



# General Assembly

Distr.: General

24 April 2024

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

### Fifty-fifth session

#### Summary record of the 56th meeting

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Friday, 5 April 2024, at 9.30 a.m.

*President:* Mr. Zniber .....(Morocco)

## Contents

Agenda item 2: Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General (*continued*)

Agenda item 3: Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development (*continued*)

Agenda item 7: Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories

---

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of the present record to the Documents Management Section (DMS-DCM@un.org).

Any corrected records of the public meetings of the Council at this session will be reissued for technical reasons after the end of the session.



*The meeting was called to order at 9.40 a.m.*

**Agenda item 2: Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General**  
(continued) (A/HRC/55/L.30 as orally revised)

1. **The President** said that statements of the programme budget implications of the draft resolutions under consideration at the current meeting had been published on the Council's extranet.

*Draft resolution A/HRC/55/L.30, as orally revised: Human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the obligation to ensure accountability and justice*

2. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), except Albania, said that, over the previous six months, the occupying Power had written a horrific new chapter in the 75-year-old tragedy of the Palestinian people. The draft resolution had been updated in response to the human rights violations committed in occupied Palestine, especially the Gaza Strip. OIC hoped that the draft would receive unanimous support.

3. The wording of the preamble expressed the Council's grave concern about the worsening situation in occupied Palestine, especially Gaza, the unacceptably high proportion of innocent civilian casualties and the war crimes and crimes against humanity being committed there. It further noted the finding by the International Court of Justice that the population faced a plausible risk of genocide. Concern was expressed about the continued transfer of weapons to Israel, which contributed to further violations of international humanitarian and human rights law and facilitated the commission of war crimes and crimes against humanity. The collective punishment meted out in Gaza included repeated military aggression; the blockade, currently in its seventeenth year; indiscriminate bombing in densely populated areas; the use of starvation as a method of warfare; the obstruction of humanitarian assistance; and the widespread and wanton destruction of residential areas and critical civilian infrastructure.

4. The human rights situation in occupied Palestine had always been precarious but in the previous months had become extreme. In the operative part of the draft resolution, the Council therefore called for an immediate ceasefire, an end to the occupation and the urgent, unhindered provision of humanitarian relief. It condemned all attacks on civilians, called for the immediate release of all remaining hostages and detainees and warned against military operations in the city of Rafah. To ensure meaningful accountability, it requested the United Nations Secretary-General and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to ensure the provision of adequate personnel, expertise and logistical support. The consensual adoption of the draft resolution would affirm the commitment of the international community to the primacy of international law and send a clear signal that impunity for human rights violations was finally at an end.

5. **The President** announced that 10 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

*General statements made before the voting*

6. **Mr. Bladehane** (Algeria) said that over the previous six months the occupying Power had written a horrific new chapter in the tragedy of occupied Palestine, where all human, moral and legal values had largely collapsed. A certain part of the international community showed double standards in respect of the Palestinian issue, failing to protect a people from genocide while, in other countries and circumstances, constantly recalling the need to respect international humanitarian and human rights law. Some parties asserted the right of the occupying Power to self-defence, while supplying it with weapons and ammunition that were used against children and other vulnerable groups; humanitarian workers, hospitals and civilian infrastructure were also targeted. The failure to address that situation jeopardized the credibility and usefulness of the Council.

7. The courageous Palestinian people, who refused to surrender to an occupier that had usurped their land and violated their rights, were on the right side of history, as were those who defended the Palestinian people and stood up for dignity, justice, peace and humanity. The draft resolution was a call to the international community to remember its moral duty, a call that addressed all humankind, transcending cultures, ethnicities and affiliations.

8. **Mr. Nkosi** (South Africa) said that the fact that the draft resolution was the Council's first response to the situation in Gaza demonstrated hypocrisy in the light of the numbers killed: at least 32,975 Palestinians, including 14,500 children, had died in just over 180 days. However, while the Council had thus far remained silent, the special procedure mandate holders had not been bowed, despite being subjected to unconscionable threats and abuse. On 16 November 2023, they had warned the Council that the violations committed pointed to potential genocide. Their findings had been included in his Government's submission to the International Court of Justice and had informed the Court's determination of a plausible risk of genocide. Their work had also been a factor in the recently adopted Security Council resolution 2728 (2024). His Government viewed the intimidation and harassment of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967, Francesca Albanese, as extremely serious and called on those responsible to desist. The work of the special procedure mandate holders would be particularly important in the collection and preservation of evidence, which was central to ensuring accountability and justice. That was the only way in which the international community could end the impunity that had entrenched the ongoing unlawful occupation and could discharge its obligations under the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Israel must respect the International Court of Justice orders and the Security Council resolution demanding an immediate and lasting ceasefire. If international law was to be credible, it must be uniformly applied and must serve the victims it was designed to protect, rather than those with power who treated it with contempt. He called on the members of the Council to cease applying double standards and to adopt the draft resolution by consensus, in the interest of upholding universal rights and fundamental humanity.

9. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) said that the urgency of the draft resolution was indisputable: human rights had been violated by Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory both before and after the events of 7 October 2023, as had been widely documented in reports of various special procedure mandate holders, other United Nations mechanisms and the Secretary-General himself. Words must be turned into action. His Government supported the strengthening of the language used in the draft resolution and the establishment of accountability mechanisms not only for the occupying Power, whose actions amounted to genocide, but also for complicit States that financed, sold and transferred weapons to Israel and made shameful use of their veto power in the Security Council. It supported the application filed by South Africa with the International Court of Justice in respect of violations by Israel of its obligations as a State party to the 1948 Genocide Convention. In addition to demanding compliance with the provisional measures ordered by the Court, the draft resolution also included calls for an immediate ceasefire, the lifting of the illegal blockade imposed on the Gaza Strip and the unhindered entry of humanitarian aid. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, and called on other Council members to do likewise, as they would be voting for justice for those killed in recent months, for an end to impunity and for the restoration of dignity.

10. **Mr. Alramzi** (Kuwait) said that the world was witnessing the continuation of the criminal war waged by the occupying Power against innocent Palestinian citizens. Despite successive Security Council resolutions and International Court of Justice orders, the occupying Power continued to ignore international conventions and murder more Palestinians, including children, every day. The magnitude of the tragedy was indescribable. Despite being forced to flee to Rafah, Palestinians continued to face threats and the humanitarian situation only deteriorated. His delegation called on Council members to fulfil their historic task of bringing justice by adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

11. **The President** invited the States concerned by the draft resolution to make statements.

12. **Ms. Eilon Shahar** (Observer for Israel) said that, for years, her Government had been calling on the Council to condemn the actions and inhumanity of Hamas and call for

accountability and justice for Israeli victims of terrorism but, even after the worst massacre of Jewish people since the Holocaust, in one of the deadliest terrorist attacks in modern times, it had still failed to do so. She asked whether 1,200 dead Israelis, and atrocities including rape and torture, were not enough, and how many stockpiles of weapons in hospitals, schools and United Nations facilities were needed to convince the Council to denounce the use of civilian infrastructure by Palestinian terrorist organizations.

13. According to the draft resolution, Israel had no right to protect its own people, while Hamas had every right to murder and torture innocent Israelis. In other words, Israel should have stood idly by on 7 October 2023 as Hamas unleashed its barbaric acts, and should have allowed it to do the same again the next day. The draft resolution would prevent States from selling arms to Israel to defend its population but would allow them to arm Hamas with weapons like the ones it had used to attack and sexually assault Israeli women. The draft resolution established a distorted equivalence between the hostages still being held by Hamas and the Hamas terrorists themselves; a one-year-old baby was considered equivalent to an Islamic Jihad terrorist who had committed rape.

14. The Council had long abandoned the Israeli people, turning a blind eye to any acts of violence against Israelis and Jews, and had long defended Hamas, thus acting as a shield for terrorists. She called on Council members to vote against the draft resolution, as a vote in favour would be a vote to legitimize Palestinian terrorism and delegitimize the fight against antisemitism; to ignore the slaughter and rape of Israeli citizens; and to undermine the right of Israel to defend itself. Israel would continue to fight Hamas and to defend its people. It would bring all 134 hostages back home.

