



General Assembly

Sixty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2015

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 47th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 18 November 2014, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Ms. Mesquita Borges (Timor-Leste)

Contents

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

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

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@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/>).

14-65053 (E)



Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

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

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

(A/C.3/69/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.3/69/L.31, A/C.3/69/L.33 and A/C.3/69/L.63)

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.28/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

1. **Mr. Yoshikawa** (Japan) said that his delegation was extremely grateful to those who had voted against the amendment contained in document A/C.3/69/L.63, proposed by Cuba at the Committee's forty-sixth meeting. The commission of inquiry report provided the basis for the international community to respond to the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which continued to be of serious concern. In the report, the Commission had concluded that systematic, widespread and gross human rights violations had been and were being committed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and recommended that the Security Council take action to ensure accountability, including by referring the situation to the International Criminal Court. It had identified abductions carried out by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in foreign countries, including Japan. The immediate return of those abductees must be secured. Human Rights Council resolution 25/25 had recommended that the General Assembly submit the report to the Security Council for its consideration in order that those responsible for human rights violations were held to account.

2. At the previous two sessions of the General Assembly, the resolution on that topic had been adopted without a vote. In the event of a vote at the current session, Member States were urged to show their serious concern at the grave violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by voting in favour of the draft resolution.

3. **Mr. Myong Nam Choe** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) expressed gratitude to those who had supported the amendment proposed by Cuba. He said that his delegation categorically rejected the draft resolution, which was a product of political and military confrontation and a plot against the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea and therefore had no relevance to genuine human rights protection. The commission of inquiry, which had never visited his country, had based its report, on the fabricated testimonies of a handful of defectors who had committed crimes and fled the country. It was no more than a compilation of groundless political accusations and contradictions and, as such, had no credibility as an official United Nations document.

4. His delegation had consistently rejected confrontation and given priority to dialogue and cooperation in the area of human rights. It had clearly reaffirmed its intention to engage in broad-ranging and constructive cooperation. The States members of the European Union and Japan had chosen to provoke confrontation by trying to force the adoption of a draft resolution that failed to reflect reality. Those States pursued only political objectives by manipulating other States with coerciveness and political, military and economic pressure.

5. The hasty inclusion in the draft resolution of information taken from despicable leaflets distributed by a few defectors along the Military Demarcation Line had blocked the opportunity for relevant United Nations personnel to visit the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. His delegation did not see the need to appeal to anyone to see the reality of its country, where the politics and social system were for the people and guaranteed their rights. It was evident that the European Union and Japan did not seek genuine promotion and protection of human rights, but were simply subservient to the hostile policy of the United States of America towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Although his delegation seriously wished to cooperate in the area of human rights, it would respond strongly and with zero tolerance for any attempt by hostile forces to abuse the human rights issue as a tool for eliminating the social system of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

6. The draft resolution was a product of the hostile policy pursued by the United States in its attempt to eliminate the social system of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by force. The United States had instigated its followers to accuse the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of crimes against humanity. It was now clear that all the aggressive joint military exercises and nuclear strike drills that had been conducted in recent years in the Republic of Korea and its surroundings were linked to the vicious

human rights campaign staged by the European Union, Japan and the United States. Therefore, his Government needed to maintain a powerful State capability in order to defend the human rights of its people and was compelled to no longer refrain from conducting nuclear tests.

7. His people would remain proud of and do its upmost to defend the social system that it had chosen and developed. The draft resolution would have unpredictable and serious consequences, for which its sponsors and supporters should be held responsible. His delegation requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and would definitely vote against it. Representatives of Member States should demonstrate their rejection of political selectivity and double standards in human rights by voting against the confrontational draft resolution.

8. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution [A/C.3/69/L.28/Rev.1](#).

9. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation associated itself with the statement delivered at the Committee's forty-sixth meeting by the representative of Cuba on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. His delegation regretted that some States were trying to impose country-specific draft resolutions for political reasons and exert pressure on other regimes, threatening the very foundations of relations among States and destroying the universal understanding with regard to addressing human rights issues. It reiterated its complete rejection of a selective approach or any attempt to interfere in the affairs of other States. Such actions did not comply with the Charter of the United Nations, which enshrined the principle of equality among Member States. Any conclusions reached on the basis of politicized country-specific resolutions could not contribute to strengthening human rights around the world. The universal periodic review was the only mechanism that should be used to examine human rights situations in specific countries. His country would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

10. **Ms. Vadiati** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that her delegation firmly believed that the continuing selective adoption of country-specific resolutions, in particular in the Third Committee, and exploitation of that mechanism for political aims breached the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity and

undermined cooperation as an essential tool to promote and protect all universally recognized human rights. The universal periodic review provided an opportunity to review the human rights situation in all member States on an equal basis. Her delegation had decided to vote against all country-specific draft resolutions, including the one currently under consideration.

11. **Mr. Nuñez** (Cuba) said that his delegation maintained a position of principle against country-specific draft resolutions that singled out developing countries for political reasons unrelated to the protection of human rights. The harmful and selective practices of politicization and double standards in the examination of human rights had discredited the Commission on Human Rights and had led to its demise. The Human Rights Council, thanks in particular to its universal periodic review mechanism, was able to study the situation of human rights in all countries on an equal footing and as part of a genuine, constructive dialogue. The only way to promote and defend human rights effectively was through genuine international cooperation based on the principles of objectivity, non-conditionality, impartiality and non-selectivity. Cuba would not be complicit in establishing a precedent of manipulating Council procedures with a view to creating pretexts for meting out punishment or referring matters to the Security Council or the International Criminal Court, where the powerful were guaranteed impunity.

12. He expressed appreciation to those delegations that had voted in favour of Cuba's proposed amendment. Cuba would vote against the draft resolution. Its position on the draft resolution did not imply any value judgement concerning the pending issues referred to in paragraph 3 of the text, which called for a just and honourable solution with the agreement of all interested parties.

13. **Ms. Divakova** (Belarus) said that her delegation reiterated her country's rejection of the draft resolution. The mechanism of country-specific resolutions was not universally accepted and could not be considered legitimate. The sponsors of such resolutions should not be under the illusion that they could use them as they wished or that they could freely impose their views and ways of reviewing human rights on the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies. As one of the founding countries of the United Nations, Belarus could not allow that to happen

and it would vote against the draft resolution. It called on all delegations to follow its example.

14. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that, regardless of the situation in the country in question, his delegation rejected politically motivated reports and country-specific resolutions since they violated the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity that should govern the treatment of human rights issues and undermined the mandate of the Human Rights Council. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution. He urged Member States to build on the positive advances recorded since the establishment of the Council, particularly through the universal periodic review.

15. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that Ecuador condemned all human rights violations regardless of where they were committed and respectfully called on all countries, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to cooperate with human rights mechanisms. His delegation hoped that the investigation into the abduction of Japanese nationals would soon bear fruit. The universal periodic review, however, was the appropriate mechanism for examining human rights situations. Country-specific resolutions did not improve the situation in the country in question; on the contrary, they undermined international relations and cooperation. In the past, his delegation had abstained when draft resolutions on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been submitted, but operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of the current draft resolution were incompatible with the principle of cooperation upheld by Ecuador, and his delegation would therefore vote against the resolution.

16. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.28/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy,

Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Oman, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/ A/C.3/69/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted by 111 votes to 19, with 55 abstentions.*

18. **Mr. Bishnoi** (India) said that India had not acceded to the Rome Statute because that instrument did not shield the International Criminal Court (ICC) from political interference and granted the Security

Council power to refer, block and bind non-States parties, in violation of international law. Even more invidiously, the Statute gave non-States parties, working through the Security Council, the power to bind other non-States parties, as demonstrated in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft resolution. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the amendment to those paragraphs proposed by Cuba at the Committee's forty-sixth meeting but had no option other than to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as it stood. It was unfortunate that human rights matters were being submitted to a vote. The United Nations should be a forum for dialogue and cooperation, not confrontation.

19. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation was opposed to naming and shaming countries and to the use of country-specific resolutions to address human rights issues. Efforts to advance human rights should be pursued in a spirit of genuine dialogue aimed at constructive cooperation and in accordance with the principles of equality, impartiality, non-selectivity and non-politicization. Referring matters to the ICC would be counterproductive, and Pakistan had therefore abstained.

20. **Mr. Percaya** (Indonesia) said that his delegation wished that the draft resolution could have been adopted without a vote as had been the case in the past two years. There had been a window of opportunity to achieve consensus, but the lack of willingness from related parties had prevented that from happening. It was important for the Human Rights Council special procedures and mechanisms to promote genuine cooperation and dialogue, as well as to avoid becoming potential tools for political manipulation by certain countries. His delegation welcomed the willingness of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to open human rights dialogue with other countries and to cooperate with the United Nations human rights mechanisms, particularly the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and it hoped that those promises would be delivered. Indonesia continued to encourage the international community to work more collaboratively in order to create an environment that fostered dialogue and cooperation between the country concerned and the international community. For that

reason, Indonesia had decided to abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

21. **Mr. Lynn** (Myanmar) said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and based on its national position, his country steadfastly opposed country-specific resolutions that selectively targeted particular Member States. Despite recent positive changes, Myanmar remained one of the few countries targeted. However, it had chosen the path of cooperation and engagement to promote and protect the human rights of its people. The universal periodic review was the most dependable and uncontroversial monitoring mechanism for addressing the human rights situations of all countries, and country-specific resolutions did not serve that purpose. Myanmar had therefore voted against the draft resolution.

22. **Ms. Changtrakul** (Thailand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution out of genuine and serious concern about the ongoing deterioration of the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The willingness recently expressed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to cooperate with OHCHR and receive a visit from the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was an important window of opportunity that could potentially lead to tangible improvement on the ground, based on constructive engagement and cooperation.

23. Thailand had been particularly concerned about access to food in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It agreed with the commission of inquiry report that humanitarian assistance, especially the provision of food, should be provided without imposing any conditions or pressure.

24. Despite voting in support of the draft resolution, Thailand reaffirmed its goodwill towards the Government and people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and sincerely wished to see progress there in both human rights and socioeconomic development. She emphasized Thailand's unwavering support of genuine dialogue and encouraged the international community to take the opportunity to remain positively engaged with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

25. **Ms. Ntaba** (Zimbabwe) said that the targeting of individual countries through country-specific resolutions and the establishment of mandates

undermined the important work of the Committee. The universal periodic review mechanism remained best placed to address country-specific human rights issues on an equal footing and in a balanced manner. On that basis, her country had voted against the draft resolution and would do so for all resolutions of that nature.

26. The Security Council was not the appropriate body for considering human rights. The Third Committee should not institutionalize the practice of taking measures in relation to Member States based on information that had not been authenticated by a country visit. Her delegation had therefore voted in favour of Cuba's proposed amendment on the basis of that principle and in rejection of the precedent that would be set by paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Raja Zaib Shah** (Malaysia) said that his delegation firmly believed in a non-confrontational approach to all interstate matters, including the issue of human rights. Malaysia favoured constructive dialogue and cooperation with the intention of improving the state of affairs with due respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity. It also propagated impartiality, non-selectivity and transparency in matters related to human rights.

28. Malaysia believed that dialogue and constructive engagement, as well as the country visit by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, should take precedence over any punitive action, including any referral of the situation to the International Criminal Court. On that basis, his delegation had decided to abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

29. **Mr. Guilherme de Aguiar Patriota** (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It recognized the progress made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea towards deeper engagement with the United Nations human rights system, but there was still room for improvement. It took note of the reported arrangements between that State and Japan concerning victims of abduction and missing individuals and urged the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take concrete steps to address that issue. It praised the decision of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to invite the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to visit the country and hoped that the invitation would be

formalized in the near future. However, his delegation remained deeply concerned at the conclusions of the commission of inquiry report and other official reports presented to the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. It hoped that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would make further progress towards the enjoyment of all human rights in the country.

30. **Mr. Thammavongsa** (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that his delegation shared the position of many countries that country-specific resolutions were not an appropriate way for the international community to achieve universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Inquiries into individual countries were against the principles of non-politicization, non-discrimination, non-selectivity and respect for national independence and sovereignty. The referral of a human rights issue to the Security Council contradicted the true principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as the Security Council was mandated to deal with international peace and security. The universal periodic review was the most suitable forum for engaging in discussion and review of human rights in any country and was of the utmost importance when engaging with the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the international human rights system. In that regard, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution.

31. **Mr. Do Hung Viet** (Viet Nam) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution on the basis that constructive dialogue and cooperation, particularly through the universal periodic review, were the only appropriate and effective approaches to address human rights concerns. His delegation noted the readiness of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to conduct bilateral human rights dialogue, invite the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to visit the country and cooperate with OHCHR. It hoped that concrete steps would be taken in a spirit of constructive dialogue and positive engagement. His delegation stood firmly against all acts of abduction and extended its thoughts and sympathies to the victims and their families. It called on the parties concerned to find a satisfactory solution to that issue.

32. **Ms. Ali** (Singapore) said that her delegation maintained its principled position against country-specific resolutions, because they were highly selective

and often driven by political rather than human rights considerations. Its abstention should not be regarded as taking a position on the human rights situation in the country concerned or condoning the mistreatment of citizens. Her delegation noted that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had shown willingness to engage in human rights dialogue with the international community and encouraged it to continue that engagement.

33. **Mr. Kim Song** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation wished to thank delegations that had voted against the confrontational draft resolution, which it categorically rejected. The forced adoption of the draft resolution clearly showed that the so-called human rights dialogue advocated by the European Union was only intended to pursue sinister political objectives aimed at eliminating the ideology and social system of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. His country would continue to move forward in the direction of its choice and to safeguard its socialist system.

34. **Ms. Larsen** (Norway) said that her delegation supported the draft resolution because of deep concern at the ongoing systematic, widespread and gross violations of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It welcomed the recent willingness expressed by that State to consider human rights dialogues with States and accept a country visit from the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and expected it to follow through on those commitments.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.31: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

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

36. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Botswana, Libya, Mauritania, Moldova, San Marino, Seychelles and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors.

37. **Mr. Al-Mouallimi** (Saudi Arabia) presented the draft resolution on behalf of the Arab sponsors, namely Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. Georgia, Montenegro, Palau and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. The sponsors of the draft resolution had come together to bring attention to the deteriorating human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, as well as the documented violations of international

human rights instruments. They wished to speak out for the Syrian people, who were still affected by killings, displacement, sieges and terrorism whose only parallels in contemporary history were the massacres in Rwanda and the tragedy in Cambodia. Since the adoption of the Committee's third resolution on the topic in the previous year, the Syrian authorities had continued to perpetrate atrocities using various methods, including barrel bombs; chemical weapons and chloride gas; starvation; sexual violence against women, children and even men; and enforced displacement. More than 200,000 people had been killed, with hundreds of thousands injured and more than 3 million displaced. There was also an indeterminate number of detainees in prisons and torture centres.

38. His brother and colleague the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic would say that the draft resolution was country-specific, which was something that the Non-Aligned Movement and other countries opposed. However, the draft resolution was sponsored by over 16 States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and it was in fact situation-specific, rather than country-specific. It addressed a specific situation that humanity had not witnessed before during that century.

39. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic would also say that the war was carried out by the Government against terrorism and accuse Saudi Arabia and other sponsors of supporting terrorism. Such accusations had come to sound like a broken record. Saudi Arabia had backed its words with actions, and its counter-terrorism efforts, in cooperation with its Arab and international allies, were plain to see. Before the international community had done so, Saudi Arabia had placed the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and the Nusra Front on terrorist lists and had criminalized activities that supported such organizations. It had supported the establishment of the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre along with other specialized centres throughout the world. The Syrian Government, in connivance with ISIL, had freed terrorists from prisons and allowed them to infiltrate Iraq.

40. The sponsors had sought balance in the draft resolution's condemnation of all acts of terrorism whatever the source or the perpetrators. It had condemned ISIL, the Nusra Front and other terrorist groups through which the Syrian Government had

committed war crimes and crimes against humanity. It had urged the unconditional withdrawal of all foreign terrorist combatants from the Syrian Arab Republic, whatever their affiliation or nationality and whatever front they were fighting on. Everyone who had committed war crimes or crimes against humanity must be brought to justice. Bringing an end to the human tragedy required a just solution that respected the sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic, preserved its territorial integrity and realized the aspirations of the Syrian people in terms of change, freedom and security, irrespective of religion, sect or affiliation. In accordance with the Geneva communiqué, a transitional Government with broad executive powers should be established in order to undertake the necessary constitutional reforms.

41. Voting in favour of the draft resolution would send a clear message that the international community stood in solidarity with the Syrian people in its tragedy and fight against injustice. It would also send a clear message against terrorism, irrespective of the perpetrator and without selectivity or political considerations. Saudi Arabia urged delegations to vote in favour of the draft resolution to be on the right side of history and stand by the Syrian people. He urged the Syrian people to stand firm; gold could be melted, but never burned.

42. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Monaco had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

43. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the representative of Saudi Arabia had borrowed his image of melting gold from the great Iraqi poet Muhammad Mahdi al-Jawahiri, whose intent he had distorted; the poem had been written in defence of Damascus against Wahhabi terrorism. The claim that the representative of Saudi Arabia spoke on behalf of the Arab States was also a gross misrepresentation; not all Arab States were sponsoring the draft resolution. Moreover, the representative of Saudi Arabia insisted on referring to him as his "brother", while at the same time committing the sin of Cain against Abel.

44. The statement made on behalf of the Saudi regime, the Qatari regime and others was like a media stunt similar to those of Al Jazeera and Al Arabiya. To hear the representative of Saudi Arabia preach about human rights was reminiscent of the theatre of the absurd to the point of being beyond Kafkaesque.

Neither the Saudi nor the Qatari regime knew the meaning of the right to vote; power was transferred by coup, inheritance or murder, and those changes were dictated from abroad. Hundreds of reports showed that those regimes, together with the Turkish Government, were involved in promoting terrorism in his country, making it impossible to reach a political solution. In October 2014, the Saudi prince Alwaleed bin Talal had stated through the news channel CNN that the Saudi regime and sheikhs from the Gulf States had supported and funded terrorist groups in Syria, including ISIL. CNN had reported that Qatar was backing Al-Qaida and ISIL. In close connection with Israel, Qatar had also supported the operations of the Nusra Front in Syria, including the abduction of Fijian members of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Syrian Golan. In paying ransom to the Nusra Front, Qatar and the United Nations itself had violated the provisions of Security Council resolution 2133 (2014).

