



General Assembly

Seventy-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 January 2024

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 53rd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 15 November 2023, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Marschik (Austria)

Contents

Agenda item 71: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

- (c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

23-22237 (E)



Please recycle



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

Item 71: Promotion and protection of human rights *(continued)*

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives *(continued)*
(A/C.3/78/L.39, A/C.3/78/L.40/Rev.1,
A/C.3/78/L.41 and A/C.3/78/L.42)

1. **Ms. Novruz** (Azerbaijan), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that, at the eighteenth summit of the Movement, held in Baku in October 2019, the Heads of State and Government of the Movement had emphasized the role of the Human Rights Council as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly responsible for the consideration of human rights situations in all countries, in the context of the universal periodic review, based on cooperation and constructive dialogue.

2. At the summit, they had also expressed their deep concern over the continuing and proliferating practice of selectively adopting country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee and in the Human Rights Council, which was a means of exploiting human rights for political purposes and breached the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity in addressing human rights issues. It also undermined cooperation, which was essential for the effective promotion and protection of all universally recognized human rights. There was a need for greater coherence and complementarity between the work of the Committee and the Council so as to prevent duplication and ensure constructive working relations.

3. The universal periodic review was the main intergovernmental mechanism for reviewing national-level human rights issues on the basis of objective and reliable information in all countries without distinction, with the full involvement of the country concerned and with due consideration for its capacity-building needs. In that context, the Movement rejected the practice in the Security Council of furthering certain States' political objectives on the pretext of addressing human rights concerns. The States members of the Movement were committed to fulfilling their obligations to promote universal respect for and protection of all universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, other core international human rights instruments and international law.

4. The Movement unequivocally condemned gross and systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and serious obstacles to and violent acts that infringed upon the full enjoyment of

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

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.39: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

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

6. **Mr. Belmont Roldán** (Spain), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union, said that it was deeply troubling that there had been no improvements in the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea over the past 12 months. The draft resolution included renewed calls for cooperation with United Nations mechanisms, in particular with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, new references to the links between the human rights situation and peace and security as a whole, and several references to the disproportionate impact of human rights violations on women and girls as a result of gender inequality, gender-based violence and violations of economic, social and cultural rights. Moreover, the draft resolution called for the continued engagement of the international community, including the international staff of humanitarian agencies who had had to leave the country and suspend assistance projects in 2022, which had negatively affected access to health services, water and sanitation. It was vital to voice continued support for the mandate and important work of the Special Rapporteur and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). The European Union pursued a policy of critical engagement with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and stood ready to help to improve the human rights situation in the country.

7. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Georgia, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Montenegro, Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia, Türkiye, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Vanuatu.

8. He then noted that Maldives also wished to become a sponsor.

9. **Mr. Kim Song** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation categorically rejected the draft resolution, which had nothing to do with the genuine protection and promotion of human rights and contained fabrications based on the false testimonies of defectors. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had a people-first policy embedded in all spheres of social life, whereby its people fully enjoyed their human rights and fundamental freedoms both legally and practically and led dignified and worthwhile lives. The human rights violations described by the United States and the European Union could therefore never exist in his country.

10. The motivation behind the references to fictitious human rights problems in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was not interest in human rights but a desire to defame, demonize and ultimately eliminate the country's socialist system under the pretext of human rights. The main sponsors of the draft resolution were chief human rights violators that unleashed aggression against and infringed on the sovereignty of other countries, and massacred, and grossly violated the dignity and rights of, innocent people. The most urgent human rights problems confronting the international community were racism, racial discrimination, the refugee crisis, violence against women and children and the aggression and massacres prevalent in the United States and Western countries. With its typical hypocrisy, double standards and shamelessness, the European Union was complaining about the so-called human rights problems in one country while failing to say one word about Israel, which had massacred a large number of innocent civilians, including children, through recent indiscriminate military attacks in Palestine, or about the United States, which had connived in those attacks.

11. The international community should increase its vigilance against the attempts by some countries to use human rights issues as a political tool for achieving their ulterior motives and the United Nations as a platform for interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign States and overthrowing their social systems. When promoting and protecting human rights throughout the world, it was essential to uphold the principles of objectivity and impartiality, respect sovereignty and reject politicization, selectivity and double standards, in line with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The European Union had shown that it was the biggest obstacle to the universal promotion and protection of human rights by turning the United Nations into a theatre of confrontation, rather than a

space for dialogue and cooperation, and misusing it for its own interests.

12. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea would do everything to eliminate the reckless human rights campaign conducted by hostile forces and to defend its people-centred socialist system. The draft resolution unjustly infringed on his country's dignity and sovereignty; he therefore expected other delegations to take an impartial position on the text.

13. **Ms. Eyrich** (United States of America) said that the situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea – one of the world's most repressive States – remained dire. Severe restrictions were imposed on freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, association, religion or belief and movement. Moreover, there were credible reports of unlawful and arbitrary killings by the Government, forced disappearances, torture and other forms of cruel, inhumane and degrading punishment, harsh and life-threatening prison conditions, including in political prison camps, forced abortion and sterilization and the worst forms of child labour. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea continued to commit widespread human rights abuses and violations and, as with many authoritarian Governments, kept expanding its repressive policies beyond its borders in the form of transnational repression. In addition to its efforts to control and monitor North Koreans overseas, the Government exploited them, forcing them to work in inhumane conditions without freedom of movement. Workers were regularly forced to send their wages back to the regime, sustaining it in power and enabling it to pursue its unlawful programmes on weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. It remained deeply troubling that North Korean escapees seeking freedom from human rights violations were being repatriated to the country against their will. All States should abide by the principle of non-refoulement. In addition, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must grant international humanitarian organizations and human rights monitors immediate and unhindered access. States must continue to speak out regarding that Government's human rights record and call upon it to take action to protect the human rights of its own people.

14. **Mr. Devereaux** (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution reiterated the international community's long-standing demands for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to accept the scale of its human rights violations, including its extensive system of political prison camps, arbitrary detentions and lack of freedom of religion or belief. The United Kingdom strongly encouraged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take the opportunity to engage with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a constructive and meaningful way and to uphold its responsibilities towards its most vulnerable people, including women and girls. Moreover, it should allow humanitarian organizations full, safe, rapid and unhindered access to provide assistance to those in need as the country's borders began to reopen. The people of North Korea deserved better. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea must cease diverting its resources to its illegal weapons programmes and focus on bringing about permanent change and improvement for its people.

15. **Ms. Arab Bafrani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the continued selective adoption of country-specific resolutions and the exploitation of that platform for political aims contravened the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity in addressing human rights issues, undermined cooperation and dialogue as the key principles for the promotion and protection of human rights and undermined trust between countries, which was essential for international cooperation. Member States should put an end to that practice and ensure that all countries were treated equally. The European Union and its allies presented the draft resolution every year without considering the efforts made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The universal periodic review was the proper mechanism for reviewing the human rights situation of every Member State on an equal basis, without recrimination and with the full participation of the Government concerned. Her delegation therefore disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

16. **Mr. Gafoor** (Singapore) said that, as a matter of principle, Singapore did not support country-specific human rights resolutions in the Committee, which was not the right platform to discuss country-specific situations. Such resolutions were selective in nature and driven by political considerations. Unfortunately, the hypocrisy and double standards that had always characterized the Committee's work had reached even greater heights, especially in recent weeks. Country-specific resolutions were inherently divisive and counterproductive and did not serve their declared purpose of making a difference in people's lives. Country-specific situations should be addressed by the universal periodic review. Although Singapore would for that reason abstain from voting on all country-specific draft resolutions in the Committee, that should not be construed as taking a position on the substance of the human rights issues raised in any of the draft resolutions. Member States were obliged to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.39 was adopted.*

18. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking on behalf of the Group of Friends in Defence of the Charter of the United Nations, said that the presentation of country-specific resolutions without the consent of the States concerned was contrary to the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization and non-confrontation. It also contravened the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and undermined the development of friendly relations among nations and the achievement of international human rights cooperation. The Group firmly rejected all double standards that undermined the promotion and protection of human rights and prevented progress in that area. It was also seriously concerned at the proliferation of mechanisms and procedures purporting to conduct impartial assessments of human rights situations in specific States, but which lacked their due consent and participation and based their reports on biased or non-credible secondary or tertiary sources. Such reports were therefore mere propaganda but were given a semblance of legitimacy simply by virtue of the fact that they were issued by bodies of the United Nations. In addition, the Group rejected the practice of the Security Council dealing with issues outside of its mandate, including by addressing human rights issues in pursuit of the political objectives of certain States.

