



General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
21 January 2021

Original: English

Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

Summary record of the 9th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 4 November 2020, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Kelapile (Botswana)

Contents

Agenda item 50: Effects of atomic radiation (*continued*)*Agenda item 51: International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space
(*continued*)*Agenda item 52: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in
the Near East (*continued*)*Agenda item 53: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices
Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the
Occupied Territories (*continued*)*Agenda item 54: Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping
operations in all their aspects (*continued*)*Agenda item 55: Comprehensive review of special political missions (*continued*)*Agenda item 56: Questions relating to information (*continued*)*Agenda item 57: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted
under Article 73 *e* of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*)*Agenda item 58: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the
peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*Agenda item 59: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of
Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the
international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*)*

* Items which the Committee has decided to consider together.

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/>).



Agenda item 60: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)*

Agenda item 61: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other agenda items*) (*continued*)*

Agenda item 50: Effects of atomic radiation (*continued*)

Agenda item 51: International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space (*continued*)

Agenda item 52: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Comprehensive review of special political missions (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Questions relating to information (*continued*)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda item 50: Effects of atomic radiation
(*continued*) (A/75/46)

Agenda item 51: International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space (*continued*) (A/75/20)

Agenda item 52: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
(*continued*) (A/75/13, A/75/196, A/75/299 and A/75/305)

Agenda item 53: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (*continued*) (A/75/199, A/75/328 and A/75/336)

Agenda item 54: Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Comprehensive review of special political missions (*continued*) (A/75/312)

Agenda item 56: Questions relating to information
(*continued*) (A/75/21 and A/75/294)

Agenda item 57: Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter of the United Nations (*continued*)
(A/75/23 and A/75/64)

Agenda item 58: Economic and other activities which affect the interests of the peoples of the Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*)
(A/75/23)

Agenda item 59: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations (*continued*) (A/75/23 and A/75/73)

Agenda item 60: Offers by Member States of study and training facilities for inhabitants of Non-Self-Governing Territories (*continued*) (A/75/74 and A/75/74/Add.1)

Agenda item 61: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*Territories not covered under other agenda items*) (*continued*) (A/75/23, A/75/73, A/75/220 and A/75/367)

1. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Observer for the League of Arab States) said that, over the previous seven decades, the Committee had participated in establishing the international terms of reference underpinning the effort

to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict and the question of Palestine, which included the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Madrid terms of reference, the Oslo Accords and the Arab Peace Initiative, with the ultimate aim of establishing a Palestinian State on the borders of 4 June 1967 with East Jerusalem as its capital, on the basis of the two-State solution. The League of Arab States rejected any initiatives not based on those internationally recognized parameters or on direct negotiations between the two parties.

2. Israel continued to pursue its illegal settlement policy, imposing new facts on the ground with a view to annexing the Occupied Palestinian Territory, in contravention of Security Council resolutions. Other Israeli practices in violation of international law, international humanitarian law and international human rights law included demolition of homes and forced displacement. The League once again condemned the violations perpetrated with impunity by Israel in the occupied Arab territories, including the Syrian Golan, and echoed the Secretary-General's call for a resumption of the peace process through high-level meetings of the international Quartet and a return to constructive negotiations between the two parties, on the basis of the two-State solution and the international terms of reference, which was the only way to achieve a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. It enjoined all international stakeholders to translate their words on the issues addressed under agenda items 52 and 53 into deeds, and to help realize the vision set out in the Arab Peace Initiative.

3. It was incumbent upon the international community to settle the pivotal question of Palestine refugees. Pending such settlement, it must continue to provide support to the Palestine refugees in the areas served by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). Any interruption in voluntary contributions to the Agency would imperil the continuity of its vital services, to the detriment of Palestine refugees. The League of Arab States therefore called on donor countries that had frozen or reduced their financial contributions to UNRWA to reconsider that decision in order to sustain the Agency's humanitarian work.

4. The Department of Global Communications had played a leading role in protecting multilingualism and publicizing Arab causes. It had provided good coverage of issues related to Syria, Yemen, Iraq, the Sudan and Somalia. The Department's media strategy must draw attention to the suffering of the Palestinian people living under Israeli occupation, including through the dissemination of periodic reports from UNRWA and other United Nations entities handling questions related

to Palestinian rights. The Department's strategy should also contribute to repudiating extremist religious and social ideologies, which were harmful to all societies, by promoting multilingualism, non-discrimination and dialogue among civilizations, religions and cultures.

5. Given the vast potential of radio to reach people in remote, less developed and technologically underdeveloped areas of the Arab world, the Arabic-language section of United Nations Radio should receive due attention. United Nations media operations should carve out a role for national and regional Arabic-language media platforms, especially radio and television. They should increase investment in social media, with a particular focus on persons with special needs and on the use of sign language.

6. Lastly, the League of Arab States endorsed the Secretary-General's appeal for a global ceasefire with a view to promoting international solidarity in combating the health, economic and social impacts of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic.