15. **Mr. Khraishi** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that a litany of lies had been heard at the meeting; such allegations could not be discussed without an independent international investigation. The Palestinian authorities were prepared to ensure that those proved to be perpetrators of atrocities were held accountable. He did not understand how other countries could blindly follow the words of the criminal Netanyahu and his associates as they tried to impose a new law on the world. Certain States called for accountability in all parts of the world, except when the perpetrator was Israel. He did not understand how they could justify to their own children the genocide they were seeing on television. The 14,000 children and 9,000 women killed had not been Hamas fighters and there was no evidence that hospitals were used as weapons stores. Rather, Al-Shifa Hospital had been destroyed and the bodies of the doctors and patients killed there were a stain on the international community. The recent attack on staff of the non-governmental organization World Central Kitchen had claimed several victims who were not Palestinians but, even so, the Heads of State of their countries had merely requested an investigation, which was but a masquerade.

16. Even after the Security Council had adopted resolution 2728 (2024) on 25 March 2024, the United States had stated that it was not binding. However, the resolution fell under Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations, Article 25 of which provided that States were to carry out the Security Council's decisions. If the law of the jungle was allowed to reign, the result would be terrorism everywhere, affecting everyone. Ever since the Nakbah of 1948, the Palestinian people had suffered the consequences of what had happened during the Second World War, for which they were in no way responsible.

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

17. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America) said that far too many civilians had been killed in the conflict and every civilian death was a tragedy. Her Government was outraged by the recent deaths in Gaza of seven World Central Kitchen humanitarian workers, including one American citizen. Such incidents should not happen; the protection of all civilian life was a moral and strategic imperative and Israel had not done enough to mitigate the harm caused to civilians. Her Government was gravely concerned at the unprecedented loss of life and the lack of adequate humanitarian assistance that had left men, women and children in Gaza on the brink of widespread starvation.

18. The brutal terrorist attack by Hamas on Israel six months previously had irreparably shattered many lives. Her Government demanded the release of the hostages held by Hamas.

Although Israel, like all other States, had an obligation to defend itself and the right to prevent the events of 7 October 2023 from happening again, the way in which it did so mattered. The United States had repeatedly urged Israel to deconflict military operations against Hamas with humanitarian operations in order to avoid civilian casualties and to ensure that humanitarian actors could carry out their essential mission in safety. That had not happened and more humanitarian workers had been killed in Gaza than in any war of the modern era. President Biden had therefore underscored the need for an immediate ceasefire by all parties as essential to stabilizing and improving the humanitarian situation and protecting innocent civilians. Her Government urged Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and Hamas to conclude an agreement without delay to bring the hostages home.

19. The draft resolution was problematic in a number of ways, such as its omission of a specific condemnation of the attacks by Hamas on 7 October 2023 or their terrorist nature. While language calling for the immediate release of the hostages had been added, no distinction was made between hostages, who had been brutally abducted and allegedly subjected to repeated sexual violence, and detainees, whose treatment was governed by legal processes. The text also drew a number of conclusions about the conduct of the conflict without sufficient evidence. The United States was determined to bring life-saving aid to Gaza, to push for an end to the conflict and to work to bring about a just and stable two-State solution. However, the draft resolution would not further those aims. For all those reasons, her delegation requested a vote on the draft resolution and encouraged all Council members to vote against it.

20. **Ms. Fuentes Julio** (Chile) said that the civilian population of Gaza, especially women and children, had been subjected to indiscriminate attacks and would face a real risk of starvation and death if the military offensive continued. Her Government unequivocally condemned the abduction of civilians by Hamas and called for their immediate and unconditional release. However, the violation of fundamental norms by one party was not an excuse for the other to ignore the rules of humanitarian law. Her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, as it had always done, and repeated its call to Israel to cease the serious violations of humanitarian and human rights law. The aim of the draft resolution was to ensure accountability and justice; in that regard, Chile supported the role of the International Criminal Court, to which it had referred the situation in Palestine, and of the International Court of Justice in determining the existence of crimes and identifying the parties responsible. She urged Israel to cooperate with both Courts.

21. **Mr. Honsei** (Japan), noting that the comments of his delegation had been accommodated in the draft resolution, said that his delegation had always previously voted in favour of resolutions on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. His Government was deeply concerned about the ongoing humanitarian situation in Palestine, particularly in the Gaza Strip, and the increasing numbers of civilian casualties, including many children, women and elderly people. It had condemned the terrorist attacks by Hamas and had consistently called for the immediate release of the hostages. It wished to reiterate the importance of protecting civilians and to urge all parties to act in accordance with international law, including international humanitarian law, and in good faith on the basis of the relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions, such as resolution 2728 (2024), including by ensuring humanitarian assistance.

22. Despite the many additions to the draft resolution to reflect the current situation, the text should not prejudice the legal outcome of matters pending before the International Court of Justice. His Government had not made a legal assessment of the extent to which the actions of Israel were consistent with international law. As the number of civilian casualties was increasing, further explanation was needed from the parties as to whether their military action as a whole was justified under international law. In the light of those factors, his delegation would abstain from voting.

23. **The President** announced that Indonesia had withdrawn its sponsorship of the draft resolution.

24. **Mr. Habib** (Indonesia) said that, despite numerous diplomatic, legal and humanitarian efforts by the international community, Israel was continuing its deliberate and

barbaric military actions against civilians in Gaza, including medical personnel and aid workers, during the holy month of Ramadan, in complete disregard of the mandatory orders of the International Court of Justice and United Nations Security Council resolution 2728 (2024). As the occupying Power, Israel must not exploit the approaching end of the holy month of Ramadan to escalate its acts of violence. His Government called for an immediate and permanent ceasefire, for the occupying Power to comply with international law and for all States to help prevent acts that amounted to genocide in Gaza, including by ending the transfer of arms to Israel.

25. The draft resolution was a balanced text through which the Council would condemn all acts of violence and the targeting of civilians, while demanding the immediate release of all hostages, detainees and victims of enforced disappearance. The element of accountability had been significantly enhanced through the addition of new paragraphs. The vital work of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel was of particular importance, but his delegation was deeply worried that the resources allocated were inadequate compared to those of other country-specific mandates. It therefore strongly supported the call for the allocation of additional resources, to allow the Commission of Inquiry to fully implement its mandate. The unprecedented magnitude of the atrocities committed in the Occupied Palestinian Territory demanded that the Council should adopt the draft resolution, which would give momentum to the international community's unwavering commitment to the human rights of all peoples, including the Palestinians. Reaffirming his delegation's solidarity with the Palestinian people and support for the wider recognition of Palestinian statehood, he urged the members of the Council to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

26. **Mr. Sterk** (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was concerned about the dramatically deteriorating situation in Gaza, the increasing numbers of victims, including humanitarian workers, and the potential for further escalation of the conflict. The effects on civilians, particularly children, were disproportionate, and the insufficient entry of aid created an imminent risk of famine. Immediate measures must be taken to prevent any further population displacement and ensure that civilians were protected at all times. However, his delegation had expected that the draft resolution would include a more explicit and accurate reference to the acts that had triggered the current escalation, specifically the terrorist attacks, including murder, gender-based violence and hostage-taking, that had been perpetrated against Israel on 7 October 2023. His delegation reiterated its strongest condemnation of Hamas and was disappointed that the text did not include a more explicit and unequivocal condemnation of those heinous attacks and a stronger call for the release of the hostages. Although it recognized the efforts made by the drafters of the text, his delegation considered that some elements rendered its applicability inequitable, and so would vote against it. Lastly, he reiterated the right of Israel to self-defence, but also the need for all parties to comply with international law and the decisions of the International Court of Justice.

27. **Mr. Da Silva Nunes** (Brazil) said that his delegation condemned both the terrorist attacks by Hamas and the disproportionate and indiscriminate response of Israel, which had resulted in large numbers of deaths, especially of women and children, hunger and the destruction of civilian infrastructure, including health facilities. With the aim of breaking the unrelenting cycle of violence and impunity, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution. All parties must respect international humanitarian and human rights law and must end all human rights violations.

