



General Assembly

Seventy-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
5 May 2023

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 45th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 4 November 2022, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Venancio Guerra (Vice-Chair) (Portugal)

Contents

Agenda item 25: Social development (*continued*)(c) Literacy for life: shaping future agendas (*continued*)Agenda item 57: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)Agenda item 65: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)Agenda item 66: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)Agenda item 109: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

22-24879 (E)



Please recycle



In the absence of Mr. Blanco Conde (Dominican Republic), Mr. Venancio Guerra (Portugal), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

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

Agenda item 25: Social development (continued)

(c) Literacy for life: shaping future agendas

(continued) (A/C.3/77/L.16/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.16/Rev.1: Literacy for life: shaping future agendas

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

2. **Mr. Vorshilov** (Mongolia), introducing the draft resolution, said that literacy was the basis for a more peaceful, just, inclusive and humane society. The promotion of literacy programmes and initiatives should be at the heart of social agendas, both nationally and internationally. Literacy was an essential foundation for achieving human rights and fundamental freedoms and instrumental in achieving several of the Sustainable Development Goals. It was his delegation's strong belief that literacy should be approached from a lifelong learning perspective.

3. The progress made towards achieving youth and adult literacy targets had been slow and uneven, with the most recent estimates suggesting a global adult literacy rate of 87 per cent, meaning that 770 million adults lacked basic literacy skills. Moreover, with a literacy rate of 83 per cent for women and 90 per cent for men, the global literacy gender gap stood at 7 percentage points.

4. The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) crisis continued to have a significant negative impact on literacy. It was therefore time to enhance political commitments, strengthen legal frameworks and increase investment in the area of literacy. Literacy and numeracy were an integral part of the right to education, which empowered people, expanded their capabilities and paved the way for further learning.

5. New elements had been included in the draft resolution to acknowledge the need for inclusive and equitable quality education in a rapidly changing world and to take into consideration multiple circumstances, such as urban-rural, young-old and gender digital divides. Furthermore, note had been taken of the Transforming Education Summit, and the establishment of the United Nations Youth Office had been welcomed.

6. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Austria, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Congo, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Maldives, Montenegro, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Suriname, Switzerland, Thailand, Türkiye, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

7. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iceland, Kazakhstan, Malawi, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Tajikistan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zambia.

8. **Mr. Lang** (United States of America) said that his country had appreciated the opportunity to participate in the high-level meeting to address post-pandemic recovery of learning loss, namely, the Transforming Education Summit. The United States was heavily focused on funding educational programmes both domestically and abroad to address that crucial issue. His delegation strongly supported the education goals of the draft resolution. As educational matters in the United States were primarily determined at the state and local levels, his delegation understood that, when resolutions called upon countries to strengthen various aspects of education, that was done in terms consistent with the respective federal, state and local authorities of the United States.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.*

10. **Ms. Alison** (Nigeria) said that her country was profoundly concerned that 770 million adults, two thirds of whom were women, lacked basic literacy skills, that under 70 per cent of 10-year-old children in low- and middle-income countries were not able to read and understand a simple text, and that 244 million children and youth had remained out of school in 2021. Recognizing the gender divide in the learning environment and in schools in Nigeria, her Government was working assiduously to ensure that girls had equal learning opportunities to boys.

11. Literacy skills should be assessed on the ability to read and write not only foreign adopted languages but also Indigenous languages. Under her Government's

national policy on education, the language of instruction in early childhood and pre-primary education should be the mother tongue or the language of the immediate community. In 2020, the first national early grade reading assessment had been conducted in the Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo languages to better assess the abilities of learners to understand native languages.

12. The international community must work collectively to close the glaring digital divide between developed and developing countries, and especially the gender digital divide in developing countries, and promote digital inclusion by addressing the challenges associated with access, affordability, digital literacy and digital skills, thereby ensuring that the benefits of new technologies were available to all, especially in developing countries.

Agenda item 57: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (continued) (A/C.3/77/L.37)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.37: Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

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

14. **Mr. Gimolieca** (Angola), introducing the draft resolution, said that, on a global level, the armed conflicts, socioeconomic situations, political instability and environmental dynamics of recent decades had triggered emergencies that required international protection for those forced to abandon their places of origin. Angola noted with great concern the data in the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/77/12) on the growing number of refugees and displaced persons in various parts of the world, recognized the efforts of Member States, the High Commissioner and other stakeholders to improve the situation of refugees and displaced persons in host communities, and acknowledged the needs of vulnerable groups, in particular women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities, and the dangers they faced. In that connection, Angola wished to strengthen its contribution and response to the needs of refugees and displaced persons, considering that the Global Compact on Refugees called upon States and all stakeholders to fully implement the Compact in order to achieve all four of its objectives equitably, on the basis of the principle of burden- and responsibility-sharing.

15. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Cuba and Panama had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

16. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Algeria, Brazil, Congo, Iceland, Malawi, South Africa, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.37 was adopted.*

Agenda item 65: Rights of indigenous peoples (continued)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (continued) (A/C.3/77/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.20/Rev.1: Rights of Indigenous Peoples

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

19. **Ms. Caldera Gutiérrez** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), introducing the draft resolution, said that the negotiations on the text had resulted in the updating and incorporation of important wording for Indigenous Peoples of the seven Indigenous sociocultural regions. The draft resolution reflected the importance of holding a follow-up World Conference on Indigenous Peoples to enable follow-up on the implementation of the outcome document. It also mentioned for the first time that Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation or initial contact had the right to self-determination and could choose to live in accordance with their traditions. Moreover, States and the private sector were encouraged to ensure more sustainable, environmentally friendly and responsible corporate behaviour that addressed the impact of certain activities on Indigenous Peoples and on the lands and territories traditionally inhabited by them.

20. The draft resolution included a reference to the need to revitalize Indigenous languages and empower their users and recognized the importance of Indigenous languages as a driver for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. In that context, the International Decade of Indigenous Languages, to be launched in December 2023, offered a great opportunity for empowering Indigenous language users and making the Goals relevant to Indigenous Peoples as well.

21. Lastly, one fundamental change reflected in the English version of the draft resolution was the use of initial capital letters when referring to Indigenous Peoples. Accordingly, the Secretariat should reflect

those changes in all applicable official languages of the Organization.

22. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Australia, Chile, Cyprus, El Salvador, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Madagascar, New Zealand, Palau and South Africa.

23. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Angola, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Greece, Malta, Trinidad and Tobago and Uganda.

24. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.*

25. **Ms. Carrel** (New Zealand), speaking also on behalf of Australia and Canada, said that those three countries shared a strong commitment to advancing the rights of Indigenous Peoples, at home and internationally. At the same time, they recognized that the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples domestically was a work in progress and much remained to be done.

26. Working in partnership with Indigenous Peoples to advance reconciliation and address long-standing inequalities at home, the three countries sought to learn from one another's experiences. In September 2022, on the margins of the high-level week of the General Assembly, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Australia, Canada and New Zealand had co-hosted a round table with Finland, Mexico and Indigenous representatives to examine pathways for building an inclusive approach to Indigenous engagement in foreign policymaking. The meaningful participation of Indigenous Peoples was a key requirement in any attempt to build a more peaceful, prosperous and sustainable world. Australia, Canada and New Zealand agreed that Indigenous Peoples should be represented in meetings of the United Nations and other multilateral forums on issues affecting them and looked forward to participating in the expert workshop on the enhanced participation of Indigenous Peoples in the work of the Human Rights Council.

27. The three countries appreciated the attention given in the draft resolution to the critical loss of Indigenous languages and welcomed the launch of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages. They were committed to working in partnership with Indigenous Peoples to implement the Decade with a view to promoting, preserving and revitalizing Indigenous languages domestically and abroad.

