

LEGAL POSITIONS OF STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE ITEM "ELIMINATION OF UNILATERAL EXTRATERRITORIAL COERCIVE ECONOMIC MEASURES USED AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC COMPULSION" (1996-2024)

ARITZ OBREGÓN FERNÁNDEZ

POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHER UNIVERSITY OF THE BASQUE COUNTRY



This document has been produced thanks to the funding of the Basque Government's Postdoctoral Programme for the Improvement of Doctoral Research Personnel.

Please cite the document as follows:

Obregón-Fernández, Aritz, "Legal positions of States and international organizations on the subject 'Elimination of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures used as an instrument of political and economic compulsion' (1996-2024)", *Laboratório de Direitos Humanos da UFRJ*, March 2025, http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.32820.97924.

See the Spanish version in: Obregón-Fernández, Aritz, "Posiciones jurídicas de los Estados y organizaciones internacionales en el tema 'Eliminación de las medidas económicas coercitivas unilaterales extraterritoriales utilizadas como instrumento de coacción política y económica' (1996-2024)", *Laboratório de Direitos Humanos da UFRJ*, marzo 2025, http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19399.20643.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENTATION	7
AFRICA	
Algeria	
Benin	
🗾 Burkina Faso	
🔀 Burundi	9
🔚 Equatorial Guinea	9
📂 Eritrea	
🗪 Eswatini	
🕶 Ghana	
Libya	
Mali	
📂 Namibia	
🛂 Senegal	
≽ South Africa	
🖿 Sudan	
💳 Zimbabwe	
ASIA-PACIFIC	
🦰 China	
< Cyprus	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	
	21
💶 Iran	
💳 Iraq	
• Japan	
🗲 Jordan	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	
📟 Malaysia	
💶 Nauru	
Qatar	
E State of Palestine	
🔤 Syrian Arab Republic	
Timor-Leste	

Wemen	. 35
EASTERN EUROPE	. 36
- Armenia	. 36
📕 Belarus	. 36
N Bosnia and Herzegovina	. 36
📕 Bulgaria	. 38
🖿 Czechia	. 39
💳 Estonia	. 40
🛟 Georgia	. 41
💳 Hungary	. 42
💳 Latvia	.44
💳 Lithuania	. 45
Montenegro	. 46
Poland	. 48
Republic of Moldova	. 48
Romania	. 50
Russian Federation	. 51
🕮 Slovakia	. 52
🗀 Slovenia	. 54
Ukraine	. 55
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	. 58
🔤 Argentina	. 58
Bolivia	. 58
📀 Brazil	. 59
📥 Colombia	. 59
🗲 Cuba	. 60
📥 Ecuador	. 63
💳 Honduras	. 63
💌 Jamaica	. 64
Mexico	. 64
💳 Nicaragua	. 65
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	. 66
🔼 Venezuela	. 67
WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES	. 69

🏝 Australia	69
Canada	70
Iceland	72
Liechtenstein	74
° 📕 Malta	76
📷 New Zealand	77
Hendrich Norway	77
📤 San Marino	80
C Türkiye	80
🚟 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	80
United States of America	81
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS OF STATES	84
European Union (EU)	84
Group of 77 and China	87
Group of African States	88
Group of Friends in Defense of the Charter of the United Nations	90
League of Arab States	91
Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)	92
© Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)	95
Southern African Development Community (SACD)	95

PRESENTATION

This paper is one in a series of reports aimed at clarifying both the state practice and *opinio iuris* on the possible creation or existence of a rule on the prohibition of unilateral coercive measures, as well as its hypothetical content.

In particular, it presents the legal positions of States, groups of States and international organizations expressed following the adoption of the General Assembly resolution on the 'Elimination of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures used as an instrument of political and economic coercion' during the 51st, 55th,57th, 65th and 78th sessions of the General Assembly (2002-2024).¹

Resolution	In favour	Against	Abstention	No vote
A/RES/57/5, 27 November 1996	133	2	2	54
A/RES/55/6, 26 October 1998	136	2	10	41
A/RES/53/10, 26 October 2000	80	2	67	36
A/RES/51/22, 16 October 2002	56	4	76	49

At these sessions, resolutions were adopted with the following number of votes:²

As far as the structure of the document is concerned, we have opted to classify the States' positions according to the distribution of UN geographical groups and in alphabetical order. After the States' positions, the positions of the groups of States and international organizations that have expressed their positions have been included. In this sense, it should be noted that the United States of America and Turkey have been included in the "Western Europe and other States" group, and the State of Palestine, a non-member observer, in the "Asia-Pacific" group.

In addition, the official United Nations code has been used to reference the records and documents containing the legal positions listed.

March 2025

 $^{^1}$ After 14 years, the 78th session of the General Assembly agreed -without a vote- to raise the item again and address at the next session (A/RES/78/329).

² The individual votes of each State can be consulted in Obregón-Fernández, Aritz, Voting record of the UNGA Resolutions on "Elimination of unilateral and extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion", March 2025, http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.29164.07043.

Algeria

2024. "[...] The unilateral <u>coercive economic measures</u>, such as economic sanctions and trade embargoes, imposed on several developing countries undermine the principles of the sovereign equality of States and of non-intervention, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. These measures restrict not only the free flow of trade and have a negative impact on populations by depriving them of access to food, medicine and other essential goods and services, but also constitute a violation of international law and the United Nations Charter.

Algeria expresses its support for all countries under unilateral coercive measures and firmly believes that it is crucial for all countries to refrain from promulgating nations [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 2-3)

📕 Benin

2000. "The Republic of Benin <u>neither recognizes nor applies any coercive economic</u> <u>measure or law of an extraterritorial nature unilaterally</u> imposed by any State whatsoever". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 2)

🗾 Burkina Faso

1998. "[...] As we know, sanctions were originally among the political means to which States could resort in order to make recalcitrant members of the international community listen to reason. Relevant international law has done everything possible to incorporate sanctions into the arsenal of political and legal coercive measures. However, since the founding of the United Nations, sanctions have tended to be an exception among exceptions, in that they were intended to be used with great caution and discretion, as is the case with any weapon. This means that they should be used only once peaceful means, such as negotiation, mediation and conciliation, have been exhausted. It is in this sense that the Charter of the United Nations clearly spells out in Article 2, paragraph 3, that: 'All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered'.

But it is precisely economic sanctions that are most unjust and the most harmful, because of their contagious effects and the insidious damage they inflict. If a country cannot for four, five or six years export its products or obtain foodstuffs from abroad, imagine the suffering of the people of that country. The paradox is this: <u>the quest to punish a State for a serious failing or for an offence it has committed — in other words, because an injustice has taken place — results in another injustice: starving a population that, in terms of the scale of responsibility, is completely innocent. Herein lies the iniquity of economic coercion. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 10-11)</u>

🔀 Burundi

1996. "[...] First, <u>Burundi is in principle against any measure that unjustly affects</u> <u>the population of any State under whatever pretext</u>. Secondly, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to remind the international community that my country is suffering from an inhuman, illegal and unjust economic blockade imposed by the neighbouring States under a pretext involving my country's domestic policies — a question that has already become nugatory. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 24)

🔚 Equatorial Guinea

2024. "[...] Even though States, regional organizations and international organizations, particularly the <u>Security Council</u>, are able to adopt sanctions, pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, such sanctions must be adopted in strict conformity with the obligations under the rules of international law. They must also be proportionate and carefully calibrated. Only if they are conceived of and applied in this way can they serve as an important tool for use by the international community to strengthen efforts to prevent, mitigate and resolve long-standing and emerging global challenges.

Nevertheless, <u>extraterritorial unilateral coercive measures</u>, which we are discussing in this debate, fail to observe even the basic requirements of international law and <u>do not respect our promise and common goal of leaving no one behind</u>. We therefore reiterate our wholehearted condemnation of the adoption, use and recognition of unilateral coercive measures by any State or group of States as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international humanitarian law, international human rights law and the norms and principles governing friendly relations between countries.

Such measures contravene <u>the principles of sovereign equality between States and</u> <u>of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. They stand in the way of the full</u> <u>enjoyment of human rights, such as the right to an adequate standard of living</u>. They worsen the situation for the most vulnerable groups in society, especially women, children and persons with disabilities. They distort trade and investment flows and have a generally negative impact on international economic cooperation and global efforts to move towards an open, transparent, multilateral and non-discriminatory trade system. They also prevent and limit the resolution of conflicts through peaceful dialogue and mutual understanding.

Unilateral coercive measures are used as an instrument to exert political, judicial, financial, economic and other kinds of pressure on developing countries, to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and promote certain international political interests. We suspect, in fact, that the application of extraterritorial coercive measures is being seen as an alternative to military force, just without the massive suffering and sacrifice required by war. That premeditated and absurd practice gives an unfair advantage

to developed and economically stable countries and endangers the future of developing and underdeveloped countries. [...]

In that context, we call firmly on all States to abstain from adopting and applying unilateral coercive measures that are contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and that prevent the full achievement of economic and social development, in particular in developing and underdeveloped countries. Humanitarian assistance in cases of natural disasters, pandemics and armed conflicts or conflicts of any other kind must not be subject to unilateral coercive measures.

States or groups of States that impose unilateral coercive measures must provide compensation for the damage that such measures cause. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 8-9)

📂 Eritrea

2024. "The <u>application of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as</u> a means of political and economic compulsion does not only contravene the <u>fundamentals of the Charter of the United Nations and the general principles of</u> <u>international law</u> but is also an inhumane and immoral practice of its architects, aimed at impoverishing and depriving nations. Neither the norms of international relations nor the rules of the international trading system justify the application of such egregious policies dictated at the whim of the proponents of global hegemony. Those Powers have been unapologetic with their intentions and deeds; as expressly stated in their foreign-policy toolbox, such policies are used to compel those who do not conform with their self-professed ideals. [...]

All forms of unilateral coercive measures must be lifted immediately, and the injustices and damages endured by the affected nations need to be rectified. Unilateral coercive measures run contrary to the globally agreed development goals, underpinned by the motto of "leave no one behind", as they are impoverishing those in the global South and widening the development gap. The sovereign equality of all nations and the right to development, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, must be fully respected. <u>Any unilateral action outside the cardinal principles of the Charter of the United Nations needs to be rejected and repealed in totality</u>. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 5-6)

🚥 Eswatini

1996. "My delegation has opted to abstain, and we want to explain our reason for abstention. This does not mean that we agree that any State has a right to coerce another to achieve its purposes. But in this context, we have opted to live by our policy. [...]

Otherwise, our abstention means no condonation, but it means that we should sit down and talk and become friends and Members of the United Nations". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 22)

Africa

💶 Ghana

1998. "[...] The main objective of all such measures is to prevent the targeted State or States from exercising their right to decide, voluntarily, their own political, economic and social systems. <u>But that runs counter to the cardinal principle of the United Nations Charter, which upholds the sovereign equality of States and non-intervention and non-interference in their internal affairs. [...]</u>

Another feature of the measures in question, and the legislation backing them, is that they are unilateral in nature, taken without <u>any regard whatsoever to the</u> <u>United Nations Charter principle requiring all Member States to refrain from the</u> <u>threat or use of force in their international relations or to the provisions of Chapter</u> <u>VI of the Charter, which call on Member States to settle disputes by peaceful means</u> <u>such as negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial</u> <u>settlement</u>.

We are also disturbed by the recent attempt to introduce new concepts of international law aimed at internationalizing the essential elements contained in extraterritorial laws through multilateral agreements. [...]

We wish to conclude by reiterating that it is the inalienable right of every State, however small, however weak and however poor, to choose the political, economic and social system that it deems appropriate for the well-being of its people, in accordance with its own national plans, policies and priorities. No other State has the prerogative or the right to interfere in the exercise of such choice". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 5-6)

💶 Libya

1996. "[...] In 1996, the United States enacted United States legislation that punishes foreign non-United States companies which invest more than \$40 million to develop petroleum resources in either the Jamahiriya or the Islamic Republic of Iran.

These laws, since their introduction as bills, have rightly caused a wave of international surprise and expressions of opposition and condemnation. <u>That is because they run counter to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, violate the principles of international law and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, impede international efforts aimed at liberalizing world trade, and gravely harm the economies and development plans of developing countries. These negative effects have even affected the substantial interests of many developed countries. Moreover, the laws reflect extreme selfishness on the part of the United States Administration which, having safeguarded its economic interests following the Gulf War, wants to deprive Western and other countries of the remaining important markets in the Middle East. It is not difficult to identify the obvious fallacies in the justification for those laws. [...]</u>

The draft resolution has nothing to the do with the sanctions imposed by the Security Council on the Jamahiriya. Rather, it focuses on the unilateral laws enacted by a certain State imposing sanctions on other countries and their nationals. [...]

The draft resolution does not attempt to defend any special interest, but seeks rather to defend the interests of a large sector of developed and developing countries. It attempts to defend the general interests of the international community. It speaks of principles, not details. It aims to protect us against the turbulence and chaos that could soon be caused by extraterritorial laws enacted unilaterally to impose coercive economic measures. The draft resolution attempts to confront the unilateral decisions that have begun to jeopardize the international community in many areas. To deny that would be to deny facts and the provisions of the draft resolution before the Assembly". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, pp. 11-15)

1997. "The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya attaches the utmost importance to General Assembly resolution 51/22 of 27 November 1996 entitled "Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion", which calls for the immediate repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on companies and nationals of other States. That resolution reflected the views of the overwhelming majority of members of the international community (States and organizations), which joined together in public repudiation of unilateral sanctions as a means of exerting political, economic and social pressure on developing countries. [...]". (A/52/343/Add.1, 14 October 1997, p. 1)

2000. "[...] he General Assembly has given clear expression to the overwhelming rejection by Member States of coercive measures and the strength of their opposition to the use of such measures against other States as a means of compulsion and of forcing them to accept policies that are not appropriate or suitable for them. <u>An international consensus has developed with regard to the need for a halt to be put to such measures, which are adopted by certain States with a view to pursuing their foreign policies and which are employed in their dealings with other States.</u>

The States concerned should comply with and respect the will of the international community, as expressed in the resolutions, declarations and instruments adopted at various levels within the United Nations and in other bodies. [...]

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya also <u>urges the international community strongly to</u> reject the imposition of laws and prescriptions which have extraterritorial implications and all other forms of coercive economic measures, including unilateral sanctions against developing countries, and reiterates the urgent need for them to be repealed forthwith. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya stresses that measures of <u>this</u> <u>type are not merely destructive of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the</u> <u>United Nations and international law</u>, but also pose a grave threat to freedom of trade and investment. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya therefore urges the international community not to recognize or implement such measures". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, pp. 3-6)

2002. "[...] condemnation and firm rejection of any measures that bar any State from exercising its full political rights in choosing its political, economic and social

Africa

systems, because this constitutes a flagrant violation of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970.

[...] All of the instruments and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in this regard affirm that the enactment of such laws is incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, constitutes <u>a flagrant violation of the norms of international law</u>, has an extremely negative impact on the economies of developing and developed countries alike and poses an obstacle to the endeavours of the international community aimed at constructive cooperation and mutually beneficial exchange.

The General Assembly has also affirmed that the enactment of such <u>laws constitutes</u> <u>interference in the internal affairs of States and a violation of their sovereignty, and</u> <u>is incompatible with international instruments</u>, including the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, proclaimed by the Assembly in resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974. Both of these instruments state that no State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measure to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its political rights.

[...] the General Assembly has given clear expression to the overwhelming rejection by <u>Member States of coercive measures and the strength of their opposition to the</u> <u>use of such measures against other States as a means of compulsion and of forcing</u> <u>them to accept policies that are not appropriate for or satisfactory to them</u>. An international consensus has developed with regard to the need for a halt to be put to such measures, which are adopted by certain States with a view to pursuing their foreign policies and which are employed in their dealings with other States.

The States concerned should comply with and respect the will of the international community, as expressed in the resolutions, declarations and instruments adopted at various levels within the United Nations and in other bodies. However, the measures that they have taken and the practices that they pursue demonstrate that their intentions are quite different. [...]