28. His delegation called on all parties to cooperate with the special procedure mandate holders, including the Independent International Commission of Inquiry. It also supported the proceedings brought by South Africa before the International Court of Justice and emphasized the importance of full compliance with all the provisional measures adopted by the Court, which must be implemented immediately to guarantee the rights of Palestinians under the Genocide Convention and ensure the unhindered provision to them of basic services and humanitarian assistance. While pursuing justice, the international community must also find a way to heal the deep wounds and chart the future of the region. Brazil was committed to a two-State solution under which an economically viable State of Palestine could live side by side with Israel in peace and security within mutually agreed and

internationally recognized borders, including the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and East Jerusalem as its capital.

29. **Mr. Bonnafont** (France), thanking the delegation of the State of Palestine for having endeavoured, even in the current terrible circumstances, to find the broadest possible agreement on the draft resolution, said that the human rights situation in Gaza was catastrophic. France had been at the forefront of the humanitarian response in Gaza and his Government would continue to call on Israel to ensure that aid was allowed in, including through the port of Ashdod and by land from Jordan. It would continue to oppose any Israeli offensive on Rafah and to call for an immediate and lasting ceasefire, respect for international law, including humanitarian law, by all parties and guarantees of protection for humanitarian workers in all circumstances. All persons deprived of their liberty must be treated with humanity at all times. France would continue to support the fight against impunity and the principles of responsibility, justice and accountability.

30. However, his delegation considered that the mention of genocide in the draft resolution should not have been included in the absence of a finding to that effect by a competent court. The text should have expressed the strongest possible condemnation of the attacks perpetrated by Hamas and other terrorist groups and of the treatment of victims, including the use of sexual violence. Israel had the right to defend itself from attack by a group that contested its very existence, but must exercise that right with full respect for the principles of international humanitarian law, under which civilians must not be targeted. The hostages still being held in the Gaza Strip must be released unconditionally. As those factors were not adequately addressed in the draft resolution, his delegation would abstain from voting. His Government had spearheaded discussion of the question in the Security Council since the beginning of the crisis and firmly believed that a two-State solution was the only way to meet the security needs of both Israel and the Palestinian people and of meeting that people's legitimate aspiration to statehood.

31. **Mr. Mao Yizong** (China) said that an unprecedented humanitarian disaster was unfolding in the Gaza Strip and that it was imperative to ensure the timely and full implementation of Security Council resolution 2728 (2024) and achieve an immediate ceasefire. The Palestinian people's 70 years of displacement were a stain on the conscience of humankind. The international community should ensure justice for the Palestinian people as soon as possible and support the protection of their human rights.

32. China supported the establishment of a fully sovereign and independent State of Palestine based on the 1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital, and firmly opposed the forcible transfer of the Palestinian people and the occupation of Palestinian land. China called on all parties to faithfully implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, Security Council and Human Rights Council and urged Israel to investigate violations of the human rights of the Palestinian people, hold their perpetrators to account and compensate the victims. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on the other members to do the same.

33. **Mr. Foradori** (Argentina) said that Argentina called for an immediate, sustainable ceasefire in Gaza to allow humanitarian assistance to reach those in need. It also called on the parties to respect international humanitarian and human rights law, in particular the obligation to protect civilians. It strongly condemned the deaths of children, humanitarian workers and journalists, among other civilians. The Council could not remain indifferent in the face of an utterly unacceptable situation lest its silence should amount to complicity. His Government also unequivocally condemned the 7 October 2023 terrorist attacks and hostage-takings perpetrated by Hamas and recognized the right of Israel to self-defence. It called for the hostages to be released without conditions, for their safety and dignity to be respected, for their medical needs to be met and for the International Committee of the Red Cross to be granted immediate access to them.

34. The task at hand, however, was to consider the draft resolution on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the obligation to ensure accountability and justice. His delegation took the view that the text was unbalanced, as it did not explicitly mention Hamas or the terrorist nature of its actions, which had neither begun nor ended on 7 October 2023. His delegation could not overlook that

omission and would therefore vote against the draft resolution, and urged other delegations to do likewise. The only solution to the conflict lay in the definitive establishment of an independent, democratic and territorially contiguous State of Palestine that guaranteed the right of Israel to live in peace within secure and internationally recognized borders. The United Nations had the organs and mechanisms necessary to work towards that goal; all that remained was to show the political will to achieve durable peace between Israel and Palestine, with no excuses or delays.

35. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany) said that Germany shared the sense of urgency regarding the catastrophic situation in Gaza and deplored the suffering of innocent civilians. It was therefore working tirelessly towards improving the humanitarian situation and reaching a diplomatic solution to the conflict. Israel, in exercising its right to defend itself against attacks by the terrorist group Hamas, must respect international humanitarian and human rights law, in particular the obligation to minimize the impact of hostilities on civilians, including in Rafah, and to allow sufficient humanitarian assistance to reach people in need. Germany called on Israel to adhere to the provisional measures ordered by the International Court of Justice on 26 January and 28 March 2024.

36. Her delegation had engaged actively in the consultations on the draft resolution and acknowledged the willingness of the delegation of the State of Palestine to accommodate a number of suggested improvements. However, the text failed to mention Hamas and denied Israel the exercise of its right to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, it referred to the 2004 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which related to the situation in the West Bank and did not apply to the situation arising from the events of 7 October 2023. The text insinuated that Israel engaged in practices of apartheid and accused it of carrying out collective punishment, deliberately targeting Palestinian civilians and using starvation as a method of warfare. While allegations of that nature should be investigated, the Council should not prejudge the results of such investigations. Accordingly, her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

37. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Eritrea, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Honduras, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Argentina, Bulgaria, Germany, Malawi, Paraguay, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Benin, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, France, Georgia, India, Japan, Lithuania, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Romania.

38. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#), as orally revised, was adopted by 28 votes to 6, with 13 abstentions.*

39. **The President** invited delegations to make statements in explanation of vote or general statements on either of the draft resolutions considered under agenda item 2.

40. **Mr. Bladehane** (Algeria) said that human dignity was at the core of all human rights and that Algeria condemned all violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they occurred in the world. While it recognized the need to consider the human rights situation in South Sudan, his delegation had voted against draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.20/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, because the resolution could have the opposite of its intended effect. It was important to engage in constructive dialogue with the country concerned. On the other hand, his delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.34/Rev.1](#), which was aimed at achieving sustainable peace in South Sudan through technical assistance and capacity-building.

41. Algeria was concerned at the increasing polarization and politicization of the Council and rejected any practices that might detract from the Council's *raison d'être*, namely the



protection and promotion of human rights. The Council must examine human rights situations in a universal and objective manner, devoid of double standards and selectivity. Algeria regretted that some States applied double standards with regard to the Occupied Palestinian Territory and thus undermined the Council's credibility. He could not understand how the Council could fail to take concrete action within its mandate to safeguard the right to life and security and protect vulnerable groups from the war crimes and genocide being perpetrated by the Israeli occupation in Gaza and other occupied Palestinian territories.

42. **Mr. Bekkers** (Kingdom of the Netherlands) said that his country was appalled by the immense suffering of civilians in Gaza. It condemned the terrorist attacks carried out by Hamas on 7 October 2023 and the ensuing escalation of violence. An immediate ceasefire in line with Security Council resolution 2728 (2024) was crucial, as was the release of all hostages. The Kingdom of the Netherlands strongly supported calls for a massive increase in humanitarian assistance and for accountability and justice for violations of international law committed by all parties to the conflict. However, his delegation had disagreements or reservations about several elements of draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#), including language that pre-empted current judicial investigations into alleged breaches of international humanitarian law and references to the right of self-defence and the transfer of military equipment. The Kingdom assessed the transfer of military equipment with particular caution and vigilance on a case-by-case basis, in keeping with its obligations under the Arms Trade Treaty and the common position of the Council of the European Union defining common rules governing control of exports of military technology and equipment. For those reasons, the Kingdom had abstained from voting on draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#).

