

Today, I wish I was representing a mythical state like Mediana. The advantage of representing mythical states is that there are no instructions from headquarters and you can have your flights of fancy. I am afraid I have a point of view which is different from that expressed yesterday here when U.S. citizens were analyzing U.S. attitudes towards the United Nations.

In listening to the discussions yesterday, what struck me most was that, while discussing the United Nations, nobody mentioned the idea of a World Government. Nobody mentioned idealism. This struck me very strongly because, if you ask an average Indian as to what the United Nations is, he will say that it is the nucleus of a World Government, or the beginning of One World. That, I think, is the difference between a superpower trying to look at the U.N. as an instrument of its policy, and another country looking at it as a family of nations. Perhaps this is inherent in Indian thinking because we have been visualizing One World for centuries. We look at the United Nations as the beginning of democratization of international relations. We, therefore, tend to overlook some of its deficiencies. We are not particularly disappointed if it does not succeed in one area or another. The fact that it is there is reason for hope even if it is not as effective as it should be.

The United Nations has been a reality for us all these years, all these fifty years. It has been doing useful work. The General Assembly has formulated consensus documents of far reaching significance on decolonization, economic issues, social matters, and human rights. It is not as though the U.N. has come to life only after the Cold War.

Did the United Nations achieve its objective of saving the future generations from a third world war? That is a question that we can discuss forever and we may not find an answer. I must tell you an interesting story to illustrate the point.

There was an old man walking around in Manhattan spreading some white powder on First Avenue. Intrigued by this, someone walked up to him and asked him what he was doing. He said that he was spreading lion powder to keep lions out of Manhattan. When he was told that there were no lions in Manhattan, he said, "You see, my powder is effective. It is because I have been spreading this powder on First Avenue for the last several years that lions keep away from Manhattan."

* Deputy Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations.

Similarly, the U.N. can claim that it was because of the hundreds of resolutions that were adopted by the United Nations, it was because of the speeches that were made at the U.N. that there was no third world war. Just as it cannot be proved whether the lion powder was effective or not, no one can say whether the U.N. prevented a world war or not. Perhaps the work done by the United Nations over a long period, the time, energy and resources spent on it, may have been the reason for the absence of a third world war.

Talking about global attitudes to the U.N., I must say that a country like India is not seeking anything from the United Nations. Perhaps, you would find this a surprising statement. When a country joins the United Nations, is it not seeking something from it? Is there not something you want from it? The answer is "no" in the case of India. Apart from the expectation that the United Nations will do some good for the world one day, India is not looking for benefits for itself from the U.N. Ironically, however, India was one of the countries that went to the Security Council soon after its independence. I am talking about 1948, when India went to complain to the Security Council that Pakistan had committed aggression against India. India went to the United Nations not because we could not resolve the problem ourselves. If India had not gone to the United Nations at that time, the Indian army would have thrown the aggressor out of Kashmir in a few hours. It was India's idealism, it was the feeling that the new world organization should resolve conflicts and disputes, that prompted India to go to the Security Council. Similarly, when we speak of a just international economic order, when we ask for new and additional resources for environmental protection, I do not think that we are seeking assistance for ourselves. What we are seeking to do is to pursue a kind of dream, a dream for a better world.

The contribution that the United Nations has made in the areas of decolonization, disarmament, and development even before the end of the Cold War has been great, and even if it has not been very successful in the settlement of disputes all around the globe, its contribution in other areas is widely recognized and understood and our attitude towards the United Nations is determined by that perception.

Now let us come to the new United Nations. I have had two stints at the United Nations. One was in the early 1980s at the height of the Cold War, and the other began in 1992. I think these are two distinct phases in the history of the United Nations. We belong to that group of countries which believes that what happened soon after the Cold War was an exceptional situation that required an exceptional approach.

The U.N. Charter has never stood in the way of what the members have wanted to do. The word "peacekeeping" does not figure in the Charter, just as there is no "peacemaking," and there is no "preventive diplomacy." Somebody said that the Charter was so magnificent and so unique, that it was not written by human hands. No international action, however innovative, has been prevented by the limitations of the Charter.

Where does the Charter talk about internal disputes? Yet, where has it prevented the United Nations from going into situations of internal disaster? Therefore, obviously the Charter is flexible enough, and it is comprehensive enough, to allow innovative interpretations.

In the process, however, the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole have eroded something which is considered extremely important by its member states, which is sovereignty. One thing that is dear to every member of the United Nations, whether it is a small state or a big state, is respect for its sovereignty. In fact, some of the smaller states joined the United Nations simply to safeguard their sovereignty, as against their stronger and bigger neighbors or as against others who might want to swallow them up. So, if you join the United Nations as a member in order to safeguard your security, your identity, and your aspirations, how can you accept erosion of sovereignty by the United Nations? We may have acquiesced in, and we may have accepted a U.N. role in a situation where there is an internal dispute. But the fact that the United Nations has no role in internal affairs of states, and that it should not trample upon the sovereignty of individual states, is something which is very dear to every member of the U.N. What you do not accept for yourself, you should not impose on others. In some exceptional situations, we may have permitted the U.N. to act in internal situations, but this should be seen more as an exception rather than the rule.

