



LEGAL POSITIONS OF STATES AND  
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON THE  
ITEM “UNILATERAL ECONOMIC MEASURES AS  
A MEANS OF POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC  
COERCION AGAINST DEVELOPING  
COUNTRIES” (2013-2023)

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 item “Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries” (2013-2023)”, *Laboratório de Direitos Humanos da UFRJ*, March 2025, <http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20788.56965>.

See the Spanish version in: Obregón Fernández, Aritz, “Posiciones jurídicas de los Estados y organizaciones internacionales en el tema ‘medidas económicas unilaterales como medio de ejercer presión política y económica sobre los países en desarrollo’ (2013-2023)”, *Laboratório de Direitos Humanos da UFRJ*, marzo 2025, <http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12399.96160>.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESENTATION.....	7
AFRICA .....	8
 Burundi .....	8
 Central African Republic .....	8
 Congo.....	9
 Egypt .....	9
 Eritrea .....	9
 Eswatini .....	9
 Ghana.....	10
 Lesotho .....	10
 Madagascar .....	10
 Malawi.....	10
 Nigeria.....	11
 Senegal .....	11
 South Africa .....	12
 Sudan .....	12
 Tunisia .....	12
 Zambia.....	13
 Zimbabwe .....	13
ASIA-PACIFIC .....	14
 Brunei Darussalam.....	14
 Cambodia .....	14
 China .....	14
 Democratic People's Republic of Korea.....	15
 Iran.....	15
 Iraq.....	17
 Jordan .....	17
 Kyrgyzstan .....	18
 Lao People's Democratic Republic.....	18
 Mongolia.....	18
 Oman.....	18
 Papua New Guinea .....	18
 Philippines .....	19

 Qatar .....	19
 Sri Lanka .....	19
 Syrian Arab Republic.....	19
 United Arab Emirates.....	24
 Yemen.....	24
<b>EASTERN EUROPE .....</b>	<b>25</b>
 Albania .....	25
 Armenia.....	26
 Belarus .....	27
 Bosnia and Herzegovina .....	27
 Georgia .....	29
 Latvia .....	30
 Lithuania.....	30
 Montenegro .....	30
 North Macedonia.....	32
 Republic of Moldova .....	34
 Russian Federation.....	35
 Serbia .....	38
 Ukraine .....	38
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....</b>	<b>39</b>
 Brazil.....	39
 Chile .....	40
 Colombia.....	40
 Cuba .....	40
 Ecuador .....	45
 Guatemala.....	45
 Honduras.....	47
 Nicaragua.....	47
 Paraguay .....	48
 Uruguay .....	48
 Venezuela.....	48
<b>WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES .....</b>	<b>51</b>
 Australia .....	51
 Canada .....	51

 Iceland.....	51
 Liechtenstein.....	52
 Türkiye.....	52
 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland .....	53
 United States of America.....	54
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS OF STATES.....	56
 European Union (EU) .....	56
 Group of 77 and China .....	60
Group of Friends in Defense of the Charter of the United Nations .....	61

## 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 norm on the prohibition of unilateral coercive measures.

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 “Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries” during the 68th, 70th, 72nd, 74th, 76th and 78th sessions of the General Assembly (2013-2023).

At these sessions, resolutions were adopted with the following number of votes:<sup>1</sup>

Resolution	In favour	Against	Abstention	No vote
A/RES/68/200, 20 December 2013	127	2	50	14
A/RES/70/185, 22 December 2015	131	2	49	11
A/RES/72/201, 20 December 2017	130	2	48	13
A/RES/74/200, 19 December 2019	122	2	51	18
A/RES/76/191, 17 December 2021	126	6	46	15
A/RES/78/135, 19 December 2023	128	8	43	15

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The individual votes of each State can be consulted in Obregón-Fernández, Aritz, *Voting record of the UNGA Resolutions on “Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries”*, March 2025, <http://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15204.90249>.

## AFRICA

### Burundi

**2013.** “Burundi does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

The use of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries hampers the promotion of the development of poor countries, and disorganizes the international system as a whole to the detriment of the needy populations of the South”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 6)

**2019.** “Burundi does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures. These measures are contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and are often applied against developing countries in order to influence domestic politics in violation of the sacred principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries. [...]

Unilateral measures violate the economic and social rights of the people living in the target countries. They are immoral because many vulnerable people die for lack of basic necessities. These measures also violate the Charter of the United Nations and the duty of all to international solidarity. If we want to build a just world order based on the rule of law, the United Nations should take concrete steps to discourage the imposition of unilateral, politically motivated measures against sovereign States”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 5)

**2023.** “Like other countries, Burundi does not agree with unilateral economic measures as instruments of coercion against developing countries.

Burundi once again condemns the application of such measures, which constitute a flagrant violation of international law and seriously undermine the principle of sovereignty, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 8)

### Central African Republic

**2015.** “The imposition of coercive economic measures is not the best means of exerting pressure on States, since these countries are under intense economic pressure. Sanctions affect the population rather than the political leaders who caused them to be imposed. Such measures affect the country's economy, and the poorest people suffer the consequences while their leaders maintain a normal lifestyle, as essential commodities become very expensive. This also leads to the impoverishment of the middle class, a decrease in trade volume and a decline in standards of living.

Financial sanctions affect contributions to the national treasury, since tax revenues fall as a result of the downturn in the economy, particularly in trade. As the private sector is not well developed in the Central African Republic, it is often the salaries of government officials that keep the money supply flowing. As public funds dry up,



## Africa

salary arrears begin to accumulate, and traders and farmers can no longer sell their products. The embargo on goods leads to a rise in prices that has a serious impact on those who are less affluent (the majority). It is therefore essential to stop the application of coercive measures and find alternatives". (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, pp. 6-7)

**2019.** "The Central African Republic does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures. Such measures prevent these countries from achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

All countries that are subject to such measures are limited in their quest for development and their populations are the victims, owing to a lack of health, education and basic necessities". (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 5)

## Congo

**2015.** "The Congo does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The use of such measures, unfortunately, harms the economies of developing countries and has negative effects on international cooperation.

The Congo still believes that the international community should take effective and binding measures for ending the use of coercive measures that go against the United Nations goals and principles. The Congo reaffirms its commitment to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. No State may impose unilateral economic, political or any other type of measures or encourage their application in order to coerce another State to carry them out". (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 7)

## Egypt

**2013.** "Egypt does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]". (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 8)

## Eritrea

**2021.** "[...] Unilateral coercive measures violated international law, undermined the rule of law and weakened multilateralism. While such measures were often portrayed as narrowly targeted and not destabilizing, the people of the targeted countries faced untold hardships. [...]". (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, para. 23)

## Eswatini

**2013.** "The Kingdom of Swaziland views the continued imposition of economic, commercial and financial measures, including the embargo against Cuba since 1960, further enforced by the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, as a violation of the principle of the sovereign equality of States, non-intervention and non-interference in each

other's domestic affairs. In addition to being unilateral and contrary to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, and to the principle of good-neighbourliness, the embargo against Cuba has caused huge material losses and economic damage to the people of Cuba. The blockade has not only caused incalculable suffering to the people of Cuba but also undermines the legitimate economic interests of third countries. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 12-13)

## Ghana

**2019.** “Ghana does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures.

Ghana believes that unilateral measures adversely affect the economic development of countries on which such policies are imposed and therefore urges the international community to halt all such measures worldwide”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 1)

## Lesotho

**2017.** “Lesotho does not support the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against any country, as that is contrary to multilateralism”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 11)

## Madagascar

**2015.** “Madagascar does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

Political events or political crisis should not be considered a condition for the suspension of the commercial or trade activities of a developing country, in view of the social and humanitarian consequences and the direct impact on the economic development of that country, which ultimately affects not only the Government but also its populations, who suffer the most”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 11)

**2017.** “Madagascar does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

The Government of the Republic of Madagascar has never promulgated laws of applied economic, commercial and financial measures against the Republic of Cuba and supports all the decisions that aim to lift the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed on this country”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 11)

## Malawi

**2023.** “Unilateral coercive measures play a harmful role in the social and economic development of developing countries illegally subjected to such measures. The number and scope of unilateral coercive measures has expanded in recent years, thereby heavily affecting the ability of affected countries to access development finance, engage in free trade and investment, etc. The imposition of laws and regulations with an extraterritorial impact and all other forms of coercive economic

measures, including unilateral sanctions, against developing countries not only undermines the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law or the rules-based multilateral trading system, but also severely threatens the freedom of trade and investment. [...]. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 11-12)

## ■ ■ Nigeria

**2019.** “Nigeria does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

Unilateral measures are contrary to the principles of the multilateral trading system and contravene the Charter of the United Nations. Such measures negatively impact the economic development of the affected countries”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 11)

## ■ ■ Senegal

**2013.** “Senegal does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

Such measures are unjust and constitute an obstacle to the development of poor countries. Moreover, the main victims are innocent members of the public. Coercive economic measures limit global trade development and hamper global economic expansion. These practices should be discarded in favour of greater United Nations involvement in the mediation of relationships between sovereign States”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 11)

**2015.** “Senegal does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The foreign policy of Senegal is designed to achieve people-centred economic development and respect for and protection of human rights. This policy continues the quest for peace and stability, as well as the peaceful settlement of disputes. [...]. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 12)

**2017.** “The imposition of unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries is inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations related to the principles of international law. All States signatories to the Charter must respect those principles. Accordingly, no State, regardless of its economic strength or political influence, should coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereignty, even if that State is developing or politically weak.

The United Nations must ensure the implementation of all necessary preventive measures against States that might be tempted to violate General Assembly resolution 70/185, adopted on 22 December 2015.

