



**STATEMENT BY MR. NIRUPAM SEN, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE, ON THE REPORT OF THE IGH LEVEL PANEL ON THREATS, CHALLENGES AND CHANGE AT THE INFORMAL MEETING OF THE PLENARY OF THE 59<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON JANUARY 27, 2005-01-27**

Mr. President,

We join other delegations in expressing our appreciation to you for your initiative in convening this informal meeting of the General Assembly for an exchange of views on the report of the High Level Panel set up by the UN Secretary-General on Threats, Challenges and Change. We broadly associate ourselves with the statements made by the Chairman of NAM and the Chairman of G-77. We consider the Panel's report to be an important input in our journey towards the Major Event for review of the implementation of the Millennium Declaration and commemoration of the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, in September 2005. We believe that the Report of the Panel and the Millennium Project report by Prof. Jeffrey Sachs will assist us in making effective and meaningful decisions. We await the report of the Secretary-General in March, 2005 on the comprehensive review of the implementation of the Millennium Declaration that would provide Member States with his views prior to the in-depth inter-governmental scrutiny and consideration of the recommendations of the Panel.

There is an expectation that the UN would safeguard the interests of the developing countries which constitute the vast majority of its membership. The insecurities of this vast majority relate to the problems of socio-economic development, particularly the eradication of poverty and the development of social infrastructure, especially education and public health. Collective security that is truly for all cannot be so unless it addresses the insecurity of this vast majority. The Tsunami tragedy has once again brought home to all the value of collective action and international solidarity. Even in the case of threats in their more limited meaning, the High Level Panel Report has to conclude that these cannot be met either in isolation or by States alone but require global cooperative action.

We firmly believe that development is required not for the sake of security but for itself. In human history threats have come not from the poor, but from the rich, from their fear of the poor, their repressive anticipatory action against the poor. Whenever the poor have acted decisively, whatever the short-term impact, in the long-term international stability has been strengthened. If the poor were indeed the source of long-term instability, every religion would not especially bless them. Development is required so that people do not lead diminished lives in poverty, hunger, disease and illiteracy. The Millennium Project Report provides a valuable strategy for achieving the Millennium Development Goals but does not fully meet this concern

because it sees development purely from an anti-poverty, country-related perspective for achieving MDGs. Developed countries must achieve the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for ODA. The developmental agenda of the Doha Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations has to be realised (at present a complex undertaking in many sectors). However, the fundamental issue is the recovery by the United Nations of its role in setting the international economic agenda which it could till the mid-Seventies. The long retreat since then with the exception of the possible rearguard action of Monterrey, has to be halted and reversed.

We have noticed, particularly in recent years, that in practice, the developmental activities of the UN have diminished while the regulatory and punitive aspects have acquired prominence. The developing countries are the target of many of these actions which has led to a sense of alienation among the majority of the UN Member States. There is a need to bring a greater balance in the UN's priorities in order to reflect the concerns of the majority of its membership. This is also seen in the distortions in the financing of the UN. The regular budget is shrinking while donors are increasingly funding specific activities through ad-hoc voluntary contributions. This has also resulted in distortion of priorities and a donor-driven, rather than a UN-driven, agenda.

A fundamental issue that the Panel has not adequately examined is that equitable access to natural resources is seriously hampered by the unsustainable patterns of production and consumption in the developed world. Threats to the global environment primarily emanate from such unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and these need to be clearly spelt out and addressed, with the recognition that the developed countries must shoulder the main responsibility for preventing and reversing environmental degradation.

The report has rightly identified International Terrorism as one of the most difficult and significant threats facing the International community. The Panel has emphasised the need for better counter-terrorism instruments. In this framework, it has underlined the political imperative of achieving a Comprehensive Convention on Terrorism (CCIT). As the Member State that had tabled the draft Comprehensive Convention of International Terrorism in 1996, we hope that the Member-States would demonstrate the necessary political will and flexibility for an early conclusion of the CCIT.

