

**Security Council Open Debate on the Maintenance of International Peace and Security:
Interdependence Between Security and Development**
11th February 2011, Security Council Chamber (GA-TSC-01)

Statement by H.E. Mr. Jarmo Viinanen, Permanent Representative of Finland to the United Nations.

On behalf of the Nordic countries, let me start by thanking the delegation of Brazil for convening today's important debate.

The Millennium Declaration (General Assembly resolution 55/2) and World Summit Outcome document (General Assembly resolution 60/1) specifically address the interlinkages between peace and security, human rights and development. One pillar is not sustainable without the two others. We need an approach that places the security of people before institutions and mandates

Human rights violations are at the root of many conflicts. The protection and promotion of all human rights must remain at the core of our responses. The Council itself has recognized the importance of human rights to peace and security. As efforts are made to strengthen the linkages between security and development, it is crucial to ensure that all actors integrate human rights into their efforts.

National ownership needs to be emphasized. Lasting peace and long-term development cannot be imposed. National capacities for setting development priorities following an armed conflict are often weak. War-torn societies need assistance in restoring trust and in addressing key concerns, such as building credible security, strengthening the rule of law and facilitating economic recovery.

Engaging women in all efforts is essential. Despite women's involvement in peace initiatives, they are too often excluded from peace negotiations. That undermines efforts to achieve long-term peace. The empowerment of women is a precondition for long-term development and peace.

The peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations was set up to address the gap between stabilization and long-term development. Too often, however, the lack of synchronization between peacekeeping operations and development programmes leads to a failure to deliver. I would like to point out three challenges in that respect.

First, as the mandates of United Nations bodies are not likely to change significantly, we should ask ourselves how the United Nations can work better using the existing tools and deal with the shortcomings. In that regard, we look forward to the recommendations of the review of civilian capacities and their swift implementation. For the United Nations system as a whole, we must do more to advance integration, coordination and delivering as one. The current structure is often a disincentive to coordination. Human resources management policies, financial regulations and audit and investigation rules are some of the issues that we need to address. We must engage the Bretton Woods institutions more closely and strategically. We believe that the 2011 World Development Report will provide good insight in our ongoing discussions. Coherence can be achieved only if we, as donors and Member States, practice what we preach. We must ensure that mandated tasks are properly funded to allow for their full implementation.

Secondly, Council mandates should not be overloaded. That includes an honest assessment of the role of the mission and of which tasks would be better undertaken by other United Nations entities or partners. Mandates must be matched by resources. Peacekeeping missions have become integrated and multifunctional. They have broader mandates and last longer than in the past. A telling example in that regard are elections, which were an exit point in the earliest missions and have now become a benchmark for most. Peacekeeping today includes peacebuilding. There is a limit to what peacekeepers can and should do, and to the role of other actors. Nevertheless, it is in the interest of the Council that a mission be sufficiently equipped to support efforts for achieving the level of stability necessary for a handover to peacebuilding and development actors.

Thirdly, there should be room for closer interaction between the Council and development partners. The Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific configuration should be invited to the Council when a country on the Council's agenda is also on the agenda of the Commission. One should also consider other options for engaging non-members of the Council beyond consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries.

We need an approach that is centred on the security and safety of individuals. Our success or failure is measured by how much we manage to reduce vulnerabilities and increase the opportunities for people affected by conflict. The conflict in South Sudan will serve as an important test case. We hope that the United Nations can deliver a coordinated, cohesive and efficient response in support of a people that has suffered from decades of armed violence and poverty.