



General Assembly

Distr.: General
5 September 2016

English only

Human Rights Council

Thirty-third session

Agenda item 3

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,
political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

Written statement* submitted by the Maarij Foundation for Peace and Development, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[28 August 2016]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.16-15334(E)



* 1 6 1 5 3 3 4 *

Please recycle



The impact of unilateral coercive measures against Sudan

Last year's General Assembly resolution recalled "no State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind..."

Economic sanctions are unilateral action that falls under what is known as one-sided coercive measures, used by the great powers against a state for the purposes of political gains, or to remove the existing regime in that country or put pressure on it.

Maarij notes with great concern that, for the past two decades, Sudan has been subjected to economic sanctions by the United States, and later adhered to by the European Union and many international financial institutions.

The US sanctions resulting from the existence of general laws in force, obliges the US administration to the implementation of sanctions on a particular country if that country fell under specific categories, such as defaulting on a debt, a lack of respect for the freedom of religious or other justifications.

The American sanctions specifically targeted Sudan and were issued as executive orders through the executive body, or legislation from Congress.

Some of the super powers have used multiple forms of economic sanctions, as a tool to punish regimes that do not comply with them whether this excuse was acceptable or not, legitimate or illegitimate, making people suffer the unjust consequences of the economic sanctions

This double standard in the perception of human rights, as well as the devastating effects of the application of economic sanctions against nations such as the economic sanctions imposed on countries like (Libya, Sudan, Syria, Zimbabwe, Somalia, South Africa and others), mean that the blockade in the traditional concept is based on cutting international communication, or monitoring it. Cutting communications in this sense aims to ensure the effectiveness of the blockade. The blockade mostly includes a more general and binding actions, so the economic embargo means the imposition of much wider sanctions than bans, because it aims to cut off all economic and financial relations. It is common that the blockade is the use of force to enforce the respect of a specific ban.

Sudan Central Bank has suffered tremendously because of the lack of dollar revenues, and the difficulties in transferring of external financial transactions by the banks that do not comply with the US sanctions, which increased the cost of these transactions, as well as the loss of funds belong to the government of Sudan, Sudanese companies or individuals, the United States has reserved.

Sanctions also made some foreign commercial banks abandon Sudan, such as Citibank, the American bank which left Sudan in 1998, as well as some other foreign companies working in the fields of telecommunications, oil, etc. The sanctions have devastating effects on the national sector, especially small investors, increased the cost of business achievement, and the loss of external funding opportunities.

Before the sanctions, the performance of economic indicators in Sudan was good during the nineties, and its economy was attractive for investment.

Sudan was the second country in the region in attracting investments, but Sudan economy and its indicators began to decline after the sanctions, and the value of its national currency deteriorated from 2 Sudanese pounds against the dollar to nearly sixteen pounds now. The rate of growth also declined from 7% per year on average, to less than 3.4%.

Sanctions badly affected some vital sectors, such as the agricultural sector, upon which 70% of the population depend on, and representing more than 30% of GDP.

At the level of the oil and mining sector, the sanctions have led to the loss of the opportunity to acquire advanced American technology. The American sanctions affected 164 Sudanese companies, mostly working in the field of petroleum and petrochemicals.

The greatest danger which the Americans seem to ignore, is the fact that their unjustified sanctions against Sudan are encouraging the growth and spread of extremism and terrorism among young people, which contribute to factors that threaten national and regional security.

The sanctions also increase the chances of human trafficking and the organized crimes, as well as the use of drugs among young people due to psychological problems caused by unemployment, vacancy and war.

Sanctions threaten global security and also the future security, especially regarding the use of resources and protection of the environment and radiation control.

On the third day of November every year, Sudan marks the annual renewal of American sanctions against it, under pretexts and false pretenses by the United States that Sudan is sponsoring terrorism, restricts public freedoms, and works to raise wars and tension in the region.

In conclusion, it is crystal clear that the US is using the sanctions as a bargaining chip and a pressure tool against Sudan, despite all the reforms the country has made in all levels, political, economical and social.