[...] that measures of this type are not merely destructive of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also pose a grave threat to freedom of trade and investment. [...]". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, pp. 3-6)

"[...] We are not against any one State; we are trying only to defend ourselves. Legislation of this nature not only contravenes the principles of international law and the Charter, but goes against all international human rights instruments. It also goes against sustainable development — a subject on which the international community is holding conference after conference at the summit level. What right does a parliament in any particular country have to legislate to prohibit countries from cooperating among themselves? We do not subscribe to the theory of laissezfaire — yet those countries that subscribe to it are the very ones who are not allowing us to develop. Those who preach international free trade are the very ones who have legislated to prohibit international trade, cooperation, progress and development. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 2)

Mali

2000. "[...] firmly condemns the use of coercive economic measures as a means of political compulsion. Recourse to such <u>measures constitutes a flagrant violation of the norms of international law, in particular those relating to freedom of trade and navigation.</u>

The Government of the Republic of Mali considers that States must refrain from using unilateral coercive measures. The Government of the Republic of Mali is therefore convinced that the international community must adopt, as a matter of urgency, effective measures to eliminate the imposition against developing countries of unilateral coercive measures that are not authorized by the competent United Nations organs or are not in conformity with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, and are contrary to the fundamental principles of the international trade system.

The Government of the Republic of Mali opposes the adoption by any country of unilateral coercive economic measures in order to exert pressure aimed at changing a political or economic situation that does not lie within its territorial jurisdiction. In that regard, it reaffirms that every <u>State has the inalienable right to economic and social development and to choose the political, economic and social system that it deems to be most appropriate for the welfare of its people, in accordance with its national plans and policies". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, pp. 6-7)</u>

2002. "[...] condemns the use of unilateral extraterritorial coercive measures as a means of political compulsion. <u>The use of such measures constitutes a flagrant violation of the norms of international law, in particular in relation to freedom of trade</u>. [...]

The Government is opposed to the adoption of unilateral extraterritorial coercive measures by any country in order to <u>exert pressure with a view to changing a</u> <u>political or economic situation that is not within its territorial jurisdiction</u>. In this respect, it reaffirms that every State has the <u>inalienable right to economic, social</u> <u>and cultural development and the right to choose freely the political, economic and</u> <u>social</u> system that it deems most conducive to the well-being of its population, in accordance with its national plans and policies". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 3)

💋 Namibia

1998. "[...] On several occasions during the sessions of this body and in other international forums, <u>Namibia has registered its strong opposition to the laws enacted by a Member of the United Nations which seek to advance its political, economic and military interests in countries of the developing world, with a view to preventing those countries from exercising <u>their inalienable rights to self-determination by freely choosing their political system and to determine their own</u></u>

Africa

path of economic, social and cultural development. The spirit and letter of these dubious laws contravene the resolutions of the General Assembly, in particular resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty.

These extraterritorial laws also contravene resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, which prevents the use of economic, political or any other means to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights. [...]

The Government of Namibia — out of respect for the <u>sovereignty of other States</u>, the <u>non-interference in the internal matters of other Member States</u>, the promotion of <u>international cooperation</u>, peace and security, and the creation and maintenance of <u>just and mutually beneficial relations among nations</u> — will not entertain any <u>unilateral measures by any State</u>. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 14)

2002. "The Government of the Republic of Namibia does not have unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose coercive economic measures, contrary to international law, on corporations and nationals of other States. <u>Such laws are not recognized by Namibia, since they violate the principles and objective of the Charter of the United Nations</u>". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 3)

Senegal

2000. "The Republic of Senegal <u>neither applies nor recognizes unilateral economic</u> <u>measures or laws as a means of political and economic compulsion</u>". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 7)

🔰 South Africa

1998. "South Africa is committed to the principles of the sovereign equality of States and the freedom of international trade. [...]

South Africa would like to reiterate and endorse the call of the NAM Durban summit on all countries <u>not to recognize the unilateral or extraterritorial imposition of</u> <u>sanctions against other States and foreign companies or individuals and to refrain</u> <u>from adopting such coercive measures as a means of exerting pressure on nonaligned or other developing countries.</u>

As the leaders of NAM noted, these measures constitute violations of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. They called on the international community to take effective action to arrest the trend, including attempts to introduce or internationalize such extraterritorial measures through multilateral institutions or agreements, and they specifically rejected the trend geared towards the strengthening of coercive unilateral measures through the Bretton Woods institutions.

My delegation would like to reiterate and underline our opposition to all forms of unilateral coercive measures, [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 13)

2024. "[...] South Africa appreciates the convening of today's much-needed debate on the elimination of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion. <u>I would like to state unequivocally that my delegation believes that unilateral extraterritorial economic measures are a violation of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Today's debate comes at a time when there has been a noticeable increase in the scope, targets and extraterritorial nature of unilateral coercive measures. The illegality of unilateral coercive measures has been repeatedly reaffirmed by the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. South Africa remains deeply concerned about the extraterritorial application of laws and regulations imposing unilateral coercive measures, and urges States to make use of multilateralism, diplomacy, negotiations, dialogue and other peaceful tools to resolve differences without resorting to coercive measures such as unilateral sanctions.</u>

We reiterate that unilateral coercive measures violate our solemn commitment, pledged in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, to leave no one and no country behind. [...]

Today more than one in four countries are subject to some kind of sanctions, affecting a large segment of the world's population. [...] <u>Unilateral coercive measures are a</u> <u>flagrant violation of human rights</u>. Such practices are contrary to the International Bill of Human Rights, impacting many rights, including the right to food, employment, education and health. [...]

We would like to highlight the <u>catastrophic humanitarian impact of unilateral</u> <u>coercive measures</u>, which, in addition to poverty, nutritional and health insecurity, includes destroying essential public services, educational opportunities for youth and the livelihoods of families and increasing the risk of the right to life in sanctioned countries. [...]

Finally, South Africa categorically rejects the application of unilateral coercive measures and calls on the sanctioning countries to withdraw them. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 25-26)

🗖 Sudan

1998. "[...] At last session's debate, it was demonstrated that such coercive economic measures <u>are illegal and that they run counter to the most fundamental principles</u> <u>of peaceful coexistence and international economic cooperation</u>. They also contradict the international consensus on the need for a more open, non-discriminatory world trading system, and call into question the credibility of the noble standards of trust and the supremacy of the rule of law, which are important underpinnings of international relations and of relations between States. [...].

[...] my delegation reaffirms that the use of such coercive economic measures violates the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, their national sovereignty, and their political and development choices based on their own economic and cultural criteria. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 7-8)

Africa

2000. "[...] The Government of the Sudan <u>opposes the extraterritorial application of</u> <u>domestic laws</u>. It opposes, in particular, unilateral trade measures that impose coercive penalties and sanctions, such as those that the United States of America is maintaining against the Sudan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and other countries for the purpose of advancing its own interests in a manner that is totally incompatible with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international cooperation. [...]

The Government of the Sudan is fully confident that, in conformity with the purposes and principles embodied in its Charter, <u>the United Nations will fulfil its assigned</u> <u>role in combating the unilateral extraterritorial application of national laws</u>". (A/55/300/Add.1, 28 September 2000, p. 1)

2024. "[...] <u>the application of unilateral coercive economic measures and sanctions is</u> <u>contrary to the principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations</u> <u>and the principles governing friendly relations among countries. They undermine</u> <u>the opportunities to participate in and benefit from the international financial</u> <u>system and international trade</u>. [...].

[...] peace and development are naturally interlinked. However, the application of sanctions has led to the failure to meet the needs of developing countries, especially with regard to the Sustainable Development Goals, and has deprived them of the ability to benefit from international financial institutions, international trade and inclusion in the international banking system. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 10-11)

💳 Zimbabwe

2024. "[...] <u>The illegality of the unilateral coercive measures imposed by certain countries against other States, businesses and individuals has been well documented in numerous United Nations studies.</u> [...]

Despite the clear will of the global majority for the total elimination of such illegal measures, <u>several Western countries continue to impose them with impunity</u>, <u>extending their unlawful effects both domestically and extraterritorially</u>. As a result, that coercive international order is undermining the functions, authority and credibility of the United Nations. Evidence shows that those measures cause gross violations of human rights, including the rights to life, food, health, water and sanitation. They hinder the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in addition to the response to pandemics such as the coronavirus disease pandemic and the provision of humanitarian assistance in affected countries.

It is a fallacy that such measures are targeted in nature. <u>The reality is that they</u> <u>have a spillover contagion effect on other countries, in particular by imposing a</u> <u>blanket negative perception about countries such as my own across the world,</u> <u>especially in sensitive global financial markets, where there is always</u> <u>overcompliance</u>. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 9-10)

🛀 China

2024. "[...] First, <u>unilateral coercive measures are in flagrant contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.</u> The United States, together with a minority of other States, without authorization from the Security Council, proceeds on the basis of its own preferences and decides to arbitrarily impose unilateral coercive measures on other States. That is tantamount to placing its domestic legislation above international law and the national legislation of other States, challenging the authority of the Security Council, violating the principle of sovereign equality and flouting the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The United States has even gone as far as to push for so-called secondary sanctions, compelling the compliance of third States through its unilateral coercive measures.</u> That amounts to making worse what was already wrong in the first place, thereby seriously undermining the fundamental principles of international law and the international rule of law.

Secondly, <u>unilateral coercive measures seriously impede the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals</u>. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development emphasizes that all countries should benefit equally from the dividends of development and urges countries to refrain from promulgating and implementing unilateral economic, financial or trade measures that are contrary to the Charter and international law. However, a handful of countries, including the United States, have continued to capitalize on their hegemonic economic and financial power to frequently impose unilateral sanctions on other countries, thereby seriously disrupting normal economic and trade cooperation among the countries concerned, gravely threatening the stability of the global production and supply chains, undermining food, energy and financial security, and seriously disrupting the world economic order and the efforts of the countries concerned to achieve the SDGs.

Thirdly, the <u>unilateral coercive measures are a criminal tool used to infringe on the human rights of other countries</u>. The United States and a few other States claim to protect human rights, but in reality they abuse unilateral coercive measures to the serious detriment of the rights to life, health, development and education, among other basic human rights, of the people in the countries targeted. [...]

Fourthly, unilateral coercive measures are a major driver of worsening humanitarian crises in the countries concerned. [...]

Fifthly and lastly, <u>unilateral coercive measures are an acute manifestation of hegemony and power politics</u>. The United States and those few other States abuse their power to weaponize and instrumentalize unilateral sanctions. The underlying logic that they follow is the law of the jungle, whereby the strong prey on the weak. The ultimate aim of those measures is to maintain their monopolistic hegemony and an unjust and unreasonable international order, in which the big bully the small, the strong abuse the weak and the rich oppress the poor. The unilateral coercive

measures frequently imposed by the United States and the few other countries in their foreign relations run counter to the historical trend of peaceful development and win-win cooperation and are incompatible with the common calls for building a multipolar world, practicing multilateralism and upholding equity and justice. Such actions against the tide of history will inevitably be swept away by its irresistible force.

For a long time, the international community has voiced its consistent and strong opposition to unilateral coercive measures. Since 1989, the General Assembly has adopted a resolution every two years opposing unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Since 1992, the Assembly has adopted a resolution every year urging the United States to end its economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba. And since 1997, it has adopted a resolution every year expressing concern about the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on human rights. We call on the United States and the few other States concerned to heed the just call of the international community and to fully and immediately abolish their unilateral coercive measures. We call on the Member States, the United Nations system and other international organizations to provide support to countries under sanctions to help them alleviate their hardships. We call on the international community to pay close attention to the grave consequences of such measures and collectively resist those illegal practices. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 20-21)

Cyprus

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the <u>Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed</u>, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States. We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

1998. "[...] <u>Sanction measures now being applied cannot and should not be tolerated</u>, either in view of their purpose, pursuing political and economic pressure, or of the unacceptable logical and legal grounds used to justify their application and their catastrophic consequences.

In this connection, the international community should pay serious attention to the question of upon whom and on what grounds the sanctions are imposed, and it should work out a fair solution. In many instances, the target States of the sanctions are small States whose social systems and political policies and positions are alleged to be reason for sanctions. It is both serious and deplorable that the situation, which

is characterized by coercive sanctions and domination by power, has been created as a result of extraterritorial and arbitrary laws and acts on the part of certain big <u>Powers.</u>

The use of forcible means in pursuit of political aims is a clear violation of the purposes of the United Nations Charter, the principles of international law, resolutions of the General Assembly and the declarations and programmes of action of major international conferences [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 12-13)

2000. "[...] <u>All forms of unilateral coercive measures contrary to the Charter of the</u> <u>United Nations, international laws and practices should be eliminated once and for</u> <u>all</u>. [...]". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 2)

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has consistently opposed the imposition of unilateral sanctions on a sovereign State. Imposing sanctions on other countries in pursuit of economic interests or for political purposes constitutes a violation of the principles of respect for sovereign equality and the right to self-determination embodied in the United Nations Charter and relevant United Nations resolutions. It also runs counter to the promotion of friendly relations and the strengthening of international cooperation among Member States". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 22)

Indonesia

2024. "[...] Today the global community is facing challenges. <u>The use of unilateral</u> <u>coercive measures has not only undermined international law and the multilateral</u> <u>system, but has also demonstrated hypocrisy, double standards and a widening trust</u> <u>deficit and has broken solidarity</u>. We regret that countries are often pressured to take sides and apply unilateral coercive measures on issues not directly related to them. Indonesia therefore continues to support efforts within the United Nations to call for the elimination of such measures... [...].

[...] the United Nations must pursue action on matters that put multilateralism at risk. Illegal sanctions challenge the principles of dialogue, diplomacy and unity, upon which multilateralism in the United Nations is built. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-8)

💳 Iran

1996. "[...] <u>The impermissibility under international law of unilateral sanctions is</u> <u>uniformly recognized by the international community</u>. The adoption of coercive economic measures lies only within the mandate of the United Nations in particular situations where there exists a threat to peace or a breach of peace. Moreover, several relevant principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations provide a solid basis for the Organization to offset the use of unilateral sanctions by individual States.

According to General Assembly resolutions, unilateral coercive measures violate the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of other States, as well as in the exercise of the sovereign rights of States. In

this regard, both the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Interference in the Internal Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted on 21 December 1965, and the <u>Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted on 12 December 1974</u>, [...].

The <u>Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of</u> <u>States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty goes on to say that</u> <u>such measures also cannot be used to "secure advantages of any kind" from another</u> <u>States (resolution 2131 (XX), para. 2)</u> <u>Furthermore, the General Assembly has</u> <u>denounced on various occasions unilateral economic coercion as a means of achieving</u> <u>political goals</u>. Resolutions entitled "Economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries", adopted at the forty-fourth and fiftieth sessions of the General Assembly, is a prominent example of a series of United Nations reactions to such unlawful actions.

The imposition of coercive economic measures and the approval of domestic legislation for the horizontal escalation of such actions with extraterritorial implications also <u>contradicts established international trade law</u>, including the <u>regulations of the World Trade Organization</u>. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, pp. 17-18)

1997. "[...]The exercise of power through the application of illegal means such as unilateral actions and the imposition of coercive economic measures against other countries in order to achieve unjustifiable objectives is the prominent example of an emerging unilateralism that is extremely arrogant and self-centred, that feeds on hegemony and expansionism and that entails serious interference in the internal affairs of other countries to the point of sabotage and subversion.

Impermissibility of unilateral sanctions under international law is commonly recognized by the international community. Unilateral actions and extraterritorial application of domestic laws seriously menace the international community's efforts towards cooperation in various areas of peace and security, development and environment. Undertaking such measures goes against not only the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also against the provisions of a large number of United Nations resolutions and other relevant international agreements.