The World Trade Organization and other relevant bodies, within their respective areas of jurisdiction, should also ensure compliance with the resolution and report potential threats”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 15)

**2019.** “Senegal does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures, for several reasons.

First, Senegal is one of the developing countries that have ratified United Nations system conventions relating to economic development. Second, coercive economic measures were strongly condemned by the United Nations General Assembly in October 2000. In addition, Senegal complies with trade measures and rules which it has adopted under World Trade Organization agreements. [...]”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 12)

### South Africa

**2019.** “First and foremost, South Africa opposes unilateral measures, as we believe that there should be other ways to resolve conflicts without resorting to such measures”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 13)

**2021.** “South Africa opposes unilateral coercive measures and is of the view that measures should be undertaken in the multilateral framework, that is, by the United Nations. [...]”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, p. 14)

### Sudan

**2013.** “The Sudan does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. If these measures are used to make the targeted governing system comply with the requirements of the imposing countries it is of very limited and minor success: the severe impact is on the livelihood of the country’s population. [...]

The impact of unilateral economic measures includes higher prices overall, which affect the life of ordinary people; increasing poverty and unemployment; a decrease in machinery and exports needed for development. Most economic and trade sanctions are imposed by advanced developed countries which possess advanced technology in the manufacturing sector. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 11-12)

**2019.** “The Republic of the Sudan not does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures.

Sudan rejects all unilateral measures since they are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. The Sudan considers that these measures directly violate the sovereignty of developing countries and that they hinder the achievement of sustainable development and inclusive economic growth”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 13)

### Tunisia

**2015.** “Tunisia does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Tunisia views the imposition of unilateral economic measures as a violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law,

particularly the principle of sovereign equality of States. Furthermore, such sanctions are an infringement on the rules governing the multilateral trading system. The negative effect of these sanctions is certain. They seriously hamper the efforts of developing countries to improve the living conditions of their peoples and to achieve development. Tunisia believes that these sanctions generate a very heavy humanitarian cost. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 15)

### Zambia

**2019.** “The Government of the Republic of Zambia does not agree with the imposing of unilateral measures that are not authorized by relevant United Nations organizations, or those inconsistent with the principles of the international laws as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 20)

### Zimbabwe

**2015.** “Zimbabwe does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Zimbabwe believes in the resolution of differences through dialogue. Unilateral economic measures constitute a violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well as of international law. The sanctions also constitute a blunt instrument that often hurts the economies and citizens of targeted poor nations. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 17)

**2019.** “[...] Regrettably, in total disregard of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, certain Western powers frequently resorted to the imposition of illegal unilateral coercive measures, economic blockades and financial sanctions against other countries, and even disrupted the normal economic exchanges between the targeted countries and third parties. As a consequence of its land reform programme, his country had been suffering for almost 20 years from illegal sanctions imposed by the European Union and the United States. Zimbabweans knew very well that it was impossible for such sanctions to be either “smart” or “targeted”. It was hypocritical for certain States to impose unilateral coercive economic measures while at the same time calling for implementation of the 2030 Agenda”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 36)

**2021.** “[...] Unilateral coercive measures went against the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, international law and multilateralism, as well as the norms of international cooperation. They prevented the full enjoyment of human rights by severely impeding the socioeconomic advancement, stability and prosperity of developing countries.

As a consequence of its land reform programme, Zimbabwe had suffered under unwarranted and unjustified sanctions for 20 years. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 17-18)

## ASIA-PACIFIC

---

### Brunei Darussalam

**2015.** “Brunei does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 6)

### Cambodia

**2015.** “Cambodia’s position is against the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Cambodia is of the view that the imposition of such coercive measures violates the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, according to which no State may use or encourage the use of unilateral 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. In addition, it contravenes the rules of the World Trade Organization, especially those concerning the basic principles of the multilateral trading system, aimed at preventing trade discrimination. Finally, the coercive measures adversely impact international economic cooperation and the development efforts of developing countries. Cambodia considers that unilateral economic measures are not admissible and should not be taken against any countries, including developing nations. Cambodia urges that these be eliminated and therefore requests a recorded “yes” vote on resolution 68/200”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 6)

**2019.** “Cambodia does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures. Cambodia is of the view that the current use of unilateral measures by certain superpowers on developing countries are done with the objective of undermining development efforts and, in certain cases, putting pressure on them for regime change in order to serve the superpowers’ political agendas”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 5)

### China

**2019.** “[...] The imposition of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries undermined the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, the norms governing international relations and the efforts of the affected countries to advance social and economic development. All countries had the right to choose their own social systems and their own development paths. [...]”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 37)

**2021.** “[...] The imposition of unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion seriously undermined the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international relations. It also hindered social and economic development and post-pandemic recovery. The

international community should take urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of unilateral economic, financial or trade measures against developing countries.

China had always advocated respect for the right of countries to choose their own social systems and development paths. It firmly opposed the use of military, political, economic and other means to impose unilateral measures on other countries. It also opposed interference in the internal affairs of other States as well as practices that hindered development. Bullying certain States would not solve anything, and China urged the countries imposing unilateral sanctions to lift them immediately and completely in order to facilitate COVID-19 control and prevention, humanitarian assistance and post-pandemic recovery. With less than 10 years to deliver on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, all States should put people at the centre and work together in the spirit of true multilateralism to achieve sustainable development and build a community of shared future for humanity”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 21-22)

### Democratic People's Republic of Korea

**2019.** “[...] unilateral economic sanctions against developing countries were an infringement on sovereignty, a crime against humanity and a violation of human rights in breach of the Charter of the United Nations. All anachronistic and unjust economic sanctions against developing countries, which hindered economic and social development and achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, should be ended. [...]”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 28)

### Iran

**2013.** “Iran does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. It runs counter to the principles of international law governing the relations among States and contradicts the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. [...]”

It is inhuman and against the sovereign right of all countries to expand trade and economic relations with others, and is damaging to all aspects of the rights of people, including freedom of trade, finance, movement and navigation, and is a distorting factor for the social and environmental development of the country and the region as a whole, including health, education, etc.

It is a brutal measure contrary to the principles of international law, sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and peaceful coexistence among States”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 8-9)

**2019.** “[...] the enforcement of national laws with extraterritorial effects was unlawful and violated the principle of equal sovereignty of United Nations Member States. Unilateral coercive measures were a form of indiscriminate collective punishment that amounted to economic terrorism. Such abuse of economic power had been illegitimately exercised against his country for more than four decades. Measures that deprived entire populations of access to medicine, education and food should be unanimously condemned as a crime against humanity. Such measures

were war by a different name – a war being waged against women, children, hospital patients, older persons, the poor and refugees. There could be no justification for taking civilians hostage for the purposes of political rivalry. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 40)

**2021.** “[...] the unilateral coercive measures and even unilateral economic measures are a tool for leveraging political and/or economic pressure against any other countries, in particular against developing countries, with a view to prevent those countries from exercising their right to decide their own political will, their political, economic and social systems and to benefit from their human rights, including, but not limited to, the right to development and fulfilling the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular Goal 17.

The unilateral coercive measures and unilateral economic measures have negative effects on vulnerable people, including but not limited to patients with special needs such as epidermolysis bullosa and diabetes as well as persons with disabilities, since they do not comply with collective and multilateral actions as set forth in the United Nations Charter. These unilateral acts could even be regarded as *economic terrorism*, violating the United Nations Charter (Article 2(4)) and international law with the potential to trigger the use and threat of use of force and endanger international peace and security. [...]

Human rights are inalienable, interrelated, inherent and interdependent. Violation of one right unquestionably impacts the realization of another right. The unilateral coercive and economic measures violate all human rights. Furthermore, the consequences of the unilateral coercive and economic measures wind back directly and indirectly progress under the Sustainable Development Goals. The unilateral coercive and economic measures are also contrary to the various resolutions of the General Assembly, Human Rights Council and the Commission on Human Rights, international law, international humanitarian law, the United Nations Charter and the norms and principles governing peaceful relations, such as the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States.

The economic crisis, deteriorating living standards, poverty and inequalities, high inflation, widespread unemployment, discontent and demonstrations in affected countries have positive correlations with the imposition of the systematic, cruel, illegal and unlawful unilateral coercive and economic measures, which, in many cases, disrupt the public safety, public order, public health and fundamental rights of people, inflicting exceptional and unwarranted limitations or restrictions as set forth in articles 12 (3), 18 (3), 19 (3), 21 and 22 (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The violating nature of unilateral coercive and economic measures is specifically contrary to Sustainable Development Goal 17, in which a global partnership is envisioned, and also contrary to all of the international documents that encourage partnership and cooperation for the achievement of a better future, including chapter IX of the United Nations Charter.

Unilateral coercive and economic measures and legislation are contrary to international law, international humanitarian law, the United Nations Charter and



the norms and principles governing peaceful relations among States. They have a severe damaging effect on the people living in targeted States, including in situations of emergency. [...]

Persons affected by disasters are entitled to the respect for and protection of their human rights in accordance with international law. Unilateral coercive measures disrupt the exercise of the rules and principles governing humanitarian assistance and partially or totally prevent them to be delivered.

