



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

---

NEW YORK, 29 JANUARY 2019

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**QUESTION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION ON AND INCREASE IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE  
SECURITY COUNCIL AND RELATED MATTERS**

**STATEMENT BY CHRISTIAN WENAWESER, AMBASSADOR, PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE**

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE PRINCIPALITY OF LIECHTENSTEIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Co-chairs,

Thank you very much for taking on this very difficult mandate; we will certainly support you to the fullest of our abilities in your job.

I have to admit, like my colleague from Singapore, that I was also wondering whether we should register for this debate when we received the invitation. For the reason that he has mentioned, I came to the same conclusion as he has, namely, that it is important to put our views on the record once again, both on process and on substance. But I also noticed that some others have reached different conclusions and I think that is part of what we should keep in mind in thinking about our way forward.

We are certainly concerned about the state of this process on Security Council reform and we are also concerned about the state of the Security Council more generally speaking, because we would not agree that the Council has in recent years proven to be effective at carrying out its work. At a time when we are discussing in the corridors, in think tanks, sometimes in our meetings at the UN, about the need to strengthen multilateralism, it would be extremely important to have as effective a Council as possible. We have not had that for a number of years now. I think it is safe to say that we have been in this stalemate essentially for a decade or so.

At some point, we have started to call the process we find ourselves in a negotiation, but we have in fact never started to negotiate. We are still discussing the parameters of what a negotiation could look like. That is not due to lack of good leadership. I think we have good leadership and we are confident that you will provide us with that in this season as well. Nevertheless, it is difficult to lead if your constituency does not want to be led. We do not agree with those who

want to see a minimal role for the co-chairs. We think that any negotiation, and certainly a difficult negotiation, requires strong leadership that also comes forward with ideas and seeks to identify compromise.

We certainly fail to understand how a negotiation can be based on anything but a text. We all know that what we are trying to do has to result in amendments to the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the United Nations cannot be amended orally. At some point we need to have a text and we believe it is possible to have that text. We are prepared to look at any text that you will give us and support you in the efforts to put it forward.

We are among those who, and again I want to echo what my colleague from Singapore has said, do not believe that enlargement and reform of the Council are identical things. We attach very high importance to the working methods of the Security Council, to the way the Council interacts with the rest of the membership in terms of its inclusion, transparency and accountability. In recent years, we have in fact invested more time in that part of Council reform than in enlargement because we believe it is the more promising aspect of the reform.

That being said, we obviously support enlargement. We have a Security Council that does neither represent the geopolitical realities of today, nor the membership of the United Nations. I come from a region - Europe - that is massively overrepresented in the Security Council. Others in the room, for example our colleagues from Africa, and others, are certainly seriously underrepresented. This is in and of itself a strong incentive for the enlargement of the Council and we are committed to it as a goal of the reform, which is why we have put forward our own ideas on how the Council could be enlarged.

In fact, I agree with our colleague from Russia, who said that there is no guarantee that an enlarged Council is automatically a more effective Council. We think that this is the crux and in a way the center of our discussion, even though it is not usually talked about in this way, is in fact the existence of the veto. We cannot enlarge the Council effectively without addressing the veto and I think this is reflected very clearly in the diverging views that have been put forward by different groups before.

We are among those who believe quite strongly that creating new vetoes will not do anything to enhance the effectiveness of the Security Council, given the problem that the existence, use, and threat of the veto is posing to the Council's work on a daily basis.

This does not mean that we do not understand and support the aspirations of those who want to play a larger role. We believe that they are entitled to do so and that we should find a solution under which states have the possibility to serve permanently on the Security Council de facto without having a permanent seat as currently enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. We have long advocated for a model of long term renewable seats, which would make precisely that

possible. We have also dedicated years on how to safeguard the interest of small states in particular, as will be easy to understand, since we are one of the smallest members of the United Nations. We are happy to talk about that in a separate discussion as well.

Having no new veto rights is a crucial and essential element for us in SC enlargement, which should, however, also be accompanied by measures that address the practice, the use and the application of the veto that will continue to exist. We are willing to accept that, not because we think it is a particularly good feature of the Charter of the United Nations, but simply because we are realistic enough to say that we do not think it can be changed, given that the Charter can only be changed with the consent of the permanent members.

This is why we believe the work on the use of the veto is so important. We have supported the French-Mexican Initiative, which was referenced by our colleague from France, and we have advocated for the ACT Code of Conduct, which is currently supported by 119 Member States. We very strongly believe that these are key initiatives to really change the collective culture in the work of the Security Council. We are committed to further expanding the number of those who support the ACT Code of Conduct. We will continue our outreach together with our friends and we will work on the implementation of the Code. In parallel, we will continue to work intensely with those who are generally committed to making the Security Council a more efficient and a more effective body.

We are committed to coming here as frequently as you think is helpful throughout the year. This is an extremely important exercise and limiting the meeting time to a set number of meetings does not seem the obvious way to go for us at all. Yet, I think at some point in this discussion we also have to ask ourselves the question what it is that we are doing here, whether the IGN is turning into a vehicle that is useful only for those who want to delay the process, and not for those who want to see reform of the Council. We do believe that we have to look at ourselves honestly. We will be happy to engage in this kind of discussion.

I thank you.