

**Statement by Ambassador Munir Akram, Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the United Nations, in the Plenary of the General Assembly under Agenda Item- 53: “Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and related matters” July 11, 2005**

**Mr. President,**

I thank you for convening this meeting of the General Assembly.

2. When the Charter of the United Nations was adopted in San Francisco, President Harry Truman of the United States said to the assembled delegates:

*“You have created a great instrument for peace and security and human progress in the world.*

*The world must use it now.*

*If we fail to use it, we shall betray all those who have died in order that we might meet here in freedom and safety to create it.*

*If we seek to use it selfishly – for the advantage of one nation or any small group of nations – we shall be equally guilty of that betrayal.”*

**Mr. President,**

3. When Secretary-General Kofi Annan, after a divisive war, proposed a Panel on UN Reform, his purpose was to strengthen and unite the United Nations to address old and new threats. Unfortunately, this important endeavour was, almost from the outset, hijacked by a “small group of nations” seeking new and unequal privileges for themselves in an enlarged Security Council. Since the establishment of the High-Level Panel, pressure, of all kinds, was exerted on its members, its Secretariat, on other officials and on Member States, to secure reflection of a model for Council expansion that could “selfishly” secure permanent membership for this “small group of nations.” During these months, the endeavour by the so-called Group of Four to secure support and endorsement of their position has taken forms, which if practised in national elections, would be judged as unethical or worse. An outcome for Council reform achieved by such questionable means is unlikely to be sustainable or to strengthen the United Nations. We should adopt guidelines, within the UN reform process, to prevent the use of such means to twist the democratic will of free peoples and nations.

4. To add insult to injury, self-interest has been portrayed as altruism. The seekers of special privileges and power masquerade as the champions of the weak and

disadvantaged – asserting that the special privileges they seek will make the Council more “representative” and neutralize the power of the present permanent members. History has witnessed many such who proclaimed that they came “to bury, not to praise Caesar.”

**Mr. President,**

5. On behalf of Pakistan, and I am sure I speak for all the members of the Uniting for Consensus movement, let me express our regret that the Group of 4 has formally tabled its draft resolution. This move, and the reported intention to put it to a vote, is contrary to our decisions and agreements regarding the process of our preparations for the September.

Summit. In UNGA Resolution 59/291, we decided to achieve the “broadest possible agreement” on “all major issues” including Security Council reform. In a letter dated 16 May, the Group of Four, while circulating their text informally, expressed the desire for a “constructive dialogue, with a view to reaching the broadest possible agreement.” As a result of the UfC’s positive response, it was agreed with you, Mr. President, to engage together in a constructive dialogue on the issue of Security Council reform.

6. The tabling of the Group of Four’s draft resolution has several serious implications of which we should all be aware:

**One**, Council reform, willy-nilly, will overshadow, and even eclipse, other aspects of UN reform;

**Two**, the rules by which we have been preparing for the September Summit – the painstaking effort to build consensus on the President’s outcome document – will now change. Resolutions could now be submitted and voted upon on various issues – including other divisive issues such as human rights, management reforms, terrorism, weapons of mass destruction.

**Three**, a divisive vote on this issue would politicize and perhaps derail the entire preparatory process for September.

**Mr. President,**

7. The views of Pakistan, and other UfC members, on the draft resolution contained in document A/59/L.64, are no secret. We oppose this resolution strongly, for several reasons.

**First**, the proposal is contrary to the principle of sovereign equality of states enshrined in the UN Charter. Most of us, when we entered the United Nations, were given no choice regarding the existing permanent members. But, today, we do have a choice. And, we will not choose to anoint six States with special privileges and stamp ourselves as second class members in this Organization. Let

us remember, we all entered the United Nations as sovereign and equal states. We cannot compromise the very basis of our membership.

**Second**, it is unequal. It will give permanent membership to 11 states, consigning 180 others to compete for 14 seats.

**Third**, it will erode – not enhance – democracy and accountability in the Security Council. The ratio of permanent (unelected) to non-permanent (elected) members would increase from 1:2 to almost 1:1. Half of the Council’s membership will be unaccountable (The word “accountability” does not appear in the G-4’s resolution).

**Fourth**, it will enlarge the “club of the privileged” who will have a vested interest in addressing most issues in the Security Council, further draining the oxygen out of the General Assembly, and enhancing the domination of the Security Council.

**Fifth**, it will reduce, not improve, the effectiveness and efficiency of the Security Council by requiring the constant reconciliation of the interests of 11 instead of 5 permanent members.

**Sixth**, this zero-sum proposal (with 6 winners and 180 losers) will increase divisions and tensions, not only within the United Nations, but within various regions, contradicting the objective of promoting peace and security.

**Seventh**, the G-4’s complex, three-phase approach will, in any case, lead to a dead-end. It could fail to receive two-third’s majority at any one of the three stages. And, given the opposition to the proposal from a significant number of significant states as well as the opposition or reservations of some of the five permanent members, it is highly unlikely that a Charter amendment, based on the G-4’s approach, would ever come into effect. If we follow the G-4 into this ‘*Cul de Sac*,’ we will squander the present opportunity to realise an equitable and acceptable reform of the Security Council.

**Mr. President,**

8. Instead of walking into the G-4’s dead-end, I would like to offer instead, the draft resolution circulated by the members of the Uniting for Consensus as an approach that can accommodate the legitimate interests and concerns of all Member States, regions and sub-regions. Let me outline the virtues of our proposal (which is being again circulated with my statement).

