



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
14 April 2023

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 52nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 16 November 2022, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Blanco Conde (Dominican Republic)

Contents

Statement of behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives
(*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/>).

22-25997 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Statement on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries

1. **Ms. Novruz** (Azerbaijan), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that, at its summit in 2019, the Heads of State and Governments of the Movement had emphasized the role of the Human Rights Council in considering the human rights situations in all countries, in the context of the universal periodic review, based on cooperation and constructive dialogue. They had also expressed deep concern over the continued practice of selectively adopting country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee of the General Assembly and in the Human Rights Council. That practice exploited human rights for political purposes and breached the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity. It also undermined cooperation, which was essential for the effective promotion and protection of all universally recognized human rights. There was a need for greater coherence and complementarity between the work of the Third Committee and that of the Human Rights Council, to avoid the duplication or overlapping of their activities in addressing human rights situations. Moreover, the universal periodic review was the main intergovernmental cooperative mechanism for reviewing human rights issues at the national level, with the full involvement of the country concerned and consideration of its capacity-building needs.

2. In that context, the States members of the Movement rejected the ongoing practice of the Security Council addressing human rights issues in pursuit of the political objectives of certain States. It was critical for the universal periodic review to be implemented as an action-oriented, cooperative mechanism, on the basis of objective and reliable information and interactive dialogue, in an impartial, transparent, non-selective, constructive, non-confrontational and non-politicized manner. The States members of the Movement attached significant importance to the promotion and protection of human rights, and were committed to fulfilling their obligations to respect, observe and protect all universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, other international human rights instruments and international law. They unequivocally condemned gross and systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as violent acts and activities, and situations that infringed on the full enjoyment of the latter. All human rights, including the

right to development, were universal, inalienable, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated. Human rights issues should be addressed in a fair and equal manner, with objectivity, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, impartiality, non-selectivity and transparency, in keeping with the political, historical, social, religious and cultural particularities of each country.

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (continued)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (continued) (A/C.3/77/L.32)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.32: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

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

4. **Mr. Klíma** (Czechia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union, said that it reflected concerns about the severe human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the lack of improvement in that regard, over the previous year. The text had been updated in relation to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, cooperation on vaccines and the new special procedure mandate holder, and continued to call for actions and engagement by the international community. A clear message should be sent to the authorities of the country, to incite them to take immediate steps to improve the human rights situation. Similarly, continued support should be shown for the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and its field office in Seoul, to ensure accountability for human rights violations. The European Union pursued a policy of "critical engagement" with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and, while introducing the draft resolution in an effort to draw international attention to the human rights situation, stood ready to assist in improving it.

5. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Georgia, Guatemala, Israel, Kiribati, Liberia, Maldives, Mexico, Nauru, New

Zealand, Norway, Palau, San Marino, Serbia and Tuvalu.

6. **Mr. Kim Song** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation resolutely denounced and categorically rejected the draft resolution, which was a political plot that had nothing to do with the protection or promotion of human rights. The repeated annual adoption of the text was a grave political provocation fabricated and led by the European Union, in line with the human rights scenario put forward by the United States of America, which sought to stifle his country. The so-called concerns raised in the draft resolution did not deserve to be discussed, as they were rife with trickeries, inveterate denial, bias and hostility towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which incorporated a people-first principle into all spheres of social life, in order to firmly and systematically guarantee the rights and interests of the population, in legal and practical terms. The sponsors of the draft resolution had historically inflicted indescribable pain and misery on innocent civilians in many countries, through illegal aggressions and massacres, under the pretext of protecting human rights and defending democracy. After having triggered human-made disasters as a result of its poor governance of national affairs, South Korea had not hesitated to engage in uncontrolled fratricidal confrontation and maximize the human rights issue to evade internal and external criticism. The main violators of human rights were attempting to turn the United Nations into a theatre of confrontation, rather than a space for dialogue and cooperation, and to misuse it to justify their interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. Their actions deserved to be condemned by the international community.

7. All Member States should adhere to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and reject politicization, selectivity and double standards, in order to ensure impartiality and objectivity in the protection and promotion of human rights. However, the United States and other Western countries, including the members of the European Union, were using human rights issues as a political tool to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and overthrow their systems, and misusing the United Nations to realize their ulterior motives. While those countries were troubled by social ills including racism, racial discrimination, refugee crises, sexual violence, murders, human trafficking and gun-related crimes, they continued to slander other innocent nations, as part of an intolerable insult to international justice and human

rights. His country was firmly committed to contributing to global efforts to protect and promote human rights, and would not tolerate any attempts to slander its social system, which was valued by its people. His delegation strongly denounced and rejected the draft resolution submitted by the European Union as a grave infringement on the sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which was intended to incite confrontation. All delegations should disassociate themselves from the text.

8. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Group of Friends in Defence of the Charter of the United Nations on the agenda item as a whole, said that the presentation of country-specific resolutions without the consent of the States concerned went against the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization and non-confrontation. It also contravened the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and undermined the development of friendly relations among nations and the achievement of international human rights cooperation. The Group firmly rejected all double standards that undermined human rights and prevented progress in that area, and remained concerned at the proliferation of unilateral mechanisms purporting to conduct impartial assessments of the human rights situation in specific States, without their due consent and participation. It also rejected the ongoing practice of the Security Council dealing with issues outside of its mandate, including by addressing human rights issues in pursuit of the political objectives of certain States. That practice was contrary to the higher ideals of the Organization and violated the purposes and principles of its Charter, which compelled all Member States to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction.

9. The politicization of human rights needed to stop, and the best way to strengthen and guarantee the full and effective realization of the human rights pillar of the United Nations was to strengthen multilateralism, while strictly adhering to the aforementioned principles. The universal periodic review, the treaty bodies and the special procedures of the Human Rights Council provided important opportunities for advancing to that end, in a fair and constructive manner, on the basis of dialogue, cooperation and mutual respect, and in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, namely the sovereign equality of all States, the inalienable right to self-determination of

peoples and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

10. Lastly, speaking in his national capacity, he said that his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.32](#).

11. **Mr. Gafoor** (Singapore) said that, as a matter of principle, his delegation did not support the submission of country-specific human rights draft resolutions within the Third Committee, since unfortunately, the latter were increasingly selective and driven by political considerations. Such texts were inherently divisive and counterproductive, since they did not serve to make a difference in the lives of people. Human rights issues should instead be addressed under the universal periodic review process of the Human Rights Council, which had been created for that very purpose. For that reason, Singapore would maintain its position of abstaining from voting on country-specific draft resolutions within the Committee, if and when they were put to a vote. That position did not extend to the substance of the human rights issues raised in any of the draft resolutions. All Member States had an obligation to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

12. **Mr. Sharma** (India), speaking on the agenda item as a whole, said that the human rights agenda must be pursued in a fair manner, with due respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, such as national sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the affairs of States. The spirit of constructive dialogue and cooperation should guide the work of the Committee in furthering the protection and promotion of human rights. His delegation did not support the establishment of country-specific human rights mechanisms without the consent of the country in question or the adoption of country-specific human rights draft resolutions. The selective focus on certain human rights issues and situations was counterproductive to the mandate of the Committee to globally promote and protect all human rights. Therefore, India did not support country-specific draft resolutions.

13. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China) said that her delegation always supported the proper handling of differences in the area of human rights, through constructive dialogue and cooperation, on the basis of equality and mutual respect. China opposed politicization, selectivity, double-standards and the provocation of confrontation. It disagreed with the practice of exerting pressure on other countries in the name of human rights through the creation of country-specific human rights mechanisms,

without the consent of the countries concerned. Because national conditions and development levels varied from country to country, the international community should safeguard the legitimate right to development, respect independently chosen political systems and development paths, and oppose hegemony, power politics and the imposition of unfair rules or the will of a few countries. The draft resolution ignored the efforts and achievements of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in promoting and protecting human rights, and the infringement on the human rights of its population caused by the unilateral coercive measures imposed by some countries. China was gravely concerned that the draft resolution was in fact an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of that country, under the pretext of human rights and, accordingly, would not join the consensus on the text.

14. **Mr. Chimbindi** (Zimbabwe) said that his country had adopted a principled position against country-specific draft resolutions and was committed to the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations with regard to the principles of solidarity, cooperation, equality, non-selectivity, objectivity and genuine dialogue in the work of the Organization. Country-specific draft resolutions ran contrary to those principles, as they were divisive, controversial and confrontational, and Zimbabwe had therefore aligned itself with those delegations that continued to express concerns about them. Such texts politicized human rights issues and did not proffer sustainable solutions to or assist in addressing human rights concerns. His delegation remained committed to upholding and promoting the fundamental and inalienable rights of all peoples, and acknowledged the important role played by the United Nations and its Human Rights Council. Multilateralism was synonymous with dialogue and mutual respect for the sovereignty of Member States, and dialogue should be the preferred solution for addressing human rights gaps, where they existed. In the light of the foregoing, Zimbabwe did not support country-specific draft resolutions and would vote against those that were put to a vote.

