



General Assembly

Seventy-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 January 2024

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 47th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 3 November 2023, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Marschik (Austria)

Contents

Agenda item 24: Social development (*continued*)

- (b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

- (a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

Agenda item 71: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).



The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

1. **Ms. Korac** (United States of America) said that her delegation wished to clarify its cross-cutting priorities with respect to the draft resolutions adopted during the current session under all the agenda items allocated to the Committee. The non-truncated statement would be posted on her Mission's website on the final day of the session.

2. The draft resolutions of the Committee did not change the current state of conventional or customary international law and did not create new legal obligations. Any reaffirmation of previous instruments in draft resolutions applied only to those States that had affirmed them initially. The United States was fully committed to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which was a non-binding document that did not create rights or obligations under international law. The term "right to development" did not have an agreed international meaning, and her delegation therefore continued to oppose references to that "right".

3. While the United States supported policies aimed at advancing respect for economic, social and cultural rights, both nationally and in its foreign policy, the United States was not a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the rights contained therein were not judiciable in its courts. The language used in the draft resolutions under consideration did not inform her country's understanding of its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

4. When Member States were called upon in draft resolutions to strengthen or address various aspects of education, including curricula and the quality of education, the United States understood those texts in keeping with the policies of its respective federal, state and local authorities. The United States did not accept that sanctions were tantamount to violations of human rights, as sanctions could play a valuable role in deterring human rights violations and abuses, promoting accountability and responding to threats to peace and security.

Agenda item 24: Social development (*continued*)
([A/C.3/78/L.10](#) and [A/C.3/78/L.13](#))

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.10: Persons with albinism

5. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

6. **Ms. Chimbiri Molande** (Malawi), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that the ambition behind the draft resolution, which was a technical update of General Assembly resolution [76/130](#), had been to take into account developments since 2019, including issues that had emerged during and after the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. However, the Secretariat had failed to implement paragraph 11 of resolution [76/130](#), in which the Secretary-General had been requested to present to the Assembly at the main part of its seventy-eighth session a report on the various social development challenges faced by persons with albinism. Such a report could have served as a foundation for the substantive revisions to the previously adopted resolution. Its absence represented a missed opportunity for positive change and also reflected badly on the importance that the Secretariat attached to the issue and to decisions of the Assembly. Nevertheless, the draft resolution contained relevant and important issues, and Member States were called upon to consult and actively involve persons with albinism in issues affecting them.

7. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, France, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Somalia, Sweden, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

8. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Guinea-Bissau, India, Kiribati, Senegal and South Africa.

9. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.10](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.13](#): Inclusive policies and programmes to address homelessness, including in the aftermath of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19)

10. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that the activities provided for in paragraph 23 of the draft resolution would affect sections 2, 9 and 15 of the programme budget for 2025. The production of the updated report requested in paragraph 23 would entail

an addition to the workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in the form of one pre-session document of 8,500 words in all six official languages, requiring additional resources for documentation in the amount of \$24,500 in 2025.

11. In addition, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs would require one consultant for four months in 2025 to conduct focused research on the challenges faced in the implementation of inclusive social development policies with a focus on disadvantaged groups, such as Indigenous Peoples, older persons, persons with disabilities and youth, and to draft recommendations on access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing. That work would give rise to additional resource requirements amounting to \$32,300 in 2025.

12. Furthermore, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme would require three regional experts for one month each to conduct targeted data mining and one consultant for four months to conduct desk research and data analysis to identify up-to-date information on the policies and programmes in place to address homelessness and to assess the progress made and persisting challenges in that regard in Central and South America, Africa and Asia. Additional resource requirements for that work in 2025 would amount to \$62,800.

13. Accordingly, if the draft resolution were adopted, additional resource requirements amounting to \$119,600 would arise in 2025.

14. **Ms. Andriamiarisoa** (Madagascar), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that homelessness threatened the lives of millions of people in Africa, a continent that was one of the regions most affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. The draft resolution was a technical update of General Assembly resolution [76/133](#), through which Member States had been urged to eliminate all forms of discrimination against individuals experiencing homelessness; to decriminalize homelessness in all geographical areas without any distinction; and to foster social integration and implement programmes to benefit youth, persons with disabilities, migrants and Indigenous Peoples.

15. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Fiji, Haiti, Indonesia, Lebanon, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Türkiye, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

16. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Bangladesh, India, Iraq and the Russian Federation.

17. **Mr. Ono** (Japan) said that his delegation fully recognized the importance of the draft resolution. However, it was regrettable that the statement of programme budget implications had been circulated only late the previous evening, leaving Member States insufficient time to consider them. His delegation wished to ask the Secretariat, once again, to submit statements of programme budget implications in a timelier manner. Japan would discuss the programme budget implications of the draft resolution in the Fifth Committee.

18. **Ms. Wallenius** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that her delegation recognized the importance of the draft resolution in addressing the crucial issue of homelessness but regretted that the Secretariat had circulated the statement of programme budget implications of the draft resolution only late the previous evening, thereby denying Member States sufficient time to assess them. Her delegation wished to ask the Secretariat to circulate statements of programme budget implications with adequate notice in the future. The delegations looked forward to discussing the programme budget implications of the draft resolution in the Fifth Committee.

19. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.13](#) was adopted.*

20. **Ms. Brzeski** (United States of America) said that her Government remained committed to finding solutions to eradicate homelessness. Her delegation interpreted the references in the draft resolution to the obligations of States as applicable only to the extent that States had assumed such obligations and, with respect to States parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in the light of its article 2 (1). The United States was not a party to the Covenant and was therefore not bound by the obligations therein, and the rights contained therein were not justiciable in its courts.