According to various resolutions of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council and the Commission on Human Rights, unilateral coercive measures and legislation are contrary to international law, international humanitarian law, the United Nations Charter and the norms and principles governing peaceful relations among States. [...]”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, pp. 13-19)

“[...] the imposition of coercive measures by one State or a group of States was illegal under international law, contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and a clear violation of the right to self-determination. Indeed, the use of such measures to destroy the economy and living standards of another State constituted an act of war. Even when unilateral coercive measures did not apply to food or medical supplies, by excluding a country from international trade and the international banking system, they deprived it of the ability to acquire those supplies through normal commercial mechanisms. [...] Countries maintaining such measures during the pandemic had undeniably caused the death of innocent people, crossing the red line from economic terrorism to crimes against humanity. Member States should unite in rejecting universal coercive measures and work together on the basis of human values and moral principles”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, para. 24)

## Iraq

**2021.** “Unilateral economic measures affect the economies and development efforts of developing countries and have negative impacts on international economic cooperation. They have a negative impact on the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals that require financing and harnessing domestic resources, and have a negative impact on trade and overall development. Any economic measures must be taken in accordance with the United Nations Charter, and should be authorized by relevant organs of the United Nations”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, pp. 7-12)

## Jordan

**2013.** “Jordan does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 9)

**2019.** “Jordan does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures because they violate the terms of World Trade Organization agreements and weaken the economies of developing countries”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 10)

## Kyrgyzstan

**2017.** “[...] Kyrgyzstan was committed to the principles of international law concerning good-neighbourly relations and cooperation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. No State could impose unilateral economic, political or other measures against another State in order to subordinate the exercise of its sovereign rights”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 12)

## Lao People's Democratic Republic

**2013.** “Lao does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The imposition of unilateral economic measures has violated the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the multilateral trading system, in particular the principle of sovereign equality of States and the freedom of international trade and navigation. It also has hindered the progress of the country’s development and prosperity as well as affecting socioeconomic development, and causes untold suffering to the people in the country. [...]”

Lao calls upon the international community to make every effort to eliminate and reject the imposition of all unilateral measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 9)

## Mongolia

**2015.** “Mongolia does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 11)

## Oman

**2015.** “Oman does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The Sultanate of Oman believes that the use of economic sanctions against developing countries is inconsistent with the principles of international law and the basic principles of the multilateral trading system as referred to in the Secretariat’s note Oman has never been subjected to any economic measures from any country and has never used such measures against any country, nor does the Sultanate of Oman agree with the imposition of economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, pp. 11-12)

## Papua New Guinea

**2023.** “Under international law this is not allowed”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 15)

## Philippines

**2013.** “The Philippines does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 10)

## Qatar

**2013.** “Qatar does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

The State of Qatar did not impose or implement any decision or take any measures that are not permitted by concerned agencies of the United Nations, or that might contradict the principles of international law in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, or that might be in contradiction with the multilateral trading system, against any developing country, and it did not take any unilateral decisions in this regard”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 11)

## Sri Lanka

**2013.** “Sri Lanka does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 11)

**2015.** “Sri Lanka does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Sri Lanka does not approve of the use of unilateral economic measures against any country, as it is inconsistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Sri Lanka is of the view that the implementation of such measures impedes the rule of law; the transparency of international trade and freedom of trade and navigation. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 12)

**2017.** “Sri Lanka does not approve of the use of unilateral economic measures against any country that are inconsistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Sri Lanka is of the view that the implementation of such measures impedes the rule of law, the transparency of international trade and the freedom of trade and navigation”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 22)

**2019.** “Sri Lanka does not approve of the use of unilateral measures against any country that are inconsistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Sri Lanka is of the view that the implementation of such measures impedes the rule of law, the transparency of international trade and the freedom of trade and navigation”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 13)

## Syrian Arab Republic

**2013.** “As a matter of principle, the Syrian Arab Republic categorically rejects the imposition by States and regional bodies of all unilateral economic, trade or financial measures outside the framework of legitimacy against developing countries. It also

rejects all justifications for the imposition of those measures. In that regard, the views of the Syrian Arab Republic are consistent with full respect for the provisions of international law and the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly the need to respect the sovereignty and independence of States, refrain from intervening in their internal affairs, develop friendly relations between them and create conditions of stability and well-being in accordance with Article 55 of the Charter. The views of the Syrian Arab Republic are, moreover, based on the clear recommendations contained in numerous resolutions adopted by the Organization and its principal organs, particularly the General Assembly. Most recently, in resolution 66/186, the Assembly prohibited any unilateral measures outside the international framework that are not authorized by the relevant organs of the United Nations, are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter or contravene the principles of multilateral trade law, and that are imposed as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

All world leaders have affirmed the need to abide by those recommendations in numerous key United Nations conference documents, especially those concerning development. The most recent of these were the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development and the outcome document of the thirteenth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Regrettably, in complete contradiction with the recommendations of the Organization, certain regional bodies and Governments, including those of certain Western and Arab States, have for political purposes imposed unilateral coercive measures of every sort against developing countries. Their aim is to politically and economically blackmail their targets and secure policy changes in their own interests. The measures include ending the provision of development assistance; cutting off economic ties; imposing economic, trade and financial blockades; prohibiting financial and banking transactions; and impeding investment flows to and from developing countries. The States imposing those measures also intimidate and place various forms of pressure on third-country Governments in order to encourage them to follow their example. Other measures are imposed with a view to paralysing the economies of developing countries and undermining their ability to achieve sustainable development for their peoples.

The Syrian Government emphasizes that those coercive unilateral economic measures violate all human rights, including, in particular, the rights to development, health, life and education. Their negative impact is felt principally by the weakest members of society and especially by children, women and persons with disabilities. Their imposition violates the right of peoples to self-determination, including the freedom to determine their political status and pursue economic, social and cultural development in accordance with article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. [...]

La República Árabe Siria destaca la importancia de poner fin inmediatamente a las políticas que imponen medidas económicas, financieras y comerciales unilaterales como medio de ejercer presión política y económica sobre los países en desarrollo. Por

un lado, experiencias pasadas y presentes nos han demostrado claramente que este tipo de medidas perjudican a los pueblos de los países en desarrollo afectados cuando tratan de conseguir el desarrollo sostenible, unas condiciones de vida decentes y el fin de la pobreza, el miedo, el desempleo y la enfermedad. Por otro lado, estas medidas no han logrado ni lograrán ninguno de sus objetivos, a saber, cambiar las políticas de los países en desarrollo afectados; estos seguirán defendiendo los principios de la independencia, la justicia, la soberanía y la no injerencia en sus asuntos internos. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 13-16)

**2015.** “The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic categorically rejects the policy of imposing unilateral coercive measures, whether economic, commercial or financial, outside the framework of international law, against Member States, in particular against developing countries, for the purpose of achieving narrow political ends. It also rejects the pretexts used by States that impose such measures to justify their conduct.

The views of the Syrian Government rejecting such measures are consistent with the unequivocal calls by the United Nations in its annual resolutions, the most recent of which are General Assembly resolutions 68/200 and 69/180, on all Member States to refrain from imposing any unilateral economic measures against other States, in particular against developing countries. It is also consistent with the affirmation by the United Nations that such measures are contrary to the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the principle of respect for the sovereignty of States, and to the principles of multilateral trade law. The United Nations has also warned against the disastrous impact of such measures on the efforts of Member States to achieve development for their peoples; the impediments they pose to the rights of the peoples of the affected States, in particular children and women, to economic and social development, a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being, and to food, medical care and education and the necessary social services; and the impediments they pose to investments and the trade sector, which is the engine of development. [...]

The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic reiterates the importance of practical and non-selective compliance of the policies and practices of the Governments of all Member States with the principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations, multilateral trade law and human rights law. It also stresses the need for immediate compliance with United Nations resolutions calling for a cessation of the imposition of unilateral economic, financial and commercial measures against other States, in particular developing countries, as a means of political and economic coercion. Such compliance would ensure the fulfilment of one of the requirements for achieving sustainable development for all peoples of the world, without exception, allowing them to enjoy the benefits of prosperity and a dignified life”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, pp. 13-15)

**2017.** “The Syrian Arab Republic strongly opposes the imposition of unilateral economic measures, as these measures are fundamentally based on an unethical concept and contradictory to the principles of human rights and international humanitarian law. The content of this unethical concept is that there are some

Member States that have the economic power and the financial means to use unilateral economic measures, which only harm peoples, as a means of achieving private and unfair political goals and agendas, especially against developing countries.

On this basis, the United Nations will never be able to achieve the goals and objectives of sustainable development in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as long as these countries and communities, particularly the United States of America and the European Union, continue to impose these coercive measures on many peoples of the world. [...]

In paragraph 2 of its resolution 70/185, the General Assembly urged the international community to take urgent and effective measures to put an end to the use of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries, since these measures are not authorized by the relevant organs of the United Nations and they contradict the principles of international law and the Charter and violate the basic principles of the multilateral trading system.

However, the legal and ethical dilemma and paradox, to which the United Nations today has the primary responsibility to provide serious and effective solutions, are that there are no international legal mechanisms to challenge these unilateral measures. These illegitimate measures will continue to reflect a bitter international reality in which some States and economic groups exert their influence and dominance over developing countries. As a result, annual resolutions of the General Assembly and annual reports of the Secretary-General, while important, will not alone put an end to injustice imposed on peoples, States, individuals and institutions that fall victim to such illegal unilateral economic measures". (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, pp. 15-21)

"[...] Evidently, some States still thought of economic power as a weapon to be used against other States in the service of political hegemony. [...]

It was hypocritical for certain Governments to impose unilateral coercive economic measures even as they promoted adherence to the letter and spirit of the 2030 Agenda. The United Nations needed to find a way to put an end to such measures so that the prosperity and dignity of weaker States would no longer be held hostage by the stronger States that monopolized most of the world's resources". (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, paras. 16 y 18)

**2019.** "The Syrian Arab Republic strongly opposes the imposition of unilateral measures, as these measures are fundamentally based on an unethical concept and contradictory to the principles of human rights and international humanitarian law. The content of this unethical concept is that there are some Member States with the economic power and the financial means to use unilateral measures, which only harm peoples, as a means of achieving private and unfair political goals and agendas, especially against developing countries. On this basis, the United Nations will never be able to achieve the goals and objectives of sustainable development in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as long as these countries and communities,

particularly the United States of America and the European Union, continue to impose these coercive measures on many peoples of the world. [...]

In paragraph 2 of its resolution 70/185, the General Assembly urged the international community to adopt urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries that were not authorized by the relevant organs of the United Nations or were inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and that contravened the basic principles of the multilateral trading system.