15. **Mr. Kuzmin** (Russian Federation) said that the draft resolution was an example of gross interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had already stated its position on the politicized draft resolution and, in doing so, it had acted correctly, wisely and as any self-respecting State should. The Russian delegation wished to act in the same way by disassociating itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

16. **Mr. Morales Dávila** (Nicaragua) said that his delegation was opposed to the yearly presentation to the Committee of country-specific human rights reports and draft resolutions, which were selective, unobjective and politicized, and were prepared without the consent of the peoples and Governments concerned. Dialogue and cooperation were always the preferred solution, especially during the post-COVID-19 recovery period. The international community should show solidarity and strengthen multilateralism. The internal affairs of States should be respected, without resorting to external interventions or the politicization of human rights issues. There should be no conditions or external pressures, such as the imposition of illegal unilateral coercive measures, which did not facilitate the peaceful settlement of conflict. Nicaragua remained committed to promoting and protecting all human rights, and wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

17. **Mr. Khani Jooyabad** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the continued selective adoption of country-specific draft resolutions by the Committee and exploitation of that platform for political ends contravened the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity in addressing human rights issues. Cooperation and dialogue were essential for the promotion and protection of human rights, and country-specific draft resolutions undermined such an approach. Human rights situations could be addressed in an equal and non-discriminatory manner, through the universal periodic review mechanism of the Human Rights Council, which was the proper channel for reviewing the human rights situations in all Member States equally, with the meaningful participation of the concerned countries. In the light of the foregoing, the Islamic Republic of Iran disassociated itself from the draft resolution and strongly condemned all unilateral coercive measures, especially by the United States, against the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

18. **Ms. Mozgovaya** (Belarus) said that her delegation consistently opposed the consideration of country-specific topics at the United Nations since they undermined the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity, increased confrontation among States and created additional barriers to equal rights and constructive dialogue. Her delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on the draft resolution because it would in no way improve the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

19. **Mr. Yamanaka** (Japan) said that his delegation welcomed the draft resolution. Many Japanese citizens had been forcibly abducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the 1970s and 1980s, in one of the most serious human rights violations committed by that country, causing grave concern and putting the lives and safety of his people in danger. In that regard, Japan welcomed the references to the issue of abduction in the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Secretary-General. The abductees and their families had been suffering for many years, and many of them had aged and passed away without ever seeing their loved ones again. Time was of the essence and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea needed to urgently take into consideration the views of the international community, as expressed in the draft resolution, listen to the voices of the victims and their families, and take concrete actions to quickly resolve the issue, including by returning all abductees. The draft resolution should be adopted with the support of all Member States.

20. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, on principle, his delegation rejected the politicization and selectivity of country-specific draft resolutions on human rights issues. It was unfortunate and unacceptable that mandates had been established and reports had been published on certain countries, without any consultation with the latter. It was also unacceptable to level accusations and use double-standards, while covering up practices on the part of other States that might constitute human rights violations. The adoption of the draft resolution would create confrontation, without leading to constructive cooperation, and would therefore violate the Charter of the United Nations and sow division between States. The politicization of the noble issue of human rights was an attempt to undermine a Member State, and the Syrian Arab Republic disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

21. **Ms. Micael** (Eritrea) said that owing to her country's principled and consistent position against the politicization of human rights, it strongly opposed country-specific draft resolutions, which were selective, counterproductive, and rife with double-standards. Such texts, which served to harass some countries while ignoring the violations committed by others, were clearly motivated by political considerations. Her delegation called for an end to the selective approach to addressing human rights, which failed to promote the rights of people on the ground. In that regard, human

rights issues should be addressed under the universal periodic review mechanism, in an equal and fair manner that respected national sovereignty, aimed to enhance cooperation and partnership and promoted human rights.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.32 was adopted.*

23. **Ms. Rodríguez Abascal** (Cuba) said that her delegation did not support mandates or draft resolutions which were submitted for selective, discriminatory and politically motivated reasons, without the consent of the countries concerned. As such, it disassociated itself from the draft resolution. Such texts did nothing to improve the human rights situation on the ground but rather promoted confrontation and distrust, and only targeted developing countries that were already faced with unilateral coercive measures. By opting to punish and sanction the Democratic People's Republic of Korea the proponents of the text were attacking the very rights that apparently justified such an approach. Furthermore, the draft resolution was dangerous because it involved the Security Council in issues that were not within its competence. Cuba could not join the consensus on such a text or be complicit in the attempt to deny the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of their right to peace, self-determination and development. Only international cooperation, respectful dialogue and strict compliance with the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity would allow for effective progress in protecting and promoting all human rights, for all people. No country was immune to challenges in that area and the universal periodic review should be allowed to facilitate a depoliticized debate that could promote respectful cooperation with the country concerned. The position adopted by her delegation did not in any way prejudice the value of other pending issues relating to abductees, which required a fair and honourable solution, with the agreement of all the parties concerned.

24. **Mr. Truong Dang** (Viet Nam) said that although the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus, genuine international cooperation and adherence to the principles of objectivity, impartiality, and non-selectivity were the best ways forward for the effective promotion and protection of all human rights. The universal periodic review should be used to conduct non-politicized and non-selective debates and encourage respectful cooperation with the country concerned. His delegation wished to extend its sympathy to the victims of abduction and their families, and called on the parties concerned to engage in

dialogue, in order to find a mutually satisfactory solution to the issue.

25. **Mr. Johnson** (United Kingdom) said that his delegation remained deeply concerned by the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The draft resolution, which had been adopted by consensus, sent an unequivocal message to the Government of that country and reiterated the long-held demands of the international community for concrete action to end its systemic and widespread human rights violations. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea should accept the existence and extent of its human rights violations, including its extensive system of political prison camps, arbitrary detentions and lack of freedom of religion or belief. It should take the opportunity to engage constructively and genuinely with the new Special Rapporteur in order to uphold its responsibilities for its most vulnerable people and allow full, safe and unhindered access for humanitarian organizations to provide assistance to those in need. Restrictive COVID-19 measures should be proportionate and should not be used to further constrain the freedom of citizens or to restrict the ability of the international community to engage with authorities in Pyongyang. Resources should no longer be diverted to illegal weapons programmes, and the focus should be placed on bringing about permanent change and improvement for the people of North Korea.

26. **Mr. Joonkood Hwang** (Republic of Korea) said that the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution for consecutive years was a demonstration of broad and strong support for the issue. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea should not turn a blind eye to the consistent concerns about and calls to improve its human right situation. His Government noted with concern that the human rights and humanitarian situations of the most vulnerable populations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had worsened with the imposition of COVID-19 measures. It was deplorable that resources that should be spent on improving those situations were instead being diverted to the continued development of weapons of mass destruction. His delegation joined the international community in condemning the ongoing, systematic, widespread and gross violations of human rights by the current regime and urged the latter to take effective measures to improve its track record, in keeping with the recommendations of the United Nations human rights mechanisms, including those contained in the draft resolution and in the report of the Special

Rapporteur on the situation of human right in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A/77/522).

27. While his delegation would not reply to every groundless accusation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea against his Government, the absurd remarks over the recent tragedy in his country and the continued missile provocations showed stark disregard for human rights. The Republic of Korea was once again disappointed by those callous acts, was deeply saddened by the tragedy and was making every effort to ensure support for victims, accountability and the prevention of any recurrence.

28. **Mr. Andreas Lingad** (Philippines) said that his delegation disassociated itself from paragraph 12 of the draft resolution and all other paragraphs in the draft resolutions of the Third Committee that referred to the International Criminal Court. His country had withdrawn from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court in 2019 and had adopted a principled stand against those who politicized human rights and disregarded the independent and well-functioning organs and agencies of the Philippines. The Rome Statute was anchored in the principle of complementarity, rather than substitution. It recognized that States had the first responsibility and right to prosecute international crimes and that the International Criminal Court could only exercise jurisdiction when national legal systems failed or were unable to do so. The International Criminal Court could not substitute for fully functional domestic courts.

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.33/Rev.1: Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

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

30. **Mr. Alwasil** (Saudi Arabia), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of the European Union and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, said that the Rohingya minorities had been for several decades subjected to systematic violations of their human rights, which had led them to flee their country. Over 2 million Rohingya refugees had fled to Bangladesh, and hundreds of thousands lived in internment camps. The situation of those minorities in Myanmar had worsened, giving rise to concerns about the prevention of their voluntary return. The violation of their human rights was condemnable and Myanmar should uphold its international obligations and guarantee the safety and security of its people, including Rohingya Muslims and

other minorities. The draft resolution was balanced and shed light on the human rights situation of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities, based on reports dating back to February 2021, when the state of emergency had been declared. It had been adopted by an unprecedented consensus for the first time at the previous session of the General Assembly, which reflected the unity of the international community regarding the protection of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar. The text, which sought to bolster efforts to prevent the further violation of human rights and help those communities to return to their homes, should be adopted by consensus.

31. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Canada, Congo, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Kiribati, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, San Marino, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

32. **Mr. Tun** (Myanmar) said that the draft resolution maintained a much-needed focus on the Rohingya community and strongly condemned past and continuing violations of their human rights by the armed and security forces of Myanmar, at the direction of the illegal military junta. It recommended concrete action to support the voluntary, safe and dignified reintegration of Rohingya Muslims and other displaced persons, and sought to ensure their equal and inclusive access to services and opportunities for representation, in keeping with their fundamental rights, orders of the International Court of Justice and ongoing investigations by the International Criminal Court. However, the text did not adequately reflect the heart-breaking and deteriorating human rights situation in Myanmar in the wake of the illegal military coup orchestrated by the military dictatorship in February 2021. It did not sufficiently underscore the need for the junta to be held accountable for its atrocities and assault on democracy and human rights, and for triggering a humanitarian crisis and threatening regional peace and security. Furthermore, the text failed to demand an arms embargo targeting the escalating aerial and artillery attacks by the junta against schools, public gatherings and villages.