The spirit and letter of such resolutions and international agreements emphasize particularly that States should refrain from interference and intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and from any attempt to impose their policies on them. According to those resolutions, <u>unilateral coercive measures violate the principles of non-intervention, non-interference in the internal and external affairs of other States and the exercise of the sovereign right of States. [...]</u>

International jurisprudence against such coercive measures provides a solid base for the Organization to offset the exercise of unilateral sanctions by individual States. <u>The imposition of coercive economic measures and the adoption of domestic laws for</u> <u>the horizontal escalation of such actions with extraterritorial implications also</u> <u>contradict the established rules and regulations of international trade law, including</u>

Asia-Pacific

those under the World Trade Organization. Therefore, unilateral coercive economic measures undermine the authority and credibility of those organizations that are legitimately concerned about this trend in the conduct of international relations. [...]". (A/52/343, 15 September 1997, pp. 2-3)

1998. "[...] <u>The impermissibility under international law of unilateral and extraterritorial sanctions against other countries is uniformly recognized by the international community</u>. The adoption of coercive economic measures falls within the mandate of the United Nations only in particular situations where there exists a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace. Moreover, several relevant principles set forth in the Charter provide a solid basis for the Organization to offset the exercise of unilateral sanctions by individual States. <u>United Nations documentation against unilateral action is comprehensive</u>. According to General Assembly resolutions, unilateral coercive measures violate the principles of non-intervention, non-interference in the internal and external affairs of other States, and the exercise by States of their sovereign rights. In this regard, both paragraph 2 of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965, and article 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974 [...].

The imposition of coercive economic measures and the enactment of domestic legislation with extraterritorial implications for the horizontal escalation of such actions and measures also contradict provisions of established international trade law, including those under World Trade Organization (WTO) regulations. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 8-10)

2000. "[...] <u>The Member States of the United Nations, in adopting these resolutions,</u> <u>have rejected the application of extraterritorial coercive economic measures or</u> <u>legislative enactments unilaterally imposed by any State</u>. They have also called for the repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on corporations and nationals of other States.

Promulgation and application of laws or regulations that have extraterritorial effects or that affect the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction — a clear violation of the universally accepted principles of international law — have been strongly rejected on various occasions by the overwhelming majority of States. [...]

In these times of rapid and unprecedented change, the world needs peace, security and stability, which <u>could be strengthened through collective responsibility of</u> <u>countries and also through, inter alia, respect for sovereignty, rejection of</u> <u>interference in the internal affairs of other States</u>, refraining from compulsion and intimidation, as well as creation of an enabling environment for replacing conflict and unequal relations with dialogue and negotiations. [...]". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, pp. 2-3)

2002. "[...] <u>The Member States, in adopting these resolutions, have rejected the</u> <u>application of extraterritorial coercive economic measures or legislative enactments</u>

<u>unilaterally imposed by any State</u>. They have also called for the repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on corporations and nationals of other States.

<u>Promulgation and application of laws or regulations that have extraterritorial effect</u> or that affect the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction — a clear violation of the universally accepted principles of international law — has been strongly rejected on various occasions by the overwhelming majority of States. [...]

Enforcement of unilateral coercive economic measures, in defiance of the Charter, has inflicted grave and irreparable losses, including a heavy financial and human toll, on the targeted countries. To this effect, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as one of the affected countries, reserves its right to pursue its financial and intellectual claims and lodge its complaint against Governments enacting those measures, through the adoption of concrete actions. All countries should, in the true spirit of multilateralism and sincere observance of international laws and regulations, avoid resorting to and enacting such measures". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, pp. 1-2)

2024. "[...] from a legal perspective, the imposition and application of unilateral sanctions is a gross violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Unilateral sanctions materially breach the purposes of the United Nations, particularly those set out in Article 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, namely, to develop friendly relations among nations, to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights. Similarly, the introduction and application of unilateral sanctions is a <u>flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations, in particular those set</u> forward in Article 2, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, concerning the sovereign equality of States and fulfilling in good faith the obligations assumed by Member States under the Charter. That is why, according to the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, all States should refrain from using military, political, economic or any other type of measure to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind.

The imposition of unilateral sanctions also contravenes the principles and norms of international human rights law and <u>violates article 2 of the International Covenant</u> on Civil and Political Rights and article 2 of the International Covenant on <u>Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, according to which</u>, '[i]n no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence'.

It also materially <u>breaches article 47 of the International Covenant on Civil and</u> <u>Political Rights, as well as article 25 of the International Covenant on Economic,</u> <u>Social and Cultural Rights,</u> according to which, '[nothing therein] shall be interpreted as impairing the inherent right of all peoples to enjoy and utilize fully and freely their natural wealth and resources'.

Asia-Pacific

Unilateral sanctions furthermore contradict the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, as set out in <u>article</u> <u>12</u>, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural <u>Rights</u>. Equally, they violate the inherent right of every human being to life, as reaffirmed by article 6, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and no derogation therefrom is permitted, according to the Covenant's article 4, paragraph 2. While unilateral sanctions adversely affect and violate many other human rights, from the right to work to the rights to shelter, a decent environment and education, there is no need to add to the examples I mentioned. [...]

I would now like to turn to the question of why the international community of States must pay serious attention to the horrifying trend of the introduction and application of unilateral sanctions. That is necessary and urgent for the following reasons.

First, by <u>any measure</u>, <u>unilateral sanctions are inhumane</u>, <u>immoral and unlawful</u>. <u>They are both a brutal collective punishment of targeted nations for their</u> <u>determination to exercise their inherent right to self-determination</u>, as recognized in <u>Article 1 of the Charter</u>, as well as article 1 of the International Covenant on <u>Economic</u>, Social and Cultural Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on <u>Civil and Political Rights</u>.

Secondly, human rights are not realized in a vacuum. Rather, they can be realized only if the necessary conditions are created, as has rightly been stated in the preamble to both Covenants, and such conditions cannot be created, at least not satisfactorily, in countries targeted by unilateral sanctions, since sanctions, inter alia, prevent such States from using their resources, disrupt their economies and trade relations and prevent them from importing their people's basic needs such as food and medicine. Countries introducing sanctions weaponize food, medicine, medical equipment and other necessities to further their narrow national policies. Unilateral sanctions continue to destroy the fabric of multilateralism, with the United Nations at its centre; seriously breach the letter and the spirit of the Charter; reject cooperation; foment confrontation; and instead of promoting friendly relations, cause hatred and hostility. All those alarming realities continue to undermine the very essence and spirit of the Organization and its Charter, which were founded first and foremost on such lofty values as inclusion, cooperation, peaceful coexistence, good-neighbourliness, solidarity, freedom and justice. Unilateral sanctions are nothing but economic war and terrorism. They restrict the access of the targeted nations to essential goods and services; exacerbate economic hardship and poverty; undermine the well-being of civilians and ordinary people; perpetuate a cycle of poverty, inequality and human suffering; and worst of all, have the greatest impact on the most vulnerable segments of targeted societies. We must not allow that dangerous trend of unilateralism to undermine the rule of law, multilateralism and our collective endeavours to promote peace, prosperity, solidarity and friendship among nations. That is what we owe to the current and future generations of our societies. If unchecked, the Western States that continue to race to the bottom on imposing more brutal sanctions on more nations will ultimately transform unilateral

sanctions into actual economic blockades against targeted States, the living example of which is the 17-year-old unlawful and inhuman blockade of the Gaza Strip by the Israeli regime. Israel is now weaponizing food, water, medicine and other life-saving aid needed by the civilian population and uses starvation as a method of war. I must stress that despite the claims of Western States, there are no so-called humanitarian exemptions for sanctions. That false and hypocritical term was coined by the United States and other Western States merely to putatively hide the inhuman nature of their sanctions. Such terms are nothing but lies and deceptions. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 15-17)

🚾 Iraq

1996. "[...] Experience has shown <u>that coercive economic measures are an odious</u> means which will never convince people to give up their inalienable right to make their own economic, political and social choices. However, this weapon has unfortunately proven to be effective. The results of this are the suffering of innocent civilians, the halt of economic development in the target country — and to a lesser extent among its international trading partners — and economic and political instability.

The use of this weapon is also <u>a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United</u> Nations and of international law. These include the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the right of people to choose their <u>own economic and political regimes</u>, and the right to development and to participate <u>in international economic relations on the basis of mutual interests</u>.

These coercive economic measure, whether imposed unilaterally by a given State or through influencing multilateral institutions, are backed up by a policy which leads to nothing. I point out that <u>States that resort to coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion are trying to find a way to legitimize their policies by having such measures imposed by multilateral international agencies. This is the case of Iraq. This is now the case of Cuba, as attempts are under way to impose a multilateral sanctions regime. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, pp. 18-19)</u>

1997. "[...] <u>The threat or use of coercive economic measures constitutes a flagrant</u> violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, in particular of Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which states, 'The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members'.

Such measures also constitute a flagrant violation of General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), adopted on 24 October 1970, entitled "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", [...].

General Assembly resolution 51/22, which reaffirms the inalienable right of every State to economic and social development and to choose its political, economic and social system, was prompted by the Organization's concern to establish the rights of peoples as embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, and

Asia-Pacific

with a view to realizing the goals of the Organization with regard to establishing conditions for international peace and security.

The coercive measures taken by some States, both individually and collectively, constitute a real threat to international peace and security and a flagrant violation of human rights principles. [...]

The destinies of peoples and their basic human rights should in no way be used as a tool to be exploited by some international Powers for purposes of political extortion and economic coercion. If such policies, from which many peoples in the world are suffering, are allowed to continue, the political foundations of the United Nations will be destroyed, together with the principles of human rights, foremost among them the right to live in freedom and dignity". (A/52/343, 15 September 1997, pp. 3-4)

1998. "[...] The Charter clearly states the circumstances in which the international community may have to resort to the use of economic sanctions. The first of these is the existence of any threat to international peace and security, provided that all preventive or pre-emptive measures together with other undertakings, such as international arbitration and mediation in conflicts and the assignment of a role to regional organizations to find adequate solutions to conflict, have all failed.

It is unfortunate that many States, particularly influential States in the Security Council, rode roughshod over these standards and began imposing coercive economic and political measures against other States. This was done for no other reason than the refusal by those States to acquiesce to the will of hegemonic States on the international political scene. Experience has already shown that these States care for nothing other than their own narrow national interests when dealing with important international issues.

Differences of opinion between States are in the nature of things. <u>What is not normal</u> is for some States to regard these differences as a basis for adopting policies that run counter to international law with a view to forcing other countries to change their political and economic approach in a way that would make them responsive to the political or economic approach followed by the States that impose these policies. That is so even if this approach runs completely counter to the interests of the countries on which coercive political and economic measures are imposed. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 7)

2000. "The use, even the intimation of the use, of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles on which the Charter of the United Nations and international law are based and also, as a cardinal matter, of Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which states that: "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members". Such measures are also in manifest breach of the provisions of a large number of United Nations resolutions and international conventions, including the following:

(a) The Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2131 (XX) of 21 December 1965.

(b) The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, annexed to General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970, which states, inter alia, that: [...]

(c) The Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 3281 (XXIX) of 12 December 1974, [...]

(d) General Assembly resolution 51/22 of 27 November 1996, in which the Assembly reaffirms the inalienable right of every State to economic and social development and to choose its own political, economic and social system. [...]

The use of coercive measures as a means of political and economic compulsion, whether unilaterally or under the auspices of regional and international organizations, poses <u>a genuine threat to international peace and security and is in manifest breach of the principles of human rights</u>. [...].

The destinies of peoples and their basic human rights may not under any circumstances become an instrument to be exploited by certain international Powers for purposes of political blackmail and economic subjugation. To permit such policies to continue would mean the destruction of the basic underpinnings of the United Nations and the principles of human rights, and particularly of the right to a life of dignity". (A/55/300/Add.2, 12 October 2000, pp. 2-3)

2002. "[...] <u>Practical experience has demonstrated that coercive economic measures</u> is a loathsome weapon that cannot deter peoples from attaining their inalienable right to chose their own political, economic and social systems. This weapon has shown its effectiveness in injuring innocent civilians, delaying development in targeted countries and their trading partners, sowing the seeds of economic and political instability throughout the world, and flouting the Charter, international humanitarian law, human rights, and the principles of the sovereign equality of States, territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. It has also been effective in suppressing the right of peoples to choose their own political and economic regimes and their right to development and participation in international economic relations based on mutually beneficial common interests. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 10)

• Japan

2002. "[...] The Government of Japan takes the position that unilateral economic measures that are taken as the result of extraterritorial application of domestic laws are contrary to international law, and thus unacceptable. Based on this position, it voted in favour of the above-mentioned resolution". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 2)

💳 Jordan

2000. "Jordan <u>does not apply any unilateral laws that impose economic sanctions or</u> <u>boycotts on the companies or individuals of other States</u>.

Jordan is not bound to comply with or apply any coercive extraterritorial economic measures or laws imposed unilaterally by any State.

Jordan is not bound to apply the economic sanctions or boycott measures of any State if such sanctions or measures are contrary to the principles of international law". (A/55/300/Add.3, 2 November 2000, p. 1)

Lao People's Democratic Republic

2002. "The Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic <u>upholds strictly the</u> principles of peaceful coexistence, respect for national independence, sovereignty, <u>self-determination and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries</u>. It expresses its concern over the negative impact of unilaterally imposed extraterritorial coercive economic measures on trade, financial and economic cooperation at all levels. The Lao Government refuses to recognize the unilateral extraterritorial law enacted and the imposition of penalties on corporations and nationals of other countries by any country. Such law and measures are contrary to the principles and norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, pp. 2-3)

2024. "[...] We firmly believe that the continued <u>application of unilateral coercive</u> measures against sovereign States is contrary to the recognized principles of <u>international law and the Charter of the United Nations</u>. In this regard, the Lao People's Democratic Republic reiterates its unwavering commitment to promoting the principles of the United Nations Charter, which includes respecting the sovereignty of States, refraining from interfering in the internal affairs of other countries and promoting friendly relations among all nations.

Against this backdrop, the Lao People's Democratic Republic has closely followed, with deep concern, the negative consequences that unilateral sanctions have had on the lives of innocent people in many countries. As widely recognized, the impact of unilateral coercive measures extends far beyond the realm of the economy. Such measures, which are currently imposed on more than 30 countries, detrimentally affect the fundamental rights of people, including the right to development and survival, and impede their access to essential needs, including food, medicines and other means of daily subsistence. On the whole, unilateral coercive measures can exacerbate extreme poverty and hunger, disproportionately affecting the most vulnerable populations. All this contravenes the overall objectives contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goal [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, p. 2)

🚥 Malaysia

1998. "[...] From the statements made in this Assembly today and in the past, and the responses received by the Secretary-General pursuant to a previous resolution of the Assembly on this subject, it is clear that there is considerable concern on the part of the international community over the use of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion. This concern is based on the following compelling arguments.

First, such coercive economic measures <u>violate the established norms of relations</u> among nations, including, in particular, those enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and numerous relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. They violate the universal principles of the equal sovereignty of States and non-intervention in their internal affairs.

Secondly, <u>they violate the letter and spirit of the Agreement Establishing the World</u> <u>Trade Organization and the acknowledged objectives and purposes of many regional</u> <u>economic or trade organizations</u>, which, inter alia, uphold and promote the universal principles of international trade, in particular, the principles of non-discrimination and freedom of international trade.

Thirdly, such unilateral measures <u>are discriminatory in nature, intended to serve</u> <u>specific political agendas against the target country or countries</u>.

Fourthly, <u>these measures have an extraterritorial dimension</u>, in that they extend the <u>application of domestic laws to other countries</u>.

Like many delegations that have addressed the Assembly on this subject, Malaysia is against the application of such extraterritorial coercive measures in inter-State relations. [...]. It is clear that these measures are as unpopular as they are anachronistic — they are a throwback to a world of the past, characterized by its cold-war rigidity. They are out of step with the current trend towards increasing interdependence as well as interaction and interconnectedness among States, developed and developing, a trend impelled by a new and palpable universal sense of a truly global community. In an increasingly borderless world in which global trade plays a pivotal role in relations among States, there is really no place or justification for the continuation of such policies. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 15-16)

2002. "[...] We are dismayed that, despite the recommendations adopted on this issue by the General Assembly and United Nations conferences, unilateral coercive measures continue to be promulgated and employed as State policies and practices, with all their negative effects on the socio-economic development of the affected countries. The imposition of such measures contravenes international law and is totally incompatible not only with international rules and regulations, but also with the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

Malaysia rejects the application of such measures as tools for political or economic pressure or coercion against target countries for their negative and often debilitating

Asia-Pacific

effects on large sectors of the population, especially children, women, the elderly and the disabled. [...]

From the development perspective, unilateral coercive measures are one of the major obstacles to the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Development. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, pp. 5-6)

2024. "[...] Malaysia remains a nation steadfast in its commitment to upholding the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. <u>It is within that framework that Malaysia has consistently opposed the imposition of unilateral coercive measures against any country. Malaysia firmly believes that such measures constitute a blatant contravention of international norms and contradict the fundamental purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter. Those actions undermine the spirit of multilateralism and cooperation that the international community strives to uphold. The imposition of unilateral coercive measures, especially on developing countries, has had severe repercussions. Those measures have significantly restricted the ability of the affected countries to improve economic growth and provide for the basic needs of their peoples. They have stifled free and open business across borders and hindered the social development of their populations. Their impact on ordinary citizens has been profound, exacerbating hardships and denying them access to essential services and opportunities.</u>

<u>Malaysia remains unequivocally opposed to all forms of unilateral economic,</u> <u>financial and commercial measures that contravene international law and</u> <u>international humanitarian law.</u> Such measures contradict the very essence of the United Nations Charter, which advocates for the promotion of peace, cooperation and respect for sovereign equality among nations. As we strive towards advancing the. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, p. 22)

💻 Nauru

2000. "The Republic of Nauru <u>has not in the past and does not presently apply any</u> <u>extraterritorial coercive economic measures or legislative enactments unilaterally</u> <u>imposed by or on any Member State</u>". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 7)

Qatar

1998. "[...] At a time when we are looking forward to entering the twenty-first century in a spirit of tolerance, amity and brotherhood among all humankind, the elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion has become an urgent need in order to get rid of the effects of the use of force and the confrontational thinking that prevailed in international relations during the cold-war era. These were a stumbling-block on the path of the economic development of developing countries.

Coercive economic measures run counter to the "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", adopted by the General Assembly on 24 October 1970 by resolution 2625 (XXV) [...]. [...] General Assembly resolution 51/22 recalled its numerous resolutions in which it called upon the international community to take urgent and effective steps to end coercive economic measures, and expressed grave concern over the recent enactment of extraterritorial coercive economic laws in contravention of the norms of international law, the aims and purposes of the United Nations and the relevant provisions of the World Trade Organization.

<u>That resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of States to economic and social</u> <u>development and to choose their political, economic and social system</u> on the basis of the international Organization's commitment to the consolidation of the rights of peoples embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, in the interest of achieving the Organization's objectives of the maintenance of international peace and security. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 11-12)

2002. "The Government of the State of Qatar has consistently opposed the imposition of unilateral sanctions on a sovereign State. The <u>imposition of sanctions on other</u> <u>countries with a view to economic interests or the achievement of political ends</u> <u>constitutes a violation of the principle of sovereign equality and the right to self-determination, as set forth in the Charter and the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It is also incompatible with the development of friendly relations and the strengthening of international cooperation among Member States. Article 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 3281 (XXIX), states: "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights". [...]</u>

The State of Qatar therefore affirms its <u>categorical rejection of all attempts aimed at</u> <u>the extraterritorial application of domestic laws</u> to nationals or corporations of third countries for the purpose of coercing other countries to comply with unilaterally adopted economic measures, which is contradictory to international law and the Charter of the United Nations". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, pp. 3)

E State of Palestine

2024. "[...] <u>Unilateral coercive measures, including blockades, undermine the</u> principles of sovereignty, self-determination and international cooperation <u>enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations</u>. Those measures inflict severe harm on the most vulnerable populations, exacerbate poverty and impede the development of the nations that they target, particularly developing countries. In doing so, they obstruct our collective efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly those related to ending poverty and hunger, ensuring good health and well-being and fostering inclusive economic growth.

In developing countries, the human cost of unilateral coercive measures is stark: they are not just an abstract concept, but rather a painful reality for hundreds of millions of persons around the world. It is estimated that well over one third of the world's population is affected by unilateral coercive measures. Families are pushed deeper into poverty, healthcare systems are strained beyond capacity, opportunities for education and employment are severely hindered, and access to technology is either limited or restricted. Unilateral coercive measures therefore contravene the principles of multilateralism as they erode the spirit of international cooperation that the United Nations embodies, in addition to the rules and principles of international law. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 12-13)

🚾 Syrian Arab Republic

2002. It adheres to resolution 55/6, the position of the Non-Aligned Movement and the South Summit Declaration. Thus, [...] "all peoples have the right to <u>self-determination</u> and that, by virtue of that right, to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

[...] expressed the need to eliminate coercive measures and legislation as <u>contrary to</u> <u>international law, the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations</u> <u>and the norms and principles governing peaceful relations</u> among States, and urged States applying unilateral coercive measures to put an immediate end to those measures.

[...] rejected the imposition of laws and regulations with extraterritorial impact and all other forms of coercive economic measures. They emphasized that <u>such actions</u> not only undermined the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also severely threatened the freedom of trade and <u>investment</u>. They therefore called on the international community neither to recognize these measures nor to apply them". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 6)

"[...] A nation's imposition of its national laws on the nationals or companies of third countries in such a way as to exceed its territorial limits is a further <u>violation of the</u> <u>sovereign rights of States.</u>

Unilateral, extraterritorial coercive economic measures are not just a violation of the principles of international law and the standards, goals and <u>norms governing</u> <u>international trade and World Trade Organization agreements</u>, they also have negative consequences on the social and human development of developing countries victimized by such measures. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, pp. 8-9)

2024. "[...] The Charter of the United Nations affirmed the principle of sovereign equality among Member States and prioritized achieving international cooperation and promoting the economic and social advancement of all peoples among its purposes. With a view to developing friendly relations among States and strengthening international cooperation on the basis of justice and equity, the General Assembly adopted in 1970 resolution 2625 (XXV) containing the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, which stipulates: 'No state may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another state in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind'.

The General Assembly reaffirmed that position in article 32 of <u>resolution 3281</u> (XXIX), adopted in 1974, which includes the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. [...]

In recent years, the pace of the United States and the European Union imposing unilateral coercive measures has increased. The scope of those illegal measures was expanded in their various forms and appellations. That has caused extreme economic hardships for our countries and immense humanitarian suffering. It has prevented several peoples from enjoying their fundamental rights, including the right to a dignified life, to health, food and development. <u>It has subjected them to collective punishment, which represents a United Nations Charter violation. The Charter entrusted the Security Council, exclusively, with the power to impose sanctions, pursuant to the criteria set out in Chapter 7.</u>

The United Nations has <u>condemned the imposition of unilateral coercive measures</u>, <u>considering them to be blatant violations of the provisions of international law and</u> <u>the purposes and principles of the Charter</u>, as well as an obstacle to the enjoyment <u>of human rights</u>. The relevant General Assembly resolutions recognize that coercive measures directly and seriously affect all aspects of life in the targeted countries. However, successive United States Administrations and the European Union have chosen to continue to impose unilateral coercive measures, ignoring the resolutions of our Organization and its principles and invoking the so-called rules-based order — and nobody knows what those rules are — in their attempt to consolidate such rules instead of being guided by the United Nations Charter. [...]

Syria reaffirms that unilateral coercive measures represent <u>economic terrorism</u>. They are a sword hanging over the necks of peoples, financial institutions, commercial and business sectors in third countries, which refrain from transacting with the targeted States in order to avoid being targeted themselves by the unjust United States sanctions. Experience has shown the falsehood of what is being said about the humanitarian exemptions. We witnessed that firsthand during the coronavirus disease pandemic and in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in Syria last year.

The countries that consider those measures as foreign policy tools have been offering baseless justifications for their criminal conduct against our peoples, but such justifications will not change the fact that unilateral coercive measures run counter to the United Nations Charter and the principles and rules of international law and international customary law. They are internationally prohibited acts that entail responsibility for the countries imposing them. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 26-28)

💌 Timor-Leste

2024. "[...] <u>The use of unilateral extraterritorial coercive measures is a controversial topic, with advocates and critics both presenting valid arguments.</u> However, amid that debate, over 30 countries are being denied access to fundamental rights as a result of those measures, which violates the Charter of the United Nations, various United Nations resolutions and the principle of multilateralism. <u>That situation highlights the urgent need for a re-evaluation of unilateral coercive measures, as they contradict the principles of international cooperation and respect for sovereignty, causing harm to innocent populations and undermining global stability.</u>

Asia-Pacific

It is essential to explore alternative solutions that prioritize dialogue, diplomacy and human rights, ensuring that all nations can access basic rights and participate equally in the global community.

The <u>removal of economic sanctions</u>, trade restrictions and other measures imposed by one country on another without the consent of the targeted country is a must. As we have heard from previous speakers, while such measures are often used as a means of political and economic pressure, they can have devastating consequences for the targeted countries, including economic hardship and instability, disruption of global supply chains, violations of sovereignty and international law, discrimination against certain countries or industries, and the creation of obstacles to economic development and cooperation.

As we all know, <u>the practice of coercive measures was introduced and imposed</u> <u>primarily by large and powerful nations against smaller, economically weaker</u> <u>States.</u> They can take many forms, including economic sanctions, trade embargoes, asset freezes, investment restrictions, travel bans and other forms of coercive measures used against targeted nations, such as in the case of Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela. Those countries, along with other targeted countries, have seen the worst of economic hardship and political instability. Worse still, <u>innocent populations</u>, <u>primarily vulnerable groups such as the elderly</u>, women and youth, bear the brunt <u>of such measures</u>.

Unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures should find no place in our world today. They violate State sovereignty and international law, undermining the principles of equality and non-interference. They violate the Charter of the United Nations, human rights principles, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Their humanitarian impact is significant, with innocent civilians bearing the brunt. They hinder economic development and cooperation, restrict access to markets, technology and resources and limit the potential for economic growth and diversification, thereby perpetuating economic inequality and dependence and undermining the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

As we have seen thus far, coercive measures are employed as a means of political coercion, rather than as a legitimate response to political or economic concerns. That undermines the rule of law and perpetuates a culture of "might makes right", rather than encouraging diplomacy, solutions and dialogue. Coercive measures can also lead to retaliation from affected parties, escalate tensions and potentially spark trade wars. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 11-12)

TYemen

2000. "The Republic of Yemen reiterated its opposition to the unilateral punitive economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and, accordingly, <u>the Government of Yemen, maintaining its traditional position of respect for the self-determination of peoples, has neither promulgated nor applied unilaterally any laws against Libya". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 7)</u>

EASTERN EUROPE

🗖 Armenia

2002. "[...] Armenia condemns the continuing practice of unilateral coercive economic measures, particularly in the South Caucasus region. <u>Such measures contradict the basic measures and norms of international law and the United Nations Charter, as well as the norms and regulations of the multilateral trading <u>system</u>. The imposition of such restrictive economic measures has a detrimental impact on developing and transitional countries, as in the case of landlocked Armenia, which, in addition to a geographical impediment, is suffering from a continuing blockade. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 13)</u>

📕 Belarus

2024. "[...] Those responsible for unilateral sanctions cannot be unaware of the real consequences of such measures, which violate every conceivable norm of international law and all human rights and are aimed solely at undermining the independent foreign policy of certain undesirable countries. <u>There is no such thing as a smart sanction</u>. All illegal economic sanctions are aimed at strangling and destroying the economy of a country and thereby lowering the living standards of its people. [...]

By analysing data on the impact of sanctions on people, researchers have come to the conclusion that unilateral measures are comparable in their impacts to acute armed conflicts and natural disasters. We propose that illegal unilateral sanctions be considered not just economic terrorism but also acts of aggression, with all the consequences that entails. Belarus is proud of its achievements in social policy and economy. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 19-20)

N Bosnia and Herzegovina

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

<u>Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations</u>. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed

groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated, aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

📕 Bulgaria

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

<u>The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral</u> <u>measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic</u>

coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

🕨 Czechia

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> <u>rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against</u> <u>the nationals or businesses of third States</u>, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed</u>, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States. We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

🗕 Estonia

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

🕂 Georgia

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act</u>.. [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated, aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

Hungary

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the <u>Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

— Latvia

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

<u>The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral</u> <u>measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic</u>

coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

🛑 Lithuania

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the <u>Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

Montenegro

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

<u>Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations</u>. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated</u>, <u>aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

- Poland

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States. We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.</u>

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

Republic of Moldova

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the

case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated</u>, <u>aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

📕 Romania

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of</u>

<u>third States</u>. We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

Russian Federation

2024. "[...] Today in the General Assembly, after a break of many years, we have an opportunity to make a comprehensive assessment of the practice of unilateral coercive economic measures. <u>That practice of Western countries is not only contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the entire world order that it enshrines, it is also an obstacle to international development, cooperation and human rights. It is a practice that is quite literally killing people by depriving them of what they need most.</u>

To start with, <u>our opponents are trying to equate Security Council sanctions with</u> <u>illegal unilateral coercive measures in order to steer the discussion away from an</u> <u>unpleasant subject.</u> First of all, Security Council sanctions are an auxiliary instrument for responding to the emergence of threats to international peace and security. Their application should be calibrated, targeted and time-limited and should take into account the entire range of potential humanitarian, socioeconomic and human rights consequences. Security Council sanctions regimes have to be regularly reviewed to ensure that they are responding appropriately to the situation on the ground. As the stability of the political context improves, so must the international restrictions be eased and ultimately lifted altogether. It is impermissible to abuse this tool in order to pursue unfair competition and punish undesirable States. It is also impermissible to supplement Security Council sanctions with unilateral restrictive measures, particularly those of an extraterritorial nature.

Turning to unilateral measures that circumvent the Security Council, the subject of our agenda today, we underscore that the Western unilateral coercive measures target countries that have independent foreign and domestic policies and therefore sometimes respond to that independence with neocolonialist economic methods and models. The aims of such sanctions campaigns are openly declared. They are designed to isolate countries financially and technologically in order to undermine their prospects, weaken their domestic political circumstances, create preconditions for regime change and exert external control over sovereign resources. However, the Western countries try to convince us that they are acting lawfully. They say they are only encouraging other countries to fulfil their obligations under international law and allege that the coercive measures stem from their opponents' own international obligations. We have heard that today as well. In that regard, I would like some answers to a number of questions.

First, who appointed them the judge of who, where, when and how much others are fulfilling their obligations? Let me remind them that under the Charter, the right to introduce coercive measures is the prerogative of the Security Council alone. Moreover, not a single international treaty provides that if in the opinion of the West its provisions are being violated by any State, Western countries then have the right to abuse their position as the global financial hegemon and hinder that State's trade or seize its sovereign assets.

Secondly, what should we do when the West itself violates its obligations? The answer is of course clear. There are no such violations. The position of countries that practice illegal unilateral coercive measures can be expressed in a well-known Latin maxim: *quod licet Iovi, non licet bovi* — Jove may do what cattle may not. In other words, there is no legal basis, merely rules that the West changes as it goes along to suit its interests.

As has already been said today, unilateral measures are currently in effect against roughly 30 countries with a total population of almost 2 billion people, meaning that more than a quarter of the world's population are dealing with illegal restrictions on their economic activity. [...]

In general, we want to emphasize that the Western countries' attempts to maintain their slipping hegemony — and their reliance on unfair competition, "green" barriers, clamping down on effective forms of technology and investment flows and erecting other new kinds of barriers — are self-destructive choices by our opponents, whose own populations are already expressing their opinion of them. Unlawful and uncontrolled economic pressure from Western countries is ensuring that there will be strengthened joint resistance to those measures and consolidation around a new global model based on polycentricity, equality and mutual respect [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 23-25)

👛 Slovakia

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> <u>rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against</u> <u>the nationals or businesses of third States</u>, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed</u>, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States. We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the

European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

📥 Slovenia

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the <u>Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed</u>, <u>both on</u> <u>legal grounds and in principle</u>, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and

<u>unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States</u>. We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

Ukraine

1996. "In spite of the fact that resort to unilateral measures of economic compulsion not sanctioned by the world community for the purpose of gaining political dividends has been repeatedly deplored in the highest international forums, including those held under United Nations auspices, we note with regret that this practice remains in the political arsenals of some States, which use it to interfere in the internal affairs of other States and, in certain situations, for so-called material support of direct territorial claims.