19. The illegal and immoral application of unilateral coercive measures had a negative impact on the enjoyment and realization of all human rights, including the rights to development, life, food, health and peace. The Group strongly urged States to refrain from applying, and to lift, any unilateral coercive economic, financial or trade measures that impeded the full achievement of economic and social development, in particular, but not exclusively, those imposed against developing countries.

20. The politicization of human rights needed to stop, and the best way to strengthen and guarantee the full and effective realization of human rights was through the universal periodic review and the treaty bodies of the United Nations system.

21. Lastly, speaking in his national capacity, he said that his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

22. **Mr. Kuzmenkov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation did not support the practice of considering selective, one-sided draft resolutions on human rights situations in specific countries. It believed them to be ineffective and capable only of exacerbating confrontation between Member States. The Russian

Federation was in favour of establishing a constructive and mutually respectful dialogue on the promotion and protection of human rights. It condemned the practice of Western States, which used Committee resolutions as a tool to exert pressure on the Democratic People's Republic Korea so as to undermine the development of that State and the well-being of its people.

23. The culprit behind the tension on the Korean Peninsula was the United States, which, guided by its hegemonic aspirations, impeded the search for diplomatic solutions and escalated military activity in the region. That led to the deterioration of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. The United States should abandon its aggressive course and stop its subversive activities. The Democratic People's Republic Korea had unequivocally demonstrated its position on the politicized draft resolution, which his delegation fully understood. Accordingly, his delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

24. **Mr. Ono** (Japan) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. Japan was deeply concerned about the human rights situation in North Korea. Many Japanese citizens had been forcibly abducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the 1970s and 1980s, in one of the most serious human rights violations committed by that country, putting national sovereignty and the lives and safety of his people in danger. In that regard, Japan welcomed the references to the issue of abduction in the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the reports the Secretary-General. The abductees and their families had been suffering for many years, and many of them had passed away. As only a limited number of surviving family members remained, there was no time to waste, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea needed to take seriously the views of the international community, as expressed in the draft resolution, listen to the voices of the victims and their families, and take specific action to quickly resolve the issue, including by returning all abductees.

25. **Ms. Pichardo Urbina** (Nicaragua) said that her delegation opposed the annual presentation to the Committee of politically motivated reports and draft resolutions, which lacked objectivity and impartiality and did not contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights. Nicaragua would continue to strongly condemn politicization, selectivity and double standards in the Committee's work, which should be based on the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity, and constructive international dialogue and cooperation. Rather than promote the protection of human rights, such draft resolutions, which did not

correspond to reality and were prepared without the consent of the peoples and Governments concerned, increased mistrust between countries and exacerbated confrontation, thereby undermining mutual dialogue, multilateralism and international solidarity.

26. Nicaragua called for respect for the sovereignty, self-determination and territorial integrity of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and for non-intervention in its internal affairs. Furthermore, it rejected the instrumentalization of the draft resolution to justify and continue justifying further attacks and illegal unilateral coercive measures against the country and its people. Consistent with its opposition to the manipulation of the human rights discourse to attack sovereign States for political reasons, Nicaragua disassociated itself from the so-called consensus on the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Hwang Joonkook** (Republic of Korea) said that the Committee had shown universal support for the draft resolution, having again adopted it by consensus. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea should not ignore the General Assembly's ongoing concerns and its calls for improvement in the human rights situation in the country. The Republic of Korea condemned the continued systematic, widespread and gross human rights violations committed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which might amount to crimes against humanity. That country should improve its human rights situation instead of blatantly disregarding the lives of its own people in its obsessive pursuit of nuclear weapons and missiles. It was especially troubling that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was diverting resources to nuclear weapons and missile development through such human rights violations as forced labour, both domestically and overseas. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea must take effective measures to improve the human rights and humanitarian situation of its people in accordance with United Nations resolutions and the recommendations of United Nations human rights mechanisms, including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

28. The Republic of Korea was deeply concerned about the media reports on the forced repatriation of hundreds of North Korean escapees. The serious human rights violations suffered by such people had been well documented. In that context, his country called on all Member States to uphold the non-refoulement principle and provide assistance so as to ensure that North Korean escapees in third countries were not repatriated against their will and that they were able to move around safely and freely. Non-refoulement was an obligation not just

under the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951 Convention) and its associated Protocol but also under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

29. **Mr. González Behmaras** (Cuba) said that his delegation was not in favour of mandates or draft resolutions that were selective, discriminatory and politically motivated and were not supported by the country concerned. As such, it wished to disassociate itself from the draft resolution. Such texts did nothing to improve the human rights situation on the ground but rather promoted confrontation and mistrust, delegitimized the United Nations human rights mechanisms and exclusively targeted developing countries that were already faced with unilateral coercive measures. The emphasis on punishment and sanctions in the draft resolution constituted an attack on the very rights that apparently justified such an approach. Furthermore, the draft resolution was dangerous because it involved the Security Council in issues that were not within its competence.

30. Cuba could not join the consensus on such a text or be complicit in the attempt to deny the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea their right to peace, self-determination and development. Only international cooperation, respectful dialogue and strict compliance with the principles of objectivity, impartiality and non-selectivity would allow for effective progress in protecting and promoting all human rights, for all people. No country was immune to challenges in that area and the universal periodic review should be allowed to facilitate a depoliticized debate that could promote respectful cooperation with the country concerned. His country's opposition to the selective and politicized mandate did not imply any value judgement concerning the pending issues referred to in the twenty-third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

31. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that his delegation consistently opposed the consideration of country-specific topics at the United Nations since they were based on a selective and biased approach that was incompatible with the principles of objectivity and impartiality. The Committee and the United Nations system as a whole had been trying to exert pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in that way for decades, leaving no chance for constructive dialogue and merely provoking confrontation. The international community needed to change the way it interacted with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and create conditions for positive engagement. In view of the foregoing, his delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

32. **Ms. Guevarra-de Dios** (Philippines) said that, unlike in previous years, her delegation would not disassociate itself from paragraph 12 of the draft resolution and all other paragraphs in the draft resolutions of the Committee that referred to the International Criminal Court. However, the Philippines reaffirmed its position that it was the fundamental right of States to decide whether or not they wished to be bound by a treaty. The withdrawal of the Philippines from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court was therefore a valid exercise of State prerogative and a principled stand against those who politicized human rights.

33. Perpetrators of the most serious crimes should be held accountable. The Rome Statute was the product of deliberate and protracted negotiations among States aimed at putting an end to impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes of concern to the international community as a whole. However, the Court could neither overstep its jurisdiction nor unreasonably and unnecessarily exert its dominance over States' primary right to investigate and prosecute serious crimes. That would not contribute to the success of the Court but would merely undermine its attempts to dispense global justice.

34. **Ms. Zhang Sisi** (China) said that her delegation always supported the proper handling of differences in the area of human rights, through dialogue and cooperation. China opposed politicization, selectivity, double standards and the provocation of confrontation. It disagreed with the practice of exerting pressure on other countries in the name of human rights through the creation of country-specific mechanisms, without the consent of the countries concerned. The draft resolution went against the will of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, failed to take an impartial and objective view of its achievements in promoting and protecting human rights and disregarded the infringement on the human rights of its population caused by the unilateral coercive measures imposed by some countries, which were a means of interfering in the country's internal affairs in the name of human rights. China therefore dissociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

35. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, in 10 years, nothing had changed – the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had failed to achieve any result. If the international community continued to take the same approach, it would reach the same dead end. It was never too late for it to reconsider its approach. There was no reason for it to fear losing credibility – that had been lost a long time ago.

36. Although the draft resolution had been adopted without a vote, that did not mean that it had been adopted by consensus. The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had developed a significant new approach towards the draft resolution, which was not to engage and not to ask for a vote. The Syrian delegation had taken the same approach. Although it had joined the consensus, it had mentally and morally voted against the draft resolution, just like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the other countries that understood the truth of what was going on in the country. The Syrian Arab Republic stood with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and supported its efforts to protect and promote human rights. Accordingly, his delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.40/Rev.1: Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar

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

38. **Mr. Alwasil** (Saudi Arabia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation and the European Union, said that the Rohingya minorities had for decades been subjected to systematic violations of their basic rights, which had led them to flee their country. Since 2017, over 1 million Rohingya Muslims and other minorities had fled to Bangladesh. The situation of those minorities had become even more precarious, especially following Cyclone Mocha. The continuing tragic developments that prevented the voluntary and safe return of those refugees was worrying, and the violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Myanmar were condemnable. Myanmar should uphold its international obligations and guarantee the safety and security of its people, including Rohingya Muslims and other minorities. The draft resolution had been adopted by consensus for the first time at the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly, which reflected the unity of the international community regarding the response to the suffering of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, despite the many humanitarian crises currently confronting the world. The text, which was balanced and reflected the overall views of the sponsors, should be adopted by consensus.

39. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Japan, Liechtenstein, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino,

Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Vanuatu.

40. He then noted that Australia, Iceland, Kiribati and Tuvalu also wished to become sponsors.

41. **Mr. Tun** (Myanmar) said that his delegation was grateful that the draft resolution maintained a focus on the situation of the Rohingya and strongly condemned past and continuing grave violations by the inhumane and illegitimate military junta. Myanmar welcomed that efforts had been made to better reflect the situation on the ground in Myanmar, notably through the inclusion of references to junta air strikes and the recognition of the "widespread, deliberate, indiscriminate and excessive" nature of junta violations. However, the text still fell far short of meeting the expectations of the people of Myanmar concerning the illegal military coup, the military junta's atrocities, accountability, an arms embargo and strengthened references to the National Unity Government of Myanmar and its work.

42. For more than 33 months, all people in Myanmar had suffered from the inhumane and terrorists acts of the illegitimate military junta. It would therefore be more beneficial for the Rohingya and other minorities in Myanmar if the draft resolution could focus on those areas where practical solutions could be found and root causes of the crisis could be addressed. The prevailing devastating situation on the ground and the military junta's continued atrocities against the people of Myanmar had clearly revealed that the root cause of the crisis in Myanmar, including the Rohingya issue, was the inhumane military and its continued enjoyment of a culture of impunity. The international community must not forget that the Rohingya issue was a part of the crisis in Myanmar. His delegation would support the draft resolution and all Member States should do the same and adopt it by consensus.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.*

44. **Ms. García Rico** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the draft resolution addressed the atrocities committed against Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar over many years, which had led in 2017 to more than 1 million people being forced to flee the country. It also addressed the human rights violations and abuses against other minorities and the people of Myanmar since the unjustified, illegal and unconstitutional military coup in February 2021, which had forcibly overthrown the democratically elected Government and plunged the country into brutal conflict and repression.

45. The humanitarian and human rights situation in Myanmar had further deteriorated since 2022. Violence

and armed conflict had spread throughout the country, and the Myanmar armed and security forces had stepped up their widespread, deliberate and indiscriminate use of force against the civilian population, including through air strikes and the burning of villages and camps for internally displaced persons, mass killings, torture, mutilation and sexual and gender-based violence. Politicians, journalists, civil society activists and peaceful demonstrators continued to be arbitrarily detained. Martial law had been imposed in parts of the country and 18 million people, a third of the population, were in need of humanitarian aid. At the same time, the Myanmar military continued to deliberately block humanitarian aid from reaching those in need, even after the devastating Cyclone Mocha had hit Rakhine State in May 2023.

46. With the current situation in Myanmar, there was little hope or prospect for the safe, voluntary, dignified and sustainable return of Rohingya refugees. The international community could not stand idly by while those atrocities continued. The draft resolution was intended to reflect the deteriorating situation in Myanmar. The text recalled Security Council resolution [2669 \(2022\)](#), called on the Secretary-General to appoint a new Special Envoy on Myanmar and develop a strategy for Myanmar and recognized the important role of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in facilitating a peaceful solution to the crisis. It contained stronger language on international humanitarian law and children's rights and maintained a strong focus on the need for accountability. The European Union and its member States remained deeply concerned that the build-up and flow of weapons and technology into Myanmar gravely undermined human rights, which it would have liked the draft resolution to reflect. However, it believed that the text sent an important message that the General Assembly remained committed to the situation in Myanmar.

47. **Mr. Kuzmenkov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation did not support the practice of considering selective, politicized and one-sided draft resolutions on human rights in specific countries. Such draft resolutions were contrary to the spirit of cooperation and mutually respectful dialogue on human rights and only complicated the search for just solutions.

48. The international community should take a cautious and balanced approach to the situation in Myanmar. All parties to the conflict must avoid violence and exercise restraint, which were essential to finding peaceful solutions. The one-sided presentation of the facts set out in the draft resolution, which were provided by the so-called Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar – a mechanism that had been established

without that country's consent – was alarming. In the absence of cooperation between Myanmar and the Mechanism, it was difficult to take its findings on trust.

49. The deaths of more than 6,700 civilians, including 233 children, at the hands of opposition militia was a matter of grave concern. The lack of condemnation of such crimes by the United Nations was more likely to fuel escalation than to create conditions for reconciliation. Furthermore, there was no mention in the text of the Myanmar leadership's efforts to return refugees and its openness to cooperation with various United Nations agencies. The Russian Federation could not agree to the adoption of a country-specific draft resolution on Myanmar in the Committee. Accordingly, his delegation disassociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

50. **Mr. Chindawongse** (Thailand) said that, as a neighbouring country, Thailand attached utmost importance to ensuring peace and stability in Myanmar. Constructive engagement between the international community and all parties in Myanmar was key to resolving the conflict and improving the country's overall human rights situation, including that of the Rohingya. All parties in Myanmar must immediately end the violence and the use of force and initiate a dialogue in order to find a peaceful solution that was Myanmar-led and Myanmar-owned. Thailand would work even more closely and proactively with Myanmar to create a conducive environment for such solutions and to address other issues of common concern, including transboundary haze pollution and trafficking in persons. It attached high importance to timely, unimpeded and non-discriminatory access to humanitarian assistance and stood ready to cooperate with the international community in that regard. Furthermore, Thailand fully supported the role of ASEAN, especially the implementation of the five-point consensus, and hoped that the international community would continue to support the ongoing efforts of ASEAN.

51. **Mr. Gafoor** (Singapore) said that the situation in Rakhine State was complex, and Myanmar should work with relevant United Nations agencies to create conducive conditions for the safe, voluntary and dignified repatriation of refugees from Bangladesh. Commending the efforts of the Government of Bangladesh to facilitate that outcome, he encouraged both parties to continue engagement and dialogue. While ASEAN and its member States had provided humanitarian assistance to the refugees, there was a need for political stability in Myanmar and in Rakhine State. Singapore remained deeply concerned by the situation in Myanmar following the February 2021 coup

and was disappointed by the lack of progress in the implementation of the five-point consensus that had been agreed with the leader of the military authorities. The military authorities should work with ASEAN to expeditiously implement the consensus. ASEAN leaders had reviewed the implementation of the consensus and would establish an informal consultation mechanism comprising the previous, current and future ASEAN Chairs in order to engage with all Myanmar stakeholders and ensure the sustainability of ASEAN efforts to address the crisis. ASEAN and Singapore would continue to work with external partners, including the United Nations, to facilitate a peaceful solution. His country welcomed the role of the United Nations and the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Myanmar in addressing the situation and looked forward to the timely appointment of the next Special Envoy on Myanmar.

52. **Mr. Rizal** (Malaysia) said that the situation in Myanmar remained of great concern, and the ongoing conflict had further exacerbated the dire situation of the Rohingya and other minorities. His delegation was disappointed that there continued to be a lack of real, timely and meaningful progress in the implementation of the five-point consensus. Malaysia appreciated the recognition by the international community of the crucial role played by ASEAN in addressing the issue. During the ASEAN Summit in September 2023, ASEAN leaders had reaffirmed that the five point-consensus remained the main reference for addressing the political crisis in Myanmar and should be implemented in its entirety.

53. Malaysia welcomed the adoption of Security Council resolution [2669 \(2022\)](#), which would contribute to finding a peaceful solution. However, violence and targeted attacks against civilians and civilian infrastructure continued. Follow-up action from the Security Council was therefore crucial to prevent the situation from deteriorating further. The Security Council must take decisive measures to support and supplement the efforts of ASEAN and to stop the ongoing violence.