45. The involvement of Turkey, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf States had also been remarked on by the Vice President of the United States, Joe Biden. Moreover, studies had shown that Saudi Arabia was one of the three main exporters of terrorists to Syria, along with Tunisia and Morocco. Meanwhile, according to INTERPOL, Turkey, which had made toppling the Syrian regime a policy objective, had facilitated the passage of thousands of terrorist mercenaries into the Syrian Arab Republic. The Turkish Government had even opened terrorist training camps, and had said that the Syrian Government must fall in order for Syrian civilians in Ayn al-Arab to be saved from ISIL.

46. It was bizarre that Saudi Arabia would submit a draft resolution supporting the mandate of the Special Envoy of the United Nations on Syria, since it had refused to receive successive Special Envoys. Instead, the Saudi regime was training terrorists and supplying them with chemical weapons with a view to sending the Syrian Arab Republic back to the Dark Ages. In Saudi Arabia, women were denied all their rights and people were discriminated against on the grounds of their race, colour and religious beliefs. The violation of the rights of Shia Muslims in eastern Saudi Arabia had been reliably documented. Saudi law allowed the flogging of anyone who did not perform their prayers, in violation of the right to freedom of worship and the Islamic precept of tolerance.

47. The United Nations had an obligation to discern the true intentions of the draft resolution's sponsors, which were using terrorism to convert the Syrian Arab Republic into a failed State, as in Somalia and Libya. In the past three years, those sponsors had played their roles in the jihadist theatrics in the Third Committee, rather than direct their diplomatic jihad against the Israeli occupation of Palestine or come to the rescue of Jerusalem or the occupied Syrian Golan. The sponsors had rejected any positive reference to the efforts made by the Syrian Government to tackle terrorism in his country. They had abjectly failed to understand the threat posed by terrorism. The current draft resolution and its predecessors belonged in the dustbin of shame.

48. The world had produced many great literary figures, but Qatar and Saudi Arabia could boast only a series of embarrassing fatwas on such topics as the drinking of donkey urine and marriage jihad; the marriage of Syrian girls in the Za'tari refugee camp in Jordan; the execution of human rights advocates in Saudi Arabia; and the use of petrodollars to buy people off.

49. He had before him a letter from the Minister of the Interior to the Director of Prisons requesting the release of prisoners on death row, provided that they were shipped to the Syrian Arab Republic. He also had a letter from the chargé d'affaires a.i. of Saudi Arabia in Tripoli, Libya, stating that he had recruited 1,000 Libyan terrorists for deployment to Syria.

50. The sponsors of the draft resolution were trying to interfere in the internal affairs of another State under the pretext of promoting human rights. It was nothing but shameful theatre. And his delegation knew who was behind Saudi Arabia and Qatar, since many delegations had reported receiving calls from the representatives of Turkey, United Kingdom and United States encouraging them to vote in favour of the resolution. He asked for a recorded vote and urged Member States to vote against the resolution.

51. **Mr. Lamek** (France) said that the Syrian regime had relentlessly shot, tortured and bombed its people for over three years. It had used increasingly destructive and inhumane weapons, including chemical weapons and barrel bombs, against civilians with total impunity. Over 180,000 people, including 10,000 children, had died as a result, and the humanitarian situation was catastrophic. The draft resolution, which was sponsored by over 60 countries, would send a

clear message condemning the systematic violations of international human rights law by both the regime and other parties to the conflict. It would also allow the international community to express its solidarity with the Syrian people and the communities in the neighbouring countries affected by the crisis, as well as support for the mission of the new Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Syria, Staffan de Mistura, who faced a formidable task. France would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution and encouraged all delegations to do the same.

52. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that her delegation called on all Member States to vote in favour of the resolution. Recent reports of the commission of inquiry showed that the regime of President Assad, associated militias and ISIL had committed multiple violations of human rights law, including mass killings, rape, torture, public executions, chemical attacks and abductions. The Assad regime continued to imprison thousands of people arbitrarily and subject many of them, including children, to ill-treatment and torture. Syrian groups estimated that over 200,000 persons had been detained, including 35,000 political prisoners; a further 85,000 persons had been forcibly disappeared. The efforts to achieve sustainable peace in the Syrian Arab Republic required the robust response of the General Assembly in the form of condemnation of the atrocities and insistence on accountability, as called for in the draft resolution.

53. **Mr. Emadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the draft resolution under consideration was confrontational and would not improve human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic. It failed to refer to the unprecedented acts, including suicide bombings, committed by armed terrorist groups against Syrians or to the negative impact of the unilateral sanctions imposed on the country that had aggravated the humanitarian crisis. It was the international community's responsibility to facilitate a Syrian-led dialogue to end the violence and bring about reconciliation. His delegation commended the Syrian Arab Republic for complying with the chemical weapons treaties to which it had acceded. The use of chemical weapons by opposition groups must also be acknowledged. The universal periodic review was the mechanism for examining human rights situations; country-specific resolutions violated the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity essential

for protecting those rights. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

54. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution [A/C.3/69/L.31](#).

55. **Ms. Divakova** (Belarus) said that country-specific resolutions constituted interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and exertion of political pressure. The country-specific draft resolution on the human rights situation in Syria undermined the founding principles of the United Nations with regard to respect for the national sovereignty of States. Her country called on the authors of the draft resolution to find a new way and mechanism to regulate the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic, rather than a counterproductive and ineffective country-specific resolution. Only through regulation of the conflict would human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic be truly respected. Since the authors of the resolution were effectively undermining the founding principles of the United Nations, Belarus could not support their actions and would vote against the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Al-Mouallimi** (Saudi Arabia) said that, as a mere diplomat, he would not attempt to compete in intellectual allusions with the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, whose comments on literature appeared to be vindictive in nature. As for his calling the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic a brother, he hoped that the latter would, at the very least, acknowledge the brotherhood of humanity. The fact that the draft resolution was based on the reports of the Secretary-General, the commission of inquiry and other United Nations entities, while the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic cited media and unknown sources, underscored the difference in their statements. He wished to clarify that no message had been sent by any representative of Saudi Arabia in Libya, as claimed by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, and his Government would welcome a visit from the Secretary-General's Special Representative for Syria at any time.

57. **Mr. Kim Jin Song** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that country-specific resolutions had nothing to do with the genuine promotion and protection of human rights and were manifestations of politicization, selectivity and double standards. Human rights issues had to be addressed through the universal periodic review and promoted through dialogue and cooperation based on respect for

territorial integrity and sovereignty. The draft resolution was politically motivated and aimed to exert pressure on the Syrian Arab Republic. His delegation would therefore vote against it.

58. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said he would send the two letters he had mentioned earlier to the secretariat of the Third Committee to support his affirmation. The other information that he had provided had been reported by a centre for Gulf studies based in Washington, D.C., and not in Damascus.

59. He was pleased that Saudi Arabia was willing to support the mission of the Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Syria, and he hoped that would mean the end of the dispatch of terrorists from Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey to his country. It was surely a novel development for democracy in Saudi Arabia that the country's representative could refer to Prince Alwaleed bin Talal, a member of the royal family, as an unknown source.

60. The Saudi and Qatari regimes spread ignorance and extremism and harmed the image of Islam and Arabs throughout the world, suppressed the rights of their own people and served the interests of Israel. He supported the legitimate aspirations of the people of Saudi Arabia and Qatar for openness to the outside world, freedom from shameful fatwas and obscurantist customs, freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, gender equality, political pluralism, equitable distribution of wealth, transfer of power and the right to vote. In his country, the Vice President was a woman; in Saudi Arabia, the son of the King had prevented female doctors from driving golf carts even around the campus of the hospital in which they worked. Yet Europe and the United States would not submit a draft resolution on the human rights situation in Saudi Arabia and Qatar; instead they would align themselves with those flagrant human rights violators as long as Saudi oil flowed through the veins of their economies. The historic name of the Arabian peninsula had been replaced with that of the Saudi royal family. That the country's representatives wanted to talk about human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic was therefore not only laughable, it insulted the intelligence of the Committee.

61. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that, regardless of the situation in the country in question, his delegation rejected politically motivated reports and country-specific resolutions

since they violated the principles of universality, non-selectivity and objectivity that should govern the treatment of human rights issues and undermined the mandate of the Human Rights Council. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution. He urged Member States to build on the positive advances recorded since the establishment of the Council, particularly through the universal periodic review.

62. **Mr. Viktorov** (Russian Federation) said that his country would vote against the draft resolution, which constituted yet another attempt to turn the Third Committee into a body that churned out politicized, country-specific resolutions with the sole aim of exerting pressure on the Governments of Member States. Such an approach was unacceptable.

63. The draft resolution under consideration unfortunately brought an atmosphere of confrontation and mistrust to the General Assembly at a time when it was so important for the international community to consolidate its efforts to achieve a peaceful solution to the crisis in the Syrian Arab Republic. Even though it was the foreign opposition that needed to be encouraged to engage in negotiations, the sponsors of the draft resolution had placed the greatest responsibility for the situation on the Government, thus reducing the chance of a political and diplomatic settlement. The draft resolution contained groundless accusations against the Syrian Government, but nothing was said about the many crimes of the anti-government armed groups that continued to kill peaceful citizens, commit acts of torture, bomb residential areas, schools and other civil buildings, and take hostages. The draft resolution also did not mention the bandits who were purging areas with religious minorities of Christians, Alawites and Kurds.

64. The Russian Federation was committed to finding a rapid and peaceful solution to the situation in the Syrian Arab Republic and was counting on the firm support of the entire international community to that end.

65. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that Ecuador had, since the outset of the crisis, condemned the serious human rights violations committed in the Syrian Arab Republic and called for the prosecution of those responsible for the violence, as well as of those who supplied the different parties with arms. Since the discussion of the first resolution on the human rights situation in the country, the violent acts and human

rights violations committed by extremists had intensified. The draft resolution failed to take into account all the parties responsible for the crisis, as well as the need to respect the sovereignty of the Syrian Arab Republic and pursue an all-inclusive solution. Instead, it tended to polarize the conflict. Human rights issues should be addressed through the specialized mechanisms of the human rights treaty body system, such as the universal periodic review. Country-specific resolutions only politicized the situation and did not help the victims of violence. Ecuador would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

66. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Côte d'Ivoire had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

68. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.31.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern

Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen.

Against:

Belarus, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Grenada, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Tajikistan, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zambia.

68. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.31 was adopted by 125 votes to 13, with 47 abstentions.*

69. **Mr. Zhang** Guixuan (China) said that his delegation opposed the politicization of human rights and attempts to use them as a pretext for exerting pressure on certain countries. His delegation had therefore voted against the resolution.

70. **Ms. Yassine** (Brazil) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on account of the gross violations of human rights occurring in the Syrian Arab Republic, but found the text to be imbalanced in its treatment of the violations committed by armed groups opposed to the Syrian Government. Placing blame on only one party would not contribute to a peaceful solution to the conflict. Indiscriminate references in the text to armed groups as "terrorists" without the term having been defined by the United Nations might also have harmful consequences. Furthermore, the draft resolution misrepresented the findings of the commission of inquiry on the use of chemical weapons. Such weapons had been confiscated from armed opposition groups as well as the Syrian authorities. The inclusion of text stressing the international community's responsibility to protect through peaceful means, in addition to the responsibility of the national Government to do so,

would have been a welcome development. There would be never be a military solution to the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic, and her delegation called for a comprehensive arms embargo in the region and for talks to be held to end the violence. In the meantime, all parties must respect international human rights and humanitarian law and guarantee unhindered access for humanitarian assistance providers.

71. **Mr. Ruidiaz** (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution as an expression of its condemnation of the mass violations of human rights occurring in the Syrian Arab Republic, including the use of chemical weapons, sexual violence and denial of access to humanitarian aid. His delegation also condemned the violence to which Syrian children were being exposed and called for the full implementation of Security Council resolution 2143 (2014). However, the resolution just adopted should have stated more emphatically that non-State armed groups and groups designated as terrorist organizations by the Security Council had committed human rights violations, as well as Government forces and pro-Government militias. Furthermore, the value and validity of the "Caesar" report mentioned in the resolution had yet to be confirmed by the pertinent United Nations bodies.

72. All those responsible for human rights violations in the Syrian Arab Republic must be held accountable, including by referring cases to the ICC. To do otherwise would deny the victims justice and empower the perpetrators. It was also essential to pursue truth and reconciliation and, in that regard, his delegation welcomed the registration of crimes begun by the independent commission of inquiry and supported the calls for a political solution to the conflict. That solution must come from Syrians themselves and be a fully inclusive process aimed at establishing full democracy in accordance with the Geneva Communiqué of 30 June 2012. It was also essential to end militarization and the flow of arms into the Syrian Arab Republic. Only then might the deterioration of the human rights situation in the country and the region be reversed.