**First**, it is equitable and fair. In proposing an increase of Council membership from 15 to 25, it does not discriminate between member states. All will be eligible for election (or re-election) in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality.

**Second**, it will increase the Council's representativeness. The ratio of unelected to elected members will change from 1:2 to 1:4 (instead of 1:1 under the G-4 draft resolution). Simple arithmetic indicates that under the UfC proposal the chances of all States, including the smaller states, to serve on the Council will be doubled.

**Third**, the UfC draft resolution will enhance accountability through the mechanism of periodic election and/or re-election. States which are elected to represent regions or groups will remain answerable to these regions or groups (If elected "permanently", they would not). It will, as a by-product, also reinforce the authority of the General Assembly – that is of the general membership – in relation to the Security Council.

**Fourth**, the UfC proposal is simple. It proposes direct approval of Charter amendments. It will not need to go through a complex and uncharted three-stage process. This proposal could come into effect much sooner.

**Fifth**, our proposal is realistic. It can accommodate the interests and positions of all Member States, including the P-5, and thus is more likely to secure eventual ratification than the G-4 proposal.

9. Perhaps the single greatest virtue of the UfC proposal is its inherent flexibility. This proposal can – through variable geometry – better accommodate the aspirations and interests of the majority of the membership as well as regional groups, such as the African Union.

10. We understand fully the desire of Africa for greater representation as well as equal rights with other regions. We note from the African Union's draft resolution, and the accompanying documents adopted in Sirte, that the AU wishes to select its own representatives who would represent the AU and act on its behalf.

11. If the African Union wishes to designate two countries for continuous (i.e. permanent), membership of the Security Council, it could do so under the proposal of the Uniting for Consensus. The only difference would be that, under our proposal, the African Union would retain the power to ensure accountability on the part of the nominated State or States through periodic election and/or re-election. In case the African Union wants more than two countries to occupy its two "permanent" seats, i.e. to opt for some form of periodic rotation, this would also be possible under the UfC proposal. Such periodic rotation could ensure, furthermore, equitable and balanced representation of all the 5 sub-regions of Africa. However, if the African Union believes that the allocation of an additional seat is essential to ensure equitable representation of all of Africa's sub-regions, my delegation at least, and I am sure other members of the UfC, would be prepared to discuss this with the members of the African Union.

12. We fully understand Africa's desire to possess the same rights as those enjoyed by other regions. The AU's desire for "full rights", however, appears to be qualitatively different from the veto right as presently possessed by 5 permanent members. As we

understand it, the AU is seeking this right on behalf of the entire African region, not one that is to be retained by one or two countries for themselves. The Pakistan delegation believes that ways and means can be evolved, under the UfC proposal, to provide Africa with the collective ability to uphold its interests within a reformed Security Council.

13. The UfC welcomes the fact that the AU Summit decision has sought negotiations and reciprocal support from other Groups. The UfC looks forward to continuing the dialogue with the African Union, which we had initiated prior to the Sirte Summit, with a view to exploring the prospects of accommodating each other's positions and interests in a final decision regarding Security Council reform.

14. Similarly, the UfC believes that our approach can accommodate the aspirations of other inter-regional, regional and sub-regional Groups such as the OIC, the Arab League, CARICOM and the Pacific Island countries. All of them have legitimate political and regional interests to promote and defend within the Security Council.

15. The OIC – whose 57 members constitute over one-fourth of the UN membership – has asked for “adequate representation” on the Council in proportion to its membership of the United Nations. The Arab League also wants adequate and continuous presence on the Council. Under the UfC approach, the Arab countries could be assured of one seat each from Africa and Asia. The OIC could also obtain one or more additional elected seat from the non-Arab sub-regions of Africa and Asia.

16. Under the UfC's proposal, the CARICOM and Central America could also hope for adequate representation for their respective sub-regions. Similarly, the States of the Pacific Islands Forum could seek adequate representation within Asia. It must be noted that the representation of smaller States would be significantly enhanced under the UfC formula rather than G-4 proposal. They could compete for 20 elected seats under the UfC proposal versus 14 under the G-4's proposal.

17. Finally, the UfC approach could even accommodate, at least partially, the aspirations and interests of the Group of 4 and other aspirants for permanent membership. As in the case of Africa, other regions could also evolve agreements for more frequent, longer-term, or even continuous representation of certain countries within their respective regions.

18. Such specific arrangements to accommodate the interests of all concerned can be reflected either in the text of the resolution, or in separate annexes or protocols, to be approved by the General Assembly.

**Mr. President,**

19. If we are to achieve a result that can accommodate the interests of all major groups within the United Nations, what is required now is not a divisive and precipitate vote but a wise decision to initiate a process to achieve such an outcome. At stake is the success or failure of the September Summit. At stake is whether or not we can achieve

important decisions on development and genuine UN reform, or squander our political energies on a selfish and ultimately fruitless demand of a few ambitious States for unequal privileges. What is at stake is the credibility, and perhaps the survival, of the United Nations. What is at stake is peace and tranquillity in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe. We urge that the Assembly step back from the brink. Instead of a divisive vote, let us opt for a decisive dialogue. It is only through dialogue and consensus that, together, we can build a new era of friendly relations among equal and sovereign nations at the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.