



**Statement by Ambassador Munir Akram, Permanent
Representative of Pakistan to the UN during the Fourth IGN on
Security Council Reform
(Model Presented by Group of Four – G-4)
(7 March 2024)**

Thank you, Co-Chair,

I would like to start by thanking the distinguished Permanent Representative of India for her very comprehensive introduction of the model presented by the Group of Four (G-4).

Co-Chair,

As a member of the Uniting for Consensus (UfC) Group, it is evident that our position has consistently opposed the issue of the creation of new permanent members, and this notwithstanding would be different from the distinguished representative of the United States. Our opposition arises from the fact firstly that the creation of new permanent members would contravene the basic principles and objectives of the reform of the Security Council, the very purpose for which it was launched. The title of our item indicates two basic vectors, firstly, expansion and secondly, equitable representation.

These are the basic vectors of our reform exercise. The reason for expansion is obvious. When the United Nations was created there were 55 members. When the Security Council was last expanded, I believe, there were 110, we are now 193. The membership now is composed mostly of small and medium states. There are over 100 countries which are members of the Singapore Club, small states, so it is obvious what is the nature of the member of the United Nations and representation therefore can only come about when these small and medium states are equitably represented in an enlarged Security Council.

The second purpose of reform is equitable representation, and here what does equitable representation imply? It implies firstly a greater balance between the permanent and the non-permanent members. This has been the frustration of the general membership of the United Nations over the years.

The frustration with the monopolization of power and influence not only in the Security Council but as my colleague from Italy said the pervasive influence of the 5 within the whole system because they possessed the veto power and their ability to dictate the elections of the Secretary General and have an over say about the appointments of all the senior positions within the United Nations. So, this is the only frustration of the general membership and this frustration can only be

addressed if there is greater representation of the small and medium states in the Security Council.

The G-4 model would direct us in the opposite direction. It would expand 6 new permanent seats, but only 5 new non-permanent seats. And therefore, the proportion of the members who are permanent vs. those who are non-permanent would become even greater.

Today, the permanent members are 1 to 2, 5 permanent members to 10 non-permanent members. In the G-4 model, in a 26-member council, the equation would be 1 to 1, 11 permanent members to 14 or 13 non-permanent members. It would reduce the proportionality between permanent membership and non-permanent membership by half and reduce the chances of representation for the rest of the 182 countries who will not be permanent members on the Security Council. So, this is a major flaw and goes in the wrong direction of what is the purpose of Security Council reform.

Equity and equitable representation also implies that we represent all the diversity in the UN membership. Large and medium and small states, different geographies, different civilizations, the nature of various states and governance systems, and this too will be curbed and curtailed by the model that the G-4 has presented, because it is based on the presumption that there are certain states have a more equal right to be permanently on the Council than others.

A contravention, I might add, of the basic principle of sovereign equality of states. Secondly, equitable representation also means equity between the five regions that are represented in the United Nations, the five geographical regions that we have. Expanding the Security Council by 6 permanent and 5 non-permanent seats, this would reduce the possibilities of greater regional representation and greater equitable representation. It will, first of all, strengthen and not contain the influence of the permanent members, as I have said. It would reduce the equity that we already have.

Today, in Asia, we have 54 countries and 26 of those countries compete for one seat. In the UfC model, the chances of Asian countries to compete for non-permanent seats would double. It would become one seat for 13 members, in the UFC model.

In the G-4 model, it would be reduced to say 1 to 15. We would still have 15 or more countries competing for 1 seat, more like 18 for one seat. So that is another reason why the rest of the membership would have a bad deed in the G-4 model, as compared to the UfC model, which is the purpose of expansion. Regional seats are also imbalanced in the G-4 model. In that model the Asian, the African group would have 6 or 7 Asian groups would have 6.

There are 54 countries in each group in Africa and Asia. The Western European group has only 29 member states, but the Western European group would also have 6 seats in the G4 model. This is not equitable representation. Even the distribution of the permanent seats in the G-4 model is unequal. It would give 2 permanent seats to Africa, 3 permanent seats to Asia, and 4 permanent seats to the Western European group.

They already have 3. And this would expand the Western European group's permanent membership by 1 into 4. That is not equitable, and that should not be acceptable to the rest of the membership, especially not to Asia or Africa, that we, with a larger number of states, with larger stakes are reduced to lesser representation on both non-permanent and permanent representation.