The legal and ethical dilemma and paradox, to which the United Nations today has the primary responsibility to provide serious and effective solutions, are that there are no international legal mechanisms to challenge these unilateral measures. These illegitimate measures will continue to reflect a bitter international reality in which some States and economic groups exert their influence and dominance over developing countries. As a result, annual resolutions of the General Assembly and annual reports of the Secretary-General, while important, will not alone put an end to injustice imposed on peoples, States, individuals and institutions that fall victim to such illegal unilateral measures”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, pp. 13-19)

“[...] collective punishment that undermined the United Nations system, deprived States of their right to development, impeded international commerce and obstructed implementation of human rights instruments. The international community needed to go beyond simply condemning such measures and create a mechanism to compensate victims. An international registry should be kept of unilateral measures that affected human rights. [...] Governments that imposed illegal economic embargoes should be held politically, legally and financially responsible for their effects on the delivery of vital services that were crucial for the lives of citizens and achievement of the 2030 Agenda”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 34)

**2021.** “The Syrian Arab Republic strongly opposes the imposition of unilateral economic measures, as these measures are fundamentally unethical because they catastrophically impede meeting the basic needs of the targeted people. The resorting of some countries or regional groups to imposing inhuman measures for the purposes of political and economic coercion individually and without the authorization of the Security Council is a practice that contravenes the rules of international law and the principles and purposes contained in the Charter of the United Nations, including the principle of equal sovereignty and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. On this basis, the United Nations will never be able to achieve the goals and objectives of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as long as these countries and communities, particularly the United States and the European Union, continue to impose these coercive measures. [...]

The United Nations should have a stronger position against the imposition of unilateral economic measures, which contradict its Charter, and must exercise its power to call upon the countries that impose unilateral coercive measures to lift them without any preconditions”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, pp. 14-17)

**2023.** “[...] The United Nations should have a stronger position against unilateral economic measures, which contradict its Charter, and must exercise its power to call upon the countries that impose such measures to lift them without preconditions.”

The Syrian Arab Republic stresses the need for the immediate, full and unconditional lifting of these measures, establishment of more effective United Nations and international mechanisms to support the targeted countries; as well as the need to hold the countries and entities that impose such measures accountable and to ensure their obligation to compensate the targeted countries for the lost development opportunities”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 15-17)

“[...] It was no coincidence that all targeted States were developing countries with foreign policies that were similar to each other but very different from those of Western countries. Unilateral coercive measures were evidently being used for purely political, rather than humanitarian, reasons. Such measures could almost certainly not be imposed through Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, para. 40)

### United Arab Emirates

**2015.** “The United Arab Emirates does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Such actions go against the principles of international law, and have proven to be a failure. [...]”

The United Arab Emirates, based on the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and the fundamental principles of the multilateral trading system, does not apply any sanctions or unilateral economic measures as a means of political coercion or economic against any other country, since it is proven that such measures have a negative political and economic impact on the people of the targeted developing countries”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 11)

### Yemen

**2017.** “Yemen is against unilateral measures as an instrument of political coercion. Mostly, the most vulnerable groups are the most affected by such measures [...]”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 21)



## EASTERN EUROPE

---

### 🇦🇱 Albania

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2017.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 10)

**2019.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] Unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its

member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 31)

**2021.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. [...]

The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 9-13)

## Armenia

**2017.** “Armenia does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. As a form of political and economic pressure exercised by one State towards another, the application of unilateral coercive measures constitutes an obstacle to the realization of the right to development and, as such, is detrimental to sustainable development. [...]” (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 5)

**2023.** “The Republic of Armenia strongly condemns the imposition of the unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The position of the Republic of Armenia in this regard has been reiterated on numerous occasions, including in framework on the relevant United Nations Committees. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 5)

## Belarus

**2013.** “[...] individual States had used unilateral coercive economic measures as a foreign policy tool to advance their own interests, thereby undermining the economic and social rights of peoples under sanctions. The United Nations must ensure that such measures were repealed. The draft resolution should send a clear message to States that continued to impose sanctions and blockades and act against international law and international human rights law. [...]”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 4)

**2017.** “Belarus has stated many times at the United Nations that unilateral coercive measures constitute a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and have a negative impact on the multilateral trading system. Such measures are counterproductive in every respect and only exacerbate tensions in relations between sovereign States. Unilateral coercive measures taken in violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations run counter to the principles of sustainable development. Full implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is possible only if unfair and unlawful means of exerting influence in relations among countries are rejected.

Unilateral sanctions often have extraterritorial effects because they impact not only on the countries on which they are imposed but also on third countries, since they have a negative effect on regional economic cooperation. [...]” (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, pp. 5-6)

**2023.** “The Republic of Belarus does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion and believes that such measures must be abolished as they violate the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and multilateral trade system. They negatively affect the sustainable development of targeted countries and violate basic human rights. [...]”

The Belarusian side considers restrictive measures against Belavia as hasty, unprecedented, unsubstantiated and taken in violation of the international law. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 6-8)

## Bosnia and Herzegovina

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance.

The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2017.** "[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 10)

**2019.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: "[...] Unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 31)

**2021.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: "[...] The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its

Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. [...]

The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 9-13)

### ✚ Georgia

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2017.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States

were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 10)

### Latvia

**2015.** “Latvia does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

Latvia has been affected by economic sanctions during the period 2012 -2014. An embargo was imposed on 6 September 2014 by the Russian Federation on imports of beef, pork, poultry, fish, fruit, vegetables, cheese, milk and other dairy products from the European Union, including Latvia. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 10)

### Lithuania

**2023.** “[...] Certain aspects of the text made it impossible for his country to vote in favour of the draft resolution. Lithuania had abstained in 2021, when a similar draft resolution had been put forward, but the geopolitical situation had changed considerably in the intervening years. Specifically, more sanctions had been imposed on Russia in response to its illegal war of aggression against Ukraine. [...]”

Sanctions were an integral part of a broader political strategy and a legitimate tool with which to respond to grave violations of the Charter of the United Nations, and to uphold human rights and the principles of international law. They were a means of fostering international peace, security and democracy, rather than an end in themselves. Those imposed by the European Union, in particular, were targeted and measured, and not used against developing countries. [...]”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, paras. 18-19)

### Montenegro

**2013.** “Montenegro does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Montenegro strongly supports the adoption of effective measures for the elimination of the use of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries that are not authorized by 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 and that contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 9-10)

“[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the

State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2017.** "[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 10)

**2019.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: "[...] Unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 31)

**2021.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: "[...] The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good

governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. [...]

The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 9-13)

## North Macedonia

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2017.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of



WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 10)

**2019.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] Unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 31)

**2021.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. [...]

The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 9-13)

## Republic of Moldova

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2019.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] Unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 31)

**2021.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. [...]

The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 9-13)

## Russian Federation

**2015.** “[...] Such measures were a direct violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the standards of international law and the rules of the multilateral trading system. They undermined the very right of States to their own development, preventing them from fulfilling their obligation to ensure the well-being of their populations. Long-term use of such measures could also lead to serious humanitarian crises. The application of such measures dealt a serious blow to important sectors of the economy and had a negative impact on the rate of economic growth and on production levels. They reduced employment opportunities and income while increasing the price of basic commodities, primarily medicines and everyday items. Their long-term application could also lead to serious humanitarian crises.

[...] Attempts at political coercion through the use of sanctions, trade embargoes, and other measures were not only carried out against developing countries: the imposition of unilateral sanctions circumventing the Charter had almost become the norm. Countries employing such methods blatantly violated the principles of their own political ends, but also to remove competitors from the marketplace. The extraterritorial consequences of unilateral sanctions also impeded regional economic cooperation, a recognized mechanism for achieving global sustainable development. [...]”. (A/C.2/70/SR.31, 12 November 2015, paras. 24-25)

**2017.** “La Federación de Rusia no está de acuerdo con la imposición de medidas económicas unilaterales como instrumento para ejercer presión política y económica sobre los países en desarrollo. [...]

In summary, it should be noted that so-called sanctions are counterproductive and do not achieve their primary goal. Moreover, the biggest losses are sustained by

businesses not only in countries subject to unilateral economic measures, but also in their partner countries. We also note that restrictive measures have an impact on sectors (and companies) on which no sanctions have been directly imposed”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, pp. 11-14)

**2019.** “[...] The Russian Federation has always maintained that the unilateral imposition of restrictive economic measures as a means of exerting pressure on other countries is inadmissible. Such measures, taken in contravention of international law, are illegitimate and run counter to the accepted principles of fair competition and the freedom of trade and investment. They undermine trust between countries and the role of the United Nations as the sole legitimate arbitrator in such matters. We believe that only the Security Council may decide to impose sanctions, in line with the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations (arts. 39–42). [...]”

The Russian Federation regards the economic sanctions imposed on it as an attempt to encroach on its foreign policy sovereignty. [...]

