Mr. President,

At the outset, let me sincerely thank the two Co-Chairs; Ambassador Menon of Singapore and Ambassador Yanez-Barnuevo of Spain, and their teams for the commendable job they have done. By their hard work and constructive approach, they have successfully given comprehensive dimensions to an “operational” strategy.

Let me also thank you Mr. President for your commitment to the role of the General Assembly.

Mr. President,

We have noted that some aspects of the counter-terrorism strategy have been stated clearly and directly in the resolution and the Plan of Action, while other would need explanations and beefing up. This could involve a process of redefining of some elements of the strategy, however, we support this approach as it helps to evolve broader consensus.

For my delegation the most important aspect of this UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy is that it is dynamic and it would be implemented by the General Assembly. We appreciate that the General Assembly would examine progress made in its implementation and consider updating it. We also appreciate that Member States have recognized that objectives contained in the strategy could be achieved in the short, medium or in the long term time-frames. Which means the process of review and updating would also be extended until achievement of long term objectives. In this context Mr. President (GA) you rightly concluded yesterday (September 7, 2006) that “the strategy will remain a living document”.

Statement by Mr. Imtiaz Hussain, Minister, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations on The UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (08 September 2006)
We welcome recalling of the General Assembly resolution 46/51 of 9 December 1991. This is an unequivocal acknowledgement of the legitimacy of national liberation movements as in pp 15 of this resolution Member States reaffirmed “the inalienable right of self-determination and the independence of all the people under colonial and racist regimes and other forms of alien domination and foreign occupation, and upholding the legitimacy of their struggle, in particular the struggle of national liberation movements, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter and the Declaration on Principles of International law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”.

The Strategy has a full fledged section on the “conditions conducive to spread of terrorism”. We believe, the conceptualization and development of these root causes of terrorism would help to eliminate motivation for the terrorist acts. The list of conditions conducive to spread of terrorism, given in the Plan of Action of the strategy, is not exhaustive; however, acknowledgement of the fact that “prolonged unresolved conflicts” are one of the root causes of terrorism is a clear reflection of the fact. These conflicts arise mainly from foreign occupation and denial of the right of people to self-determination. These root causes will have to be addressed and overcome vigorously, if the strategy is to succeed in countering and eliminating terrorism.

The strategy rightly recalls that in the September 2005 Outcome document our leaders redictated themselves to support all efforts to uphold “the right to self-determination of peoples which remain under colonial domination and foreign occupation”. We hope this should provide inspiration for implementation of the General Assembly resolutions on self-determination, as many of those could not be implemented until now.

We also welcome that the Strategy addresses the problem of “foreign occupation”. In the preamble of the resolution it highlights support of the world leaders for the people under “foreign occupation”. At another place in the preamble it affirms determination of Member States “to do all they can to end foreign occupation”. We recognize that in addressing this important root cause of terrorism we have moved a step forward.

We understand the challenges faced by the Co-Chairs in articulation of “state terrorism”. Therefore, we appreciate the strong condemnation of
terrorism, in the strategy document, committed by “whomever, wherever” in the beginning of the resolution. We also appreciate paragraph 1 of Section I of the Plan of Action, which express the resolve of States to refrain from “participating in” terrorist activities. These are adequate guidelines to prepare plans for the fight against “state terrorism”.

The strategy acknowledges that socio-economic marginalization creates conditions conducive to spread of terrorism. We support your (President GA) views that these conditions should be dealt in a “comprehensive manner”. However, the General Assembly would need to develop appropriate strategies to transform these ideas into actions.

The listing and delisting procedures of the Security Council sanctions committees lack due process and the right to effective remedy. These are recognized as fundamental human rights by the jurists. We appreciate that the Counter-Terrorism Strategy has taken note of these problems and has asked fair and clear procedures for placing individuals and entities on the sanctions lists; for removing them from the lists; and for granting humanitarian exceptions. We hope the relevant Security Council sanctions committee would address these problems and provide statement of case of the listed individuals and entities to the concerned States for judicial proceedings.

The UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy does not address our concerns on some issues. On a few we would like to explain our position.

Regarding paragraph 2.a of the Plan of Action, we would like to add that Pakistan had constructively participated in the process to review the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Convention and the Protocol to ensure the safety and security of maritime navigation against the threat of terrorism. These protocols have NPT related obligations. Pakistan is not Party to NPT. Therefore, we cannot accept NPT related obligations, which are reflected in the amendments to the Convention.

Regarding paragraph 11 of Section II of the Plan of Action, we consider that control of biological weapons is primarily a concern in the industrially advanced States due to extensive use of biological agents by them. The Biological Weapons Convection should therefore be strengthened, in particular, by reviving the BW Verification Protocol. The process of the BWC Conference is the best forum to deliberate upon and seek agreed
solutions including the threat to bio-terrorism. Therefore, we should not rely on the restrictive regimes in addressing these threats. Treaty regimes take time but once they are agreed, they command wider respect and legitimacy.

Regarding paragraph 9 of Section III of the Plan of Action we are of the view that last sentence of the paragraph violates the “national implementation mechanism” established by the Security Council Resolution 1540.

I thank you Mr. President.