

**EGYPT**



**مصر**

The Permanent Mission of Egypt  
to the United Nations  
New York

بعثة مصر الدائمة  
لدى الأمم المتحدة  
نيويورك

**Statement by**  
**H.E. Ambassador Maged ABDELAZIZ**  
**Permanent Representative**  
**Of**  
**The Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations**  
**Before**  
**The 85<sup>th</sup> Plenary Meeting of The 59<sup>th</sup> Session of the General Assembly**  
**On**  
**Agenda items 45 and 55:**  
**Integrated and Coordinated Implementation of and Follow-up to the**  
**Outcomes of Major United Nations Conferences and Summits in the**  
**Economic, Social and Political Fields; Follow-up to the Outcome of**  
**the Millennium Summit**

Please check against delivery

6 April 2005

Mr. President,

At the outset, I would like to express our appreciation for the constructive and transparent approach you are adopting in steering the consultation on the preparatory process for the upcoming High-Level plenary meeting of the General Assembly, including the consultation on the report of the Secretary-General entitled: "In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights". In this context, I would also like to express Egypt's appreciation for the effort exerted by the Secretary-General in the drafting of that report, which could be described as bold, frank, and clear.

Allow me at the beginning, Mr. President, to extend our sincere condolences to the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See for the sad demise of Pope John Paul II.

Allow me also to associate our position with the statements delivered by Malaysia on behalf of NAM, Jamaica on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and Malawi on behalf of the African Group.

Before commenting on the substantive elements of the report, I wish to express our views on some procedural elements of special importance to our collective endeavour to reach an agreement on a prospective final document to be presented to our leaders for adoption in September 2005. These elements are as follows:

First: The negotiation on the final document should not be based on one specific reference document, but rather on a number of references, which include the report of the Secretary-General as well as comments and observations expressed by Member States, as well as geographic and political groupings. Such comments and observations should be transformed, during the course of the negotiation, to specific decisions and recommendations. In this context, we were pleased with the assurances provided by the Deputy Secretary-General that the "Package" referred to by the Secretary-General means

that we should reach a number of balanced recommendations, rather than to accept or reject the recommendations in the report as an integrated package.

Second: It is essential to ensure that the final outcome of this negotiation process is a balanced one. An outcome that would strike a practical balance between development and security needs. Although we might, theoretically, all agree on this approach, it is of great significance that each of us would guarantee the full implementation of the agreed outcome, and that such outcome will, necessarily, secure both our developmental and security goals. There is simply no more room for rosy promises that were never fulfilled in the past.

Third: It is indispensable that our efforts should focus on reaching an agreed document through negotiation that reflects the intergovernmental nature of the process. Each country should have the opportunity to contribute to and participate in formulating the final outcome. In this regard, I would like to emphasize that the confidence vested in the President of the General Assembly and his facilitators entails a heavy responsibility of reflecting the different views and ideas expressed during the process, and of avoiding the presentation of proposals and ideas which could not serve the purpose of reaching agreement by all.

Fourth: Our exercise should depart from a common understanding that recognizes the need to address and resolve the causes of frustration and despair felt by many peoples as a result of our failure to settle their political and economic problems. We should agree that the alleviation of such sentiments is the key to international peace and security. Therefore, the outcome of the upcoming high-level meeting should devote a special chapter on practical recommendations to address such sentiments with a view to achieve lasting solutions to the hardships that produce them. Such recommendations should aim at strengthening the principles of equality, democracy and justice. They should also obliterate double standards and socio-political nepotism.

Fifth: The success in deepening further the principles of democracy and respect for human rights at the national level, will depend to a great extent on our ability to promote and respect such principles in the conduct of international relations. It is essential that we respect the sanctity of the legal and moral principles upon which the United Nations was established. Such principles are – and will always remain – the foundation of a more secure and stable world.

Sixth: Our endeavour to establish an effective collective security system, and to achieve sustainable development in all its political, economic and social aspects, should not distract our attention from pursuing an honest and sincere dialogue among civilizations and religions, nor should it lead us to neglect the diversity and multiplicity in the specificity of our societies. Such diversity is in fact the key to a successful dialogue aimed at achieving global security and stability, without prejudice to any culture or religion.

Mr. President,

I would like to address the development aspects in the report of the Secretary-General. In this regard, I welcome the fact that the report acknowledged the nexus between development and security, and to emphasize that the departure point for any international collective efforts in addressing development is the sincere and effective implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and of the outcome of major related United Nations summits and conferences within agreed timeframes. We should be able to meet the main challenges to development, including foreign occupation, armed and civil conflicts. To this end, we should focus our attention on the formulation of practical and implementable recommendations in the areas of market access and debt relief, including the establishment of effective mechanisms for the facilitation of the integration by developing countries into the international trading system.

In this context, I would like to highlight that development efforts in Africa deserve special attention on the part of the international community. We emphasize in this regard the content of the African Group's statement, and reaffirm the critical importance of

lending the full and unhindered support to NEPAD. The African countries, through NEPAD, have taken huge and unprecedented steps in the areas of good governance, democracy, and human rights. It is thus fundamental to strengthen and expand the partnership between the international community and African countries within the framework of NEPAD and on the basis of the African ownership of such initiative and on the priorities we have set for ourselves in the Continent with the objective of achieving Africa's developmental goals.

Mr. President,

Our endeavour to revitalize the collective security system enshrined in the United Nations Charter would require the wide participation of all Member States in the adoption of a new vision to this end and to start its course. More importantly is our commitment to implement such vision in the multilateral framework, which will require a comprehensive and non-selective approach in addressing all threats and challenges facing the international community. It is essential, in this respect, to identify a clear approach to address the diverse views on threat perceptions.

