

Unofficial translation

**S T A T E M E N T**

**by H.E. Ambassador Andrey I. Denisov,  
Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations  
at the informal UNGA meeting on the reports of the High-level Panel on Threats,  
Challenges and Change and of the Millenium Project headed by J.Sachs**

February 22, 2005

Mr. President,

Several rounds of the General Assembly informal consultations on two reports – “A More Secure World” by the High-Level Panel and “Investing in Development” of the Millennium Project headed by J.Sachs – showed that the Member-States widely support the key point that in the era of global interdependence the problems of security and development are inseparable and require a comprehensive collective response with the UN playing the central role. There is no alternative to such approach, this is Russia’s consistent position.

This jubilee year will see adopted important decisions aimed at creating a more efficient system of security, a more effective plan for contributing to the development and a better United Nations.

As it has been rightly pointed out by the Secretary-General, the reports “A More Secure World” and “Investing in Development” complement each other well and contain a wide spectrum of recommendations which represent a solid basis for discussion of the Member-States. The raised problems of fundamental importance deserve a detailed consideration in their entirety, without establishing artificial deadlines. What matters most is to guarantee the efficiency of decisions to be adopted and their legitimacy for the world community. We share the Secretary-General’s opinion that on certain issues decisions could be made in the nearest future, even by the Summit-2005, provided that there is a broad consent or, better, consensus.

We believe that the recommendations of the Secretary-General’s report should match the political level of the Summit-2005 and reaffirm the international community’s commitment to enhancing collective mechanisms, which, based on international law, ensure peace and security, as well as to stepping up joint efforts in order to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

One of the most important issues in this context is the use of force in international relations. The Russian delegation believes that this part of the UN Charter does not require a revision or a new interpretation. The proposed basic criteria for the legitimacy of the use of force seem right. However they should be seen only as guidelines which should not limit or induce the Security Council to use military force. In other words, there can be no limitations on the UN Security Council prerogatives written down in the Charter. Large-scale human rights violations, crimes against humanity, genocide, war crimes may serve as a reason for interference by international community in internal affairs of corresponding states but only when sanctioned by the Security Council and in cases when the situation in those states is qualified by the Security Council as a threat to international peace and security. Any Security Council decision on the use of force must rest upon thoroughly checked and impartial information, also taking into account the position of relevant regional organizations. Of course, the use of force should remain the last resort. This possibility may be raised only when all vast political and diplomatic machinery for prevention and settlement of conflicts is exhausted.

The report to be released in March should, undoubtedly, reflect the task of strengthening the efficient global action against terrorism on the basis of international law and under the leading and coordinating role of the UN Security Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee. In addressing the problem of terrorism one should not confine himself to the methods involving the use of force. The multifaceted efforts aimed at eliminating the root causes of terrorism should be encouraged. We assume that the Secretary-General's proposals on a comprehensive anti-terrorist strategy, which he intends to present soon in Madrid, will be a good basis for further work.

We confirm Russia's readiness to support the idea of Peace-Building Commission for better coordination and integrity in providing post-conflict international assistance to the countries emerging from crisis. We expect the report to

contain specific proposals regarding the status, functions and modalities of work of this body.

As for Russia's position on the UN reform, including the issue of the Security Council reform, it is a well-known one. It is of fundamental importance to reach the broadest possible consent here so as to avoid a split in the United Nations fraught with long-term negative consequences for the future of the world Organization.

We hope that the human rights section of the Secretary-General's report will include the High-Level Panel proposals, which deserve unconditional support, about the need to decrease the level of politicization of human rights and to abandon double standards. At the same time some recommendations in this sphere, in our opinion, will require another thorough analysis so that the ripen reforms could indeed contribute to enhancing authority and professionalism of the bodies which deal with human rights and social issues.

The March report should pay considerable attention to further development of the UN capacity to address global socio-economic problems, including through strengthening the role of ECOSOC in international cooperation for development. We proceed from the premise that any innovations should, first of all, contribute to strengthening the coordinating functions of the ECOSOC in strict compliance with the UN Charter. We call to show caution when it comes to the idea of creating within the ECOSOC different kinds of "executive committees" which are not mentioned in the current rules of procedure. It could only result in a duplication of the structures which already exist in the Council.

We deem it would be appropriate for the March report to reflect those recommendations of the Millennium Project which have already been supported by most delegations during the consultations. We would particularly mention the concept of "Quick Wins", the need to ensure the leading role of governments in elaborating

programs and development strategies, and a special attention to be given to the development of basic infrastructure.

On the other hand, certain proposals of the Millennium Project concerning trade, indebtedness and innovative sources for financing development have not yet found consensus for some reasons and, therefore, require further examination and discussion in relevant multilateral formats. Before such consultations take place, it would be premature to include any specific recommendations in the Secretary-General's report. We are convinced that emphasizing in the report the initiatives, which have no wide international support, can undermine our joint efforts and distract international community from the consideration of other, no less important mechanisms. We would like to stress that it is unacceptable to include in the Secretary-General's report incorrect and biased ideas about dividing countries in the context of achieving good governance on those, who are worthy of receiving massive international assistance as a matter of priority, and those who are not. It is obvious that this approach runs counter to the principles of universality, neutrality and non-political nature of the United Nations activities in the area of development.

Our understanding is that implementation of the proposals on the reform should not lead to an increase in the Organization's expenses. The proposals, which will be agreed upon by the Member-States, should be implemented through more rational use of financial and human recourses.

We are convinced that the General Assembly should preserve its decisive role in determining whether the Organization's resources should be used and how as well as in exercising proper control over the work of Secretariat, which has the responsibility for efficient spending of the funds provided by the Member-States. However we do not rule out that formulas, which could give sufficient flexibility to the Secretariat in managing resources, will be found.

Mr. President,

Given the all-embracing and integral nature of all three reports their recommendations will, undoubtedly, require further deep collective discussion. We believe that this process will be productive and will enable a successful holding of Summit-2005. Russia will continue to be an active contributor to that.

Thank you, Mr. President.