43. **Mr. Scappini Ricciardi** (Paraguay) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#) because it failed to mention the terrorist attacks of 7 October 2023 and glossed over the matter of the Israeli hostages. Consensus leading to lasting peace would be found only when the Council took all aspects of the situation into account.

44. **Mr. Bichler** (Luxembourg) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#) on account of the urgency of the situation on the ground. The Heads of State and Government of the European Union had condemned in the strongest possible terms the criminal atrocities committed by Hamas and other armed groups on 7 October 2023 and recognized the responsibility of Israel to protect its population, as well as its right to defend itself while respecting international law and international humanitarian law. Luxembourg dissociated itself from paragraph 13 of the resolution, as calling on States to cease the provision of arms, munitions and other military equipment to Israel, but not to Hamas, was incomprehensible.

45. Luxembourg remained deeply concerned at the catastrophic humanitarian situation in Gaza and its disproportionate impact on civilians, especially children, and at the imminent risk of famine due to the obstruction of humanitarian aid. Full, timely, safe and unhindered humanitarian access to the entire Gaza Strip must be provided via all possible routes. Luxembourg urged the Government of Israel not to proceed with a ground offensive in Rafah. Lastly, he hoped that the Council would fulfil its preventive mandate, as well as its mandate to promote and protect human rights in all circumstances. The extreme urgency of the situation in Gaza, the West Bank and East Jerusalem demanded action by the Council.

46. **Ms. Schroderus-Fox** (Finland) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#) and urged Israel to comply with international humanitarian law and the legally binding orders issued by the International Court of Justice, including the order issued on 28 March 2024 in view of the worsening living conditions in Gaza, particularly the spread of famine and starvation. Regarding the eighteenth preambular paragraph of the resolution, Finland wished to note that it was not for the Council to determine the applicability of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and that the 2004 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice had found Article 51 to be irrelevant only in relation to the construction of the wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. Finland was fully committed to respecting and ensuring respect for international humanitarian law and to fulfilling its obligations under the Arms Trade Treaty and the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies.

47. **Mr. Antwi** (Ghana) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.20/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, because it believed that continued engagement between the Council and the South Sudanese authorities was necessary to advance human rights in that country. The concerns expressed by the South Sudanese authorities and the importance of respecting the principles, modalities and mechanisms of the human rights system were not mutually exclusive. Reaching agreement on recommendations to set up institutions or fact-finding missions was a central pillar of the human rights architecture and a necessary condition for preserving the relevance of the Council. Nevertheless, Ghana commended the main sponsors for their willingness to push the frontiers of constructive engagement with all members of the Council and with the State concerned in particular, which would pave the way for further engagement with the leadership of South Sudan to support the country at the current delicate stage of implementation of the Revitalized Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Republic of South Sudan.

48. More must be done to enhance the livelihoods and access to justice of the South Sudanese people. Attention must be paid to victims of abuse, especially sexual violence, and unfair treatment. Ghana therefore encouraged the South Sudanese authorities to remain committed to building the requisite State institutions. Lastly, Ghana urged the Council to take a unified, consensus-based approach to matters relating to South Sudan.

**Agenda item 3: Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development** (*continued*)  
([A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#) as orally revised, [A/HRC/55/L.36](#), [A/HRC/55/L.37](#), [A/HRC/55/L.39](#), [A/HRC/55/L.40](#), [A/HRC/55/L.41](#) and [A/HRC/55/L.42](#))

*Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#), as orally revised: Rights of the child: realizing the rights of the child and inclusive social protection*

49. **Mr. Pecsteen de Buystwerwe** (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States members of the European Union and the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, said that social protection remained beyond reach for more than 1.77 billion children globally, despite clear evidence that social protection had a profound positive impact on children's lives. The draft resolution stressed the right of all children to social security and recognized States' obligation to ensure access to inclusive social protection. The main sponsors had prioritized the mainstreaming of an age-, gender- and disability-responsive approach throughout the text. The draft resolution highlighted the importance of mainstreaming children's rights across the United Nations system, calling for child-friendly modalities for the participation of children and promoting their right to be heard. The main sponsors had sought to accommodate the various amendments proposed during the extensive consultations, striking a careful balance between the various requests from delegations and a steadfast commitment to formulating a text centred on the best interests of the child in the context of inclusive social protection. They urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

50. **Mr. Mata Prates** (Observer for Uruguay), continuing the introduction of the draft resolution, as orally revised, said that inclusive social protection was vital for ensuring that children's rights were respected and that they could develop their potential to the fullest. The various crises in the world had deepened poverty, inequality and social injustice, the effects of which were disproportionately felt by children. The draft resolution, as orally revised, called on States to step up efforts to implement effective social protection systems that safeguarded the best interests of the child and responded to the needs of children by involving them in decisions that affected them. He called on the members to adopt the text by consensus.

51. **The President** announced that there were 14 additional sponsors of the draft resolution.

52. **Mr. Gamaleldin** (Observer for Egypt), introducing the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.36](#) on behalf of Bahrain, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar and his own delegation, said that family-oriented policies were designed to support parents and caregivers so that they could provide the necessary care to their children. It was nearly impossible to improve the situation of children's rights without improving the context in

which children lived. Parental leave, breastfeeding support, comprehensive early childhood care and development services, and programmes on parenting and on violence prevention were vital.

53. The drafters of the proposed amendment had participated in good faith in the negotiations and had made several requests to align the wording of the draft resolution with international law. While one such request had been to include a reference to “family-oriented policies”, other requests had concerned proposed references to the situation of children under foreign occupation; he deeply regretted that those proposals had not been accommodated. In the light of recent atrocities and grave violations of children’s rights, texts adopted by the Council must reflect the harsh realities on the ground. Discussions could not remain limited to the usual topics, such as sexuality education, when children were being mercilessly killed every day. Regrettably, many of the sponsors of the draft resolution had not supported a joint statement on the unprecedented violations of children’s rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. Pioneers of human rights should lead by example and condemn the killing of children wherever it occurred.

54. Listening to voices from Africa and Asia in seeking ways to achieve the aims of the Convention on the Rights of the Child was not a luxury in a universal body. The peoples, cultures and ways of life in different regions were different. As long as the same goals were being sought, all ideas should be respected and there was no place in the Council for claims of cultural superiority on any topic. Recent events had shown that feelings of cultural superiority could affect States’ vision as to which children deserved the Council’s sympathy.

55. In the light of those considerations, the drafters wished to withdraw the proposed amendment. The fact that some States were adopting strict positions and rejecting simple and modest contributions was forcing the drafters to reassess their engagement in the Council beyond the proposed amendment. The Council needed to consider how best to reflect the realities in different countries and the ambitions and priorities of the children in those countries while ensuring respect for international law.

56. Speaking as the representative of Egypt, he said that his delegation dissociated itself from the paragraphs on which other proposed amendments had been submitted, should those amendments not be adopted.

57. **The President** said that the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.38](#) had been submitted by the Russian Federation but had not been sponsored by any member of the Council. In accordance with rule 72 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, which were applicable to the Human Rights Council pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/251, the Council could take action on a proposal submitted by an observer delegation if it was requested to do so by at least one member of the Council. As no member had made such a request with regard to the proposed amendment, he took it that the Council did not wish to consider it.

58. *It was so decided.*

59. **Ms. Khusanova** (Observer for the Russian Federation), introducing the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/HRC/55/L.37](#), [A/HRC/55/L.39](#), [A/HRC/55/L.40](#), [A/HRC/55/L.41](#) and [A/HRC/55/L.42](#), said her delegation regretted that, even though the current session was the longest in the Council’s history, such an important draft resolution had been given only one reading. Council resolutions should reflect the views of all parties, not just those of the sponsors. Despite the efforts of the delegation of Uruguay to find compromise solutions, the concerns raised by her delegation had not been taken into account. The draft resolution was far from balanced and its provisions departed from those of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

60. Although it had many concerns about the draft resolution, her delegation had focused on six key problematic areas and had submitted six proposed amendments, one of which had just been withdrawn. As the main sponsors had accepted the language in the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.40](#), that document was also being withdrawn.

