



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 IV) on August 2, 2005

Mr. President,

I would like to join other delegations in complimenting you on the manner in which you have conducted these discussions and on your leadership.

- In earlier statements, my delegation has emphasised the importance that we attach to institutional changes for strengthening the United Nations. The touchstone for these changes would be the enhanced responsiveness of the organization and the UN system to the needs and concerns of the developing countries, apart from their ability to meet challenges of the coming years.
- On the proposed Human Rights Council, we would reiterate that the challenge before us is to design a body that would move away or reduce the politicisation and divisiveness that has beset the Commission on Human Rights. The Council should be a shield for people not a sword of coercion against countries. We agree that the Council should be established as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and its members elected directly by the General Assembly on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. We are not sure whether paragraph 131 on the mandate of the proposed Council encompasses all the elements that are required or whether those listed there are practicable and fully achievable. In this sense, we find these elements to be selective and perhaps incomplete. We are ready to discuss with other delegations various aspects of the proposed Council so as to adopt a decision on the modalities, mandate, procedures and working methods of the proposed Council and the transitional arrangements.

Mr. President,

- We find that several new proposals have appeared or new elements have been added to existing proposals in the revised version of the draft outcome document. While such proposals may or may not have merit, the objectives underlying these

proposals and their implications need to be clearly explained and understood. Such proposals have to be carefully considered in much greater detail and further developed. Here we are referring to the proposals in paragraphs 139, 140, 141, 144, 146 and 147. In addition, we must also avoid loading a high-level document with such minutiae as setting up new offices in the Secretariat which are routine functions of the General Assembly.

- The case for providing greater flexibility to programme managers has not yet been made. Flexibility in terms of authority to redeploy posts has been given to the Secretary-General during the current budget period. In any case, as we have pointed out earlier, it is doubtful that Member States can agree to provide even greater flexibility as long as issues regarding accountability and transparency in the operation of the Secretariat are not addressed. Paragraph 136 thus requires appropriate reformulation. The same is true for the proposed review of human resources management and budgetary rules in paragraph 137. With regard to the pursuit of gender balance in the Secretariat, our concern that this has so far been pursued to the detriment of representation of women from developing countries has not been taken into account. In para 148, it would be useful to add after the first sentence "and urge that the problem of continuing low proportion of women from developing countries in the Secretariat, especially at the senior level should be addressed". Also, in para 140, in the last sentence, after "OIOS and" the phrase "implementation of the recommendations of" should be inserted because since the Board of Audit is composed of Auditors of member States elected by the General Assembly, the Audit Advisory Committee assessing the Board of Audit may not be acceptable to the GA.

Mr. President,

- The UN system, particularly the Funds and Programmes and Specialised Agencies, can play an important role in assisting developing countries in their efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. The primary requirement for enhancing the capacity of the UN system to achieve development results is, no doubt, the predictability, long-term stability, reliability and adequacy of its funding, especially "core" funding. It is important that we strengthen the operational arm of the UN by providing it with stable, reliable, untied and adequate flow of resources to equip the UN system for the role that we as Member States expect of it. The relevant bullet of Paragraph 151 needs to be reformulated appropriately.
- We propose the deletion of the bullet referring to the "main horizontal policy themes". Guidance for the UN system's operational activities for development has recently been provided in General Assembly resolution 59/250 on "Triennial Comprehensive Policy Review of the Operational Activities for Development of the UN System". In our view, therefore, there is no need to provide new guidance to the UN system under this Cluster on operational activities.
- It would be useful to separate 'Operational Activities' from 'Humanitarian Assistance'.

- Under the Operational Activities section, the language needs refinement, firstly, to clarify that it is the UN country presence that is being referred to and, secondly, to reflect the accepted principle that the activities of the UN at the country level are to be “fully” aligned with the country strategies.
- Under Humanitarian Assistance, we would emphasise the need for humanitarian assistance to be guided by the principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality contained in the annex to General Assembly resolution 46/182. We would also recommend that the reference pertaining to access to vulnerable populations be deleted to avoid politicisation of the important discussion of humanitarian assistance that is being attempted in the draft outcome document. There is need to strengthen the references to inter-agency and country level responses to the needs of the internally displaced persons.