Statements made in exercise of the right of reply

7. **Mr. Bastaki** (United Arab Emirates) said that, in response to the irresponsible and baseless accusations levelled by the representative of Iran at the previous meeting, he was obliged to reaffirm the undeniable reality that the three islands of Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa were an integral part of the United Arab Emirates. He therefore called on Iran to stop making such accusations and to respond constructively to his Government's calls to resolve the matter peacefully through direct negotiations or referral to the International Court of Justice.

8. **Mr. Kadiri** (Morocco) said that the representative of Iran had seen fit to exercise the right of reply at the previous meeting despite the fact that his own delegation's statement had contained no references to that country. It was on the basis of the very principle of territorial integrity mentioned by Iran that Morocco reaffirmed its full support for the sovereignty of the United Arab Emirates over the three occupied islands of Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa. The islands had always been an integral part of Emirati national territory, as confirmed by legal and historical documents. The request to resolve the conflict peacefully, either through direct negotiations or by referral to the International Court of Justice, should indeed be heeded.

9. Iran, whose representative had invoked the right to self-determination, should start by granting that right to religious, linguistic, ethnic and other minorities. The rampant, systematic violation by Iran of those groups' rights had been confirmed by the United Nations and

non-governmental organizations, with the General Assembly adopting an annual resolution on the human rights situation in Iran.

10. Iran should stop its reprehensible, destabilizing interference in neighbouring countries and throughout the Arab world, stoking conflicts in the region, threatening peace and violating principles of good-neighbourly relations, international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Lastly, with regard to the Moroccan Sahara, he referred the representative of Iran to the numerous statements delivered by delegations, including his own, highlighting the historical, political, geographical, human, religious and legal evidence that the Sahara was Moroccan.

11. **Mr. Mazzeo** (Argentina), replying to the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning the Malvinas Islands at the previous meeting, said that his delegation reiterated the statement made by the President of Argentina to the General Assembly on 22 September 2020, as well as the statement by the Permanent Representative of Argentina and those made in right of reply at the Committee's meetings during the current session. The Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas were an integral part of the national territory of Argentina and, being illegally occupied by the United Kingdom, they were the subject of a sovereignty dispute between the two parties, which was recognized by a number of international organizations. That illegal occupation had led the General Assembly to adopt 10 resolutions on the issue, all of which recognized the existence of the sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands and called upon the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute as soon as possible. For its part, the Special Committee on decolonization had repeatedly adopted resolutions in the same vein, most recently as contained in its report for 2020.

12. The principle of self-determination, which the United Kingdom used as the basis for its refusal to resume negotiations on sovereignty, was inapplicable to the dispute in question, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Special Committee resolutions. Consequently, the 2013 vote held in the Malvinas Islands was simply a unilateral action undertaken by the United Kingdom, devoid of any legal value; it in no way changed the essence of the question, it did not resolve the sovereignty dispute and it had no effect on the legitimate rights of Argentina.

13. The solution to the sovereignty dispute was not dependent on the results of a vote in which British subjects had been asked whether they wished to remain British. Allowing the British inhabitants of the Islands to arbitrate in a sovereignty dispute to which their own country was a party distorted the right to self-determination of peoples, given that the people of the Malvinas were not a people within the meaning of international law. The interests and way of life of the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands were adequately addressed by the relevant General Assembly resolutions and by the Constitution of Argentina.

14. The United Kingdom alleged that General Assembly resolutions concerning decolonization were not legally binding; however, in its advisory opinion concerning the legal consequences of the separation of the Chagos Archipelago from Mauritius in 1965, the International Court of Justice had clearly asserted the crucial role of the General Assembly, and its Special Committee on decolonization, in supervising the implementation of obligations incumbent upon administering Powers; establishing the modalities necessary for ensuring the completion of decolonization processes; and determining whether the right to self-determination was applicable in specific cases and, if so, how that right should be exercised. The Court had also affirmed the normative value of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the principles set out therein, including that of territorial integrity, which had been constituted as customary law through State practice and *opinio juris*. According to the advisory opinion, the right to self-determination could not be exercised by a population that did not constitute a people entitled to self-determination. The obligation to resume negotiations did not depend on the wishes of the inhabitants implanted in the Islands by the colonial Power, but was instead enshrined in Article 2 (3) of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant General Assembly resolutions.

15. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation categorically rejected the baseless claim made by the representatives of Morocco and the United Arab Emirates in respect of the three Iranian islands. The claim constituted an attack on the territorial integrity of a country with thousands of years of history, as well as a desperate attempt, in the case of Morocco, to conceal its failure to fulfil its obligation to grant the Sahrawi people the right to self-determination long promised to it by the international community, in accordance with international law and the Charter. Morocco should stop interfering in the internal affairs of other States and challenging territorial integrity, uphold its obligation to the Sahrawi people, refrain from

committing human rights violations and implement the United Nations resolutions on the Sahrawi people's right to self-determination, a right disregarded by the Moroccan Government for decades. The Islamic Republic of Iran reaffirmed the Sahrawi people's right to self-determination, in line with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and expressed support for the ongoing negotiation process aimed at achieving a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution that would provide for the exercise of that right. It was vital that the parties commit to continuing the process within the framework of United Nations-sponsored talks without preconditions and in good faith, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter. For its part, the international community must commit to implementing all United Nations resolutions and decisions on Western Sahara and supporting the Territory's people in its quest for self-determination.