33. For approximately 22 months, innocent civilians in all parts of Myanmar had been subjected to inhumane and terrorist acts, as had been reported by several United Nations agencies and mechanisms. The situation of the Rohingya Muslims could not be addressed in isolation,

but should be dealt with in a holistic manner, with urgent and decisive action by the international community to prevent further atrocities and put an end to military impunity. United Nations resolutions could play a vital role in that regard, but a great opportunity to do so had once again been missed. His delegation would support the draft resolution and all Member States should do the same and adopt it by consensus.

34. **Mr. Klíma** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; and the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina, said that the draft resolution addressed the atrocities committed against the Rohingya and other minorities, and against the entire population of Myanmar, following the military coup of February 2021. The indiscriminate use of violence by the armed and security forces across the country, the breaches of international humanitarian law, the continued arbitrary detentions and the unjustified restrictions to fundamental freedoms were alarming and intolerable, and the international community needed to take action to stop the atrocities. Furthermore, the build-up and flow of arms into Myanmar gravely undermined human rights and needed to be stopped immediately.

35. Millions of Rohingya and other minorities continued to face violations of their fundamental rights and the current situation in Myanmar suppressed hopes for their voluntary, safe, dignified and sustainable return from Bangladesh and across the region. The draft resolution sent a strong message on the importance of the ongoing work by the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice, and all countries needed to actively cooperate with the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar, including by facilitating access to victims of human rights violations. The European Union supported all the people of Myanmar, including the Rohingya and other minorities, and underscored the importance and urgency of fully implementing the five-point consensus put forward by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

36. **Mr. Dinger** (United States of America) said that his delegation was increasingly concerned by the atrocities and human rights abuses reportedly committed by Myanmar, and more specifically its military, which had escalated into violence against the people of that country, including members of civil society, journalists and human rights defenders. The actions of the military had created a humanitarian and

human rights catastrophe that was rapidly undoing the hard-fought democratic process achieved over the last decade. The worsening crisis had exacerbated conditions for the most vulnerable populations, including the Rohingya Muslims and other ethnic and religious minorities. The international community needed to act collectively to pressure the military to cease violence, release unjustly detained persons, address human rights abuses, promote justice and accountability, allow unhindered humanitarian access and support the people of Myanmar in their aspirations for peace and multiparty democracy. The United States condemned the continued repression by the military regime and called for coordinated action to stop the transfer and sale of arms by Member States to the military and end complicity in its continued violence and brutality. With regard to other issues relevant to the draft resolution, his delegation referred the Committee to its general and unabridged statements, which would be posted on the official website of the United States Mission to the United Nations. His Government would continue to work with its international partners to advance justice and accountability for the aforementioned atrocities and highlight behaviours that undermined the credibility of the regime.

37. **Ms. Ducasse** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Iceland, Lichtenstein and Norway, said that their countries condemned the ongoing violations and abuses of human rights and humanitarian law in Myanmar. The international community had been witnessing worsening violence and armed conflict in that country, since the 2021 coup d'état, in which the military regime had deposed the democratically elected civilian Government. The curtailment of human rights and freedoms, attacks on and recent execution of pro-democracy activists, and reports of violations of international law and attacks against civilians were deeply concerning, had implications for local and regional stability and security, and diminished prospects for the safe, voluntary, sustainable and dignified return of Rohingya refugees. The draft resolution acknowledged that the Rohingya crisis and the coup were inextricably interlinked and stemmed from the same root causes. As such, their countries welcomed the continued commitment of the international community to ending the impunity of the Myanmar military, promoting accountability for grave crimes under international law, and working towards the realization of justice.

38. The escalation of attacks by air and with heavy weaponry was deplorable, and the supply of weapons to

Myanmar was enabling the conflict and human rights violations. As called for in General Assembly resolution 75/287, all Member States should prevent the transfer, sale and provision of arms, military equipment, material and technical assistance to the military regime. The efforts made by ASEAN to support a peaceful resolution in the interest of the people were commendable, and the military regime should engage meaningfully with ASEAN to fully implement its five-point consensus. The efforts of the United Nations, including the draft resolution and the ongoing work of the Security Council were part of an approach that sought to address the situation in a manner that complemented and reinforced the efforts of ASEAN. The military regime should cease all violence immediately, release detainees and facilitate unhindered humanitarian access.

39. **Ms. Benedicta** (Indonesia) said that the restoration of peace and stability in Myanmar was the only way to find a just and comprehensive solution to the issue of the Rohingya Muslims. As the incoming Chair of ASEAN, Indonesia would continue to work towards finding a peaceful and durable resolution. The leaders of ASEAN had recently agreed that the five-point consensus should remain a valid reference and be implemented in its entirety, and all parties concerned should adhere to it. At the same time, attention should not be diverted away from the Rohingya and other ethnic and religious minorities in Myanmar. Efforts should be sustained to create a conducive environment for the safe, voluntary and dignified return of the Rohingya Muslims. Since the ongoing political crisis created another obstacle to their repatriation, the cessation of hostilities and violence should be prioritized and the preliminary assessment of their needs should be resumed. The humanitarian situation on the ground should also be addressed to prevent delays and discrimination in the delivery of assistance and ensure that the intended recipients were reached. Furthermore, there was a need to promote the meaningful participation of women in nation-building; the ongoing development of a platform in that regard was welcome. All partners should support that and other initiatives aimed at creating an inclusive and participatory platform for all people in Myanmar. Indonesia supported the draft resolution and remained committed to keeping international attention on the plight of the Rohingya.

40. **Mr. Khani Jooyabad** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the continued deterioration of the human rights and humanitarian situations of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities was gravely concerning. The indiscriminate attacks on Muslims had resulted in

significant loss of life and had exacerbated a history of discrimination. Myanmar should uphold its responsibility to address the root causes of the crisis and ensure the voluntary and sustainable return of all Rohingya refugees and other internally displaced persons. Extremism had always served as a breeding ground for atrocities. The Islamic Republic of Iran supported all efforts towards the cessation of violence, the delivery of humanitarian assistance and the safe, voluntary and dignified return of all forcibly displaced persons. His delegation wished for a durable solution to the situation and had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

41. **Mr. Sylvester** (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution highlighted the continued deterioration of human rights in Myanmar, including for the Rohingya and other minorities, as the country plunged deeper into political, economic and humanitarian crises in the wake of the military coup. The United Kingdom condemned the military campaign of human rights violations, including credible reports of torture, the burning of villages, indiscriminate airstrikes, mass killings and the use of sexual violence to terrorize vulnerable populations. Hundreds of thousands of Rohingya remained in Rakhine State, where they continued to face systemic discrimination and were denied their citizenship rights and access to education and health care. While his delegation supported the draft resolution, it would have preferred to see the inclusion of more language about the role of international arms flows, which facilitated the most egregious human rights violations. His country had adopted a comprehensive arms embargo on Myanmar and all Member States were urged to halt the flow of arms to the military regime. The United Kingdom continued to stand with the people of Myanmar and called for an immediate end to violence and a return to democracy.

42. **Mr. Fepuleai** (New Zealand) said that his country remained deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Myanmar and strongly condemned both the coup and the ongoing violence against civilians. There should be an immediate end to the violence and a return to civilian rule, and all prisoners should be released. New Zealand was opposed to the death penalty and deplored the recent execution of prisoners in Myanmar. It remained deeply concerned about the plight of the Rohingya and other minorities, and that the coup had exacerbated the humanitarian situation of the most vulnerable. Accountability measures were welcome, along with the ongoing work of the Independent Investigative Mechanism and the International Court of

Justice. Further measures needed to be taken by Myanmar to protect the human rights of all communities and to fully cooperate with all relevant United Nations agencies and representatives. His country continued to support ASEAN and its five-point consensus, which should be fully implemented by the military regime.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted.*

44. **Mr. Gafoor** (Singapore) said that the situation in Rakhine State was complex, and Myanmar should work with relevant United Nations agencies to create conducive conditions for the safe, voluntary and dignified repatriation of refugees from Bangladesh. Commending the efforts of the Bangladeshi Government to facilitate that outcome he encouraged both parties to continue dialogue and engagement. On the humanitarian front, while ASEAN and its member States had provided humanitarian assistance to the refugees, there was a need for political stability in Myanmar and in Rakhine State. His Government remained deeply concerned by the dire situation in that country, following the February 2021 coup, and was disappointed by the lack of progress in the implementation of the five-point consensus that had been agreed with the leader of the military authorities. Those authorities should work with ASEAN to expeditiously implement the consensus. ASEAN leaders had also reviewed and agreed on a series of further steps aimed at sending a clear signal to the military authorities and would continue to work with external partners, including the United Nations, to facilitate a peaceful solution. Singapore welcomed the role of the United Nations and the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Myanmar in addressing the situation and supported the latter's extensive efforts to promote dialogue, reconciliation and humanitarian assistance, which were complementary to the work being done by ASEAN to implement the five-point consensus.

