

## **Part III**

# **Purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations**

---

## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introductory note . . . . .	215
I. Principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples under Article 1, paragraph 2 . . . . .	216
Note . . . . .	216
A. Decisions relating to Article 1 (2) . . . . .	216
B. Constitutional discussion relating to Article 1 (2) . . . . .	217
C. Invocation of the principle enshrined in Article 1 (2) in communications . . . . .	219
II. Prohibition of the threat or use of force under Article 2, paragraph 4 . . . . .	219
Note . . . . .	219
A. Decisions relating to Article 2 (4) . . . . .	219
B. Constitutional discussion relating to Article 2 (4) . . . . .	222
C. Invocation of the principle enshrined in Article 2 (4) in communications . . . . .	226
III. Obligation under Article 2, paragraph 5, to refrain from assisting the target of enforcement action . . . . .	226
Note . . . . .	226
Decisions relating to Article 2 (5) . . . . .	227
IV. Non-intervention in the internal affairs of States by the United Nations under Article 2, paragraph 7 . . . . .	228
Note . . . . .	228
A. Decisions relating to Article 2 (7) . . . . .	228
B. Constitutional discussion relating to Article 2 (7) . . . . .	228
C. Invocation of the principle enshrined in Article 2 (7) in communications . . . . .	229

---

## **Introductory note**

Part III covers the consideration by the Security Council of Articles contained in Chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations relating to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, namely Articles 1 (2), 2 (4), 2 (5) and 2 (7). Part III consists of four sections. Section I covers material relating to the principle of self-determination of peoples under Article 1 (2) of the Charter. Section II features material relevant to the prohibition of the use of force or the threat of the use of force as enshrined in Article 2 (4). Section III covers the obligation of States to refrain from assisting a target of the Council's enforcement action as stipulated in Article 2 (5). Section IV deals with the Council's consideration of the principle of non-intervention by the United Nations in the internal affairs of States, as regulated in Article 2 (7).

In 2014 and 2015, the Council explicitly invoked all the above-mentioned Articles in a resolution concerning the protection of civilians in armed conflict, and discussed the application and interpretation of those Articles in discharging its functions in maintaining international peace and security. The Council deliberated on the principle of self-determination and on the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in connection with the tensions that erupted in Ukraine in 2014, in particular in the context of the referendum held in Crimea on 16 March 2014. The same two principles were the subject of debates in the Council under the item entitled "Maintenance of international peace and security". Speakers also reflected upon the principle of non-intervention by the United Nations in the internal affairs of States during the Council's deliberations on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.

---

## I. Principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples under Article 1, paragraph 2

Article 1, paragraph 2

[The Purposes of the United Nations are:]

*To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.*

### Note

Section I concerns the practice of the Security Council with regard to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as enshrined in Article 1 (2) of the Charter of the United Nations and focuses on the actions of the Council in this regard. Subsection A features decisions relevant to the principle enshrined in Article 1 (2). Subsection B delineates references made to Article 1 (2) and the principle of self-determination in Council discussions during the reporting period. Subsection C sets out instances in which the principle of self-determination was invoked in communications to the Council.

### A. Decisions relating to Article 1 (2)

During the period under review, the Security Council made only one explicit reference to Article 1 (2) of the Charter, in a resolution adopted under the item entitled “Protection of civilians in armed conflict”. The meeting at which the resolution was adopted was held under the sub-item “The protection of journalists in conflict situations”. In the preamble to the resolution, the Council reaffirmed its commitment to the purposes of the Charter as set out in Article 1, paragraphs 1 to 4, and to the principles of the Charter as set out in Article 2, paragraphs 1 to 7, including its commitment to the principles of the political independence, sovereign equality and territorial integrity of all States and respect for the sovereignty of all States.<sup>1</sup>

In connection with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples included in Article 1 (2), the Council also made reference to the decision by the Ngok Dinka to conduct a “unilateral” community referendum in Abyei and the envisaged referendum in Western Sahara (see table 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> Resolution 2222 (2015), third preambular paragraph; see also part III, sects. II.A, III and IV.A.

Table 1  
Decisions containing implicit references to Article 1 (2)

Decision and date	Provision
<b>Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan</b>	
Resolution 2156 (2014) 29 May 2014	Noting that the continued delay in establishing the temporary institutions and resolving the final status of Abyei contributes to tension in the region, emphasizing the importance of all parties refraining from any unilateral action to aggravate intercommunal relations within the Abyei Area, and expressing concern over the continued implications of what the Peace and Security Council described in its press statement of 6 November 2013 as “the decision by the Ngok Dinka to conduct a unilateral referendum” (nineteenth preambular paragraph)  <i>See also see resolution 2179 (2014), nineteenth preambular paragraph; resolution 2205 (2015), eighteenth preambular paragraph; resolution 2230 (2015), eighteenth preambular paragraph; and resolution 2251 (2015), eighteenth preambular paragraph</i>
<b>The situation concerning Western Sahara</b>	
Resolution 2152 (2014) 29 April 2014	Reaffirming its commitment to assist the parties to achieve a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution which will provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara in the context of arrangements consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, and noting the role and responsibilities of the parties in this respect (third preambular paragraph)