28. The three countries welcomed the call in the draft resolution for Member States to take necessary measures to ensure the rights, protection and safety of all Indigenous Peoples and for cases of threats, harassment and reprisals to be investigated and perpetrators to be held accountable. States must also recognize and work to counter the multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination that disproportionately affected Indigenous Peoples.

29. **Mr. Mogyorósi** (Hungary) said that the adoption of the draft resolution sent a powerful message about the international community's shared commitment to the promotion and protection of the rights of Indigenous Peoples. Although his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it disassociated itself from the tenth preambular paragraph, since Hungary had voted against the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration and therefore could not accept any references to it. Moreover, the definition of migration policies remained a national prerogative, and his delegation interpreted the current draft resolution in line with those considerations. It also disassociated itself from paragraph 20, as Hungary collected data disaggregated by sex and therefore interpreted the term "gender" to mean "sex".

30. **Ms. Stanciu** (Romania), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, France and Slovakia, said that their four delegations had joined the consensus on the draft resolution and were fully engaged in the promotion and protection of the rights of all individuals. Persons belonging to Indigenous groups were too often victims of discrimination and violations of their human rights and fundamental freedoms. Those persons must enjoy the same rights and freedoms as any other individuals, with full respect for the equality and universality of human rights.

31. Human rights were universal rights to which everyone was entitled. Their four delegations did not recognize the collective rights of any groups defined by their origins, culture, language or beliefs; subscribed to the political and legal tradition of human rights that was based on individual rights; and opposed all forms of discrimination. They therefore could not accept the references in the draft resolution to the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples. It would be preferable to refer to the rights of persons belonging to Indigenous groups in line with commonly recognized human rights principles.

32. **Mr. Sharma** (India) said that his country was a strong advocate for the promotion and protection of the rights of Indigenous Peoples and had supported the

adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007. It welcomed the process of enhancing the participation of Indigenous Peoples and institutions in relevant United Nations meetings on issues affecting them.

33. The concept of Indigenous Peoples related to specific situations in which people had suffered from historic injustices as a result of their colonization and the dispossession of their lands, territories and resources. That complex concept could not be expanded to create artificial divides by including societies in which diverse ethnic groups had lived together for thousand years. The issue of Indigenous rights pertained to peoples who were regarded as Indigenous because they were descended from populations that had inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belonged, at the time of conquest or colonization or when the current State boundaries had been established and who, irrespective of their legal status, had retained some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions. That was the definition used in the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (No. 169), of the International Labour Organization. Accordingly, his Government considered the entire population of India at the time of its independence, and their successors, to be Indigenous. The concept of Indigenous Peoples was thus not applicable in the context of India. It was with that understanding that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution.

34. **Ms. Diouf** (Senegal) said that her delegation opposed the use of the phrases “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination” and “health services” and therefore wished to disassociate itself from them.

35. **Ms. Raban** (United Kingdom) said that her Government had always provided political and financial support for the economic, social and political development of Indigenous Peoples and would continue to work overseas and through multilateral institutions to improve their situation. Indigenous individuals were entitled to enjoy the full protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms in international law on an equal footing with others. However, since equality and universality were fundamental to human rights, it was the long-standing position of the United Kingdom not to accept the concept in international law of collective human rights, whereby groups benefited from the enjoyment of human rights not available to others, except where that concept applied to the right to self-

determination. Although the Governments of many States had strengthened the political and economic situation of Indigenous Peoples by granting them collective rights, her country’s position meant that individuals within groups could not be left vulnerable or unprotected if the rights of a group superseded the human rights of individuals. The United Kingdom thus understood any internationally agreed references to the rights of Indigenous Peoples to refer to rights accorded to Indigenous Peoples by Governments in accordance with that position.

36. **Mr. Salah** (Libya) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution given the particular importance of its subject. Libya could not, however, accept the controversial concepts contained in the draft resolution, which, as everyone knew, contravened the national legislation and the cultural and religious particularities of many countries, including Libya. Those concepts, notably the phrase “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination”, weakened the draft resolution. His delegation therefore expressed its reservations regarding the eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 20.

37. **Ms. Nasrullah** (Iraq) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution with the understanding that the phrase “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination” in the eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 20 did not refer to any concepts that did not enjoy consensus.

38. **Mr. Mohd Zim** (Malaysia) said that his Government was committed to protecting and promoting the rights of Indigenous Peoples in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The adoption by consensus of the draft resolution demonstrated the shared view of Member States on the importance of protecting, promoting and respecting the rights of Indigenous Peoples. While Malaysia had joined the consensus, the text continued to feature terminology that was inconsistent with its position on the topic. His delegation therefore wished to disassociate itself from and express its reservations regarding the use in the eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 20 of the phrase “multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination”, which it did not recognize as agreed language.

39. **Monsignor Murphy** (Observer for the Holy See) said that his delegation recognized the importance of the draft resolution, particularly in the year marking the

fifteenth anniversary of the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The draft resolution would contribute to the international community's efforts to develop policies and programmes to protect the rights of Indigenous Peoples. In that regard, the Holy See and the Catholic Church were committed to promoting Indigenous cultures through specific and appropriate forms of spiritual accompaniment and tangible measures of support, including attention to Indigenous traditions, customs, languages and educational processes. In addition, his delegation welcomed the fact that the draft resolution drew adequate attention to the urgent need to preserve, revitalize and promote Indigenous languages, which represented an important addition to the text, particularly as the year 2022 marked the beginning of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages.

40. While his delegation appreciated the fact that, during the negotiations, the facilitators had sought to minimize the use of controversial terms in the draft resolution, it was regrettable that unclear terms and expressions that lacked an intergovernmentally agreed definition and vague and problematic terminology related to discrimination had been included. In addition, the Holy See understood the term "gender" to be grounded in biological sexual identity and difference, namely, male or female.

41. **Ms. Rizk** (Egypt) said that her delegation disassociated itself from the use of the phrase "multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination" in the eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 20, since it was a controversial expression.

Agenda item 66: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)
([A/C.3/77/L.5](#), [A/C.3/77/L.51](#) and [A/C.3/77/L.52](#))

Draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.5](#): Combating glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

42. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution and the proposed amendments contained in documents [A/C.3/77/L.51](#) and [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) had no programme budget implications.

43. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), introducing the draft resolution and an oral revision thereto, said that the following paragraph should be added after paragraph 2: "Takes note of the report of the Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, prepared in accordance with the request contained in its resolution [76/149](#)".

44. Since the adoption of resolution [76/149](#), the problems identified therein had not been resolved, but rather had worsened in many respects. Denial of the world's common history was once again being witnessed. Racist and xenophobic rhetoric and calls to get rid of migrants, refugees and foreigners were increasing. In many countries, expressions of Islamophobia, Christianophobia, Afrophobia and antisemitism had become commonplace. The war declared in certain countries against monuments to those who had fought against Nazism and fascism had reached an unprecedented scale. Neo-Nazi marches and torchlight processions were taking place on city streets in the heart of Europe to honour those who had actively cooperated with Nazis and been complicit in their crimes. Such individuals were increasingly extolled as national heroes and heroes of national liberation movements and presented as role models for younger generations.

45. Such actions were not an expression of the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of expression; rather, they constituted blatant attempts to falsify the outcome of the Second World War and were cynical and offensive towards those who had liberated the world from the terrors of Nazism. Moreover, they were offences punishable by law under article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

46. The adoption of the draft resolution with the widest possible support from Member States would make a significant contribution to the elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The draft resolution was intended to foster dialogue and cooperation, not confrontation.

47. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised: Armenia, China, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

48. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Malawi, Nigeria, Philippines, Senegal and Zimbabwe.

49. **Mr. Fifield** (Australia), introducing the proposed amendments contained in [A/C.3/77/L.51](#) and [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) also on behalf of Japan, Liberia and North Macedonia, said that, after the Russian Federation had announced through the Secretariat on 1 November 2022 that it would reintroduce paragraph 3 of resolution [76/149](#) into the draft resolution, his delegation had asked the Russian Federation to submit a new draft document, given that there had been adequate time until the submission deadline of 2 November 2022. The Russian Federation had not heeded that advice, however. Given the importance of the draft resolution, his delegation had submitted the proposed amendments to demonstrate transparency and openness. Additionally, it had shared its reasoning for the proposed amendments through the Secretariat as a symbol of its genuine intent to engage and cooperate constructively. That had not, however, been reciprocated by the Russian Federation, which had cancelled all informal meetings following the first presentation of the draft resolution on 25 October 2022. Nevertheless, his delegation thanked the Russian Federation for its oral revision to reintroduce paragraph 3 and would withdraw its amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.51](#) accordingly.

50. The proposed amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) consisted of inserting a new paragraph using wording from paragraph 70 of the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance ([A/77/512](#)). The draft resolution was intended to combat glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and contemporary forms of racism, but the Russian Federation was doing the exact opposite. The fact that the Special Rapporteur explicitly referred in her report to the draft resolution could not be dismissed and had led his delegation to propose an amendment using language from the report. Australia condemned the efforts of the Russian Federation to utilize and manipulate the draft resolution to justify its invasion of Ukraine.

51. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the proposed amendment: Albania, Canada, Guatemala, Iceland, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Norway, Ukraine and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

52. He then noted that Papua New Guinea and the United States of America also wished to become sponsors.

53. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the proposed amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#).

54. **Mr. Kulháněk** (Czechia), making a general statement before the voting on behalf of the European Union and the candidate country Ukraine, said that combating racism was a founding principle of the European Union. For over a decade, the European Union had engaged actively and constructively on draft resolutions on combating glorification of Nazism. The current draft resolution had been presented as a technical rollover; however, the reason for the initial removal of paragraph 3 by the Russian Federation was clear and could not be justified through technicalities. The Russian Federation had used the false narrative of denazification to justify its war of aggression against Ukraine, violate human rights, breach the Charter of the United Nations and violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent Member State. The European Union strongly encouraged the broader United Nations membership to take that into consideration when determining their position on the draft resolution as a whole. Accordingly, the European Union member States would vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

55. **Mr. Danailov Frchkoski** (North Macedonia), making a general statement before the voting, said that the proposed amendment would help to avoid any misinterpretation and misuse of the draft resolution, especially in view of the fact that the main sponsor had officially and publicly justified its aggression towards Ukraine by claiming that it was carrying out the so-called denazification of the country. As his delegation did not want the draft resolution to become a weapon in the hands of the aggressor, it called upon all delegations to vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

56. **Ms. McGill** (Liberia), making a general statement before the voting, said that her country was committed to the values of non-discrimination and equality and condemned the glorification of Nazism and all forms of racism, xenophobia, discrimination and related intolerance. However, her delegation was concerned that the draft resolution was being used as a tool for disinformation and for justifying the military invasion and territorial aggression of the Russian Federation in Ukraine. Her delegation strongly opposed the misuse of

efforts to combat racism for politically motivated issues outside the scope of the human rights agenda. For those reasons, Liberia encouraged all delegations to vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

57. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation did not support the proposed amendment and urged delegations to vote against it. As the main author of the draft resolution, his delegation had proved its readiness to conduct open and constructive negotiations on the text year after year. Many provisions of the draft resolution were the result of compromise and reflected the wishes and suggestions of other delegations. His delegation had proved its willingness to consider all proposals on the basis of their merits, not political or other considerations.

58. His delegation wondered why the authors of the proposed amendment had not discussed their proposals at the open consultations, choosing instead to submit them at last minute. It was clear that the aim of the proposed amendment was to politicize the issue of combating neo-Nazism, racism and xenophobia.

59. His delegation was always ready to discuss any constructive proposals but could not agree to proposals that affected the substance and focus of the draft resolution. For his delegation and the other sponsors, it was essential that the draft resolution be thematic and not country specific. The draft resolution was aimed at dialogue and cooperation, not naming and shaming. The problems identified in it were cross-border in nature and affected many countries around the world. The draft resolution was thus a logical complement to the other draft resolution on countering racism that was traditionally considered by the Committee.

60. In their efforts to turn the draft resolution into a political, country-specific document, the authors of the proposed amendment had outdone themselves. Even if the proposed amendment were adopted, the draft resolution as a whole would still be unacceptable to them. Without any hope of getting their way by any other means, the authors of the proposed amendment had resorted to procedural manoeuvring to have the provisions that they wanted included in the text. Such actions were yet another attempt to divide Member States and hinder international cooperation in combating neo-Nazism, racism and xenophobia.

61. **Ms. Ahangari** (Azerbaijan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, as the proposed amendment was contrary to the letter and

spirit of the draft resolution, her delegation would vote against it.

62. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.3/77/L.52.*

In favour:

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

Against:

Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, China, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Central African Republic, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen.

63. *The proposed amendment was adopted by 63 votes to 23, with 65 abstentions.*

64. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution [A/C.3/77/L.5](#), as orally revised and amended.

65. **Mr. Knyazyan** (Armenia), making a general statement before the voting on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty Organization, said that its member States fully supported the draft resolution. Victory over Nazism had been achieved thanks to the decisive contribution of the peoples of the member States, who had joined together to fight against fascism. The anti-Hitler coalition had also made its own contribution to the victory over the misanthropic ideology of Nazism, becoming a unique example of countries with different political systems uniting around a common goal. Preserving the truth and memory of that heroism was both a sacred duty and a practical way to prevent the revival of Nazism.

66. The Collective Security Treaty Organization strongly condemned the targeted politically motivated campaigns in certain countries to rewrite history and revise and distort the outcomes of the Second World War, including attempts to place equal responsibility for the outbreak of the war on Nazi criminals and the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. Furthermore, the desecration or destruction of monuments to those who had fought against Nazism and the unlawful exhumation or removal of their remains was of deep concern. States should fully comply with their relevant obligations in that respect, in particular article 34 of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I). In addition, the States on whose territory the battles of the Second World War had taken place had a special responsibility to preserve monuments to victorious heroes. War graves, memorials and obelisks in honour of those who had died in the struggle against Nazism must be protected. Vandalism against them was unjustifiable.

67. **Ms. Wallenius** (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her country stridently opposed the glorification of Nazism in all its forms. At issue, however, was the indefensible use of the draft resolution by the Russian Federation to justify its territorial aggression against Ukraine. Its persistent references to Nazism to justify its unjustifiable actions in Ukraine was a ridiculous ruse that did not mask the illegality or brutality of the invasion. Furthermore, that false narrative seriously undermined genuine attempts

to combat neo-Nazism and all forms of racial intolerance. Even the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance had condemned in the strongest terms such pretextual use, including in relation to the unlawful breach of the sovereign territory of Ukraine and the resulting humanitarian crisis. Canada unequivocally shared that view. Neither a pretextual draft resolution, nor a false narrative could ever justify the actions of the Russian Federation.

68. While her delegation welcomed the adoption of the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), the draft resolution as a whole remained problematic. It was regrettable that the changes consistently proposed by delegations to have the text reflect additional contemporary forms of racism, properly reinforce the importance of freedom of expression and correct the mischaracterization of the obligations of Member States under international human rights law had still not been accepted, and that there had not been opportunities to engage substantively in informal consultations.