We simply have to read the two Agendas for Peace that the Secretary-General has put forward to see how he himself is trying to correct the aberrations and bring the activities of the U.N. closer to the dictates of the Charter. There is a basic difference between the approaches of these two documents. Perhaps the first document was a creation of a group of people at a time when the Secretary-General had not himself gained much experience, while the second document is the essence of his experience in the last three years or so, tempered by the realities of the situation. It has the stamp of a person who has lived through these changes and these aberrations and wishes to approach them with a realistic, and a more rational mind.

The most important point that we have noticed in the Agenda for Peace II, as we have come to call it, is that the Secretary-General has virtually returned to the precepts of the Charter. He has started treating the changes, the modifications, and the alterations as consequences of the dictates of the situation. This is what we welcome. For example, when Agenda for Peace II speaks of peacekeeping operations it makes clear that you need the consent of the parties concerned for peacekeeping. You need to realize that there is a difference between peacekeeping and peace enforcement. The blurring of these two concepts, or keeping these as two aspects of the same "continuum" has not been right. These are two independent, individual, separate operations which must be done in accordance with the scheme of the Charter for peaceful settlement of disputes. The use of force has to be resorted to only in exceptional circumstances.

In short, we would favor a return to the fundamental precepts of the Charter, the respect for sovereignty and consent of the parties concerned even for humanitarian activities. Let us not forget the words in Chapter VI which say, "all other methods freely chosen by the states themselves." It is not important and it is not necessary for the U.N. to intervene in everything. It is not compulsory, it is not obligatory. If two states are willing to resolve their problems by bilateral means, there is no need for the U.N. to intervene. It is not necessary. Leave it to them; let them decide.

This is the kind of vision that we have—of bilateral efforts, regional efforts, and the U.N. as a last resort when everything else fails. The United Nations does not have the resources to start interfering in every little war in every corner of the world. It is not expected to; it ought to be there only when it becomes necessary and other means fail.

I might touch upon just two more points which you have partly discussed yesterday and even today. One is sanctions. No one doubts that sanctions are a means of settling problems. Sanctions are useful instruments. Somebody has called them blunt instruments, but indeed they are instruments. If you look at the history of sanctions, you will see that it was the developing world, the nonaligned countries, who advocated sanctions in the case of South Africa. The General Assembly had several resolutions calling for the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. It is interesting to remember that, at that time, the bigger powers said that if sanctions were imposed against South Africa, it would have some unintended victims. "Yes, we hate apartheid, of course, but we will do nothing against South Africa, because it will have adverse implications for unintended victims of sanctions," we were told.

This is a point that the Secretary-General makes in his Agenda for Peace II. He makes the point that sanctions are useful in certain circumstances, but we should think about the implications of the sanctions both for the errant state as well as for its neighbors. India voted for Resolution 687, the resolution which extended sanctions against Iraq. The difficulties arose in Resolution 661 when the sanctions were first imposed against Iraq, because the resolution set as its objective not just the "liberation of Kuwait," but "restoration of international peace and security in the region." Thus, the Security Council arrogated to itself the right to continue its sanctions as long as it wished.

This kind of a broad mandate, which was given by the Security Council to continue sanctions against Iraq, has created the present impasse in which one does not know when these sanctions will end or even be relaxed. It may be better than war. But the difference is that a war cannot continue indefinitely, while sanctions can continue indefinitely like in the case of Iraq.

Is it fair for the U.N. to be criticized that it has some blood of innocent children of Iraq on its hands? Sanctions have to be clinically applied to a certain situation. It should also be considered as to what implications such sanctions would have for the unintended victims that are affected. This is where Article 50 of the Charter comes in. Article 50, in fact, anticipated all of these problems. Hats off to the framers of the Charter. They acknowledged that when the Security Council imposed sanctions against one country, there could be adverse effects on certain other countries. Hence, those countries have the "right" (that was the word used) to consult the Security Council with a view to resolving their problems. In actual practice, however, Article 50 has had no effect. It has offered no compensation for the unintended victims of sanctions.

I myself chaired a Working Group of the Security Council on Article 50 and I am ashamed of the document we have issued because it simply says that the Member States must explore various possibilities without even acknowledging the fact that the Security Council has a responsibility and the affected member states have a right to seek redress. Imagine, you have the right to go to the Security Council, but the Security Council has no obligation to do anything! We are still struggling with this particular responsibility of the Security Council, to have some kind of a mechanism which would come into play automatically as soon as sanctions are enforced.