Mr. President,

- As I said during discussions on the Second Cluster, the Yalta-Potsdam system of dominance meant dividing the world into blocs, ruling over colonies, maintaining a monopoly on permanent membership of the UNSC, on nuclear, space and other technologies and gerrymandering trade in their favour. This system has ended geopolitically in Europe. In other areas, the dominant powers have given way when they were forced to by anti-colonial struggles, non-alignment, anti-apartheid struggle and the mastery by other countries of nuclear, space, information and other technologies. The same would be true of the UN Security Council. We would, therefore, say to the Uniting for Consensus: Do not prolong the death agony of the Yalta-Potsdam system of dominance. The London Agreement between the G-4 and the African Union Follow-up Mechanism is a decisive moment in ending this system. Far from damaging solidarity with Africa as one of the permanent members feels, it would cement solidarity, overcome division and strengthen unity. A delegation that spoke shortly before said that what we propose doing is a violation of the Modalities Resolution. This Resolution speaks only of modalities for the High Level event. By no stretch of imagination does it postulate that there would be a violation of the Rules of Procedure of the GA or Resolution 53/30 if there is action on any proposal before the General Assembly. Far from hindering reform such action would give synergy to all other aspects of the reform process. As far as we know the Red Flag has no reference to train wreck: it has always been a flag of the dispossessed, seeking equality, a flag for radical ideas.
- The same delegation referred specifically to “the US proposal” and echoed the non paper or speaking note of one of the permanent members called “Defeating the G-4 Framework Resolution on UN reform”: “While there is a broad consensus regarding the need for Security Council expansion, major differences exist regarding what kind of expansion should occur”. The defenders of democracy have been reduced to this. Hopefully, they will discover that there are things that cannot be reached with power and others that cannot be retained by it and that there is courage found in men that cannot be overcome by it. They do not seek to defeat the UFC Resolution because it

does not threaten their power. They do not need to defeat the AU Resolution if they can defeat the G-4 Resolution because it is more radical. According to this note, the reform should “do no harm”; this English expression means something that can do no good either. Above all, harm to whom – to some of the permanent members or the GA. I empathise with the small countries under pressure. But only through bearing the pressure and bringing about radical reform can they enter an era of justice where such pressure can be minimised if not eliminated. Only through resisting can they come into their own. In any case, we are looking not to a G-4 Resolution but a joint AU-G-4 Resolution. The choice before the GA remains the same – does it defeat the Resolution and remain devitalized or defeat those calling for defeating this Resolution and thereby revitalize itself.

- A country to the north of here says that it knows of no democracy in which the single election is sufficient to entitle the winner to remain in office in perpetuity. It only has to look at itself to find a democracy that is willing to keep unchecked in perpetuity the dominance of the existing great powers, quite apart from ignoring the accountability inherent in the right of review. The intervention by the Swiss Representative on working methods reinforces the need to have new permanent members committed to these. We would support a stronger formulation on working methods. We do not share the objection of another delegation to the word ‘legitimacy’ and support the existing formulation in the Draft Outcome Document. The reason is that there is a difference between legality which actions possess and legitimacy which is a political concept implying wide acceptance if not support; moreover, there is always scope, especially in this sense, for greater legitimacy.

Mr. President,

- In conclusion, let me say that we have progressed, but have still not appropriately reflected the concerns expressed by Members States in the consultations held over the last couple of months. We should not miss this opportunity to comprehensively address the expectations of the vast majority of the membership on issues of socio-economic development, particularly the eradication of poverty and the development of social infrastructure. We appreciate the efforts you and the facilitators have taken to fine-tune the document to reflect the views of the larger membership and this should continue. We remain optimistic that the High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly will mark a water-shed in the history of the United Nations, heralding its rebirth as an institution in which its members repose their faith as well as their aspirations.
- - Thank you, Mr. President.

BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS