

Islamic Republic of

**I R A N**

Permanent Mission to the United Nations

Statement by:

Ms. Paimaneh Hastaie

Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran  
to the United Nations

on the Resolution L.45:

“Situation of Human Rights  
in the Islamic Republic of Iran”

New York, November 18, 2005

Please check against delivery

*In the Name of GOD, the compassionate, the Merciful*

Mr. Chairman

Once again the Third Committee has before it the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in Iran. The motives behind the Canadian move both in drafting this resolution as well as the attempt to distort the facts and replace them with the fictions in its content, may be viewed from different standpoints. Today I deem it necessary and useful to reflect on it chiefly in the context of the current human rights discourse and the varying dimensions surrounding that.

Beyond any doubt, the 60 years history of the collective endeavor in setting universal standards on human rights at the United Nations and the exemplary perseverance exhibited by its member states in putting in place the process of implementation have resulted in the great achievements in progressive realization of some aspects of human rights, not least the widespread acceptance of human rights as a paradigm in the modern legal and political systems. Yet, what has to be acknowledged further is that, concurrently and over the past decades, a dangerous, normative and structural tendency has evolved within the entire system disguised in the legitimate human rights concerns but virtually pursuing a political agenda based on the emerging complications and exigencies in the domestic, bilateral and multilateral politics in a global environment. Indeed, the perpetuation of this unleashed tendency has enormously contributed to the emergence of profound suspicion and mistrust among the members of international community, thus laying foundation for further polarization in human rights debate to the detriment of common understanding and cooperation to address genuine concerns for gross and systematic violation of human rights in all its forms and the efforts to remedy them.

Building on this understanding, and in view of the recent developments in human rights arena, one may draw a conclusion that, by and large, two groups of states are acting within the human rights domain in the United Nations system. The first which we call it majority, is characterized with the conviction that all human rights is for all and all governments whether in the South or in the North are equally accountable to their obligations and should thus be held responsible for their failure in safeguarding human rights, in an objective and non-selective manner. This group also believes that what matters most in the realization of human rights, is the enforcement of a promotional approach including capacity building at the domestic level, if human rights were to be effectively addressed in a result oriented framework. However, the second group which we call it minority, is of the firm conviction that human rights scrutiny in the Commission on Human Rights or in the future council and the General assembly should be confined exclusively to the countries of the South and by no

means should the developed countries be subject to the international monitoring in the intergovernmental bodies. They believe further that the countries of the North are strong enough to be kept beyond the scrutiny of any monitoring system and that any attempt by developing countries to raise the human rights violation by some developed countries must be thwarted and the initiator should immediately be accused of "making an effort to deflect the attention" from its own human rights record" (I referred to the right of reply exercised by Canada on Nov.3 in response to the delegation of Iran raising human rights concern in Canada). This group also believes that confrontational and not promotional attitude is the key to improve the situation of human rights worldwide. Thus, some in developed countries consistently promote the view that the practice of naming and blaming policy as well as pointing finger to others through the use of human rights mechanisms, in a selective and arbitrary mode, is considered an effective means to promote and protect human rights in the world. Some may argue, Mr. Chairman that this expression represents a biased approach to the western thought in the human rights implementation. Certainly it is not. This is frequently evident from the very fact that despite expressing grave concern by the governments, intergovernmental and treaty bodies and non governmental organizations on some aspects of human rights records of some countries of the North, no single reference, is ever made to these alarming situations, in the Commission and the Third Committee where, instead, lots of endless accusations were made against the developing countries. Will it not represent complacency and self-pride in human rights?

Viewing at the past experiences, it becomes crystal clear that the politicization of human rights is at the heart of the western human rights policy, and in this regard, no development could be more indicative and self-explanatory than the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Canada on a fully thematic issue such as the reform of the human rights machinery, earlier this year in the general debate, when he says "We need the Council because it will help us take an in-depth look at the situations of concern to us, such as Iran." It clearly demonstrates that in Canada's vision of the reform, the Human Rights Council will only be legitimate if the situation of human rights in Iran or other developing countries are structurally addressed. Indeed, Canada's statement on the reform in the general debate is an effort to preempt the structure and the mandate of the Council in ways that will serve as a tool to help further its political goals.