21. Noting that countries had a wide array of policies and actions that might be appropriate in promoting the progressive realization of economic, social and cultural rights, her delegation believed that draft resolutions should not try to define those rights or related rights, including those derived from other instruments. Her delegation's understanding was that the draft resolution, including its reference to a right to adequate housing, did not alter the current state of conventional or customary international law, which did not contain a stand-alone right to adequate housing. Her delegation

understood the reference in the draft resolution to a right to adequate housing to be an abbreviated reference to the right to an adequate standard of living, including housing, in the Covenant and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

22. The fact that the statement of programme budget implications of the draft resolution had been circulated to Member States just hours before consideration of the draft resolution was a matter of concern. Her delegation encouraged the Secretariat to share information as early as possible and well in advance of the consideration of a draft resolution. The United States would thoroughly discuss the issue in the Fifth Committee.

23. **Mr. Devereaux** (United Kingdom) said that his Government recognized the importance of the draft resolution and had proved its commitment to helping people experiencing homelessness throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. In reference to the promotion of caps on rental costs in paragraph 20 of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to clarify that his Government did not support rent controls in the private renting sector that would set a limit on rent increases. Historical evidence suggested that such action would discourage investment in the sector and lead to a decline in property standards, benefiting neither landlords nor tenants. Recent international examples suggested that rent controls could negatively affect housing supply and encourage illegal sub-letting. Lastly, it was regrettable that Member States had had no opportunity to give proper consideration to the costs associated with the draft resolution. His delegation urged the Secretariat to work collaboratively with concerned delegations to find a more sensible and cost-effective approach.

Agenda item 24: Social development (*continued*)

(b) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, persons with disabilities and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/78/L.11)

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.11: Cooperatives in social development

24. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

25. **Ms. Vangansuren** (Mongolia), introducing the draft resolution, said that cooperatives were important for an inclusive and resilient recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and for sustainable development more broadly. The draft resolution, which was a technical update of General Assembly resolution [76/135](#), underlined the potential of cooperatives to contribute to sustainable, resilient and inclusive food

systems, the economic status of women and the well-being and development of all persons, including youth, older persons, persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples and rural communities. In the light of the success of the International Year of Cooperatives in 2012, the draft resolution contained a call for the proclamation of another International Year of Cooperatives in 2025, as a way of promoting cooperatives and raising awareness of their contributions to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. That call was motivated also by the demand expressed among cooperatives and other stakeholders. In addition, Governments were encouraged to consult with cooperatives as part of their preparations for their voluntary national reviews for the high-level political forum on sustainable development. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution would enjoy unanimous support and wide sponsorship.

26. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Türkiye, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Viet Nam.

27. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Marshall Islands, Senegal, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago and Zambia.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.11 was adopted.*

29. **Ms. Santa Ana Vara** (Mexico) said that cooperatives were an important and regulated means of organization in Mexico, and her Government recognized the key role of cooperatives in social development. Her delegation had therefore joined the consensus on the

draft resolution. However, her delegation did not support the twelfth preambular paragraph, which had been introduced outside the negotiations despite the fact that delegations had already accepted a different version of the paragraph. Indeed, Mexico had previously disassociated itself from the paragraph as worded in the draft resolution. The paragraph indicated that the world social summit to be convened in 2025, including its scope and possible outcomes, would be discussed and agreed upon by Member States but, a few lines later, stated prematurely what the focus of the possible outcome of the summit should be. All discussions about the proposed summit should be held as part of open, transparent and inclusive consultations with specially appointed facilitators. Prematurely deciding on such issues in draft resolutions of the Committee was inappropriate. Her delegation wished to disassociate itself from the twelfth preambular paragraph and would not consider the focus of the summit to have been agreed.

Agenda item 69: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)
([A/C.3/78/L.7](#) and [A/C.3/78/L.58](#))

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.7: Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

30. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution and the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) had no programme budget implications.

31. **Mr. Lukiantsev** (Russian Federation), introducing the draft resolution, said that, while the General Assembly had been adopting iterations of the draft resolution since 2005, the problems identified therein had not been resolved, but rather had worsened in many respects. The world's common history was increasingly being denied and distorted. Racist and xenophobic speech and calls to get rid of migrants, refugees and foreigners were increasingly heard. In many countries, expressions of Islamophobia, Christianophobia, Afrophobia and antisemitism had become commonplace.

32. The war on monuments to those who had fought against Nazism and fascism had become a part of the State policy and national ideology of certain countries. Neo-Nazi marches and torchlight processions were taking place on city streets in the heart of Europe to

honour those who had actively cooperated with Nazis. Such individuals were increasingly extolled as national heroes and heroes of national liberation movements and presented as role models for younger generations. A Nazi had recently been honoured by members of parliament, leaders and heads of diplomatic missions of a number of countries.

33. Such actions were not an expression of the rights to peaceful assembly and freedom of expression; rather, they constituted blatant attempts to falsify the outcome of the Second World War and were cynical and offensive towards those who had liberated the world from the terrors of Nazism. The adoption of the draft resolution was a duty not only towards those who had created the United Nations, but also towards future generations.

34. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tajikistan, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

35. He then noted that the Gambia and Senegal also wished to become sponsors.

36. **Mr. Lamce** (Albania), introducing the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) also on behalf of Australia, Guatemala, Japan, Liberia, Marshall Islands and North Macedonia, said that the paragraph that was proposed for insertion after paragraph 3 was not new; it had already been adopted by the Committee in 2022, when the majority of its members had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution [77/204](#).

37. The aim of the draft resolution was purportedly to combat the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and contemporary forms of racism but in reality was to manipulate historical truth. The Russian Federation was deploying disinformation in an attempt to justify its aggression against Ukraine, as recognized in the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance ([A/77/512](#)). The amendment included wording taken verbatim from that report and was of direct relevance to the draft resolution.

38. It was regrettable that the facilitator of the draft resolution had not included the proposed paragraph and had cancelled informal consultations, thereby denying opportunities for meaningful engagement on the text.