54. As the Committee focused on addressing the political situation in Myanmar, equal emphasis needed to be placed on the plight of the displaced Rohingya Muslims. The continued influx of Rohingya refugees into neighbouring countries increased the strain on the national resources of host countries, including Malaysia. His country therefore called for proportionate burden- and responsibility-sharing and urged States parties to the 1951 Convention to uphold their obligations to receive more refugees for resettlement or relocation. The root causes of the Rohingya crisis must be

addressed in order to facilitate the safe, voluntary and dignified return of Rohingya to Rakhine State. The international community should continue to provide its assistance in that regard, since sustained international support on the political and humanitarian fronts would bring direct positive impacts to the Rohingya refugees.

55. **Ms. Oehri** (Liechtenstein), speaking also on behalf of Australia, Canada, Iceland, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland, said that it was regrettable that important elements of agreed language from previous iterations of the draft resolution had been omitted. The text acknowledged that the Rohingya crisis had been exacerbated by the February 2021 coup and the subsequent deterioration of the situation throughout Myanmar. Those crises were inextricably linked and stemmed from the same root causes. As such, their delegations strongly supported language reiterating the continued commitment of the international community to ending the impunity of the Myanmar military and working towards the dispensation of justice.

56. The impact of the coup, the subsequent violations of international humanitarian law and human rights, the negation of human life and dignity and the resulting interlinked humanitarian, economic and political crises remained of deep concern. The ensuing regime violence against civilians and minority groups, including but not limited to the Rohingya, mass killings, razing of villages, arbitrary detentions, extrajudicial killings, torture, mutilations, the rise in gender-based violence, including conflict-related sexual violence targeting women and girls, and the escalating attacks on civilians, including attacks by air and with heavy weaponry, were deplorable. The perpetrators of such crimes must be held accountable. The supply of weapons to Myanmar was enabling the conflict and human rights violations. As called for in General Assembly resolution [75/287](#), all Member States should take measures to prevent the flow of arms into Myanmar. Member States should also halt the transfer of aviation fuel and revenue to the military regime. The countries reaffirmed their strong support for Security Council resolution [2669 \(2022\)](#) and called for its full implementation. They also supported the important work of such accountability mechanisms as the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar and the ongoing investigation of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, and continued to call for the referral by the Security Council to the Court. Moreover, the countries backed ASEAN efforts to promote a peaceful resolution in the interests of the people of Myanmar through the five-point consensus.

57. **Ms. Monica** (Bangladesh) said that six years had elapsed since her country had opened its border to nearly 1 million Rohingya Muslims fleeing ethnic cleansing in

Myanmar. However, despite collective efforts, no real progress had been achieved in enabling the Rohingya to return to their homes – the root causes of their persecution remained unaddressed, and their justice needs had yet to be met. Instead, the situation continued to deteriorate as a result of regression in the democratic transition and ongoing armed conflicts. At the same time, gaps in humanitarian funding for the displaced Rohingya continued to widen. Against that backdrop, the adoption of the draft resolution was a significant development, sending a strong signal of solidarity and demonstrating the international community's renewed commitment to paying continued attention to the matter.

58. As a small country with a high population density and limited resources, Bangladesh was not in a position to host Rohingya on its territory for a protracted length of time. The necessary conditions therefore needed to be created for their safe, voluntary and dignified return. It was Myanmar, however, which bore responsibility for improving the situation, for guaranteeing the basic rights of the Rohingya, including the right to movement, and for ensuring that they had access to livelihood opportunities when they returned. The role of the international community, including the countries of the region and ASEAN, was critical in that regard. The Rohingya living in the camps deserved the solidarity of the international community, and the humanitarian response plan to support them needed to be adequately funded.

59. The current draft resolution had benefited from the adoption of the first ever Security Council resolution on Myanmar in December 2022. In its resolution [2669 \(2022\)](#), the Security Council recognized the profound impact of the ongoing state of emergency and the increasing incidents of violence against and the arbitrary detention and execution of civilians. The recognition of the critical role of ASEAN in addressing the challenges faced by civilians in Myanmar was a welcome improvement to the text. Furthermore, Bangladesh appreciated the provisions in support of all accountability processes, including those involving investigation by the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court and the proceedings in the International Court of Justice under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. As a neighbouring country, Bangladesh wished to see progress in the overall situation in Myanmar and the improvement of conditions in Rakhine. It therefore highly appreciated the international community's continued attention to the cause, as reflected in the draft resolution. The text would provide much-needed impetus to step up collective efforts to bring peace and prosperity to Myanmar, so that

all people, including the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities, could live with equal rights and in dignity.

60. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that his delegation continued to follow the development of the situation in Myanmar and shared the concern of other Member States about the fate of the Rohingya Muslims and other minorities. However, the numerous resolutions, dozens of reports and the work of the mandate holders all served as tools for confrontation rather than dialogue and cooperation. It was time to search for new solutions that would be both constructive and mutually acceptable to all parties. His delegation supported adopting the draft resolution without a vote but was in principle opposed to country-specific approaches and wished to disassociate itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

61. **Mr. Devereaux** (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolution highlighted the deteriorating situation in Myanmar, including for the Rohingya and other minorities, as the military regime rolled back democratic progress and choked civic space. There were credible and widespread reports of air strikes, the burning of villages, torture, rape and other forms of sexual and gender-based violence. Conflict continued throughout Myanmar and access to humanitarian assistance remained blocked. Over 18 million people were in need of such assistance, with 2 million people displaced. In that context, Member States must halt the flow of arms to the military regime. The risk of further violence and discrimination against the Rohingya and other minorities remained, with Rohingya continuing to face restrictions on freedom of movement, access to services and the lack of a credible pathway to citizenship. Conditions would worsen following the breakdown of the ceasefire in Rakhine State and the resumption of violence there. Any repatriation of Rohingya should happen only when the conditions allowed. Returns must be safe, voluntary, dignified, to areas of origin or choice and in consultation with refugees. The international community could only put an end to the culture of impunity in Myanmar through accountability and justice for the Rohingya. The United Kingdom was proud to support the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar and encouraged all Member States and United Nations agencies to cooperate with the Mechanism in order to facilitate its critical work to hold the military to account. The United Kingdom continued to stand with the people of Myanmar and called for an immediate end to violence and a return to democracy.

62. **Ms. Dhanutirto** (Indonesia), welcoming the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, said that the text shed light on the dire human rights situation

faced by the Rohingya and other minorities in Myanmar and reaffirmed the urgent call to action to address that situation. It also underscored the commitment of ASEAN to responding to the plight of the Rohingya people. As a member of ASEAN, Indonesia recognized that resolving the Rohingya crisis was not only a humanitarian imperative but a crucial component of addressing the broader political challenges in Myanmar. Inclusive national dialogue, as encouraged by ASEAN through the five-point consensus, must encompass solutions for the Rohingya community. Such dialogue was vital for establishing lasting peace and stability in the region. ASEAN remained steadfast in its commitment to assist in the safe, voluntary and dignified repatriation of Rohingya refugees. Indonesia would continue to stand by the Rohingya people. The international community must keep supporting Rohingya refugees so as to ensure their well-being and uphold their dignity as they awaited repatriation. Indonesia was deeply concerned about the actions of the military junta, which served to exacerbate the situation on the ground, especially for the Rohingya. Such actions were counterproductive and undermined efforts to address humanitarian and human right issues. Indonesia therefore called on the junta to fulfil its obligation towards the Rohingya as an integral part of the Myanmar population. Their rights and dignity must be upheld and protected.

63. **Ms. Zhang Sisi** (China) said that, as a friendly neighbour, her country sincerely wished for peace and stability in Myanmar. Since the political changes in Myanmar, China had remained objective and impartial and had actively engaged with all parties in the country to promote peace talks. Her country supported ASEAN in its efforts to work with Myanmar to implement the five-point consensus. Myanmar and Bangladesh should address the repatriation of refugees from Rakhine State through dialogue and consultation, and the international community needed to create the conditions necessary for such discussions. China would continue to play a constructive role in that regard.

64. The draft resolution, which considered various issues in Myanmar from a human rights perspective, was seriously unbalanced as it exerted too much pressure on the relevant parties, could aggravate the conflict and would not help the parties to resolve differences through dialogue and consultation. China had always advocated constructive dialogue and cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual respect in properly addressing human rights differences. It opposed the use of human rights as a pretext for exerting pressure on other countries and the creation of country-specific mechanisms without the consent of the countries

concerned. In that connection, China dissociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

65. **Mr. Tun** (Myanmar), welcoming the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, said that his country would implement its recommendations together with the commitments outlined in the policy position on the Rohingya issued by the National Unity Government in June 2021. While Myanmar would continue its cooperation with all relevant stakeholders, it urged Member States and the international community to cooperate and assist in the implementation of those recommendations. The people of Myanmar were determined to end the military dictatorship, restore democracy and build a federal democratic union, for which they required strong and effective support from the international community.