The trend towards a broader application of economic restrictions of an extraterritorial nature is a source of particular concern. Such actions in practice amount to a form of blockade, violate the basic norms of international humanitarian law and create a toxic and intimidatory atmosphere. [...]”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, pp. 11-12)

“[...] Unilateral economic measures ran counter to international law and the Charter of the United Nations. Unfortunately, such measures were becoming the norm for certain countries, which used them to punish countries for choosing their own paths to development and also to gain an unfair competitive advantage in global markets. That directly violated the principle of free and mutually beneficial economic cooperation that lay at the core of the 2030 Agenda, thereby undermining trust and the sustainability of international relations”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 32)

**2021.** “The Russian Federation has consistently adhered to the position of inadmissibility of the use of unilateral restrictive economic measures as an instrument of coercion against developing countries. Such measures, taken in flagrant violation of international law, are illegitimate, contrary to generally accepted principles of freedom of trade and investment; and fair competition. They undermine trust between countries and the role of the United Nations as the sole legal arbiter in this issue. Any decision to apply the sanctions toolkit can only be adopted by the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of Articles 39 to 42 of chapter VII of the Charter of the Organization. Russia is considering economic sanctions against it as an attempt to put pressure on its sovereign foreign policy. Restriction initiators do not hide the fact that economic restrictions are aimed at providing long-term economic pressure on Russia and expect that domestic financial institutions will not be able to compensate for the lack of Western loans from other sources. In fact, anti-Russian restrictive measures are aimed at ensuring competitive advantages for the business entities of Western countries. [...]”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, pp. 12-14)

**2023.** “[...] The use of unilateral economic measures undermined the principle of leaving no one behind and subjected hundreds of millions of ordinary people to collective punishment because they lived in a country in which the Government had opted for a different development path or dared to independently determine its foreign policy. Those in favour of unilateral coercive measures claimed that they did not limit development or well-being, or run counter to the Charter of the United Nations, and could therefore be imposed on any country regardless of the ensuing suffering, illness, degradation and risk of conflict. [...]”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, para. 13)

“Such measures, taken in circumvention of international law, are illegitimate, contrary to the generally accepted principles of free trade and investment, as well as fair competition. They undermine trust between countries and the role of the United Nations as the sole legal arbiter on this matter. The decision on the use of sanctions instruments can only be made by the Security Council in accordance with the provisions of Articles 39–42 of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

The nature of the measures: restrictive measures are both personal (in relation to individuals and legal entities) and sectoral in nature, including trade, investment and financial prohibitions. [...]

Economic sanctions attempt to put pressure on Russia’s sovereign foreign policy. The human rights and humanitarian component of anti-Russian restrictions is crucial. In practice, the principle of collective responsibility of residents of individual regions for the desire to make full use of basic civil rights and freedoms, primarily the right of peoples to self-determination, is being implemented.

For many years now, the “collective West” has been replicating sanctions as an instrument of pressure on the sovereign foreign and domestic policy of independent states. In broad terms, it is with the help of such a neo-colonial approach that Western countries seek to subordinate other countries to their world order – indisputable, uncontested, rules-based and subject to the standards of the United States and its allies.

Russia today has become the main target of the West’s restrictive campaign. The use of an unprecedented arsenal of anti-Russian restrictions and prohibitions has all the signs of an economic war, the goals and means of which are incompatible with the universal principles of peaceful coexistence, sovereign equality, mutually beneficial cooperation, universal socioeconomic development and prosperity. [...]

Of particular concern is the trend towards a wider use of economic restrictions of an extraterritorial nature, the so-called secondary sanctions. Such actions amount to some form of blockade and violate the basic norms of international humanitarian law, and create an atmosphere of toxicity and intimidation.

The principle of responsibility of “third” countries, their authorities, citizens and businesses for maintaining and developing mutually beneficial trade and economic relations with those against whom restrictive actions have been applied is introduced into the practice of inter-state relations. In fact, we are talking about interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, the neo-colonial practice of

forcing compliance with illegal restrictions through direct pressure on the sociopolitical elites of the focus countries”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 13-15)

### Serbia

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

### Ukraine

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### Brazil

**2013.** “Brazil does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

Brazil is deeply concerned with the proliferation of unilateral coercive measures, especially economic and financial sanctions, as a tool of international policy. There is no provision under the Charter of the United Nations for the application of unilateral sanctions, which are conditioned upon a decision of the Security Council. According to Chapter VII, a “complete or partial interruption of economic relations” is subject to a Security Council decision. The trade policy autonomy of Member States should not be allowed as a subterfuge to justify the misuse of economic measures for undue pressure over other States. Under Chapter VI, Member States agree to exhaust (“first of all”) every peaceful and diplomatic means — negotiation, mediation, conciliation and other equivalent processes — to find a solution. Coercive measures foreseen under Chapter VII must be adopted by the Security Council, on an exceptional basis, only as a last resort.

The effectiveness of economic sanctions is highly debatable, as shown by the track history of their use. The norms of international law usually invoked to justify economic sanctions are those invariably violated by unilateral measures. Humanitarian impact and severe losses among the civilian population are frequently disregarded, as tragically experienced in Iraq and currently evidenced in Iran and Syria. Major harmful effects of such unilateral measures end up falling upon the very same civilian population they claimed to protect in the first place. “Target sanctions”, “smart sanctions” and other conceptual and operational adjustments have not proved sufficient to prevent, in many cases, deleterious effects for the vast majority of innocent citizens of the targeted countries. The United States decades-long embargo on Cuba is another example of the ineffectiveness of unilateral sanctions, which will be the object of Member States’ comments for the report of the Secretary-General in response to resolution 67/4.

Unfortunately, this logic of mass punishment has been observed not only in the adoption of unilateral measures, but also in sanctions imposed by the Security Council. Sanctions allegedly applied to curb violations of human rights are those which paradoxically burden the same population they claimed to protect. [...]

Brazil disputes the interpretation that unilateral sanctions act as “countermeasures” to induce a State to end the infringement of certain norms of international law. Even if this were the case, there should be acceptance of clear parameters of legality, such as proportionality, to provide guarantees that fundamental human rights will not be put at risk. Once again, this kind of interpretation does not relieve Member States of their ongoing obligation of previously exhausting all peaceful efforts for a negotiated outcome, as authoritatively stated in draft articles 50, 51 and 52 on the

Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, adopted by the International Law Commission.

In Brazil's perspective, insisting on the adoption of sanctions as a preferential tool for the settlement of disputes is a menace not only to full enjoyment of human rights but also to the legitimacy of the international system as endorsed by the Charter of the United Nations. In this regard, unilateral sanctions are an outright violation of the Charter and should be immediately eliminated. In the face of today's complex challenges to peace and security, the most adequate and efficient way to ensure peace and stability and the full enjoyment of human rights is renewing the commitment of the international community to conflict prevention, diplomacy and other instruments for peaceful settlement of disputes. Diplomacy is still the best assurance of legitimate and sustainable political arrangements. In those cases where sanctions are deemed to be necessary, they must always be, without exception, adopted with the authorization of the Security Council, bearing in mind that sanctions must be imposed on an exceptional basis and after exhausting all political and diplomatic means". (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 5-6)

 Chile

**2015.** "Chile does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries". (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 7)

 Colombia

**2013.** "Colombia does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Such measures could cause serious disruption in growth and commerce. [...]". (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 6)

 Cuba

**2013.** "Cuba does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]"

The imposition of unilateral coercive economic measures as a means of exerting political and economic pressure on developing countries is a flagrant violation of international law and of the aims and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. In particular, it infringes a sovereign State's right to peace, development and security.

Such measures breach the principle of peaceful coexistence among sovereign States and constitute a persistent threat to a country's stability, while encroaching upon the right of peoples to self-determination, freedom of trade and navigation, and the rules of the multilateral trading system.

Cuba continues to be affected by an economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the Government of the United States for more than 50 years in an



attempt to overturn the system of government chosen by the Cuban population in exercise of its sovereignty. [...]

The embargo remains distinctly extraterritorial in nature, as its impact extends beyond the United States and affects companies and citizens of third countries. [...]

The embargo against Cuba has been the longest and harshest imposed on any country. Although it was officially decreed in 1962, in practical terms it began to be implemented as soon as the Cuban revolution triumphed in 1959. By its nature, it constitutes an act of genocide under article 2 (c) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948 Geneva Convention) and an act of economic war under the terms of the Declaration concerning the Laws of Naval War adopted by the London Naval Conference in 1909. [...]

The Government of the Republic of Cuba is also concerned at the increasing use of unilateral economic measures, by select countries or groups of countries, as a means of exerting political and economic pressure on developing nations. Reiterating its strongest condemnation of such measures, Cuba calls on the international community to take immediate action to eliminate their use, in accordance with the principles of international law and the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, pp. 7-8)

**2015.** “Cuba does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The Republic of Cuba rejects all unilateral economic coercive measures, since they are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. Cuba considers that such measures directly violate the sovereignty of developing countries, and that they hinder the advancement of national development programmes and the achievement of better social and economic realities.

Cuba has been affected by the economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed by the United States of America since 1962.

For over 50 years, the United States Government has imposed a blockade policy on Cuba, ignoring the systematic and growing clamour of the international community to immediately put an end to it. [...]

The blockade also qualifies as an act of genocide by virtue of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 and as an act of economic warfare according to the Declaration concerning the Laws of Naval War, adopted by the Naval Conference of London of 1909.

The blockade against Cuba must end. It is the most unfair, severe and prolonged unilateral system of sanctions that has ever been applied to any country. On 23 occasions, the General Assembly, with an overwhelming majority, has declared itself to be in favour of respect for international law, compliance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the right of the Cuban people to choose their own future for themselves. That must be respected”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, pp. 7-10)

**2017.** “Cuba does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. The Republic of Cuba rejects all unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries, since they are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. Cuba considers that these measures directly violate the sovereignty of developing countries and that they hinder the advancement of national development programmes and the achievement of better social and economic realities.

The Republic of Cuba has endured, and still endures to date, an economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed by the Government of the United States of America since 1962. The laws and regulations that uphold this policy of unilateral economic measures are still in place and are rigorously applied by United States authorities.

These measures were designed to bring about “hunger, desperation and overthrow of [the Cuban] Government”. They constitute an absurd policy that is morally unsustainable, as former President Barack Obama acknowledged. They have not served the purpose of breaking down the decision of the Cuban people to choose their political system and control their future. [...]

The blockade also qualifies as an act of genocide by virtue of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 and as an act of economic warfare according to the Declaration concerning the Laws of Naval War adopted by the Naval Conference of London of 1909.