16. **Mr. Rogers** (United Kingdom), replying to the comments made by the representative of Argentina, said that the United Kingdom had no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas of those Territories, or regarding the right of the Falkland Islanders to self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. The allegation that the Falkland Islanders were not entitled to self-determination because they did not constitute a people was untrue. He looked forward to a time after the pandemic when the people of the territories discussed in the Committee would be able to return to United Nations Headquarters to have their voices heard.

17. His Government's relationship with the Falkland Islands, as with all of its Overseas Territories, was a modern one based on partnership, shared values and the right of the people of each Territory to determine their own future.

18. **Mr. Bastaki** (United Arab Emirates) said that, with regard to the spurious allegations made in respect of the three islands in the Arabian Gulf, the islands were an integral part of his country's national territory and had long been under the rule of the emirates of Sharjah and Ra's al-Khaimah. The failure of Iran to substantiate its allegations with documented evidence made it clear that it had no legitimate right over the Emirati islands. Moreover, the representative of Iran had crossed the line by encroaching on the issue of Moroccan sovereignty over the Moroccan Sahara, attesting to that country's disregard for international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

19. **Mr. Kadiri** (Morocco) said that Morocco, a country with a history spanning thousands of years, fully supported the sovereignty of the United Arab Emirates over the islands of Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb and Abu Musa occupied by Iran. Historical and legal records confirmed that the islands were an integral part of the United Arab Emirates. Morocco therefore called on Iran to comply with the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the principle of territorial integrity by ensuring that the islands were restored to their rightful owner. The United Arab Emirates had demonstrated its respect for international law and the Charter by committing to peaceful settlement of the dispute, either through direct negotiations or by referral of the case to the International Court of Justice.

20. It was ironic that Iran was calling for non-interference in the internal affairs of States, given its persistent habit of interfering in the affairs of neighbouring countries, a fact attested to in United Nations reports. Iran must put an immediate end to such interference, which posed a dire threat to regional peace and stability, and instead comply with international law and the Charter and respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours and all Arab countries.

21. As for the right to self-determination, instead of supporting it when it saw fit, Iran should begin by granting it to its own minorities, which continued to clamour for that right despite being subjected to all manner of discrimination. It must also uphold all human rights, which it violated on a daily basis, including the rights to freedom of expression, freedom of belief and freedom of association, in addition to refraining from resorting to torture, extrajudicial killings and arbitrary detention, including of holders of more than one nationality and of foreign nationals, as documented in United Nations reports. Lastly, he once again advised the representative of Iran to educate himself about the question of the Moroccan Sahara by referring to the statements of over 40 countries, including his own, regarding the historical, geographical, political, religious and legal foundations of the Moroccan character of the Sahara.

22. **Mr. Mazzeo** (Argentina), responding to comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom, said that the principle of self-determination was not applicable to the question of the Malvinas Islands, given the absence of an active subject that possessed that right in that special and particular situation. Furthermore, self-determination as a right was not absolute but was delimited by the principle of territorial integrity, as stipulated in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). The General Assembly itself had expressly ruled out the

applicability of the principle of self-determination to the question of the Malvinas Islands in 1985, when it had rejected two proposals by the United Kingdom seeking to incorporate that principle into a draft resolution on that specific question. The particular characteristics of the question of the Malvinas Islands, as recognized by the General Assembly, stemmed from the fact that the United Kingdom had, by an act of force, usurped part of the territory of an independent State in 1833, expelling the Argentine authorities and population and preventing them from returning. The population implanted by the United Kingdom had not been subjected to subjugation or domination by a colonial Power in line with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and as had been the case in other colonial situations. Argentina had never consented to the establishment by the United Kingdom of its own community in the islands. In other words, there was a colonial situation but not a colonized population. Any other approach to the situation would amount to endorsing an act of usurpation and allowing the inhabitants of the Islands to arbitrate a territorial dispute to which their country was a party. To conclude, Argentina reaffirmed its legitimate sovereignty rights over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia Islands and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, which were an integral part of its national territory.

23. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation did not recognize any issue regarding the three Iranian islands, which remained an integral part of Iranian national territory. The unfounded claim made by the representative of the United Arab Emirates was irrelevant to the agenda item relating to decolonization and an instance of that country's continual abuse of the Committee to advance its narrow political interests in the Persian Gulf. He called on the United Arab Emirates to uphold its obligations under international law and the Charter of the United Nations and to put an end to its destabilizing behaviour and unlawful conduct in an already volatile Middle East.

24. He categorically rejected and strongly condemned the remarks of the representative of Morocco, which, given its long history of violating the human rights of the Sahrawi people and disregarding the Organization's demand for that people to be allowed to exercise its right to self-determination, was in no position to lecture the delegation of Iran on such matters. Those remarks constituted a violation of international law, insofar as they openly flouted the principles of territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

Agenda item 50: Effects of atomic radiation
(continued) (A/C.4/75/L.4)

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.4: Effects of atomic radiation

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

26. **Ms. Henderson** (Australia), introducing the draft resolution, said that the sixty-seventh session of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation had been postponed from July 2020 to November 2020, owing to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Her delegation welcomed the update on the activities of the Scientific Committee since its sixty-sixth session (A/75/46) and looked forward to the consideration of the three new scientific annexes and the future programme of work for the period 2020–2024 at its sixty-seventh session. The work of the Scientific Committee remained the basis for the international radiation safety framework, affecting the decisions of Governments and international bodies. Its objectivity, independence, competence and calibre, attributes that had earned the respect of the international community, must be safeguarded in order to ensure a strong scientific basis for the protection of current and future generations.

27. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, France, Greece, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Monaco, North Macedonia, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

28. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Albania, Croatia, Malawi, Malta, Montenegro and Papua New Guinea.

29. **Ms. Sutton** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that her delegation was a strong supporter of the Scientific Committee. However, it believed that the language in paragraph 24 regarding the criteria for new members of the Scientific Committee was insufficient. While it was important to establish criteria for the experts nominated by Member States to serve on that body, the record of those Member States themselves in terms of their support for the Organization's mission of maintaining international peace and security must also be taken into account. The continued provocative and destabilizing behaviour of Iran, including the continued expansion of its nuclear capabilities, was inconsistent with that mission.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.4 was adopted.*

31. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he wished to remind the representative of the United States that her delegation's prior attempt to raise the issue in 2018 had been categorically rejected by the Committee. Doing so again would not be constructive, as the entity's exclusively scientific purview shielded it from political interference by other States.

Agenda item 51: International cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space (continued)
(A/C.4/75/L.5)

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.5: Continuity of the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its subsidiary bodies

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

33. **Mr. Hussar** (Romania), speaking on behalf of the Chair of the Working Group of the Whole on international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, said that the Working Group of the Whole had considered the draft resolution on the basis of the English advance version and had agreed to the text with no amendments. The draft resolution had subsequently been issued in all United Nations official languages.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.5 was adopted.*

Agenda item 52: United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
(continued) (A/C.4/75/L.9, A/C.4/75/L.10 and A/C.4/75/L.11)

Agenda item 53: Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (continued) (A/C.4/75/L.12, A/C.4/75/L.13, A/C.4/75/L.14 and A/C.4/75/L.15)

35. **Mr. Koba** (Indonesia), introducing draft resolutions A/C.4/75/L.9 and A/C.4/75/L.11 submitted under agenda item 52, said that the texts contained only technical updates and continued to reflect the difficult situation facing Palestine refugees and UNRWA in the Agency's five fields of operation. The Agency's severe funding shortfalls jeopardized the continuity of its operation and its ability to meet the needs of the vulnerable refugee population. UNRWA had continued to play a key role during the COVID-19 pandemic, providing relief and social services to 5.6 million refugees in what remained the largest humanitarian assistance effort in the region. He appealed to Member States to maintain their support for that effort, in line with international law, the relevant United Nations resolutions and humanitarian obligations, and as a

critical reaffirmation of solidarity with the Palestine refugees until a just solution to their plight was realized on the basis of General Assembly resolution 194 (III).

36. **Mr. Sithole** (South Africa), introducing draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.10](#) submitted under agenda item 52, said that the resolution comprehensively addressed the main aspects of UNRWA operations and the challenges faced by the Agency in all fields of operation, including East Jerusalem. Furthermore, the text had been updated to recognize the Agency's efforts to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the refugee community.

37. In the interest of streamlining, the text of draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.10](#) had been merged with key provisions of the resolution adopted at previous sessions concerning persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities. One such provision affirmed the right of the displaced persons to return to their homes in the territories occupied by Israel. His delegation once again called for the Agency's serious funding gap to be closed in order to avert the humanitarian, political and security risks that could result from any interruption or suspension of its work.

38. **Mr. Hoeseb** (Namibia), introducing draft resolutions [A/C.4/75/L.12](#) and [A/C.4/75/L.13](#) submitted under agenda item 53, said that Israeli violations had only escalated over the previous year, with settlement activity, threats of annexation, home demolitions and evictions inflicting untold suffering on the civilian population and further impairing the contiguity of Palestinian land, which undermined the prospects for realizing the two-State solution and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. That deplorable situation had been documented thoroughly in reports by United Nations agencies on the ground and international human rights and humanitarian organizations.

39. In the draft resolutions, Israel was called upon to comply with the Charter of the United Nations and with its obligations under international law, including the Fourth Geneva Convention and the relevant United Nations resolutions. The text of draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.12](#) was a technical update of the resolution on the same topic adopted at the previous session; the resolution renewed the mandate of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories, in addition to reaffirming the parameters of that mandate and requesting the Secretary-General and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to support the Special Committee in fulfilling it. The text of draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.13](#) was unchanged from that of the

resolution on the same topic adopted at the previous session, apart from some technical updates. It reaffirmed the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including the Syrian Golan.

40. **Mr. Rivero Rosario** (Cuba), introducing draft resolutions [A/C.4/75/L.14](#) and [A/C.4/75/L.15](#) submitted under agenda item 53, said that they focused on the grave and systematic violations of international law, particularly humanitarian and human rights law, committed by Israel, the occupying Power, in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan since 1967. The text of draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.14](#) was based on the resolution on the same topic adopted at the previous session, with technical updates. The condemnation of all acts of provocation and violence, whether by the Israeli occupying forces and settlers against Palestinian civilians or by militants and armed groups against Israeli civilians illustrated the objective, reasonable and balanced nature of the draft resolution.

41. Draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.15](#) was based on the text of the resolutions on the same topic adopted in previous years, with updates of certain dates and figures. For over 50 years, the Syrian people living under Israeli occupation had endured repressive and discriminatory treatment and the theft of their natural resources. They had been denied the opportunity to receive instruction under Syrian curricula or to carry Syrian national identity documents. Most recently, the occupying Power had attempted to impose illegitimate elections on Syrian nationals, whose boycott had been met with force and arrests. Cuba hoped that the firm support of Member States would contribute to putting an end to the Israeli occupation and enable the Palestinian people to exercise its rights to self-determination and independence, leading to a just, lasting and peaceful solution to the conflict.

42. **The Chair** said that recorded votes had been requested on the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 52 and 53, which had no programme budget implications.

43. **Mr. Erdan** (Israel) said that his delegation had requested a vote on the draft resolutions. Before voting, delegations must understand that every vote in favour of those shameful draft resolutions constituted another step towards making the United Nations irrelevant, as well as more proof of the Organization's refusal to see that the resolutions had achieved nothing. Instead of leading Palestinians on the path to negotiations, those resolutions further encouraged Palestinian intransigence.

One of the major causes of the Organization's failure to end the conflict was its continued support for UNRWA, an ineffectual organization that operated in contravention of United Nations principles and perpetuated the conflict. Its very existence rendered the conflict intractable; consequently, business as usual could no longer be allowed.

44. UNRWA schools were used to spread hatred and anti-Semitism, incite children to violence, promote terrorism and call into question the right of Israel to exist. Instead of protecting Palestinians from Hamas, the Agency had enabled the terrorist organization to use United Nations infrastructure to carry out its belligerent activities, which included digging terror tunnels and stockpiling rockets. Unlike the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, UNRWA inflated the number of so-called refugees, automatically recognizing all descendants of Palestinians, even those who were fully settled and integrated in other countries. It reinforced the ridiculous demand that millions of Palestinians be allowed to settle in Israel instead of remaining in areas under Palestinian authority or where they currently resided.

45. Israel supported providing humanitarian assistance to refugees as a matter of course. What it opposed, and what all Member States should oppose, was wasting resources on people who were not refugees according to the internationally accepted definition. In recent months, Israel had achieved peace with three Islamic countries, a development made possible by the fact that the United Nations, with its distorted view of history, had not been involved. The warm peace established between the Governments and peoples of Israel and its new partners demonstrated that peace would come when the sides were able to communicate and focus on opportunities. Unfortunately, UNRWA rendered impossible such communication between Palestinians and Israelis, and with it, the coexistence and peace that could otherwise ensue. It was for the sake of peace and a better future for Israelis and Palestinians alike that Israel would vote against the draft resolutions and called on all delegations truly interested in regional peace and prosperity to follow suit.

46. **Ms. Sutton** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her Government continued to prioritize peace in the Middle East. It was taking active steps to build greater trust between its partners in the region, identify their shared interests and move them away from past conflicts. The United States Vision for Peace plan and the Abraham Accords had yielded tangible gains in promoting peace, security and prosperity in the region. Despite the efforts of the United States, Israel and other regional partners,

the United Nations and the Committee continued to cling to the same unbalanced approach. The disproportionate number of resolutions that were unfairly critical of Israel demonstrated a clear and persistent institutional bias against a single Member State. Those resolutions recycled the tired rhetoric that only served to lock the two sides into the same intractable conflict, presupposing the outcome of final status issues that could be resolved only through negotiations between the parties. They also damaged the Organization's credibility and cast doubt on its impartiality. As the United States had repeatedly made clear, that dynamic was unacceptable. Her delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolutions and encouraged other States to do so as well, as the cause of peace would be served when the anti-Israel bias of the United Nations ended.

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.9: Assistance to Palestine refugees

47. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

48. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Gambia and Nigeria.

49. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary,

Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cameroon, Canada, Ghana, Kiribati, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Palau, Serbia, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.9 was adopted by 153 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.10: Operations of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

51. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey,

United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

52. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Gambia and Nigeria.

53. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Cameroon, Guatemala, Kiribati, Malawi, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Serbia, Solomon Islands.

54. Draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.10](#) was adopted by 151 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.11: Palestine refugees' properties and their revenues

55. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

56. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Gambia, Montenegro and Nigeria.

57. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman,

Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Honduras, Kiribati, Malawi, Serbia, Solomon Islands.

58. Draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.11](#) was adopted by 151 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions.

59. **Mr. Chaudhary** (Pakistan) said that his delegation, a staunch supporter of the Palestinian cause, had voted in favour of draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.9](#), but wished to dissociate itself from paragraph 6 thereof, by means of which the General Assembly would decide to invite India to become a member of the Advisory Commission of UNRWA. The atrocities perpetrated by India in the occupied territory of Jammu and Kashmir demonstrated its utter disregard for United Nations resolutions, including the Declaration on decolonization, and the Charter of the United Nations. Those atrocities had been well documented, and numerous United Nations officials had decried the human rights situation there, most recently in a joint communication issued by 18 special procedures mandate holders of the Human Rights Council.