61. The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.37](#) would replace vague terms not defined in international human rights law or clearly explained by the main

sponsors, such as “human rights-based”, “child rights-based” and “child rights-compliant”, with “a child rights perspective”, which was the term used in paragraph 29 of Council resolution 49/20. The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.39](#) was intended to align the language with articles 3 and 12 of the Convention and with broadly accepted terminology. It also sought to ensure that any action taken by States with regard to children, including decisions on social protection and administrative and judicial proceedings, took into account the rights and duties of parents and legal guardians under international human rights law, notably article 40 (2) (b) (iii) of the Convention. The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.41](#) introduced a new preambular paragraph taken verbatim from article 5 of the Convention to ensure that all the elements of the draft resolution were interpreted in a manner consistent with State obligations under the Convention and to better align the text with General Assembly resolution 78/187.

62. The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.42](#) was designed to remove the ambiguous wording “right to sexual and reproductive health”, as well as “sexual and reproductive” before “information, education and care services”. That wording was not only highly inappropriate, but also irrelevant given the theme of social protection. First, there was no stand-alone right to sexual and reproductive health in international law. While the recommendations of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development referred to a so-called “right to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health”, paragraph 1.15 of the Programme of Action clearly stated that the Programme did not create any new international human rights. Moreover, the opening paragraph of the section on principles stated that the implementation of the recommendations contained in the Programme of Action was the sovereign right of each country, consistent with national laws and development priorities, with full respect for the various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of its people, and in conformity with universally recognized international human rights. Secondly, under the Convention and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the promotion of children’s access to health-care services and to sexual and reproductive health information and education must respect the right of parents and legal guardians to provide appropriate direction and guidance to their children and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions. Thirdly, removing references to sexual and reproductive health would expand the scope of “health information, education and care services” to encompass all health-related concerns that children faced.

63. Her delegation was disappointed that the Council had decided not to consider the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.38](#), which would have brought a number of provisions of draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, into line with article 12 of the Convention. She called on those States that sought to comply with their legal obligations under the Convention to support the proposed amendments.

64. **Mr. Pecsteen de Buystwerve** (Belgium) said that the main sponsors were not in a position to accept the amendments proposed by the Russian Federation and therefore called for them to be put to a vote.

65. **The President** invited members of the Council to make general statements on the draft resolution, as orally revised, and the proposed amendments.

66. **Mr. Habib** (Indonesia) said that, although it was unfortunate that the main sponsors had not held two rounds of informal consultations, as was traditionally the practice, his delegation appreciated their efforts to engage with other delegations to produce a more balanced draft resolution. Nevertheless, there was a need to strengthen the draft by highlighting the role, rights and duties of parents in accordance with international human rights law, particularly the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Furthermore, the role of children’s legal guardians, extended family and community, as provided for by article 5 of the Convention, should be acknowledged. Indonesian national laws and policies confirmed the importance of sexual and reproductive health for women and children. However, to ensure the protection of children’s rights, the laws in place provided for age-appropriate sexual and reproductive health-care services. His delegation therefore supported the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/HRC/55/L.39](#), [A/HRC/55/L.41](#) and [A/HRC/55/L.42](#) and called on the members of the Council to do the same.

67. **Mr. Guillermet Fernández** (Costa Rica) said that inclusive social protection was still out of reach for nearly 2 billion children around the world. The adoption of the draft resolution would encourage States to increase their investment in social protection to ensure that it was truly inclusive and gender-sensitive and would promote the development of resilient and sustainable societies that respected children's rights. Costa Rica reaffirmed its full support for the draft resolution, which focused on the importance of inclusive social protection to ensure that children lived in dignity as rights holders and to help advance the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Lastly, he wished to highlight the efforts made by the main sponsors to reach an understanding with the States that had proposed amendments, which his delegation considered to be somewhat hostile, and called on members of the Council to reject the proposed amendments and to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

68. **Mr. Staniulis** (Lithuania) said that Lithuania would continue to advocate the realization of children's rights through universal, non-discriminatory, comprehensive, disability-inclusive and child rights-based social protection systems in the best interests of the child. His delegation welcomed in particular the references in the draft resolution to increasing the capacity and resources of OHCHR to ensure the meaningful and safe participation of children in all relevant United Nations action and United Nations forums. Children were not just dependent on adults; they were active members of societies, often playing the role of human rights defenders. It was deeply regrettable that so many amendments had been proposed in respect of the draft resolution. The seven amendments proposed after such an inclusive negotiation process reflected a desire to polarize the Council. The draft resolution, as presented, was balanced and should be adopted by consensus, as such resolutions had been in previous years.

69. **Mr. Alimbayev** (Kazakhstan) said that the draft resolution's purpose was to draw the attention of the international community to the need to develop and implement universal, non-discriminatory, comprehensive, child rights-based and inclusive social protection systems in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and international human rights law. His delegation appreciated the main sponsors' efforts to find a middle ground and balance in the text. The draft resolution addressed the needs of the family and recognized the central role of parents and caregivers in the upbringing of children, while acknowledging children as full human rights holders under international law. His delegation therefore called on the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

70. **Ms. Haque** (Bangladesh) said that her delegation wished to raise a number of concerns about the draft resolution. First, the main sponsors had limited the informal consultations to one reading only despite the fact that a number of delegations had raised concerns about the text. Second, as reflected in the 2030 Agenda, social protection policies were to be determined at the national level and therefore should reflect the particular development levels, needs and conditions of each country. She was concerned about the overly prescriptive nature of certain provisions of the draft resolution, which appeared to impose a "one-size-fits-all" solution informed by a particular ideological perspective. Third, the draft resolution, which should address the full scope of health issues facing children throughout childhood, placed a narrow focus on sexual and reproductive health. Fourth, the draft resolution did not adequately emphasize that States should take into account the rights and duties of parents and legal guardians to protect and care for their children, in accordance with article 3 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

71. Her delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that Bangladesh reserved the right to interpret and implement its provisions in accordance with national laws and development priorities, with full respect for the various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of its people. Furthermore, it would interpret the draft resolution in the light of its obligations under the Convention, including the provisions concerning the responsibilities, rights and duties of parents and other legal guardians to provide, in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child, appropriate direction and guidance in the exercise by the child of his or her rights.

72. **Mr. Bonnafont** (France) said that almost two thirds of the world's children had no social protection. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) had highlighted the risks to which nearly 2 billion children were

exposed, including poverty, hunger, disease, violence and discrimination. Those children were also more likely to be deprived of an education, forced to work and, in the case of girls in particular, exposed to early marriage. No progress had been made on the social protection of children in recent years. According to the second ILO-UNICEF joint report on social protection for children, entitled *More than a billion reasons: The urgent need to build universal social protection for children*, the number of unprotected children increased every year, yet the States parties to the Convention on the Rights of the Child had acknowledged children's right to social protection. Without such protection, the international community would not achieve the goals under the 2030 Agenda. His delegation regretted that the proposed amendments tended to dilute children's autonomy and hinder their full enjoyment of their rights and freedoms. He called on all members of the Council to support the draft resolution without the proposed amendments.

73. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.37](#).

74. **Ms. Milačić** (Montenegro), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation deeply regretted that the Russian Federation had again decided to use amendments as its preferred negotiating tactic instead of engaging constructively in a spirit of collaboration. That way of working led to unnecessary polarization of the Council, adversely affecting its integrity and credibility. Such procedural moves were not sustainable and must stop. The proposed amendment was intended to divert attention from children as full human rights holders and to remove references to the well-established concepts of "human rights-based" and "child rights-based" approaches, which were essential for enabling States to promote the well-being and development of all children without discrimination, in line with their obligations under international law. The proposed amendment would thus dilute the focus on children's rights and could lead to a less robust protection regime. Therefore, her delegation would vote against it and called on all others to do the same.

75. *At the request of the representative of Belgium, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Bangladesh, China, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, South Africa, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Algeria, Benin, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Gambia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates.

76. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.37](#) was rejected by 24 votes to 3, with 19 abstentions.*

77. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.39](#).

