Mr. President,

I thank you for convening this important meeting. We admire the manner in which you are leading the process of preparations for the High-Level Event of the UNGA in September. We also thank the Secretary-General for submitting to the General Assembly his latest Report: “In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all.”

2. The Pakistan delegation associates itself with the statements made by Malaysia as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement and Jamaica as the Chair of G-77 and China.

Mr. President,

3. Today, we are starting the second stage of our preparations for the September High-Level Event. We have, in the first stage, already expressed our positions on the issues of peace and security and development, in response to the report of the High-Level Panel and the Millennium Development Project. We have now received the Secretary-General’s long-awaited Report. In this debate, and in the subsequent meetings outlined in your Road Map, we shall be obliged to reiterate many of the same views and positions that have been already expressed in our previous informal discussions, specially since – as noted by the NAM and G-77 Chairmen – many of our views have not found reflection in the Secretary-General’s Report.

4. Much has been said about the self-evident reality that peace and development are mutually interdependent. Let us remember that the complete quotation, used in the title of the Secretary-General’s Report is: “social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.” Indeed, the September Summit was originally designed to review mainly the implementation of the internationally agreed development goals, including the MDGs. For the vast majority of Member States, perhaps the more serious deficit of the Secretary-General’s Report is its failure to clearly spell out a Plan of Action to implement the agreed development goals, beyond endorsing the welcome recommendations of the Sachs Report for increasing ODA, providing debt relief and open market access for the poorest countries and implementing some “quick wins.” The September Summit will be a failure, from our perspective, if it does not include clear commitments to at least:

create an equitable and development-oriented international trading system. Summit leaders cannot leave this to WTO negotiators;

decide on changes to make international financial and economic governance more equitable and supportive of development goals;

address the endemic problem of commodities; and

promote measures for generation of universal employment.

Mr. President,

5. In the area of Peace and Security, the Secretary-General’s Report has not only endorsed, but further accentuated, a concept of collective security that is conceived as an instrument of
coercion and intervention rather than of universal cooperation and harmonization – which is the underlying spirit of the UN Charter. It endorses the undue concentration of authority in the Security Council. This concept would result in legitimizing and reinforcing the pervasive inequality – in security, power and wealth – which characterizes our times and which the UN must seek to rectify.

6. The recommendations relating to the use of force and Articles 42 and 51 in the Report illustrate this point. The UN’s central purpose, under the Charter, is to prevent, not facilitate, the use of force and military intervention. The Report spells out so-called “criteria” for the authorization of force, which are subjective and which could be misused mostly by the powerful against the weaker States. Furthermore, going even against the High Level Panel’s caution against re-interpretation of Article 51, the Report’s analysis and recommendations open the door to the “pre-emptive” and even “preventive” use of force.

7. The endorsement of the so-called “responsibility to protect” would steer the UN along the same interventionist path. Those who would decide “where” and “when” to intervene to “protect” people at risk will be the big and powerful States, not the small and weaker ones. International law, specially humanitarian law, already provides the basis for the international community to protect peoples’ subjected to gross violations of human rights and genocide. In Rwanda, Srebrenica and elsewhere it was the failure of political will that prevented action; not the absence of an interventionist doctrine.

8. Pakistan is in the forefront of the war on terrorism. We welcome the conclusion of the Convention on Nuclear Terrorism. We agree that a comprehensive strategy is required to combat terrorism. But such a strategy must be clear, equitable and realistic. Everyone can agree that wanton violence against innocent civilians constitutes terrorism and this must be so whether perpetrated by non-state actors or state actors. Of course, civilians do not include armed forces suppressing or occupying peoples. And, individual acts of terrorism cannot in themselves deligitimize legitimate movements for self-determination and national liberation. Nor can the root causes of terrorism, including foreign occupation, denial of self-determination, political and economic injustices, all be brushed under the carpet in any effective counter-terrorism strategy.

9. The recommendations on Weapons of Mass Destruction are partial and incomplete. The first priority remains to achieve nuclear disarmament and the effective prohibition and elimination of all WMD. Non-proliferation must be promoted in tandem with disarmament. Arms control – global and regional – is essential to offer equal security to all States.