60. In an astonishing display of duplicity, India proclaimed itself a supporter of Palestinians forcibly uprooted from their homeland while itself perpetrating demographic changes in Jammu and Kashmir, which it had occupied illegally. Just like the Palestinian people, Kashmiris were being dispossessed of their territory. India had made a massive land grab and opened the floodgates to illegal settlements by allowing non-Kashmiris to buy land in the disputed territory. The ultimate aim of India was to annihilate the native Kashmiris and make them a minority in their own land.

By every measure, India had emerged as a settler colonial State for Kashmiris.

61. He commended UNRWA for its effective provision of vital assistance to the Palestine refugees. Pakistan would continue to support the Agency politically and financially, and it would always stand with its Palestinian brothers and sisters in their just struggle for self-determination, independence and economic development.

62. **Mr. Erdan** (Israel) said that the one-sided draft resolutions served no purpose other than to demonize and discriminate against Israel, emboldening a narrative that led to incitement and violence. Anyone who wanted peace should not even contemplate supporting such hypocritical resolutions, which should be an embarrassment to the institution. The Special Committee bolstered Palestinian propaganda, thereby undermining the prospect of peace.

63. True concern for the rights of Palestinians could be demonstrated by condemning Hamas or the Palestinian Authority for denying them the right to elect their own leaders. In addition to undermining the Organization's primary goal of promoting peace and security, the resolutions shamefully contravened the principle of impartiality by adopting the Palestinian narrative, further entrenching their uncompromising position and encouraging continued rejectionism.

64. He wondered whether the point of resolutions was merely to pave the way for future resolutions, wasting United Nations resources and sabotaging chances for peace in the process. The disgraceful absence in the draft resolutions of any references to the link between the Jewish people and the Temple Mount, the holiest site in Judaism, underscored that the conflict was being considered solely through the prism of the Palestinian narrative. That audacious attempt to rewrite history would not alter the indisputable fact that the Jewish connection to the city of Jerusalem dated back thousands of years, nor that that connection was stronger than ever, with a growing number of countries acknowledging that Jerusalem was the united, undivided capital of the Jewish people and the Jewish State and moving their embassies there.

65. As minister for public security, he had ensured that people of all faiths had access to the holy sites. During his term, the number of Jews visiting the Temple Mount had more than tripled. No United Nations resolution would stop that process or change the eternal connection between the Jewish people and the holiest site in their faith, the Temple Mount. For years, the Palestinians had promoted language that included only the Islamic term of Haram Al-Sharif, purposely excluding the Jewish

name, in a distortion of history and truth. Member States could not justify perpetuating that injustice any longer. He wondered whether the purpose of the United Nations was to pass resolutions that worsened conflict and heightened religious tensions.

66. Denying the Jewish connection to the holy sites also undermined any attempt to resolve the conflict. In his recent briefing to the Security Council, the Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process had expressed concern about the threats made by Palestinian officials against Muslims who wanted to visit the Aqsa Mosque as a result of recent normalization agreements. The Committee's support had emboldened Palestinians not only to deny the Jewish connection to the sites but to deny Muslims access to them by threatening violence. By supporting the draft resolutions, the Committee would be complicit in such behaviour, reaffirming the long-standing position of Israel that the Committee was unable to play a constructive role in resolving the conflict, instead damaging the prospects for peace. For those reasons, Israel would be voting against all the draft resolutions under agenda items 52 and 53, and called on all who desired peace to do likewise.

67. **Ms. Maitra** (India), speaking in exercise of the right of reply to the statement made by the representative of Pakistan, said that no amount of repetition of the same blatant falsehoods and irrelevant issues would change the fact that Pakistan was recognized as a global hub for terrorism and the biggest destabilizing force in the world. The delegation of Pakistan paid lip service to the Secretary-General's call for a global ceasefire while its Government violated it with impunity, sponsoring cross-border terrorism and glorifying terrorists as martyrs.

68. Her delegation completely rejected the malicious references by Pakistan to the Union Territory of Jammu and Kashmir, which was an integral part of India. The baseless allegations of Pakistan concerning the internal affairs of India were completely out of order. The residents of Jammu and Kashmir presently enjoyed in full the same fundamental rights and freedoms that all Indian citizens did; the same could not be said of the beleaguered minorities of Pakistan. She once again reminded the delegation of Pakistan that the principle of self-determination could not be misused as a justification to undermine the territorial integrity of a Member State. Pakistan should abandon its desperate attempts to level unsubstantiated allegations that bore no relation to the agenda items being considered by the Committee.

69. **Mr. El Eid** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolutions under

agenda item 53, said that the European Union as a whole had not expressed a legal qualification with regard to the term “forced displacement”, which was used in some of the draft resolutions. Furthermore, the use of the term “Palestine” could not be construed as recognition of a State of Palestine and was without prejudice to the individual positions of member States on the issue and, therefore, to the question of the validity of the accession of Palestine to the international instruments referred to in the draft resolutions. The European Union welcomed the efforts of the Palestinian Mission to streamline the draft resolutions and encouraged it to continue such efforts in the future.

