

*(Check against delivery)*

**STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR GERT ROSENTHAL  
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GUATEMALA TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
WRAP-UP SESSION OF THE WORK OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL  
DURING THE CURRENT MONTH  
(30 APRIL 2013)**

Mr. President,

Guatemala understands that the purpose of this exercise is not to repeat our positions on each one of the agenda items examined during the month, but rather to make a quick balance of achievements and shortcomings in our work, as well as its impact in the field. In this respect, I would like to start by congratulating you, Ambassador Gasana, and all your team, for what we consider a well-run stewardship of the Council during the month of April. We are very grateful to Rwanda for this.

This month was notable due to what we accomplished and also for what we failed to accomplish. In addition, we began a conversation between us with conceptual overtones, which will surely continue to evolve in the coming months. I will briefly refer to the three aspects: achievements, failures and the formulation of policies.

Regarding achievements, I would like to highlight the Briefing on Peace and Security in Africa, with its focus on the prevention of conflicts. The significance that it was precisely Rwanda, which underwent its own conflict with horrendous consequences, who organized this interesting briefing, was not lost on anyone; the session gave rise to a Presidential Statement which, although questioned by us on one particular aspect, contains a text that we highly value. We also appreciate the fact that the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Rwanda presided not only the mentioned briefing, but also the open debate on women, peace and security.

The month of April, added to the last week of March, will also be recorded in the annals of this Council due to the approval of two high-profile peacekeeping operations, which contain novel elements of cooperation with regional partners. I am referring, of course, to resolution 2098 (2013), adopted on 28 March, which contains a new approach to the Democratic Republic of Congo, in support of the Framework for the Peace, Security and Cooperation of that country, and to resolution 2100 (2013), adopted last week, which creates a complex and multidimensional operation for Mali. As if this were not enough, we also began our analysis of the presence of a more complex UN political mission in Somalia, as a complement to the African Union Mission, and we held consultations on some important progress in the situation between Sudan and South Sudan.

As to the failures, the name of Syria stands out. The humanitarian situation of Syrians is ever more desperate, as we were eloquently informed during a briefing by OCHA, UNHCR and other officials of the Secretariat. We also received a briefing from Lakhdar Brahimi, his first since last January, who shared his frustration with us at the lack of progress in the search for a political transition that would put an end to violence. Although we have other frustration, as would be the case of Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic, it is Syria that stands out as the empty drawer in our agenda since Guatemala participates in the work of this Council.

Finally, as to the conceptual debate, it was during the month of April that the discussion among us intensified, regarding the meaning of robust operations for peacekeeping. It will be recalled that first in the DRC, at the end of March, and then in Mali, a few days ago, we have incorporated elements of peace

enforcement -- meaning, offensive activities – which raise important questions. The main one is defining the limits between peacekeeping and peace enforcement; in other words, the limits between adhering to or contravening the basic principles of the United Nations' practice, in that the blue helmets should be perceived as impartial, and that they will not resort to force except in self-defense. In our case, when joining the consensus in approving the so-called "Intervention Brigade" in the DRC, expressed in our explanation of vote that: "As a matter of principle, when armed insurgent groups challenge the State of the host country, we believe that the Mission of the United Nations must offer its good offices, its mediation, and even a pro-active stance to resolve the dispute. But its presence must be perceived by all parties as one of an honest broker, and not as a potential party to conflict." How to distinguish between conventional peacekeeping troops and "parallel" and specialized brigades? Are we going to expose our peacekeeping troops to engage militants, rebels or terrorists? And, if in the affirmative, what political and legal consequences does such a decision entail? These questions still do not have definitive answers, but they were the object of our deliberations during the month, in our meeting rooms and also in the informal retreat held a few days ago.

We are therefore confident that we will be able to continue building on the legacy left by the Rwandan presidency, both in focusing on policies, as well as increasing our achievements and overcoming our failures.

Thank you.