The Panel has also drawn attention to the dangers inherent in the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and the possible links with terrorism, but we believe missed out a clear reaffirmation of the international community's accepted goal of general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament in a time-bound manner under effective international control. The responsibility of the Nuclear Weapon States in bringing about the complete elimination of nuclear weapons through negotiations has also not been referred to. In the field of proliferation, while the focus of the Panel is on recipients, there is an absence of adequate attention on the sources or the supply side from which such proliferation has emanated.

The Report pays inadequate attention to the role of the General Assembly. In our assessment, it is the General Assembly, the only universal body of the United Nations which must be revitalized to enable it to guide and direct the other organs of the system. In doing so, the General Assembly would be fully exercising its functions envisaged under Article 10 of the Charter. The coincidence of long-term development and long-term security needs relating to post-conflict peace-building, including in its institutional form, are best addressed by the General Assembly. In general, the Security Council is neither mandated nor equipped to handle economic and social issues. This revitalisation of the General Assembly is a matter of both

theory and praxis: by actually electing permanent members of the Security Council, it would make clear their accountability.

The UN Security Council reflects essentially the world of 1945. The world of Yalta and Potsdam has crumbled outside but is artificially being kept alive through the UN. Those who were vanquished, colonized, marginalized in 1945 continue to be excluded though they have come into their own with a demonstrable capacity of contributing to peace and security. Expansion of the permanent together with the non-permanent membership is not a matter of arithmetical sophistry but of two clear issues for the majority of the vulnerable and developing world. Firstly, the Security Council's legislative decisions and those on the use of force under Chapter-VII appear as an arbitrary and alien power: this is an alienation not of the individual or class but of countries. Secondly, there is no radical advance of the core political and economic interests of the developing countries. These two concerns cannot be met either through an expansion of non-permanent membership or making even this third class through a second tier of rotating members. Non-permanent membership for more than half a century has not been able to address either these issues or the vulnerability of the vast majority, precisely because it lacks the continuity and institutional memory of permanent membership. The inclusion of major developing countries from Asia, Africa and Latin America and new players from the developed world who are capable of global responsibility is necessary to transform the balance of forces in favour of the political and economic concerns of the vast majority. On its part, India has expressed its readiness to undertake its responsibility as a global player in an expanded Security Council. We will work together with Brazil, Germany, Japan and Africa in our quest to make the Security Council more representative, democratic, legitimate and effective. Effectiveness is also not an arithmetical concept but one of responsible and rational decisions that would have wide acceptability. Developing countries including small and vulnerable countries have many creative ideas, as we saw in Mauritius, on transparency and working methods. These can become a material force when there are permanent members to carry them out.

There is an apprehension among many developing countries that the interpretation of the Report of the Panel on Article 51 of the Charter on the use of force could encourage selective and politically motivated actions. Member States would need to carefully examine this recommendation to ensure that it is not utilized for actions that could go beyond the scope of its application under the Charter.

We believe that there is also a need to look at other approaches that are not solely limited to the paradigm of conflict or security. The UN and the international community should strengthen and promote democratic regimes. We take positive note of the role envisaged for the UN in the Panel's report in developing frameworks to protect democratically elected Governments from unconstitutional overthrow. A mature democracy can effectively address and efficiently resolve both its internal and external issues.

Mr. President,

**We need not just development for security but development in itself; not just non-proliferation but disarmament; not just the security of the few but the security of all; not just the vigour of one body but the reform and revitalization of all bodies; not just the use of force but its minimization through rational decisions and their wider acceptability; not consensus at the lowest level of its least meaningful common denominator but the broadest possible agreement on key issues at their most meaningful, enabling translation into effective practice.**

Mr. President,

My delegation reiterates its readiness to work with other delegations in ensuring effective and meaningful decisions on the Report of the Panel. We assure you of our cooperation in this endeavour.

Thank you, Mr. President.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)