78. **Mr. Staniulis** (Lithuania), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation deeply regretted that the Russian Federation continued to rely on amendments as its primary negotiating tactic instead of engaging constructively in collaborative efforts. That way of working was not constructive and only served to polarize the Council and undermine its integrity and credibility. Such procedural moves were not sustainable and must stop. The proposed amendment would add more references to the rights of parents and caregivers. Several paragraphs of the draft resolution already recognized the pivotal role of parents and caregivers in nurturing children. To include numerous references to parental rights would weaken the recognition of children as full human rights holders under international law, independently from their parents or guardians. Refraining from including those additional references would ensure that the text remained focused, clear and unequivocal in expressing a commitment to upholding and protecting the rights of the child.



His delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and called on others to do the same.

79. *At the request of the representative of Belgium, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, South Africa, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Benin, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives.

80. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.39](#) was rejected by 25 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.*

81. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.41](#).

82. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation regretted that the Russian Federation continued to rely on amendments as its primary negotiating tactic. That way of working was not constructive and only served to unnecessarily polarize the Council and undermine its integrity and credibility. The proposed amendment, like others, was intended to highlight the rights of parents and caregivers, thereby inadvertently detracting from the fundamental principle that children were full human rights holders, independently from parents or caregivers. In its statement of 11 October 2023, the Committee on the Rights of the Child explicitly pointed out that interpretations of article 5 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child that singled out one element while ignoring others were “contrary to an accurate and holistic understanding of the article”. The Committee also noted that parents’ responsibilities, rights and duties to guide their children were not absolute but, rather, delimited by children’s status as rights holders. The focus of the draft resolution was on the rights of the child, not those of parents or caregivers. Highlighting specific articles pertaining to parental or guidance rights under the Convention undermined the recognition of children as independent rights holders under international law distinct from parents and caregivers. Her delegation would therefore vote against the proposed amendment and called on others to do the same.

83. *At the request of the representative of Belgium, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Cameroon, China, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, South Africa, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives.

84. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.41](#) was rejected by 24 votes to 15, with 7 abstentions.*

85. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.42](#).

86. **Mr. Bekkers** (Kingdom of the Netherlands), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution on the rights of the child was among the most widely

sponsored in the Council and brought diverse regions together. It was a pity, therefore, that such a unifying effect had been hindered by the submission of proposed amendments. The one contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.42](#) would weaken the recognition that children's rights were human rights.

87. First, the proposed change to the twelfth preambular paragraph represented a retrogression from internationally agreed standards on sexual and reproductive health dating back 30 years. The explicit recognition that they applied to every human being, which naturally included children, originated from the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development. Such recognition had since been reaffirmed in numerous intergovernmental texts agreed upon by the Council, the General Assembly and others, and in target 5.6 of the Sustainable Development Goals. The right to sexual and reproductive health was an integral part of the right to health enshrined in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as clarified in general comment No. 22 (2016) of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

88. Second, the proposed change to the sixteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 15 would deny children their right to have access to information on sexual and reproductive health. Such a denial would be to their detriment, as there was ample evidence to demonstrate that access to such information was one of the most important tools for preventing human rights violations and harm to health, including child, early and forced marriage, early pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections. For all those reasons, his delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and called on other members to do the same.

89. *At the request of the representative of Belgium, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Eritrea, Indonesia, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, Sudan, United Arab Emirates.

*Against:*

Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, Romania, South Africa, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Bangladesh, Benin, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Viet Nam.

90. *The proposed amendment contained in document [A/HRC/55/L.42](#) was rejected by 25 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.*

91. **The President** invited the Council to take action on draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#), as orally revised.

92. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#), as orally revised, was adopted.*

93. **The President** invited delegations to make statements in explanation of vote or position or general statements on any of the draft resolutions considered under agenda item 3.

94. **Mr. Bladehane** (Algeria) said that future iterations of the draft resolution on the rights of the child must take greater account of the role of the family, in particular parents. Algeria would interpret the resolution just adopted in the light of its obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, including the requirement to respect the responsibilities, rights and duties of parents or legal guardians, as well as the various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of its people. As stated in the 2030 Agenda, social protection systems should be nationally appropriate and should reflect the specific capacities and the social and cultural conditions of each country, without the imposition of a "one-size-fits-all" solution based on a particular ideological perspective. Lastly, his delegation wished to emphasize the role of the State and other actors in protecting the rights of the child. Algeria, for its part, had developed laws and programmes at the national and local levels to ensure that the best interests of the child were considered, to facilitate coordination between various



departments, institutions and voluntary associations responsible for child welfare and to combat violence against children.

95. **Mr. Antwi** (Ghana) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the proposed amendments to the resolution that had just been adopted because there had not been enough time to carefully consider the impact of the new language on the delicate balance that had been carefully negotiated over decades in respect of previous resolutions, conventions and conference outcomes. It had joined the consensus on the resolution itself because the text made a useful contribution to realizing the rights of the child and inclusive social protection. The right to sexuality education was grounded in universal human rights, including the rights to education and to health, as established in numerous international agreements. As a member of the African Union, Ghana had undertaken sexuality education policy commitments, including those in the 2005 Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa. Its understanding of sexuality education, however, was that it must be age-appropriate. Lastly, he wished to stress the agreed principle that the implementation of recommendations and resolutions was the sovereign right of each country and that due regard should be given to people's various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds and to universally recognized international human rights.

96. **Ms. Peters** (United States of America), noting that her delegation had supported most of the resolutions adopted under agenda item 3, said that Council resolutions did not change the current state of conventional or customary international law and did not create rights or obligations under international law. Any reaffirmation of prior instruments and resolutions applied only to those States that had affirmed them initially. While the United States supported the full implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the Agenda was not binding and did not create rights or obligations under international law. Moreover, in the absence of an agreed international definition, the United States would continue to oppose references to the so-called right to development. Lastly, while the United States supported policies to advance respect for the rights set out in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, those rights were not justiciable in United States courts, as the United States was not a party to that instrument.

97. The full version of her delegation's statement would be available on the website of the Permanent Mission of the United States after the session and would be included in the *Digest of United States Practice in International Law*.

98. **Mr. Hassan** (Sudan), referring to draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.7](#) on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights, said that such measures deprived hundreds of millions of people around the world of the enjoyment of many of their rights, including the right to development. The peoples of countries subjected to those measures were denied access to modern technology, funding for development projects and opportunities for education and training. Unilateral coercive measures had affected the ability of countries under such sanctions to respond to crises and disasters.

99. Concerning draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.9](#) on intersex persons, although his delegation agreed that violence and discrimination were unacceptable, it did not accept the terminology used in the text. It had abstained from voting on that resolution, as the Council was not the appropriate forum in which to discuss the issues raised therein, and the medical terms used were within the area of expertise of specialized agencies only. With regard to draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#) on the rights of the child, his delegation dissociated itself completely from some of the expressions used in the text, particularly those that affected the roles and responsibilities of the family and parents.

100. **Mr. Habib** (Indonesia) said that his delegation had supported the Council's efforts to promote the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities alike, noting that the concept of "Indigenous People" was not applicable in Indonesia, as a former colony that had always been composed of multicultural and multi-ethnic communities. His delegation had concerns regarding specific paragraphs of the resolutions related to the right to food, adequate housing and the rights of the child. First, it reiterated the critical need for food security and nutrition and the invaluable role of traditional sustainable agricultural practices that promoted the well-being of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Second, it emphasized the various forms of discrimination that local communities faced in accessing adequate housing. Lastly, it

underlined that the need for resilient, inclusive and comprehensive social protection systems to ensure the rights of the child must also be applied to local communities. Adopting a more inclusive approach, particularly in the language of the resolutions under agenda item 3, was crucial. Indonesia wished to dissociate itself from the paragraphs containing the terms “multiple, aggravated and intersecting forms of discrimination” and “right to sexual and reproductive health” in draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.18/Rev.1](#). Moreover, as the proposed amendments it had sponsored in respect of that resolution had not been adopted, it wished also to dissociate itself from the twelfth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 4, 13 and 15.

