



# General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

**31**<sup>st</sup> plenary meeting  
Monday, 23 November 2020, 4.30 p.m.  
New York

Official Records

*President:* Mr. Bozkir . . . . . (Turkey)

*The meeting was called to order at 4:45 p.m.*

**Agenda item 130 (continued)**

**Cooperation between the United Nations and regional and other organizations**

**Report of the Secretary-General (A/75/345)**

**Notes by the Secretary-General (A/75/128 and A/75/153)**

**(a) Cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union**

**(b) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation**

**Draft resolution (A/75/L.27)**

**(c) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization**

**(d) Cooperation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States**

**Draft resolution (A/75/L.21)**

**(e) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Latin American and Caribbean Economic System**

**Draft resolution (A/75/L.24)**

**(f) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of American States**

**(g) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe**

**(h) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Caribbean Community**

**(i) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Economic Cooperation Organization**

**(j) Cooperation between the United Nations and the International Organization of la Francophonie**

**(k) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization**

**Draft resolution (A/75/L.23)**

**(l) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Council of Europe**

**(m) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Economic Community of Central African States**

**(n) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons**

**(o) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization**

**Draft resolution (A/75/L.22)**

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).



- (p) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Pacific Islands Forum**
- (q) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations**  
Draft resolution (A/75/L.25)
- (r) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Community of Portuguese-speaking Countries**
- (s) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization**
- (t) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Collective Security Treaty Organization**
- (u) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Central European Initiative**  
Draft resolution (A/75/L.16)
- (v) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization for Democracy and Economic Development — GUAM**  
Draft resolution (A/75/L.17)
- (w) Cooperation between the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Independent States**  
Draft resolution (A/75/L.19)
- (x) Cooperation between the United Nations and the International Organization for Migration**
- (y) Cooperation between the United Nations and the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL)**  
Draft resolution (A/75/L.20)
- (z) Cooperation between the United Nations and the International Fund for Saving the Aral Sea**
- (aa) Cooperation between the United Nations and the United Nations and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development**

**The President:** Before giving the floor to speakers in explanation of vote or position after adoption, may I remind delegations that explanations are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

**Mr. Schroeder** (Germany): I have the honour to deliver an explanation of position on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries the Republic of North Macedonia,

Montenegro, Serbia and Albania, and the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, align themselves with this statement.

We joined consensus on resolution 75/14, entitled “Cooperation between the United Nations and the Latin American and Caribbean Economic System”, as an expression of the importance we attach to the region and to regional integration initiatives. The EU is an observer to the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States and a main trade and economic partner of Latin America and the Caribbean in line with the deeply rooted social and cultural ties that extend in every direction between our two regions.

We thank Peru, facilitator of the resolution, for the inclusion of some of our proposals in the text. However, we regret that the resolution does not include a reference to the Paris Climate Agreement alongside the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. As a result, the text does not truly reflect the clear fact that the foundations of truly sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean and elsewhere in the world can be achieved only through the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. We firmly believe that these three agendas for action provide the foundation for sustainable low-carbon and resilient development under a changing climate.

With respect to resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), I also have the honour to deliver an explanation of position on behalf of the European Union and its member States. The candidate countries the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Albania, the country of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidate Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Republic of Moldova align themselves with this statement.

The European Union and its member States continue to support the resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation and encourage further cooperation between both organizations. In addition, we acknowledge that, owing to the current restrictions in place, there was not sufficient time to organize proper consultations, and the facilitator opted for a technical rollover.

That said, we need to express our disappointment that, despite objections from several delegations, including from the EU, the reference to the OIC 2025 programme of action has been maintained in resolution 75/16. The EU reiterates that the language contained in the 2025 programme of action comes without any endorsement of declarations, decisions and resolutions adopted by OIC forums, which ought to be fully consistent with General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and in full respect of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, including, notably, the principle contained in Article 2, paragraph 7, thereof.

In that regard, we wish to put on record that the provisions of the OIC 2025 programme of action related to Cyprus are not consistent with existing Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. We therefore urge the OIC to refrain from adopting positions that would undermine international law and the United Nations Charter. The EU trusts that its positions will be taken into account in future so that it can continue to support this resolution.

**Ms. Agladze** (Georgia): Georgia supports United Nations cooperation with regional organizations and believes that they play a significant role in advancing the purposes and principles of the United Nations. However, as a founding Member of the United Nations, Georgia cannot support resolution 75/9, which welcomes the efforts of States members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) to attain objectives inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

The Russian Federation continues to violate the territorial integrity and sovereignty of its neighbouring States, contrary to the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. Consequently, it cannot be said that the work of the CIS actually contributes to regional peace and security. My delegation wishes therefore to put on record that it disassociates itself from the consensus on resolution 75/9.