66. In order to strengthen the draft resolution, the General Assembly should adopt a follow-up plenary text to General Assembly resolution [75/287](#) on the situation in Myanmar, which would provide an opportunity to address the current situation in Myanmar and the efforts of ASEAN and reinforce Security Council resolution [2669 \(2022\)](#). Highlighting the importance of a nation-led, people-led approach, he requested that the main sponsors of the draft resolution involve his delegation in the drafting of future texts from the very beginning, which would enable the draft resolution to adequately reflect the desires and aspirations of the people of Myanmar. His delegation shared the Secretary-General's view that the international community had failed the people of Myanmar. The United Nations should therefore take immediate and decisive action to save their lives.

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.41: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

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

68. **Mr. Arbeiter** (Canada), introducing the draft resolution, said that the text was balanced, current, factual and relied on United Nations reporting. Over the past 12 months, the international community had witnessed the flagrant disregard of the Iranian authorities for human rights, life and dignity. The violent enforcement of the compulsory veiling law, including new restrictive and punitive measures for persons deemed to be non-compliant, illustrated the intensified targeted repression of women and girls in Iran and the outright denial of their rights. The rights of women and girls must be respected. Restrictions on the right to freedom of peaceful assembly were equally troubling. The response of the Iranian authorities to the

protests that had begun in September 2022, including the use of disproportionate force, widespread arrests, arbitrary detention and use of the death penalty, demonstrated the worsening human rights situation. Such practices were unacceptable, and the alarming increase in the application of the death penalty was condemnable. The sponsors of the draft resolution were concerned that the death penalty was imposed in violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and without fair trial and due process. Other violations persisted, including the systemic persecution of ethnic and religious minorities and limitations on freedom of opinion and expression both online and offline. No one should live in fear of violence or intimidation, including the families of the victims of the downing of Ukraine International Airlines flight 752. The draft resolution called on the Islamic Republic of Iran to release all human rights defenders and protesters unjustly detained.

69. All allegations of human rights violations in the Islamic Republic of Iran must be investigated in accordance with international standards. The draft resolution welcomed the renewal of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the establishment of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Islamic Republic of Iran. Such international monitoring was imperative, and the Islamic Republic of Iran was called upon to cooperate fully with all United Nations special procedures. The draft resolution urged Iran to implement recommendations for necessary and meaningful change, and all Member States should vote in its favour.

70. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, New Zealand, Palau, Republic of Moldova, San Marino and Vanuatu.

71. He then noted that Tuvalu also wished to become a sponsor.

72. **Ms. Ershadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that Iran vehemently rejected the biased and politically motivated draft resolution. While her delegation acknowledged that there was always room for improvement, it highlighted the selective, biased and hypocritical nature of the allegations directed against Iran. Rather than using the Committee to address human rights concerns sincerely, certain countries exploited it to advance their own political agendas, thereby undermining the core ethos of the Committee. Canada and other sponsors of the draft resolution had presented a country-specific text after having voted down a draft resolution urging the

cessation of the Israeli regime's bloodbath and massacre of Palestinian women and children. That juxtaposition unmasked the double standards applied by them vis-à-vis human rights.

73. Canada, while claiming the moral high ground and endeavouring to castigate other nations, must confront the distressing and painful reality of the annual discovery of the bodies of numerous Indigenous children. The exploitation and mistreatment of migrant workers, as highlighted by the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences, was a horrifying, deeply disturbing and inexcusable stain rooted in that country's colonial legacy. While Canada prided itself on a luminous history of purportedly protecting children's rights, such revelations painted a starkly different reality.

74. The neglect by the United Kingdom was equally disconcerting. The inexplicable silence and lack of attention regarding over 200 missing children and teenagers, all of whom were asylum-seekers, resonated with the world's alarming indifference to the plight of such vulnerable individuals. The failure to uphold the rights and ensure the safety of those young lives was utterly reprehensible and demanded urgent attention. As the world watched in horror at the desecration of the rights and lives of innocent Indigenous children, it seemed that the illustrious reputation of Canada for safeguarding the rights of children could be put to practical use. Perhaps the United Kingdom could benefit from that country's expertise in finding missing children.

75. France, draped in a veil of liberty, equality and fraternity, had been exposed by the human rights violations in its own backyard. The crackdown on religious freedoms in the name of secularism, the insidious targeting and marginalization of Muslim communities and the draconian restrictions on the hijab demonstrated that it was stifling liberties under the guise of upholding them. As a beacon of human rights yet tarnished by every discriminatory law and policy, France was a glaring example of hypocrisy, parading the ideals of equality while blatantly denying it to its own citizens.

76. The violation by Germany of the most basic rights of Muslim and migrant women and children within its borders pointed to historical parallels, such as the chemical weapons used against Iranian women and children during the imposed war. Neither history nor Iranian women and children could forget the horrendous crimes committed by Germany and its chemical weapons.

77. The illegitimate apartheid Israeli regime was at the forefront of massacres of innocent women and children. No other country could compete with the apartheid regime when it came to genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity. There was no way to explain the horrific bombing of hospitals, which had killed hundreds of patients, most of them women and children, and charred them beyond recognition. The occupying apartheid regime of Israel perpetuated a legacy of egregious and unspeakable human rights violations. The forced displacement of Palestinian people, the continued occupation of their territories, the construction of illegal settlements and the suffocating blockade on Gaza epitomized an apartheid regime that, in its quest for genocide, trampled upon the rights and dignity of the Palestinian nation.

78. The United States, in addition to promoting racism, had thrown its weight behind the Israeli regime's genocide and slaughtering of women and children in the besieged Gaza Strip. The United States pursued the very same policy by committing genocide against the Iranian people through the imposition of inhumane and unlawful unilateral coercive measures against them. It took pride in providing the Israeli apartheid regime with all the support it needed, including military, financial and political backing. The reason for the paralysis in the Security Council was obvious.

79. The Islamic Republic of Iran believed in promoting and protecting human rights, and it would continue its constructive cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms and OHCHR. However, the exploitation of human rights for political motives should concern all Member States. Instead of selectively targeting certain countries to serve political interests, Member States must collectively adopt an impartial and unbiased approach in order to genuinely address human rights violations on a global scale. In the light of the foregoing, the draft resolution had nothing to do with human rights. Her delegation had therefore requested a vote on the draft resolution in the hope that delegations would choose the right course by rejecting it.

80. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the Group of Friends in Defence of the Charter of the United Nations, said that the presentation of country-specific resolutions without the consent of the States concerned was contrary to the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization and non-confrontation. It also contravened the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and undermined the development of friendly relations among nations and the achievement of

international human rights cooperation. The Group firmly rejected all double standards that undermined the promotion and protection of human rights and prevented progress in that area. It was also seriously concerned at the proliferation of mechanisms and procedures purporting to conduct impartial assessments of the human rights situation in specific States, without their due consent, whose reports were based on biased or non-credible secondary, tertiary or other sources. Such reports were therefore mere propaganda. The Group also rejected the practice of the Security Council dealing with issues that fell outside its mandate, including by addressing human rights issues in pursuit of the political objectives of certain States.

81. The illegal and immoral application of unilateral coercive measures had a negative impact on the enjoyment and realization of all human rights, including the rights to development, life, food, health and peace. The Group strongly urged States to refrain from applying, and to lift, any unilateral coercive economic, financial or trade measures that impeded the full realization of human rights and the achievement of economic and social development.

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

83. **Mr. González Behmaras** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation did not support country-specific draft resolutions, which were politically motivated and exclusively targeted developing countries that were furthermore subjected to unilateral coercive measures. Such texts led to confrontation and mistrust and did nothing to improve the human rights situation on the ground. Their intrinsic selectivity sought to delegitimize the United Nations human rights mechanisms. It was very worrying that developing countries were being singled out and punished, while human rights violations committed in or by developed countries were met with silence. History had shown that any mandate based on politicization and double standards was doomed to fail. The continued examination of the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran was not motivated by genuine concern or interest in cooperating with that

country. Cuba would never support the instrumentalization of human rights issues to advance geopolitical interests, discredit legitimate Governments, undermine their constitutional orders and justify strategies to destabilize them. Cuba would therefore vote against the draft resolution and called for an end to the exercise against Iran. Respectful and constructive dialogue based on cooperation and the exchange of good practices was the only way to address human rights challenges, which existed in all countries.