45. **Mr. Chindawongse** (Thailand) said that his delegation had joined the consensus in the adoption of the draft resolution and wished to maintain the focus on its original objective and scope, while ensuring an inclusive process with the appropriate consultation of all relevant parties, including ASEAN. Thailand remained concerned about the ongoing violence in Myanmar, which had resulted in casualties and damage to civilian property, and called on all relevant parties in that country to take meaningful steps towards the de-escalation and cessation of violence, engage in dialogue aimed at finding a peaceful solution and ensure that the human rights of all people were fully respected.

It was critical to pave the way for a more sustainable solution to the situation in Rakhine State. The generosity displayed by Bangladesh in hosting the largest group of Rohingya Muslims should be supported with timely, sufficient and continuous contributions from the international community. There should be greater collaboration to address the root causes of the crisis and create a conducive environment for the safe, voluntary and dignified return of all displaced persons. His Government was continuing to implement three development projects in Rakhine State, based on the recommendations of the ASEAN preliminary needs assessment. It fully supported the continuous efforts of ASEAN to help to peacefully resolve the situation in Myanmar and contribute to the inclusive and sustainable development of Rakhine State, including through the implementation of its five-point consensus. The voice of ASEAN mattered and should be taken into account.

46. **Mr. Andreas Lingad** (Philippines) said that while his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution, it disassociated itself from the twenty-ninth preambular paragraph, paragraph 2, and from other paragraphs in other draft resolutions that referred to the International Criminal Court, for the reasons expressed by his delegation earlier.

47. **Ms. Mozgovaya** (Belarus) said that her delegation shared the concerns of other Member States regarding the situation of the Rohingya people and other minorities in Myanmar. However well-intentioned country-specific draft resolutions were, they undermined dialogue and were designed to exert political pressure on sovereign States. The draft resolution on Myanmar was not being submitted for the first time and the special mandate holder was beyond his first year in the role, and yet neither had brought any measurable benefit, serving only to increase confrontation. It was time to search for new solutions that would be both constructive and mutually acceptable for all parties. Her delegation supported adopting the draft resolution without a vote but was in principle against country-specific approaches and wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

48. **Mr. Kashaev** (Russian Federation) said that the situation of the Rohingya people and other minorities in Myanmar deserved the attention of the international community. However, it was pointless to indulge in unfounded and one-sided criticism and to exert pressure on the authorities of Myanmar. The country needed the international community to provide genuine assistance

to address the deep-rooted reasons for its complicated situation, especially given that the Government had reiterated its determination to resolve existing human rights issues. The Russian Federation therefore supported a depoliticized approach to discussing the state of affairs in Myanmar and the settlement of issues in a more nuanced way.

49. Many years of experience had shown that it was impossible to resolve human rights problems through country-specific resolutions. States had the primary responsibility for the promotion and protection of human rights and the role of the international community was to assist them in that regard. For those reasons, and on account of its principled position against country-specific approaches, the Russian delegation wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

50. **Mr. Hossain** (Bangladesh) said that one of the largest exoduses in global history had begun in August 2017, when hundreds of thousands of Rohingya Muslims had first fled to Bangladesh, to seek shelter and protection. Since then, that number had risen to over 1.2 million, exacerbating local overpopulation issues and worsening the vulnerability of Cox's Bazar to climate change and natural disasters. The presence of such a large number of displaced people over such a long period of time was untenable, and while his country had provided shelter to the fleeing Rohingya Muslims for humanitarian reasons, the intention had always been for them to return to Myanmar. To that end, Bangladesh had made multipronged bilateral and multilateral diplomatic efforts to improve conditions in Myanmar. It was regrettable that the situation continued to deteriorate and that the Rohingya Muslims had not been able to return home, but instead remained subject to persecution and threats of displacement.

51. In the light of the forgoing, his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which demonstrated the collective commitment of the international community to the rightful aspirations of the Rohingya refugees. Bangladesh welcomed the continued focus of the draft resolution on the need to address the root causes of the crisis, including in the context of current developments, strongly supported the mandates of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Myanmar, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, and the Independent Investigative Mechanism, and remained committed to providing its full cooperation. The countries and organizations of the region should play an increased role

in resolving the crisis, with enhanced urgency, in order to prevent the development of a regional security crisis. Pending their return, the Rohingya refugees deserved international solidarity and the humanitarian response plan needed to be adequately funded.

52. **Mr. Abd Aziz** (Malaysia) said that the situation in Myanmar was of great concern to his country, and the ongoing conflict had further exacerbated the dire situation of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities. His delegation was disappointed that there continued to be a lack of real, timely and meaningful progress in the implementation of the five-point consensus, particularly on the part of the military authorities. The aspirations and interests of the people of Myanmar were paramount, and should be fulfilled. Although Malaysia welcomed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution and appreciated the recognition by the international community of the crucial role played by ASEAN in addressing the situation, that role should be supplemented by concrete measures, especially on the part of the international community, the United Nations and the Security Council.

53. While his delegation appreciated the efforts of some members of the Security Council, who had facilitated a draft resolution on the situation in Myanmar and had reached out to ASEAN member States in doing so, regrettably, other members did not seem to share the same sense of urgency with respect to the resolution of the conflict. That lack of urgency was akin to turning a blind eye to the atrocities committed against the people of Myanmar. It was concerning and disappointing that some members of the Security Council claimed to speak on behalf of ASEAN, and to have consulted with the latter's membership, when in reality they had not. In fact, in their recent review of the five-point consensus, ASEAN leaders had called on the United Nations and other external partners to support the Association's efforts. In answering that call, the Security Council should not relegate its responsibilities to ASEAN, while watching from the sidelines as the situation continued to unfold and worsen.

54. As the Committee focused on addressing the situation in Myanmar, equal emphasis needed to be placed on the displaced Rohingya Muslims and on the root causes of their plight, in order to facilitate their safe, voluntary and dignified return to Rakhine State. The international community should continue to provide its assistance in that regard, since sustained international support on the political and humanitarian fronts would bring direct positive impacts to the Rohingya refugees.

55. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China) said that her delegation hoped that peace and stability would be sustainably restored to Myanmar. The international community should, on the premise of respecting that country's sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and national unity, help all parties on the ground to conduct dialogue and reconciliation, in accordance with the wishes and interests of the people, and find a proper solution under constitutional and legal frameworks. Since the onset of the crisis, China had remained objective and impartial, and had actively engaged with all parties in the country to promote peace talks. Her Government supported an ASEAN-led approach to addressing the issue and was working with Myanmar to implement the five-point consensus in an orderly manner. It had taken practical actions to support the people of Myanmar in their response to the COVID-19 pandemic, by providing them with millions of doses of vaccines and other supplies. Joint production of COVID-19 vaccines had been launched that year by both countries, with an estimated annual capacity of 10 million doses.

56. The issue of Rakhine State, with its complex historic, ethnic and religious background, needed to be resolved through friendly consultation between Myanmar and Bangladesh. China had always followed that issue very closely and had made considerable efforts to promote dialogue between both parties on the subject of repatriation. It looked forward to the restoration of stability, as soon as possible, and to continued dialogue and consultation aimed at creating conditions for the realization of sustainable repatriation. China had always advocated for the proper handling of differences in the area of human rights, on the basis of equality and mutual respect and, in that connection, it disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

57. **Mr. Tun** (Myanmar) said that while it would continue implementing the commitments made in the policy position on the Rohingya Muslims issued by the National Unity Government in June 2021, his country would also act on the recommendations of the draft resolution. In that regard, all Member States and the international community at large should make every effort to assist and cooperate in the implementation of those recommendations. Myanmar would continue cooperating with all relevant stakeholders, including the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Myanmar, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar, the Independent Investigative Mechanism and other United Nations mandate holders and

mechanisms. Widespread support for the draft resolution would translate into efforts to protect the human rights of all people in Myanmar, including the Rohingya and other minorities, ensure unhindered access to humanitarian assistance in affected communities, and guarantee the safe, dignified and voluntary repatriation of the forcibly displaced.

58. However, those efforts would be in vain if the root causes of the situation were not properly addressed. The only way to protect and promote the human rights of all people in Myanmar, alleviate their suffering and prevent a recurrence of the tragic situation, was to immediately hold the military accountable as the main perpetrator of all crimes against humanity. The General Assembly should therefore complement the draft resolution with another concurrent one to fully address the scale, gravity and impact of the junta's actions on the population and the region. Such a text should also make stronger demands on the international community to protect all groups, advance the democratic will of the people and dismantle the junta. Member States and the United Nations should take immediate and decisive action to end the military dictatorship and all atrocities, and to restore democracy for the people of Myanmar.

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.34: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

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

60. **Mr. Arbeiter** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text was being presented at a pivotal moment. Despite deplorable actions by Iranian authorities against protesters, mass peaceful protests were continuing into their eighth week, and women and girls in Iran were demanding full respect for their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. Their calls for freedom were legitimate and deserved the support of the international community. His delegation extended its condolences to the loved ones of all those who had died at the hands of the Iranian authorities. The violent implementation of the hijab and chastity law fundamentally undermined the human rights of women and girls and further symbolized the targeted and systemic discrimination against them. Impunity could not continue and the calls for accountability by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and others should be heeded, with the prompt, thorough, impartial and independent investigation of reported violations. Canada was deeply concerned by the use of force,

including lethal force, by the Iranian authorities against individuals and communities and staunchly supported the vital work of human rights defenders.

