising cross-regional forums, such as the League of Arab States and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, which have the capacity to contribute to the resolution of disputes among their members and other States and entities.

My delegation would be prepared, following this discussion, first, to explore the potential of that regional approach for reforming the Council, and secondly, to develop norms and guidelines that could be utilized in various regional and cross-regional organizations to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Panama.

Ms. Cano Franco (Panama) (*spoke in Spanish*): Panama believes that the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations constitute the legal framework for governing relations among States. We are required under the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter to seek peaceful ways to resolve conflicts, and as highlighted in the provisions of Chapter VIII, regional arrangements can contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security. Regional, subregional and bilateral agreements have proven to be effective tools for preventing and resolving conflicts, and it is essential to recognize their importance in the current international context. Bilateral, regional and subregional agreements can foster cooperation among countries that share geographic, cultural or economic interests. Promoting cooperation creates environments that are conducive to conflict prevention. Working together in sectors such as trade, security or the management of shared resources enables countries to build stronger relationships, which in addition to preventing future disagreements fosters transparency and mutual trust, two crucial elements of conflict prevention.

Panama firmly believes that regional agreements can contribute to the peaceful settlement of disputes. We recall with admiration the experience in our region of the Contadora Group, formed by Panama, Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela in 1983. That group played a decisive role in the peace negotiation process in Central America during the 1980s. It later evolved into the Rio Group, of which Panama was also a member, providing the basis for the creation of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States.

Subregional alliances also play a crucial role in conflict prevention and resolution. Such coalitions can work to address specific problems affecting a group of geographically close countries, which can help to identify appropriate solutions and facilitate the implementation of joint measures. A successful example of that is the Caribbean Community, which promotes peace and stability in the Caribbean through dialogue and cooperation in areas such as trade, security and sustainable development. Using those instruments reflects a proactive and effective approach to addressing the peace and security challenges facing the international community. In all those cases, political will, dialogue and diplomacy play a central role. In addition, strengthening trust among States must

involve eliminating the factors that undermine it, such as the possession of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons, and it is that why it is vital to continue to work towards their elimination.

On the international stage, where voices are diverse and perspectives may differ, listening to others is a fundamental pillar of effective diplomacy and the peaceful resolution of disputes. It is in our differences that we find the richness of humankind and the opportunity to learn and move forward together. To achieve peace and security, we must adopt collaborative approaches that start by acknowledging our diversity, and we must put ourselves in a position to understand the realities of others. We must continue to support and strengthen efforts to use peaceful means for the settlement of disputes, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, recognizing that peace is a precious commodity that requires a constant and sustained commitment. In that regard, the United Nations plays a crucial role in supporting and facilitating peace processes. Panama reaffirms its commitment to contributing to the work of the Security Council in promoting the international peace and security agenda, in line with its aspiration to be elected as a non-permanent member of the Council for the 2025–2026 term. We are optimistic that we can find common goals, because we believe firmly that more than anything else, humankind wants to live in peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Slovenia.

Mr. Malovrh (Slovenia): First, I am very grateful to Brazil's presidency of the Council for organizing today's debate.

At the outset, I want to align myself with the statement delivered earlier by Ambassador Skoog on behalf of the European Union.

While the primary responsibility for the peaceful settlement of disputes rests with the parties themselves, the Security Council could do more to identify and address crises early, when the opportunities for constructive dialogue and the use of peaceful means are greatest. The complexity of crises and their increasingly transnational nature call for a greater level of engagement by regional and subregional organizations. In some instances they are the best suited to preventing, managing and resolving conflicts, and they have proved highly successful. Let me address three issues.

First, preventing conflicts is far more effective and less costly than responding to them, especially in terms of preventing human suffering. As we have heard, regional organizations such as the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the African Union, the League of Arab States, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Caribbean Community and others possess an in-depth knowledge and understanding of the situations on the ground and have an important role to play. Many of them have developed innovative early-warning mechanisms in areas ranging from the rule of law, security and stability to equality and human rights. They have evolved a number of good practices in confidence-building, cross-border cooperation and, consequently, conflict prevention. One can imagine a toolbox with all the good practices, mechanisms and lessons learned from different regional organizations made available for global use. That is why we strongly support partnerships between the United Nations and regional organizations and call for strengthening them.

Secondly, one of the ways to address the underlying causes of conflict remains inclusion. Despite the many Security Council resolutions addressing the issue, women's full, equal and meaningful participation in peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding remains an aspiration rather than a political priority. That needs to change. Simply put, we cannot leave half of the population out of the decision-making process. Gender equality contributes to political and economic security and stability. The Security Council has already reaffirmed that the empowerment of women and girls, together with gender equality, is critical to efforts to maintain international peace and security. The comprehensive implementation of the women and peace and security agenda is pivotal in that regard.

Thirdly, a good example of a transnational challenge that can act as a threat multiplier is the effects of climate change. They increase societies' vulnerability and exacerbate the potential for conflicts. There is a role for the Security Council to play in discussing climate security in the context of conflict prevention. Closer cooperation with regional and subregional organizations and mechanisms can help us better understand the specific linkages between climate and peace and security and devise climate-sensitive responses for preventing or mitigating potential conflicts. The stabilizing potential of transboundary cooperation is often demonstrated in the area of water

issues. A good example is the International Sava River Basin Commission, which was established 20 years ago under a regional initiative, with the goal of consolidating peace and preventing a recurrence of conflict in the Western Balkans. Cooperation on a shared water policy helped build trust and paved the way for other forms of cooperation among former adversaries.

Let me conclude by saying that in an era of new and more complex threats, preventing conflict is essential. It is also the best investment for the future of any society. We must not overlook the potential of regional and subregional organizations in that regard, and we should continue to look for synergies, avoid duplication and work in a mutually supportive way.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mrs. Kamboj (India): I want to warmly congratulate you, Sir, on your country's presidency of the Security Council.

The basic premise underlying our discussions today is the erosion of trust in multilateral institutions and the need for reform. And it is indeed important for us to have an honest conversation on how to rebuild trust in multilateral institutions. Let me make four quick points as suggestions in the context.

First, the Charter of the United Nations calls for resolving any dispute through negotiations. Where there are bilateral agreements on ways to resolve any dispute pending between parties, the best way forward is for the international community to recognize the existence of such means and encourage them. We have seen several examples in the past in which bilateral discussions and regional and subregional mechanisms have been more effective in achieving mutually acceptable solutions to resolve disputes.

Secondly, with their deep knowledge of local factors and complexities, regional and subregional organizations, particularly in Africa, are uniquely positioned to find better solutions to conflict in their respective regions. We therefore support engagement between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations, in line with the Charter.