With regard to resolution 75/12, I would note that Georgia fully supports United Nations cooperation with the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSEC) and believes that this cooperation contributes to advancing sustainable development in the region. For this reason, we joined the consensus on this resolution. We thank Romania as Chair of the BSEC for its work on the resolution. At the same time, my delegation wishes to put on record that Georgia disassociates itself from

paragraph 9 of the resolution, since the information provided therein is inaccurate, does not reflect our position and raises the concern of some Member States and the BSEC Permanent International Secretariat.

**Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic would like to express its position on sub-item (b) of agenda item 130, which is before the General Assembly, and resolution 75/16, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation".

My country's delegation joined the consensus on the resolution. However, it is essential to recall that the Syrian Arab Republic was a founding member of the OIC and will remain a genuine member of the organization despite the manipulation of procedures undertaken by a group of member States in August 2012. Those member States used their financial and political influence to bring pressure to bear on other members to suspend my country's membership by taking an illegitimate decision that is contrary to the Charter of the OIC and its regulating rules.

The policies of those member States of the OIC failed to negatively affect our bilateral relations with many of the Governments of other member States in the organization. Our relations with them are based on mutual respect for the principles of sovereignty, self-determination and non-interference in their domestic affairs.

My country, Syria, has borne an unprecedented brunt of terrorism in the history of humankind. Syria, its people and army have paid the heaviest price, not only with money and property but also with blood. All those present know exactly which Governments supported, financed, armed and promoted terrorism politically and in the media. They also promoted hate speech, extremism and fake religious teachings through extreme religious platforms.

After the achievements that the Syrian State has made in its war against terrorism, we call on those Governments to acknowledge their wrong-doing and repudiate it by taking back their foreign terrorist fighters and their families who are living in camps under the control of armed separatist groups. They should reform those families so as to prohibit them from being a nucleus of terrorism and extremism that threatens our upcoming generations.

Despite everything I have just mentioned, the Syrian Arab Republic still believes in the pioneering role played by regional and international organizations. We will always engage in the collective work to confront the challenges that threaten the entirety of humankind. We expect that the OIC will be able to truly review its methodology and working methods to get back on the right track so as to be a forum that reflects the true identity of Islam as a religion of peace and love. This is a responsibility that lies with all of us as full-fledged members, or even suspended members, of the OIC.

My country's position has always been steadfast and clear to everyone. We are keen to apply the standards of democracy, transparency and equal rights and obligations among all member States of the organization. We would call on the OIC to re-establish its free decision-making and the genuine rights of the vast majority of its member States. That would enable the organization to confront the major challenges that threaten our existence and the future of our generations, realize the desired objectives since its inception until now and play a genuine role within the international community in countering terrorism and extreme ideologies.

**Mr. Hinton** (Canada): Canada joined the consensus today on resolution 75/16 because we strongly support its objective of strengthening cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). However, Canada wishes to dissociate itself from the fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution, which notes the OIC's 2025 programme of action. This is because Canada opposes initiatives at the United Nations and in other multilateral forums that unfairly single out Israel for criticism.

**Ms. Webster** (Australia): In a similar vein to my Canadian colleague, Australia supports the strengthening of cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), and so joined consensus on resolution 75/16. However, we also wish to dissociate ourselves from the fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution. Australia does not accept the characterization of Israeli actions contained in the OIC's 2025 programme of action and is opposed to the unfair targeting of Israel in the United Nations and other multilateral institutions.

**Mr. Lee** (United States of America): I take the floor to deliver explanations of position of the United States on a number of the resolutions adopted by the General

Assembly under agenda item 130 at this morning's meeting (see A/75/PV.30).

With regard to resolution 75/7, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Central European Initiative, we wish to thank Montenegro for its work on the resolution. The United States fully supports the goals of the Central European Initiative to enhance European integration and prosperity on the continent. The United States submitted a notice of withdrawal from the World Health Organization (WHO), which will become effective on 6 July 2021, and therefore we dissociate ourselves from references to the WHO in resolution 75/7. With regard to our position on the WHO, we would like to refer Member States to the general statement the United States delivered in the Second Committee on 18 November 2020.

With regard to resolution 75/9, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), we thank Uzbekistan for its efforts on this resolution. The United States fully supports efforts to expand economic development and opportunity for the peoples of the countries that comprise the CIS. The United States notes that, whereas some human rights may not be fully realized in all States, States still have international obligations and commitments to respect those human rights that are articulated in the instruments to which they are parties and enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

With regard to resolution 75/12, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization (BSEC), we wish to thank Romania for its initiative on this resolution. The United States is an observer to BSEC and fully supports the organization's work to ensure economic development and prosperity in the Black Sea region and beyond. As I noted a moment ago, the United States submitted a notice of withdrawal from the WHO, which will become effective on 6 July next year. Therefore, in this regard too, we must dissociate ourselves from the reference to the WHO in 75/12 resolution. Again, with regard to our position on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the WHO, we would refer to our general statement delivered in the Second Committee on 18 November 2020.