That is why our delegation strongly believes that this problem should not be treated as relating exclusively to the developing countries. It is similarly acute for the new sovereign States that are experiencing today a complicated and sometimes very painful period of achieving self-determination and establishing their own models of national development. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, pp. 15-17)

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

<u>Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations</u>. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated</u>, <u>aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their

business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

💶 Argentina

1998. "Argentina abstained in the voting on the resolution just adopted <u>because it</u> takes the view that the application of economic sanctions should be approved by the pertinent United Nations organs and should be in conformity with the principles of the Charter". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 18)

2002. "On 5 September 1997, the Government of the Argentine Republic promulgated Act No. 24.871, under which foreign laws that, directly or indirectly, are designed to restrict or prevent the free exercise of trade and the movement of capital, assets or persons to the detriment of any country or group of countries, shall not be applicable or produce juridical effects of any kind in the territory of Argentina.

Article 1 of the Act provides that foreign laws that seek to produce extraterritorial juridical effects, through the imposition of an economic blockade or the limitation of investments in a given country, in order to bring about a change of government in a country or affect its right of self-determination, shall also be absolutely inapplicable and have no juridical effects". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 2)

📕 Bolivia

1998. "On behalf of my delegation, I wish to explain why Bolivia did not vote in favour of the resolution just adopted, but rather abstained, thus maintaining its position of 1996 in a case which has implications beyond those considered.

This does not mean that Bolivia does not condemn and reject any extraterritorial measures applied unilaterally, since they are a violation of international law.

We confirm our 1996 position and take the view that in this situation there are other considerations to be taken into account". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 19)

2024. "[...] Bolivia condemns each and every one of the unilateral coercive measures that have been arbitrarily imposed over the years against sovereign countries, primarily developing countries. Such <u>measures are illegal and constitute a flagrant</u> violation of the United Nations Charter and the basic rules of international law, including human rights law and international humanitarian law.

Unilateral coercive measures — as the name describes clearly — are arbitrary, capricious measures imposed by one State on another with the aim of generating adverse economic, trade and financial effects for political reasons, which have devastating consequences on the economies and stability of the populations of the countries affected. Such measures not only affect Governments but also directly affect peoples, undermining their well-being, their development and their ability to lead their lives and causing suffering to vulnerable groups such as women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities and Indigenous peoples.

It is clear that unilateral coercive measures are applied as a tool of political, economic and financial compulsion against free peoples and sovereign States. [...]

Unilateral coercive measures not only affect countries' development and exacerbate poverty and inequality but also constitute <u>serious violations of human rights</u>, as they aim to make peoples suffer and deprive them the basic requirements needed for their personal, family and community development.

Our commitment to the United Nations Charter and the basic principles of international law should unite all of our countries, particularly developing countries, in efforts to definitively eliminate unilateral coercive measures and prevent them from posing an impediment to trade and investment among independent and sovereign nations.. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 4-5)

📀 Brazil

2024. "[...] Brazil has long maintained that unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures have no legal basis in international law. They violate the fundamental principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. Deprived of international legality, they lack legitimacy and weaken multilateralism. The impact of unilateral coercive measures extends well beyond the legal and political realms. Such measures have severe social consequences, as they lead to or aggravate economic crises more often than not. They contribute to poverty, inequality and, in many cases, personal suffering, as a result of shortages of food, medicine and essential goods. In other words, the brunt of sanctions is borne by regular citizens who do not have the slightest influence on, much less responsibility for, whatever it is that sanctioning States or groups of States wish to punish foreign Governments for. The purported targeted nature of some sanctions is not necessarily so — and even when it is, such measures may have serious collective implications, depending on the target. The problem is further aggravated by the fact that unilateral coercive measures have proven ineffective in achieving their declared goals. Some sanctions have been applied for decades now, while the policies they seek to change remain firmly in place.

In the light of those considerations, <u>the international community must continue to</u> <u>condemn unilateral coercive measures and clearly maintain the key principles of</u> <u>international law and the Charter of the United Nations</u>". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, p. 27;8)

🗕 Colombia

2024. "[...] Colombia joins other delegations in expressing concern with regard to the imposition of unilateral coercive economic measures, which <u>are incompatible with</u> <u>the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations</u>. Such measures harm the economies of developing countries in particular and undermine the ability of their Governments to make crucial investments to support social justice and the economic and social development of their peoples. Such measures also have a negative impact on international economic cooperation and are inconsistent with the efforts being deployed around the world to consolidate a multilateral trading system based on the principles of openness and non-discrimination. <u>Unilateral coercive economic measures constitute a violation of the principles of international</u>

law as enshrined in the United Nations Charter, and they do harm to all aspects of life in the countries against which they are directed. In particular, they negatively affect access to food, clean water and sanitation, electricity, sufficient medicines, medical equipment, prevention and control of diseases, training, and the latest scientific, technological and research knowledge, thereby undermining Governments' capacities to guarantee the well-being of their populations.

For these reasons, the <u>application of such measures limits economic and social</u> <u>development and stands in the way of the attainment of the Sustainable</u> <u>Development Goals</u>, which jointly serve as a universal plan of action for people, the planet and prosperity and which must be implemented fully and comprehensively.

Unilateral coercive economic measures have a particular impact on civilian populations, in particular women, children and other vulnerable persons, thereby limiting their ability to realize and effectively enjoy their economic, social, cultural and environmental rights.

Colombia therefore once again calls upon Member States to abstain from promulgating and applying any unilateral economic, financial or trade measures that are not in accordance with international law and the United Nations Charter and that prevent the full achievement of economic and social development, especially in developing countries, in line with paragraph 30 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, p. 1)

🗲 Cuba

1996. "Cuba's position on unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries is widely known, as is the view of the international community, as expressed in numerous international instruments and resolutions of the General Assembly.

Although it has been said euphemistically that the cold war is now over, we are still living amid an international order in which the major economic and political Power, taking advantage of its predominant position, is <u>continuing unilaterally to apply</u> <u>coercive economic measures against developing countries</u> — not because of the <u>danger these countries pose to the national security of that Power, as is usually</u> <u>alleged, but because of its manifest intent to impose upon those countries certain of</u> <u>its foreign policy objectives.</u>

Although this fact is well known, it must be reiterated: the imposition of these kinds of measures by one country against another is <u>a clear violation of international law</u> <u>and seriously damages the principles of sovereign equality, non-intervention and</u> <u>non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Moreover, the unilateral</u> <u>application of these measures contravenes the purposes and principles of the Charter</u> <u>of the United Nations and other international instruments governing relations</u> <u>among States, such as the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the</u> <u>Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty,</u> <u>and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly</u> <u>Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.</u>

In both Declarations, the international community recognized that no State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State, and that no State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure from it advantages of any kind. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, pp. 19-20)

1998. "[...] The enacting of such measures reveals the true nature of the policy being pursued by countries that claim to "promote" open and free trade at the global level even as they seek <u>unilaterally to impose their legislation on other countries</u>, including their own allies, without any moral, legal or political justification, and in blatant disregard of the principles they themselves advocate and which are endorsed by the international community and international law. [...]

The Government of Cuba, <u>consistent in its condemnation of all extraterritorial acts</u> <u>that violate the sovereignty of peoples, joins in the sweeping international rejection</u> <u>elicited by such legislation and trusts that the United Nations</u> will play its rightful role in ensuring that the will and the decisions of the international community are upheld". (A/52/343/Add.2, 14 May 1998, pp. 1-2)

"[...] Although it has been recognized by a number of General Assembly resolutions, it is necessary to reiterate that the application of such measures by one country against another is a <u>blatant violation of international law and of the principles of the Charter</u>, including the sovereign equality of States and non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

The international community has repeatedly condemned the damaging effects of the application of such measures on the health, well-being and enjoyment of human rights of people, in particular those in the most vulnerable sectors of the countries to which they are applied.

My country profoundly believes that in the current international circumstances the <u>international community must prevent the proliferation of such measures</u>, <u>particularly those that are extraterritorial</u>, and demand an end to such practices.

Accepting such legislation would mean recognizing a system of international relations that favours the hegemony and irresponsible policy of one great Power. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 6-7)

2000. "The Republic of Cuba once again strongly <u>condemns the application of</u> <u>unilateral coercive economic measures as a means of bringing political and economic</u> <u>pressure to bear on developing countries</u>; it considers that the enactment of such measures reveals the true nature of the policy of those countries which call themselves champions of free trade yet at the same time create huge obstacles to the freedom of international trade, using it to try to unilaterally impose their national laws on other countries, thereby flouting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

The application of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion is not only <u>injurious to the personality of the State concerned and of the political, economic and cultural elements of which it is made up</u>, but also affects other sensitive areas, such as the enjoyment of human rights of the peoples against whom these unilateral policies are directed. [...]". (A/55/300/Add.2, 12 October 2000, p. 2)

2002. "The Government of the Republic of Cuba joins the group of States that <u>energetically and unequivocally rejects the application of unilateral extraterritorial</u> <u>coercive measures as a means of political and economic compulsion on the developing</u> <u>countries.</u>

Once again, in the light of the persistence of such practices, Cuba deems it necessary to express its conviction that the <u>application of unilateral coercive economic</u> <u>sanctions is a flagrant violation of the Declaration on Principles of International Law</u> <u>concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the</u> <u>Charter of the United Nations, contained in the annex to General Assembly</u> <u>resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970, which states that "No State may use or</u> <u>encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce</u> <u>another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its</u> <u>sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind</u>". [...]

The Government of Cuba joins with the many which have rejected this type of <u>legislation</u> and once again expresses the conviction that the United Nations will play its rightful role and will see to it that the will of the international community is done and that its decisions are implemented". (A/57/179/Corr.1, 4 July 2002, p. 2)

"Cuba vigorously and unequivocally rejects any application of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion against developing countries. [...].

The General Assembly, in many resolutions, has opposed the application of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a flagrant violation of the principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the norms and principles governing international trade. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, pp. 4-5)

2010. "The application or promotion of the use by any <u>State of unilateral economic</u>, political or other measures to coerce another State so as to prevent it from exercising its sovereign rights constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of international law set out in the Charter of the United Nations, as well as of the basic principles of the multilateral trade system. [...]

Cuba once again reiterates its vigorous condemnation of the application of such measures, which contravene the most elementary norms and principles governing international coexistence. The application of unilateral economic coercive measures directly affects economic and social development in the developing countries concerned; it undermines the welfare of their peoples and constitutes a serious obstacle to the enjoyment of their human rights, including the rights to development, education, health care, food and the necessary basic social services. [...]". (A/65/PV.63, 13 December 2010, pp. 1-2)

Latin America and the Caribbean

2024. "[...] <u>Cuba firmly rejects the implementation of unilateral coercive measures</u>, which violate the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Such measures are particularly harmful under the current conditions of an international economy in crisis, increasingly interconnected, interdependent and subject to the dictates of the financial centres of power.

We note an unacceptable trend towards an increase in unilateral coercive measures. Their impact undermines our efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and national development plans, by preventing our participation in international markets on equal terms, in a fair and inclusive manner. Such measures cause direct, intentional and politically motivated harm to the sovereignty and independence of the States against which they are directed. In certain cases, they are directed against entire populations. They violate the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and hinder the efforts of nations to promote the full enjoyment of human rights. They constitute a violation of international trade rules, insofar as they provide for actions of economic pressure harmful to the sovereignty of countries. [...]

Demandamos la eliminación completa, inmediata e incondicional de todas las medidas coercitivas unilaterales. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 6-7)

📥 Ecuador

2000. "[...] <u>has not adopted, and will not adopt in future, any laws that run counter</u> to freedom of international trade, contain coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion, or violate the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another State. These norms are enshrined in the Political Constitution of the State and therefore determine each and every one of Ecuador's legal, political and economic policies at both the domestic and international levels". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 2)

2002. "[...] <u>has not adopted, and will not adopt, laws that infringe upon the freedom</u> <u>of international trade, or that contain coercive economic measures as a means of</u> <u>political and economic compulsion, or that violate the principle of non-intervention</u> <u>in the internal affairs of other countries</u>. These norms appear in the Constitution of Ecuador and therefore guide each and every legal, political and economic action of the country, at both the domestic and international levels". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 2)

💳 Honduras

2024. "[...] <u>Honduras reiterates that the application of unilateral measures,</u> <u>including tariff and non-tariff barriers, also undermines the multilateral trading</u> <u>system and restricts free trade and investment and, in turn, sustainable</u> <u>development, which would be of benefit to all</u>. Such measures are therefore contrary to global trading rules and to universally recognized instruments for development. The impact of such measures also weakens mechanisms for cooperation and limits access to financing, technology and various essential products, thereby compromising our fundamental commitment to leaving no one behind. [...] Honduras therefore maintains its principled position not to promote or apply any unilateral economic or trade measures or laws against other States that would affect the free conduct of international trade, in compliance with our obligations under the United Nations Charter and international law. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, p. 11)

🔀 Jamaica

2002. "The Government of Jamaica has repeatedly supported the resolutions of the General Assembly to date, in which it condemns the use of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion. <u>Such practices are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law</u>.

Unilateral coercive economic measures threaten the sovereignty of States, with deleterious effects on all aspects of their development. <u>As a method of economic or political compulsion, they are an affront to the targeted State and compromise its economic, political and cultural identity</u>. They affect the most vulnerable groups in society, including women, children and the disabled. [...]". (A/57/179, 2 July 2002, p. 2)

Mexico

2000. "Mexico is convinced that the international community should adopt urgent and effective measures to prevent the imposition against developing countries of coercive economic measures which are not expressly authorized by the relevant organs of the United Nations or are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations.

The resolution of conflicts by peaceful means is essential to the coexistence of nations. Consultation and negotiation are the instruments through which nations should resolve their problems. <u>Mexico is also opposed to the use of any type of unilateral measure</u>, whether economic or political, by any State as a means of exerting pressure in order to change political or economic processes outside its jurisdiction.

It will be recalled that, in 1996, Mexico promulgated the <u>Act to protect trade and</u> <u>investment from foreign norms that contravene international law</u>, [...]". (A/55/300, 17 August 2000, p. 7)

2024. "Mexico has reiterated many times that the Charter of the United Nations establishes that <u>the Security Council is the only body entitled to impose sanctions if</u> <u>it deems them necessary in cases where there are threats to peace and security. The</u> <u>application of unilateral economic, financial or commercial measures is simply</u> <u>incompatible with the Charter and the principles of international law, especially</u> <u>those relating to equality among States and the right to self-determination</u>. Such measures have a negative impact on individuals' enjoyment of their human rights, on the sustainable development of States and on the economic prospects of

Latin America and the Caribbean

developing countries, and they are an obstacle to progress towards the fulfilment of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Unilateral sanctions also have negative effects on civilians living in conflict and postconflict situations. In our own region of Latin America, we have seen how unilateral coercive measures hinder development and contribute to increases in irregular migration. In that regard, in follow-up to the commitments arising from the Palenque Summit, on <u>the theme of "good-neighbourliness and well-being"</u>, we call for the lifting of the unilateral coercive measures that have been imposed on the countries of our region, which, as I said, are contrary to international law. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 22-23)

💳 Nicaragua

2024. "[...] <u>Since 1983, the General Assembly has adopted resolutions recognizing the negative effect of unilateral coercive measures on the economies of developing countries and the fact that such illegal measures in no way benefit multilateralism or contribute to creating a climate of peace and friendly relations among States. Since 2000, the imposition of unilateral coercive measures has become a key foreign policy tool used by countries such as the United States and the member States of the European Union, which have imposed more than 26,000 sanctions affecting almost one third of the world's population. Such coercive measures trample people's rights to self-determination and freedom. More than 40 years after the adoption of resolution 38/197 of 1983, entitled "Economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries", the United States and its allies continue to display their imperial arrogance with total impunity, by taking advantage of their dominant position in the international economy and using such economic measures to exercise pressure on or forcibly influence the sovereign decisions of developing countries.</u>

The General Assembly has recognized the extraterritorial nature of those coercive legislative and administrative measures, policies and practices, which are adopted unilaterally to obstruct the development of people and the full realization of their human rights. The General Assembly has prescribed that developed countries must refrain from the threat or application of trade restrictions, blockades and other economic measures that run contrary to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter establishes the sovereign equality of all States. However, both the Charter and international law are conveniently applied by the imperialist Powers, which have conferred upon themselves the authority to create unilateral lists, not only by instrumentalizing human rights and democracy but also by falsely accusing others of sponsoring terrorism, under contrived pretexts and contrary to international law. Article 32 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted in resolution 3281 (XXIX), of 1974, established that, "No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights [or secure from it advantages of any kind]." [...]