Thirdly, in the context of peacekeeping, these forces need to be reconfigured to actively liaise with regional forces. It is equally important to build the capacities and capabilities of potential regional partners, as well as those of host States. For our part, we have done so

with several partners, especially in Africa. We also need to support African-led peace operations with resources and well-defined mandates that from their very inception also factor in exit strategies.

Fourthly, none of that will matter if we do not address the elephant in the room, which is that we are currently unable to peacefully resolve disputes through the United Nations, because its core body — the Security Council itself — has been rendered ineffective. Unless we undertake comprehensive reforms and get this house in order, we will continue to face a continuing crisis of credibility. The new orientation for reformed multilateralism, which India advocates, flows from the idea that there can be no genuine solidarity without trust. An overwhelming majority of countries from the global South share our belief that reform of the United Nations architecture is no longer a question of why, but rather when and how soon. The opportunity provided by the Summit of the Future next year should drive us to work for change in the direction of reformed multilateralism, including through the expansion of the Council in both categories of its membership.

Lastly and regrettably, I am compelled to point out that Pakistan has once again stooped to misuse of the forum of the Security Council. Its observations are baseless and unfounded, and we therefore reject them in their entirety. The union territories of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh are an integral part of India, as a result of Jammu and Kashmir's legal, complete and irrevocable accession to India in 1947.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Larsen (Australia): I thank you, Sir, for convening this important open debate on peace through dialogue.

Australia has always pursued a world where differences and disputes are settled not by power and size, but through institutions and agreed rules and norms. The United Nations remains the only forum in which all 193 countries have agreed to come together to navigate our differences through dialogue. We have built this institution recognizing that peace is our shared purpose. Yet, notwithstanding those efforts, the world is facing an extraordinary rise in instability, violence and armed conflict. Successive coups in the Sahel have seen the displacement of tens of millions. Russia's immoral and illegal war in Ukraine continues to cause death and destruction. And most recently,

we have witnessed Hamas attacks in Israel, including abhorrent acts of terror against innocent civilians, which Australia unequivocally condemns. In the face of all such circumstances, we reiterate our call for full respect of international humanitarian law, including protection of civilians and provision of humanitarian access.

Effective and sustainable conflict prevention and resolution requires the knowledge, capabilities and engagement of regional and subregional groups. The Security Council has an important role to play by facilitating dialogue, mediation and conciliation through its convening power under Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations. That includes working with regional and subregional groups to leverage their expertise and facilitate the peaceful resolution of disputes. Not only will that enhance the effectiveness of conflict resolution, but it will also empower nations — and regions — to lead their own peacebuilding processes and foster more sustainable and lasting peace.

Regional groups can be instrumental in the protection of civilians and in ensuring humanitarian access during times of conflict, acting as first responders and intermediaries. They can also contribute to the active protection of vital health services and health workers on the ground. And regional groups can be highly effective in negotiating safe access and facilitating the delivery of critical supplies. Australia urges the Council to continue to support regional groups' vital role in mitigating human suffering during conflict and contributing to the restoration of stability and peace in affected regions.

We support the call in the New Agenda for Peace to strengthen the role, funding and inclusivity of the Peacebuilding Commission. A stronger and more proactive Peacebuilding Commission will help mobilize political support and promote reconciliation and build on the women and peace and security agenda. And, importantly, it will support the contribution of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes. We support the call for more effective collaboration between the Peacebuilding Commission and the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Human Rights Council. We also support the call to formalize participation by regional organizations in the Peacebuilding Commission, to make its deliberations more holistic and inclusive. We look forward to progressing on these issues and

contributing to efforts to build sustainable peace, when our Peacebuilding Commission term commences in 2025. We support regional leadership in peacekeeping. We welcome Fiji's proposal to establish a new Pacific peacekeeping association to strengthen our region's capacity and cooperation. We also support the call from African States for United Nations assessed contributions for African Union-led peace support operations.

The prevention of disputes and prevention of atrocities go hand in hand. Many of the risk factors for conflict and atrocities are the same. The new responsibility to protect framework for action developed by the Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect and the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect is a useful tool for States. It outlines a wide range of actions that States and regional actors can take to prevent and respond to atrocities and build more peaceful societies.

Our commitment to international peace and security is why Australia seeks a seat on the Security Council for 2029–2030. Australia stands ready to work with Member States as we develop the Pact for the Future and serve on a Security Council that effectively addresses our shared challenges.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Omar (Malaysia): Malaysia thanks Brazil, President of the Council, for organizing today's open debate, and the briefers for their valuable insights.

Our delegation aligns itself with the statement delivered by Indonesia on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Today's topic on the contribution of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes is of utmost importance and relevance to what the world is facing today. Prolonged conflicts around the world have long cast a shadow over global peace, with disastrous spillover effects that continue to threaten international peace and security. These conflicts unfortunately devastate lives, weaken institutions, disrupt economies and fuel further instability. The detrimental impacts of conflicts often persist for many years. Against that background, conflict prevention and peaceful resolution are imperative.

Malaysia is committed to the pacific settlement of disputes through peaceful means, firmly advocated

in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations. Sustaining peace is a collective effort that requires the active involvement of all relevant actors. Towards that aspiration, the role of regional and subregional organizations is vital. In fact, many regional and subregional organizations have long histories of engagement in conflict prevention and mediation, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, which accord them useful insights and mechanisms to facilitate constructive dialogue and concrete cooperation.

As a member of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Malaysia regards the role of ASEAN in promoting peace, security and stability in the region as crucial. ASEAN was established in 1967, and ASEAN solidarity is built on mutual understanding, trust and confidence among its members. We share the same goal: to live in peace with one another and with the world at large in a just, democratic and harmonious environment, as clearly envisaged in the ASEAN Political-Security Community blueprint. To that end, the spirit of negotiation and mediation, based on our own ASEAN values, remains the bedrock of ASEAN's dispute resolution system, firmly guided by the ASEAN Charter.

Malaysia is convinced that a strengthened cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations is indispensable for the maintenance of international peace and security. The active involvement of regional and subregional organizations as reliable partners of the United Nations is crucial in delivering the Organization's mandate. Malaysia welcomes in particular the continued cooperation between the United Nations and other organizations, particularly the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), of which Malaysia is a member.

Myanmar remains one of the most challenging issues confronting our region. In that regard, Malaysia welcomes landmark resolution 2669 (2022) on the situation in Myanmar, adopted by the Security Council on 21 December 2022. Malaysia in that regard will continue to work closely and constructively with fellow ASEAN member States and the Council in efforts to achieve a peaceful and sustainable solution to the Myanmar political crisis. In that connection, we stress the need for a full and effective implementation of the five-point consensus.

