



Intervention by H.E. Mr. Nirupam Sen, Permanent Representative of India at the Informal Consultations of the Plenary on the Revised Draft Outcome Document of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly (Cluster I) on July 28, 2005

Mr. President,

We salute you for your leadership and thank you for your transparency and inclusiveness. We shall follow your advice to be interactive.

We appreciate the increased coverage of development issues in the Outcome Document. We do not intend to repeat what we have said in earlier statements or what has been said by colleagues or that which may be in the Outcome Document with which we are in agreement. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to specific suggestions giving the rationale where necessary.

The MDGs embody a quantifiable vision of human dignity and solidarity and of certain important economic and social rights. In this sense, they carry forward the right to development. Respect for all human rights, including the right to development, should, therefore, form an integral part of the values and principles.

We agree with the delegation that said that Charter values and principles should not be mixed with understandings and agreements reached subsequently. You, Mr. President, have also sought our views on para 4. As a compromise between what this delegation has correctly said and the ducks and drakes that the drafters have played with para 4, it would be better to adhere to the language of para 4 of the Millennium Declaration which has been suggested by G-77 as 4 bis in their written submission of July, 2005.

We agree that global economic governance is as important as good national governance. An important component of this is corporate social responsibility. To para 20 bullet 3, we would propose an addition on the lines of para 45 of the Sao Paulo consensus. We would be happy to supply language separately.

The delegation that spoke before me said that we should not pre-judge the negotiations in the WTO, including the Hong Kong meeting. We have no wish to pre-judge if only, in the biblical phrase, not to be pre-judged ourselves. The idea is not to pre-judge but for the Summit to give political guidance to the WTO Hong Kong meeting. The delegation also spoke of generosity. The developing countries are looking not for generosity but for fairness. To continue the biblical phrase, they are looking not for the Pasture but the Presence. In the first bullet of para 24 on trade, we would like to include specific mention of a special safeguard mechanism, substantial reduction of trade distorting domestic support and elimination of export subsidies by developed countries in the agriculture sector and a successful resolution of outstanding implementation issues. I would support my colleague who urged the inclusion of the principle of special and differential treatment, adding that this is particularly necessary in the case of agriculture and non-agricultural market access. We must remember that as early as UNCTAD of 1964, it was stated that "any definition must provide for elimination of all forms of discrimination, even those arising from so-called equal treatment. Treatment must be fair and fairness is not equality; fairness is the inequality needed to enable exploited peoples to attain an acceptable standard of living." You will notice, Mr. President, that my colleague and I are on the same side on development though on opposite sides on some institutional issues and I cannot resist noting that is being on our side on these issues would have brought him closer to achieving the developmental goals in which he believes.

The huge inequality of wealth, the unfair system of voting in IMF, the control of markets and media by the rich and powerful produce not an international democratic governance but an international dictatorial governance. On the one hand, globalization means high interest rates and on the other, low deficits. Both reduce economic activity as well as social expenditure. At the same time, terms of trade move against primary commodities and debt service obligations remain high. In this context, IMF restructuring and conditionalities promote agri-exports at the cost of food-grains, leading to lower food availability and famines. Therefore, reform of the IMF is a must and we need to tackle the central structural issue of voting power. Therefore, in para 26, we would suggest adding after Bretton Woods institutions "through addressing the central structural issue of voting power". Without concretely addressing the systemic issue, we would not be able to achieve developmental goals. One cannot simply replace a piece of machinery in the factory and carry on as before. As we have been telling our colleague mentioned earlier and his friends, what is needed is a complete shift of power.

Another fundamental issue that has not been appropriately addressed is equitable access to natural resources which is seriously hampered by unsustainable patterns of production and consumption in the developed world. Threats to the global environment primarily emanate from these. This needs to be clearly reflected with the logical conclusion (in the chapeau of para 33 after "sustainable production and consumption patterns") "with developed countries taking the lead and with all countries benefiting from the process". Keynes had said that in the long run we shall all be dead. He forgot that unless we do something about the long run, we shall be dead in the short run. Therefore, in paragraph 33, at the end of bullet 6, we would like to add "as well as the long term reconstruction and rehabilitation needs of the affected countries" (so important for small islands developing states).

We welcome the emphasis provided by the revised outcome document to the special needs of Africa. We note that the document emphasizes the strengthening of cooperation with NEPAD through coherent support for the programme drawn up by African leaders. We have consistently held that Africa knows its own challenges best as well as the solutions to those challenges. African countries have already demonstrated their commitment to advancing the implementation of NEPAD. Africa needs support for the solutions that have been identified.

According to relatively recent statistics, 29 OECD countries spent \$ 550 billion on R&D – more than the combined economic output of the world's 30 poorest countries. There are more telephone lines in Manhattan than in the whole of Africa. Without the use of science and technology to bridge this divide, development goals cannot be achieved. A Technology Fund is, therefore, called for. At the turn of the century, the debt service payments by developing countries amounted to \$ 78 billion. Through the mechanism of grant/debt write off a swap of only 1.3 per cent of this debt service would raise 1 billion for technology research. Similarly, to check the misuse of biogenetic resources of developing countries, the UN should take the lead in creating a traditional knowledge and resources digital library linked to the international patent specification systems. An important reason for the economic gap we have referred to is technology restriction and technology denial regimes. Integration of the development dimension in the rule making process in the IPR regime so as to facilitate transfer of technology to developing countries needs to be clearly addressed and spelt out. This can be included at the end of bullet 2 of para 37.

In the interest of brevity, Mr. President, we shall separately submit our written suggestions on the text of the Outcome Document.

Thank you, Mr. President.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)