Member States had time and again asked the facilitator to consider including new language that reflected genuine attempts to combat the glorification of Nazism, racism, xenophobia and related intolerance, but the Russian Federation had instead used that narrative to justify its illegal and immoral actions.

39. His delegation condemned the efforts by the Russian Federation to use the draft resolution to justify its invasion of Ukraine, which was an affront to international law. Including the proposed paragraph would ensure that the draft resolution more accurately reflected real world events. All Member States should support and vote in favour the amendment.

40. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand and Ukraine had become sponsors of the amendment.

41. He then noted that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America also wished to become sponsors.

42. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#).

43. **Mr. Belmont Roldán** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the European Union was committed to global efforts to combat violent extremism, racism, including antisemitism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Muslim hatred and related intolerance. The draft resolution had been incorrectly presented as a technical rollover. It was unacceptable that Russia had not included paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution [77/204](#), which had been based on wording from the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance ([A/77/512](#)). The paragraph proposed in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), which had been successfully included the year before, was a factual statement that underlined the politically motivated misuse by Russia of the narrative of combating Nazism to justify the unjustifiable.

44. The Russian Federation had clearly used the false narrative of denazification to justify its war of aggression against Ukraine, violate human rights, breach the Charter of the United Nations and violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent Member State. Accordingly, the European Union member States would vote in favour of the amendment and strongly encouraged others to do so as well.

45. **Mr. Lukiantsev** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation did not support the amendment and urged

delegations to vote against it. The amendment was aimed at politicizing the issues addressed in the draft resolution, rather than finding solutions, and constituted a procedural ploy.

46. For his delegation and the other sponsors of the draft resolution, it was essential that the draft resolution be thematic and not country specific. The draft resolution was aimed at dialogue and cooperation, not naming and shaming. The problems identified in it were cross-border in nature and affected many countries around the world. The draft resolution was thus a logical complement to the other draft resolution on countering racism that was traditionally considered by the Committee.

47. In their efforts to turn the draft resolution into a political, country-specific document, the authors of the amendment had outdone themselves. Even if the amendment were adopted, they would still vote against the draft resolution as a whole, as they had done the year before. The amendment was therefore nothing more than a veiled “no-action motion” to not consider the substance of the draft resolution. The authors of the amendment and their supporters were seeking to force the Russian Federation to vote against its own draft resolution, but they would be disappointed.

48. Without any hope of getting their way by any other means, the authors of the amendment had resorted to procedural manoeuvring to have the right to freedom of speech included in the text as justification for the spread of racist, xenophobic and neo-Nazi ideas and ideologies. They had failed in their attempts to have the references to the outcome document of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance removed from the text and to revise the decisions of the Nuremberg Tribunal. Such actions were yet another attempt to divide Member States and hinder international cooperation in combating neo-Nazism, racism and xenophobia.

49. **Mr. Larsen** (Australia), making a general statement before the voting, said that his country was committed to global efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia in all forms. The year before, Australia had introduced the same amendment because of its direct relevance to the draft resolution. His delegation remained a main sponsor of the amendment because it should be known that the Russian Federation had sought to justify its aggression against Ukraine under the pretext of eliminating neo-Nazism, as documented by the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

50. It was unacceptable that the Russian Federation misrepresented and falsified historical narratives to support its gross violations of international law and used the draft resolution to justify the war on Ukraine. No country, including Australia, had a perfect human rights record, but no country was above fair scrutiny of its human rights obligations. Every Member State was responsible for upholding the vision of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to protect and promote the human rights of all. In the Charter of the United Nations, Member States had committed to uniting to maintain international peace and security, and the vote on the amendment represented an opportunity to do so. Australia urged all Member States to vote in favour of the amendment.

51. **Mr. Ono** (Japan), making a general statement before the voting, said that countries were united and unyielding in their resolve to defeat Nazism, neo-Nazism and all forms of racial discrimination. However, it was deeply concerning to see that critical issue manipulated to justify territorial aggression, namely, the actions of the Russian Federation in Ukraine. Employing the false narrative of combating Nazism was not only groundless but also undermined genuine global efforts against neo-Nazism. It was regrettable that the Russian Federation was once again trying to alter the historical record by omitting a significant section of the resolution adopted the year before, thereby betraying human rights values and distorting historical truths and international principles. The actions of the Russian Federation in Ukraine had been disingenuously framed in the context of combating Nazism, as part of a complex agenda in which even noble causes could be exploited for ulterior motives. The memory and lessons of history must not be twisted for transient political objectives. Countries must stand united, uphold the pillars of truth and fairness, and address genuine human rights concerns. For that reason, Japan was a main sponsor of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) and urged all delegations to vote in favour of it.

52. **Ms. Mudrenko** (Ukraine), making a general statement before the voting, said that her country reaffirmed its strong condemnation of all forms of Nazism and neo-Nazism, and of other forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The draft resolution had nothing in common with genuine efforts to combat Nazism, neo-Nazism and other forms of intolerance. On the contrary, it constituted an attempt by the Russian Federation to use the pretext of combating neo-Nazism to justify its brutal war of aggression against Ukraine and its heinous war crimes and crimes against humanity.

53. An example of such manipulation had been seen during a Security Council meeting in which the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations had cynically justified the mass murder of 59 civilians, including an 8-year-old child, attending a funeral reception in the village of Hroza in Kharkiv Province on 5 October 2023 by claiming that neo-Nazis had been present. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had conducted a fact-finding mission two days after the attack and had found no indication that any of the people attending the reception had been members of the Ukrainian Armed Forces.

54. Her delegation was grateful to Albania, Australia, Guatemala, Japan, Liberia, Marshall Islands and North Macedonia for submitting an important substantive amendment that revealed that the draft resolution's true purpose was to distort history and abuse the common victory over Nazism, to which millions of Ukrainians had made an enormous contribution by sacrificing themselves. For that reason, Ukraine called on all delegations to vote in favour of the amendment.

55. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#).*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Nauru, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu, Zambia.