We also recognize the tireless effort by the OIC in its solidarity to address the dire situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question. We endorse the final communiqué of the open-ended emergency extraordinary meeting of the OIC Executive Committee, held on 18 October 2023, on finding ways for the Palestinian people to attain their inalienable right to self-determination, in an independent and sovereign State of Palestine.

The call by the Secretary-General through a New Agenda for Peace for robust regional frameworks and organizations ought to be supported and advanced. Malaysia will continue to contribute and participate actively in regional efforts to strengthen dialogue and cooperation in the maintenance of peace and security.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Qatar.

Ms. Al-Thani (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like at the outset to congratulate you, Mr. President, and Brazil on your presidency of the Security Council this month. I thank you for convening this important open debate. We also thank the briefers who have enriched our meeting this morning.

This meeting is held as humanitarian crises and armed conflicts are on the rise in the world, even as their nature and dimensions are constantly changing, including in the Middle East. That is specifically true regarding the latest developments and their humanitarian repercussions in the Gaza Strip, which require intense coordination of regional and international efforts in the light of the exceptional circumstances in the region. Those protracted conflicts and their implosion, from time to time, as well as their threat to regional and international peace and security, make it inevitable for all of us to adopt a more inclusive approach to achieve a just, comprehensive and sustainable peace by addressing the root causes of conflicts, especially the conflict in the Middle East.

It is also important in this open debate to think about the aspirations of the Summit of the Future, to be held next year, and to take into consideration the 2025 Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, as well as to follow up the outcomes of the Sustainable Development Goals Summit, held in September. In that context, the State of Qatar reiterates its support for the Secretary-General's *Our Common Agenda* (A/75/982) and the New Agenda for Peace. We note brief 11 of the New Agenda for Peace, which stressed the need for

strong partnerships between the United Nations and regional organizations and for investing in diplomacy and preventive measures in order to stop violence and conflicts, while supporting peacemaking efforts through dialogue and mediation.

The State of Qatar is proud that preventive diplomacy, dialogue and mediation are the cornerstones of our foreign policy and strategy. That has helped us establish a long record of successful mediation at the regional and international levels. Our efforts contributed to de-escalation and the maintenance of international peace and security. The State of Qatar maintains a comprehensive approach to the concept of peace. In our view, peace is not just stopping fighting or violence. Comprehensive and sustainable peace is based on prevention and addressing the root causes of conflicts. That includes development and humanitarian interventions and providing opportunities for the economic empowerment of women and children.

The State of Qatar believes that the Charter of the United Nations is a good framework for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, specifically its Chapter VI, while Chapter VIII also supports the role of regional and subregional organizations in the promotion of dialogue and preventive diplomacy for resolving conflicts peacefully, in the context of maintaining international peace and security. In addition, certain Security Council resolutions, including resolution 1625 (2005), stress the importance of building United Nations capabilities to prevent conflicts by supporting regional mediation initiatives through close engagement with regional and subregional organizations. Moreover, resolution 2171 (2014) called for the promotion of cooperation and building capacities with regional and subregional organizations and arrangements to help in preventing conflicts and their consequences, especially since those regional and subregional organizations and arrangements are more aware of what is happening in their region.

In that regard, we welcome the progress made in forging partnerships between the Security Council and regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements and organizations so as to promote conflict prevention, preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peacebuilding.

Addressing new conflicts and their rapid changes require the Security Council to shoulder its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter and relevant resolutions, which call for the promotion

of partnerships and joint initiatives with regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements and organizations in the context of preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention and conflict resolution through peaceful means. We also call for investing in early-warning systems and in peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations as part of a comprehensive reform agenda. We also call for adopting a comprehensive approach that ensures adaptation with changes in conflicts, as part of the New Agenda for Peace, led by the Secretary-General.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Namibia.

Mr. Gertze (Namibia): Today we meet in the Security Council Chamber in a state of heightened tension amid a perilous war raging in the Middle East. Let us recall that it is this same Chamber that was created with a primary mandate to oversee and pursue the maintenance of international peace and security. This is the organ we look to, to do its best to ensure that dialogue through diplomacy and the facilitation of compromises between parties in conflict situations are the best armaments of peace.

I thank the delegation of Brazil for organizing this open debate on the topic “Peace through dialogue: the contribution of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes”. I also wish to thank the briefers on the important topic.

Our own experience in Namibia has taught us the value of multiple approaches for the attainment of freedom and bringing about an end to colonial rule and occupation. For us, that anchoring is the key example etched in our minds of how diplomacy can facilitate the transition from tension to negotiation and, eventually, lead to peace and reconciliation. That process was neither easy nor swift, but it inculcated in us a spirit of openness to the notion that dialogue and diplomacy can work.

For that reason, article 96 of the Namibian Constitution encourages the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. That is the general disposition of Namibia in any conflict, and we have remained fervent advocates for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In instances where that has proved difficult, we have resorted to the use of systems, processes and institutions at the national, regional and subregional levels. Similarly, we have consented to the jurisdiction

of institutions such as the International Court of Justice. On one occasion, the Court ruled in our favour as it determined the need for the immediate end to our occupation. On another occasion, the Court did not rule in our favour, and we were required to be magnanimous and accept its decision.

The Secretary-General's New Agenda for Peace is commendable. It puts forward several ways in which the driving force for a new multilateralism must be diplomacy. It further recognizes the value of diplomacy as a tool for reducing risks in conflict, on the one hand, and managing heightened fractures, on the other.

Our world continues to evolve through ebbs and flows of polarization. In such a context, we look to the Charter of the United Nations for guidance on how best to embark on the peaceful settlement of disputes. When we find ourselves in times of trouble, we should revert to the deployment of the tools enumerated in Chapter VI as our first line of defence to prevent armed conflict.

Namibia wishes to highlight, however, that the peaceful settlement of disputes, is not a mere lofty ambition. Instead, it requires the setting of conditions that enable dialogue. Additionally, the correct set of players, enablers and interlocutors form the bedrock of success through diplomatic mediation efforts.

For that reason, we commend the efforts of the Egyptian Government and all stakeholders, including the Secretary-General, to initiate the Cairo Peace Summit, to be held tomorrow, bringing to the table a multitude of voices and perspectives on the ongoing crisis in the Middle East. To that end, my delegation encourages regular information-sharing between the Security Council and regional actors to enhance situational awareness and have clarity on nuances that are not obvious.

In conclusion, the events of this week were a stark reminder of the urgent need for the reform of the Security Council, as it is untenable that the Council fails to respond appropriately and with a sense of urgency in times of crisis, especially when civilian lives are at stake.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Ms. Squeff (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, we would like to congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the presidency of the Security Council this month and to commend you and your delegation for

the efforts being undertaken at such a difficult time. In that vein, we welcome the convening of this important open debate.