69. Canada unequivocally condemned any form of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia or related intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism. It had ratified the relevant international conventions and was fully committed to their implementation. States that had not already done so should ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and consider making the declaration under article 14 of the Convention.

70. **Mr. Croker** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his country unequivocally condemned the glorification of Nazism and neo-Nazism. While the draft resolution was purported to combat the glorification of Nazism, in reality it had become part of the attempts by the Russian Federation to justify its territorial aggression against Ukraine by promoting lies, spreading disinformation and distorting history. His delegation shared the alarm expressed by the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance at the manipulation by the Russian Federation of the legitimate human rights concerns raised by neo-Nazi mobilizations where they existed to create a pretext for war in Ukraine. Doing so undermined genuine attempts to combat neo-Nazism around the world. The United Kingdom continued to make clear that it did not accept the distortion of history or the manipulation of the truth for political purposes.

71. The process leading up to the submission of the draft resolution had been a sham. Although the Russian representative had mentioned dialogue, cooperation and consultative negotiations, the Russian delegation had held just one meeting on the draft resolution and had failed to respond to the breadth of concerns raised by numerous Member States. The claims that it had engaged seriously on the topic were performative. In the light of the above, the United Kingdom had supported the amendment and welcomed its adoption.

72. It was just as imperative to safeguard the truth as it was to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. It was therefore necessary to question the content and intent of the draft resolution. Despite President Putin's absurd claims that he was denazifying Ukraine, he was in fact engaged in an illegal war and his regime was mirroring many of the disturbing acts of the worst regimes of the twentieth century. The United Kingdom would not stand by as that happened and would vote against the draft resolution to stop the further manipulation of human rights concerns to justify the illegal invasion of Ukraine.

73. **Mr. Hill** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation opposed the draft resolution on account of its attempt to legitimize long-standing Russian disinformation narratives that smeared neighbouring nations under the guise of halting Nazi glorification. The United States condemned the glorification of Nazism and all modern forms of violent extremism, antisemitism, racism, xenophobia, discrimination and related intolerance. That said, it continued to oppose the use of the United Nations system by the Russian Federation to spread disinformation. The draft resolution was a cynical attempt by that country to further its contemporary geopolitical aims by invoking the Holocaust and the Second World War to malign other countries. Such an attempt was all the more egregious when Russia used false accusations of Nazism to try to justify its unconscionable violence against the people of Ukraine. The draft resolution did not represent a serious effort to combat Nazism, antisemitism, racism or xenophobia; instead, it was a shameful political ploy and a thinly veiled effort to justify the Russian war of aggression in Ukraine.

74. While his delegation fully supported the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), it continued to have serious concerns about the invocation in the draft resolution of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial

Discrimination and article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to justify restrictions on freedom of expression. It also had serious concerns about the process surrounding the introduction of the draft resolution, as the Russian Federation had failed to provide any opportunity for Member States to engage meaningfully in negotiations on the draft text, having cancelled two of the three informal negotiations and held only one meeting to take concerns on board, which it had not done. There had been a long history of sham negotiations on the draft resolution and pitiful attempts to appear to run a transparent process.

75. In closing, he called upon the Russian Federation to cease its use of force against Ukraine immediately and withdraw its forces from all Ukrainian territory.

76. **Mr. Kyslytsya** (Ukraine), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, reaffirmed his country's strong condemnation of all forms of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and reiterated its long-standing position that the draft resolution had nothing in common with genuine efforts to combat Nazism, neo-Nazism and other forms of intolerance. On the contrary, it constituted an attempt by the Russian Federation to exploit the pretext of combating neo-Nazism to justify its brutal war of aggression against Ukraine and its heinous war crimes and crimes against humanity.

77. His delegation was grateful to Australia, Japan, Liberia and North Macedonia for having submitted two important substantive amendments that had revealed that the draft resolution's true purpose was to manipulate and distort history and abuse the common victory over Nazism, to which millions of Ukrainians had made an enormous contribution by sacrificing themselves. It was also grateful to all delegations that had supported the adopted amendment.

78. It was the height of hypocrisy when the aggressor submitted a draft resolution aimed at combating the ideology once used to justify the same form of aggression against sovereign States to which the Russian Federation itself was resorting against Ukraine. For that reason, Ukraine would vote against the draft resolution.

79. **Mr. Magosaki** (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation welcomed the efforts of Member States to prevent any further opportunistic use of efforts to combat Nazism as a pretext for invasion. While the oral revision by the Russian Federation should have been made before the

submission of the draft resolution, it was better late than never. At the same time, the text should be more comprehensively reviewed to rule out any future misuse of efforts to combat Nazism in violation of the Charter of the United Nations. That was why Japan would vote against the draft resolution, notwithstanding the oral revision and the amendment. Lastly, Japan reaffirmed its condemnation of the efforts of the Russian Federation to utilize and manipulate the draft resolution to justify its invasion of Ukraine, which was an affront to international law. It sincerely hoped that the Russian Federation would face up to what had been said and decided at the Committee and to the unjustifiable suffering on Ukrainian soil and make the right decision.

80. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.5, as orally revised and amended.*

In favour:

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

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati,

Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Congo, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Mexico, Myanmar, Palau, Panama, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Serbia, Switzerland, Tonga, Türkiye.

81. *The draft resolution, as orally revised and amended, was adopted by 105 votes to 52, with 15 abstentions.**

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

83. **Mr. Poveda Brito** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation reaffirmed its full support for the draft resolution but wished to disassociate itself from the hostile amendment contained in document A/C.3/77/L.52, as it did not contribute to the purpose of the draft resolution and sought to undermine its spirit and politicize its content.

84. **Mr. Morales Dávila** (Nicaragua) said that his country strongly opposed all kinds of extremist, fascist,

* The delegations of Burundi, Egypt and Mali subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution, as orally revised and amended.

Nazi and neo-Nazi ideologies that promoted racism, apartheid, xenophobia, antisemitism and all other forms of intolerance. It was deeply regrettable that attempts had been made to politicize the draft resolution in order to divert attention from the important struggle of States and the international community as a whole to eradicate such harmful ideologies. His country reaffirmed its principled position of rejecting the adoption by some States of selective approaches and double standards aimed at promoting agendas against specific countries and singling out countries according to their own selfish interests and agendas, hindering collective efforts to achieve a more just, harmonious, equitable and peaceful world. In that regard, his delegation disassociated itself from the amendment contained in [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), which undermined efforts to combat and eliminate racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

85. **Mr. Šimonović** (Croatia) said that his country unequivocally condemned all forms of extremist and totalitarian ideologies, including neo-Nazism, and the glorification of Nazism and was fully committed to combating all forms of discrimination. His Government had banned hate speech and prohibited the spread of racism, antisemitism, xenophobia and ideas connected to all totalitarian regimes, including Nazism and fascism. In addition, Croatia was an active member of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and would assume the presidency of the Alliance in March 2023. The Alliance's definition of antisemitism was a valuable tool that Croatia used in educational institutions and training activities to prevent, identify and combat all forms of antisemitism.

86. For years, the Russian Federation had used the draft resolution on combating glorification of Nazism and the associated report to attack and accuse of Nazism the very European States that had suffered so greatly from it. In February 2022, the Russian Federation had launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine under the guise of combating neo-Nazism and had thus made clear the meaning of "combating": tens of thousands of people dead, towns and cities in ruins and millions displaced. The crimes were piling up, including the crime of aggression, war crimes, crimes against humanity and the illegal annexation of Ukrainian territory. Croatia could not subscribe to the Russian definition of combating neo-Nazism and had thus voted against the draft resolution for the first time in a decade.