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

85. **Ms. Pichardo Urbina** (Nicaragua), speaking in explanation of the vote before voting, said that her delegation opposed the annual presentation to the Committee of politically motivated reports and draft resolutions, which lacked objectivity and impartiality and did not contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights. Nicaragua would continue to strongly condemn politicization, selectivity and double standards in the Committee's work, which should be based on the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity, and constructive international dialogue and cooperation. Rather than promote the protection of human rights, such draft resolutions, which did not correspond to reality and were prepared without the consent of the peoples and Governments concerned, increased mistrust between countries and exacerbated confrontation, thereby undermining mutual dialogue, multilateralism and international solidarity.

86. Nicaragua called for respect for sovereignty, self-determination, territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Furthermore, it rejected the instrumentalization of the draft resolution to continue the unjust attacks and imposition of illegal unilateral coercive measures against the country, which violated the human rights of

its citizens. Nicaragua remained committed to the promotion and protection of all human rights and firmly opposed their use for political purposes. For those reasons, her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

87. **Mr. Kuzmenkov** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of the vote before the voting, said that his delegation maintained that the adoption of selective politicized country-specific draft resolutions was counterproductive. The draft resolution on the Islamic Republic of Iran had nothing to do with protecting human rights. It contained unsubstantiated accusations, was aimed at spreading disinformation and targeting political opponents, and served as an attempt to punish a sovereign State for pursuing an independent foreign policy.

88. As usual, behind the whole anti-Iranian campaign was the United States, which, in addition to preparing such highly dubious draft resolutions, was making extensive use of illegal sanctions and subversive work against Iran. The Islamic Republic of Iran had never refused constructive cooperation with the human rights bodies of the United Nations system. His delegation welcomed the responsible approach of Iran to the promotion and protection of human rights and had read with interest the report prepared by Iran on that subject. Guided by those considerations, Russia would vote against the draft resolution.

89. **Mr. Hamer** (Australia), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation was pleased once again to vote in favour of the draft resolution, which aimed to reflect the current human rights situation in Iran without prejudice. The text was evidence-based and drawn from the reports of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the reports of the Secretary-General. Australia remained gravely concerned by the deteriorating human rights situation in Iran, especially the persecution of women and girls, oppression of ethnic and religious minorities and treatment of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community. His country stood with Iranian women and girls in their struggle for equality and empowerment and called on Iran to cease its oppression of women. The disproportionate use of force against protesters in Iran following the death in custody of Mahsa Amini was condemnable. Australia stood in solidarity with the brave people of Iran and supported their right to protest peacefully.

90. As emphasized in the draft resolution, domestic investigations must meet relevant international human rights law and standards, including the requirements of

promptness, independence and transparency. The use by Iran of the death penalty, especially against protesters, was deeply disturbing. Australia opposed the death penalty in all circumstances and called on Iran to establish a moratorium on all executions.

91. Some delegations had suggested that country-specific draft resolutions infringed on sovereignty. Member States were indeed sovereign, but sovereignty was not a shield against international scrutiny for behaviour that impinged on universal human rights. No country was above fair scrutiny of its human rights obligations, and the international community could not turn a blind eye and suggest that deaths, violence, arbitrary detention, discrimination and oppression were internal matters. To do so would be to ignore the human rights of the individuals that the United Nations had committed to promote and protect. Member States should therefore support the draft resolution.

92. **Ms. Qureshi** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the consideration of human rights situations should be based on the principles of impartiality, transparency, objectivity, non-selectivity and non-politicization, yet countries like Iran continued to be selectively targeted for political, economic and strategic purposes, under the guise of promoting and protecting human rights. Despite the imposition of unilateral coercive measures against Iran, that country continued to make efforts to promote and protect the rights of its citizens. Sanctions against Iran had not been lifted, even in the wake of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, which had an impact on the human rights of its people. The human rights agenda was best served through the universal periodic review and not through the imposition of country-specific resolutions on developing countries. For that reason, her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

93. **Ms. Rios Balbino** (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her country acknowledged the progress made by the Islamic Republic of Iran in the area of human rights domestically, including its efforts to provide the growing Afghan refugee population with basic services. Furthermore, Brazil acknowledged the appointment by the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran of the Special Committee to investigate the 2022 unrests and recalled that its work should be in line with international human rights law and the standards applicable to domestic investigations.

94. While it recognized the country's engagement with human rights treaty bodies, Brazil called on Iran to collaborate with the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, particularly with the Special Rapporteur

on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. There were still important areas of concern. Iran must strengthen its protection of the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association and participation, address the application of the death penalty and its disproportionate use against persons belonging to minorities, and uphold the right to freedom of expression and opinion, both offline and online. It also needed to repeal existing gender-discriminatory laws and promote the rights of women and girls. Brazil remained troubled by the reports of violations against women, human rights defenders and religious and ethnic minorities. In that connection, Brazil reaffirmed its support for the rights of the Baha'is to practise their faith freely and peacefully in Iran. On the understanding that Iran would strengthen its efforts to improve the human rights situation in the country and on the basis of the constructive dialogue that had been held, her delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

95. **Mr. Islamuly** (Kazakhstan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the presentation of country-specific draft resolutions within the Committee without the consent of the States concerned was not conducive to dialogue and did not improve the human rights situation in those States. Kazakhstan opposed selectivity in assessing human rights situations and the politicization of human rights. He called on all Member States to engage constructively on the issue of human rights, instead of taking confrontational, counterproductive and coercive approaches. Human rights must be promoted and protected through equal dialogue, in a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation and on the basis of the principles of non-selectivity, impartiality, objectivity and non-interference in internal affairs. The universal periodic review, the treaty bodies and the special procedures of the Human Rights Council were the most suitable mechanisms for objectively and reliably assessing the human rights situation in every country, on the basis of dialogue and cooperation.

96. **Ms. Gebrekidan** (Eritrea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation strongly opposed country-specific draft resolutions, which were politicized, confrontational, counterproductive and mostly imposed on developing countries with independent policies. It therefore did not support the country-specific draft resolution on Iran and would vote against it. Eritrea called for human rights situations in all countries to be considered on an equal footing. The international community should cooperate with Iran and support its efforts to meet the needs of its people, including through the lifting of unilateral

coercive measures, which were contrary to international law and continued to have a negative impact on the human rights situation of its population and on all other populations affected by such measures.

97. *At the request of the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.41.*

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia,

Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

98. *Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.41 was adopted by 80 votes to 29, with 65 abstentions.*

99. **Mr. Belmont Roldán** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the deteriorating situation of women and girls, the intensification of targeted repression, discrimination and measures taken to further impose restrictive and punitive laws and policies on women and girls were deeply troubling. Despite repeated calls for restraint, the Iranian security forces continued to respond disproportionately to demonstrations. More than 20,000 people had been arrested in connection with the protests and more than 500 had been killed, including women and children. That was unacceptable. The European Union and its member States deplored the lack of further investigation or accountability and renewed its call on Iran to allow an impartial, transparent and thorough investigation into the use of violence by Iranian security forces in response to the protests. The significant increase in executions in Iran was also of grave concern. The European Union and its member States strongly opposed the death penalty at all times and under all circumstances and called on Iran to cease all executions, including those of juvenile offenders, dissidents, protesters and for drug-related offences, and to pursue a consistent policy aimed at the abolition of capital punishment, which was an unacceptable denial of human dignity and integrity. For those reasons, the States members of the European Union had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

100. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that his delegation wished to reiterate its rejection of selective country-specific approaches in the work of the United Nations on human rights issues. Guided by such considerations, Belarus had voted against the adoption of yet another biased document that attempted to dictate to a sovereign State how to conduct its domestic policy. Any concerns should be addressed through constructive dialogue, not through diktats. The universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council should be the main intergovernmental mechanism for examining human rights issues in all countries without exception.

101. **Ms. Zhang Sisi** (China) said that her delegation had always maintained that the work of the Committee should be guided by the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity and non-selectivity. The international community should view the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran in an objective

and impartial light, respect the path of human rights development independently chosen by its people, be more attentive to the demands of its Government and people, and stop using human rights to interfere in its internal affairs. The unilateral coercive measures that infringed on the human rights of the Iranian population should be lifted without delay. While the sponsors of the draft resolution had turned a blind eye to their own serious human rights problems, they were hell-bent on using human rights as a tool to attack and discredit developing countries and interfere in their internal affairs, which was a clear case of politicization and double standards. For the foregoing reasons, China had voted against the draft resolution.