Conflict prevention is the cornerstone of the peace architecture. The United Nations has long recognized the importance of regional and subregional organizations in conflict prevention, because they have the capacity to complement the work of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, as provided for under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, in which the international community is called on to resort to those fundamental tools in the promotion of and search for peace.

Regional and subregional organizations are in an optimal position to understand the root causes of conflicts and to seek to open the doors for dialogue, given their thorough knowledge of the realities of the region in which they operate. It is within those organizations that the cultural affinities shared by neighbouring countries are best projected, and it is through them that a better framework for the dialogue that is necessary to reach understandings and resolve conflicts can be facilitated. We can reaffirm that with first-hand knowledge in the light of our own history and reality. The subregional processes for building trust in Latin America have allowed us to move from a logic of confrontation to a logic of cooperation, making South America a zone of peace.

The organizations of Latin America and the Caribbean have repeatedly expressed the region's interest in reaching, as soon as possible, a solution to the prolonged sovereignty dispute between Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland over the Malvinas Islands and South Georgia and the Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces, in accordance with the relevant resolutions, and they have supported the legitimate rights of Argentina in that dispute.

Argentina highlights the relevance of the various alternatives adopted at the regional and subregional levels in matters of peace and security, in particular the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace and the positive contribution that those can make to the global peace architecture. Argentina is part of the South Atlantic Peace and Cooperation Zone, which is composed of three South American States — Uruguay, Brazil and Argentina — and 21

African States, and is recognized as such by General Assembly resolution 41/11, of 1986.

Similarly, Latin America and the Caribbean is a zone of peace, which was formally proclaimed during the second Summit of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, held in Havana in January 2014, as well as a zone free of nuclear weapons. It advocates the peaceful resolution of controversies and promotes the application of a system based on friendly relations and cooperation among its member States and with other regions and countries on a reciprocal basis in order to eliminate once and for all the threat and use of force.

Argentina also actively participates in the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, which has maintained a strong commitment to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation since its creation on the basis of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. It also supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the understanding that they make an effective contribution to international peace and security. We also wish to highlight the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials, which celebrates its thirty-second anniversary this year. The Agency is the corollary of a strategic approach and a trust-building process through which Argentina and Brazil signed an agreement on the exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The creation of that binational safeguards institution is unique in the world and allowed the vision of a nuclear-weapon-free Latin America to be consolidated.

While the Council has improved its interactions with regional and subregional organizations over the past two decades, those contacts have not always been utilized in the context of conflict prevention. It is therefore our responsibility to deepen the Council's contribution. The survival of humankind depends on us working together. We need cooperation, not confrontation. Argentina has been and will continue to be a firm supporter of multilateralism and a defender of the use of diplomacy for peace.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Mr. Muhith (Bangladesh): I congratulate Brazil on assuming the presidency of the Security Council this month and commend its successful steering of the work of the Council. I thank the briefers for their insightful presentations.

The debate on peace through dialogue and the contribution of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the prevention and peaceful resolution of disputes could not be timelier, as the Council is convening back-to-back urgent meetings to stop the further escalation of the crisis in Palestine and to save millions of civilians in the Gaza Strip. We have also been witnessing conflicts in different parts of the world that have brought misery to billions of people, especially by causing the deepening financial, food and fuel crises, among other crises.

Our collective experiences show that that there should be no other way to tangibly settle disputes except the approaches mentioned in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations, entitled "Pacific Settlement of Disputes". Therefore, regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements have a critical role to play in the effective implementation of those means of dispute settlement. Allow me to highlight a few points in that regard.

First, regional and subregional arrangements have the potential to find common ground and build trust among the parties to disputes and enable them to meet and continue the necessary dialogue. Regional and subregional organizations remain inherently in a better position to understand the regional and local dynamics and environment in which to promote the best solution and address the root causes of conflict.

In that regard, we wish to make particular reference to resolution 2669 (2022), which acknowledges the role of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in helping to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Myanmar in the interests of the people of Myanmar. We urge ASEAN to redouble its efforts in the implementation of its five-point consensus, and to find a sustainable solution to address the root causes of crisis in Rakhine state and create a conducive environment for the safe, voluntary and sustainable return of the Rohingyas to their homeland of Myanmar.

Secondly, regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements bolster the socioeconomic, cultural and political ties among parties and nations, thereby further contributing to preventive diplomacy, the development of early-warning systems and the creation of environments that are conducive to stability. For example, the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States play a critical role in the peaceful settlement of disputes in the region. We also underscore the potential contribution of the

Organization of Islamic Cooperation to enhancing confidence-building measures among nations.

Thirdly, the Security Council should enhance its engagement with, and support for, regional and subregional organizations in the settlement of disputes. Special political missions also play an important role in connecting regional and subregional organizations with the United Nations and strengthening cooperation in a meaningful way.

Fourthly, the Peacebuilding Commission is a potential platform for transmitting the words and actions of regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements to the Security Council and the General Assembly. It also enables the parties to share their views and opinions and subsequently contribute to building a stronger collective security machinery — one of the action points contained in the New Agenda for Peace.

Finally, I would say that the current dynamics in the world have given a clear indication that strong and effective regional, subregional and bilateral arrangements are indispensable for an effective multilateralism.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Mr. Kimani (Kenya): I would like to congratulate Brazil warmly on its assumption of the presidency for this month. I also thank your delegation, Mr. President, for its determined, cooperative and timely effort to negotiate a resolution on the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question.

We value the Secretary-General's strong endorsement of regional frameworks and entities for maintaining peace. However, let me add a layer of nuance to that applause. The success of arrangements under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations largely hinges on Security Council members' fulfilment of their obligation under the Charter to focus solely on resolving specific threats to international peace. When the Council is fragmented by national interests or is used as a platform for geopolitical rivalries, regional peace initiatives can be weakened or even brought to a standstill. In simpler terms, the Council's internal divisions can sometimes be transferred to those regional efforts, leaving them much like a boat that cannot move forward because its rowers are pulling in different directions. It is also important to recognize that not all regional and defence frameworks contribute positively

to international peace and security. Some may actually heighten risks. We must therefore be discerning in our support, endorsing only those regional arrangements that align with the fundamental values and international laws that underpin the United Nations.

Allow me to make four further recommendations. First, the Security Council presidency can foreground regional experiences and perspectives. Presidents can encourage the Council to conduct on-the-ground assessments jointly with regional entities to generate joint diagnoses of the complex factors leading to conflict.

Secondly, the Council should be a learning environment. More regions should consider adopting a model similar to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa.

