

Home > General Assembly > A little more bite and a little less bark; A little less fight and a little more spark; A little less conversation, a little more action

A little more bite and a little less bark; A little less fight and a little more spark; A little less conversation, a little more action









JOINT G4 STATEMENT BY BRAZIL, GERMANY, JAPAN AND INDIA

Delivered by H.E. Ambassador Syed Akbaruddin
Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations
At the Informal Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly
Intergovernmental Negotiations on Security Council Reform
New York, 12 June 2017

Co-Chairs,

I have the honour to deliver this statement on behalf of the G4 countries, Brazil, Germany, Japan and my own country India.

We welcome your approach at this meeting of focusing discussions on the document that has been provided, rather than on general statements.

We are grateful for the diligence with which you have worked to accommodate many of the issues delegations highlighted at the last meeting. In our view, this revised version of the Food for Thought paper reflects, in many areas, the thrust of our discussions thus far.

Co-Chairs,

I list the following **five** specific issues that need to be redressed so as to accurately reflect in a balanced manner all positions and discussions in this revised version.

First, we note that page 1 recaps the history of the reform process since the World Summit of 2005. We welcome this narration. However, the history of this process precedes this seminal event. It was in 1979 that an item was enshrined on the agenda of the GA on the subject. Regular consideration dates back to GA resolution 47/62 of December 11, 1992. Since then other milestones, inter-alia, include resolutions 48/26 and 53/30. Our request, therefore, is to summarise all these in the first paragraph so as to provide a holistic picture.

Second, in our understanding, on page 2, the Section on Commonalities and Sub-Section General is based on common themes and draws upon accepted language. Hence, it needs to adhere to concepts which we have all generally agreed to. It broadly does so, with an exception.

The last sentence of 1d referring to the principle of democracy is not, to our knowledge, drawn from any document or agreed to common understanding of this term in the process that has been underway thus far.

After all, if this process were democratic, we would not have a situation where **despite** 164 states wanting to proceed to text-based negotiations, we have not yet been able to do so.

Also, although 54 countries of Africa want to change their status of being unrepresented in the permanent category, this document does not even make a reference to the common African position, in spite of garnering support from many others, including the G-4.

We, therefore, suggest that the clause referring to democracy be put under Issues for further consideration and not under Commonalities for the present. This is a precept that we have failed to practice. Or, to offer a charitable explanation, seem to have very different understanding of at present.

Third, on page 2 itself in the same section & sub section at 1 f) where a reference is made to the wish of the Member States to move the IGN process forward, we would like to add the clause, 'in accordance with the usual practices and procedures of the UNGA'. We presume that as our deliberations are a part of the GA's consideration of the issue, it is only natural to reflect this.

Fourth, on page 3 Commonalities Section under sub-section 4 relating to Categories of Membership, we request that the correct factual position on proposals concerning this issue be reflected.

Let me explain our position. All proposals offered thus far for the expansion of the 2-year term non-permanent seats are linked to expansion of other categories also and none exists in a stand-alone mode. So, our specific suggestion is, at the end of the first sentence of sub-section 4 ending with 'accepted by all Member States', the clause 'as part of an expansion that includes other categories' is added.

In our view, the reference to 'other categories' is broad enough to cover all eventualities, protects all positions and is also factually in tune with Section II sub section 4 on page 4 in the Issues for Further Consideration dealing with categories of membership. Not adding the additional clause will give a wrong impression, undermine different positions and is factually incorrect.

Fifth, in the Section on 'Issues for further consideration', subsection 1a on page 3, we welcome your reference to many Member States expressing a desire to move to the next phase. However, it would be useful to amplify what that phase is. It is a call for text-based negotiations.

Also, we find it not very helpful to juxtapose the reference to moving to the next phase with the existence of a large variety of opinions. Indeed, the idea of moving to the next phase is imbued with the desire to structure the process in a manner that narrows and ultimately overcomes differences. As one of the most prominent thought leaders of our times, the former Czech President Vaclav Havel said:

'Just as the constant increase of entropy is the basic law of the universe, so it is the basic law of life to be ever more highly structured and to struggle against entropy'.

In other words, different views on reform need not be seen as being in contradiction with efforts to structure the process in order to resolve differences. Our submission, therefore, is to reorder the structure of this sub-section by beginning with a listing of differences and then introduce the objective of many Member States. The revision would read as follows:

'Although a large variety of opinions on Security Council reform persist, particularly in relation to the following three clusters: categories of membership; the question of veto; regional representation, many Member States express a desire to move to the next phase of text-based negotiations'

Co-Chairs,

In the next session, we would be entering into the 10th year of the IGN process and the 25th year of the consideration of this issue by the General Assembly. Is there a silver lining to the efforts that we have made in 25 years? Can this revised version of the Food for Thought paper be a harbinger of change so as to make a transition from discussions to negotiations? Our submissions are made in that spirit of hope. After all diplomatic deliberations are precursors to decision-making.

☐ While, academic discussions indicate that the veto is the most unpopular aspect of the Council's functioning, politically its abolition is acknowledged as being extremely difficult.

☐ While in debates it is accepted that the views of the Troop Contributing Countries need to be taken into account in framing peace operations, the political reality is that they do not have an effective platform for expression on such matters.

☐ While theoretically a body of 15 should be run by 15, politically, we know that is not the case with the Council.

☐ While legally the Charter does not provide for the concept of regional representation, however, we know that politically, regional representation is an issue of importance to Africa.

To address these issues we need to move beyond discussions to political give and take negotiations.

Co-Chairs,

Just last week, a participant from outside the UN pithily reminded all delegates of what the world beyond expects of us. He paraphrased a well-known song as follows:

A little more bite and a little less bark

A little less fight and a little more spark

A little less conversation, a little more action

Co-Chairs, is 25 years of conversation not time enough for us to heed that call for a little more action? We certainly think so.

Thank you.

Copy right policy Terms & Condition Privacy Policy Hyperlinking Policy Accessibility Option

Copyright © 2018. Permanent Mission of India to the UN, New York Visitors: 296196 , Page last updated on: May 23, 2018

Powered by: Ardhas Technology India Private Limited.