101. **Ms. Rolón Candia** (Paraguay), noting the importance of addressing violence against all persons in all its forms, said that her Government would implement draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.9](#) to the extent that the terms of the resolution did not conflict with existing national legislation. As the resolution dealt with an issue that was still under discussion at the domestic level, its adoption did not set any precedent for Paraguay and the text of the resolution would not be considered agreed language for future negotiations.

102. **Ms. Arias Moncada** (Honduras) said that her delegation was grateful for the constructive efforts of all delegations throughout the negotiation process, which had enabled the Council to strengthen international human rights standards in the resolutions adopted under agenda item 3. The historic draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.9](#) deserved special mention.

103. If the Council’s primary task was to define and defend the highest possible standards of human rights, with a focus on the protection of victims, it also needed to review the wealth of evidence concerning the harmful effects of foreign debt and unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of all human rights. International human rights obligations, including extraterritorial obligations, did not disappear in the economic, commercial and financial sphere; on the contrary, greater efforts were needed to overcome the fragmentation of international law. Honduras reiterated its commitment to dialogue and cooperation in respect of human rights situations around the world.

104. Her delegation had supported the resolution on the rights of the child after extensive negotiations on an issue of particular importance for the protection of all human rights, including the right to development, in accordance with national laws and circumstances. Lastly, Honduras was committed to overcoming persistent inequalities between hemispheres, regions and States and to increasing efforts to protect the human rights of the most vulnerable groups, such as persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples, peasants and small-scale agricultural producers.

**Agenda item 7: Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories** ([A/HRC/55/L.13](#), [A/HRC/55/L.14](#) and [A/HRC/55/L.28](#) as orally revised)

*Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.13](#): Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination*

105. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except Albania, said that the realization of the right to self-determination was a peremptory norm of international law and the cornerstone of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and many other instruments. Denying or undermining that right was tantamount to ignoring a substantive portion of international law.

106. The draft resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including their right to live in freedom, justice and dignity and their right to an independent State of Palestine. The text had remained unchanged from the previous year, which reflected his delegation’s belief that, while the problems facing the Palestinian people had grown more urgent, their self-determination continued to be the solution. The draft resolution reaffirmed the need to achieve a just, comprehensive and lasting solution and called on the occupying Power, Israel, to immediately end its occupation of the Occupied Palestinian Territory.

107. In the previous six months, the measures taken by Israel to alter the demographic composition of the Occupied Palestinian Territory had been stepped up. In the West Bank, Israeli State and settler violence were at the highest levels since United Nations record-keeping had begun in 2005. Settlements were expanding at an unprecedented rate, land belonging to Palestinian civilians was being expropriated and their lives and livelihoods were being destroyed. In the Gaza Strip, the threat of genocide loomed over the starving, displaced and besieged population. The draft resolution, as a thematic text, did not refer to those facts. Rather, it urged all States to render assistance to the United Nations in ensuring the realization of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. Pakistan trusted that the Council would restore the world's confidence by adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

108. **The President** said that nine States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications.

*General statements made before the voting*

109. **Mr. Nkosi** (South Africa) said that the right to self-determination was a cardinal principle of international law and the very wellspring from which all other fundamental rights and freedoms flowed. Ensuring respect for the inalienable right to self-determination was one of the very purposes of the United Nations, as reflected in its Charter. However, some States either wilfully ignored that right or chose to invoke it in a selective manner, depending on whether it suited their interests. The Palestinian people's inalienable right to self-determination and full independence had been recognized by the United Nations in numerous resolutions over the decades. Therefore, the unlawful occupation of Palestinian land by Israel, and the expansion of illegal settlements, were in complete defiance of international law and had led to the unprecedented human tragedy currently taking place in the Gaza Strip.

110. The actions of Israel were undermining the prospect of a two-State solution, which would allow Palestinians and Israelis to live side by side in peace. South Africa therefore demanded an immediate, unconditional and complete end to the Israeli occupation in all its forms. Israel must immediately cease establishing illegal settlements and cease all measures aimed at altering the character, status and demographic composition of the Occupied Palestinian Territory. It must also dismantle all illegal structures, including the settlements and the wall, and immediately, unconditionally and totally withdraw its forces from the Occupied Palestinian Territory. Furthermore, it must rescind all legislative measures adopted with a view to annexing Palestinian land, return all Palestinian land and assets and allow the right to self-determination of the Palestinian people to be realized. The Council members should fulfil their legal and moral duty by adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

111. **Mr. Quintanilla Román** (Cuba) said that Cuba wished to reiterate its unwavering support for the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, which was a principle of *jus cogens* that was unambiguously enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The draft resolution promoted practical measures to guarantee the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including the exercise of sovereignty over their natural resources and the search for a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the conflict in accordance with international law. As the occupying Power, Israel must urgently cease its illegal policy of building settlements and annexing land and must respect and preserve the territorial unity, contiguity and integrity of the Occupied Palestinian Territory. Genocide was currently being committed in the Gaza Strip because, for more than 75 years, Israel had denied the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and had acted with impunity, with the criminal complicity of the United States and other Western countries.

112. The scenes of terror and despair in Gaza were a constant reminder of the international community's inability to enforce international law and secure peace. They were also a sad reminder of the urgent need for a two-State solution that would provide the Palestinian people with an independent and sovereign State, within the pre-1967 borders, with East Jerusalem as its capital, and guarantee the refugees' right of return. In accordance with its position of principle in support of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on other members of the Council to do likewise.

113. **The President** said it was his understanding that one of the States concerned by the draft resolution, Israel, did not wish to make a statement. He invited the other State concerned to make a statement.

114. **Mr. Khraishi** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that his delegation was grateful to those members of the Council that had voted in favour of draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.30](#) on the human rights situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the obligation to ensure accountability and justice, which had been submitted under agenda item 2. Regarding draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.13](#), he said that efforts to uphold the right to self-determination were consistent with efforts to protect the right to life, which was the most fundamental of all human rights. The right to self-determination was enshrined in a number of core international legal instruments, including the Charter of the United Nations. That value had enabled a number of the States members of the Council to emerge from situations of colonization, trusteeship and occupation. It was unconscionable that the Palestinian people were being deprived of the right to self-determination and difficult to believe that any State might consider voting to deny them of that right.

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

115. **Ms. Taylor** (United States of America) said that the United States continued to oppose the Council's bias against Israel, which was demonstrated by the existence of agenda item 7. No country was above scrutiny, including the United States and Israel, but no country except Israel was the subject of a stand-alone agenda item. The United States opposed the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 7 and called for a vote on draft resolutions [A/HRC/55/L.13](#) and [A/HRC/55/L.28](#). Time and time again, States members of the Council claimed that they could not support country-specific resolutions that did not enjoy the support of the country concerned. However, those same States repeatedly supported a biased group of resolutions that were targeted at Israel but did not enjoy its support.

116. Since the horrific terrorist attacks on Israel that had taken place on 7 October 2023, violence in the West Bank had increased sharply. Extremist Israeli settlers had targeted Palestinians and their property, sometimes displacing entire communities. The United States was opposed to the expansion of settlements in the West Bank, as they undermined the geographic viability of a two-State solution, exacerbated tensions and further undermined trust between Israelis and Palestinians. The United States believed that a two-State solution was the best and only way to ensure enduring peace, security and respect for human rights, and the only means of achieving a secure, Jewish and democratic Israel and the right to self-determination for the Palestinian people. Her delegation deeply regretted that the draft resolution had been submitted under agenda item 7, as that had prevented United States engagement on the text.

117. **Mr. Foradori** (Argentina) said that item 7 of the Council's agenda, under which the draft resolution had been submitted, was the only item that addressed a single country. The scrutiny to which Israel was subjected under item 7 was discriminatory and unbalanced, and thus undermined efforts to promote dialogue, stability, trust and mutual understanding between Israel and the Palestinian people. For that reason, his delegation would abstain from voting on the three draft resolutions submitted under item 7. However, it would be willing to reconsider its position if those draft resolutions were submitted under item 2 or item 4, as they contained some elements that were worth taking into account.

118. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Qatar, Romania, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Paraguay, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Argentina, Cameroon.

119. Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.13](#) was adopted by 42 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

*Draft resolution A/HRC/55/L.14: Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan*

120. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except Albania, said that the ongoing illegal occupation of the Syrian Golan by Israel was the root cause of the grave human rights situation in that territory. The violations being perpetrated by Israel included the illegal imposition of Israeli citizenship on Syrian citizens, arbitrary arrest, torture, the exploitation of indigenous resources, changes in the population's demographic composition and the prohibition of visits by Syrian citizens to their families in Syria, all fuelled by a climate of impunity. The draft resolution expressed the Council's rejection of all such unlawful actions, the aim of which was to perpetuate the illegal occupation. By adopting the draft, the Council would reaffirm the illegality of the decision by Israel to impose its laws on the occupied Syrian Golan and the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and would express support for a just and comprehensive peace in the region, based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). He urged the Council to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

121. **The President** said that three States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which had no programme budget implications. It was his understanding that one of the States concerned by the draft resolution, Israel, did not wish to make a statement. He invited the other State concerned to make a statement.

122. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for the Syrian Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution addressed some of the consequences of the Israeli occupation of the Syrian Golan, which had been ongoing since 1967. The text was based on a set of established principles of international law, including those relating to the obligations of the occupying Power and the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. The draft resolution highlighted the illegality of the measures that Israel had taken, and continued to take, to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the occupied Syrian Golan, in violation of Security Council resolution 497 (1981), and addressed the ongoing establishment and expansion of illegal settlements and the depletion of the territory's natural resources. The draft resolution also addressed the dangers posed by a project to construct wind turbines, which was described by the occupying Power as an environmental project but involved the confiscation of land and therefore caused irreparable harm to the people of the Syrian Golan and ran counter to the obligations of the occupying Power not to use occupied territories for its own benefit or in a manner that harmed the interests of the people under occupation.

123. Western countries, led by the United States, would give pretexts for voting against the draft resolution in order to deny their responsibility for ensuring the implementation of the clear principles of international law on which it was based. They would continue to promote politicized resolutions, such as draft resolution A/HRC/55/L.21 on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic, adopted the previous day. In so doing, they clearly revealed their hypocrisy. They used human rights merely as a tool to target specific countries while ignoring the need to respect international law, end the Israeli occupation and put a stop to genocide, ethnic cleansing, forced displacement, settlements and human rights violations. He called on the members of the Council to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

124. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany) said that the position of Germany on the illegality of annexation remained unchanged. However, the draft resolution painted a distorted picture of the situation in Syria. While hundreds of thousands of Syrians suffered at the hands of the Syrian regime, the draft resolution focused only on Israel. Her delegation therefore requested

a vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it, while calling on the other members of the Council to do likewise.

125. **Mr. Mao Yizong** (China) said that the ongoing construction of settlements in the Syrian Golan violated Syrian sovereignty, infringed the human rights of the Syrian people and undermined the international community's efforts to seek a political solution. The international community should effectively implement the relevant Security Council and Human Rights Council resolutions by calling on Israel to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Syria, abide by the Charter of the United Nations and international law, stop violating the Syrian people's human rights and provide reparation to the victims of the occupation. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and called on the other members of the Council to do the same.

126. *At the request of the representative of Germany, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Gambia, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Qatar, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Paraguay, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Argentina, Cameroon, Romania.

127. *Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.14](#) was adopted by 29 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions.\**

*Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.28](#), as orally revised: Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan*

128. **Mr. Ahmad** (Observer for Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, as orally revised, on behalf of the main sponsors, namely the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, except Albania, said that, despite the comments made by other delegations, agenda item 7 did not concern a specific country, but a specific problem. The draft resolution highlighted the devastating consequences of the illegal settlement policy being implemented by Israel in the occupied territories. The ongoing existence and expansion of illegal settlements demonstrated that Israel acted with impunity and with complete disregard for international law. By adopting the draft resolution, the Council would affirm that the forcible transfer of the protected Palestinian population and the transfer by Israel of parts of its own civilian population to the territory it occupied constituted grave breaches of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949 and customary international law.

129. The draft resolution also noted that the magnitude and persistence of the settlements, as well as explicit statements by Israeli officials, confirmed that the Israeli authorities had every intention of making the occupation permanent, which would seriously endanger the viability of a two-State solution. It was of particular concern that secular extremists continued to enjoy impunity and State protection for their illegal acts, including deadly violence. Through the draft resolution, the Council would call on Israel to comply with all its obligations under international law; call on States and international organizations to avoid taking any action that recognized, aided or assisted the expansion of settlements or the construction of the wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory; and call on enterprises to

\* The delegation of Romania subsequently informed the Council that it had intended to vote against the draft resolution.



assess and address the heightened risks of human rights abuses arising from business relationships with illegal Israeli settlements.

130. The Israeli settlement enterprise had created a dark world where the settlers' property rights were based on the dispossession of the Palestinian people and where human rights existed only for members of the colonial occupation, while the protected civilian population was disenfranchised. He urged the Council to reject those gross violations and to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

131. **The President** said that 11 States had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. It was his understanding that one of the States concerned by the draft resolution, Israel, did not wish to make a statement. He invited the other State concerned to make a statement.

132. **Mr. Khraishi** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that everyone was aware that the Israeli settlements were illegal. Some 30 years previously, when the peace process had begun, the State of Palestine had recognized Israel, renounced violence and terrorism and affirmed that the only way to proceed was through peaceful resistance in accordance with the law. At the time, there had been 120,000 settlers in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. Currently, there were 750,000 settlers occupying 60 per cent of the territory of the West Bank. The Israeli authorities continued to announce their intention to build more settlements, destroy villages, displace populations and confiscate property in what amounted to acts of forced displacement. Ethnic cleansing was taking place before the eyes of the world, despite the failure of some States to recognize it. Practical measures must be taken to put an end to the Israeli actions that were killing off the possibility of a two-State solution. Those actions amounted to a war crime under article 8 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. It was not clear why no legal action was being taken against the gangs of terrorists in Palestine, who were destroying property, killing people and looting natural resources.

133. Recently, the criminal Israeli politician Itamar Ben-Gvir had celebrated the distribution of 100,000 weapons to the settlers, who were criminals and murderers. The settlements should be boycotted and, since they were illegal, any form of cooperation with them should be considered illegal and condemned. Israeli settlers should return to where they had come from. It was well documented in history that the land they occupied rightfully belonged to the Palestinian people. It was therefore surprising that any member of the Council should consider voting against the draft resolution, which was intended to send a message to the extremist Government of Israel to exercise restraint and cease displacing the people of the West Bank. Mention should also be made of the intimidation, harassment and restriction of freedom of movement inflicted on the Palestinian people inside Israel.

134. **Ms. Stasch** (Germany), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation shared the sense of urgency about the settlements that was expressed in the draft resolution. The situation in the West Bank had deteriorated significantly since the terrorist attack carried out by Hamas against Israel on 7 October 2023. Germany was deeply concerned about the escalating violence in the West Bank, which included violent acts committed by settlers against Palestinian civilians. The decision by the Government of Israel to grant new construction permits and to illegally confiscate 800 hectares of land posed a threat to peace and security across the region. Further displacement of communities must be prevented.

135. Together with its European Union partners, Germany had agreed to impose sanctions on a number of settlers. She recalled her Government's firm position that the settlements were illegal, a violation of international law and an obstacle to the only possible way to achieve peace and prosperity: a two-State solution in line with the relevant Security Council resolutions. Although, for those reasons, her delegation had previously voted in favour of resolutions on settlements, it rejected the references to segregation in the draft resolution and could not support any measures that might lead to a boycott. It would therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution despite fully agreeing with its core message.

136. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Qatar, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam.

*Against:*

Malawi, Paraguay, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Georgia, Germany, Lithuania, Romania.

137. Draft resolution [A/HRC/55/L.28](#), as orally revised, was adopted by 36 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions.

*The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.*