In terms of resolution 75/14, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Latin American

and Caribbean Economic System, with regard to the third preambular paragraph and its reference welcoming resolution 74/306, the United States made its position clear in our explanation of vote delivered on 11 September 2020 (see A/74/PV.64). We also note the third preambular paragraph's unfortunate lack of clarity in the way it characterizes the resolution's reference. While the United States joined the consensus on resolution 75/14, in terms of the references to 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and the WHO in the resolution, we would once again refer colleagues to the concerns we raised in our general statement of 18 November 2020.

Finally, while the United States joined the consensus on resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, we would like to make clear that we dissociate ourselves from the reference to the OIC's 2025 programme of action therein. The United States views the OIC 2025 programme of action's treatment of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in particular as one-sided, politicized and biased in a way that does not contribute positively to efforts to resolve the conflict.

**Mr. Knyazyan** (Armenia): I take the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia on resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). Armenia maintains cordial relations and constructive cooperation with most of the States members of the organization.

With respect to the resolution adopted, the delegation of Armenia would like to reiterate the importance of fostering the settlement of disputes and supporting efforts aimed at the peaceful resolution of conflicts within internationally mandated negotiation formats. In this regard, Armenia notes with regret the reference in the resolution's preamble to the OIC 2025 programme of action.

The resolution also contains formulations that blatantly contravene the basic principles of the settlement of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. We have been appealing to the States members of the OIC, when making references to the Nagorno Karabakh conflict, to adhere to the language and formulations contained in the documents of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Minsk Group Chairs, as the internationally mandated format dealing with the

peaceful settlement of the conflict, and to reject any attempts by one State Member of the United Nations to misuse the OIC platform to misrepresent and distort the root causes, essence and principles of the need for conflict resolution.

In the light of the foregoing, the delegation of Armenia would like to dissociate itself from the fourth preambular paragraph, which contains a reference to OIC 2025 programme of action.

**Ms. Fisher-Tsin** (Israel): Resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), refers to the OIC 2025 programme of action that was adopted in 2016. Behind the phrase "programme of action" hides yet again another attack against Israel. It seems that no matter what we discuss, be it cooperation, conflict prevention or development, some members of the OIC insist on injecting poisonous, false and accusatory language about Israel in every forum and in every resolution. It is regrettable to see the hijacking of yet another organization for the purposes of promoting the anti-Israel agenda, which does nothing to encourage dialogue and does even less for peace.

Israel is pleased to join the consensus on resolution 75/16, as we have strong relations with some of the OIC members. However, Israel disassociates itself from the fourth preambular paragraph of the resolution.

**Ms. Rose** (United Kingdom): Please allow me to share an explanation of position on resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC).

The United Kingdom continues to support this resolution and cooperation between the United Nations and the OIC. However, as we have expressed in previous years, we are disappointed that the OIC 2025 programme of action continues to be referenced in this text. Specifically, the United Kingdom is concerned with the reference to a "constituent Turkish Cypriot State" contained in the programme of action.

The United Kingdom does not recognize the self-declared "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" as an independent State. Our position respects Security Council resolution 550 (1984), which, in paragraph 3, calls upon States

"not to recognize the purported State of the 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus' set up by secessionist

acts and calls upon them not to facilitate or in any way assist the aforesaid secessionists entity”.

The United Kingdom recognizes only one Cypriot State, the Republic of Cyprus, and only one Government as the sole legitimate Government. We hope that the United Kingdom’s position is acknowledged and our concerns are addressed in any future iteration of this text so that we continue to support it.

**The President:** We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position.

Before giving the floor to speakers in the exercise of the right of reply, may I remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

**Mrs. Kocuyigit Grba** (Turkey): I wish to make the following statement in exercise of our right of reply to the explanations of position by the observer of the European Union (EU) and the representative of the United Kingdom regarding resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC).

Turkey supports a settlement to the Cyprus issue, as was clearly demonstrated in the last round of talks that ended in failure in Crans-Montana in July 2017 and at the previous attempt in 2004, namely, the Annan plan. Only a negotiated settlement based on dialogue can be sustainable. We will continue to engage with all relevant parties on that understanding. In the meantime, we call upon all to contribute to these efforts without bias or prejudice. We regret, however, that the explanations of position read out on behalf of the EU and the United Kingdom and the approach that they reflect are examples to the contrary.

The EU admitted the Greek Cypriot Administration as a full member, despite the overwhelming Greek Cypriot vote in 2004 against a comprehensive settlement. That position is totally disconnected from the facts and continues to be in contravention of the very treaties that founded the bicomunal partnership state of Cyprus in 1960. Since then, the EU has been unable to adopt a balanced position on the Cyprus issue. The explanation of position of the EU read out today reminds us once again that it regrettably maintains that biased approach. As long as the EU positions exclusively reflect the interests of the Greek Cypriots,

the EU will continue to disqualify itself from the role of an objective contributor to the efforts in search of a solution.