Those unilateral coercive measures are further examples of the use of force and mechanisms to interfere in the internal affairs of States, which is prohibited by the Charter of the United Nations. They constitute a collective punishment against peoples, disrupt the economies of countries and affect the standard of living of entire populations, restricting their access to food, medicine, water and sanitation, health, housing, education and employment, with the aim of provoking social discontent and overthrowing legitimate Governments. Such measures are usually based on fake news and are accompanied by negative stereotypes and hate speech against brotherly countries, such as China, Cuba, Iran, Belarus, Eritrea, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Russia and other countries, including Zimbabwe, which are also victims of such measures. <u>Coercive measures are not innocent tools of soft power. They kill just as bullets kill in war. They starve people to death. They kill people by depriving them of medicine. They are aimed at deliberately affecting the living conditions of a population to bring about its total or partial physical destruction. That is called genocide.</u>

It is imperative to immediately suspend the unilateral coercive economic measures imposed on our peoples. We must eliminate those aggressions, which are genuine obstacles to the eradication of poverty, and advance towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals contained in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The General Assembly must be proactive. It must not be satisfied with encouraging and condemning those genocidal practices in violation of international law. The General Assembly must adopt a resolution in accordance with Article 96 of the United Nations Charter, referring the legal issues related to the unpunished implementation of illegal unilateral coercive measures to the International Court of Justice, requesting an advisory opinion on the consequences of the continued imposition of such measures and establishing the obligation to compensate the countries that are victims of those measures for the damages caused". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 18-20)

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

2024. "[...] Today's timely, albeit overdue, discussion is occurring at a pivotal moment. The world is fraught with discord, and we are witnessing increasing recourse to the promulgation of unilateral economic coercive measures, which are often applied against developing countries by developed countries in the pursuit of nationalistic agendas or for the sake of political expediency. This constitutes a grave threat to the norms and principles governing friendly relations among States, further undermining the very rules of engagement upon which our international system has been built and threatening an already fragile multilateral order.

Such measures are imposed in violation of international law and have been condemned categorially by an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly, as in the case of the resolution entitled 'Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States against Cuba'. This indicates that their use is at variance with the goodwill of the international community and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. No State has the right nor the authority to circumvent international law. The promulgation and application of unilateral coercive measures is a violation of the commitment made by we the peoples of the United Nations. It demonstrates a blatant disregard for multilateralism and multilateral institutions, suggesting that international norms, standards and laws can be flouted with impunity, the result of which is an erosion of trust, always with dire consequences for citizens.

Too often, <u>unilateral coercive measures are a tool used as part of the power dynamic</u> <u>between States</u>, without regard for the often-devastating effect that they have on the <u>well-being of peoples</u>. These measures impede the full realization of human rights and constrain access to healthcare and other basic, everyday necessities, of which every human being is deserving. They also often have far-reaching consequences, such as impeding efforts to strengthen South-South cooperation. The disruption of the PetroCaribe agreement — the concessionary financial oil agreement between Venezuela and Caribbean Member States — had a significant impact on the economies of the parties to the agreement. Moreover, the application of unilateral coercive measures impedes the overall development of a State, including its ability to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and attain the Sustainable Development Goals — another framework within which we have made a people-centric promise. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 3-4)

🔁 Venezuela

1996. "We voted in favour of this resolution because we agree with the main elements it contains. [...]

We believe that operative paragraph 1 can be understood only in the context of States' full compliance with the commitments they have entered into under the Charter of the United Nations, international law, democratic principles and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 23)

2024. "Since at least 2014, the criminal United States Government, allied with sectors of the evil and corrupt Venezuelan and Latin American ultra-right oligarchy, has been applying one of the most aggressive illegal sanctions programmes in modern history against Venezuela. Its purpose has always been to impose a policy of regime change and its predatory model on a people who, in building their freedom and independence, have refused to give in to its blackmail, and who are firmly determined to be the masters of their own destiny.

As part of what they called a maximum pressure campaign against our country, a whole network of lies and legal and financial falsehoods has been approved to attack our people — criminal laws, damaging executive orders, lists of sanctioned entities and people and regulations aimed specifically at our country. <u>All of those actions make up a criminal structure that seeks to legitimize and justify an illegal and spurious policy, applied extraterritorially, designed to conceal the conduct of a decadent empire that believes it can act with impunity in the face of a weak international system. That set of systematic and sustained measures of economic terrorism — more than 930 to date — applied by the Government of the United States, the European Union and other satellite nations has resulted in freezing the</u>

Venezuelan people's assets and property. They have blocked accounts and prevented bank transfers, among other things interrupting our country's payment of debts and collection of interest, titles and bonds. They have prevented the purchase of machinery, supplies and parts of various kinds on the international market. They have paralysed the contracting of services at the international level, exerted pressure aimed at discouraging economic and commercial exchanges between Venezuela and third countries and hindered imports of goods and services that are essential to ensuring the welfare of the Venezuelan people.

Those measures, which constitute modern-day colonialist practices, are aimed at achieving the collapse of the Venezuelan national economy and at manufacturing and inducing an unprecedented multifactorial crisis, with a negative impact on the public and private economy of our nation. That has been acknowledged by the promoters of those crimes against humanity themselves. One of the criminals, William Brownfield, the infamous representative of the genocidal Government of the United States of America, confessed: 'We must treat this as an agony, a tragedy that will continue until it reaches an end ... and if we can do anything to speed it up, we must do it, understanding that this is going to have an impact on millions of people who are already having difficulty finding food and medicine ... We cannot do this and pretend that it is not going to have an impact. We have to make a hard decision. The desired end justifies this severe punishment'.

However, to evade their international responsibility for the crimes committed, the financial executioners who impose that set of unilateral coercive measures try to hide behind the issuance of the well-known licenses. In reality, such licenses, which in some cases are even euphemistically presented as so-called humanitarian exemptions, are a means of administering collective punishment, a mechanism of economic neocolonization that enforces conditions on the attacked States and adapts to the political and economic interests of private corporations and the Government of the aggressor State. In other words, <u>they are licenses to dominate, administer pain, deepen and extend the structural ties of economic and financial dependence — a dependence already sustained by an unjust international system and designed to suit the interests of the North — and manipulate the sovereignty and self-determination of peoples. [...]" (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 3-6)</u>

WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES

🎫 Australia

1996. "My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/51/L.23 because the draft resolution <u>fails to draw a clear distinction between measures imposed</u> <u>unilaterally by individual States and those measures that are undertaken pursuant</u> <u>to resolutions of the Security Council under the United Nations Charter</u>.

Australia has, in this and other forums, <u>made clear its opposition to national</u> <u>legislation that seeks to impose extraterritorial sanctions</u>, determined unilaterally, on companies and individuals of third countries". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 21)

1998. "<u>Australia draws a clear distinction between sanctions imposed unilaterally</u> on other countries by individual States and those sanctions that are promulgated and implemented with the full authority of the Security Council. This resolution does not differentiate sufficiently between those two very different sets of circumstances. Furthermore, it contains other language which <u>Australia considers problematic. In</u> particular, its reference to the inalienable right of every State to choose the political, economic and social system that it deems most appropriate for the welfare of its people appears to undermine the universality of fundamental human rights. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 18)

2000. "When this item was considered in the General Assembly two years ago, Australia abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because of concern that it <u>did</u> <u>not adequately differentiate between unilateral extraterritorial measures, about</u> which we have long-standing concerns, and sanctions promulgated and implemented with the full authority of the Security Council. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 23)

2002. "Australia continues to oppose the application of extraterritorial unilateral economic coercive measures that affect third countries and, therefore, we support the central tenets of this draft resolution.

However, under certain extreme circumstances, it may be appropriate for States to take appropriate measures aimed at encouraging other Governments to cease violating their citizens' human rights and ignoring the rule of law. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 13)

2024. "I am pleased to deliver this statement on behalf of Canada and my own country, Australia.

Canada and Australia reject the claim that autonomous sanctions are illegitimate or illegal. <u>Canada and Australia apply autonomous sanctions judiciously,</u> transparently and consistently with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. Autonomous sanctions are aimed at deterring and preventing the very behaviours that pose a threat to international peace and security, including human rights violations and abuses and serious corruption, and at restricting the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes that there are times when sanctions are necessary to address threats to global peace and security. By imposing autonomous sanctions, Member States send a clear signal that policies and behaviours that violate international rules, norms and conduct will not be tolerated.

Canada and Australia also challenge the claim that contemporary autonomous sanctions disproportionately impact vulnerable people. <u>Our sanctions target regimes</u> that give little consideration to the needs of their people. And sanctions target entities that carry out crimes whose victims are everyday people in our communities. When Canada and Australia implement targeted sanctions measures, we strive to minimize any adverse consequences for civilian populations and for legitimate business and humanitarian activities. We work closely with the private sector and humanitarian partners to ensure that humanitarian aid can be delivered effectively in contexts in which sanctions apply. And we stand ready to address any legitimate concerns in that regard.

Canada and Australia expect the Security Council to lead on applying and monitoring the implementation of sanctions regimes that it has adopted. But <u>on</u> <u>matters in which the Council is blocked from responding to egregious behaviour,</u> <u>including violations of the Charter, we look to a broader set of tools to ensure that</u> <u>regimes and terrorists cannot benefit from international crimes</u>. Sanctions are one of a suite of tools that we use to respond to situations of international concern. [...]

Finally, Canada and Australia are deeply concerned that this debate continues to draw attention away from pressing international issues. Criticisms of autonomous sanctions, too often, are a deliberate <u>effort to divert attention from breaches of international peace and security</u>, serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation and terrorism — an effort made by perpetrators of those violations and threats. We urge all Member States to focus on the fundamental need to promote respect for the Charter and international law". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 13-14)

1997. "Belgium, like its partners in the European Union, is opposed to the extraterritorial application of national legislation, more particularly the unilateral imposition of commercial measures, especially sanctions. The European Union confirmed this position in its explanation of vote when the General Assembly voted on resolution 51/22, entitled 'Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" on 27 November 1996". (A/52/343, 15 September 1997, p. 2)

• Canada

1996. "[...] Canada has always taken a vigorous stand against measures with extraterritorial effect that seek to constrain the freedom of investment and trade of third countries. While the resolution we have just considered calls for the repeal of unilateral, extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on other States, it fails to make clear the essential distinction between those measures undertaken with the full authority of the Security Council and in conformity with the Charter of the

Western European and other States

<u>United Nations, and those imposed unilaterally by individual States</u>. As a result, we were not able to lend our support to this text". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 22)

1998. "[...] Canada <u>has always been firmly opposed to extraterritorial measures</u> aimed at limiting the freedom of trade and investment of third parties.

While the resolution we have just considered requires that unilateral extraterritorial laws imposing sanctions on third parties must be repealed, it <u>fails to</u> <u>distinguish clearly between measures taken under the authority of the Security</u> <u>Council and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and measures</u> <u>imposed unilaterally by States</u>. Therefore, we have not been able to support the resolution". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 18)

2002. "[...] Canada opposes extraterritorial measures that contradict or undermine the laws or clearly enunciated policies of another State exercising concurrent jurisdiction on a territorial basis over the same conduct.

With respect to the resolution just adopted, Canada understands that the inclusion of <u>the term "coercive</u>", notably in operative paragraph 4, <u>is intended to ensure that</u> <u>the scope of the resolution is meant to apply to the State that is the subject of the</u> <u>sanctions or to affected third States and their nationals and corporations</u>.

Canada's understanding is that the inclusion of the word "coercive" is not intended to condemn unilateral prescriptive measures that apply the objective nationality principle. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 13)

2024. "I am pleased to deliver this statement on behalf of Canada and my own country, Australia.

Canada and Australia reject the claim that autonomous sanctions are illegitimate or illegal. <u>Canada and Australia apply autonomous sanctions judiciously, transparently and consistently with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. Autonomous sanctions are aimed at deterring and preventing the very behaviours that pose a threat to international peace and security, including human rights violations and abuses and serious corruption, and at restricting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes that there are times when sanctions are necessary to address threats to global peace and security. By imposing autonomous sanctions, Member States send a clear signal that policies and behaviours that violate international rules, norms and conduct will not be tolerated.</u>

Canada and Australia also challenge the claim that contemporary autonomous sanctions disproportionately impact vulnerable people. <u>Our sanctions target regimes</u> <u>that give little consideration to the needs of their people.</u> And sanctions target entities that carry out crimes whose victims are everyday people in our communities. When Canada and Australia implement targeted sanctions measures, we strive to minimize any adverse consequences for civilian populations and for legitimate business and humanitarian activities. We work closely with the private sector and humanitarian partners to ensure that humanitarian aid can be delivered effectively in contexts in which sanctions apply. And we stand ready to address any legitimate concerns in that regard.

Canada and Australia expect the Security Council to lead on applying and monitoring the implementation of sanctions regimes that it has adopted. But <u>on</u> <u>matters in which the Council is blocked from responding to egregious behaviour,</u> <u>including violations of the Charter, we look to a broader set of tools to ensure that</u> <u>regimes and terrorists cannot benefit from international crimes</u>. Sanctions are one of a suite of tools that we use to respond to situations of international concern. [...]

Finally, Canada and Australia are deeply concerned that this debate continues to draw attention away from pressing international issues. Criticisms of autonomous sanctions, too often, are a deliberate <u>effort to divert attention from breaches of international peace and security, serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation and terrorism — an effort made by perpetrators of those violations and threats. We urge all Member States to focus on the fundamental need to promote respect for the Charter and international law". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 13-14)</u>

🖶 Iceland

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of

Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> <u>international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be non-</u> <u>action in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the</u> <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated, aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals,

legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

📒 Liechtenstein

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the <u>Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

<u>Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations</u>. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act</u>.. [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated, aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...] <u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

Malta

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the

European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

🎫 New Zealand

1996. "New Zealand takes this opportunity to reiterate its long-standing opposition to the application of national legislation on an extraterritorial basis. <u>We regard as completely unacceptable and in violation of international legal principles any attempts by a country to restrict the freedom of companies from a third country to trade with any other State or to invest in another State. New Zealand has already made its position on this issue clear in the General Assembly during this session.</u>

That said, we cannot support any attempt by a country to challenge in the General Assembly sanctions that have been imposed on it under the Charter of the Organization. As measures imposed by the Security Council, these sanctions enjoy full legitimacy and require the support of the membership of the Organization. This distinguishes them clearly from the unilateral, extraterritorial measures just mentioned.

<u>The draft resolution does not make a sufficiently clear distinction between these two</u> <u>concepts.</u> [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 22)

1998. "New Zealand takes this <u>opportunity to reiterate its long-standing opposition</u> to national legislation that imposes unilateral sanctions that purport to have <u>extraterritorial effect on third States</u>.

The resolution just adopted, however, does <u>not distinguish clearly between these</u> <u>unilateral sanctions and Security Council sanctions which are imposed legitimately</u> <u>under the United Nations Charter and which must be supported by all Member</u> <u>States.</u> [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 19)

Hendrich Norway

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated</u>, <u>aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals, legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

📥 San Marino

1997. "The Permanent Mission of the Republic of San Marino to the United Nations has the honour to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the Republic of San Marino <u>does not have any laws regarding the above-mentioned</u> <u>question and has never applied such measures or sanctions</u>". (A/52/343, 15 September 1997, p. 4)

🖸 Türkiye

1996. "[...] Turkey is basing its vote only on its <u>opposition to the practice of</u> <u>extraterritoriality — in other words, any practice that extends the application of a</u> <u>country's legislation outside its jurisdiction</u>. The application of extraterritorial <u>measures not only runs counter to international law</u> but also has a negative impact on the economic interests of third countries and on the free flow of international trade.