87. **Mr. Fifield** (Australia) reaffirmed his country's steadfast commitment to global efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia in all its

forms. Such hateful and divisive rhetoric had no place in Australia or anywhere in the world, online or offline. His delegation welcomed the adoption of the oral revision and the amendment and thanked Member States for demonstrating that the weaponization of the Holocaust and Nazism by the Russian Federation in justifying its unilateral, illegal and immoral aggression against the people of Ukraine through the draft resolution was not acceptable. Australia condemned the efforts of the Russian Federation to utilize and manipulate the draft resolution to justify its invasion of Ukraine, which was an affront to international law.

88. While the text addressed elements of combating Nazism, neo-Nazism and racism, Australia had changed its long-standing position of abstaining from the voting on the draft resolution and had voted against it, given its serious concerns that the draft resolution would continue to be used to justify the illegal war in Ukraine and thus mischaracterized the human rights obligations of Member States. There were, however, opportunities to strengthen the draft resolution and embrace a more inclusive approach to addressing the diverse practices that fuelled contemporary forms of Nazism, neo-Nazism, racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Australia therefore called upon the Russian Federation to hold an open and transparent dialogue on future draft resolutions on the topic to enable Member States to engage constructively and genuinely contribute to addressing the challenges globally.

89. **Mr. Malovrh** (Slovenia) said that any incitement to violence or war was prohibited under the Slovenian Constitution. The Holocaust and other related crimes should never be forgotten. As a member of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, Slovenia fostered awareness of that tragic chapter in history, as education and research would help to prevent it from ever happening again. It was therefore saddening that, almost 80 years after the Second World War, the Russian Federation had attempted to blatantly manipulate efforts to combat racism and eliminate neo-Nazism to justify the military invasion of and aggression against Ukraine. Slovenia welcomed the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and strongly condemned such pretextual use of neo-Nazism. It was for that reason that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution for the first time.

90. **Ms. Morris Garrido** (Guatemala) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution

because her country's national legislation provided that all human beings were free and equal in dignity and rights. The rights of all human beings must therefore be respected without discrimination of any kind. However, her delegation remained concerned about the recommendation of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, in paragraph 94 of her report, that Member States review the definition of antisemitism used by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance.

91. **Mr. González Behmaras** (Cuba) said that his country was fully committed to combating all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Nazism and neo-Nazism were the most extreme manifestations of supremacist theories that were scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous, and had already led to the loss of millions of lives. The international community must prevent the continued spread of those ideas and the legitimization of the discourse of hatred, intolerance and discrimination that characterized them. Those phenomena were on the rise in some countries, including within the political system, which was even more worrying. Cuba would always support those who defended the full equality of all human beings and promoted tolerance and respect for cultural diversity. Nothing justified the promotion of racist or xenophobic ideas. For that reason, his delegation was a main sponsor of the draft resolution.

92. In that capacity and taking into account that the text submitted at the current session was a technical update of resolution 76/149, as well as the importance of preserving the unity of the international community on such an important issue, his delegation had voted against the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), as it introduced a divisive element and diluted the consensus on efforts to combat Nazism and neo-Nazism. Moreover, it attempted to draw attention to a specific situation even though the draft resolution was thematic in nature. Attention could be drawn to the issue of Nazism and neo-Nazism in other contexts as well. In several developed countries, such as the United States, violent acts had been committed against ethnic and religious minorities, indicating that Nazism and neo-Nazism persisted. However, none of that had been mentioned in the amendment. In that regard, his delegation disassociated itself from the amendment, did not consider it to be agreed language and did not feel bound by it or by its possible scope.

93. **Mr. Valtýsson** (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic and Baltic countries (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden), said that those countries reaffirmed their unequivocal condemnation of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and all forms of racial intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, and their full commitment to global efforts to combat any form of those ideologies. Openness, democracy and diversity were core values of the Nordic and Baltic countries, which was why they had reacted so strongly to the draft resolution submitted by the Russian Federation.

94. At its core, the document constructed a narrative that was being used to justify the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine under the cynical slogan of "denazification". The Nordic and Baltic countries categorically rejected that false narrative and the way in which the elimination of neo-Nazism was being used as a pretext to justify a full-scale invasion and attempted annexation of a sovereign country, in blatant violation of international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, such misappropriations further undermined genuine efforts to combat those heinous ideologies. The Nordic and Baltic countries had voted in favour of the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) in order to partially redress the utter lack of that context in the draft resolution. Despite the adoption of the amendment, however, the Nordic and Baltic countries remained deeply concerned about not only the content of the draft resolution but also the abhorrent context in which it was being presented, which was why all eight Nordic and Baltic countries had voted against the draft resolution as a whole.

95. Although a draft resolution on such an important topic deserved an inclusive approach, for years the Russian Federation had failed to engage transparently and take the concerns of other Member States into account. That country should therefore give up its role of presenting the draft resolution. In the future, Member States must be able to engage in honest conversation on the topic, and it must not be misappropriated as a cover for aggression against another State.

96. **Mr. Gunaratna** (Sri Lanka) said that it was incumbent upon all Member States to adhere to the letter and the spirit of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action in all human activities with a view to eliminating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. The amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) politicized efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related

intolerance and had introduced a narrow, restrictive country-specific approach within a thematic resolution that would otherwise have had a wider scope. Sri Lanka called upon all Member States to adhere to the principles of universality, impartiality, non-selectivity and objectivity in the promotion and protection of human rights and, accordingly, disassociated itself from the amendment while having voted in favour of the draft resolution.

97. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation was grateful to those who had voted in favour of the draft resolution and thus condemned the worst manifestations of the glorification of Nazism, namely, destroying monuments to those who had fought against fascism, holding neo-Nazi marches, prohibiting symbols associated with the victory in the Second World War and extolling Nazis and Nazi collaborators as national heroes. It was significant that Member States had demonstrated integrity and supported the draft resolution despite all the pressure that had been placed on them and all the attempts to politicize the issue. The results of the voting on both the draft resolution and the amendment had only confirmed the point made in his previous statement that the aim of the amendment was to undermine the draft resolution. Even though the amendment had been adopted, the delegations that had proposed it had nevertheless voted against the draft resolution as a whole. Such an approach could not be considered constructive. His delegation wished to disassociate itself from the text that had been included in the draft resolution as a result of the adoption of the amendment.

98. **Ms. Mimran Rosenberg** (Israel) said that the darkest chapter in the history of the Jewish people, the Holocaust, served as proof of the moral depths to which human beings could sink when they followed that type of ideology. Unfortunately, neo-Nazism was more than just the glorification of a past movement; it was a contemporary phenomenon with strong vested interests in racial inequality and antisemitism. In order to defeat Nazism in all its forms, it was important to identify it and tackle it early on, which was no easy task and required the mobilization of Governments and the international community. In addition, States, educators and social media platforms needed practical tools and guidance to combat hate speech in all its forms. The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance had that exact mandate. It was important to follow closely its work and adopt the various definitions dealing with that phenomenon.

99. Given the paramount importance of tackling antisemitism and the glorification of Nazism, Israel had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, that should not be seen as a green light for countries to use unacceptable comparisons with Nazi ideology or the Holocaust in the context of the war in Ukraine. Israel wholeheartedly opposed any politicization or trivialization of the Holocaust by any country and the distortion of history. All States had a duty to learn from history and not to abuse it for political gain. Accordingly, Israel called upon Member States to refrain from using such rhetoric in the future.

