

STRICTLY EMBARGOED UNTIL 1800 EST / 2300 BST ON 23 SEPTEMBER

SPEECH BY THE FOREIGN SECRETARY TO
THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY
NEW YORK, 23 SEPTEMBER 2004

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Mr President,

Congratulations on your election.

Eighteen months ago, the United Nations faced divisions more serious than any since the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962. We all worried whether the strength and unity which we had built up since the end of the Cold War could survive.

Then last year we saw Kofi Annan standing at his now famous fork in the road. But in
CHInt nions al Atomic Energy Agency Tj1 0 0 1 126 7 23Tm(MrIoacognisOct OculdrsOcte rofru yrioms

The High-Level Panel appointed by the Secretary-General is preparing its recommendations for how we can address these challenges. We should remember that we have one great advantage. Though its institutions and the founding text of the Charter has hardly changed in 60 years, the United Nations is not an Organisation set in stone – but a set of living institutions based on a shared will to make collective security work. It has adapted in the past – with the development of peacekeeping, a greater focus on individual rights, or the setting of global targets for development. I am confident that it can adapt in the future.

Of course, institutional change is part of that. We are conscious in particular of the need to widen the membership of the Security Council. At the UN's foundation, one-eighth of its members could expect to be elected members of the Security Council at any one time. Today it is less than one-eighteenth. The United Kingdom has long supported the case for expanding the Security Council to say 24 members, including amongst the permanent membership Germany and Japan – two countries which between them contribute 28 per cent of the UN's budget –; India, which represents one sixth of the world's population; and Brazil, which just missed permanent membership in 1945.

But we should not see an expansion of the Security Council, or other institutional change, as a panacea. The bigger need is to adapt our common understanding, the UN's jurisprudence if you like, and its operational effectiveness – so that we can respond more quickly and more thoroughly to today's new threats.

Let me highlight three areas which to me seem particularly important. First, our approach must be broader, tackling threats to the most vulnerable, such as poverty, disease and environmental degradation. Second, we must build a new consensus by expanding the scope of collective action. And third, we must deal with the threat of terrorism which menaces us all and everything for which we stand.

Mr President,

So, first – the need for a broader approach which addresses the complex and interdependent nature of security today.

Here, we have to do more to meet the Millennium Development Goals and promote sustainable development, especially in Africa. And we must do so not just because of our concern for justice and our common humanity; membe9Tzmo reduc0 lirrverythikm9hbdsprudence if you

UK will pursue work on the Secretary-General's report during our Security Council Presidency next month.

We could also use the UN to agree, to monitor and to help to implement globally-accepted norms of good governance, helping to stop unstable states from failing and building the transparency and accountability which create the conditions for lasting security and prosperity.

And we need to act together, quickly, on climate change – perhaps the greatest long-term threat to our world in terms of stability and security, not just the environment. We must begin by implementing Kyoto; and we must also agree emissions reductions beyond 2012.

Mr President,

Second is the need to build a new consensus on the scope of collective action.

We all represent independent, sovereign states. But even as we founded the UN we recognised that sovereignty was a trust in the hands of a nation's government: there to be respected, not abused, either from without or within. An abuse from without could be dealt with through the inherent right of self defence recognised in Article 51 of the Charter. But an abuse from within which threatens the peace could and should be dealt with by the Security Council under the powers enshrined in the other articles of Chapter VII of the Charter, and by the many Conventions within the UN framework, including, for example, the 1948 Genocide Convention. No longer could or should the world turn away from unspeakable barbarities like the Holocaust.

We have not however always lived up to all that – as the tragedies of Rwanda and Bosnia ten years ago remind us. But today we must resolve to do so and to engage – both in situations of humanitarian catastrophe or grave violations of international humanitarian law, and in the face of other threats to international peace and security. The principle of non-interference has to be accompanied by an expectation that governments will respect the rights of their citizens. Where they do not, the international community will need to consider how to react.

So we need for example to be ready to support greater use by the Secretary-General of his powers under Article 99 to bring threats to the peace to the Security Council's attention; and we must act quickly and effectively in response, because prevention is better than cure. We should look to work more closely with regional organisations, as we are doing with the African Union in Darfur. We need more discussion on the criteria for when the international community might have to intervene with sw.needed ap don-intecuanisations, as we arre aros

My third point is the urgent need to combat global terrorism – a menace directed at all of us.

If we have learnt anything in the three years since 11 September 2001 it is that international terrorism is indiscriminate in its targets, and merciless in its hatred.

working closely with Russia on its important draft Security Council Resolution, to see how best we can prevent those who commit, support and finance terrorism from sheltering behind a refugee status to which they are not entitled, and to look at ways to ensure the speedier extradition of such individuals.

Mr President,

We, the United Nations, have over the last year begun to show a new determination to