Thirdly, the Council should deepen its cooperation with the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), whose inclusive peacebuilding dialogue with regional mechanisms and national actors can produce useful insights. The existing role of informal coordinator between the Council and the PBC should be leveraged ambitiously to enhance the quality of advice that the Commission produces.

Fourthly, in its deliberations and decisions, the Council should consistently consider the interplay between diversity and State-building in the quest for sustainable peace, which represents a key area of alignment between the Council and the PBC. That was the central focus of an open debate we initiated during Kenya's most recent Council presidency in October 2021 (see S/PV.8877). It is imperative that both the Council and regional actors recognize that identity-based conflict is a significant catalyst for violence and that sustainable peace is most achievable when prevention, mediation and post-conflict initiatives actively incorporate the inclusive management of social and cultural differences as a core competence for any effective State.

In conclusion, I commend the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) for its admirable efforts to foster a Haitian-led political process that can lead to an orderly transition for preparing free, fair and credible elections in Haiti. I strongly urge the Council and its individual members to extend their full support to CARICOM and Haiti.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Kanu (Sierra Leone): I thank you, Mr. President, for providing strong leadership of the Security Council, and I would like to commend the presidency of Brazil for its efforts during this difficult moment for the maintenance of international peace and security. Let me also thank the briefers, Assistant Secretary-General Khaled Khiari, former Presidents Michelle Bachelet and Thabo Mbeki, and Ms. Josefina Echavarría Álvarez, for their important contributions, enriching our understanding of the topic of today's debate.

The deepening mistrust of the role of collective security, as that role was envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, has profoundly diminished faith in the ability of the United Nations to respond to the myriad conflicts around the world. The Charter is a living document that provides a forward-looking framework for preventing conflict and the escalation of disputes through various mechanisms for the pacific settlement of disputes, as set out in its Chapter VI.

The catastrophic toll of conflict on human lives — with conflicts unfolding in the Middle East, Ukraine, Somalia, the Sahel, the Great Lakes, the Horn of Africa, the Lake Chad basin and elsewhere — underscores the primacy of dialogue in the search for global peace and security. The path to peace is forged by dialogue and cooperation, which is shaped by mutual trust and a common understanding of the specific concerns and threats from the perspectives of the parties involved in conflicts. To achieve that objective, we need to restore the multilateral rules-based order, underlining the paradigm of coexistence and cooperation, in order to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security.

The complexities and the current frequency of conflicts are requiring actors at the regional, subregional and bilateral levels to take on a greatly enhanced role in the prevention of conflicts and conflict mediation, as provided for in Chapter VIII of the Charter. While the Security Council does bear the primary responsibility for the maintenance of global peace and security, as stipulated in Article 24 of the Charter of the United Nations, in these times the Council has been unable to act promptly, effectively or with unity of purpose. We must therefore reinforce the involvement of regional and subregional arrangements in the peaceful settlement of disputes, including

through conflict prevention, confidence-building and mediation, in view of their existing and potential capabilities and their understanding of the dynamics of regional conflicts. In our subregion, the successful engagements of the Economic Community of West African States in the conflicts in Liberia, Sierra Leone and the Gambia, for instance, illustrate the viability of utilizing subregional frameworks in the search for peace in a particular region. The growing role of the African Union (AU) in peace support operations across Africa, the limitations on its resources notwithstanding, lends credence to the argument in favour of developing effective partnerships between the United Nations and regional arrangements to enable early responses to disputes and emerging crises.

Regional and subregional organizations are well positioned to understand the causes of conflicts, owing to their knowledge of the interests and concerns of the parties to a conflict in their region. They have a better understanding of bilateral relations between countries and are best placed to act as credible mediators in conflict situations. That is further buttressed by the Secretary-General in his policy brief on the New Agenda for Peace, in which he says,

“Regional frameworks and organizations are critical building blocks for the networked multilateralism that I envisage. They are particularly urgent in regions where long-standing security architectures are collapsing or where they have never been built”.

In that regard, the regional economic communities in Africa and the African Union itself have clearly contributed to the maintenance of peace and security in the continent by providing troops for peace support operations, as was the case with the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group in West Africa and the African Union Mission in Somalia. The African Union has also supported mediation efforts in conflicts in Africa through such bodies as UN-Women Africa and the Panel of the Wise. Furthermore, the African Union has set up a peace fund to support peace operations, and the Africa Facility to Support Inclusive Transitions on the continent.

Despite those efforts, the missing link in the puzzle has been and is still the lack of adequate, predictable and sustainable financing for regionally and subregionally led peace support initiatives. We therefore fully subscribe to the proposal of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the African Union, adopted

as a consensus paper, on predictable, adequate and sustainable financing, based on its suggested tripartite actionable funding models, which are United Nations assessed contributions for hybrid missions, assessed contributions through a United Nations support office model and direct support to African Union subregional peace support operations.

There is a need to deepen the cooperation and partnership between the United Nations and the African Union, and in particular between the Security Council and the African Union Peace and Security Council. That should be done across the range of available tools that can make peace sustainable, including conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, sustaining peace and addressing the request for the sustainable financing of AU-led peace support operations, whose importance cannot be overemphasized.

Sierra Leone further underscores the need for continued improvement of the working methods between the two Councils to facilitate regular dialogue and cooperation on capacity-building and mutual strategies for achieving sustainable peace and stability in Africa, especially through regular monthly coordination meetings between the Chair of the AU Peace and Security Council and the President of the United Nations Security Council, as well as undertaking joint field and assessment missions. The consolidation of avenues of cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union is not only needed to sustain peace and security in Africa, but, more broadly, to also address the complex nature of the socioeconomic and other thematic security risks, including climate-induced insecurity, which continues to disproportionately affect Africa.

In Africa's search for home-grown solutions to African challenges, the African Union, in collaboration with subregional organizations in Africa, should continue to focus efforts on the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the AU Agenda 2063 in order to address the root causes of conflict, silence the guns in Africa, address the adverse impact of climate change and build a better and secure future for all Africans.

In conclusion, Sierra Leone is convinced that one of the approaches to resolving ongoing conflicts around the world is to reform the Security Council to reflect present-day geopolitical and regional realities. Its rules and practices should rekindle trust in the United Nations

to make it fit for purpose. There is urgency to redress the historical injustice done to Africa, as that questions the very structural legitimacy of the Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Ugarelli (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): Peru thanks Brazil for organizing today's open debate and for its mention in the concept note (S/2023/732,annex) of the comprehensive and definitive peace agreement signed between Peru and Ecuador in 1998, as a successful example of the peaceful settlement of disputes. We will mark its twenty-fifth anniversary on 26 October. In a process that lasted more than three and a half years, which began with the 1995 Itamaraty Peace Accord and culminated with the signing of the 1998 Brasilia Declaration, we used various tools listed in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations and confidence-building mechanisms. We negotiated directly and bilaterally, and when we were unsuccessful in making progress that way, we turned to the guarantor countries — Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States. They assumed mediation, reconciliation and, towards the end of the process, arbitration roles, always within the context of the provisions of the 1942 Protocol of Peace, Friendship and Boundaries.