100. **Mr. Pilipenko** (Belarus) said that 2022 had been declared the Year of Historical Memory in Belarus. In less than three years, the world would mark the eightieth anniversary of the end of the worst war in the history of humankind. The magnitude and tragedy of those events required that tribute be paid to those who had, at great cost and suffering, prevented the world from falling into an abyss of pain and hatred under Nazism.

101. The Nazis had put into practice the theory of racial superiority, adopting discriminatory laws, spreading xenophobia and publicly declaring the elimination of entire ethnic groups, including gypsies, Jews and Slavs, as one of their aims. They had created a network of concentration camps across Europe, with the Auschwitz death camp – which had eventually been liberated by Soviet soldiers – becoming the ominous symbol of the misanthropic essence of Nazism. More than 60 million people, including about 2 million citizens of Belarus, a third of the country's population at that time, had given their lives to the victory over Nazism.

102. Until recently, it had seemed as though the historical significance of the victory over fascism and the true spirit of alliance could never fall prey to short-sighted politicking. The events of the Second World War had drawn a clear line between good and evil, and that line had been enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the decisions of the Nuremberg Tribunal. Attempts to justify or glorify Nazi accomplices and erode the memory of the great victory were therefore futile. Such attempts had been repeatedly condemned in similar United Nations resolutions.

103. Having adopted the draft resolution, the Committee had once again confirmed the irrevocable verdict of history that Nazism, neo-Nazism, xenophobia, racism and racial discrimination had no place in the modern world. In view of its opposition to attempts to politicize that important topic and its desire to preserve the thematic nature of the draft resolution,

his delegation wished to disassociate itself from the irrelevant paragraph that had been introduced by the politically motivated amendment.

104. **Mr. Hauri** (Switzerland) said that his country unequivocally condemned all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism. Racism and racial discrimination were incompatible with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, divided communities and bred fear and animosity. It was troubling that such phenomena remained a reality for many racial, ethnic and religious communities around the world and continued to affect societies, institutions and cultures. That was why Member States must adopt an active and intersectional anti-racist approach in their commitment to human rights.

105. The draft resolution contained important elements contributing to efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Switzerland welcomed the inclusion of the reference to the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, as had been done in the past. However, Switzerland condemned the fact that the Russian Federation had sought to justify its military aggression against Ukraine on the basis of the alleged elimination of neo-Nazism, as stated in the Special Rapporteur's report. Switzerland strongly rejected the claim that Ukraine needed so-called "denazification" and condemned the use of that term. The military aggression against Ukraine was a flagrant violation of international law. For that reason, Switzerland supported the adoption of the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#).

106. It was regrettable that the draft resolution did not reflect additional contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia or related intolerance and the resurgent scourge of racism. Moreover, the way in which the obligations of Member States with regard to international human rights law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations were mischaracterized was cause for deep concern. Lastly, Switzerland reiterated its strong commitment to the rights to freedom of expression, freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of association. In the light of the above, his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

107. **Mr. Dang** Tran Nam Trung (Viet Nam) said that his country condemned all forms of racist violence, racial discrimination and incitement to racism. In that

spirit, Viet Nam had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as it had done for years, but disassociated itself from the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#). Genuine cooperation and dialogue based on the principles of non-selectivity, impartiality and non-politicization were the most effective way of addressing human rights issues. Rather than helping to achieve those objectives, the amendment was divisive and counterproductive. Unnecessary duplication of work and substance should be avoided, especially when there were appropriate forums to discuss such issues.

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

109. However, the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) shifted the focus of the text away from a thematic resolution to one that targeted specific countries, which sowed divisiveness rather than encouraging unity in combating extremism. The noting of the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution as orally revised applied to the report as a whole and not just to paragraph 70, on which the text of the amendment was based. The outcome of the voting had shown that the introduction of the amendment had never been based on substance or relevance to the draft resolution but was clearly another example of double standards. In the light of the above, Malaysia disassociated itself from the amendment, urged Member States to refrain from presenting proposals that further entrenched differences and called for constructive dialogue.

110. **Mr. Kulháněk** (Czechia), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the candidate country Ukraine, said that, for many European countries, the end of the Second World War had resulted not in freedom but in further occupation and more repression, and in some cases even crimes against humanity by other totalitarian regimes. Indeed, the most devastating parts of Europe's

history had been the result of totalitarian ideologies, including Nazism. Under the false pretence of combating Nazism, the Russian Federation had brought the horrors of war back to Europe, along with the reminder that peace could not be taken for granted. The European Union and its member States strongly condemned the abuse of the argument of combating Nazism and rejected the inaccurate and inappropriate use of the term “denazification” by the Russian Federation to justify its inhuman, cruel and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine, the continued impacts of which were dire not only for the people of Ukraine but also for people around the world. Such distortion eroded the understanding of the Holocaust, disrespected its legacy and undermined democratic principles.

111. For years, the European Union had called upon Member States to avoid misusing and co-opting efforts to combat extremism and the condemnation of Nazi ideology for politically motivated purposes in an attempt to excuse new violations and abuses of human rights. The tragic legacy of the Second World War should continue to serve as moral and political inspiration to face the current global challenges. The European Union and its member States were unequivocal in their commitment to global efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and related intolerance. Joint efforts to combat contemporary forms of all extremist and totalitarian ideologies, including neo-Nazism, must be a priority for the whole international community. For all those reasons, the European Union member States had voted against the draft resolution.

112. **Mr. Passmoor** (South Africa) said that Member States should avoid using thematic debates and draft resolutions to examine country-specific issues, as doing so served only to dilute the value of such an important international conversation. South Africa opposed the politicization of human rights and any attempts to utilize the draft resolution on combating glorification of Nazism to undermine multilateralism. All countries must be guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the International Bill of Human Rights and avoid selectivity and the politicization of draft resolutions. Consequently, any criticism directed towards Member States should be applied fairly and equally and must not be politically motivated.

113. The resolution on combating glorification of Nazism remained an important thematic document that complemented the resolution relating to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. Racism and

racial discrimination were structural issues in the global system and must not be abused for political purposes, because doing so would undermine the intent of the agenda item and limit its capacity. Discussions on the draft resolution should be aimed at addressing the systemic causes of racism and avoid politicization of the issue. While his delegation recognized the critical value of the draft resolution as one of the key pillars in global efforts to combat racial discrimination, it wished to unequivocally disassociate itself from the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), which introduced country-specific language into a thematic human rights draft resolution. Lastly, he urged all Member States to avoid selectivity and the politicization of human rights.

114. **Ms. Jimenez de la Hoz** (Spain) said that her country reaffirmed its commitment to democratic values and unreservedly condemned all manifestations of Nazi and fascist ideologies. The Spanish Parliament had passed a law on historical memory in 2007 and a law on democratic memory in 2022 as a tribute to all those who had fought and resisted Nazism and fascism in all their forms and as a tool against hate speech, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and Islamophobia.

115. It was a perversion of the values and principles of the Charter of the United Nations to try to use them to justify their violation, to use force and to question the sovereignty of States in the name of so-called “denazification”, as was currently the case with the Russian invasion of Ukraine. That was why, while reiterating its commitment to democratic efforts to combat Nazism, fascism, racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and Islamophobia, Spain was obliged to denounce the deliberate manipulation of those efforts and had voted against the draft resolution in defence of the Charter of the United Nations.

116. **Ms. Orduz** (Colombia) said that her country was committed to combating the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and other practices that fuelled contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. Member States should understand the need not to incorporate elements that could politicize the agenda item and instead focus on the importance of the draft resolution for combating all forms of discrimination. For those reasons, Colombia had voted in favour of the draft resolution and against the amendment.