61. His delegation was deeply concerned by the alarming rise in the application of the death penalty, since the latter was incompatible with human rights and dignity, and by the fact that it was being imposed for alleged acts that were not considered to be the most serious crimes. Other disturbing violations included the systemic persecution of ethnic and religious minorities, restrictions on Internet access and mobile phone services, and generalized recourse to arbitrary detentions and forced disappearances. The draft resolution urged Iran to implement recommendations for necessary and meaningful change, and all Member States should vote in its favour.

62. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Greece, Guatemala, Kiribati, Liberia, Palau, Republic of Moldova, San Marino and Tuvalu.

63. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.34](#) by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

64. **Ms. Ershadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her Government categorically rejected and condemned the draft resolution in its entirety. The text had been drafted based on the flawed report, defective findings and biased behaviour of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. The sponsors of the draft resolution, who claimed to be championing human rights in Iran, had a long record of blatant hypocrisy, double-standards and manipulation of human rights for their short-sighted agendas, and were not morally fit to preach on Iranian human rights. The main sponsors of the text were criminal partners who had reunited to make another display of sympathy for individuals whose rights they had violated. Their claims were obviously hypocritical, as the sponsors of the draft resolution had never truly worried about human rights in Iran. Some of those who pretended to protect human rights needed to be reminded of their own crimes, so that they did not forget their true faces.

65. The involvement of Member States such as Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Israeli regime and Germany came as no surprise to her delegation. Those Member States shared similar histories of brutality, callousness, arbitrary killings,

genocide and ethnic cleansing, and they had vowed to use all their resources to morph peaceful protests into acts of violence, under the guise of protecting human rights. The international community had been shocked by the discovery of more than 1,300 unmarked graves in Canada, where the systematic rape, murder and killing of Indigenous children had been witnessed on a large scale. Having turned into a safe haven for criminals, Canada had consistently refused to uphold its international obligation under the United Nations Convention against Corruption to extradite those who had perpetrated crimes against the fundamental human rights of Iranian people with impunity. The United States claimed to be the “land of the free”, even though Iranians continued to suffer severely as a result of its cruel, decades-long sanctions, and it had adopted the standard practice of abusing valued concepts such as human rights, to pursue its illegitimate political agenda. The United Kingdom, a so-called human rights champion, had implemented a barbaric policy that caused millions of Iranians to perish during the great famine of 1919, and now discriminated against migrants and refugees based exclusively on their ethnicity, colour and religion, with its plan to send non-white and non-European migrants to Rwanda.

66. The United States and the United Kingdom had never been concerned about the Iranian people. In 1953, Washington overthrew the then popularly elected Government of Iran, in collusion with London. They had staged a coup d'état simply because they were outraged by the success of the Iranian people's struggle to nationalize their oil industry. Germany had armed and supplied the Saddam Hussein dictatorship with chemical weapons of mass destruction to slaughter people in Iran, the majority of whom were women and children. German war crimes had resulted in the loss of many lives, and that country should compensate victims and their families for the devastating and long-lasting consequences of its actions. No one could deny the violence and war crimes committed by the Israeli apartheid regime against the Palestinian people. That regime had continued its oppressive apartheid policies and systematic violation of Palestinian human rights by murdering defenceless civilians, including women and children, plundering and destroying their property and forcefully displacing them from their homes.

67. The history and culture of Iran were rich in concepts emphasizing the importance of human rights for all Iranians. Her country was neither an island that had to colonize other nations to survive, nor had it been discovered coincidentally by pirates and falsely

claimed. The Islamic Republic of Iran was home to one of the oldest, most significant and longest-lasting civilizations, which dated back over 7,000 years, and its people, particularly its women and girls, would not succumb to coercion or intimidation. Iranian women and girls were intelligent, well educated, dedicated and patriotic, and they were fully aware of their rights. They knew how to peacefully and constructively interact with the Government in order to advance their demands, and were the daughters, spouses and sisters of those who had sacrificed their lives in defence of their country against those who had imposed the eight-year war on Iran. As such, there was no need for Western countries to advocate on behalf of Iranian women and serve as their so-called protectors.

68. Genuine international cooperation and strict adherence to the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity were the best way forward for the effective promotion and protection of all human rights. The Islamic Republic of Iran remained committed to future international efforts in that vein and maintained constructive cooperation with human rights mechanisms, including OHCHR. Her delegation had requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution in the hope that delegations would choose the correct path and reject the politicization of human rights.

69. **Ms. Allan** (Australia), making a general statement before the voting, said that her delegation was pleased once again to sponsor and vote in favour of the draft resolution, which sought to reflect the current human rights situation in Iran without prejudice. All language in the text was evidence-based and drawn from the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Secretary-General. Australia was deeply concerned by the deteriorating human rights situation in Iran, proudly stood with Iranian women and girls in their struggle for equality and empowerment and called on the Iranian authorities to cease their oppression of women. The circumstances surrounding the death of Mahsa Amini were disturbing, and her Government condemned the use of force against protesters following that incident, which had resulted in the death and injury of hundreds of people. Her delegation supported calls for a prompt, thorough, independent and transparent investigation into all such instances in order to hold those responsible to account.

70. Australia was also concerned by reports that a protester had been sentenced to death, as it opposed the death penalty in all circumstances, for all people, and

had been proud to present with Costa Rica the draft resolution calling for a moratorium on the use of the death penalty, which had been adopted with a record number of votes. Iran should establish a moratorium on all executions and cease its long-standing oppression of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex persons, and its unjustifiable discrimination against ethnic and religious minorities. While some delegations had suggested that country-specific draft resolutions infringed on sovereignty, the United Nations had been founded, in part, to ensure that Governments could never again commit the human rights violations that had taken place during the Second World War. Member States were indeed sovereign, but that did not mean that the international community could not scrutinize their actions in the area of human rights. Sovereignty was not a shield and the international community could not turn away and suggest that deaths, violence, discrimination and oppression were internal matters. Member States should vote in favour of the draft resolution.

71. **Ms. Rodríguez Abascal** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation did not support country-specific draft resolutions, which only targeted developing countries that were furthermore subjected to unilateral coercive measures. Such texts created distrust and confrontation and did nothing to improve the human rights situation on the ground. It was very concerning that developing countries were being singled out, while human rights violations committed in or by developed countries were kept silent. Any mandate based on politicization and double-standards was doomed to fail. The continued examination of the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran was motivated by political reasons instead of genuine concern or interest in cooperating with that country. The manipulation of human rights issues sought to advance political interests in order to discredit legitimate Governments, undermine their constitutional orders and justify strategies to destabilize them. Cuba would therefore vote against the draft resolution and called for an end to the exercise against Iran. Constructive dialogue based on cooperation and the exchange of good practices was the only way to address human rights challenges, which existed in all countries.

72. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Venezuela did not support the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and condemned the creation of mechanisms, mandates and resolutions on human rights

situations in specific countries, which did not contribute to constructive dialogue with States and were contrary to the spirit in which the United Nations had been created. As a position of principle, his delegation rejected the creation of any instrument against a specific country without the consent of its Government, which amounted to politicization and selectivity in the treatment of human rights. Such instruments failed to involve dialogue with all partners and tended to refer to third and fourth-party sources. Furthermore, their reports were often used for political purposes by other actors, which did not help to build the trust required to address important issues.

73. The practice of adopting politically motivated reports and resolutions violated the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization, non-confrontation, equality and mutual respect, as well as those of political independence, respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the self-determination of peoples, which were all enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Multilateralism should be promoted by setting aside such interfering practices, strengthening the Human Rights Council and furthering the progress achieved since its creation. The universal periodic review was the best way to address human rights issues in collaboration with States, in addition to the periodic reporting cycles of treaty bodies and other instruments, on the basis of cooperation and dialogue with the countries concerned.

74. **Mr. Sylvester** (United Kingdom), making a general statement before the voting, said that the human rights situation in Iran had continued to deteriorate in recent months, and the tragic death of Mahsa Amini was a shocking reminder of the repression faced by women in that country. His delegation deplored the violent suppression of women's rights and enforcement of the mandatory hijab and chastity law by the so-called morality police, and condemned the Iranian authorities' response to the protest movement, which had led to the loss of over 326 lives and arrest of over 14,000 people. The death sentence passed on a protester the week before marked a shocking worsening of the situation. For those reasons, the United Kingdom welcomed efforts to call a special session of the Human Rights Council, which would hopefully mandate a robust investigation into protest-related human rights violations. Sadly, such repression remained systematic in Iran, where at least 251 people had been executed in the first half of 2022 and a juvenile offender had been executed in November 2021.

75. His Government supported the work of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, which had shed light on that country's human rights violations. It welcomed efforts to expose the systematic repression of minority groups and the continued restrictions on media freedom and the Internet. The Iranian people had suffered enough and it was time for their fundamental freedoms to be upheld, including the rights to peaceful assembly and to freedom of expression and speech, both on and offline. Iranian leaders needed to choose another path and stop blaming external actors, but they continued instead to suppress the voices of civil society. Their reported attempts to prevent some non-governmental organizations from accessing the meeting room were very concerning. All Member States should vote in favour of the very timely draft resolution.