The first stage was the establishment of the Ecuador-Peru Military Observer Mission, comprising officials from the guarantor countries, to supervise the ceasefire agreed in 1995 and to prevent future escalation. We then defined the remaining points of impasse and a framework for the substantive discussions required to resolve them. When negotiations stalled, a creative proposal from the guarantor countries allowed us to broaden our perspectives so that, in addition to the issue of the shared land border, we also addressed other issues, such as the freedom of navigation on waterways, border integration and military cooperation. That allowed us to overcome zero-sum logic and reach several agreements in those areas.

Finally, to finalize the demarcation of our shared land border, we requested the guarantor countries to submit a proposal that would help to achieve the objectives of peace, friendship, understanding and goodwill. To that end, our Governments accepted the binding nature of that proposal, with the approval of our respective congresses. That is how we achieved the peace that our peoples now enjoy.

We can list several lessons we can draw from that process that are relevant to today's open debate.

First, it should be recalled that, as Member States, we conferred on the Security Council the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. It is imperative to underscore the fact that the commitment to resolving our international disputes by peaceful means has been assumed by each of the States Members of the United Nations. To that end, we have, first of all, the tools listed in Chapter VI of the Charter, which we can use without the need for our case to be placed on the agenda of the Security Council.

Secondly, in his policy brief entitled "A New Agenda for Peace", the Secretary-General rightly diagnosed the fact that one of our greatest collective shortcomings is the underutilization of the tools for peaceful dispute settlement referred to in Chapter VI of the Charter, specifically in Article 33. But for those tools to be effective, the political will of Member States is required.

Thirdly, bilateral conflicts have a regional impact that can roll back progress made in various areas. The guarantor countries understood that and made every effort to fulfil their role.

The experience of Peru and Ecuador, above and beyond it being a bilateral and regional achievement, shows the entire world what can be achieved when there is political will. Peru reaffirms its commitment to peace and the pacific settlement of disputes and offers its experience in that area. We call upon all Member States to take action in line with the purposes and principles to which we committed when we adopted the Charter. Only in that way can we build a more harmonious and prosperous future for our peoples.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Jamaica.

Mr. Wallace (Jamaica): I have the honour to speak today on behalf of the 14 member States of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM).

We thank you, Mr. President, for convening today's open discussion on the contributions of regional mechanisms for peace and security.

The increased number of conflicts underlies an imperative to ensure that solutions to conflicts, including preventive measures, are durable and inclusive, allowing for pertinent inputs from regional

organizations, regional security mechanisms and other appropriate stakeholders. That is critical for CARICOM. The Latin American and the Caribbean region is known as a "zone of peace", not merely for its proud status as a denuclearized zone but also for its collaborative initiatives, aimed at preserving international peace and security.

Peace and security are important pillars in the foreign policy of CARICOM member States. Within that context, CARICOM continues to seize opportunities within the United Nations and with its bilateral and regional partners to contribute to the global peace and security agenda. Within CARICOM, we regularly convene official ministerial-level and Heads-of-Government-level meetings to discuss issues related to peace and security. Our regional mechanisms include the Implementation Agency for Crime and Security, which has direct responsibility for research, monitoring and evaluation, analysis and project development relating to the implementation of CARICOM's regional security agenda.

In addition to regional cooperation on peace and security, CARICOM member States have collaborated, bilaterally and as a region, with third parties to develop common positions in the First Committee of the General Assembly, as well as in the Security Council, on matters related to peace and security. Our contribution to the international peace and security agenda is evident in the areas of counter-terrorism, nuclear disarmament, small arms and light weapons, weapons of mass destruction and intelligence-sharing with regional and third-party authorities. Our engagements with third parties have also elicited technical assistance and capacity-building for our security systems and infrastructure.

Importantly, we ensure that our approach to pursuing the regional peace and security agenda, including through partnerships with external stakeholders, respects our democratic values and adheres to the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

One of the key security issues for CARICOM is our work with the international community to bring peace, stability and sustainable development to Haiti, our sister member State. Through collaboration within CARICOM, we have pursued advocacy for the adoption of resolution 2699 (2023), which, among other things, authorizes the deployment of a Multinational Security Support Mission to Haiti to assist the Haitian

National Police in re-establishing security and bringing a reasonable level of stability to the situation on the ground, and we thank our partners in Kenya for their leadership on that issue.

In that regard, we once again thank members of the Security Council for heeding that call. Not only has that critical decision provided valuable support to the Government of Haiti, but it also assists all CARICOM members in safeguarding the regional security environment from those who may seek to exploit security loopholes in conflict areas. As small island developing States, we are very cognizant that instability in one CARICOM country can destabilize the entire region.

I take this opportunity to underscore the importance of deepening cooperation between the international community and regional security mechanisms in CARICOM and the provision of technical assistance and capacity-building to our regional mechanisms, with a view to sustaining our collective objective of securing peace and security in the region.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mrs. Jiménez Alegría (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is through dialogue, the exchange of ideas, the exercise of listening to other points of view, that peace is built. The peaceful settlement of disputes is nothing other than the acceptance of the other as one accepts oneself.

Latin America and the Caribbean is a region characterized by its commitment to multilateral diplomacy and the use of good offices, mediation and jurisdictional institutions to settle its differences.

To give one example, it was in Central America that the first standing international tribunal, the Central American Court of Justice, was created at the beginning of the twentieth century by the Washington Peace Conference to resolve conflicts in the subregion. That position in favour of the peaceful settlement of disputes was further consolidated in 1948 with the signing of the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement, known as the Pact of Bogota.

Similarly, in the past decade, our region has appealed 15 times to the International Court of Justice, which demonstrates the confidence placed in the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. In the inter-American context, solid institutions have been

established, especially for the protection of human rights. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights have become indispensable points of reference at the national, regional and international levels and guarantors of democracy and the rule of law.

Mexico reiterates its support for the work of the International Court of Justice, which, as a universal tribunal, plays a fundamental role in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Therefore, since 1947, we have recognized its compulsory jurisdiction. Taking into account the central role of the International Court of Justice, both in contentious and advisory matters, it is surprising that, to date, only 74 States have accepted the jurisdiction of the Court, including only one permanent member of the Security Council. We therefore solemnly call on those that have not yet done so to take that important step in favour of ensuring peace through the law.

