I have the honor to deliver this statement on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

At the outset, I would like to welcome the organization of the panel and thank all Panelists and the Moderator for their valuable contribution.

Mr. President,

Notwithstanding the theoretical controversy over the concept of the unilateral coercive measures and the different political positions we may have, it is an established fact of today that those measures have direct negative impacts on the enjoyment of human rights of peoples, especially the poorest ones, around the globe. We cannot and should not deny this unignorable fact by simply saying that the HRC is not an appropriate platform to discuss this matter. If this Council is not
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competent to discuss the human rights dimension of the acts of member states, especially their negative impacts on the human rights, what other functions the Council should have to be relevant? Let us remind ourselves that pursuing old approaches based on coercion and exclusion has proved, time and again, to be pointless and futile.

As a matter of fact, unilateral coercive measures, in particular in the form of economic sanctions, have far-reaching implications for the human rights of the general population of target States. The primary victims of these measures are often the most vulnerable classes who suffer more acutely as a result of denial of access to life-saving equipment and medications, basic food products and educational equipment while others are prevented from joining the job market.

It is also unfortunate that the most current unilateral coercive measures have been imposed on developing countries, at great cost, in terms of the human rights of the poorest and most vulnerable groups, by developed countries which praise themselves as the self-
proclaimed guardian of the temple of human rights. Moreover, long-term unilateral coercive measures result in social problems and raise humanitarian concerns in relation to the most vulnerable segments of society. Also, the measures in question often extend extraterritorial application of domestic rules, adversely affecting the interests of third States and their nationals.

This move is clearly in contradiction with the main objectives and principles of UN enshrined in its Charter. Many basic documents have also explicitly emphasized that, no State may use or encourage the use of any type of measure, including but not limited to economic or political measures, to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind. Moreover, the World Conference on Human Rights held in 1993 calls upon States to refrain from any unilateral measure that creates obstacles to trade relations among States and impedes the full realization of human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human
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rights instruments, in particular the rights of everyone to a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being.

Accordingly, NAM reiterates that states must refrain from adopting unilateral coercive measures as it breaches their human rights obligations under treaty or customary international law. In this regard, while emphasizing on the importance of OHCHR role in addressing the challenges arising from UCM and its negative impact on human rights of people; NAM emphasize on the urgent need for having an independent mechanism of the UN machinery for the victims of unilateral coercive measure to address the issues of remedies and redress with a view to promote accountability and reparations.

Thank you.