73. **Mr. Fernandez Valoni** (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it reflected international concern over the grave human rights situation in the Syrian Arab Republic. All parties should put an end to the violence and violations of human rights and international humanitarian law and should be held responsible

before the law. However, the catastrophic situation in the country was the result of the uninterrupted militarization of the conflict and the growing violence being exercised against the civilian population. The emergence of ISIL and other extremist groups showed that it was impossible to predict all outcomes of a conflict and that there was a risk of terrorist groups forming or gaining influence in such situations. His delegation was, therefore, disappointed that the draft resolution did not explicitly call for an end to international financing and provision of arms and materiel for the conflict.

74. His delegation also rejected paragraph 19 of the draft resolution, which blamed the Government for the use of chlorine gas as a weapon, as the mandate of the fact-finding mission of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons had been limited to determining whether or not chemical weapons had been used. Similarly, the General Assembly did not have the right to directly or indirectly determine responsibility for any such acts. Lastly, there had been too little consultation on the draft. A draft that was more representative of the views of the General Assembly would have had a greater impact.

75. **Mr. Raja Zaib Shah** (Malaysia) said that human rights violations committed by all parties to the conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic continued to worsen, despite the issue having been on the agenda of the General Assembly for over three years. A draft resolution on that issue had been proposed once again because of the dire situation on the ground and because the international community had not been able to find a workable multilateral solution. All parties concerned, both within and outside of Syria, should refrain from any action that would prolong the conflict and contribute to further violence and bloodshed. His delegation was appalled by the human rights abuses perpetrated against the innocent people of the Syrian Arab Republic by ISIL and other terrorist foreign fighters. It therefore particularly welcomed the condemnation of the involvement of extremists and terrorist groups in the country and would continue to support international efforts to combat terrorism.

76. While his country maintained a policy of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States and respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, it was deeply concerned by the level of violence, the security and humanitarian situations and the human rights abuses in the Syrian Arab Republic, which

would have a serious impact on the stability and security of the region. His country had once again supported the draft resolution because of its strong belief in the multilateral system and its ability to find an amicable and solution to the conflict, negotiated in good faith. A peaceful solution was not only still viable but was, in fact, the only option for resolving the crisis.

77. **Ms. Savitri** (Indonesia) said that country-specific resolutions were often counter-productive to the Committee's efforts to promote and protect human rights. Nevertheless, her delegation remained deeply concerned about the ongoing conflict in the Syrian Arab Republic. All parties to the conflict must be urged to immediately cease their acts of violence and hostilities, including through a local ceasefire agreement; to demonstrate the utmost respect for human rights and humanitarian law; and to ensure unhindered and safe humanitarian access to those in need. All parties to the conflict should steadfastly pursue a peaceful resolution to the conflict through an inclusive, Syrian-led political process. Her delegation had, therefore, voted in favour of the draft resolution.

78. **Ms. Ali** (Singapore) said that her delegation would abstain from voting on all three draft resolutions under discussion at the meeting, owing to its principled position against country-specific resolutions, which were often highly selective and driven by political considerations as well as being inherently divisive and counter-productive. Human rights issues in individual Member States should be addressed by the Human Rights Council through the universal periodic review mechanism. Her delegation's abstention should not be considered to imply a particular position on the human rights situation in the country concerned, or as condoning the mistreatment of citizens. It called upon all Member States to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

79. **Mr. Nuñez** (Cuba) said that his country maintained a position of principle against country-specific draft resolutions. The Human Rights Council, thanks in particular to its universal periodic review mechanism, was able to study the situation of human rights in all countries on an equal footing and as part of a genuine, constructive dialogue. Cuba had opposed initiatives against specific countries in both the Third Committee and the Human Rights Council and would continue to vote against such draft resolutions and to disassociate itself from the consensus in cases where there was no voting record.

80. **Ms. Sucuoğlu** (Turkey) said that Member States had once again overwhelmingly confirmed that the resolution was relevant and justified. His country, in close cooperation with the United Nations and other international organizations, would continue to support the Syrian people, who were being collectively punished.

81. **Mr. Mahmoud** (Egypt) said that his country had once again joined the sponsors of the draft resolution because of the violations of human rights and international humanitarian law that were being committed by the Syrian authorities and the other parties to the conflict on an unprecedented scale. However, his delegation had some reservations concerning the references to international justice and stressed the paramount importance of ensuring that no issue covered by the resolution was politicized. There could be no military solution to the crisis and all parties to the conflict were urged to come to a negotiated settlement, which would be the only way to meet the legitimate aspirations of the Syrian people, preserve the territorial integrity of the State and put an end to terrorism.

Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.33: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

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

83. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Palau, Panama, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tuvalu and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors.

84. **Mr. Rishchynski** (Canada), speaking as the main sponsor of the draft resolution, said that New Zealand had joined the sponsors. In spite of the statements made by the Islamic Republic of Iran the previous year, which had caused Member States to hope that the human rights situation in that country would improve and that its Government would begin to better engage with the international community to address ongoing challenges, there had been little concrete improvement and a number of extremely troubling developments. While addressing human rights challenges was difficult and took time, violations in the country had continued, respect for the rights of women, girls and ethnic minorities had worsened and the authorities had further limited the space for large numbers of the population to exercise their basic freedoms and rights. The draft

resolution had been introduced because such a context made it even more important for the international community to demonstrate support for those within the country who continued to pursue positive reforms, at great personal risk.

85. The text did acknowledge the few instances where the Islamic Republic of Iran had taken steps in a positive direction, including its recent cooperation with the United Nations treaty bodies and the submission of its second report to the universal periodic review mechanism. His delegation hoped that those steps would lead to concrete action and improvement, in contrast to the 2010 universal periodic review, when very few of the accepted recommendations had actually been implemented. The sponsors hoped to see positive developments, but the international community was extremely concerned by the current human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran, which fell short of its own constitutional framework. As the sole universal membership body responsible for addressing international human rights issues, the Third Committee had an obligation to underline situations of grave concern. Those in the country, both within and outside the Government, who sought meaningful and lasting reform deserved the support of the Committee in making sustainable change a reality.

