

Statement by Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri, Permanent Representative of India at the Eighth Round of 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 on July 2, 2012

Mr. Chairman,

Let me begin by quoting two formulations in your letter of 11 June which laid out the reasons for our coming together here and now.

Commenting on the last five exchanges of the eighth round of Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council reform you wrote and I quote, "I was pleased with the increased level of engagement and interaction which emerged from this series of meetings." You went on to state that "As a logical and straight-forward follow-up to this, I am pleased to announce a meeting on 2 July aimed at collectively drawing conclusions from our exchanges..."

Mr. Chairman,

The manner in which you chose to connect the atmospherics in the last five exchanges and the proposed way forward caught our attention for two reasons.

First, as you will agree, it is par for the course in all intergovernmental negotiations to move from discussions to negotiations and then to text-based negotiations that hold out the hope for a solution that represents the distilled wisdom of the assembly or the common will of the largest number. The negotiation that is most successful is the one that combines the two.

And your letter seemed to radiate a faint hope that we may be well on our way towards that El Dorado!

Second, the Facilitator in such negotiations can and is expected to pronounce on the obvious conclusions that can be drawn from the interventions that have been made.

But I must confess Mr. Chairman, that the letter falls short on this count.

I do not intend however to dissect and critically analyze this fact.

On the contrary, I intend to outline the elements that require your careful attention and urgent action if we are to be true to ourselves, our process and the undertaking of our leaders who meeting in New York in 2005 called for 'early' reform of the Security Council.

Mr. Chairman,

In so far as my delegation is concerned, let me state for the record that we have been taking part in a constructive manner.

We have made numerous proposals aimed at taking the process forward, including the short resolution, streamlining the Rev3, straw poll, enhancing convergences with other groups and delegations etc.

I therefore have no hesitation in stating that we have tried to meet you and the rest of the groups more than half the way, in fact, far deeper in your zones than ours.

Mr. Chairman,

During the course of the current General Assembly session, we have also drawn some useful lessons which we are reflecting on. As a reform-minded delegation we intend to factor these lessons in our future approach.

You have already heard the statements by the distinguished Permanent Representative of Japan, Ambassador Tsuneo Nishida on behalf of the G4 and the distinguished Permanent Representative of Jamaica, Ambassador Raymond Wolfe on behalf of the L69.

They have clearly articulated the basic elements of the Indian approach as we go forward in our process. We fully align with these statements.

Mr. Chairman,

There is a palpable desire among the membership for early reform of the Security Council to make it reflective of contemporary reality and also acknowledge the manifold changes that have taken place in the world since the Council was created in 1945.

Equally, there is the unmistakable yearning among the several countries to be recognized for their effective contributions to world affairs, including the maintenance of international peace and security. The subtle response from some quarters that the patrimony is either indivisible or can only be shared in bits and pieces is unacceptable to the large majority of the membership.

It is therefore no wonder that you find increasing convergences between the L69 and the African Group. Similarly, as the meeting on 26 January demonstrated, the G4's narrative finds immediate acceptability with an ever expanding group of countries. The demand for a reform model that encompasses expansion in both the permanent and non-permanent categories is a fundamental one and should be the starting point of real negotiations. Those who are opposed to this tenet are in a clear minority and they have acknowledged as much in these very meetings.

Mr. Chairman,

Also there is considerable convergence on other aspects.

We have not yet heard one dissonant voice in respect of enhanced representation for Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and Caribbean region, WEOG states as well as an exclusive non-permanent seat for the SIDS.

The clamour for treating new permanent members on par with existing ones is loud and clear and growing stronger by the day. You have heard Ambassador Raymond Wolfe clearly express the L69 Group's position in this regard. In particular, we support African aspirations for permanent membership with the veto.

The reformed Council is expected to have a size in the mid-twenties. The membership also wants the Council to continually improve its working methods and see the General Assembly transforming itself into the chief deliberative, legislative, policy-making and representative body of the international community.

In addition, the membership is keen on streamlining the Rev3 along the lines of I outlined above and making it an eminently workable document.

These then are the conclusions for you Mr. Chairman. It is my fervent hope that you will be able to capture the same in a draft resolution or in a report that the Assembly could adopt. Needless to say, such a step is not merely warranted but quite necessary at this juncture.

And I have no hesitation in stating that the alternative is action on the floor of the General Assembly.

I thank you Mr. Chairman.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)