The blockade against Cuba must end. On 25 occasions, the General Assembly, with overwhelming majority, has declared itself to be in favour of respect for international law, compliance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the right of the Cuban people to choose their own future for themselves. That must be respected”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, pp. 6-9)

**2019.** “The Republic of Cuba does not agree with the imposition of unilateral measures. Cuba rejects all unilateral measures, since they are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. Cuba considers that these measures directly violate the sovereignty of developing countries and that they hinder the advancement of national development and the achievement of better social and economic realities. The unilateral coercive measures are intended to cause economic and political difficulties in the States against which they are directed. Therefore, they do not make any real distinction between the States subject to the sanctions and the civilian population residing in these States.

Cuba has endured, and still endures to date, an economic and financial blockade imposed by the Government of the United States of America since 1962. The laws and regulations that uphold this policy of unilateral measures are rigorously applied by United States authorities.

These measures were designed to bring about “hunger, desperation and overthrow of [the Cuban] Government”. [...]

There are numerous examples of unilateral economic coercive measures in the world, all in violation of international law as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations, and the Republic of Cuba condemns them all. The blockade of the United States Government against Cuba happens to be the longest, most unjust and illegal set of unilateral economic coercive measures ever to be applied in history to a single country. This policy and its extraterritorial scope have tried to isolate our country simply because it defends its sovereignty and its right to freely choose its future.

Cuba and the United States are not at war. Cuba has never launched any military aggression against the United States nor has it promoted acts of terrorism against the American people. It is unsustainable to justify the measures being taken under this ordinance.

The blockade also qualifies as an act of genocide by virtue of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 and as an act of economic warfare according to the Declaration concerning the Laws of Naval War adopted by the Naval Conference of London of 1909.

The blockade against Cuba must end. On 27 occasions, the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority, has declared itself to be in favour of respect for international law, compliance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the right of the Cuban people to choose their own future for themselves. That must be respected”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, pp. 6-10)

“[...] being held hostage to the aggressive and unilateral conduct of a handful of countries with hegemonic ambitions. Unilateral coercive measures violated the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference in the affairs of other States, and hindered development efforts and the exercise of human rights. The brunt of their impact was borne by women, children and older persons. Her delegation opposed the imposition of unilateral coercive measures irrespective of the country targeted, because they were incompatible with the principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the multilateral trading system. [...]”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 41)

**2021.** “The Republic of Cuba rejects all unilateral economic coercive measures, since they are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the United Nations Charter and contravene the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. Cuba considers that these measures directly violate the sovereignty of developing countries, and that they hinder the advancement of national development programmes and the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. [...]

The tightening of the United States blockade has been expressed, particularly in the intensification of the extraterritorial nature of this policy. In recent years, sanctions and persecution against citizens, institutions and companies of third countries that establish or intend to develop economic, commercial and financial relations with Cuba have been intensified in an unprecedented manner. [...]

There are numerous examples of unilateral economic coercive measures in the world, all in violation of international law as provided for in the United Nations Charter. The blockade of the United States Government against Cuba is the longest set of unilateral economic coercive measures ever to be applied in history. This policy and its extraterritorial scope have tried to isolate our country simply because it defends its sovereignty and its right to freely choose its future.

Such a policy should come as no surprise, since the core of the United States blockade against Cuba resides in the following words: to bring about “hunger, desperation and overthrow of [the Cuban] Government”. [...]

The blockade constitutes a massive, flagrant and systematic violation of the human rights of all Cuban men and women. Because of its declared purpose and the political, legal and administrative framework sustaining it, these sanctions qualify as an act of genocide according to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide of 1948 and as an act of economic warfare according to the Naval Conference of London of 1909.

The blockade against Cuba must end. It is the most unfair, severe and prolonged unilateral system of sanctions that has ever been applied to any country. [...]”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, pp. 5-7)

“[...] Unilateral coercive measures directly threatened the sovereignty, equality and political independence of States. They violated the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and hindered development and the full enjoyment of human rights. They were designed to create economic and political difficulties for the targeted States, without any real distinction between the government and the people. Cuba rejected the use of unilateral coercive measures against any country as incompatible with the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and a violation of the basic norms of the multilateral trading system. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, para. 16)

**2023.** “[...] Unilateral coercive measures directly threatened the sovereignty and political independence of States. They violated the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and hindered development and the full enjoyment of human rights. They were designed to create economic and political difficulties for the targeted States, without any real distinction between the Governments concerned and the people. Cuba rejected the use of unilateral coercive measures against any country as incompatible with the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations and a violation of the basic norms of the multilateral trading system and the World Trade Organization. [...]”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, paras. 29)

“Cuba rejects the imposition of all unilateral economic coercive measures, since they are inconsistent with the principles of international law as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and contravene the principles of the multilateral trading system. Cuba considers these measures in violation of the sovereignty of developing countries, and an obstacle for national development programmes and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed by the United States against Cuba since 1962 constitutes a flagrant and systematic violation of the human rights of the Cuban people. It is the most unfair, severe and prolonged unilateral system of sanctions that has ever been applied. It is destructive for the material, psychological and spiritual well-being of the Cuban people and impedes economic, cultural and social development, in the context of a global crisis. [...]

The blockade violates the right to life and health of all Cubans. [...]" (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 9-11)

## Ecuador

**2015.** "Ecuador does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Ecuador considers the imposition of unilateral economic measures to be a transgression against the principle of sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of United Nations Member States. [...]

The imposition of unilateral economic sanctions as a form of political and economic pressure threatens the principles of non-interference and equality among Member States, as well as the principle of sovereignty, contained in the Charter of the United Nations. Ecuador has expressed itself accordingly when such sanctions have occurred, as is the case with Cuba, Iran and Venezuela. It is also important to note that such sanctions affect the principle of presumption of innocence, as they are applied on a discretionary basis without proper investigation or judicial order". (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 10)

## Guatemala

**2017.** "Guatemala does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Such action violates all the general principles of law codified and universally recognized in international treaties, whose main function is to serve as a source of international law. We find the main principles that govern international law in the Charter of the United Nations and in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The general principles of public international law are thus jus cogens norms, or peremptory norms, accepted and recognized by the international community; they cannot be otherwise agreed and may only be modified by subsequent norms of general international law of equal value and breadth, and so breaching them would automatically void them ab initio.

The World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements contain the main subjects that govern international trade through legal rules that set limits, understood as the trading rights and obligations of States; therefore, it was also necessary to establish the minimum principles that should govern them both in the international trade in goods and in the international trade in services.

The principles codified in the different normative texts of WTO form the basis of the multilateral trading system; they must be understood, applied and interpreted broadly in matters governing world trade.

The imposition of unilateral measures that are outside the general framework of public international law blatantly violates both general principles of law and the principles that govern multilateral trade, including the principle of predictability, which is intended to give members clear rules and legal certainty for trade in goods and services, as only this can generate real business that increases investment and commerce among members. The different agreements that are part of WTO, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the General Agreement on Trade in Services and the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights agreement, inter alia, consolidate the rights and obligations of members by providing predictability in the countries with which they wish to conduct trade activities.

To impose such measures against developing countries not only worsens and delays economic growth but also drives away potential investors, owing to a lack of predictability and a breach of the clear rules that must be applied in democratic systems and in the multilateral trading system.

Recalling that the current general principles of international law codified to date are mainly to be found in the Charter of the United Nations, countries must observe, respect and implement them in order to achieve the goal of responding to the aspiration of a world union of States, with equal rights and fraternal cooperation.

The imposition of unilateral measures by developed countries with the intention of exerting political and economic coercion violates the commitments made at the global level in the Charter of the United Nations and the commitments made in the Marrakesh Agreement.

There are many alternatives and forums for the settlement of international political and economic disputes; Guatemala is of the opinion that these remedies must be exhausted and that developed countries must refrain from imposing measures that violate predictability in trade and the self-determination of peoples.

Guatemala urges complete compliance with the following principles:

1. Equal rights and the self-determination of peoples
2. Sovereign equality and the independence of all States
3. Good faith in the performance of obligations
4. Refraining from the threat or use of force
5. Universal observance of human rights
6. Cooperation among States
7. Non-interference in the internal affairs of States
8. Peaceful settlement of disputes.

In commercial matters, the following principles must be observed and respected:

1. Most-favoured-nation treatment
2. National treatment
3. Freer trade
4. Predictability
5. Fair competition
6. Promotion of development and economic reform”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, pp. 9-11)

## Honduras

**2023.** “The Republic of Honduras reaffirms its respect for the fundamental principles on which contemporary international law and the United Nations are based, as well as the primacy of the Charter of the United Nations. The Republic of Honduras objects to all forms of unilateralism, including threats or the application of sanctions or unilateral coercive measures, even more so those that for decades have not yielded any positive result. The Republic of Honduras rejects the extraterritorial application of laws and/or the unilateral imposition of economic, commercial, financial blockades, and trade measures, while recalling that multilateralism is the only option and must be the shared commitment of the international community, as well as the only way to contribute to the development of all peoples. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 11)

## Nicaragua

**2013.** “Nicaragua does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

The Government of Reconciliation and National Unity of the Republic of Nicaragua, in accordance with the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, reaffirms its strong and unwavering respect for the sovereign equality of States, the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in internal affairs, and the freedom of international trade and navigation, as set forth in various international instruments, as well as for other principles that are essential to peaceful coexistence internationally. Nicaragua also reiterates the right of every State to choose its own social, political and economic system free from outside interference. Accordingly, we condemn and reject the implementation of these unilateral extraterritorial coercive measures. [...]”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 10)

**2019.** “[...] that powerful countries continued to target developing countries with unilateral measures that deprived entire peoples of their right to development. The brunt of such measures was borne by the most vulnerable members of the societies targeted. No State had the right to impose such damaging and inhumane measures, which were in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

The pretexts offered to justify them were lies. [...]”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 43)

**2023.** “[...] No country or group of countries can take upon itself the power to violate the sovereignty and legitimate right to development of peoples, under any mechanism, including financing for political destabilization, sanctions against government officials, lies/fake news, trade blockades, or pressure on multilateral organizations and banks to restrict access to financial resources. These measures directly affect citizens, especially the poorest, distancing developing countries from their goals of reducing overall poverty and eradicating extreme poverty. [...]”