70. With respect to the holy sites in Jerusalem, the European Union was concerned at the troubling developments and recurrent violent clashes at the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif. Recalling the special significance of the holy sites, the European Union called for the status quo of the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif established in 1967 to be upheld, in line with previous understandings and acknowledging the special role of Jordan. The position of the European Union with respect to the draft resolutions did not imply a change in its stance on the terminology concerning the Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif.

71. The European Union welcomed the addition the previous year of wording reaffirming the special significance of the holy sites and the importance of the city of Jerusalem for the three monotheistic religions, in the resolution entitled “Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem”. However, the wording referring to the holy sites of Jerusalem must reflect the importance and historical significance of both the city of Jerusalem and the holy sites for the three monotheistic religions and respect religious and cultural sensitivities; the future choice of language might affect the support of the European Union for that draft resolution according to the established voting pattern.

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.12: Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

72. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

73. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Dominica, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Czechia, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Malawi, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

74. *Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.12 was adopted by 72 votes to 13, with 76 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.13: Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan

75. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

76. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates,

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Hungary, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Kiribati, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Serbia, Solomon Islands, Togo, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

77. *Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.13 was adopted by 142 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.14: Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem

78. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Yemen.

79. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique,

Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Guatemala, Hungary, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Austria, Belarus, Cameroon, Colombia, Czechia, Honduras, Kiribati, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Togo, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

80. Draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.14](#) was adopted by 138 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

Draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.15](#): The occupied Syrian Golan

81. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Namibia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa and United Arab Emirates.

82. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Guatemala, Honduras, Kiribati, Malawi, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Solomon Islands, Togo, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

83. Draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.15](#) was adopted by 142 votes to 2, with 19 abstentions.

84. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the adoption of all resolutions under agenda items 52 and 53 by an overwhelming majority was indicative of the widespread support among Committee members for the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and for holding the occupying Israeli regime accountable for its crimes against Palestinians, in particular, women and children.

85. Since the tragedy of Palestine had occurred, various concerned countries, the United Nations and other organizations had taken numerous initiatives to address the crisis and mitigate the plight of the Palestinian people. Resolutions had been adopted condemning the Israeli regime, various plans for peace had been proposed, and fact-finding missions had been established. However, support for the Israeli regime on the part of the United States had prevented the international community from finding a just solution to the crisis. Only by ending the Israeli occupation,

restoring the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, facilitating the return of Palestine refugees to their homeland and establishing an independent and viable State of Palestine with Jerusalem as its capital would it be possible to bring decades of conflict and instability in the Middle East to an end and establish a durable peace.

86. **Ms. Maitra** (India) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions under agenda item 52 to express its deep commitment to the Palestinian cause. The only way to redress Palestinian grievances was by establishing an independent, sovereign Palestinian State, living side by side in peace and security with Israel. India welcomed the efforts of the Palestinian Mission to streamline the resolutions under agenda items 52 and 53, including the decision to change the title of the agenda item on Israeli practices to “Israeli practices and settlement activities affecting the rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the Occupied Territories”, as from the seventy-sixth session of the General Assembly, in order to reflect more accurately the content of the resolutions considered under that item. Her delegation had abstained on draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.12](#), given its view that that resolution, along with draft resolution [A/C.4/75/L.14](#), should be streamlined in order to avoid duplication in the mandates given to the Special Committee in the former and the Secretary-General in the latter. India stood ready to work constructively with all parties to that end.

87. **Mr. Ja’afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the overwhelming support of Member States for the draft resolutions under agenda items 52 and 53 sent an unambiguous message to Israel, the occupying Power, demanding that it bring an end to the occupation and desist from its violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention, in particular, its settlement activities, theft of natural resources, confiscation of land and expulsion of the Syrian people of the Golan from their land. The decisive nature of the votes also sent an important message to those who would unilaterally legitimize the Israeli occupation of Palestinian and Syrian lands. That occupation was not a matter subject to Israeli whims but rather a legal and moral matter that United Nations diplomats handled as such, in accordance with international law. By voting against the draft resolutions, the United States and Israel had provided additional proof of their violations of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

88. The remarks made by the representative of Israel, characterizing the Organization as obsolete, betrayed a level of disdain and sheer hatred of the United Nations that made one wonder why his delegation bothered to

participate in proceedings governed by an international legitimacy that it disavowed.

89. Not satisfied with supporting Israel militarily and politically and shielding it from accountability before the Security Council, the United States had transgressed the norms of civilized relations between nations by declaring occupied Jerusalem the capital of Israel, defending the right of Israel to establish settlements in the territory it occupied, and striking the so-called deal of the century, which had further destabilized a region already in turmoil as a result of Israeli policies.