Mr. President,

10. There are also some significant omissions in the Report. It does not fully address the most important and existential threats to peace arising from foreign occupation, denial of self-determination, territorial disputes, interventionist policies and the excessive accumulation of increasingly lethal conventional and non-conventional armaments. Nor is the troubled relationship between Islam and the West addressed in the Report.

11. While seeking “to make the most far-reaching reforms in the history of the UN,” the Report does not fully focus on building on the major strengths of the UN system: (a) the enlargement of the treaty-making role of the General Assembly; (b) the empowerment of the international judicial system, specially the ICJ; (c) the considerable scope for action, under Chapter VI, for the pacific settlement of disputes; and (d) the UN’s capacity for coordination of international development assistance and for global humanitarian relief.

Mr. President,
12. We agree that it is essential to adjust and adapt the UN’s intergovernmental as well as Secretariat structures to the realities, challenges and opportunities of our times.

13. The UN General Assembly’s authority and role under the Charter must be restored. The rationalization of the Assembly’s agenda and working methods can help in this process. But, the central issue is a political decision to halt and reverse the encroachment by the Security Council on the Assembly’s functions and prerogatives.

14. Appropriate measures to enhance the role of the Economic and Social Council, as the central policy and coordination organ in the economic and social fields is also overdue. Some of us are working to achieve this. If Charter amendments are to be envisaged, we should consider a change to make the decisions of ECOSOC binding on Member States, like the decisions of the Security Council.

15. We support the proposal to create a new Peace-Building Commission. It should be mandated to deal with all stages of complex conflicts: conflict-prevention, conflict-management and post-conflict peace-building. It should be created by the General Assembly and report to both the Security Council and the ECOSOC. Its role should be advisory in nature. Its membership should include all major actors involved in addressing specific crises.

16. The proposal to create a new Human Rights Council appears to be a counter-intuitive answer to address the complex and controversial problems relating to UN’s approach to human rights. In our judgment, it will be difficult to realise this proposal. There are, however, simpler and effective avenues by which the consideration and action of the UN on human rights issues can be made more effective. My delegation hopes to advance some suggestions on this during our debate under the relevant cluster.

Mr. President,

17. It is a matter of concern that deep differences persist on the issue of Security Council reform. They threaten to overwhelm the entire reform agenda. If a partisan model, reflecting the ambitions of a few large states, is put to a vote, as they have indicated, it could derail the entire process of UN reform. It would be wise to realize a comprehensive reform of the Security Council by building a general consensus for a model that accommodates the legitimate interests and aspirations of all states, reflects current global realities and enhances the representativeness and effectiveness of the Security Council. A group of Like Minded countries is seeking to unite to promote such a consensus. These efforts deserve the support of all Member States, the Secretary-General, and the President of the General Assembly.

18. It is obvious that adjustments in the UN’s policies and institutions will require appropriate changes in the UN Secretariat. These changes must await, not precede, the intergovernmental decisions. While much of the recent media criticism against the UN and the Secretary-General is unfair and uninformed, there are several improvements which can and should be made to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the UN Secretariat. My delegation will offer some concrete suggestions in the near future, including on issues such as personnel policies, staff buyout, hiring of consultants, accountability and efficiency.

Mr. President,

19. The success of the September Summit will depend, very substantially, on clarity regarding its outcome, the preparatory process and the method of decision-making.
20. Pakistan endorses your indication that we will adopt a Final Document which would reflect a “balanced consensus” on all major issues. We do not like cherry-picking. But we can only harvest the fruit which is ripe and ready. Early harvests are, often, bitter harvests.

21. We also endorse your commitment to conduct an open, transparent and inclusive process of preparations for the Summit. We must underline that the outcome must be an openly negotiated document, not one produced through only bilateral or plurilateral consultations.

22. Finally, it is also evident that if we are to produce a “new consensus” for the new global order and a revitalized UN, this consensus must be achieved by consensus. It is disingenuous for some to imagine that they could force votes on certain issues but insist on consensus on others. One vote will lead to a series of votes. It could produce a mixed bag of results that could further erode the image and relevance of the UN and create a new “world order” marked by controversy and conflict rather than cooperation and collective action.

23. Let us choose the course of wisdom. Let us not seek partisan solutions and impose arbitrary deadlines. Let us unite for consensus. Let us make a real effort to create a United Nations that responds to the interests and aspirations of all the peoples of the United Nations.