102. **Mr. Henzel** (United States of America) said that, more than a year after the protests sparked by the death in custody of Mahsa Amini, the human rights situation in Iran had continued to deteriorate dramatically. His country remained deeply concerned that the Iranian regime had responded to peaceful protests by killing hundreds of protesters, including children, torturing and threatening detained protesters and activists and carrying out death sentences against people merely for exercising their rights. Reports of abuses involving extrajudicial killings, disproportionate use of force, arbitrary arrests and detention, gender-based violence, unfair trials, Internet shutdowns and targeted harassment demonstrated the cruelty of the regime and its hostility to universal human rights. Iran must grant access to the country for the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran immediately. The United States firmly supported Iranian civil society activists, human rights defenders and others who continued to protest their Government's human rights abuses, including gender-based violence against women and restrictions on the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms. His country joined Iranians and millions of others around the world in calling for those responsible to be held accountable.

103. The draft resolution helped to promote accountability, which was essential. The United States was pleased that the text provided updates on the situation over the past 12 months and expressed support for the independent international fact-finding mission on the Islamic Republic of Iran created during the special session of the Human Rights Council in November 2022. The result of the vote on the draft resolution served as strong condemnation of the Iranian regime's continued human rights violations and abuses and sent a strong signal of support to the brave Iranians, including women and children, who were demanding respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

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

105. **Ms. Mimran Rosenberg** (Israel) said that it was of the utmost importance to support a draft resolution that reflected the human rights situation in Iran. Israel welcomed the reference to the need to eliminate violence against protesters and the call for the cessation of the widespread and systematic use of arbitrary arrests and detention against protesters in Iran, as highlighted in paragraph 13. It was essential to keep the family members of protesters safe, especially in the light of the arrests of the father, lawyer and friends of Mahsa Amini, as reported by Amnesty International.

106. The issue of the enforcement of the hijab had still not been resolved, and the Iranian regime continued to harass women who were perceived to be wearing the hijab improperly in the streets using violence, digital face recognition and service denial. Moreover, at least three web-based companies had been shut down in July and August 2023 after publishing photographs of their female employees without headscarves. Paragraph 26 expressed serious concern about the ongoing severe limitations and increasing restrictions on the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief and the persecution, arbitrary arrest and detention of persons belonging to religious minorities. In August 2023, Iran had executed at least eight individuals over three days, all of whom belonged to the Baluch minority. In addition, Iran International had recently reported that an unknown number of Jewish community members in Iran had been forced to block the phone numbers of their relatives in Israel and to hold a rally in support of the massacre committed by Hamas on 7 October 2023. Israel was fully committed to the draft resolution and encouraged other Member States to stand up for human rights, gender-based rights, the protection of protesters and the rights of religious minorities in Iran.

107. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic), noting that his country's position on Iran and the relationship between the two countries was well known, said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. He did not believe that the representative of Canada had read the content of the draft resolution before delivering his statement, as there was no way that the text could be described as "balanced". Rather, the text reflected the

relationship of Iran with the sponsors of the draft resolution. With regard to the comment made by the representative of the United States concerning the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, he said that special rapporteurs were not the same as special envoys of the Secretary-General. States therefore had the right to choose whether or not to cooperate with them. Most importantly, if a State chose not to cooperate with a special rapporteur, it did not mean that they were violating human rights.

Draft resolution A/C.3/78/L.42: Situation of human rights in temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine, including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol

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

109. **Mr. Kyslytsya** (Ukraine), introducing the draft resolution, said that his delegation had presented the draft resolution annually since 2016. It sincerely appreciated the support from those Member States that had consistently voted in favour of the text, thereby emphasizing the inadmissibility of the illegal occupation of territories of sovereign States. That stood as a clear expression of Member States' dedication to the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations. If, over the years, that dedication had been expressed more broadly and the General Assembly had conveyed a stronger message to the aggressor and occupying Power, then the distressing events witnessed around the world today might have been prevented.

110. The draft resolution underscored the significant deterioration of human rights in all Ukrainian territories under Russian control. Over the past nine years, Russia had widely practised arbitrary detentions, reprisals, torture, killings and enforced disappearances. With the full-scale invasion in February 2022, the severity of violations and abuses had escalated in the newly occupied territories. The recent report by the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine (A/78/540) confirmed widespread and systematic torture by Russian authorities. More than 28,000 Ukrainian civilians were held mostly in incommunicado detention and inhumane conditions in the temporarily occupied territories of Ukraine. The draft resolution aimed to safeguard the rights of the Crimean Tatars, the largest Muslim community in Ukraine, who had faced ongoing pressure since the start of the Russian occupation in 2014. Furthermore, the text focused on the forceful deportation of Ukrainian children to Russia and called for the provision of

comprehensive information to United Nations agencies and the safe return of those children to Ukraine.

111. Since the Russian aggression launched in 2014, Ukraine had remained transparent, collaborating with United Nations monitoring mechanisms and inviting the human rights monitoring mission in Ukraine to visit the country. It was more important than ever for the Committee to send a strong signal to the aggressor that the international community continued to closely monitor the situation, ensuring that all its crimes and atrocities were made known and that they were not tolerated. He therefore called upon all responsible Member States to stand with Ukraine and vote in favour of the draft resolution.

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

113. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the Group of Friends in Defence of the Charter of the United Nations, said that the presentation of country-specific resolutions without the consent of the States concerned was contrary to the principles of impartiality, objectivity, transparency, non-selectivity, non-politicization and non-confrontation. It also contravened the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and undermined the development of friendly relations among nations and international cooperation on human rights. The Group firmly rejected all double standards that undermined the promotion and protection of human rights. It was seriously concerned at the proliferation of mechanisms and procedures purporting to conduct impartial assessments of human rights situations without the due consent of the State concerned and whose reports were based on biased or non-credible secondary, tertiary or other sources. Such reports were therefore mere propaganda. In addition, the Group rejected the practice of the Security Council dealing with issues outside of its mandate, including by addressing human rights issues in pursuit of the political objectives of certain States.

114. The illegal and immoral application of unilateral coercive measures had a negative impact on the enjoyment and realization of all human rights, including the rights to development, life, food, health and peace. The Group strongly urged States to refrain from applying, and to lift, any unilateral coercive economic, financial or trade measures that impeded the full achievement of economic and social development, in

particular, but not exclusively, those imposed against developing countries.

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

116. **Ms. Zabolotskaya** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, as a loyal follower of its Western sponsors, Ukraine promoted their practices in the Committee, including through the introduction of a draft resolution that contravened the principles of the Committee's work and had no relevance to its mandate. The draft resolution was completely misleading, starting with its title – it had nothing to do with the human rights situation and certainly did not refer to the occupied territories. The draft resolution had two purposes – to try to challenge the status of the Republic of Crimea and the other constituent entities of the Russian Federation: the Donetsk People's Republic, the Luhansk People's Republic and the Kherson and Zaporizhzhia Provinces, and to legitimize the daily killing of civilians living there in an attempt to forcibly return the territories to Zelensky's control.

117. The inhabitants of the aforementioned territories had made their choice in favour of Russia in the referendums held in order to realize the right of peoples to self-determination enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Their choice was no accident. It was the consequence of the bloody coup d'état in Kyiv in 2014, orchestrated by the West, and the decision of the Kyiv regime to start a war against Donbas in April of the same year. It was the consequence of the policy of the Kyiv authorities to oust the Russian language from education, the media and public life, the squeezing of Russian culture out of Ukraine and the persecution and murder of cultural figures and journalists if they spoke out against the Kyiv regime's rabid Russophobia.

118. Ukraine had been taking care of human rights in the Donetsk People's Republic and Luhansk People's Republic for nine years, shelling both territories daily. Thousands of civilians and more than 100 children had

been killed. The "care" shown by Ukraine towards human rights in the Republic of Crimea was also well known. In the winter of 2015, with the support of the Kyiv authorities, power lines supplying Crimea had been blown up, cutting off electricity supply to 575 settlements. Ukraine had also cut off the water supply to Crimea through the North Crimean Canal, which provided 85 per cent of the Republic's water supply. Ukraine had blown up the Crimean bridge, too. Since February 2022, the Donetsk People's Republic had been subjected to artillery and missile strikes more than 25,000 times, resulting in the destruction and damage of 16,000 residential houses and the deaths of 4,755 civilians, including 140 children. In the light of the foregoing, her delegation had called for a vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it.