90. Perhaps the most egregious show of disdain for international consensus was the decision of the United States President to recognize the supposed sovereignty of Israel over the occupied Syrian Golan and the decision by the Prime Minister of Israel to establish a settlement named after Donald Trump in the Golan, in exchange for the United States President’s shabby acknowledgement. His Government once again condemned in the strongest terms the illegitimate and immoral order signed by the United States President in that regard, in flagrant violation of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council resolution [497 \(1981\)](#), which the United States administration in office at the time had supported. That order was nothing but a unilateral act by a party with neither the standing nor the political, legal and moral competence to decide the fate of the peoples of the world or to dispose of lands that were an integral part of the Syrian Arab Republic. In accordance with Security Council resolution [497 \(1981\)](#), any such unilateral measures were null and void and without international legal effect.

91. It behoved the United States, as a permanent member of the Security Council and host country of United Nations Headquarters, to form an international coalition to achieve peace, end the Israeli occupation and restore occupied Arab territories to their rightful owners instead of forging an illegal alliance with sponsors of terrorism, perpetrating aggression, entrenching occupation and stealing Syrian oil.

92. **Ms. Abdelhady-Nasser** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that her delegation was sincerely grateful to Member States for their strong support for the draft resolutions, which constituted important contributions towards addressing the fundamental issues that persisted decades after the 1948 Nakbah and the 1967 occupation of Palestinian territory. General Assembly efforts to address the grave human rights violations and pervasive suffering of Palestinians under Israeli occupation were vital, as were the clear, strong calls for Israel to respect

international law, international humanitarian law and international human rights law.

93. The adoption of the draft resolutions by an overwhelming majority served as further confirmation of the international community's abiding, principled position and strengthened the solidarity with the Palestinian people, including Palestine refugees, at a most difficult time. That broad support was also the clearest answer to the hostile, undiplomatic statement and false accusations made by the Israeli representative, impugning the integrity of UNRWA, the Committee and the Organization and its Member States. Far from being biased or one-sided, the resolutions were firmly rooted in international law and previous United Nations resolutions; any claim to the contrary was simply false. The General Assembly should be proud of the collective will, expressed in the resolutions, to uphold the law with respect to the question of Palestine and contribute to a just, lasting and peaceful solution. Implementation of those resolutions was paramount to preserving the Organization's credibility and the viability of the international, rules-based order. Ensuring compliance would help alleviate the miserable reality of suffering and insecurity endured by the Palestinian people in the absence of a just solution and as Israeli violations against Palestinians persisted and escalated. Her delegation reaffirmed the need to mobilize funding to prevent any interruption in vital assistance for Palestine refugees and appealed to the international community to continue to show generosity and compassion.

94. In the face of immense hardship, the support of nations large and small reinforced the Palestinian people's resilience and belief in the possibility of a just peace and a life of freedom, dignity, peace and security in an independent, sovereign Palestinian State with East Jerusalem as its capital. Such support was needed now more than ever, hence the importance of the principled positions unequivocally reaffirmed by the Committee's votes.

Agenda item 55: Comprehensive review of special political missions (continued) (A/C.4/75/L.6)

Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.6: Comprehensive review of special political missions

95. **Mr. Salovaara** (Finland), speaking also on behalf of Mexico, and introducing the draft resolution, said that special political missions continued to play an important role in preventing conflicts and sustaining peace, while their response to the COVID-19 pandemic showed their flexibility. The recent United Nations reforms and the negotiations of the resolutions on the peacebuilding architecture framed the Committee's consideration of

how to ensure that special political missions supported a holistic approach to peacebuilding and had a positive impact on the ground. Given that those negotiations were still under way, the draft resolution before the Committee contained only technical updates. Member States that had not yet joined the sponsors were encouraged to do so in order to demonstrate support for the work of special political missions.

96. **Ms. Gross** (Assistant Secretary of the Committee) said that the following delegations had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Croatia, Denmark, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iraq, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Thailand, Ukraine and Uruguay.

97. She then noted that the following delegations also wished to become sponsors: Chile, Slovakia and Switzerland.

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

99. *Draft resolution A/C.4/75/L.6 was adopted.*

Agenda item 56: Questions relating to information (continued) (A/75/21)

Draft resolution A: Information in the service of humanity (A/75/21 (chap. IV))

Draft resolution B: United Nations global communications policies and activities (A/75/21 (chap. IV))

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

101. **Ms. Sutton** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position before the decisions, said that her delegation would join the consensus on the draft resolutions but wished to make a number of clarifications. Regarding climate change and energy security, the United States had submitted formal notification of its withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on 4 November 2019. Separately, her Government recognized the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as a global framework for sustainable development that could help countries work toward global peace and prosperity. It commended the call in the Agenda for shared responsibility, including national responsibility, and it emphasized that all countries had a role to play in realizing that vision. As was recognized in the Agenda, each country must work towards implementation in accordance with its own national policies and priorities. Moreover, in paragraph 18 of the

Agenda, States were urged to implement the Agenda in a manner consistent with their rights and obligations under international law.

102. Her delegation dissociated itself from paragraph 81 of draft resolution B owing to its long-standing concerns regarding the premise of a “right to development”, which was not recognized in any of the core United Nations human rights conventions and did not have an agreed international meaning. More work would be required in order to define a right to development consistent with those human rights conventions, which the international community recognized as enshrining universal rights that all individuals enjoyed and could demand from their Governments.

103. *Draft resolution A was adopted.*

104. *Draft resolution B was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.