76. **Mr. Kim Nam Hyok** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation maintained its position against country-specific draft resolutions, which typically reflected politicization, selectivity and double-standards in the area of human rights. Such texts had nothing to do with the promotion and protection of human rights, but instead led to confrontation, pressure and interference in the internal affairs of States, while hindering dialogue and cooperation on human rights matters. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea continued to reject the politicized efforts of some countries to overthrow legitimate Governments by submitting such draft resolutions under the pretext of human rights. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

77. **Ms. Carty** (United States of America), making a general statement before the voting, said that the human rights situation in Iran had deteriorated dramatically since the Committee had last adopted the annual draft resolution. The recent Security Council Arria-formula meeting had heard reports on the Iranian Government's human rights violations and abuses, and on how the violent morality police violated human rights, particularly those of women and girls. The Iranian authorities had responded to peaceful protests by killing hundreds of protesters, including children, and threatening detained protesters and activists with death sentences. Furthermore, the Iranian judiciary had issued its first death sentence to a protester. To obscure those actions, the Iranian Government had severely restricted access to information and freedom of communication, pre-emptively detained or threatened activists and human rights defenders, and targeted protesters with

online harassment and abuse in an effort to silence and intimidate them. Instead of continuing to refuse access to the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Iranian authorities should allow a country visit without delay.

78. The draft resolution sent a message of solidarity and support to the Iranian people and included language that specifically mentioned Mahsa Amini, who had died at the hands of the Iranian police. It echoed global calls for independent, impartial and transparent investigations on and accountability for human rights violations. The upcoming special session of the Human Rights Council would vote on a draft resolution to establish a mechanism to promote accountability in Iran, and the United States and other countries intended to take action to terminate Iran's membership of the Commission on the Status of Women. The Committee, which had a duty to condemn the brutal acts of repression and violence, should support its words with action by voting in support of the draft resolution.

79. **Mr. Zellenrath** (Netherlands), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation remained deeply concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation in Iran and strongly condemned the violent repression of peaceful protesters, which was a systemic violation of the rights of Iranian citizens. There was a need for transparent and impartial investigations into the undue use of violence by the Iranian authorities, which had led to the death of Mahsa Amini and many others. The Netherlands stood with Iranian women, who had been denied their human rights through repressive legislation and policies, and through violence. His Government had always taken a principled stand against the death penalty and was deeply disturbed by recent calls for its use against protesters. Reported increases in the arbitrary detention and torture of lawyers, journalists, human rights defenders and foreign and dual nationals were extremely concerning, and continued calls would be made on Iran for fair trials and the immediate release of arbitrary prisoners. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

80. **Mr. Rashid** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that while the consideration of human rights situations should be based on the principles of impartiality, transparency, objectivity, non-selectivity and non-politicization, countries like Iran continued to be selectively targeted for political, economic and strategic purposes, under the guise of promoting and protecting human rights. Despite the imposition of unilateral coercive measures against Iran,

that country continued to make efforts to promote the rights of its citizens. Sanctions against Iran had not been lifted, even in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, which had an impact on the human rights of its people. The underlying principle of the United Nations human rights architecture was that States had primary responsibility for the promotion and protection of the rights of their citizens, in accordance with their international obligations. The best way for addressing human rights concerns was through the effective, non-politicized, objective, impartial and non-discriminatory universal periodic review mechanism. The human rights agenda was better served by two-way communication and mutual consent, particularly when dealing with sovereign Member States. As that agenda gained nothing from the imposition of country-specific mandates on developing countries, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

81. **Mr. Morales** (Nicaragua), speaking in explanation of the vote before voting, said that his delegation opposed the annual presentation to the Committee of reports and draft resolutions on the human rights situation in specific countries. Such texts were to be rejected because of their selectivity, double-standards, politicization and lack of objectivity, and because they did not have the consent of the countries concerned. Dialogue and cooperation were the best solutions to all situations, especially during the post-COVID recovery, when the international community should show solidarity and seek to strengthen multilateralism. The internal affairs of States should be respected and their human rights situations should not be politicized, much less through the imposition of conditions or external pressures, such as illegal and inhumane unilateral coercive measures, which did not facilitate peaceful resolution in any conflict. Nicaragua remained committed to the promotion and protection of all human rights and, as a matter of principle, continued to firmly oppose the politicization of human rights issues. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

82. **Mr. Fepuleai** (New Zealand), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation was deeply concerned by the continued and escalating human rights violations in Iran. New Zealand had established a bilateral human rights dialogue with that country in 2018 and had held an initial session in 2021. During that period of time, his delegation had consistently supported the annual draft resolution on the human rights situation in Iran, without sponsoring it.

However, recent developments, particularly surrounding women and girls, had led to the re-evaluation of that approach and to the determination that bilateral approaches on human rights were no longer tenable. Accordingly, New Zealand had indefinitely suspended that bilateral dialogue and had sponsored the draft resolution once again. It supported the recommendations contained in the text and the important work of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, whose access to the country should be expedited. There was a need for accountability for the ongoing systemic repression of women and girls, and of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex and other persons, including those belonging to ethnic and religious minorities. The recent imposition of a death penalty sentence on a protester was particularly concerning, as New Zealand was opposed to the death penalty in all cases, under all circumstances, and was committed to its urgent abolition, worldwide.

83. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China), speaking in explanation of the vote before voting, said that the work of the Committee should be guided by the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity. Her delegation remained committed to constructive dialogue and cooperation in the area of human rights. It opposed the politicization of related issues and the creation of country-specific mechanisms, without the consent of the countries concerned. The international community should view the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran in an objective and impartial light, respect the path of human rights development chosen by its people, be more attentive to the demands of its Government and people, and stop interfering in its internal affairs. The unilateral coercive measures that infringed on the human rights of the Iranian population should be lifted without delay. While the sponsors of the draft resolution had turned a blind eye to their own human rights violations, they were hell-bent on manipulating human rights to attack and vilify developing countries and interfere in their internal affairs, which was a clear case of bare-faced selectivity, politicization and double-standards. For the foregoing reasons, China would vote against the draft resolution.

84. **Mr. Kuzmin** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of the vote before voting, said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and maintained that the adoption of politicized country-specific draft resolutions was counterproductive. Such documents had nothing to do with protecting human rights and were used primarily to cast aspersions on

certain countries for political reasons. The draft resolution on the Islamic Republic of Iran contained deceitful fabrications and disinformation, even though Iran had provided exhaustive information, in accordance with the correct procedure, on its measures to promote and protect human rights and fulfil its international obligations in that regard.

85. Rather than absurdly and senselessly preaching to and defaming sovereign States, the sponsors of the draft resolution should focus on dealing with their own human rights violations. In Canada, for example, the systematic discrimination of indigenous peoples, including in the justice and penitentiary systems, continued to be documented. The contempt for representatives of First Nations was so pervasive that they accounted for five out of every six suicides in Canadian prisons. The growing number of crimes committed in Canada against women and girls, including in connection with the uncontrolled consumption of legalized narcotics, was also staggering. The mass graves of the children of First Nations peoples who had been violently “removed” from their communities for the purpose of forced “enculturation” was also a testament to the crimes of the country’s very recent past. Those ghastly discoveries, including as a result of the separation of children from their parents, had not yet been investigated. The Russian Federation supported calls to acknowledge them as the result of systematic genocide.

86. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation continued to reject the politicization of human rights matters and the adoption of politicized draft resolutions, which despite their claim to defend human rights, were actually used against specific countries. That approach was a confrontational one that served to isolate those countries, and had nothing to do with respect for human rights or the Charter of the United Nations. Diplomacy and dialogue were the best ways to resolve disputes and ensure respect for human rights and the rule of law. The Islamic Republic of Iran had reiterated on countless occasions that it stood ready to cooperate with the United Nations human rights mechanisms. The sponsors of the draft resolution had insisted on its submission and, in so doing, had set a dangerous precedent and called into question the credibility of those human rights mechanisms. The use of United Nations bodies by States that wielded great financial and political influence was unacceptable. The draft resolution made no mention of the unilateral coercive measures that had been imposed on Iran. It had

been submitted by Canada, despite the many reports of human rights violations and even genocide in that country. In the light of the recent story of the young Iranian chess player who had fled to France after being banned from competing against an Israeli player, only to later find himself banned by the French authorities from competing against a Russian player, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

87. *At the request of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.34.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen.