117. **Mr. Yahiaoui** (Algeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to demonstrate its commitment to combating all forms of violence, terrorism, racism and discrimination based on

religion, belief or origin. There was a need to bolster international efforts to counter contemporary forms of racism and intolerance, which were worsening throughout the world, especially with the misuse of modern technologies. In that context, Algeria reaffirmed the importance of international efforts to implement the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. His delegation disassociated itself from paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, in line with its principled position on avoiding the politicization of human rights issues, which should be addressed in a manner consistent with the principles of objectivity, independence and non-selectivity and in coordination with the States concerned, as that was the prerequisite for achieving the desired goals. All Member States should undertake further efforts to uphold the technical nature of such draft resolutions and to arrive at consensus through transparent and constructive dialogue that addressed the concerns of all States.

118. **Mr. Marschik** (Austria) said that his country rejected and condemned all forms of totalitarianism, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, as well as racism, intolerance and discrimination on any basis, including antisemitism. Austrian law prescribed severe penalties for Nazism and the promotion of Nazi ideology, and combating antisemitism was one of his Government's key priorities. Austria condemned in the strongest possible terms the illegal war of aggression waged by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and the abuse of the argument of combating Nazism. Furthermore, it rejected the inaccurate and inappropriate use of the term "denazification" in the draft resolution to justify the aggression against Ukraine. Such distortion eroded the understanding of Nazism and the Holocaust, disrespected the victims and undermined democratic values.

119. Although the European Union member States had engaged actively and constructively in the negotiations on the draft resolution, their concerns had still not been addressed. Efforts to combat extremism and the condemnation of the ideology of Nazism must not be misused and co-opted for politically motivated purposes. Although the dangers of rising global neo-Nazism and antisemitism deserved a meaningful and constructive discussion, that had not been the case for the current draft resolution. While his delegation had abstained from voting on previous draft resolutions on combating glorification of Nazism, the use of efforts to combat Nazism as a pretext to inflict the horrors of war on others could never be justified, and his delegation had therefore voted against the draft resolution.

120. **Mr. Greco** (Italy) said that his country reiterated its strong commitment to global efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and related intolerance. Equality and non-discrimination were core values of the Italian Constitution. It was regrettable that all contemporary forms of racist extremism had never been addressed in an impartial, transparent, balanced and comprehensive manner in the draft resolution on combating glorification of Nazism, and that emphasis continued to be placed on certain issues that were not directly linked to human rights or to efforts to combat Nazism and discrimination. Efforts to combat racism should neither be manipulated nor used for politically motivated purposes that fell outside the scope of human rights.

121. In that connection, Italy strongly condemned the abuse of the argument of combating Nazism put forward by the Russian Federation to justify its unprovoked and illegal aggression against Ukraine, the continuing impacts of which were dire not only for the people of Ukraine but also for people around the world. Europe's tragic past should continue to serve as moral and political inspiration to face the current global challenges, create open and tolerant societies and communities, embrace ethnic, religious and sexual minorities and promote democracy and human rights. Combating contemporary forms of extremist and totalitarian ideologies, including Nazism, must be a priority for the whole international community through the full implementation of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and other relevant human rights treaties. For all those reasons, Italy had voted against the draft resolution.

122. **Ms. Pella** (Indonesia) said that the commitment to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination, including Islamophobia, Christianophobia, antisemitism and other forms of racism, was fundamental for Indonesia, which was religiously and culturally diverse. Cherry-picking a particular paragraph from the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance demonstrated partiality and compromised the cooperative spirit enshrined in resolutions. Member States should avoid politicization and uphold international cooperation in combating racism. In that connection, her delegation was of the view that the oral revision to reinsert paragraph 3 was sufficient and provided a more comprehensive view towards the implementation of the draft resolution.

123. **Ms. Carrel** (New Zealand) said that, while her country unequivocally condemned any form of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia or related intolerance, including Nazism and neo-Nazism, it was deeply concerned by the draft resolution. Russia was seeking to misappropriate false narratives, including the glorification of Nazism, as a pretext for aggression and the use of force against a Member State. New Zealand condemned the illegal and unjustified invasion by Russia of Ukraine and called upon Russia to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine. Russia continued to seek to justify its territorial aggression against Ukraine on the purported basis of eliminating neo-Nazism. Accordingly, the draft resolution was a vehicle for that country to continue to promote that false narrative. In that regard, New Zealand was pleased to have sponsored the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#).

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

125. **Ms. Gebrekidan** (Eritrea) said that it was disappointing that, despite the universal significance of the thematic draft resolution on combating glorification of Nazism, attempts had been made to politicize it by proposing amendments critical of a specific country, which set a dangerous precedent of politicizing thematic agendas in the Committee. In that regard, Eritrea had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but wished to disassociate itself from the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#).

126. Hate crimes, incitement to violence and the targeting of anyone based on their ethnic, racial or religious background were fundamentally incompatible with the objectives and principles of democracy and human rights. Member States needed to remain vigilant in combating those phenomena, including through the promotion of tolerance and understanding among countries and societies. Eritrea strongly believed that the current agenda item was a unifying theme that could strengthen international cooperation to promote tolerance, awareness and education and to provide

accurate accounts of historical facts and injustices, no matter how uncomfortable. That was the only way of ridding the world of hatred, racism, xenophobia, Nazism and neo-Nazism and to prevent their re-emergence.

127. **Mr. Kim** Nam Hyok (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and appreciated the efforts of the Russian Federation to combat Nazism, neo-Nazism and related intolerance for the promotion and protection of human rights. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea rejected any attempt to pursue unjustified initiatives to target individual countries and stir up confrontation and distrust among Member States. His delegation therefore disassociated itself from the politicized amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#).

128. **Mr. Lamce** (Albania) said that his country condemned the glorification of Nazism, neo-Nazism and all forms of racism, xenophobia, discrimination and intolerance. While his delegation welcomed the adoption of the oral revision and the amendment to the draft resolution, the text required further substantial improvement.

129. Over the years, the Russian Federation had attempted to use the draft resolution to legitimize its long-standing disinformation campaigns by spreading false narratives and accusations. Neo-Nazism was being used by that country to justify its military invasion and territorial aggression against Ukraine, violating international peace and security and causing unprecedented human harm and suffering. The actions of the Russian Federation, its behaviour towards neighbouring countries and its brutal aggression in Ukraine had clearly shown that the draft resolution was no longer about combating the glorification of Nazism and neo-Nazism but an attempt to rewrite history and justify war. For those reasons, Albania had voted against the draft resolution.

130. **Ms. Mendez Gruezo** (Ecuador) said that her country condemned the glorification of Nazism and neo-Nazism in all their forms but also deplored the abuse of the narrative of "denazification" to justify foreign military aggression, which had had devastating humanitarian consequences for civilians and had led to a significant deterioration in the full enjoyment of their human rights. Rather than contributing to the achievement of the goals set out in the draft resolution, such acts limited its implementation. Although Ecuador would continue to defend the goals of the draft resolution, it had abstained from the vote owing to the

politicization of the initial version of the draft resolution, in which no reference had been made to the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

131. **Ms. Arega** (Ethiopia) said that her country was committed to eradicating every form of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, including Nazism, neo-Nazism and fascism. Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, violent extremism and related intolerance were global problems, with millions suffering from structural inequalities rooted in slavery, colonialism and violent extremism. Moreover, contemporary racism and related intolerance were systematic, taking the form of hate speech, bigotry and other forms of discrimination and intolerance. Over 20 years since the adoption of the Durban Declaration, States were as divided as ever. Member States should therefore act in solidarity to dismantle racism, discrimination and related intolerance and strengthen their efforts to address the disparities and inequalities in human development resulting from those phenomena.