Against:

Belarus, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Russian Federation, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen.

56. *The amendment in document A/C.3/78/L.58 was adopted by 66 votes to 26, with 67 abstentions.*

57. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution, as amended.

58. **Mr. Belmont Roldán** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Second World War had painfully divided Europe. For many European countries, the end of the war had resulted not in freedom but in further occupation and more repression, and in some cases even crimes against humanity by totalitarian regimes, including the Soviet Union. The European Union remained committed to combating extremist and totalitarian ideologies, including neo-Nazism, and firmly opposed antisemitism, which was incompatible with its founding principles and values.

59. The European Union strongly condemned the politically motivated abuse of the argument of combating Nazism and rejected the inaccurate and inappropriate use of the term “denazification” by the Russian Federation to justify its inhuman, cruel and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine. Under the false pretence of combating Nazism, the Russian Federation had brought the horrors of war back to Europe, together with the reminder that peace could not be taken for granted. In the past year, the Russian Federation had continued to abuse United Nations forums to disseminate that false narrative of its illegal and unjustified war of aggression against Ukraine.

60. The European Union was fully committed to combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism, anti-Muslim hatred and related intolerance. The problems arising from rising neo-Nazism, violent extremism and racism, including

antisemitism and anti-Muslim hatred, deserved a meaningful and constructive discussion. The point of the draft resolution was not to seek compromise but rather to sow division and use the Committee’s platform to spread disinformation. The European Union member States would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

61. **Ms. Dhanutirto** (Indonesia), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that there had been an alarming increase in the number of hatred-fuelled incidents of Islamophobia, Christianophobia, antisemitism and intolerance towards people of diverse ethnicities, religions and beliefs. The draft resolution reflected the troubling times in which the world was living and the relentless surge in extremist violence and discrimination that plagued society. A collective stand against the scourge of racism and extremism was urgently needed.

62. As a country rich in ethnicities, cultures and religion, Indonesia supported the principles upheld in the draft resolution. Nevertheless, the adoption of the amendment was regrettable, for it was impossible to overlook the glaring disparity in the ways in which human rights abuses were addressed. The horrors unfolding in Gaza could not be ignored. Actions by Israel had resulted in a human tragedy that bore the hallmark of apartheid. Persistent attacks on Palestinian lives and livelihoods had profoundly altered Gaza, leaving it exceedingly isolated and restricted. The stark double standard whereby aggression was selectively condemned on the basis of the perpetrator rather than the act must be addressed, as it undermined collective efforts to promote peace and human rights.

63. The core spirit of the draft resolution was an urgent call to defend human rights, a call that should resonate with every Member State. Indonesia stood ready to uphold the values enshrined in the draft resolution and called upon Member States to join in that endeavour.

64. **Ms. Mimran Rosenberg** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the darkest chapter in the history of the Jewish people, the Holocaust, served as proof of the moral depths to which human beings could sink when they followed that type of ideology. The massacre on 7 October 2023 had been another reminder of that. Recent reports indicating a 500 per cent rise in antisemitic incidents worldwide, including attacks against Jewish university students, should be cause for alarm. People had been proudly marching in the streets calling for the death of Jews and holding swastikas. Jews were once again being attacked, threatened and murdered, inside and outside Israel, because of their religion. It was time to effectively combat antisemitism. States should adopt the

International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's definition of antisemitism, which was a non-legally binding tool that could assist in naming and combating long-standing and contemporary forms of antisemitism.

65. Given the paramount importance of tackling antisemitism and the glorification of Nazism, Israel would vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, that should not be seen as a green light for countries to use unacceptable comparisons with Nazi ideology or the Holocaust in the context of the war in Ukraine. Israel wholeheartedly rejected any politicization of the issue by any country and rejected that abhorrent practice. All States had a duty to learn from history and not to abuse it for political gain.

66. **Ms. Mudrenko** (Ukraine), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, while the adoption of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) had been a step in the right direction, the draft resolution still served the goal of manipulation and misuse. For more than 20 months, under the pretext of combating neo-Nazism, the Russian military had continued to carry out deliberate and indiscriminate attacks on civilians and critical civilian infrastructure, summary executions, torture, rape and forceful deportations of Ukrainians. Russian propaganda had actively promoted hatred and violence against Ukrainians, with the Kremlin regime conditioning Russians to view genocide against Ukrainians as normal and acceptable, as evidenced by the repeated assertions by the Russian President that Ukraine did not exist and the dissemination of such views on Russian State media. It was the height of hypocrisy for the aggressor to submit a draft resolution aimed at combating the ideology once used to justify the same form of aggression against sovereign States to which the Russian Federation itself was resorting against Ukraine. For that reason, she encouraged Member States to vote against the draft resolution.

67. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus), making a general statement on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) before the voting, said that CSTO strongly condemned attempts to revise the outcomes of the Second World War and consign its lessons to oblivion, and to cast doubt on the decisions of the Nuremberg Tribunal, ascribe equal rights to victims and executioners, and defile the sacred memory of the fallen. The victory over fascism had been made possible by the considerable contribution of the peoples of CSTO member States, at the cost of tens of millions of lives, to stopping the spread of Nazism and freeing the peoples of Europe and beyond. The global community must protect that achievement.

68. CSTO categorically rejected any attempt to glorify Nazi movements, neo-Nazism and former members of the Waffen SS. Erecting monuments and memorials and conducting public demonstrations in celebration of a Nazi past, Nazi movements or neo-Nazism was unacceptable, as was declaring members of the Waffen SS and those who had fought against the anti-Hitler coalition, worked with Nazi movements and committed war crimes and crimes against humanity to be participants in national liberation movements, and renaming streets to celebrate them. The glorification of Nazism could be tackled only if the global community worked together to do so.

69. Lastly, CSTO was seriously concerned about the relentless demonstrations of violence motivated by racism, xenophobia and related forms of intolerance. States should ratify and effectively implement the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in particular article 4 thereof.

70. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.7](#), as amended.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bahamas, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Myanmar, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, South Sudan, Switzerland, Tonga, Türkiye, Tuvalu.

71. *Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.7, as amended, was adopted by 112 votes to 50, with 14 abstentions.*

72. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said his delegation reaffirmed its full support for the draft resolution but wished to disassociate itself from the hostile amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), as it did not contribute to the purpose of the draft resolution and sought to undermine its spirit and politicize its content.

73. **Mr. González Behmaras** (Cuba) said that Nazism and neo-Nazism were the most extreme manifestations of supremacist theories, which had led to the loss of millions of lives, and were scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous, and undermined the principle that all human beings were equal in dignity and rights. Efforts must be made to prevent the continued spread of those ideas and the legitimization of the discourse of hatred, intolerance and discrimination that characterized them. Cuba would always support those who defended the full equality of all human beings and promoted tolerance and respect for cultural diversity. Nothing justified the promotion of racist or xenophobic ideas. For that reason, his delegation was a main sponsor of the draft resolution.

74. In that capacity and taking into account that the text conserved its traditional content, as well as the importance of preserving the unity of the international community on such an important issue, his delegation had voted against the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), as it introduced a divisive element and diluted the consensus on efforts to combat Nazism and neo-Nazism. Moreover, it attempted to draw attention to

a specific situation even though the draft resolution was thematic in nature.

75. The issue of Nazism and neo-Nazism could also be seen in other contexts. In various developed countries, such as the United States, violent acts against ethnic and religious minorities were on the rise, indicating that Nazism and neo-Nazism persisted. However, none of that had been mentioned in the amendment, nor had the apartheid against the Palestinian people or the genocide that Israel was currently committing in Gaza.

76. Many countries that had voted in favour of the amendment had voted against the draft resolution as a whole, even after the adoption of the amendment. That generated questions about whether the purpose of the amendment was to improve the draft resolution or whether the true purposes lay elsewhere. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment, did not consider it to be agreed language and did not feel bound by it or by its possible scope. Cuba remained committed to eradicating all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

77. **Mr. Rizal** (Malaysia) said that his country strongly opposed racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, which divided communities, bred fear and animosity and, if left unaddressed, posed a grave threat to peace and security. The draft resolution was in line with international efforts to combat ideologies that fuelled contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Extremist ideologies, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, must not be permitted to flourish. Malaysia had therefore maintained its position of voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

78. However, the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) shifted the focus of the text away from a thematic resolution to one that targeted specific countries. Despite the adoption of the amendment, those who had supported the amendment had ironically voted against the draft resolution. It was extremely sad and deeply concerning that a certain country was abusing terminology associated with a dark period in world history to justify its indiscriminate aggression against an entire population, causing the deaths of thousands of civilians, mostly women and children. In the light of the above, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment.

79. **Ms. Carty** (United States of America) said that her country condemned the glorification of Nazism and all modern forms of violent extremism, antisemitism, Islamophobia, racism, xenophobia, discrimination and related intolerance. However, it continued to oppose the use of the United Nations system by the Russian

Federation to spread disinformation. The draft resolution was a glaring attempt by that country to further its geopolitical aims by invoking the Holocaust and the Second World War to malign countries that rightfully rejected the celebration of their years of brutal domination by the Soviet Union. Such an attempt was all the more egregious when Russia used false accusations of Nazism to try to justify its war of aggression against Ukraine. The draft resolution did not represent a serious effort to combat Nazism, antisemitism, racism or xenophobia; instead, it was a shameful political ploy and an affront to the victims of the Holocaust and all who had fought against Nazism.

80. While her delegation fully supported the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), it continued to have serious concerns about the invocation in the draft resolution of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to justify restrictions on freedom of expression. It also had concerns about the way in which the draft resolution had been introduced, as the Russian Federation had failed to provide any opportunity for Member States to engage meaningfully in negotiations, holding only one sham informal consultation, during which no suggestions had been taken on board.

81. In closing, she called upon the Russian Federation to cease all military actions against Ukraine immediately, withdraw its forces from all Ukrainian sovereign territory, including Crimea, and refrain from any further unlawful threat or use of force against any other Member States.

82. **Ms. Pichardo Urbina** (Nicaragua) said that her country strongly opposed all kinds of extremist, fascist, Nazi and neo-Nazi ideologies that promoted racism, apartheid, xenophobia, antisemitism and all other forms of intolerance. It was regrettable that successful attempts had once again been made to politicize the draft resolution in order to divert attention from the important struggle of States and the international community as a whole to eradicate such harmful ideologies. In that regard, her delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment in [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), which undermined efforts to combat and eliminate racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Nicaragua reaffirmed its principled position of rejecting the adoption by some States of selective approaches and double standards aimed at promoting agendas against specific countries and singling out countries according to their own selfish interests and agendas, hindering collective efforts to achieve a more just, harmonious, equitable and peaceful world.

83. **Mr. Passmoor** (South Africa) said that the draft resolution was an important thematic document that complemented the resolution relating to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance were structural issues in the global system and must not be abused for political purposes, because doing so would undermine the intent of the agenda item and limit its capacity. Discussions on the draft resolution should be aimed at addressing the systemic causes of racism and avoid politicization of the issue. While his delegation recognized the critical value of the draft resolution as one of the key pillars in global efforts to combat racial discrimination, it wished to unequivocally disassociate itself from the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), which introduced country-specific language in a thematic human rights resolution.

84. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that, in the modern world, there should be no need to consider the draft resolution year after year, but the ideals set forth when the United Nations had been created out of the ashes of the Second World War were far from being realized. Certain shocking and appalling modern-day events brought the world back to the 1940s: gatherings of SS veterans, torchlight processions and standing ovations for Nazis in parliaments, which were all the result of policies justifying and absolving Nazi supporters and glorifying their crimes.