Against:

Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana,

Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

88. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.34 was adopted by 79 votes to 28, with 68 abstentions.**

89. **Mr. Samson** (France) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and supported the work of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. The draft resolution, which had been adopted by a large majority, factually described recent violence and the arrest and arbitrary detention of protesters, while highlighting the violation of women's rights and freedom of expression through the blocking of news websites and social media networks. That brutal repression was exacerbating an already concerning situation. The text drew attention to the rising number of executions and death sentences, the legal discriminatory measures that infringed on the fundamental rights of women and girls, and retaliatory action against human rights defenders, journalists, filmmakers and all persons engaged in the defence of freedom of expression. It also denounced the generalized use of arbitrary arrests, torture, degrading treatment and forced confessions. France continued to condemn the ongoing degradation of the human rights situation in Iran and urged the Iranian authorities to fulfil their international obligations in that respect, including those under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

90. **Mr. Klíma** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the deaths of many young people and protesters, including Mahsa Amini, were deeply concerning and saddening. The full enjoyment by women and girls of their human rights was at the core of the internal and external action of the European Union, which stood in solidarity with all Iranians in their call for those rights to be respected, along with the rights to freedom of assembly and expression. It was disturbing that, despite repeated calls

* The delegation of Panama subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

for restraint, the Iranian security and police forces had responded disproportionately and that lives had been lost. Human rights should be respected in all circumstances and Iran needed to allow an impartial, transparent and thorough investigation into the use of violence by its security forces in response to the recent protests. Iran should also strictly abide by the principles enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which it was a party. Gravely concerned about the notable increase in executions in Iran and about recent calls by local authorities for protesters to be sentenced to death, the European Union strongly opposed the death penalty at all times and under all circumstances and called for a cessation of executions, including those of juvenile offenders, dissidents and protesters, in keeping with its pursuit of the abolition of capital punishment. For those reasons, the European Union and its member States had supported the draft resolution.

91. **Mr. Gafoor** (Singapore) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, in keeping with its principled position of abstaining from voting on country-specific human rights draft resolutions within the Third Committee. As already explained, its position should not be interpreted as a position on the substance of the human rights issues raised in the draft resolution. All Member States had an obligation to protect and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

92. In response to remarks made by the representative of Australia concerning the adoption by a record number of votes of the draft resolution on the moratorium on the death penalty the week before, he said that the Committee had also, at that same session, adopted an amendment on sovereignty, with a record number of votes. In so doing it had reaffirmed the sovereign right of all countries to determine their own legal systems, including legal penalties, in accordance with their obligations under international law. It was neither useful nor helpful to reopen and relitigate the issue of the moratorium under every agenda item considered by the Committee. It was important for the latter's work to be based on mutual respect, respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and respect for international law. To truly strengthen the multilateral rules-based system, Member States should show respect for each other, listen to each other and engage in constructive dialogue.

93. **Ms. Mozgovaya** (Belarus) said that country-specific approaches without the agreement or

involvement of the targeted countries were unacceptable. Every country faced human rights issues to some degree, but they could be resolved only through fair and respectful dialogue. The draft resolution under consideration represented the foisting of one point of view onto a sovereign State, which could be interpreted as interference in its domestic affairs. Her delegation had therefore voted against its adoption.

94. **Mr. Zahneisen** (Germany) said that his delegation remained deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Iran, where the protests following the death of Mahsa Amini were direct consequences of persistent and grave violations by local authorities of the fundamental human rights of citizens, particularly women and minorities. Germany strongly condemned the violent repression of peaceful protests and was deeply disturbed by reports of violence, arbitrary detentions and disproportionate prison sentences, including against children and juveniles. The courage of those Iranians who had risked their lives to demonstrate against oppression was commendable. More than 340 persons had been killed, over 15,000 persons had been arrested and the first confirmed death sentence had been imposed, making it imperative for the international community to ensure that the human rights violations in Iran were documented and that those who were responsible were held to account.

95. A special session of the Human Rights Council had been requested to address the situation and, at that session, his delegation would, with the delegation of Iceland, submit a draft resolution focusing on the right to peaceful protest, on the need to safeguard the rights of women and girls and on the establishment of an international fact-finding mission. Members of the Human Rights Council should support that draft resolution and Iran should put an immediate end to the severe violence against and arbitrary detention of protesters, human rights defenders, journalists and other media workers, many of whom were women. Germany condemned the restrictions placed on access to the Internet, social media and mobile communications, as a means of repression. Iran should live up to its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and ensure its citizens' rights to freedom of information and expression.

96. **Ms. Mendoza Elguea** (Mexico) said that the draft resolution sought to balance the progress being made in Iran, while also accounting for persisting or deteriorating challenges. The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

had highlighted that Iranian women had been subjected to discriminatory laws for many years, and various United Nations agencies had reported that the repression of recent peaceful demonstration had resulted in hundreds of deaths, including those of 24 women and 41 children. Mexico had voted in favour of the text based on its merits, and in keeping with its feminist foreign policy, which promoted a global human rights agenda under which gender-based violence was incompatible with the dignity and worth of all persons. It also condemned other human rights situations, in the competent forums, without biased reviews, and in cases where human rights violations were evident, in its quest for consistency and impartiality at all times.

97. **Ms. Almeheid** (Saudi Arabia) said that while her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, in keeping with its convictions, it regretted the language used in some paragraphs. The text should not be interpreted as a reflection of the provisions of Islamic sharia law, particularly paragraphs 15 and 24 of the draft resolution, as the violations listed thereunder pertained to the practices of the Iranian regime and had nothing whatsoever to do with Islamic sharia law. Furthermore, unlike what had been suggested by the draft resolution, the hijab itself was not a problem, because millions of women wore it voluntarily, owing to their own beliefs and convictions, and they had never been oppressed on those grounds. With respect to paragraph 9, her delegation reiterated the sovereign right of States to apply the death penalty, in accordance with international instruments in that regard.

98. **Ms. Dale** (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and was proud to sponsor it, along with other country-specific draft resolutions. Norway remained deeply concerned about the deteriorating human rights situation in Iran and by the heavy-handed response of that country's Government and security apparatus to recent demonstrations. The Iranian authorities should heed the call of the General Assembly to respect women's rights, protect peaceful demonstrators and safeguard the rights to peaceful assembly and freedoms of association and expression. All persons who had been arbitrarily arrested should be released, including journalists and human rights defenders. Her Government was concerned about the situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, queer and intersex persons, and by the ongoing prosecution and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Norway was alarmed by the measures taken to restrict or disrupt Iranians' access to and dissemination of information

online, and their ability to communicate securely. Such measures prevented them from enjoying the rights to peaceful assembly and freedom of association and expression, and limited the ability of journalists, human rights defenders and others to report on and document human rights violations and abuses. The Government of Iran should lift all restrictions on access to and use of the Internet, including social media platforms. Human rights were at the core of an inclusive, sustainable and democratic society. The Government of Iran should take the necessary measures to fulfil its human rights obligations.

99. **Mr. Nze** (Nigeria) said that human rights were standards that recognized and protected the integrity of all human beings, regardless of race, sex, nationality, religion or any other status. The recognition of the inherent dignity and inalienable rights of all members of the human family was the foundation of global freedom, justice and peace. States therefore had a responsibility and duty to protect the human rights of their citizens and hold the violators of those rights to account. Nigeria condemned all forms of abuse, suppression and oppression that violated human rights, and was in that regard deeply concerned by the excessive use of force against peaceful protesters. It called on the Islamic Republic of Iran to ensure that those who were responsible for such actions were brought to justice. However, opposing the selectivity, lack of objectivity and double standards that characterized human rights measures, Nigeria maintained that human rights issues should be addressed through constructive dialogue and cooperation, based on equality and mutual respect. For that reason, Nigeria would abstain from voting on all country-specific draft resolutions on human rights. His delegation had not abstained from voting on the draft resolution on the human rights situation in Iran because it condoned the violation of human rights, but because constructive dialogue and mutual respect should be used to address all issues in a peaceful and effective manner.

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.35: Situation of human rights in the temporarily occupied Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, Ukraine

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

101. **Mr. Kyslytsya** (Ukraine), introducing the draft resolution, said that his delegation had presented the draft resolution annually, since 2016, and that the text had become a landmark, as the Russian aggression against Ukraine had been launched in Crimea in

February 2014, with Russia's temporary occupation and illegal attempt to annex the Ukrainian peninsula. In the ensuing years, the Russian occupying authority had transformed Crimea into a gloomy island of fear and repression. Ukraine currently found itself in the ninth month of a full-scale Russian invasion and had experienced unspeakable suffering, loss and devastation on a scale that had not been seen in Europe since the Second World War. Just the day before, the Russian Federation had once again hit civilian buildings and critical civilian infrastructure in several Ukrainian cities, with over 100 missiles. That heinous terror could not be tolerated. The already grave human rights situation on the peninsula had further deteriorated and the worst Russian violations and abuses had spread to the newly occupied territories of Ukraine. Crimea had been used as a military base and springboard for Russia's attack on other southern regions of Ukraine. The return of the Ukrainian flag on the peninsula signified the protection of human rights, freedom for all peoples and communities in Crimea and an opportunity to speak freely and spread the truth. All Member States should join in sending a strong message to the aggressor State and vote in favour of the draft resolution.

102. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Monaco, Portugal, San Marino, Switzerland and Vanuatu.

103. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.35](#) by the Russian Federation.

104. **Mr. Klíma** (Czechia), making a general statement before the voting and speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Iceland, Liechtenstein and San Marino, said that since the adoption of the draft resolution the previous year, Russia had launched a full-scale illegal, unprovoked and unjustified war of aggression against Ukraine and had put global peace and security at risk. The numerous human rights violations and abuses that had been documented in Crimea were now being witnessed elsewhere. The Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine had confirmed that war crimes and violations of human rights and international humanitarian law had been committed in Ukraine. For years, OHCHR had received credible information concerning alleged killings,

arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, torture and ill-treatment by the Russian security service and police in the illegally annexed Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol. Those violations and abuses of human rights must be documented and their perpetrators prosecuted.