86. **Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the draft resolution, like the previous 12 resolutions on the same matter, was a hostile, confrontational act by Canada disguised as an attempt to defend those who, in Canada's view, were being denied their rights. However, Canada's brazen defence of the Israeli criminals who had committed the recent atrocities against the civilian population of Gaza, which had been condemned by almost the entire international community, was proof that the country was not concerned with human rights. Dismissing comments made by the United Nations High Commissioner, Canada had stated that Israel had the right and an obligation to attack Gaza and that solidarity with Israel would be the best way to end the conflict. That reaction suggested that Canada was not interested in human rights but rather in furthering its own political agenda, including by introducing the biased and prejudicial draft resolution under discussion. If the sponsors were genuinely concerned about human rights, they should have first submitted a draft resolution condemning the Israeli regime for terrorizing the civilian population of Gaza and trampling the rights of Arabs and the

inhabitants of the occupied territories on a daily basis, as documented by international organizations.

87. The draft resolution took partial, unbalanced and politicized approach. Its general thrust was to portray Iranian society as closed and single-voiced, whereas in reality it was a vibrant and multi-voiced society with a broad spectrum of political tendencies and media outlets and an array of cultures and subcultures representing different sectors of society as well as multiple ethnic and religious groups. Furthermore, the text did not acknowledge the recent positive human rights developments in his country, particularly since the new Government had come into power. The text therefore ran counter to the choice of the Iranian people, who had voted in large numbers for the new Government.

88. The draft also ignored the Government's consistent readiness to cooperate with United Nations human rights mechanisms. The Government had already demonstrated its commitment to working with the universal periodic review mechanism through its reporting and its implementation of the recommendations received. The universal periodic review was well-placed to be successful, as it was universal, forward-looking and tended towards encouraging States rather than punishing them, thereby avoiding encroaching on their national sovereignty.

89. In contrast, the approach based on country-specific resolutions and mandates had been shown to be detrimental to the effective and impartial work of the United Nations human rights system, as it tended to be used to settle scores rather than to promote human rights. Not only did issuing country-specific resolutions and mandates place a financial burden on the United Nations, particularly when it resulted in double reporting, but it had become an objective in itself, with certain special rapporteurs having to sideline truth and accuracy and seek out allegations to include in their reports in order to justify the existence of the mandate. That could clearly be seen in the reports on his country by the Special Rapporteur and the Secretary-General, which used sources who had vested interests and were therefore unreliable. For those reasons, country-specific resolutions and mandates increased distrust, damaged the credibility of the United Nations and created the impression that the organization was biased against certain countries. They made cooperation difficult, if not impossible, and their

effect was ultimately the opposite of what their proponents claimed to pursue.

90. His country had constantly demonstrated its readiness to engage in a serious and results-oriented approach to human rights based on equality and mutual respect as well as its resilience in the face of pressure, injustice and unilateral, coercive measures. While other parts of the region were burning in the fire of extremism and radicalism, primarily as a result of the ill-conceived policies of certain States, and while the world was facing a threat posed by extremist forces that required a unified response, short-sighted and politically motivated vendettas such as that embodied in the draft resolution were counterproductive and pointless, in addition to being irrelevant to the pursuit of human rights. His delegation requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and hoped that Member States would preserve the dignity and credibility of the United Nations human rights mechanisms by voting against it.

91. **Ms. Divakova** (Belarus) said that the draft resolution did not reflect the real human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. It ignored the positive steps taken by the Government in order to implement the recommendations made during the universal periodic review. The Islamic Republic of Iran had adopted a number of new laws to protect children, strengthen its family policy, and improve criminal legislation, labour protection and education, as well as a draft law on the rights of citizens. There was a national mechanism for the promotion of the rights of women, children, religious minorities and ethnic groups. The Islamic Republic of Iran was constructively cooperating with human rights special procedures and treaty bodies. It had successfully completed the second cycle of the universal periodic review.

92. The resolution once again confirmed that a group of countries was trying to exert politically motivated pressure on the Islamic Republic of Iran and impose that approach on the General Assembly. In essence, it undermined the universally accepted universal periodic review mechanism and did not comply with the principles or Charter of the United Nations. Such an approach was being used to justify the use of biased, coercive measures against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Belarus, as one of the founding members of the United Nations, could never support such an initiative and would vote against the draft resolution.

93. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution [A/C.3/69/L.33](#).

94. **Mr. Kim Song** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation opposed country-specific resolutions and was deeply concerned at the lack of justice and impartiality demonstrated when addressing the issue of human rights. Politically motivated actions targeting specific States did not promote or protect human rights but rather aggravated distrust. The draft resolution was clearly politically motivated and was in violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the right to sovereignty. Human rights could not be imposed externally, and country-specific resolutions only undermined trust between potential partners. In view of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's principled position against the use of politics, double standards and selectivity in the area of human rights, his Government would vote against the draft resolution.

95. **Mr. Zhang Guixuan** (China) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution because country-specific resolutions violated the purpose and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and were impractical in practice. Such resolutions only undermined mutual trust and led to confrontation and did nothing to further the protection and promotion of human rights.

96. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Venezuela) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, as it rejected politically motivated selectivity on human rights issues and any country-specific resolution drawn up for the purposes of taking a political decision. Using human rights for political ends was a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and politically motivated country-specific resolutions violated the principles of universality, objectivity and non-selectivity that should be applied when addressing such issues. Member States were urged to build on the progress that had been made since the creation of the Council, particularly through the universal periodic review mechanism, and avoid weakening the mandate of the Council by adopting country-specific resolutions.

97. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that his country fully supported the work and institutions of the Human Rights Council, which was the appropriate body to undertake consideration of human rights situations, and urged all countries to contribute to the universal periodic review process, which enabled progress to be made while

respecting the principles of universality, impartiality, objectivity, equal treatment and non-selectivity. Country-specific resolutions did nothing to improve the human rights situations in the countries concerned and were detrimental to relations between States, constructive dialogue and international cooperation. His delegation therefore urged all Member States to put an end to such practices, which were the very practices that had led to the dissolution of the Human Rights Commission. His Government rejected the continued harassment of certain developing countries for political reasons and would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting

98. **Ms. Alsaleh** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her country rejected foreign interference in domestic matters on the pretext of protecting human rights, which should be addressed through the concerted approach that had been agreed upon: the universal periodic review. Dialogue based on the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-selectivity and transparency was the only way to promote cooperation between countries to protect human rights, leaving political considerations aside. Moreover, countries should not be singled out for reasons unrelated to human rights. Politicized, country-specific resolutions would only serve to entrench the politicization of the work of the Committee and waste a valuable opportunity to protect human rights. For those reasons, her country would vote against the draft resolution.