85. Long before the opening of a second front in Europe, Belarusian seamen had participated in the Arctic convoys that had delivered much-needed arms, supplies and food from the United Kingdom and the United States to the northern ports of the Soviet Union. Formed in 1942 in the Soviet Union, the French fighter squadron Normandie-Niemen had participated in the Belarusian operation, and several streets in cities throughout Belarus had been named in its honour. Unfortunately, the spirit of alliance that had underpinned the anti-Hitler coalition seemed to have been forgotten and the legacy of the joint victory had been sacrificed to serve the ambitions of certain Western politicians.

86. In view of its opposition to attempts to politicize the important topic of combating glorification of Nazism and neo-Nazism and its desire to preserve the thematic nature of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#).

87. **Ms. Wallenius** (Canada) said that her country unequivocally condemned any form of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia or related intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism. It had ratified the

relevant international conventions and was fully committed to their implementation. States that had not already done so should ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

88. Canada was deeply concerned that Russia was using neo-Nazism and the draft resolution itself as a pretext to justify its illegal and unjustifiable territorial aggression against Ukraine. That false narrative was dangerous and seriously undermined genuine attempts to combat neo-Nazism and all forms of racial intolerance.

89. While her delegation welcomed the adoption of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), the draft resolution as a whole remained problematic. It was regrettable that the changes consistently proposed by delegations to have the text reflect additional contemporary forms of racism, properly reinforce the importance of freedom of expression and correct the mischaracterization of the obligations of Member States under international human rights law had still not been accepted.

90. **Mr. Gunaratna** (Sri Lanka) said that it was incumbent upon all Member States to adhere to the letter and spirit of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action in all human activities with a view to eliminating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) politicized efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and had introduced a narrow, restrictive country-specific approach within a thematic resolution that would otherwise have had a wider scope. Sri Lanka therefore wished to disassociate itself from the amendment while having voted in favour of the draft resolution. It was ironic that countries that had voted in favour of the amendment had voted against the draft resolution even after the adoption of the amendment. All Member States should adhere to the principles of universality, impartiality, non-selectivity and objectivity in the promotion and protection of human rights.

91. **Mr. Kim** Nam Hyok (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his country opposed Nazism and neo-Nazism, which exacerbated all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The ongoing politicized attempt to pursue an unjustified and selective approach by presenting a confrontational amendment targeting a specific country was regrettable and contradicted the fundamental principles of impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity, leading to distrust and confrontation between Member States and hindering constructive

dialogue and cooperation in human rights. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which had been introduced with a view to undermining the basic purposes of the document.

92. **Mr. Lukiantsev** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation was grateful to the delegations that had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite all the procedural ploys used by those seeking to undermine its adoption. The historical truth about the events that had led to the establishment of the United Nations must be upheld. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from the new paragraph 4, which was of no relevance whatsoever to the draft resolution.

93. Some delegations that had either voted against or abstained from the voting on the draft resolution had accused his delegation of not being willing to hold negotiations on the text. Those very same delegations had officially declared that they would not participate in any negotiations, and yet now they were claiming that they had been given no opportunity to put forward proposals and amendments. They should make up their minds about what they wanted.

94. **Mr. Pretterhoffer** (Austria) said that his country rejected all forms of violent extremism, racism, including antisemitism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Muslim hatred and related intolerance. Austria condemned in the strongest terms the illegal and unprovoked war of aggression waged by Russia against Ukraine and the abuse of the argument of combating Nazism. Furthermore, it rejected the inaccurate and inappropriate use of the term "denazification" in the draft resolution to justify the aggression against Ukraine. Such distortion eroded the understanding of the Holocaust, disrespected the victims and undermined democratic values.

95. Although the European Union member States had engaged actively and constructively in the negotiations on the draft resolution, their concerns had still not been addressed. Efforts to combat extremism and the condemnation of the ideology of Nazism must not be misused and co-opted for politically motivated purposes, as had been witnessed in the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Although the dangers of rising global neo-Nazism and antisemitism deserved a meaningful and constructive discussion, that had not been the case for the current draft resolution, and his delegation had therefore voted against it.

96. **Mr. Xing** Jisheng (China) said that his country always sought to uphold the correct historical perspective on the Second World War and to safeguard the post-war international order. China resolutely

opposed attempts to deny, distort and misrepresent that history to glorify Nazism, fascism and militarism and to aid in the resurgence of such phenomena and all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

97. The sponsors of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) had attempted to include country-specific elements in a thematic resolution, which was not in line with the Committee's established practice. It was ironic that among the sponsors of the amendment were countries that attempted to falsify the history of the Second World War and refused to admit war crimes. Accordingly, his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment.

98. **Mr. Ono** (Japan) said that the draft resolution did not comprehensively cover the modern manifestations of racism and intolerance. Its selective focus and lack of balance meant that it fell short of what was required to effectively address the complexities of contemporary discrimination. His country supported actions that genuinely fostered equality and inclusivity, not those that were entangled in political strategies.

99. The use of efforts to combat racism as a pretext to justify aggression, as had been seen in the actions of the Russian Federation in Ukraine, was unacceptable and distorted the very essence of such efforts. His delegation had therefore voted against the draft resolution. The draft resolution should meet high standards of thoroughness, impartiality and universality and serve to unite rather than divide.

100. **Ms. Rajandran** (Singapore) said that, as a State party to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Singapore was fully committed to eliminating bigotry and racism in all its forms. An issue of such crucial importance should not be politicized or instrumentalized, particularly at a time when racial discrimination and intolerance were on the rise. Her delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution had been in support of the elimination of all contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; in no way did it condone the use of efforts to combat Nazism or neo-Nazism or any other narrative as a pretext for violating the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of other countries. Accordingly, her delegation had voted in favour of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#). Her country's support for the draft resolution should be seen in the context of its strong and consistent support for international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

101. **Ms. Eneström** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic and Baltic countries, said that those countries

unequivocally condemned racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and all forms of racial intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, and were fully committed to global efforts to combat any form of those ideologies. Openness, democracy and diversity were core values of the Nordic and Baltic countries, which was why they had reacted so strongly to the draft resolution.

