



**PERMANENT MISSION
OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
NEW YORK**

NEW YORK, 8 NOVEMBER 2011

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY - ITEM 122: QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN
THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND RELATED MATTERS**

STATEMENT BY H.E. AMBASSADOR CHRISTIAN WENAWESER

PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President

We are entering the 18th year of our collective effort to reform the Security Council. Much has happened during those years, significant geopolitical changes have taken place and are still underway - and yet, one thing has remained the same: our inability to move this discussion forward, at least in the area of enlargement. The last President of the General Assembly took a slightly different approach to the topic than most of his predecessors by putting together a smaller informal group of Ambassadors to explore ways to move this agenda forward. It was a worthwhile effort, though it yielded same results. So one must wonder what to expect for this session – and whether there are any avenues left for us to explore. We express our continued support for Ambassador Tanin and will welcome any initiative that has the potential of leading us out of the ongoing impasse.

If the Council's composition was outdated and not a reflection of geopolitical realities in 1993, this statement obviously holds even more true today. But it is hard to argue that there is stronger momentum for reform today than back then. In some ways the opposite may well be

the case, after all the unsuccessful attempts of the past few years, but in particular after all this time of circular discussions. We know these are not negotiations, despite the fact that we have decided to call them just that. We are now facing the real risk of the process being taken outside of the Assembly and of movement and progress being sought elsewhere. This could lead to a politically dangerous showdown in the Assembly, and it would certainly undermine its authority – an organ often criticized for its inability to take decisions on essential issues. This would be all the more deplorable as the reform of the Council falls squarely and exclusively within its competence.

As is well known, Liechtenstein has for some years now advocated an enlargement model that could represent a compromise by creating a new category of seats: Six members would be allowed to serve for a much longer term than the two years currently foreseen for elected members under the Charter – perhaps up to as many as ten –and they would also be immediately eligible for re-election. This new distribution of seats could lead to some States serving permanently on the Council – without the privileges of course of the Permanent Members. It could also lead to a system of rotation among a number of powerful States that could divide these new seats among themselves, with the support and consent from their respective regions. It would both safeguard the interests of small States and avoid the difficulties that come with the enlargement of the category of the Permanent Members – which is the core of the conundrum of Security Council reform.

Mr. President

Enlargement is not the only and perhaps not the most important aspect of reform. It is the way in which the Council carries out its task that needs to be addressed and the “corporate culture” governing its activities – which, in accordance with the Charter, the Council is carrying out its functions on behalf of all of us Member States. This is all the more important because many of us have never served on the Council, and many of us will have great difficulties getting an opportunity to do so. Furthermore, especially the ever farther-reaching decisions of the Council can only be effective if they find broad political support among the membership and are

matched with a strong political will to implement them. The S5 group, of which we are a proud member, therefore views real progress in the area of working methods as a means to improve the effectiveness of the Council. Certainly, the discussion on Security Council reform has created good momentum in this respect. It can even be argued that the only tangible, albeit indirect, results of the past 18 years have been in the area of working methods. That said, the measures decided on by the Council itself as part of this process are not sufficient and, more importantly: their implementation has been uneven, inconsistent and at times arbitrary. It is therefore essential that our efforts to improve working methods continue.

Working methods are an indispensable part of the comprehensive project to reform the Security Council. But it also is an area that we need to pursue on its own merits, irrespective of and even particularly in the continued absence of any progress in the enlargement of the Council. By the same token, nobody would argue that the Council cannot be enlarged in the absence of an agreement on how to improve its working methods. The S-5 has therefore circulated a new draft resolution for the consideration of the members of this Assembly, and we look forward to a continued dialogue with all the States on how to further pursue our initiative. The text does not aim to offer a complete set of measures necessary to bring about the improvements from which the Council would benefit. Much rather, it addresses some of the main political challenges, including the use of the veto, and provides for an ongoing dialogue between the Assembly and the Council on the implementation and application of these measures. This would also be very helpful in launching a genuine dialogue between these two bodies that is foreseen under the Charter, but does not exist in our current practice.

I thank you.