Mr. Chairman

Earlier, I referred to a dangerous, normative and structural tendency which has emerged over the past decades within the United Nations system aiming to serve the foreign policy goals of a few, in the name of human rights. Year after year and according to the dynamics of the then political processes, new targets from developing countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa have been chosen by some developed countries to confront. Thus, the selective and arbitrary use of the human rights mechanisms based on the western interests and priorities has become the norm

in the system, leaving the enforcement of human rights within this particular dimension at the discretion of some in the North. The end result and the bitter consequence of this long standing practice was the unacceptable exclusion of a few powerful developed from the scrutiny of human rights mechanisms. This phenomenon has, in turn, led to the further deepening of the North-South divide on human rights issues. And it has finally culminated by the recent initiatives by the developing countries to block the North abuse of human rights mechanisms through the moving of motion of non action in the Commission on Human Rights and the Third Committee. The result of these initiatives have sent a strong message that the abuse of human rights machinery and resorting to the country resolutions will no longer be tolerated and that the objection to selectivity and double standard is a matter of principle and cannot be compromised. Yet, another major phase of this process was, in our view, the Secretary General's assertion that the Commission on Human Rights has credibility deficit and that, concrete steps are required to reduce selective application and arbitrary enforcement. As you are aware this assertion constitutes the major component of the current human rights debate in the framework of the reform negotiations.

Mr. Chairman

In view of the foregoing argument, we have observed on different occasions that the international community needs to distinct the politically motivated actions from the real and genuine concerns for human rights. As an absolute principle, all individuals, societies and governments are susceptible to committing mistake. No one and no country is perfect and all of us need guidance, advice and collective wisdom and even scrutiny to correct ourselves. It is in this context that we are now engaged in full scale cooperation with the United Nations, its human rights mechanisms and some member states. The Islamic Republic of Iran was the first country in the region which has extended open invitation to all special procedures to visit the country, some of which already have visited Iran. We consider seriously their recommendations. We initiated the programe of human rights education in cooperation with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and we are engaged in a full range of human rights dialogue with the interested countries. At the domestic level, there are currently numerous legal and human rights reforms at work in various domains such as women and children whose reports have consistently been given to the Commission on the Status of Women and the Committee on the Rights of the Child. The establishment of institutionalized monitoring system, figure prominent within the legal reform in recent years. We stand ready to continue the strengthening of our cooperation with the human rights machinery to consolidate even further our national structures for the promotion and protection of human rights. However, we are extremely concerned that the continuation of the existing confrontational attitudes at the United Nations may hamper the future cooperation.

Mr. Chairman

Turning to the draft resolution L.45, it is our firm conviction that this resolution is a response to a bilateral legal dispute between the Islamic Republic of Iran and Canada, and constitutes part of the disinformation campaign against Iran launched by this country at the international level. It is meant to maximize pressure on my country, as has been particularly acknowledged by the Canadian officials on various occasions. The content of this resolution has nothing to do with the living reality in Iran and contains distortions and falsifications in many human rights areas. Clearly, we will never submit to a pressure which emanates from the exigencies of politics and political considerations. We will never accept an approach that excludes the consideration of reliable reports submitted by a number of expert and Non-Governmental organizations on the appalling human rights violations such as the so called "starlight tours" in Canada and include, unjustifiably, the situation of human rights in a developing country. We firmly believe that might is not always right and we will act accordingly.

Mr. Chairman and the distinguished delegates,

The need to eliminate politicization of human rights is at the core of the human rights debate in recent years and particularly in the current session of the General assembly. The international community is at the crossroad of a historic choice of whether it will align itself with the current conditions or decides to work for a new era in human rights implementation. Should the member states have the inspiration to make a difference and usher the human rights machinery into being a vehicle for fairness and objectivity in the promotion of and protection of human rights, the *sine qua non* is to block the current abuse of human rights through voting in favor of the motions of non-action. Therefore, my delegation now requests the adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution L.45 entitled "Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran" under the rule 116 of the rules of procedures and requests all delegations particularly from developing countries to vote in favor of this motion.

Thank you Mr. Chairman