Decision and date

Provision

*See also resolution 2218 (2015), third preambular paragraph*

Calls upon the parties to continue negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General without preconditions and in good faith, taking into account the efforts made since 2006 and subsequent developments, with a view to achieving a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution, which will provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara in the context of arrangements consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, and notes the role and responsibilities of the parties in this respect (para. 7)

*See also resolution 2218 (2015), para. 7*

## B. Constitutional discussion relating to Article 1 (2)

During the period under review, Article 1 (2) was explicitly invoked only once in the deliberations of the Security Council. At the 7539th meeting, an open debate under the item entitled “Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)”, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, called upon the Council to fully take into account the recommendations of the General Assembly on matters relating to international peace and security, “consistent with paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter”.<sup>2</sup>

The situation relating to Crimea, considered under two separate items during the period under review,<sup>3</sup> gave rise to a number of discussions in the Council on the question of self-determination under the item entitled “Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)” (see case 1). Under the presidency of China, the principles of self-determination and sovereign equality of nations were the subject of a discussion under the item entitled “Maintenance of international peace and security” (case 2). The principle

of self-determination was also mentioned in debates of the Council under other items, but none of those debates amounted to a constitutional discussion.

### Case 1 Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)

At its 7134th meeting, on 13 March 2014, the Council held an open debate under the item entitled “Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)” in connection with the then upcoming referendum in Crimea. The representative of the Russian Federation opined that “one must seek the right balance between the principles of territorial integrity and the right to self-determination”. He said that the achievement of the right to self-determination in the form of separation from an existing State was an extraordinary measure, which in this case arose as a result of the legal vacuum created by the “violent coup against the legitimate Government carried out by national radicals in Kyiv” and their direct threats to impose their order throughout the territory of Ukraine.<sup>4</sup> By contrast, a number of speakers submitted that the referendum was in violation of the Constitution of Ukraine.<sup>5</sup> The representative of the United States stated that “any referendum on Crimea must be conducted

<sup>2</sup> S/PV.7539 (Resumption1), p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Items entitled “Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)” and “Letter dated 13 April 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/264)”.

<sup>4</sup> S/PV.7134, p. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 4 (Luxembourg); p. 6 (United States); p. 7 (United Kingdom); p. 12 (Nigeria); p. 13 (Australia); and p. 17 (Lithuania).

within the bounds of Ukrainian law”,<sup>6</sup> while the representative of the United Kingdom was of the view that the referendum was illegal and could lead to destabilization “with serious implications” for the Charter and international norms. He urged the Council to make clear that “any attempt to modify Ukraine’s borders through unlawful means” would not be tolerated.<sup>7</sup>

On 15 March 2014, at its 7138th meeting, held under the same item, the Council had before it a draft resolution sponsored by 42 Member States.<sup>8</sup> Before the vote on the draft resolution, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that the philosophy of the sponsors of the draft resolution ran counter to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. He said that, after the fall of the Soviet Union, for more than 20 years Crimea had attempted to exercise its right to self-determination.<sup>9</sup> The draft resolution, by which the Council would have declared that the referendum to be held on 16 March 2014 in Crimea could have “no validity” and could not form the basis for any alteration of the status of Crimea, was not adopted, owing to the negative vote of the Russian Federation.

On 19 March 2014, at the 7144th meeting, the representative of the Russian Federation stated that “the people of Crimea have fulfilled what is enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations ... their right to self-determination”.<sup>10</sup> In response, many speakers questioned the validity of the referendum and denounced the annexation of part of Ukraine by the Russian Federation.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> [S/2014/189](#).

<sup>9</sup> [S/PV.7138](#), p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> [S/PV.7144](#), p. 8.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6 (Ukraine, France); p.11 (United States, Republic of Korea); p.13 (Australia); p. 15 (United Kingdom); p. 16 (Lithuania); and p. 17 (Jordan, Luxembourg).

## Case 2

### **Maintenance of international peace and security: reflect on history, reaffirm the strong commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations**

On 23 February 2015, under the presidency of China, the Council held its 7389th meeting under the item entitled “Maintenance of international peace and security” and the sub-item, “Reflect on history, reaffirm the strong commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations”. Several speakers affirmed the importance of the principle of self-determination. The representative of the Russian Federation said that Member States must recognize the right of people to independently decide their future without external interference.<sup>12</sup> Reflecting on the history since the end of the Second World War, the representative of Chad said that the international community’s support for peoples’ right to self-determination had enabled the United Nations to serve as the framework for the independence of all new States.<sup>13</sup> The representative of Angola stated that the Charter embodied a new type of relations among nations and peoples in the post-war era, which included the right of all peoples to self-determination.<sup>14</sup> The representative of Cuba asserted that the denial of peoples’ right to self-determination constituted a serious violation of the right to peace, adding that the philosophy of regime change was “a clear attack against peoples’ self-determination”.<sup>15</sup> The representative of Mexico opined that the self-determination of peoples was one of the principles on which collective security was based.<sup>16</sup> The representative of Pakistan considered that the fulfilment of the inalienable rights of all peoples, especially the right to self-determination, would pave the way for the uniform implementation of Security Council resolutions.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> [S/PV.7389](#), p. 6.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

### C. Invocation of the principle enshrined in Article 1 (2) in communications

During the period under review, no explicit reference was made to Article 1 (2) in the communications to the Council. The principle of self-determination was however invoked in many communications addressed to or brought to the attention of the Council. The largest number of communications related to Western Sahara,<sup>18</sup> the

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, S/2015/240; S/2015/256; S/2015/515, annex, para. 18; S/2015/786; S/2015/804; and S/2015/888.

Middle East, including the Palestinian question,<sup>19</sup> and Nagorno-Karabakh.<sup>20</sup> A few references were also made to the right of self-determination in the reports of the Secretary-General on the situation concerning Western Sahara.<sup>21</sup> In addition, in a letter dated 12 February 2015 from the representative of the Russian Federation to the Secretary-General, reference was made to “the right to linguistic self-determination”.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, S/2014/347; S/2014/514, annex; S/2015/213; S/2015/497, annex; S/2015/521; S/2015/616; S/2015/861; and S/2015/925.

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, S/2014/577; S/2015/71; S/2015/259; and S/2015/781, annex.

<sup>21</sup> See, for example, S/2014/258 and S/2015/246.

<sup>22</sup> S/2015/110, annex II.

## II. Prohibition of the threat or use of force under Article 2, paragraph 4

### *Article 2, paragraph 4*

*All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.*

### Note

Section II covers the practice of the Security Council concerning the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force under Article 2 (4) of the Charter. Subsection A highlights explicit and implicit references to Article 2 (4) in decisions adopted by the Council. Subsection B deals with constitutional discussions relating to the threat or use of force. Subsection C covers explicit and implicit references in communications to the Council to the principle enshrined in Article 2 (4).

### A. Decisions relating to Article 2 (4)

During the period under review, the Security Council made only one explicit reference to Article 2 (4) of the Charter, in a resolution concerning the protection of civilians in armed conflict, in which the Council

reaffirmed its commitment to the principles enshrined in Article 2, paragraphs 1 to 7, of the Charter, including its commitment to the principles of the political independence, sovereign equality and territorial integrity of all States and respect for the sovereignty of all States.<sup>23</sup>

During the period under review, in a number of its decisions, the Council underlined the principles of Article 2 (4) by (a) reaffirming the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations, (b) reiterating the importance of good-neighbourliness and non-interference by States in the internal affairs of others, (c) calling for the cessation of support by States to armed groups engaged in destabilizing national and regional peace and security, and (d) calling on parties to withdraw all military forces from a disputed area or occupied territories. The four themes are covered below.

### **Affirmation of the principle of the non-threat or non-use of force in international relations**

During 2014 and 2015, the Council stressed, as in previous periods, the importance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force against other Member States in many of its decisions, in particular those concerning

<sup>23</sup> Resolution 2222 (2015), third preambular paragraph; see also part III, sects. I.A, III and IV.A.

the situation in the Middle East and the territorial boundary issues between the Sudan and South Sudan (see table 2).

Table 2

**Decisions affirming the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations**

---

*Decision and date*

*Provision*

---

**The situation in the Middle East**

Resolution [2163 \(2014\)](#)  
25 June 2014

Stressing that both parties must abide by the terms of the disengagement of forces agreement of 31 May 1974 between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic and scrupulously observe the ceasefire (third preambular paragraph)

*See also S/PRST/2014/19, first paragraph; resolution [2192 \(2014\)](#), third preambular paragraph; resolution [2229 \(2015\)](#), third preambular paragraph; and resolution [2257 \(2015\)](#), third preambular paragraph*

[S/PRST/2015/7](#)  
19 March 2015

The Council expresses its deep concern following the recent incidents which occurred across the Blue Line and in the area of operation of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. The Council stresses that such violence and the presence of unauthorized weapons in the area of operation of the Force violates resolution [1701 \(2006\)](#) and the cessation of hostilities. It underlines the risk that such events could lead to a new conflict that none of the parties or the region can afford. It urges all parties to make every effort to ensure that the cessation of hostilities is sustained, exercise maximum calm and restraint and refrain from any action or rhetoric that could jeopardize the cessation of hostilities or destabilize the region (third paragraph)

Resolution [2216 \(2015\)](#)  
14 April 2015

Demands that all Yemeni parties, in particular the Houthis, fully implement resolution [2201 \(2015\)](#) and refrain from further unilateral actions that could undermine the political transition in Yemen, and further demands that the Houthis immediately and unconditionally:

...

