

STATEMENT BY MR. HARDEEP SINGH PURI, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE, ON
INFORMAL MEETINGS OF THE PLENARY ON THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL
NEGOTIATIONS ON THE QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND
INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND OTHER
MATTERS RELATED TO THE COUNCIL IN THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL
ASSEMBLY ON SEPTEMBER 01, 2009

Mr. Chairman,

Thank you for your energetic efforts to move this vital process forward. We appreciate your dedication and the courage you have consistently displayed in the discharge of your duties. I reiterate India's continuing support for you in this regard.

We are today at the beginning of the third round of negotiations. Looking back at the first two rounds, two messages emerged loud and clear: first, that an overwhelming majority of member states believe that the status quo is untenable, in response to which genuine reform of the UN Security Council is essential. Second, substantive reform requires an expansion in both permanent and non-permanent categories of membership, and significant improvement of the Security Council's working methods.

I am encouraged that that these facts are duly reflected in your letter of July 16. In fact, if anything, your letter perhaps understates the clarity of the second message. Nonetheless, a good start has been made in concentrating on proposals that genuinely reflect the sense of this body.

During the first two rounds, we have looked at the five key issues both in isolation and combinations. So it is appropriate that today we look all these issues in a composite manner.

Let me therefore reiterate our firm conviction that only an expansion of the membership of the UNSC in permanent and non-permanent categories will be credible, effective and genuine. Only such measures will meet the aspirations of

the membership at large. The G-4 framework resolution of 2005 proposed six new permanent members and four additional non-permanent members. We remain convinced that this is the optimum expansion that meets both the tests of representativeness and manageability.

Naturally, new permanent members would have the same rights and responsibilities as existing permanent members, including that of the veto. Nevertheless, recognizing the complexity of the issue, the G-4 proposal offered to defer its utilisation until a review is undertaken.

Mr Chairman,

We see the reform of the working methods of the Council as a key objective of our collective effort. Several useful proposals have been presented over the years that the OEWG meandered along. Perhaps out of sheer fatigue, even the Council discussed this a few times, with a few small steps being taken in this regard. This is useful, but not enough. The efficacy and legitimacy of the Council cannot be enhanced by tinkering at the margins. The many useful suggestions made by delegations here must be seriously considered.

Nevertheless the problem we face is not what the elements contain, but their implementation. The reality is that however good these ideas may be, they will not be implemented unless the structure of the Council is changed. And that will happen only when the Council stops reflecting the world of 1945. Hence effecting serious reform of the working methods of the Security Council is integrally connected with its composition.

Mr. Chairman,

The views of delegations have been eloquently presented and reiterated during the past few months of negotiations. We must now move beyond repetition of well-known positions and focus discussions to make real progress. Your vision of this third round is an effort towards that end.

However, we continue to harbor apprehensions over the notion of an intermediate model. First of all, it is unclear that a discussion on this model will serve the interests of finding a solution that *garners requisite support*. Apart from the limited support of a few here, and at that as a tepid second preference, it is unclear if this proposal can satisfy the central demand voiced repeatedly by members for genuine reform. Some have tried to portray the intermediate approach as a compromise solution. I remain unconvinced since it is unclear what this is a compromise between. As we see it, an interim solution appears to limit expansion of the Security Council solely to the non-permanent category.

Therefore it can hardly be a sign of flexibility to support an option that currently does not include a sense of a compromise at all.

Therefore, in keeping with your suggestion that we focus on “what has commanded the most support”, we see little point in discussing a proposal that is in essence a negation of the core demand of the membership, i.e. expansion in both permanent and non-permanent categories of membership. Perhaps it would be more useful to use the day earmarked for discussing an interim model for a discussion of the specificities of the various models suggested for expansion of both categories of membership.

Thank you.

[BACK TO TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)