

**INTERVENTION BY AMBASSADOR HARDEEP SINGH PURI,
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA TO THE UN
DURING THE INFORMAL PLENARY MEETING: EXCHANGE 2
OF THE SECOND ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS ON THE
QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND
INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL
AND RELATED MATTERS AT THE 63RD SESSION OF THE UN
GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN NEW YORK ON JUNE 12, 2009**

Mr. Chairman,

Permit me to reiterate my delegation's support to your efforts in guiding this process of intergovernmental negotiations.

At the outset, I would like to emphasize the need to ensure that the second round does not end up being a mirror image of the first round.

In this regard, we appreciate your efforts to impart focus to the discussions, while not ignoring the sanctity of the proposals made by Member States.

We hope you will continue with the determination to go for real progress, rather than take the path of least resistance by only repeating the past.

In your endeavours, we would urge you to be guided by the objective of achieving genuine reform, rather than being cowed down by a small minority intent on blocking any progress.

It is with the same goal that my delegation, despite some concerns that your overview did not quantify support for each proposal, engaged constructively and accepted your overview as a good starting point for the second round of negotiations.

Mr. Chairman,

During the discussions today and yesterday, a large number of delegations referred to the inevitability of reform.

As students of history, our view is that in the instant case, this so-called inevitability is based not on fatalistic determination but on reform that is long overdue.

This is illustrated by the fact that the UNSC was set up for the world of 1945, and its only reform took place 45 years ago! This contrasts with a world order which has been transformed beyond recognition since 1945. A reorganization is definitely long overdue, hence inevitable.

The increasing dissatisfaction at the non-representative composition of the UNSC cannot but adversely affect its credibility - a consequence that we believe is underway.

No one, however vociferous, can arrest the movement of history. There are a few who oppose real change, either by filibustering or attempting to put roadblocks. While they may succeed in slightly deferring the change that is inevitable, they do so at the cost of making the UNSC lose more credibility and effectiveness. Such actions also do a disservice to multilateralism.

Mr. Chairman,

As part of the work plan presented in the overview, today's discussions focus on composition of the UNSC. This provides an important opportunity to examine many of the core issues on UNSC reform in an integrated manner, including discussion on their interlinkages.

During the first round of negotiations, it was clear that an overwhelming majority spoke in support of the need to expand the UNSC in both permanent and non-permanent category.

If the negotiations are to make genuine progress, we need to move ahead with this option. Thus, our discussions from now on should focus on the option outlined in para 14(b)(i) of the overview viz. enlargement in both categories of membership – permanent and non-permanent two year seats.

Let me reiterate that there can be no real reform without an expansion in both membership categories.

We have in the past tried the option of an expansion only in the non-permanent category – it has not worked.

It is only with new permanent members that the UNSC can truly reflect contemporary world realities, and thereby enhance the credibility, legitimacy and representativity of the UNSC.

Further, only new permanent members, with their institutional memory and permanent presence, can ensure a real change in the power structure of the UNSC, and ensure its accountability to the membership at large.

Needless to add, genuine improvement in the working methods will also remain a mirage without these changes.

Mr. Chairman,

As regards the size of the UNSC expansion, we continue to believe that an expanded UNSC of 25 seats, with 11 permanent and 14 non-permanent members, remains the most optimal option.

The geographic regional distribution of these would be the following – of the 6 new permanent members, 2 each would be from Asia and Africa, while 1 each would be from Latin America and WEOG. The 4 additional non-permanent seats would be distribute equally amongst Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America.

Such an expansion would provide the appropriate balance between the need for greater representation, including addressing the under-representation of developing countries, and the need to ensure that the UNSC does not become unwieldy.

Let me assure everyone, Mr. Chairman, that India is acutely conscious of the need for the UNSC to be efficient and effective. The UNSC has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is in our collective interest that this body is able to discharge its functions effectively, in real-time.

Our proposal would also permit the UNSC to reflect contemporary realities, a key requirement for enhancing legitimacy and credibility.

We would, therefore, propose that negotiations focus on options 14(a)(ii) and 14(c)(i).

Of course, it is also possible to consider rotation of non-permanent seats across geographical regions in order to ensure that some member of a particular recognized cross-regional group like SIDS, LDCs or LLDCs is always serving as a UNSC Member.

Such a system is already in place informally between the Asian and African Group.

We also must not forget the requirement in Article 24(2) of the UN Charter that in the election of members to the UNSC, due regard should be specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the UN.

Let me also highlight that once elected, each member of the UNSC is expected to represent the interests of the entire membership. It is this that provides legitimacy to the actions of the UNSC.

Of course, each member is free to be sensitive to the interests of any regional group that it belongs to. However, we must keep in mind that the membership of the UNSC, as indeed of the UN itself, is composed of nation states.

Mr. Chairman,

You have attempted to identify negotiables under the various options. In the light of our discussions, we need to be more focussed.

We would, therefore, recommend that following this round, we take up the proposals that enjoy the maximum support. Detailed discussions should then be conducted on the various possible negotiables under each option.

This would permit moving towards an outcome that includes proposals enjoying wide support, inter alia expansion in both the permanent and non-permanent categories, and improvement in the working methods of the UNSC.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, let me comment that I was particularly struck by the growing inconsistencies in the statements of some of those who want to stand in the way of history.

They loudly proclaim that they support Africa and other under-represented groups. Yet their actions oppose the core demand of Africa of an expansion in both permanent and non permanent categories.

They insist that they have shown flexibility, while in reality their core position to see no new permanent members remains unchanged.

They have no hesitation to state that the first round demonstrated support for the intermediate approach, and even call for tabulating support. But they remain at the forefront to block any attempt to genuinely quantify support for any proposal.

Listening to this welter of inconsistency, I am left wondering whose game this group is playing. Are they speaking for those who seek to maintain the inequitable status quo, or those whose cause they claim to champion, or just giving expression to their own insecurities.

Thank you.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)