In the view of my delegation, coercive economic measures can be imposed only by the United Nations in conformity with its Charter. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution before us simply reflects these considerations". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 20)

1998. "[...] opposition in principle to the extraterritorial application of national legislation, which is not in accordance with the general principles of international law. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

😹 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

2024. "The United Kingdom maintains that our autonomous sanctions strongly support and are consistent with the fundamental purposes of the United Nations, as expressed in the Charter of the United Nations.

The United Kingdom's preference is to support sanctions through the Security Council in order to advance international peace and security. [...]

The United Kingdom's autonomous sanctions <u>are consistent with international law.</u> <u>They are targeted and are focused on deterring and disrupting malign behaviour and</u> <u>demonstrating support for international norms</u>. We recognize that other General Assembly members also use sanctions, even if they do not call them that, as do some regional organizations. The United Kingdom defends the right of States to use sanctions in compliance with international law.

The United Kingdom's sanctions legislation is <u>binding only on persons of the United</u> <u>Kingdom or persons within the United Kingdom</u>. While it regulates how those within our jurisdiction engage with sanctioned individuals, entities and States, it <u>does not</u> <u>attempt to regulate the activities of those outside our jurisdiction</u>.

Every sanction of the United Kingdom complies with our domestic and international legal obligations, including our human rights obligations, which are individually assessed for each listing. Our legislation provides for a transparent and robust system of legal challenge and review.

We use sanctions proportionately and rigorously, including by taking careful steps to mitigate any unintended negative impacts. That includes issuing licences to respond to humanitarian emergencies, such as earthquake relief in Syria. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, p. 5)

United States of America

1996. "[...] Libya would have United Nations Member States believe that this draft resolution is about free trade and the right of States to choose their own models of economic development. It is not. It is aimed at distracting attention from Libya's obstinate refusal to comply with its obligations under Security Council resolutions 731 (1992), 748 (1992) and 883 (1993). These resolutions were imposed because of Libya's involvement in two terrorist bombings of civilian aircraft — Pan Am flight 103 and UTA flight 772 — and its continued support for international terrorism.

By introducing this draft resolution, Libya seeks to break out of the international isolation imposed by the world community and to lend some legitimacy to its campaign to end terrorism-related sanctions, including those imposed by the Security Council. These sanctions, most recently reviewed this month, have been left in place without change through 14 consecutive reviews. Libya must not be encouraged to believe that anything less than full compliance with Security Council resolutions can end its confrontation with the international community. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, pp. 20-21)

1998. "[...] The use of sanctions as an effective and appropriate foreign policy tool by States, multilateral organizations and the United Nations itself is worthy of discussion. But when it is raised in a condemnatory way in a body such as the General Assembly of the United Nations by a State that does not respect Security Council resolutions, the subject is unworthy of the attention of Member States.

Every sovereign State has the right to decide with whom it will or will not trade. My Government regards economic sanctions as a legitimate instrument of foreign policy. The United States is by no means the only nation that resorts to such measures when necessary. In fact, applying the logic of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the international community would never have imposed economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa to force it to end the apartheid regime or against what was then known as Rhodesia — what is now Zimbabwe.

When faced with unacceptable international behaviour, the United States resorts to unilateral economic action reluctantly. Whenever possible, we work with other members of the global community to devise a collective response to egregious behaviour that violates international norms or threatens international security, as we did in the face of Iraq's armed aggression against its neighbour, Kuwait. But the United States has responded and will continue to respond unilaterally when faced with policies and actions that pose unusual and extraordinary threats to its vital interests, including its security, such as State support for international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of ballistic missiles and massive human rights abuses. We do not take such action lightly. When forced to act, we make it clear what policies we want to see changed and what the target State must do to have sanctions lifted.

Our sanctions also seek to target the subject Government, while avoiding harm to vulnerable civilian populations. [...]

We should also note that imposing economic sanctions entails real economic sacrifice on the part of the United States. That the United States is willing to make such sacrifices indicates the great importance we place on the issues involved. In responding to rogue State behaviour, the United States is defending not only its own interests but the security of the international community as a whole". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, pp. 16-17)

2002. "[...] Let me begin by saying that economic measures, including sanctions, <u>are</u> a legitimate, appropriate and effective tool for addressing threats to international peace and security. The United States is not alone in this view or practice.

The United States uses sanctions to address some of the most abhorrent and destabilizing activities of our time. We use <u>sanctions to deter terrorism</u>, <u>proliferation</u>, <u>trafficking in persons</u>, <u>trafficking in wildlife and trafficking in drugs</u>. We use <u>targeted sanctions to address behaviours that threaten our security and undermine human dignity</u>.

In some cases, we use our sanctions because there is no avenue for pursuing action at the United Nations, either because there is no applicable authority or because a minority of States are obstructing the implementation of United Nations sanctions. <u>The loudest proponents of the so-called unilateral coercive measures narrative simultaneously obstruct the implementation of United Nations sanctions and often blatantly violate them.</u>

In such cases, we and other Member States will work to address threats to peace and security as best we can within the means at our disposal. We would much prefer to see United Nations sanctions fully implemented and updated in line with the threats that they are designed to deter.

To echo what our colleagues from the European Union have said, United Nations sanctions are one of the most powerful, peaceful tools that the international community has to address threats to international peace and security. We support their use whenever appropriate, and we work closely with international partners in building the capacity of Member States to implement United Nations sanctions fully and effectively.

In cases where United Nations action is not feasible, the United States often works in tandem with other Member States to implement autonomous sanctions to address threats to our security and values. Sanctions impose financial costs on corruption and restrict the flow of dual-use components to Governments that are working hard to build weapons of mass destruction that they will use to menace their neighbours and, indeed, the entire world. We also use sanctions to hold to account State actors who violate the rights of select minorities, of women and of their political opponents.

Those that stoke the unilateral coercive measures narrative contend that autonomous sanctions undermine the principles of sovereignty and non-interference. Our autonomous sanctions are targeted and crafted with a clear nexus to the United States. [...]

Some allege that our sanctions harm innocents, when in fact we use our sanctions to target those who obstruct the delivery of humanitarian aid and those who strip their citizenry of wealth through corruption. We use sanctions to uphold the rights of those who cannot defend themselves.

The United States has taken concrete actions to mitigate any unintended consequences of sanctions domestically and at the United Nations. [...]. <u>Lastly, the United States apply sanctions consistent with international law.</u>

Allow me to leave you today with one final observation: <u>the United States has been</u> <u>the target of autonomous sanctions by some of the most vociferous critics of so-called</u> <u>unilateral coercive measures</u>. They have actually sanctioned us as well, which is the height of hypocrisy. These States aim to denigrate all sanctions with this narrative, which is designed to challenge the ability of independent nations to ensure their collective security through the peaceful regulation of their own resources. We hope that everyone here will see this political theatre for what it is. [...]". (A/78/PV.90, 13 June 2024, pp. 6-7)

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS OF STATES

European Union (EU)

1996. "The European Union wishes to take this opportunity to reiterate its rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis. We have also rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. We stress that international coercive measures can be imposed on States only by, and under the authority of, the Security Council, in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

In this regard, we wish to mention the legislation that provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.

The European Union reaffirms its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures that appear to contravene international law. <u>The European Union must</u>, however, make a firm and unmistakable distinction between measures imposed unilaterally by individual States and those that are undertaken with the full authority of the Security Council, and in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations. [...]". (A/51/PV.67, 27 November 1996, p. 20)

1997. "Belgium, like its partners in the European Union, is opposed to the extraterritorial application of national legislation, more particularly the unilateral imposition of commercial measures, especially sanctions. The European Union confirmed this position in its explanation of vote when the General Assembly voted on resolution 51/22, entitled 'Elimination of coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion" on 27 November 1996". (A/52/343, 15 September 1997, p. 2)

1998. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated country, Cyprus, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area — Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway — align themselves with this statement.

The European Union wishes to take this <u>opportunity to emphasize its unequivocal</u> rejection of attempts to apply national legislation on an extraterritorial basis <u>contrary to international law</u>. We have always rejected attempts by any country to coerce others into complying with unilateral commercial measures. <u>We stress that</u> <u>binding sanctions can be imposed on States only by and under the authority of the Security Council in accordance with Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.</u>

We wish to mention in this regard the legislation which provides for the application of legal sanctions to companies and individuals outside its national jurisdiction, including provisions designed to discourage third-country companies from trading with or investing in specific countries. <u>Measures of this type violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States.</u>

We wish to reaffirm that the European Union's strong opposition, based both on law and on principle, to the imposition of secondary boycotts and legislation with extraterritorial effect and retroactivity remains unchanged; and we wish to state that the European Union has exercised its right to react as it deems appropriate to any extraterritorial measures which appear to contravene international law, and it will continue to do so. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 17)

2000. "I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus, Malta and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to emphasize its <u>categorical</u> rejection of all attempts to apply national laws on an extraterritorial basis against the nationals or businesses of third States, which is contrary to international law. The European Union has always rejected such attempts aimed at compelling other countries to abide by economic measures adopted on a unilateral basis. [...]

Measures of that kind violate the general principles of international law and of the sovereignty of independent States. <u>The European Union is firmly opposed, both on legal grounds and in principle, to the enforcement of secondary boycotts and unilateral laws with extraterritorial effects against the nationals or enterprises of third States.</u> We stress that we reserve our right to react as we deem fit to such measures, which are contrary to international law, and we shall continue to do so.

The European Union makes a clear and indisputable distinction between unilateral measures with extraterritorial effects on the one hand and other kinds of economic coercive measures that are legal under international law, whether these are adopted by the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter or by States or groups of States, on the other. [...]". (A/55/PV.41, 26 October 2000, p. 24)

2002. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the European Free Trade Association country member of the European Economic Area, Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

We wish to refer to our statement made on the adoption of resolution 55/6 on 26 October 2000". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 11)

2024. "I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries Montenegro, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia, and the European Free Trade

Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, align themselves with this statement.

<u>Sanctions have become a fault line in the United Nations</u>. They have been misconstrued by some and unjustly blamed for matters for which they are not responsible. [...]

Sanctions are a vital tool available to the Security Council to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. They support conflict resolution, such as in the case of the two latest renewals for Libya and South Sudan. They constrain the proliferation activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Qaida and their affiliates. They curb the flow of arms and ammunition or the financing of armed groups in conflict situations. In short, sanctions are one of the most powerful peaceful tools of the international community.

Language describing sanctions as "unilateral coercive measures" can be misleading and is often a politically motivated attempt to divert attention away from the reasons the sanctions were imposed in the first place. Some of the loudest voices promoting the unilateral coercive measures narrative are at the same time obstructing the adoption or implementation of United Nations sanctions. [...]

For the EU, <u>sanctions are necessary to preserve peace and security and to defend</u> international law, the rule of law and human rights. The alternative would be nonaction in the face of clear violations of international law and the inability of the <u>Security Council to act.</u> [...]

The international community must not ignore instances of human rights violations or abuses, the imprisonment or killing of human rights defenders, the suppression of democratic opposition and civil society organizations or the use of chemical weapons. Our sanctions aim to target those responsible for these transgressions.

The EU global human rights sanctions regime applies to genocide, crimes against humanity and other serious and systematic human rights violations or abuses. It targets those who provide support for or are otherwise involved with people or entities committing such violations.

<u>EU sanctions are intended to preserve peace and support democracy, the rule of law,</u> <u>human rights and the principles of international law</u>. They seek to protect the most vulnerable. <u>The measures are targeted and carefully calibrated, aimed at those</u> <u>responsible</u>. EU sanctions do not target the civilian population. On the contrary, it is frequently the civilian population, human rights defenders and civil society entities that call for those measures. They also do not target the delivery of humanitarian aid. Food, medicine and other emergency supplies are exempted, by default, from EU sanctions. [...]

<u>EU sanctions respect the rights of the listed persons and entities, including due process rights</u>. EU sanctions designations are based on specific listing criteria and require legally robust evidence. They always give reasons for each listing so that the individual or entity concerned understands the grounds for their listing. Individuals,

legal persons and States under sanctions may challenge them before the Court of Justice of the European Union. Some of them have successfully done so.

EU sanctions <u>are temporary in nature</u>. They are subject to regular review and are proportionate to the gravity of the situation they address. The term "sanctions" can have a negative connotation, as in layman's terms, a sanction is a penalty or punishment. However, <u>sanctions are not punitive</u>. That is why the EU treaties call them restrictive measures. <u>They restrict certain activities in order to induce a</u> <u>change of conduct</u>. Those restrictions are applied to EU operators and within the EU jurisdiction. They do not create obligations for non-EU operators, unless their business is conducted at least partially within the EU. As such, our sanctions do not have extraterritorial application. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 7-9)

🕲 Group of 77 and China

The Group of 77 and China is formed by 134 States.³

1998. "[...] the practice of imposing unilateral coercive measures of an extraterritorial nature has accrued additional serious dimensions and its impact can have devastating consequences for the affected countries. Such practices run counter to the imperatives of international cooperation for development and to the spirit of partnership being fostered in the increasingly interdependent world. Moreover, the imposition of such measures by one country on another contravenes international law and is totally incompatible, not only with international rules and regulations, but also with the principles of equal sovereignty, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

As a result, such coercive actions prevent the affected countries from enjoying their equal and non-discriminatory rights in pursuing development and from freely expanding their international trade. [...]". (A/53/PV.43, 26 October 1998, p. 5)

2002. "[...] In adding our support for the draft resolution, I would like to reiterate the position of the ministers of the developing countries, expressed in the Declaration issued on the occasion of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Ministerial Meeting of the Group

³ Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

of 77, held at New York on 19 September 2002. Paragraph 42 of that Declaration states:

"<u>We firmly reject the imposition of laws and regulations with extraterritorial impact</u> and all other forms of coercive economic measures, including unilateral sanctions against developing countries, and reiterate the urgent need to eliminate them <u>immediately</u>. We emphasize that such actions not only undermine the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law, but also severely threaten the freedom of trade and investment. We therefore call on the international community neither to recognize these measures nor apply them". [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 2)

2024. "[...] Developing countries face great challenges, including <u>the increase in</u> <u>unilateral political, economic and trade actions or policies and the weakening of</u> <u>multilateralism, which are flagrant violations of the principles established in the</u> <u>Charter of the United Nations and international law and the purposes of the United</u> <u>Nations</u>. We consider that it is urgent to stop those actions, which threaten the economic and social development of the countries that are subject to them and consequently prevent them from achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

The Group considers that the application of those measures, together with all unilateral protectionist measures, including tariff and non-tariff barriers, also violate the rules of the World Trade Organization, undermine the multilateral trading system and seriously threaten free trade, the right of States to export or import goods or services from world markets, investment and sustainable development. Those measures also constitute means of arbitrary discrimination against developing countries subject to them. The impact of those measures also affects, among other things, technical and financial cooperation; technology transfer; agricultural and industrial production in the countries; access to food; the supply of medicines, vaccines, treatments and medical equipment to treat diseases, as occurred during the coronavirus disease pandemic; and even the participation of delegations in meetings of the United Nations system or of sports delegations wishing to attend international events. [...]