In that connection, Mexico supports the declaration on promoting the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, an initiative of Romania. And we will continue to promote the inclusion of jurisdictional clauses in favour of the International Court of Justice in the multilateral treaties that we are negotiating. A cursory review of the most recent cases that have been referred to the International Court of Justice shows the importance of having such jurisdictional clauses to activate the jurisdiction of the supreme global tribunal.

In line with its desire to serve the best causes of humankind, Mexico has offered its evidence and its experience in the peaceful settlement of disputes, which in the 1980s brought extremely positive results for the pacification of Central America within the framework of the efforts of the Contadora Group. In recent years, as host of the agreement signed in 2021 with the facilitation of Norway, Mexico has reactivated the negotiation and dialogue process between the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the opposition grouped in the Unitary Platform of Venezuela which resulted, just a few days ago, in very important agreements. Mexico is also one of the guarantor countries of the peace dialogue between the Government of Colombia and the Ejército de Liberación Nacional and will host the fifth round of talks.

The international community is at a historic juncture in which today more than ever it must reaffirm and strengthen the rule of law and commit to the peaceful

settlement of disputes. Mexico once again reaffirms its commitment to international law, multilateralism and dialogue. Ultimately, it is by talking to one another that people can reach an understanding.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Algeria.

Mr. Bendjama (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, once again on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I would also like to thank Mr. Thabo Mbeki, former President of South Africa; Ms. Michelle Bachelet, former President of Chile; Mr. Khaled Khiari, Assistant Secretary-General for the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific; and Ms. Josefina Echavarría Álvarez for their introductory briefings for our open debate today.

My delegation would like to underscore the following.

First, the resolution of conflicts by peaceful means has always been rooted in the founding principles of Algerian diplomacy. We are convinced that dialogue, mediation and negotiation are not just tools for resolving conflicts but also a means of preventing other crises. Algeria's contribution to crisis resolution in its immediate environment — be it within the framework of the African Union, the United Nations or even bilateral — has always been based on the primacy of dialogue and negotiation.

As is well known, in 2015, my country embarked on an arduous mediation process between the Malian parties, which culminated in the signing of the Agreement on Peace and Reconciliation in Mali. The Agreement Monitoring Committee was able to establish direct and regular channels of communication between the Malian parties, which have preserved the cessation of hostilities for eight long years. That framework remains available and at the disposal of our Malian brothers when they wish to resolve their current differences and resume the path of dialogue, in particular in the context of the withdrawal of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali. Algeria will always remain at the disposal of its Malian brothers.

As part of the African Union's efforts, Algeria is also advocating a process of national reconciliation in Libya. My country, through the African Union Ad Hoc High-level Committee on Libya, is working to contribute to efforts to organize a Libyan national

reconciliation conference, which will be essential to unifying the structures of the Libyan State and healing the wounds of its people.

Similarly, my country, faithful to the founding principles of its diplomacy, has advocated a political solution to the institutional crisis in the Niger and has rejected all foreign military intervention in the country. My country will always extend its hand to its brothers in the Niger to return to the path of national reconciliation.

Cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations, in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter, is key to the success of our joint action. In that regard, the partnership between the African Union and the United Nations is a strategic one based on complementarity and comparative advantages. The signing of the Common Framework for an Enhanced Partnership for Peace and Security in 2017 contributed to the intensification of joint efforts to address complex peace and security challenges on our continent.

The annual consultations between the two main organs responsible for peace and security, namely, the United Nations Security Council and the African Union Peace and Security Council, on all current issues is the embodiment of the desire, on both sides, to move forward to strengthen common understanding and joint responses. Those consultations are expected to be strengthened to go beyond their role of factual and descriptive observation of developments in the security situation on the continent.

The theme chosen for this open debate provides us with an opportunity to discuss the crucial issue of financing peace support operations led by the African Union. On that point, I would like to refer to the remarks of the Secretary-General, Mr. António Guterres, to the Council last April, who underlined:

“the need for a new generation of peace-enforcement missions and counter-terrorist operations, led by regional forces, with guaranteed, predictable funding”.

In saying that, he also noted that the African Union is an obvious partner in that regard. My country fully supports that vision, which adheres to the spirit of the African consensus document. The current challenge for the African Union and for the United Nations lies in agreeing on a common interpretation of the spirit of Chapter VIII, while enshrining the primacy of the role of the Security Council in preserving peace and

international security. Such a principle should give African peace support operations, authorized by the Security Council, full access to statutory contributions from the United Nations.

In conclusion, our joint efforts must not lose sight of the essential nature of investing more in crisis prevention. On that subject, my country is convinced that underdevelopment is the root cause of internal conflicts. It is with that objective that my country is working to organize an international conference on development in the Sahel. In that fraternal effort to eradicate poverty and underdevelopment, the President of the Republic, Mr. Abdelmadjid Tebboune, decided to mobilize \$1 billion for the financing of development projects on the African continent as a strong signal of Algeria's commitment to lasting peace in Africa.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Musayev (Azerbaijan): At the outset, we would like to commend Brazil for having convened this important meeting.

Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and subregional arrangements under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations is essential for the promotion of the purposes and principles of the Organization. Such cooperation does not take place in a legal vacuum. Regional, subregional and bilateral efforts should be based, first and foremost, on respect for international law, impartiality and the consent of the parties concerned.

Azerbaijan's experience of nearly 30 years of occupation of its sovereign territories by neighbouring Armenia, in blatant violation of the United Nations Charter, international law and the relevant Security Council resolutions, is an illustration and reminder of the need to do much more at the regional and international levels to confront the misinterpretation of international law and to safeguard the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

The international community failed to prevent the aggression, ethnic cleansing and atrocity crimes against Azerbaijan and our people and to ensure the implementation of its own decisions. The mediation efforts conducted within the framework of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe yielded no results. Double standards and selectivity with regard to international law and attempts to maintain "a

reasonable balance", instead of calling a spade a spade, only emboldened the aggressor.

Hoping for endless impunity, Armenia never engaged faithfully in the peace process and instead directed all its efforts at colonizing the occupied territories of Azerbaijan, under the cover of the ceasefire and the peace process, and effectively prevented international access to those territories for almost 30 years. The defeat of that policy was inevitable. By the fall of 2020, when the hostilities resumed, the situation was indicative of the absence of other reasonable means of bringing the aggression and occupation to an end, rendering the use of force in self-defence the *ultima ratio*. As a result of the 44-day war, Azerbaijan liberated more than 300 cities, towns and villages from occupation. Azerbaijan fought not against a fictitious entity or civilian residents, as Armenia falsely claims, but against the regular armed forces of Armenia, as well as terrorist and mercenary groups under its command and control.