105. International monitoring mechanisms needed unimpeded access, which continued to be refused. Russian conscription and mobilization in Crimea only added to the long list of violations, and Crimean Tatars were being deliberately and disproportionately targeted in the implementation of mobilization orders, to forcibly involve them in the war of aggression against Ukraine. That war waged by Russia and its illegal attempts to annex Ukrainian regions would not reduce the focus on ongoing human rights violations and abuses in Crimea, but would instead strengthen the determination to address them. International human rights institutions should continue to provide credible information about human rights violations and abuses in Crimea and Ukraine. For those reason, the States members of the European Union would vote in favour of the draft resolution and all other delegations should do so as well.

106. **Mr. Khani Jooyabad** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that country-specific resolutions exploited the Committee for political ends, in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity. They also undermined cooperation, which was the universal principle for the promotion and protection of universally recognized human rights. The counterproductive recommendations contained in country-specific draft resolutions hindered dialogue, understanding, mutual respect and cooperation, which was why the Islamic Republic of Iran continued to vote against them. The Committee's exertion of political pressure on the parties involved in the dispute, concerning issues falling outside of its mandate, was unacceptable and a disservice to human rights. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

107. **Mr. Croker** (United Kingdom), making a general statement before the voting, said that while Russia had launched an unprovoked and illegal war earlier that year, and had brought untold suffering to the innocent people of Ukraine, that story had begun in 2014 for the people of Crimea. Since that time, they had endured a brutal and systematic campaign of human rights abuses and violations, including arbitrary arrests and detentions, torture, and unjustifiable restrictions on the

freedoms of movement, expression and religion or belief. Many of those measures had disproportionately targeted ethnic and religious minorities, in particular Crimean Tatars. Since the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the human rights situation in Crimea had further deteriorated. The draft resolution highlighted the fact that Crimea had become both a base from which attacks were launched on the rest of Ukraine and a blueprint for further human rights abuses and violations in Ukrainian territory.

108. The United Kingdom condemned the conscription and mobilization of Ukrainian civilians in Crimea into the Russian armed forces and the forced imposition of Russian legislation, which further limited freedom of expression, including the freedom to speak out against the brutal war. It was regrettable that, despite repeated requests, Russia continued to deny access for international monitoring missions to Crimea and other parts of Ukraine under its temporary control. Although Russia would undoubtedly accuse it of politicizing the Committee, his delegation strongly defended the use of country-specific draft resolutions, which complemented the work of the Human Rights Council and other forums in providing scrutiny of adherence to human rights obligations. In fact, earlier that month the Committee had adopted a draft resolution that noted with alarm that Russia had sought to justify its territorial aggression on Ukraine on the purported basis of eliminating neo-Nazism. By failing to make even the weakest case against the language in that draft resolution, Russia had tacitly acknowledged that it had no justification for its aggression against Ukraine. Adoption of the present draft resolution would highlight the support of the international community for Ukraine in its fight against that aggression, and international resolve to maintain pressure on Russia to put an end to its systematic abuse of human rights in Ukraine.

109. **Mr. Khandamishvili** (Georgia), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation strongly supported the draft resolution, which had been presented to the Committee in the wake of the premeditated, unprovoked and unjustified full-scale Russian aggression against Ukraine and the use of temporarily occupied Crimea as a springboard for the Russian military offensive against mainland Ukraine. For years, OHCHR had been documenting human rights violations and abuses in temporarily occupied Crimea, and confirming the continued failure of the Russian authorities to adequately guarantee and protect a wide range of human rights therein.

110. Georgia remained alarmed that the population residing in Crimea continued to suffer from discrimination and grave violations of basic human rights, including torture, abductions, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detentions, sexual violence and other serious violations. It was also concerned by the illegal conscription and mobilization of Crimean residents, including Crimean Tatars, by the Russian Federation. Against that backdrop, international human rights monitoring mechanisms needed full, unhindered and immediate access to temporarily occupied Crimea and other temporarily controlled territories of Ukraine. Georgia welcomed the establishment of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine, underscored the importance of its subsequent report and remained steadfast in its support of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders and territorial waters. For the foregoing reasons, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and all other delegations should join it in upholding human rights and the Charter of the United Nations.

111. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation did not support the draft resolution and, in view of its principled position, rejected the selectivity and politicization of human rights issues and the creation of any instrument against a specific country without the consent of the State concerned. Venezuela confirmed its adherence to the earlier statement of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which rejected mandates and mechanism on the human rights situations of specific countries, as they led to confrontation and did not contribute to constructive dialogue with the States in question, contrary to the spirit in which the United Nations was created. The practice of adopting reports and creating politically motivated mechanisms and country-specific draft resolutions violated the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization, non-confrontation, equality and mutual respect, with which human rights issues should be addressed. In the light of the foregoing, there was a need to further the positive developments achieved since the establishment of the Human Rights Council, whose credibility was undermined by such special procedures. Human rights should be addressed through the universal periodic review and the periodic reporting cycles of treaty bodies and other instruments, on the basis of cooperation and dialogue with the countries concerned.

112. **Ms. Ahmadova** (Azerbaijan), making a general statement before the voting, said that her country condemned all forms of extremism, radicalism and separatism, and formally opposed the acquisition of territories through the use of force. Azerbaijan fully supported the sovereignty, political independence, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine, within its internationally recognized borders, as was demonstrated by its vote on General Assembly resolution 68/262 on the territorial integrity of Ukraine. Her delegation had maintained a clear position on the issue, namely that the conflict should be resolved based on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, within its internationally recognized border and in accordance with the core principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and relevant United Nations resolutions. Within international organizations, Azerbaijan and Ukraine had always maintained mutual support for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity. All conflicts between Member States should be settled through political dialogue, in keeping with the aforementioned principles of international law.

113. **Mr. Kim Nam Hyok** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation opposed politicization, selectivity and double standards in the area of human rights, and rejected the politicized draft resolution, which had nothing to do with the protection and promotion of human rights, but only caused mistrust and confrontation between Member States. Within the United Nations, work on human rights should be conducted in an objective, transparent, non-selective, non-confrontational and non-politicized manner. Accordingly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would vote against the draft resolution.

114. **Mr. Kuzmin** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution was not really about human rights, but was the latest desperate attempt by Ukraine to change the course of events in whatever way that it could. Several years earlier, when the Minsk arrangements were still relevant and the Kyiv authorities had had the opportunity to stop exterminating citizens in eastern Ukraine that they perceived as disloyal, the Russian delegation had called upon all delegations in favour of the draft resolution to recognize that that document was effectively a declaration of States' readiness to anchor relations with Russia on the norms of international humanitarian law rather than on dialogue. In recent years, the draft resolution had been seen by Kyiv as an

approval and encouragement of its policy of hatred towards its own population; it had strengthened the confidence of Kyiv in its own impunity and licence to do what it pleased.

115. The current Kyiv regime was a clear example of a faithful subject of hegemony that believed it had a licence to do anything, whether that be trampling on human rights and freedoms, killing people or nurturing neo-Nazi traditions and order. On the border with Russia, a hostile "anti-Russia" had been established that was fully under external control and was stocking up on state-of-the-art weaponry. Some 70 countries were waging an economic war against Russia, while it stood up to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its Ukrainian foot soldiers. Whereas the policy pursued by the United States and its allies was that of containment, for Russia it was a matter of life and death, and an unprecedented threat to its interests, sovereignty and very existence. Certain States had crossed the red line. In that context, a vote in favour of the draft resolution amounted to support for military escalation over human rights.

116. **Ms. Millard** (United States of America), making a general statement before the voting, said that the full-scale Russian invasion had escalated its long-running aggression against Ukraine, in further violation of the latter's sovereignty and territorial integrity and the Charter of the United Nations. Since 2014, when Russia had illegally seized the Crimean peninsula, the United States had rejected that attempt to change Ukraine's border by force, and had repeatedly denounced Russia and its proxies for their abuses and atrocities in Crimea and other parts of Ukraine. Russia was employing the same tactics used in Crimea to attempt to seize and illegally annex additional areas of Ukraine, including sham referendums, forced Russification, the installation of puppet authorities and other illegitimate methods to impose its control through coercion, fear and force.

117. The Committee had an opportunity to affirm that Crimea belonged to Ukraine and that attempts to annex it and other parts of Ukraine would never be recognized. Her Government would not remain silent as Russia continued its blatant violation of international law. The dire human rights situation in temporarily occupied Crimea had further worsened since the start of the Russian aggression against Ukraine, and it was concerning that the Crimean Tatars, ethnic Ukrainians and others who peacefully opposed the Russian occupation were being repressed. Credible reports documented abuses by Russian forces and puppet

authorities in the parts of Ukraine under its temporary control, including extrajudicial killings, kidnappings, torture, and sexual and gender-based violence. There had also been credible reports of deliberate separation of Ukrainian children from their parents and of abductions from orphanages. Russia had restricted the exercise of freedoms of expression, association, religion or belief, and peaceful assembly. The draft resolution drew attention to the alarming situation in Crimea and other parts of Ukraine where Russian forces were present, and underscored that respect for international law, including the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, mattered. All Member States should vote in favour of the text.

118. *At the request of the representative of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.35](#).*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Belarus, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji,

Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

119. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.35](#) was adopted by 78 votes to 14, with 79 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.