In conclusion, <u>the Group categorically rejects the application of unilateral coercive</u> <u>measures and calls on the countries concerned to refrain from imposing them,</u> <u>including unilateral sanctions and trade restrictions</u>, which negatively impact the human rights of millions of people living under those illegal measures in developing countries and in turn deepen the gap between those countries and developed countries. Instead, those countries must show greater solidarity and cooperation to support other countries in overcoming the huge challenges and vulnerabilities they face in implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, in compliance with the spirit of the United Nations Charter". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 10-11)

Group of African States

2002. "[...] on behalf of the African Group [...]:

[...] In spite of the fact that the United Nations Charter allows the Organization to use economic coercive measures only in cases that represent a threat to international peace and security, the implementation of such means by some countries unilaterally is illegal, according to the provisions and norms of international law. The General Assembly has expressed its rejection of such measures on many occasions and has adopted a number of resolutions rejecting unilateral coercive economic measures. These resolutions emphasize the fact that States should refrain from using extraterritorial laws which constitute a clear threat to international cooperation and to the fundamental principles on which the international financial, trade and economic systems are based.

[...] Such measures not only undermine the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in international law, but also seriously threaten the freedom of investments and trade, since every State has an inalienable right to economic, social and cultural development, and the right to choose freely the political, economic and social system that is appropriate for the prosperity of its people and in accordance with its national plans and policies". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 6)

2024. "[...] Several Member States in Africa face unique challenges that are compounded by unilateral economic measures. <u>Those measures significantly undermine our collective efforts to achieve sustainable development and widen the economic disparity between African nations and the developed world. Sanctions lead to reduced markets, collapse of infrastructure and increased transaction costs for small businesses.</u>

<u>Unilateral economic measures have resulted in substantial trade revenue losses for</u> <u>African countries, severely hampering our progress towards achieving the</u> <u>Sustainable Development Goals</u>. The imposition of unilateral sanctions and trade restrictions severely affects our economies, particularly in areas critical to our development, such as agriculture, healthcare and infrastructure. Those measures disrupt supply chains, restrict access to essential goods and services and impede financial and technical cooperation. [...]

Africa's development relies heavily on multilateralism and international cooperation. <u>Unilateral measures not only violate international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, but they also undermine the global trading system, limiting our access to markets and investment opportunities. The African Group emphasizes that those unilateral measures have a disproportionate impact on our women and children, who suffer the most from economic instability and reduced access to essential services. We stress the importance of a fair and equitable trading system that supports our developmental aspirations. [...]</u>

The African Group categorically rejects the application of unilateral coercive measures. We urge all nations to demonstrate greater solidarity and cooperation in order to help us overcome this immense challenge we face. We must ensure that no one and no country is left behind in our collective journey towards sustainable development. The continent has also been at the forefront of technological innovation, with several nations emerging as tech hubs. Sanctions and trade restrictions stifle that progress by limiting access to technology and international partnerships. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 14-15)

Group of Friends in Defense of the Charter of the United Nations

The Group of Friends in Defense of the Charter of the United Nations is formed by 18 States.⁴

2024. "<u>Unilateral coercive measures are illegal, and that includes those imposed as instruments of political or economic and financial coercion against any country, especially developing countries.</u> Among other things, they represent a clear violation of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, the most basic norms of international law and the provisions of both the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. One of the most notorious examples of failed policies using unilateral coercive measures is the economic, commercial and financial blockade that was imposed on the Republic of Cuba more than 60 years ago. In that regard, we renew our unwavering solidarity with the Government and the people of Cuba, while at the same time once again urging the Government of the United States to immediately and unconditionally end the embargo and remove Cuba from its arbitrary and unilateral list of alleged State sponsors of terrorism.

The promulgation and implementation of unilateral coercive measures, which is the subject of this meeting, have no place or basis of any kind in the framework of international law. They are definitively unlawful. It is important to be clear on that point, because the Governments that have imposed such measures have tried to present the world with a false narrative, with the sole purpose of deliberately confusing and misleading the international community about their blatant attempts to justify and even legitimize such illegal policies. In that context, we should point out that contrary to what some Governments would have us believe, financial transactions or the provision of goods and services necessary for humanitarian assistance and the most basic human needs are in fact affected by the mere existence of unilateral coercive measures, including as a consequence of fear of so-called secondary sanctions. Humanitarian exemptions for unilateral coercive measures are simply a fantasy and an illusion, given the fact that even if they exist on paper, in reality and in practice they have been shown to be ineffective or, more precisely, nonexistent. It is therefore not hard to conclude that unilateral coercive measures clearly constitute crimes against humanity and mass violations of human rights, since they are obviously designed to deprive entire populations of their own means of subsistence, among other things. We should not allow ourselves to be deceived or convinced otherwise.

⁴ Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Iran, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, State of Palestine, Syria, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

More than 30 nations in the world, including many that are Members of this Organization, are currently subject to unilateral coercive measures that directly affect the daily lives of more than a third of humankind. Needless to say, that reality has created a systemic crisis within our entire system of international relations, which not only continues to erode multilateralism but is also increasing uncertainty, instability, distrust and tensions throughout the world. Such measures therefore constitute a global problem that requires a global solution, and that is why this debate is so important. The fact is that today we are facing a new generation of illegal measures, more cruel and destructive than ever before. We are talking about a new generation of so-called sanctions that use the pain and suffering of entire peoples to advance interventionist and destabilizing agendas. The greatest obstacle to the implementation of the development plans of the nations subjected to unilateral coercive measures today is those very measures, weapons that seek to generate pressure and the exploitation, domination and subjugation of sovereign and independent nations. We must say it clearly. Unilateral coercive measures endanger the lives and welfare of the peoples subject to them, while simultaneously hindering international cooperation and limiting the ability of the States subject to them to access and acquire foreign investments and technologies, as well as the goods and services needed to overcome their various challenges, including environmental issues.

In the current context, as a new multipolar world is emerging, unilateral coercive measures have also become a means of fostering unfair competition in markets. Reserve currencies are used as weapons of oppression, while sovereign property is arbitrarily blocked or even confiscated. As a result, any country that is more or less dependent on Western markets, technology and financial assistance, and that may also have reserves in Western jurisdictions, is likely to face the risk of a total loss of its assets. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 1-3)

League of Arab States

2002. "[...] The Assembly should continue to reject such measures, which attempt to marginalize international law and to put national laws above its principles and norms. Such objectives contradict those on which we agreed when we set out priorities for facing the challenges of the new century, which require that we strongly uphold the principles and purposes of the Charter and that we ensure compliance with resolutions of international legitimacy, particularly on the part of those that ignore such norms. We should like to recall that the issue of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures and the fact that they contravene international law are not new.

Here, I should like to point out the inadmissibility of intervention in the internal affairs of countries and the importance of protecting the sovereignty and equality of States [...].

 $[\dots]$ The extent to which such unilateral coercive measures contravene the principles of international law — not to speak of the obvious negative economic and social effects of their implementation, which we have no time to consider at the moment

because of our convention and because they are well known to everyone — should be enough to convince the international community to continue to reject them. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, pp. 7-8)

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

2002. "At the Twelfth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Durban, South Africa, the heads of State and Government stated, in the Durban Declaration for the New Millennium, that: "We must take up the challenge to fundamentally transform international relations, so as to eradicate aggression, racism, the use of force, unilateral coercive measures and unfair economic practices, foreign occupation and xenophobia in order to achieve a world of peace, justice and dignity for all".

The Summit also condemned certain States that persist in intensifying unilateral coercive measures and in using domestic legislation with extraterritorial effects against developing countries. <u>These refer to actions that include blockades</u>, embargoes and the freezing of assets with the purpose of preventing developing countries from exercising their right to fully determine their political, economic and social systems while freely expanding their international trade. [...]

The Ministers also repeated the Non-Aligned Movement's call on all States not to recognize unilateral, extraterritorial laws as enacted by certain countries. <u>They were of the view that such measures threaten the sovereignty of States and adversely affect their social and economic development</u>. Furthermore, they marginalize developing countries with regard to the process of globalization and are contrary to international law, to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, to the norms and principles governing peaceful relations among States, and to agreed principles of the multilateral trading system". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 7)

2024. "[...] It is an honour for the Republic of Uganda to take the floor on behalf of the 121 member States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, especially on a subject to which we have historically attached particular importance, namely the respect for international law and the firm <u>condemnation of the promulgation and application of unilateral coercive measures</u>, including against member States of our <u>Movement</u>, in clear contravention of the provisions of the Charter of the United <u>Nations</u>. [...]

With respect to <u>development</u>, the Heads of State and Government of NAM recognized at its most recent Summit conference that the unilateral coercive measures and the unilateral sanction regimes imposed against developing countries constitute obstacles that prevent Member States from implementing their national development policies and plans, including the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals. They condemned the unilateral coercive measures as acts that are contrary to and in violation of the United Nations Charter and international law. They reiterated their determination to act in their denial. [...]

With regard to <u>contributions</u>, the Movement recognized that the imposition of unilateral coercive measures, unilateral sanctions or embargoes has resulted in some

cases in the failure of Member States to meet their assessed contributions to the United Nations in a timely manner, for which reason their immediate and complete lifting is urged. At the Kampala Summit, the Heads of State and Government stressed that any efforts to use financial contributions to push for the adoption of certain proposals are counterproductive and violate the obligations of the Member States to provide resources for the Organization, as enshrined in its Charter. The Heads of State and Government rejected in that context all unilateral coercive measures contrary to international law, which obstruct and sometimes impede the payments of assessed contributions from members of the Non-Aligned Movement to the budgets of the Organization.

With regard to <u>human rights</u>, let us recall that it was upon the initiative of our Movement that a Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures on the enjoyment of human rights was appointed 10 years ago, taking into account the fact that the continued imposition of such measures hinders the wellbeing of the populations of the affected countries and creates obstacles to the full realization of their human rights. [...]

Concerning <u>health</u>, the Heads of State and Government of NAM have expressed grave concern at the unilateral coercive measures imposed against some NAM member States, which have impeded or disrupted access to and the procurement of medicine and medical supplies and services and the development, purchase and delivery of vaccines and reagents and raw materials for their production, thereby creating serious challenges for the management and mitigation of infectious diseases, as well as rare diseases. They urged those States that have imposed unilateral coercive measures to promptly comply with their obligations under article X of the Biological Weapons Convention and to immediately lift all unilateral coercive measures that directly or indirectly affect the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the use of biological agents and toxins for peaceful purposes. [...]

In addition, the Heads of State and Government of NAM recognized the additional impediments faced by certain nations — including members of the Non-Aligned Movement — in the course of the <u>COVID-19 pandemic</u> as a result of the promulgation and application of unilateral coercive measures, which are flagrant violations of the norms and fundamental principles of international law, including those set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. In that regard, the NAM Heads of State and Government condemned such wrongful acts, as well as the fact that such unlawful measures were neither terminated nor even partially lifted but instead were expanded and further intensified, resulting in human losses and in both obstacles to and deliberate delays in obtaining access to essential supplies, including vaccines, medical equipment and diagnostic tests.

With regard to <u>international trade</u>, the Non-Aligned Movement expresses its deep concern at the imposition of laws and other forms of coercive economic measures, including unilateral sanctions, against developing countries, imposed by a specific country or a group for political and economic purposes. Such measures violate the Charter of the United Nations, the rules and principles of international law and the rules of the World Trade Organization. They also severely threaten the freedom of trade and investment and constitute an interference in the internal affairs of other countries. We urge the relevant countries to put an end to such coercive measures.

Similarly, we emphasize <u>that food</u> should not be used as an instrument for political and economic pressure. We also reaffirm the importance of international cooperation and solidarity, as well as the necessity of refraining from undertaking unilateral coercive measures that affect trade related to food and fertilizers, which could endanger food security. Such measures particularly impact groups in vulnerable situations and are not in accordance with international law or the Charter of the United Nations.

Moreover, on disaster and <u>risk reduction</u>, we express our deep concern that unilateral coercive measures and unilateral economic, financial or trade measures impede the development of targeted countries' multi-hazard early-warning systems and their ability to implement disaster preparedness, response and recovery in the wake of natural disasters. Such measures heavily increase the scale of economic and human losses generated by natural disasters on the countries I mentioned. We therefore firmly encourage the removal of such restrictions, especially during natural disasters.

The Non-Aligned Movement supports, in accordance with international law, the claim of affected States, including targeted States, to <u>compensation for damage incurred</u> as a consequence of the implementation of extraterritorial or unilateral coercive measures or laws. That is also in line with paragraph 32.6 of the final document of the nineteenth Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, which was concluded in Kampala.

Furthermore, allow me to recall one of <u>the principles enshrined in the Declaration</u> on the Purposes and Principles and the Role of the Non-Aligned Movement in the Present International Juncture, adopted at the fourteenth NAM Summit, held in Havana: "<u>Refraining by all countries from exerting pressure or coercion on other</u> <u>countries, including resorting to aggression or other acts involving the use of direct</u> <u>or indirect force, and the application and/or promotion of any coercive unilateral</u> <u>measure that goes against International Law or is in any way incompatible with it,</u> <u>for the purpose of coercing any other State to subordinate its sovereign rights, or to</u> <u>gain any benefit whatsoever</u>". (A/61/472, annex II, p. 103)

We conclude by expressing our unwavering solidarity with those nations and peoples subjected to the negative impacts of unilateral coercive measures, in particular those who are members of our Movement, and by reiterating our commitment to continue calling for the complete, immediate and unconditional lifting of all unilateral coercive measures, including measures used as tools to exert political or economic and financial pressure on any country, in particular developing countries. Such measures are in violation the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, especially given that they hinder the health and well-being of the populations of the affected countries, creating obstacles to their full realization of the Sustainable Development Goals, human rights and national development plans". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 11-13)

• Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)

2002. "[...] I have the honour to make this statement on behalf of the Member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC). [...]

As the Secretary-General has stated, "When countries work together in multilateral institutions — developing, respecting and when necessary enforcing international law — they also develop mutual trust and more effective cooperation on other issues". (Press release SG/SM/8447) [...]

In this connection, the Islamic Group would like to reiterate once again that <u>all</u> peoples have the right freely to determine the political orientation they deem appropriate and the ways and means they choose in order to achieve their economic growth and social development.

The Organization of the Islamic Conference would like to express its deep concern over the continued application of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion and their continual adverse effects on trade and on financial and economic cooperation. In this regard, we call upon all States not to recognize or apply unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures imposed by any State that are contrary to the recognized principles and provisions of international law. [...]". (A/57/PV.31, 16 October 2002, p. 4)

Southern African Development Community (SACD)

2024. "[...] In a world with increasing inequality and growing threats from natural calamities, the need for diplomacy cannot be overemphasized. In that context, the resort to unilateralism for political gains goes against the grain and is in any case against the Charter of the United Nations and the very spirit of multilateralism.

SADC is concerned that unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures disproportionately affect the most vulnerable segments of society, exacerbating poverty and inequality, and cause socioeconomic instability. Furthermore, the measures hinder regional and international cooperation, disrupt trade and investment flows and undermine efforts to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. They strain diplomatic relations, not only between the countries imposing the measures and those targeted by them but also with third-party nations affected by their extraterritorial reach. The measures have significant and long-term negative economic, social, political and institutional impacts on the targeted countries, as economic hardships and reduced opportunities lead to brain drains, with skilled professionals emigrating to seek better opportunities elsewhere, thereby hampering the ability of the targeted countries to recover. [...]

SADC underscores the inherent sovereignty of all nations and the principles of noninterference and mutual respect enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures violate those fundamental principles by imposing economic hardship on sovereign States, undermining their ability to exercise independent decision-making and impeding their development efforts. Such actions contravene the spirit and letter of international law, infringing upon the sovereign rights of nations to determine their own political, economic and social systems.

We call upon all States to refrain from imposing unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures on any country and to resolve disputes through dialogue, negotiation and peaceful means, in accordance with international law. [...]

SADC reaffirms its commitment to solidarity, cooperation and mutual respect among nations, and this dialogue session is therefore a first step towards addressing any concerns in a peaceful and amicable manner. We call for collective action to eliminate the use of unilateral extraterritorial coercive economic measures as a means of political and economic compulsion. We also reaffirm our commitment to a multilateral system founded on the principles of equality, justice and respect for international law, as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. We urge the international community to reaffirm its commitment to multilateralism and the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. It is imperative that we uphold the principles of sovereign equality, non-interference and respect for territorial integrity. Unilateral coercive measures, particularly those with extraterritorial reach, are incompatible with those principles and must be unequivocally rejected. [...]". (A/78/PV.89, 13 June 2024, pp. 9-10)