132. In that regard, she thanked the Russian Federation for its consistency in submitting the draft resolution on combating glorification of Nazism. Her delegation opposed the introduction of country-specific amendments to thematic topics and therefore disassociated itself from the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), which politicized and undermined the essence of the draft resolution and weakened efforts to combat and eradicate the problem.

133. **Mr. Altarsha** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his country's position on condemning and combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance was clear: nothing could justify those acts of hatred, including Nazism and neo-Nazism. That was why his delegation had consistently sponsored the draft resolution on the topic. However, it had voted against and wished to disassociate itself from the amendment contained in [A/C.3/77/L.52](#), because it was not acceptable to mention a specific country in a thematic draft resolution. Moreover, the amendment was an example of double standards and selectivity and an attempt to politicize a thematic draft resolution.

134. **Ms. Xu Daizhu** (China) said that her country resolutely opposed attempts to deny, distort and falsify the history of the Second World War to glorify Nazism, fascism and militarism and to aid in the resurgence of such phenomena and all forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

China was ready to work with all parties to uphold the correct historical perspective, to jointly preserve the achievements of the victory in the Second World War and to safeguard the international system with the United Nations at its core and the international order underpinned by international law.

135. The measures taken by Member States on the subject should aim to bridge differences and solve problems rather than stir up conflict and further complicate the situation. Unfortunately, a small number of countries were not only devoting themselves to country-specific human rights mechanisms, joint statements and side events targeting developing countries but were also trying to include country-specific elements in thematic draft resolutions by proposing amendments that were clearly not in line with the Committee's working methods. Furthermore, among the sponsors of the amendment contained in document [A/C.3/77/L.52](#) were countries that attempted to falsify the history of the Second World War and refused to recognize war crimes. In that connection, her delegation expressed its deep concern at the attempts of a few countries to create division and politicize issues and wished to disassociate itself from the amendment.

136. **Mr. Magosaki** (Japan) asked whether the delegations that had sponsored the draft resolution were able to disassociate themselves from parts of it.

137. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Member States had the right to disassociate themselves from parts of a draft resolution even if they had sponsored it.

138. **Mr. González Behmaras** (Cuba) said that it was his understanding that, when a draft resolution was amended, it was no longer the text that had been sponsored, which was why a sponsor could not withdraw a draft resolution after it had been amended and delegations were free to disassociate themselves from any part of it.

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

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/77/L.38)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.38: The right to privacy in the digital age

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

140. **Mr. Parga Cintra** (Brazil), introducing the draft resolution, said that efforts had been made to update the text and pave the way for further discussions on the right to privacy in the following two years. Member States had sought to identify which recent developments in digital technology required more attention in terms of human rights observance, with a focus on privacy. In that vein, wording had been included on face recognition technologies, predictive algorithms and blockchain technologies. Wording had also been included on vulnerable groups, including women and girls, children, persons with disabilities and older persons, and on health emergencies, in particular the recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. The draft resolution was a successful example of the complementarity between the work of the Committee and the Human Rights Council.

141. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cabo Verde, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Iceland, Ireland, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Panama, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, San Marino, Serbia and Ukraine.

142. He then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, Angola, Congo and Equatorial Guinea.

143. **Mr. Geisler** (Germany) said that, on the basis of the principle that human rights online must be protected to the same degree as human rights offline, States were called upon in the draft resolution to strengthen user agency by improving technical, regulatory, legal and ethical safeguards and not to interfere with encryption and anonymity tools used by individuals to secure their communications. In addition, business enterprises were

called upon to enhance their efforts to conduct sincere human rights due diligence in order to prevent and mitigate the adverse human rights impacts of the technologies they developed. It was noted with deep concern that tools developed by private actors to undertake surveillance, hack devices and intercept and disrupt communication interfered with the professional and private lives of individuals; and the use of non-representative data in the development of algorithms or other predictive technologies was cautioned against, as that was likely to result in racial or other forms of discrimination. Lastly, a stronger focus was placed on vulnerable groups that suffered disproportionately from violations of their right to privacy online, including children, women, journalists and other media workers and those engaged in the promotion and defence of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

144. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.38 was adopted.*

145. **Ms. Korac** (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution because crucial privacy rights and their importance for the exercise of the rights to freedom of opinion, expression, peaceful assembly and association were reaffirmed therein. Those rights, as set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and protected under the United States Constitution and laws, were pillars of democracy in the United States and globally. Her country stood firm in its commitment to the promotion and protection of the work of human rights defenders and recognized that the threats they faced were multifaceted and complex, often taking place online and offline. The United States looked forward to continuing its engagement with partners in addressing the unlawful and arbitrary use of surveillance technologies to target and censor human rights defenders, journalists and other members of civil society.

146. Her delegation understood the draft resolution to be consistent with its long-standing views regarding the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and interpreted it accordingly. The appropriate standard under article 17 of the Covenant as to whether an interference with privacy was permissible was whether it was lawful and not arbitrary. While reference was made in the draft resolution to the principles of necessity and proportionality, article 17 did not impose such a standard, and parties to the Covenant were not obligated to take such principles into account in implementing their obligations under that article. The United States

hoped further work on the topic could address other areas relating to privacy rights, including the misuse of surveillance technologies to track perceived critics and enable political repression.

147. **Ms. Raban** (United Kingdom) said that her country was actively committed to upholding the right to privacy and affirmed that rights enjoyed offline must be protected online. The steps taken by some nations to ensure that the surveillance and interception of communications were conducted with procedural safeguards that complied with international human rights standards were welcome. While her delegation would have liked the proposals to ensure a human-centric approach to technology design and to include wording on preventing unlawful interference with the privacy of human rights defenders to have been accepted, especially as both proposals had received support from several nations, it strongly welcomed the wording recognizing the importance of the inclusion of and the need to consult with persons with disabilities as technologies developed.

Agenda item 109: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/77/L.2, A/C.3/77/L.3 and A/C.3/77/L.4)

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.2: Follow-up to the Fourteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and preparations for the Fifteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice

148. **Mr. Mahmassani** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that, under the terms of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to hold the Fifteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in 2026, without prejudice to the timing of subsequent United Nations congresses on crime prevention and criminal justice and with a view to maintaining the five-year cycle of the congresses, in the light of the intensive follow-up process undertaken by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in the implementation of the Kyoto Declaration on Advancing Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice and the Rule of Law: Towards the Achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. That decision would result in an addition to the workload for the Secretariat in 2025 and 2026. The resource requirements would provide for assistance in the preparation and

servicing of the Fifteenth Congress and its preparatory meetings; specialized expertise to prepare technical research papers on the substantive agenda items and workshop topics of the Fifteenth Congress and to service the workshops at the Fifteenth Congress; participation of the least developed countries in the Fifteenth Congress and the regional preparatory meetings; and the travel of staff to provide substantive servicing for the regional preparatory meetings of the Fifteenth Congress.

149. The adoption of the draft resolution would therefore give rise to budgetary implications under the proposed programme budgets for 2025 and 2026 to cover the activities of the Fifteenth Congress and its preparatory activities. However, it was the Secretariat's understanding that the format of the proposed Fifteenth Congress might be revised from that of previous sessions. Given the uncertainty, the Secretariat was not currently in a position to determine the requirements for 2025 and 2026.

150. Accordingly, the adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any additional appropriation under the programme budget for 2023. Resource requirements for 2025 and 2026 would be presented in the proposed programme budgets for those years for consideration by the General Assembly at its seventy-ninth and eightieth sessions respectively.

151. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.2 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.3: Reducing reoffending through rehabilitation and reintegration

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.4: Strengthening national and international efforts, including with the private sector, to protect children from sexual exploitation and abuse

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

155. *Draft resolution A/C.3/77/L.4 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.