Despite the post-conflict peace prospects and the efforts made to that end with the facilitation of international partners, Armenia has opted for maintaining territorial claims, refusing to completely withdraw its armed forces from the territory of Azerbaijan, further inciting violent ethnic separatism in my country and increasing armed provocations on the ground. On 19 and 20 September, following new deadly terrorist acts that caused numerous casualties among our civilians and military, Azerbaijan undertook local counter-terrorism measures against the Armenian armed forces illegally deployed and present on the territory of Azerbaijan. Those measures were carried out in full accordance with the rights and responsibilities vested in States under the United Nations Charter and international law, and in strict compliance with international humanitarian law. They lasted less than 24 hours and culminated in the dissolution of the former occupation regime and its structures and the surrender and disarmament of the Armenian armed forces on the territory of Azerbaijan.

At this critical juncture, we expect the international community to encourage Armenia to strictly abide by its international obligations, cease and desist from disinformation and misinformation and engage faithfully in efforts to build peace and stability in the region.

Attempts by some non-regional States to impose the experience of their colonial past and present on the South Caucasus and expand their xenophobic policies in the region, including by arming Armenia and supporting its hate propaganda, do not serve peace. Azerbaijan is firm in its determination to further advance peacebuilding, reconciliation, reintegration and development in the region, as well as to ensure justice and prevent and repel any threats to the safety and well-being of its people and the State's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Pieris (Sri Lanka): The founding fathers of the United Nations established the Organization with the purposes of maintaining international peace and security, of developing friendly relations among nations and of taking other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace. They also wished to achieve international cooperation in solving economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems and to promote respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all. The political, military, economic, ecological, social and cultural environment in which the United Nations operates has changed considerably over the years and continues to evolve, both globally and regionally.

The maintenance of international peace and security is a critical objective of the United Nations and of the Security Council, its principal body for such action. In pursuing that objective of maintaining international peace and regional security, we see the United Nations feverishly working to prevent and resolve conflicts, promote disarmament and non-proliferation and support post-conflict reconstruction and reconciliation.

Overall, the maintenance of international peace and security — including regional security — is essential for the promotion of human rights, sustainable development and the well-being of people around the world. It is therefore noteworthy that the United Nations has been seen to continuously strive to promote world peace and security through its various programmes and initiatives by way of its numerous agencies. We appreciate that it is impossible to completely eradicate conflict and violence in the world. However, the United Nations has made significant efforts to address various global challenges and promote peaceful resolutions to conflicts through its regional mechanisms, including

alternative methods of dispute resolution, as part of its mandate for the pacific settlement of disputes. Article 52 of the Charter of the United Nations makes it incumbent upon the Security Council to encourage the pacific settlement of disputes through regional agencies, either on the initiative of the State concerned or by a referral by the Council itself — the principal organ being the International Court of Justice, which settles disputes or delivers advisory opinions, which have contributed to peace among nations.

The question has been asked as to whether the Security Council can do more to promote world peace and security, particularly as the main organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. It has been said that the Security Council can do more by taking a proactive approach to conflict prevention, rather than just responding to already ongoing conflicts. That could involve early-warning mechanisms and preventative diplomacy to address conflicts before they escalate. It is believed that, in addition, the Security Council and regional mechanisms could work to address the root causes of conflict, such as poverty, inequality and political instability, through long-term development initiatives.

In the final analysis, it must be accepted — without demur — that while the Security Council has made significant efforts to promote world peace and security, there is always room for improvement, and the Council can do more to address the changing nature of conflict and security threats in the world.

The permanent members of the Security Council cannot be seen as derogating from their sacred obligation and trust to ensure world peace. As we know, they command unparalleled influence over global security issues and the ability to veto draft resolutions. They indeed have a critical role as trustees of global security to play that central part in bringing about a settlement global and regional conflicts. To that end, we hold the Security Council to that sacred duty to engage in proactive diplomacy; to offer its expertise and resources to mediate; to offer incentives to the parties to encourage them to engage in negotiations and make concessions; to provide financial and technical support to initiatives aimed at peacebuilding and reconciliation, which can help strengthen local and regional mechanisms, promote civil society engagement and facilitate people-to-people dialogue; and finally, to collectively and individually reaffirm their commitment

to international law, including the relevant United Nations resolutions, and ensure their implementation.

We therefore call upon the five permanent members to collectively and individually demonstrate a strong commitment to the resolution of global conflicts and work constructively towards negotiated settlements of global disputes. Their leadership, influence and resources can make a significant contribution to creating conditions for just and lasting peace.

It has been said that the world is in need of an all-encompassing — and, of course, just and humane — order in the light of which the rights of all are preserved and peace and security are safeguarded. It is in our interest, and for the sake of our survival, that the Security Council does not lose sight of that goal.

As someone said, when it comes to geopolitics or local politics, conflict resolution and peacekeeping skills, it is best to forget about such illusory abstractions as east and west or north and south, race and sexual orientation, and to realize who we really are and why we are really here. All of us here are really here to ensure peace for the global community. We owe it to ourselves and to the global communities we represent.

The President: The representative of Pakistan has asked for the floor to make a further statement. I now give him the floor.

Mr. Sarwani (Pakistan): My delegation is compelled to take the floor again to make a brief comment in response to the statement made by the representative of India.

The greatest falsehood we just heard is that Jammu and Kashmir is part of India. Jammu and Kashmir is an internationally recognized disputed territory and is not at all a so-called “integral part of India”. Repeating a wrong position will not make it acceptable at any point or in any forum. In all its resolutions on the subject, the Security Council has decided that the final disposition of Kashmir shall be determined by its people through a United Nations-supervised plebiscite.

India accepted that decision and is bound to comply with it in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Contrary to the comment made, Jammu and Kashmir is completely relevant to today’s debate in the Council. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute has been on the Council’s agenda for more than 75 years. It is the responsibility of the Council to implement its own resolutions.

Instead of crying foul all the time — if India had any respect for the United Nations Charter and international law, or moral courage — it should stop its reign of terror, withdraw its troops and let the Kashmiris freely decide their future in accordance with Security Council resolutions. Pakistan has and will continue to highlight the continued repression against the people of the Indian illegally occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

The President: I shall now make a further statement in my capacity as the representative of Brazil.

I would like to thank all Council members and other delegations for their participation at today’s signature event proposed by the Brazilian presidency. I think we had an extensive and valuable presentation of multiple views and good experiences as regards the topic proposed for our discussion — a very timely debate on the contributions of regional, subregional and bilateral mechanisms and initiatives that help enhance peace and security. We say today from various angles that there is hope for peace and security around the world. Let us hope that this discussion will enlighten our debates in the Council and, most of all, drive our actions in facing the growing challenges to peace and security in our times.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.