Today, the international community could reach such an agreement, only if we can mutually and sincerely acknowledge the significance and sensitivity of certain threats, and only if we desist from attempts to impose unbalanced security agenda characterized by applying different standards to similar, if not identical, situations. The notion of security, on which we are seeking to reach an agreement, should be universal, notwithstanding the diversity in cultural or religious backgrounds.

Mr. President,

In addition to the views that the Egyptian delegation previously expressed during discussions on the High-level Panel and Sachs reports, I would like to comment on the newly introduced proposals and views by the Secretary-General:

First: The attempt to render legality to the concepts of “prevention” and “preemption” in relation to the “use of force”, or in reinterpretation of self-defence in cases where an attack has not occurred, is a matter which must be approached with extreme caution. Such an attempt would shake the basic legal and moral foundation of the Charter, threaten to legitimize unilateral actions, and provide additional leverage for the few more powerful and who are capable to collect better information and who possesses larger military arsenals *vis a vis* the vast majority of states who do not enjoy those advantages, and also *vis a vis* the failure by the Security Council to take the right or timely actions as a result of the lack of unanimity among its five permanent members .

Second: In addressing international terrorism, and as the Secretary-General correctly stated, a focus on the protection of civilians is necessary. However, such protection must be comprehensive in its geographic scope and must adhere to unified criteria, beginning with the protection of peoples under occupation from state terrorism exercised by the occupying power and the repressive measures it undertakes, in addition to ensure the exercise of those peoples of their inalienable rights, and in particular their rights to independence, sovereignty and equality. This is the only way to address the feelings of frustration and despair that consequently lead to the exercise of legitimate resistance, which is falsely sought by some to be labeled as “terrorism”.

In that context, the issue is not to ignore “state terrorism” or to reach an agreed definition to “terrorism”. The core issue is whether we can reach, through the General Assembly, a binding convention ensuring mutual and parallel international obligations that reinforce our ability to combat terrorism and violence through the settlement of international and regional problems. This convention, which the Secretary-General also proposed, is consistent with the call repeatedly made by President Mubarak since 1986, at the time when terrorism was not yet recognized as a global phenomenon, to embark on a negotiation process to draft such convention.

Third: We support the approach taken by the Secretary-General to reach a balance in addressing the issues of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).

In the meantime, we emphasize that such balance, particularly with regard to WMDs should be based on a clearer recognition of the rights and responsibilities of all states. As the Secretary-General appealed to Member States to join some WMDs conventions, we in turn should call on all Member States to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and to overcome pending issues in this treaty, which grant de-facto status to some states to the detriment of these principles on the basis of which we agreed to the indefinite extension of the Treaty. We also should insist on the implementation of the thirteen practical steps agreed to in the Review Conference of 2000, towards the achievement of nuclear disarmament within a framework that ensure the much needed balance between disarmament, non-proliferation, and the full right to the peaceful use of atomic energy.

Fourth: The respect for human rights, democracy, and good governance cannot be imposed on states, but can only materialize through increasing national conviction of its importance to human development, according to social, cultural and ethnic conditions and specificities of each state. I must emphasize that our individual countries have undertaken substantial strides in these fields. However, the theory of the “responsibility to protect” advocated in the Report will become a threat to the principle of national sovereignty of states, and would usher into a new form for intervention in their internal affairs, particularly when the legal underpinnings of such theory remain unclear, in addition to its reliance on an incremental division of responsibilities between the State, the international community, and the Security Council.

In this context, the proposal to establish a council on human rights appears to be an attempt to establish a new major organ, in addition to the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. The new proposed council seem to undermine the responsibilities assigned to the Commission on Human Rights and the Third Committee of the General Assembly, and would alter the intergovernmental nature of the international review process in the field of human rights, particularly as the mandate of the proposed Council and its relation to other relevant organs remain unclear.

Fifth: In the area of institutional reform, we stress that any such reform must ensure the retention of the delicate balance between the functions and mandates of the different organs of the United Nations, and should essentially aimed at revitalizing the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, with the objective to enable both organs to effectively perform their mandates without necessarily burdening the Security Council with additional responsibilities.

To this end, the proposal of establishing a peace-building commission is valid only if the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council would play their respective mandates during both the preventive diplomacy and post-conflict peace-building phases, while the responsibility of peacemaking remains with the Security Council.

In This context, we believe in the inevitability of the reform and expansion of the Security Council, in the two categories of permanent and non-permanent membership, so as to ensure transparency and credibility on the one hand, and equitable representation for the developing countries and for all cultures and civilizations on the other. I must stress that Africa was in the forefront in calling for no less than two permanent seats with all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the current permanent members. I would also like to highlight the African consensus that institutionally opposes the right to veto, but insists, at the same time, on the extension of such right to new permanent members until it is curtailed and eventually abrogated. I would like to point out that the philosophy behind this position is the belief that a permanent member without the right to veto is in fact just a non-permanent member who enjoys a longer duration period of membership in the Council. Hence, in view of the huge responsibilities to be shouldered by the new permanent members, they should be elected in a manner that would reflect the strongest possible support of the international community, and with the majority that would confirm the confidence of all of us in their ability to undertake effectively their membership's responsibilities, in particular the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. President,

These are some examples of fundamental issues that the Secretary-General's report may stir during the course of its review. It is in our view a part of a larger parcel that we will discuss in more details during our deliberations on the various clusters of issues.

I must assure you, Mr. President, of the full support to you from the delegation of Egypt in discharging your task, which we consider it ours, towards achieving a satisfactory outcome.

Thank you, Mr. President.