119. **Ms. Arab Bafrani** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that country-specific resolutions exploited the Committee for political ends, in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of universality, non-politicization, impartiality, non-selectivity, transparency and objectivity. They also promoted confrontation and mistrust among Member States and undermined the cause of human rights. Double standards and country-specific resolutions were detrimental to the spirit of international cooperation and should be avoided. The counterproductive recommendations contained in such draft resolutions hindered dialogue, understanding, mutual respect and cooperation. The human rights agenda must be pursued with due respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity. Accordingly, her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

120. **Mr. Belmont Roldán** (Spain), making a general statement before the voting and speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine; and, in addition, Georgia, Iceland and San Marino, said that almost 10 years had passed since the violent and illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol by Russia, which constituted a serious violation of international law. The European Union and its member States remained firmly committed to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders.

121. Since its full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022, Russia had orchestrated illegal sham referendums, designed as a pretext for its further violations of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. The European Union and its member States

would never recognize those illegal annexations. Those decisions were null and void and could not produce any legal effect. Crimea, Kherson, Zaporizhzhia, Donetsk and Luhansk belonged to Ukraine.

122. Serious human rights violations and abuses committed in Crimea since its illegal annexation were well documented and reported and included extrajudicial killings, arbitrary arrests and enforced disappearances, as well as torture and ill-treatment by Russian security services and police. Journalists, lawyers and human rights defenders faced persecution, harassment and intimidation, and freedom of opinion, expression, peaceful assembly, religion or belief remained severely restricted. Moreover, the destruction of cultural heritage had not stopped. Such human rights violations were now taking place in other parts of Ukraine illegally occupied by Russia. The Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine had concluded in its latest report (A/78/540) that there was evidence that the Russian authorities had continued to commit numerous violations of international law, human rights and international humanitarian law, including indiscriminate attacks against civilians, as well as the war crimes of torture, wilful killing, rape and other sexual violence, and the deportation of minors. The draft resolution drew attention to the unacceptable human rights violations and abuses in Crimea, as well as in the other territories of Ukraine illegally controlled or occupied by Russia. Such crimes must not go unnoticed. For those reason, the States members of the European Union would vote in favour of the draft resolution and urged all other delegations to do so as well.

123. **Mr. Abesadze** (Georgia), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation strongly supported the draft resolution. For the second year in a row, the international community continued to witness the devastating consequences of the premeditated, unprovoked and unjustified full-scale military aggression by Russia against Ukraine. Georgia remained deeply concerned about the systematic and flagrant violations of international human rights and humanitarian law committed by Russia in Ukraine, which were clearly illustrated in the findings of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine. His country reaffirmed its support of the mandate of the Commission of Inquiry and underlined the importance of its work. OHCHR and other international humanitarian organizations should be given immediate, safe and unfettered access to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and to the other areas of Ukraine temporarily occupied or controlled by Russia. Georgia reaffirmed its unwavering support for

the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders and territorial waters. For the foregoing reasons, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and all other delegations should join it in upholding human rights and the Charter of the United Nations.

124. **Mr. Sylvester** (United Kingdom), making a general statement before the voting, said that his delegation reaffirmed its strong support for the draft resolution and welcomed the significant number of sponsors. Since 2014, people in Crimea had endured a systematic campaign of human rights violations at the hands of the Russian authorities, designed to instil fear, break resolve and erode Ukrainian culture and identity. Fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion or belief and freedom of expression, had been severely restricted. House searches, arbitrary arrests, enforced disappearances and politically motivated prosecutions had become commonplace and were disproportionately targeted at ethnic and religious minorities, including Crimean Tatars. In the 21 months since the Russian full-scale illegal invasion of Ukraine, the use of such brutal measures had been expanded to Donetsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhia and Kherson. The Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Ukraine had uncovered a deeply troubling pattern of torture, ill-treatment and summary executions of civilians, which the commissioners had concluded amounted to war crimes and possible crimes against humanity. Across the temporarily controlled territories, Ukrainian civilians were increasingly being conscripted into the Russian armed forces, in violation of international law.

125. Member States had reaffirmed their faith in human rights, the dignity and worth of the human person and the principle of the inviolability of borders. In that regard, his delegation strongly defended the use of country-specific resolutions, which complemented the work of the Human Rights Council and other forums in providing scrutiny of adherence to human rights obligations. A vote in favour of the draft resolution would send a clear message to Russia that there would be no impunity for its human rights violations and abuses in Ukraine, or its violations of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. Russia must allow access for international monitoring missions to Crimea and the other temporarily controlled territories, cease its attack and withdraw its forces from Ukraine.

126. **Mr. Kim Nam Hyok** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation opposed politicization, selectivity and double standards in the area of human rights, and rejected the politicized draft resolution, which had nothing to do with the promotion

and protection of human rights but only caused mistrust and confrontation between Member States and advanced unjustified initiatives to target and undermine individual States for political purposes. Human rights should never be used as a political instrument to violate sovereignty and interfere in the internal affairs of other sovereign States. Within the United Nations, work on human rights should be conducted in an objective, transparent, non-selective, non-confrontational and non-politicized manner. Accordingly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would vote against the draft resolution.

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

128. *At the request of the Russian Federation, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.42](#).*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New

Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

129. *Draft resolution [A/C.3/78/L.42](#) was adopted by 77 votes to 14, with 79 abstentions.*

130. **Ms. Zhang Sisi** (China) said that the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries must be respected, the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations must be upheld, the legitimate security concerns of all countries must be taken seriously and all efforts to resolve crises must be supported. China continued to promote peace talks in a positive spirit. It did not approve of solutions that could further antagonize the parties, escalate tensions or obstruct diplomacy. The Committee should therefore engage in constructive dialogue and cooperation, on the basis of equality and mutual respect, so as to properly address differences on human rights issues. China rejected politicization, selectivity, double standards, antagonistic practices and attempts to pressure other countries under the pretext of human rights. For those

reasons, her delegation had voted against the draft resolution.

131. **Ms. Al-Thani** (Qatar), speaking also on behalf of Kuwait, said that their delegations had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, although the text contained many elements that they supported. Both countries maintained their position on the Ukrainian crisis, which was based on the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It was important to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders as well as international human rights and humanitarian law, including the principle of the protection of civilians in armed conflict. It was also important to settle conflicts peacefully and to refrain from the use or threat of use of force in international relations.

132. **Ms. Rajandran** (Singapore) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, in keeping with its principled position of abstaining from voting on country-specific human rights draft resolutions in the Committee. However, its vote should not be interpreted as a position on the substance of the issues raised in the draft resolution, or as derogating in any way from its clear, consistent and principled position against the invasion of Ukraine by Russia and the latter's violations of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Singapore maintained a long-standing position that the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all countries must be respected.

133. **Ms. Mendoza Elguea** (Mexico) said that her country condemned the Russian aggression against Ukraine, which was in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 2.4. Mexico had been clear in rejecting the illegal annexation of Ukrainian territories, including the Crimean Peninsula and the regions of Kherson, Zaporizhzhia, Donetsk and Luhansk, and repeated its call for respect for the territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. Her delegation's votes during the General Assembly's emergency special session on Ukraine clearly reflected the country's position on the conflict. With regard to the human rights situation in the aforementioned regions, Mexico was deeply concerned at the reports of serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law perpetrated in the temporarily controlled or occupied territories. The Russian Federation must comply with its obligations as an occupying Power to respect, protect and guarantee the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories and to respect the law in force in Ukraine. Furthermore, it should address the concerns and

recommendations contained in the reports of the Secretary-General and OHCHR.

134. Regrettably, consultations on the draft resolution had not been held. It was essential to have a balanced text that took a broad view of the situation. In particular, the draft resolution did not call on all parties to refrain from using illicit weapons, such as cluster munitions, which, by their very nature, were inconsistent with the principles of international humanitarian law. For those reasons, her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

135. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. The current situation in Ukraine was what happened when you trusted the West. The decision-making bodies in Ukraine were suffering from a deep misunderstanding of international relations. It was therefore time to start highlighting the opinions of the Ukrainian people, as they were most likely not satisfied with the country's current decision-making process. Any attempt to stifle their voices would fail in the end.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.