Our point is that the sanctions resolution should have within it a mechanism which would remove the difficulties of the neighboring countries who might suffer. India, for example, lost something like \$4 billion in lost

contracts when we implemented the sanctions against Iraq. We submitted documentary evidence to the Security Council, but, as of today, we have not yet received a penny out of it. As a law abiding state, if you abide by the decisions of the Security Council you also ought to have the right to be insulated against these problems. I think that only if that is done will the Security Council be able to make decisions which will be respected by the rest of the international community.

The last point that I would like to touch upon is the expansion of the Security Council. I must have given you the impression that India is fairly happy with the Charter and that there is no change necessary. The change we are seeking in the size and composition of the Council is very much in keeping with the provisions of the Charter. First of all, the Charter itself provides for amendments and changes, and the strength of the Security Council has already been changed once from eleven to fifteen.

The starting point of any expansion of the Security Council should be the proportion between the general membership and size of the Security Council. We had 11 as against 50, and then we had 15 as against less than 100, and now, by a simple mathematical calculation we have to determine how many out of 185 should be in the Council. We are not asking for a revolution, we are simply asking that the original proportion should be maintained. One may say that the Council will be too unwieldy if it is expanded beyond a point. But I do not think that efficiency has anything to do with numbers. The Security Council was very small, 11 to 15, during the Cold War. But was it efficient then? How did it become efficient soon after the Cold War? If you want the Security Council to be efficient, what you need is political will. Just because a room is smaller, or the people are fewer, there will not be greater efficiency there. In fact, the efficiency will increase if the Council is a more representative group whose decisions carry credibility and the moral authority of the entire membership of the U.N.

The formula can vary, people can argue whether they should be permanent, non-permanent, semi-permanent, rotating, or even standing, as recommended by the Global Governance Commission. Clearly, there is a need for an expansion of the Security Council to make it representative, and the question is, how do we do it? We feel that the permanent membership should itself expand. It is not simply a question of members being able to participate in the discussions, or simply witnessing them. All of us know that the permanent members occupy a privileged position in the Security Council.

The developing countries cannot play an effective role in the Security Council unless they are represented in the permanent membership. What we are seeking is not simply a ringside seat; what we are seeking is the ability to play a role in the Security Council, and this can be done only if the developing world is adequately represented in the Security Council. If the Security Council is to gain the moral authority that I mentioned earlier, the nonaligned countries ought to be represented in the permanent membership with equal rights and obligations, including the obligation to make a higher financial contribution. The important point is that if we want to change the complexion of the Security Council and its decision-making process, we ought to have nonaligned countries as permanent members of the Security Council.

How do we do that? The only way to do that is by developing universal criteria for permanent membership. All of us know that there are criteria for non-permanent membership in the Security Council, but there are no criteria for permanent membership. It is time to consider what the attributes of a permanent member are. I would say that population is an important factor. The Charter says in the Preamble "We the people of the United Nations." If it is not just a rhetorical flourish, how do you exclude one billion people who represent a whole civilization from permanent membership?

Another criterion should be the record of a country's contribution to peacekeeping operations. What is India's interest in participating in the operation in Congo, or in Haiti, or in Somalia? Obviously, we believe that the United Nations has a role there and since the Security Council has taken a decision to send an operation there, we ought to help. There was a reference made to payments, but I do not think that half the population of India knows that India is being paid for peacekeeping operations, but the entire country supports its involvement in peacekeeping operations.

India has the tragic distinction of having lost the largest number of soldiers in peacekeeping operations. We have lost something like 88 soldiers. There was no protest over such a tragedy because it was seen as much our patriotic duty to serve the United Nations as to serve the nation itself. A country like India which has participated in most peacekeeping operations, risking lives, should qualify to serve as a permanent member of the Security Council. Economic power alone should not be the criterion for permanent membership.

A reference was made yesterday to a general agreement about Germany and Japan joining as additional permanent members. I challenge that conclusion: there is no such general agreement. There is general talk, yes,

but the Japanese themselves have told us that they do not have more than thirty supporters. Even those supporters do not simply say, "Japan full stop," or "Germany full stop." No, they say, "We support Germany and Japan together with others." I have no quarrel with the claims of Japan and Germany. However, let those claims, and other claims of anybody else, be tested against universal criteria that should be agreed upon. I know that this will take time, this may not be a reality this year, or the next few years, but we can wait. The Security Council is not stuck somewhere, it is operating, it is functioning. So, it is not that we need to have a quick fix to make it run. Any expansion has to be done in a logical and coherent way so that it is satisfactory to all the countries.

I shall conclude by saying that India feels that the Charter has served humanity well, and it has been flexible enough to allow innovative interpretations. While there have been aberrations, we feel that the sooner we get back to the Charter and look at the world from the perspective of the Charter, the better. Improvements that can be brought about through open, transparent discussions should be brought about to make it even more effective. Thank you very much.