We demand the immediate cessation of all coercive measures applied to any country in the World and we claim the right of all peoples to decide their future without interference of any kind. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 12-13)

### Paraguay

**2015.** “Paraguay does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

Measures and instruments of coercion should be applied only after general debate according to international law, among all members of the international community and/or the United Nations Security Council. Such measures should be carefully regulated”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, p. 12)

### Uruguay

**2023.** “The only accepted and legal measures are the ones taken by the Security Council”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 18)

### Venezuela

**2015.** “Venezuela does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Such measures are against the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States. In particular they are an attack on respect for equal rights among States, the self-determination of peoples and non-interference in internal affairs, as well as the inalienable right of States to choose their political, economic, social and cultural systems, without the interference of another State. The imposition of such measures can affect the normal political, economic, social and cultural development of the country under them, and is an attack on the human rights of its people. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, pp. 16-17)

**2017.** “[...] Unilateral economic measures were contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; in particular, they ran counter to the principles of States’ equality and non-intervention in domestic affairs, and the peoples’ right of self-determination. The imposition of such measures constrained



the political, economic, social and cultural development of the country targeted and infringed on the human rights of its nationals. The adoption of the draft resolution was a reaffirmation by the international community of its rejection of such illegal application of political and economic pressure, which was used as a means of subjugating countries, including Venezuela”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 15)

**2019.** “[...] Unilateral economic measures were a clear violation of the principles of international law as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, contravened the basic principles of the multilateral trading system and were prejudicial to the legitimate economic interests and aspirations of Member States, particularly developing countries. No State had the right to employ coercive measures to subordinate the interests of any other State to its own. There was one particular Member State in the Organization that was not only resorting to such measures with increasing frequency, but was also calling on other States to similarly violate international law. More than 20 countries were affected by the illegal and arbitrary coercive measures imposed by that one single State, including his own country.

[...] the sanctions imposed on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela fit the definition of collective punishment of the civilian population as described both in the Geneva Conventions relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts of 1949 and the Hague Convention respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land of 1899. [...]”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, paras. 38-39)

**2023.** “[...] No State had the authority to impose unilateral coercive measures on any other, and yet certain Member States were doing so on a growing, systematic, arbitrary and illegal basis. Her country faced systematic aggression in the form of the economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed by the Government of the United States in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the precepts of international law. Cruel and inhumane, sanctions were imposed for the purpose of inflicting pain and suffering on entire peoples and deliberately undermining their inalienable right to development.

A policy of economic terrorism was depriving her country of its sovereign resources, including gold reserves held with the Bank of England and foreign assets, and hindering its access to special drawing rights through the International Monetary Fund. Once again, the intention was to perpetrate an act of extermination against the people of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, which constituted a crime against humanity under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. [...]

For such reasons, her delegation was reiterating its call for the total, immediate and unconditional abandonment of sanctions, which were an exercise in neocolonial domination. [...]”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, paras. 14-17)

“The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela rejects the imposition of unilateral coercive measures as an instrument of political and economic coercion on developing countries or against any sovereign State, because such measures severely affect the standards of living and human rights of impacted countries.

The widespread use of unilateral sanctions and other punitive or restrictive measures constitute a serious violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and infringe upon the sovereignty of States. The General Assembly has described these measures as being illegal and violative in various resolutions. [...]

The blocking of assets and impediments to bank transfers have caused a breakdown in the diplomacy of peace and cooperation, which has affected the disposition of the Government of Venezuela to maintain relations of sovereign equality between States. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, pp. 18-20)

## WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES

---

### Australia

**2021.** Position of United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and Ukraine: “[...] sanctions were a legitimate tool to preserve peace and the rule of law, uphold human rights and strengthen international security. [...]

Australia, Canada, Ukraine and the United Kingdom imposed carefully targeted and proportionate sanctions designed to prevent serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation, terrorism and other situations of international concern. They were transparent, allowed for due process protections and were neither inconsistent nor in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 19-20)

### Canada

**2021.** Position of United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and Ukraine: “[...] sanctions were a legitimate tool to preserve peace and the rule of law, uphold human rights and strengthen international security. [...]

Australia, Canada, Ukraine and the United Kingdom imposed carefully targeted and proportionate sanctions designed to prevent serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation, terrorism and other situations of international concern. They were transparent, allowed for due process protections and were neither inconsistent nor in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 19-20)

### Iceland

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

 Liechtenstein

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

 Türkiye

**2013.** “Turkey does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. [...]

Unilateral sanctions, especially those with extraterritorial effects, impact not only the targeted countries, but third countries as well, having an adverse effect on international trade and economic cooperation on a global scale. [...]

We believe that sanctions applied in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations are an important tool for the maintenance of international peace and security. To be credible and effective, they must be targeted carefully and take into account applicable rights of due process for the individuals concerned and the need to minimize their adverse consequences for third parties. In this sense, “smart sanctions”, which target the specific regimes in countries without harming the civilian populations, should be at the heart of the United Nations sanctions system”. (A/68/218, 29 July 2013, p. 16)

**2015.** “Turkey does not agree with the imposition of unilateral economic measures as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries. Only in certain cases may “smart/targeted sanctions” be useful.

Turkey has been affected by economic sanctions during the period 2012 -2014. Unilateral sanctions, especially those with extraterritorial effects, impact not only the targeted countries, but third countries as well, having an adverse effect on regional economic cooperation, as well as international trade and economic cooperation on a global scale. [...]

We believe that sanctions applied in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations are an important tool for the maintenance of international peace and

security. To be credible and effective, they must be targeted carefully and take into account the applicable rights of due process for the individuals concerned and the need to minimize their adverse consequences for third parties. In this sense, “smart sanctions”, which target the specific regimes in countries without harming the civilian populations, should be at the heart of the United Nations sanctions system. [...]”. (A/70/152, 16 June 2015, pp. 15-16)

**2019.** “Turkey does not agree the imposition of unilateral measures. It believes international problems and/or conflicts need collective action and responses with the participation of the international community as a whole. [...]

Given the interconnected nature of the international economy and trade, unilateral measures have implications not only on the countries that the measures are imposed on, but also on all countries around the world. Besides, past experiences have proved that unilateral measures also have the potential to harm the country that is imposing those measures”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 19)

**2023.** “Regardless of the targeted country in question, Türkiye in principle enforces sanctions only imposed by the Security Council and does not automatically participate in unilateral restrictive measures and sanctions. Türkiye is of the opinion that unilateral sanctions hardly serve their purpose. To the contrary, most unilateral sanctions regimes prove to be counterproductive as they often harm the people rather than the regime of the targeted country.

While adopting this principled stance on unilateral sanctions, Türkiye takes the necessary measures to prevent attempts to bypass, evade or circumvent unilateral sanctions through Türkiye’s economic and commercial relations with the third parties.

[...] Türkiye gives due consideration to the potential exposure of the various sectors of its economy to third-party sanctions. The Turkish private sector could display overcompliance due to the chilling effect of the sanctions. [...]”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 17)

## United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

**2021.** Position of United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and Ukraine: “[...] sanctions were a legitimate tool to preserve peace and the rule of law, uphold human rights and strengthen international security. [...]

Australia, Canada, Ukraine and the United Kingdom imposed carefully targeted and proportionate sanctions designed to prevent serious human rights violations, weapons proliferation, terrorism and other situations of international concern. They were transparent, allowed for due process protections and were neither inconsistent nor in conflict with the Charter of the United Nations. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 19-20)

**2023.** “[...] Targeted sanctions were one part of a comprehensive and proportionate foreign policy strategy, and were imposed by many Member States, including developing countries and regional bodies. They served to deter and constrain serious

human rights violations, breaches of international law, proliferation and the obstruction of peace processes. The Charter of the United Nations provided no blanket prohibition on sanctions applied for such purposes, which could be entirely consistent with the purposes and principles of the Organization. Sanctions imposed by the United Kingdom provided for a range of exceptions, including in relation to medicine, food and humanitarian assistance. [...]”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, para. 22)

## United States of America

**2013.** “[...] each Member State had the sovereign right to decide how it conducted trade with other countries, including by restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, were often a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. The United States considered its sanctions carefully and used them with specific objectives in mind, including as a means to promote a return to the rule of law or democracy or in response to threats to international security. The United States was within its rights in using its trade and commercial policy as tools for noble objectives. In effect, the draft resolution sought to limit the international community’s ability to respond by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or global security. [...]”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 8)

**2015.** “[...] each Member State had the sovereign right to decide how it conducted trade with other countries, including by restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, were often a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. The United States considered its sanctions carefully and used them with specific objectives in mind, including as a means to promote a return to the rule of law or democracy, out of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, or in response to threats to international security. The United States was within its rights in using its trade and commercial policy as tools for noble objectives. In effect, the draft resolution sought to limit the international community’s ability to respond by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or global security. The United States had therefore requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and voted against it”. (A/C.2/70/SR.31, 12 November 2015, para. 20)

**2017.** “[...] each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, which included restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, could be a means of achieving foreign policy objectives. When the United States had applied sanctions, it had been with specific objectives in mind, including to promote the rule of law, democracy, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to prevent threats to international security. The United States was within its rights to use its trade and commercial policy to achieve such objectives. By adopting draft resolution A/C.2/72/L.7, the Committee, in effect, was purporting to limit the international community’s ability to respond effectively and by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or world security. Targeted economic sanctions

could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 11)

“Regarding unilateral economic measures, the United States believed that economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force. Each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, and that included restricting trade in certain circumstances. The United States was within its rights to utilize its trade and commercial policy tools to achieve its national security and foreign policy objectives”. (A/C.2/72/SR.27, 30 November 2017, para. 18)