As for the document referred to in the EU statement, the plain fact is that the OIC’s 2025 programme of action is fully in line with international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Its provisions relating to Cyprus describe some of the necessary components of a viable solution that will be based upon the political equality of both sides on the island. Further detail on the issue will be provided by the Turkish Cypriot representation as needed.

**Mr. Musayev** (Azerbaijan): Similar to its reactions with regard to numerous documents adopted by international organizations with regard to the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, the representative of Armenia once again was able to find nothing other than to introduce his country’s scant set of groundless, out of context and outdated claims.

It is clear that, instead of learning lessons and drawing correct conclusions, particularly in view of the most recent developments on the ground, Armenia has made yet another useless attempt to deny its responsibility for flagrant violations of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law. The most outrageous fact is that, by blaming a single country for alleged misuse of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) platform, the delegation of Armenia in fact questions the sovereign right and ability of the members of that organization to formulate their positions and take decisions freely and independently.

The OIC has consistently expressed its principled position on the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan by condemning Armenia for aggression and other serious violations of international law; reaffirming that the acquisition of territory by the use of force is inadmissible under the Charter of the United Nations; urging strict implementation of relevant Security Council resolutions; and calling for the settlement of the conflict on the basis of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and inviolability of the internationally recognized borders of Azerbaijan. That position of the OIC, as well as that of other international organizations, fully complies with international law and the relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council and General Assembly.

The resolutions of the General Assembly on cooperation between the United Nations and the

Organization of Islamic Cooperation, including resolution 75/16, adopted earlier today (see A/75/PV.30), make it clear that the two organizations share the common objective of fostering peaceful and political solutions to conflict, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. The same position was expressed by the Security Council in its presidential statement of 28 October 2013 (S/PRST/2013/16).

Armenia long ago chose the path of going against the unified position of the international community. Therefore, it is no coincidence that, in his statement, the representative of Armenia omitted any mention of decisions and documents adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council and other international organizations. If the delegation of Armenia wishes to discuss the matter, the proper context to do so within the United Nations is in the General Assembly under agenda item 40 at the current session, entitled “The situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan”.

**Ms. Ioannou** (Cyprus): I take the floor to reply to my Turkish colleague. Before I do that, let me first stress that, first and foremost, we need to respect one another in this Hall and address Member States by their proper names.

I do not want to enter into polemics with my colleague, but I would like to say that the Turkish statement we heard today demonstrates just how and why the references to Cyprus in Organization of Islamic Cooperation documents directly contradict United Nations resolutions on Cyprus.

The rhetoric we just heard once more exposes Turkey’s agenda for the division, secession and partition of Cyprus using the Turkish-Cypriot community as a pretext and constructing a historical context to suit that long-standing strategic objective. In contrast, the United Nations has set the parameters for a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus problem through reunification, has rejected secession and has called on all to support the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus.

The narrative we heard today is one that seeks justification for aggression, occupation and heavy-handed interference in Cyprus and merely confirms who is responsible for the lack of peace in my country.

**Mr. Knyazyan** (Armenia): We thank the representative of Azerbaijan for confirming the relevance of the reservations of Armenia with regard to resolution 75/16, on cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. We resolutely reject the repetitive narratives offered by the delegation of Azerbaijan, which aim at distorting the root causes, essence and principles of settlement of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. The large-scale military aggression by Azerbaijan against the people of Artsakh, with the open and direct military support of Turkey and the involvement of Turkish-backed foreign terrorist fighters and mercenaries, has undermined the negotiation process on the peaceful resolution of the conflict.

The inalienable right to self-determination of the people of Nagorno Karabakh represents the fundamental principle of the settlement of the conflict as acknowledged by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Minsk Group co-Chairs, the internationally mandated mediation format for dealing with the resolution of the conflict. We appreciate the support of members of the international community for the efforts of the Minsk Group co-Chairs to that end and call upon the member States of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation to do the same.

**Mr. Musayev** (Azerbaijan): We see no point in responding in detail to the hackneyed allegations of the representative of Armenia. Armenia must abandon its obsolete conflict narrative — full of falsifications, distortions and misinterpretations — and follow its Prime Minister in accepting and reconciling with the new realities on the ground and implementing its obligations under the agreement of 9 November, which is imperative for a sustainable ceasefire and peace. Those new realities pave the way for Armenia to become a country that is not burdened by historical mythology and racially motivated hatred. We hope Armenia will not miss that opportunity.

**The President:** May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-items (b), (d), (e), (k), (o), (q), (u), (v), (w) and (y) of agenda item 130?

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.*