99. **Mr. Viktorov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation consistently opposed one-sided and selective country-specific resolutions. The universal periodic review had been created to review the human rights situation in countries and had proven its effectiveness and efficiency. The Russian Federation was amazed at the sponsors' persistence in submitting a draft resolution on the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic of Iran every year. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

100. **Mr. Nuñez** (Cuba) said that his country maintained a position of principle against country-specific draft resolutions designed to single out developing countries for political reasons unrelated to the protection of human rights. The harmful and selective practices of politicization and double standards were responsible for discrediting the

Commission on Human Rights, which had led to its demise. The universal periodic review mechanism was able to study the situation of human rights in all countries on an equal footing and as part of a genuine, constructive dialogue. The only way to promote and defend human rights effectively was through genuine international cooperation based on the principles of objectivity, non-conditionality, impartiality and non-selectivity. Therefore, Cuba would vote against the draft resolution and other similar resolutions in the Third Committee, as it had done at the Human Rights Council.

101. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.33.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cabo Verde, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Against:

Afghanistan, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia.

102. *Draft resolution A/C.3/69/L.33 was adopted by 78 votes to 35, with 69 abstentions.*

103. **Mr. Lynn** (Myanmar) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it maintained a principled position against country-specific resolutions, both in its national capacity and as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement. Myanmar was one of the few States that had been targeted, in spite of the progress that it had made. While his country had chosen to cooperate and engage with the process, it believed that the way to promote and protect human rights was to strengthen the capacity of Member States to fulfil their obligations and commitments, through cooperation and genuine dialogue, and maintained its conviction that the universal periodic review was the most dependable and uncontroversial monitoring mechanism that could be used to address all human rights situations on equal footing.

104. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) said that his country had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The commitments made by the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran to improve the human rights situation in the country were welcome. It was important to build trust between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the international community, and his delegation was pleased to have been able to enter into a dialogue with that country the previous year and intended to continue its constructive dialogue and cooperation. Nevertheless, it recognized that there were many areas in which improvement was still required and expected

the Islamic Republic of Iran to strengthen its dialogue with the international community, cooperate with United Nations mechanisms and accept a visit from the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. For those reasons, his country had supported but not sponsored the draft resolution.

105. **Mr. Ruidiaz** (Chile) said that the promotion and protection of human rights and collaboration with the multilateral human rights system in this regard were key elements of his country's foreign policy. His country was committed to active participation and engagement in dialogue in both the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly on all human rights issues, including those related to specific countries. It encouraged States to make use of all human rights mechanisms, including the special procedures, and urged the Islamic Republic of Iran to increase its cooperation with multilateral bodies in order to address the concerns set out in the reports of the Secretary General and the Special Rapporteur. The President's comments were encouraging, as were the positive steps that had been taken, including reforms to the criminal code and the submission of the universal periodic review and reports to treaty bodies. His country hoped that the Government would follow through on the invitation that it had made to the Special Rapporteur several years previously. Chile had voted in favour of the resolution on the present occasion. Its future position would be determined by the extent to which the commitments made by the Islamic Republic of Iran had been fulfilled.

106. **Mr. Dehghani** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the significant number of Member States that had voted against the draft resolution had thereby indicated their rejection of, or at least their doubts concerning, the primarily politically motivated approach of country-specific resolutions. Such an approach ran counter to the objectives of the United Nations human rights system and the noble causes that the Organization had been founded to further. Nevertheless, in spite of the adversarial approach taken by certain countries, his Government would continue to cooperate with the United Nations human rights bodies and continued to hope that progress could be made through appropriate mechanisms and means.

107. **Ms. Ortigosa** (Uruguay) said that, according to the Secretary-General's report, that there had been some improvements in the human rights situation in

the Islamic Republic of Iran and her delegation welcomed the positive commitments and proposals that the new Government had made with regard to freedom of expression and non-discrimination. However, those commitments had to translate into real change and engagement with the United Nations human rights bodies, and there were still many serious human rights violations taking place in the country. Her delegation rejected the practices carried out by the Islamic Republic of Iran in violation of human rights and personal freedoms and urged the country to increase its cooperation with the universal human rights system, particularly OHCHR, and to strengthen its human rights culture through the creation of an independent human rights institution at the national level. For those reasons, Uruguay had abstained from the vote.

108. **Mr. Percaya** (Indonesia) said that, while recognizing that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran had undertaken various initiatives to address the human rights situation, his delegation felt that there was still room for improvement and encouraged the Government to redouble its efforts to engage constructively with the international community in that regard. However, the international community should be more supportive and give the Islamic Republic of Iran sufficient space to fully implement its human rights commitments. As a matter of principle, the global promotion and protection of human rights had to be carried out through constructive and genuine dialogue as well as international cooperation. The universal periodic review had an important and positive role to play in that area, and his delegation welcomed the Islamic Republic of Iran's presentation of its second-cycle review and its commitment to a bottom-up approach to human rights, including through the establishment of several new mechanisms. Indonesia and the Islamic Republic of Iran had initiated cooperation in the area of human rights in 2014, which would enable the countries to share their experience and best practices. For those reasons, and in view of the lack of constructive engagement and dialogue between the main sponsors and the country concerned, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution.

109. **Mr. Carrera Castro** (Guatemala) said that his delegation shared the concerns expressed in the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. However, his delegation had abstained from voting because it was

important to recognize the goodwill and willingness to cooperate with human rights mechanisms demonstrated by the Islamic Republic of Iran, the country's participation in the universal period review process and its acceptance of a large number of recommendations from the most recent cycle, as well as the legislative and institutional reforms that it had introduced at the national level. The language used in the current resolution was more condemnatory in tone than that of previous resolutions, which did not properly reflect the balance between concerns over human rights and recognition of the efforts that had been made by the Iranian Government. It was now up to the country to take concrete steps to demonstrate to the international community that it was realizing its commitments and was prepared to cooperate with OHCHR. In that regard, his delegation encouraged the country to invite the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran to visit the country.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.