**2019.** “[...] each Member State had the sovereign right to determine how it conducted trade with other countries, which included restricting trade in certain circumstances. Economic sanctions, whether domestic or multilateral, could be a successful means of achieving foreign policy objectives. When the United States had applied sanctions, it had been with specific objectives in mind, including to promote a return to the rule of law, democracy, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to prevent threats to international security. The United States was within its rights to use its trade and commercial policy to achieve such objectives. If the draft resolution were adopted, the Committee would, in effect, be purporting to limit the international community’s ability to respond effectively and by non-violent means to threats to democracy, human rights or world security. Targeted economic sanctions could be an appropriate, effective and legitimate alternative to the use of force. [...]”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 27)

**2021.** “[...] Sanctions were an appropriate, effective, peaceful and legitimate tool for addressing threats to peace and security. They could be used to promote accountability for those who abused human rights, undermined democracy or engaged in corrupt activities. In cases where the United States had applied sanctions, it had done so with specific objectives, including the promotion of democratic systems, the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, or to respond to security threats. His country would continue to take measures to minimize the unintended economic, humanitarian or political consequences of sanctions and to support the flow of legitimate humanitarian goods and assistance”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, para. 2)

**2023.** United States of America “had consistently opposed the draft resolution in previous years and would continue to do so. Sanctions were an appropriate, effective, peaceful and legitimate tool for addressing threats to peace and security. They could be used to promote accountability for those who abused human rights, undermined democracy or engaged in corrupt activities. In cases where the United States had applied sanctions, it had done so with specific objectives, including the promotion of democratic systems, the rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, or to respond to security threats. [...]”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, para. 12)

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS OF STATES

---

### European Union (EU)

**2013.** “[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Iceland, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; the stabilization and association process countries Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that his delegation and those of the countries on whose behalf he spoke had abstained in the vote. Unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/68/SR.36, 14 November 2013, para. 9)

**2015.** “[...] unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law and the international contractual obligations of the State applying them, together with the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. Such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union remained committed to the use of sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach, which should include political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, coercive measures in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/70/SR.31, 12 November 2015, para. 21).

**2017.** “[...] the European Union considers that in appropriate circumstances, targeted economic measures imposed in accordance with international law are a legitimate part of the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union.

Targeted economic measures may be used to seek to prevent activities in third countries, including proliferation of serious violations of human rights, which pose a threat to the security of the European Union and its member States.

Where economic measures are imposed, the European Union targets these measures to limit the impact as far as possible on the civilian population. In addition, the European Union includes exemptions or derogations from economic measures for humanitarian purposes”. (A/72/307, 9 August 2017, p. 9)



“[...] speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, as well as the candidate countries Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro; the stabilisation and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and in addition Georgia, said that the European Union had abstained in the vote. The European Union and its member States believed that unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/72/SR.25, 30 November 2017, para. 10)

**2019.** “The key principles guiding European Union restrictive measures are compliance with international law and human rights, proportionality and their targeted nature. These principles are set out in the 2004 European Union Basic Principles on the Use of Restrictive Measures (Sanctions) and in the European Union Guidelines on Implementation and Evaluation of Restrictive Measures, both public documents. The European Union reiterates that the restrictive measures it imposes autonomously are fully compliant with international law and are a legitimate part of its Common Foreign and Security Policy.

The European Union condemns the application of unilateral restrictive measures that have extraterritorial effects contrary to international law.

Regarding proportionality and the targeted nature of restrictive measures, the European Union’s principled approach is that the restrictive measures should always be proportionate to the objectives they seek to achieve and should be targeted in a way that has maximum impact on those whose behaviour is to be influenced by the measures. Targeting should reduce to the maximum extent possible any adverse humanitarian effects or unintended consequences for persons not targeted or for neighbouring countries. [...]”. (A/74/264, 31 July 2019, p. 20)

Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] Unilateral economic measures must respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of WTO, where applicable. However, such measures were admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary to combat terrorism or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance. The European Union and its member States were committed to using sanctions as part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives, conditionality and even, as a

last resort, the use of coercive measures, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations”. (A/C.2/74/SR.23, 21 November 2019, para. 31)

**2021.** “The member States of the European Union abstained from the adoption of the resolution in December 2019. In the European Union explanation of vote at the time, the Union and its member States expressed the view that unilateral economic measures should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization, where applicable. They further stated the Union and its member States consider that such unilateral economic measures are admissible in certain circumstances, in particular when necessary in order to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or to uphold respect for human rights, democracy, the rule of law and good governance.

The European Union works continuously to support the United Nations and to fulfil its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. It implements all sanctions imposed by the Security Council. In addition, the Union may reinforce United Nations sanctions by applying additional measures. Finally, where the Union deems it necessary, it may decide to establish its own sanctions regimes. This is often case when serious human rights violations or abuses continue unabated, such as in Syria, Myanmar and Belarus.

Recalling the key principles underpinning the use of restrictive measures (sanctions) by the European Union:

- European Union sanctions comply with international law, including the obligations stemming from international human rights law, international humanitarian law and international refugee law, and they are part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach.
- European Union autonomous sanctions are applied in the territory of the Union and by European Union persons and entities and do not have an extraterritorial application.
- European Union sanctions are not punitive, retaliatory or coercive in nature, but are designed to bring about a change in policy or activity by the target country, entities or individuals. Therefore, Union measures are always targeted at such policies or activities, the means to conduct them and those responsible for them. Furthermore, Union sanctions are reversible and proportionate to the objectives that they seek to achieve.
- Where persons and entities are targeted by sanctions, their fundamental rights are respected, as required in European Union treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, including through the possibility to challenge the listing decisions before the European Court of Justice. [...]”. (A/76/310, 30 October 2021, pp. 17-19)

**2021.** Position of the European Union and its member States; the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Republic of Moldova: “[...] The European Union and its member States continued to consider restrictive measures to be an important tool to fight terrorism and the proliferation of weapons

of mass destruction and to uphold respect for democracy, the rule of law, good governance and human rights. They were part of an integrated, comprehensive policy approach which included political dialogue, incentives and conditionality.

States had primary responsibility to respect, protect and fulfil human rights. The European Union was committed to using restrictive measures as a tool of its Common Foreign and Security Policy, whose core objectives included defending European Union values and interests, preserving peace, strengthening international security and – a key priority – consolidating respect for human rights.

Sanctions should respect the principles of international law, including the international contractual obligations of the State applying them and the rules of the World Trade Organization. The European Union imposed restrictive measures in full conformity with its obligations under international law, and it made every effort to avoid any unintended negative impact on exclusively humanitarian activities carried out by impartial humanitarian actors in accordance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law. European Union sanctions were always targeted and carefully calibrated. [...]

The European Union objected to efforts to confuse or create an equivalence between “unilateral measures” and “unilateral coercive measures” and therefore considered the reference to the Bridgetown Covenant inappropriate. [...]”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, paras. 9-13)

**2023.** “[...] Many countries, including emerging and developing countries, used unilateral economic measures. It was therefore important to distinguish between them on the basis of their purposes, design and outcomes. The restrictive measures imposed by the European Union were a legitimate and lawful part of its wider policy approach. They served to uphold its values and interests, protect peace, support democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law, and strengthen international security.

The European Union imposed restrictive measures, among other cases, in response to serious violations of international law, such as the unprovoked war of aggression perpetrated by Russia against Ukraine. Its measures were temporary, selective and carefully calibrated to target those responsible for the relevant policies or actions, as well as always being consistent with international law and the Charter of the United Nations. To ensure full compliance with humanitarian principles and international humanitarian law, the restrictions imposed by the European Union systematically included humanitarian exceptions. The European Union embraced transparency regarding such measures and their use, and was mindful of unintended consequences. Such measures could be challenged in court and reversed when circumstances so dictated.

The States members of the European Union recognized that unilateral economic measures could have broader consequences when they were applied in a manner incompatible with international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and if they were not subject to legal challenge or reversal. [...], in recognition of the importance of the draft resolution for many of its partners, which were extremely

concerned about unilateral measures that contravened international law and the Charter of the United Nations, the European Union had decided to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole”. (A/C.2/78/SR.24, 21 November 2023, paras. 26-28)

“The European Union decides sovereignly on its foreign and security policy and adopts within its jurisdiction any measure it considers necessary to advance its foreign policy interests, in full compliance with its international obligations. The Union foreign and security policy has among its objectives to consolidate democracy, rule of law, human rights and the principles of international law, to maintain peace, prevent conflicts and consolidate international security, in conformity with the objectives and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Union restrictive measures are peaceful means aiming to bring about a change in policy or activity by a given country, part of country, government, entities or individuals, in line with the Union’s foreign policy objectives. The Union’s restrictive measures are targeted, temporary measures, which are regularly reviewed and adapted to take into account developments on the ground. They are of a temporary and reversible nature”. (A/78/506, 4 October 2023, p. 11)

### Group of 77 and China

The Group of 77 and China is formed by 134 States<sup>2</sup>.

**2019.** “[...] the imposition of coercive economic measures against developing countries, including unilateral sanctions, did not contribute to economic and social development and, moreover, constituted a major obstacle to achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Such actions not only undermined the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in international law, but also severely threatened freedom of trade and investment. They also disproportionately affected the most vulnerable segments of society. The international community was called upon to adopt urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of unilateral coercive economic measures”. (A/C.2/74/SR.22, 14 November 2019, para. 3)

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

## 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.<sup>3</sup>

**2021.** “[...] unilateral coercive measures of an economic or political character had become the favourite tool of certain States for bending the sovereign will of States to their own advantage. The use of unilateral coercive measures was a clear violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, which designated the Security Council as the sole body with the authority to impose sanctions. Furthermore, because of their broad scope and extraterritorial nature, such measures had a negative impact on the enjoyment and realization of all human rights, including the right to development, which had been further threatened by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic”. (A/C.2/76/SR.10, 23 November 2021, para. 3)

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