And if, as some say, there is a majority to consider permanent membership, and if we reopen the permanent membership, I think it would be a good opportunity, first and foremost, to reduce this over-representation of the West European group. If we are going to amend the charter and play around with the number of permanent members, why only expand? Why not reduce those regions and those countries which are over-represented in the Security Council? If we were to apply the rules that have been cited in Article 23 of the charter.

Let's examine, would all 5 existing permanent members qualify for permanent membership? And perhaps we can then reopen the issue and see how the developing world can be better represented if permanent membership is open. But would the P5 allow that permanent membership to be open? What we heard in our consultations is we're not going to give up our rights.

And when we give you the right to be permanent members, we will not give you the veto. So, equity is going to be sacrificed because, in the G-4 model, we are presented with this ingenuous offer of suspending the veto for the new permanent members for 14 or 15 years until we have a review. I can say with confidence that this will be in oblivion. And the new permanent members will get zero in terms of veto rights if this is what is accepted.

And my colleague from Africa, Sierra Leon, has stated this in very clear terms. So that's a ruse to make those countries which want a veto, like the African countries, it seems like a ruse to allay their demand for an immediate veto right if they are given permanent seats. We are also offered another ruse.

And that is the assertion that the new permanent members will, after all, be elected, elected by the General Assembly. In which democracy does an election take place for a permanent office? That only happens in kingdoms and dictatorships. No democracy elects someone to office permanently. This would defeat the very fundamental principles of democracy.

The election is held periodically in order to ensure accountability, in order to ensure that elected officials do what they have promised to do. But if you elect these 5 or 6 new permanent members permanently, they would have no accountability. Their representation of their regions would be minimal. They would be left to mainly promote their national interests. And therefore, this idea lets us come in through the route of election, and then we will be there permanently.

Now, if the 4 who are proposing this were to tell us that they are not candidates for permanent membership. I think their offer would be more credible. But if they are not prepared to give the offer that this is the route we want to create new permanent membership, but we are not interested because we have the interest of the whole United Nations at heart, I think that is the route to credibility.

This reform process was not designed to promote the individual national ambitions of any state. And we should avoid that. When we name countries that should become permanent members, we see some declarations which say well, so and so should be permanent members. Who has given the authority to any member of the United Nations to propose who should be a permanent member? We do not give the right to

anybody to tell us who they think should be permanent members. That authority should come in a democratic process, but that democratic process cannot be a process which elects people permanently and imposes a new dictatorship on the general membership of the Council.

Co-chairs,

I will not go into some of the processes related to the issues that we have seen, but perhaps one question I would leave here is in the view of the members of G-4, what are the objective criteria by which a member would qualify for permanent membership of the Council, is its size, is its contribution to peace and security? I presume it has been said Article 23 provides the criteria.

But if Article 23 is taken, then you see we have two wars going on in the world. What is the contribution of the members of the G-4 to allaying these wars? In Ukraine, it was a member of the OIC, which made the greatest contribution to trying to promote peace. We haven't seen any contributions from the 4.

In Gaza, if you see the voting record, which are the countries who have opposed the plausible genocide that is taking place, and who are those who voted the other way? Who are those that are sending arms to the aggressor in Gaza? What is their contribution to peace and security, which brings me to my last point.

Co-Chair,

The only way in which we will have equitable representation of the diversity of countries, countries in the regions, countries in cross-regional groups such as SIDS, the OIC, the Arab group, both of which have asked the Arab group and the OIC have said, if there are permanent seats to be created, we would want to have 1 permanent seat on the Council.

How will the G-4 model accommodate these cross-regional groups and respond to their demands, African demand, Arab demand, and the OIC demand? It can only be done in two ways, either we create the non-permanent seats in large numbers, or we create regional seats, as the Africans have proposed.

And we transform some of the permanent seats for Europe into a regional EU seat. And similarly, for Asia, we create an Asian seat selected

by Asia. I think that could be a solution. But the G-4 model does not offer those solutions. Is the G-4 ready for a dialogue on how we could accommodate these cross-regional aspirations of the Arab and the OIC countries and of the African group together in one model, that could be revised, and we would be prepared to enter into such a dialogue.

I thank you!