102. At its core, the document constructed a narrative that was being used to justify the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine under the cynical slogan of "denazification". The Nordic and Baltic countries categorically rejected that false narrative and the way in which the elimination of neo-Nazism was being used as a pretext to justify a full-scale invasion and attempted annexation of a sovereign country. Such misappropriations undermined genuine efforts to combat those heinous ideologies.

103. The Nordic and Baltic countries had voted in favour of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) in order to partially redress the utter lack of that context in the draft resolution. Despite the adoption of the amendment, the fundamental problems with the draft resolution remained, since it contained highly politicized and problematic language that had been used by Russia to accuse sovereign States formerly occupied by the Soviet Union of glorifying Nazism.

104. Although a draft resolution on such an important topic deserved an inclusive approach, the Russian Federation had consistently failed to engage seriously and take the concerns of other Member States into account. If it was not interested in having an open and fair process, Russia should give up its role of presenting the draft resolution. In the future, Member States must be able to engage in honest conversation on the topic, and it must not be misappropriated as a cover for aggression. For such reasons, the Nordic and Baltic countries had voted against the draft resolution as a whole.

105. **Mr. Zitko** (Slovenia) said that any incitement to violence or war was prohibited under the Slovenian Constitution. The Holocaust and other crimes should never be forgotten. As a member of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, Slovenia fostered awareness of that tragic chapter in history, as education and research would help prevent it from ever happening again. His country rejected the attempt by the Russian Federation to justify its unlawful aggression against Ukraine under the pretext of combating neo-Nazism and had therefore voted against the draft resolution.

106. **Ms. Buist-Catherwood** (New Zealand) said that, while her country unequivocally condemned all forms

of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, it was deeply concerned by the draft resolution. Russia was seeking to misappropriate false narratives, including the glorification of Nazism, as a pretext for its war of aggression against Ukraine, which contravened the prohibition under the Charter of the United Nations on the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. New Zealand condemned the illegal invasion by Russia of Ukraine and reiterated its call for Russia to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and to withdraw its troops immediately from within the internationally recognized borders of Ukraine.

107. The way in which the obligations of Member States were mischaracterized in the draft resolution with respect to international human rights law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations was of serious concern. Moreover, it was regrettable that no attempt had been made to broaden the scope of the draft resolution to reflect additional contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. It was critical for an inclusive and intersectional approach to be taken to address those issues.

108. **Ms. Maric** (Switzerland) said that her country unequivocally condemned all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, which were incompatible with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, divided communities, bred fear and animosity, and led to violence. The current rise in violence in the Middle East was having repercussions across the globe. Switzerland stood firmly against any discrimination based on religion, including all forms of antisemitism, Christianophobia and Islamophobia. All States should protect and respect human rights in their territory without any discrimination. Hate speech and inflammatory language capable of provoking further violence should be avoided.

109. The draft resolution contained important elements contributing to efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. However, Switzerland was concerned by the fact that Russia had continued to attempt to justify its military aggression against Ukraine on the basis of the alleged elimination of neo-Nazism. Switzerland strongly rejected the claim that Ukraine needed so-called “denazification”. The military aggression against Ukraine was a flagrant violation of international law. The use of the term “denazification” in that context completely disrespected the victims of the Nazi regime and their descendants. For that reason, her delegation

supported the adoption of the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#).

110. It was regrettable that the draft resolution did not reflect additional contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia or related intolerance and the resurgent scourge of racism. The instrumentalization of the topic of the draft resolution for political purposes was unacceptable. In the light of the above, her delegation had abstained from the voting on the draft resolution.

111. **Ms. Idres** (Sudan) said that the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) deviated from the main purpose of the draft resolution, which was aligned with the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. The amendment politicized the draft resolution, and her delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from it while maintaining its steadfast support for the draft resolution as whole.

112. **Ms. Kim** (Australia) said that her country reaffirmed its commitment to global efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia in all its forms. Her delegation was deeply concerned about the draft resolution and the weaponization of the Holocaust and Nazism by the Russian Federation in justifying its illegal and immoral aggression against the people of Ukraine. Australia condemned the efforts of the Russian Federation to use the draft resolution to justify its invasion of Ukraine, which was a gross violation of international law.

113. While some elements of combating Nazism, neo-Nazism and racism were addressed in the draft resolution, Australia had voted against the text as a whole, given its serious concerns that the draft resolution would continue to be used to justify the illegal war in Ukraine and thus mischaracterize the human rights obligations of Member States. Australia had traditionally abstained from the voting on the draft resolution on the basis that there were opportunities to strengthen the text and embrace a more inclusive approach to addressing the diverse practices that fuelled contemporary forms of Nazism, neo-Nazism, racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. However, the Russian Federation had once again denied Member States such opportunities on the pretext that the draft resolution was a technical rollover. The Russian Federation should hold an open, honest and transparent dialogue on future draft resolutions on the topic to enable Member States to engage constructively

and genuinely contribute to addressing the challenges globally.

114. Australia condemned the illegal and immoral Russian invasion of Ukraine and reiterated its call on the Russian Federation to immediately withdraw its forces from Ukraine and end its war.

115. **Mr. Hassani** (Algeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to demonstrate its commitment to combating all forms of violence, terrorism, racism and discrimination based on religion, belief or origin. There was a need to bolster international efforts to counter contemporary forms of racism and intolerance, which were worsening throughout the world, especially with the misuse of modern technologies. In that context, Algeria reaffirmed the importance of international efforts to implement the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action.

116. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in line with its principled position on avoiding the politicization of human rights issues, which should be addressed in a manner consistent with the principles of objectivity, independence and non-selectivity and in coordination with the States concerned, as that was the prerequisite for achieving the desired goals. All Member States should undertake further efforts to uphold the technical nature of such draft resolutions and to arrive at consensus through transparent and constructive dialogue that addressed the concerns of all States.

117. **Ms. Rizk** (Egypt) said that her country was committed to combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including neo-Nazism and Islamophobia, and therefore had consistently voted in favour of the draft resolution. It was regrettable that a number of countries persistently attempted to politicize a thematic resolution by introducing an amendment to shift the focus away from its substance. Even more regrettable was the selective approach to upholding legal obligations under international law. The countries that had spoken of a Russian aggression against Ukraine had blatantly manifested double standards by failing to equally condemn the Israeli genocidal aggression against the civilian population in Gaza and by justifying that aggression in contravention of international law.

118. Accordingly, her delegation had voted against the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) and in favour of the draft resolution. Egypt continued to reject politicization of the draft resolution. Greater collective efforts were needed to combat all acts related to the exaltation and endorsement of neo-Nazism. Considering that the adoption of the amendment had changed the

thematic draft resolution into a country-specific text, her delegation wished to disassociate itself from paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

119. **Mr. Oehri** (Liechtenstein) said that the draft resolution had been used to promote false narratives to justify the aggression against Ukraine, which had been deplored by the overwhelming majority of Member States and carried out in blatant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Liechtenstein once again condemned the illegal invasion of Ukraine by Russia and therefore supported the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#).

120. His delegation had strong reservations about the misrepresentation of the obligations of Member States under human rights and international law in the draft resolution. It also regretted the unwillingness of the draft resolution's main sponsor to consider expanding the text to more faithfully and inclusively reflect the challenges addressed therein. Accordingly, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution.

121. His country reaffirmed its stance against Nazism, all forms of discrimination and religious intolerance and was concerned about the increase in antisemitism.

122. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that it was incomprehensible that certain Western countries had reaffirmed their opposition to Nazism, neo-Nazism and all forms of discrimination while voting against the only draft resolution in which such issues were addressed. Even more incomprehensible, however, was that the representative of the United States had called the draft resolution a shameful political ploy while engaging with its allies in precisely a shameful political ploy.

123. Syria had reaffirmed its long-standing position of rejecting all forms of discrimination by sponsoring and voting in favour of the draft resolution. Those that had reaffirmed their opposition to all forms of discrimination and then voted against the draft resolution had undermined their credibility, which had already been in question given their blind support for the war of genocide committed by the occupying Power of Israel against the Palestinians.

124. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#) and had voted against it. The amendment would stand as proof of the hypocrisy of the Western countries that had presented it, as such paragraphs would disappear but the draft resolution would remain.

125. **Mr. Ndiaye** (Senegal) said that the draft resolution offered an opportunity to support the Organization in its work to overcome hatred in line with the Durban

Declaration. More needed to be done to combat the rise in racial discrimination and intolerance across the globe, without taking a selective approach, as that phenomenon did not apply only to some people in some parts of the world.

126. His delegation had voted against the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#), which politicized the debate and pushed countries further from the aims for which the draft resolution had initially been brought before the Committee. Targeting a country in a paragraph of a thematic resolution was inconceivable and represented a double standard when compared with other similar draft resolutions considered by the Committee.

127. **Ms. Asaju** (Nigeria) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to disassociate itself from any politicization or selectivity in addressing sensitive human rights concerns. Accordingly, her delegation wished to disassociate itself from the amendment in document [A/C.3/78/L.58](#).

Agenda item 71: Promotion and protection of human rights (continued) ([A/C.3/78/L.25](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.25](#): Commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

128. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

129. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.25](#) was adopted.*

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (continued) ([A/C.3/78/L.2](#), [A/C.3/78/L.3](#), [A/C.3/78/L.4](#), [A/C.3/78/L.5](#) and [A/C.3/78/L.6](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.2](#): Follow-up to the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Fifteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

130. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that the requests in paragraphs 13, 14 and 18 of the draft resolution would constitute an addition to the Secretariat's workload in 2025 and 2026. The adoption of the draft resolution would therefore give rise to budgetary implications under the proposed programme budgets for 2025 and 2026.

131. The resource requirements would provide for assistance in the preparation, documentation and

servicing of the Fifteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and its preparatory meetings; the participation of the least developed countries in the Fifteenth Congress and the regional preparatory meetings; and the travel of staff to provide substantive servicing for the Fifteenth Congress and the regional preparatory meetings.

132. It was the Secretariat's understanding that the format of the proposed Fifteenth Congress and the regional preparatory meetings was still being decided by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. Given the uncertainty, the Secretariat was not currently in a position to determine the requirements for 2025 and 2026.

133. Accordingly, the adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any additional appropriation under the programme budget for 2024. Resource requirements for 2025 and 2026 would be presented for consideration by the General Assembly at its seventy-ninth and eightieth sessions, respectively.

134. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.2](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.3](#): Reducing reoffending through rehabilitation and reintegration

135. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

136. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.3](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.4](#): Enhancing the contributions of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice to the accelerated implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

137. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

138. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.4](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.5](#): Technical assistance provided by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime related to counter-terrorism

139. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

140. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.5](#) was adopted.*

Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.6](#): Equal access to justice for all

141. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

142. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.6](#) was adopted.*

143. **Ms. Eyrich** (United States of America) said that her delegation welcomed the adoption of the first-ever draft resolution on equal access to justice for all. The draft resolution would set the stage for new efforts to advance support for inalienable rights included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, such as the rights to an effective remedy and to a fair trial. Her delegation supported the draft resolution given the grave challenges to securing equal access to justice in the United States and beyond. Efforts to advance progress should continue with shared resolve, informed by promising practices and lessons learned around the world. The United States stood ready to support the implementation of the draft resolution and encouraged all Member States to do the same.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.