(e) refrain from any provocation or threats to neighbouring States, including through acquiring surface-to-surface missiles and stockpiling weapons in any bordering territory of a neighbouring State (para. 1 (e))

**Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan**

Resolution [2156 \(2014\)](#)  
29 May 2014

Reiterating that the territorial boundaries of States shall not be altered by force and that any territorial disputes shall be settled exclusively by peaceful means (third preambular paragraph)

*See also resolution [2205 \(2015\)](#), third preambular paragraph; resolution [2230 \(2015\)](#), third preambular paragraph; and resolution [2251 \(2015\)](#), third preambular paragraph*

Stressing that both countries will have much to gain if they show restraint and choose the path of dialogue instead of resorting to violence or provocations (eleventh preambular paragraph)

*See also resolution [2205 \(2015\)](#), twelfth preambular paragraph; resolution [2230 \(2015\)](#), twelfth preambular paragraph; and resolution [2251 \(2015\)](#), twelfth preambular paragraph*

---



**Reiteration of the principles of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and regional cooperation among States**

In 2014 and 2015, the Council reiterated in several of its decisions the principles enshrined in Article 2 (4) of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and regional cooperation, in particular with regard to

the situations in the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, the Middle East and the Sudan and South Sudan. In those decisions the Council also reaffirmed its commitment to the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of those States (see table 3).

Table 3

**Decisions affirming the principle of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and regional cooperation among States**

<i>Decision and date</i>	<i>Provision</i>
<b>The situation in the Central African Republic</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2134 (2014)</a> 28 January 2014	Reaffirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Central African Republic, and recalling the importance of the principles of non-interference, good-neighbourliness and regional cooperation (second preambular paragraph)  <i>See also resolution <a href="#">2149 (2014)</a>, second preambular paragraph; resolution <a href="#">2196 (2015)</a>, second preambular paragraph; and resolution <a href="#">2217 (2015)</a>, second preambular paragraph</i>
<b>The situation in Côte d'Ivoire</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2153 (2014)</a> 29 April 2014	Reaffirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity of Côte d'Ivoire, and recalling the importance of the principles of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and regional cooperation (second preambular paragraph)  <i>See also resolution <a href="#">2162 (2014)</a>, second preambular paragraph; resolution <a href="#">2219 (2015)</a>, second preambular paragraph; and resolution <a href="#">2226 (2015)</a>, second preambular paragraph</i>
<b>The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2136 (2014)</a> 30 January 2014	Reaffirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as well as all States in the region, and emphasizing the need to respect fully the principles of non-interference, good-neighbourliness and regional cooperation (second preambular paragraph)  <i>See also resolution <a href="#">2147 (2014)</a>, third preambular paragraph; resolution <a href="#">2198 (2015)</a>, second preambular paragraph; and resolution <a href="#">2211 (2015)</a>, third preambular paragraph</i>
<b>The situation in Liberia</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2190 (2014)</a> 15 December 2014	Affirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and unity of Liberia, and recalling the principles of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and regional cooperation (second preambular paragraph)  <i>See also resolution <a href="#">2239 (2015)</a>, second preambular paragraph</i>

### The situation in the Middle East

[S/PRST/2014/18](#)  
29 August 2014

The Council urges all the parties in Yemen to adhere to resolving their differences through dialogue and consultation, reject acts of violence to achieve political goals, refrain from provocation and fully abide by resolutions 2014 (2011), 2051 (2012) and 2140 (2014). Furthermore, the Council calls upon all Member States to refrain from external interference which seeks to foment conflict and instability and instead to support the political transition (second paragraph)

[S/PRST/2015/7](#)  
19 March 2015

The Council expresses deep concern at all violations of Lebanon's sovereignty and calls upon all parties to fully respect Lebanon's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence within its internationally recognized borders, in accordance with the relevant Council resolutions (sixth paragraph)

[S/PRST/2015/8](#)  
22 March 2015

The Security Council supports the legitimacy of the President of Yemen, Mr. Abd Rabbuh Mansour Hadi, and calls upon all parties and Member States to refrain from taking any actions that undermine the unity, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Yemen and the legitimacy of the President of Yemen (fourth paragraph)

*See also resolution 2216 (2015), eighth preambular paragraph*

The Security Council calls upon all Member States to refrain from external interference which seeks to foment conflict and instability and instead to support the political transition (twenty-fourth paragraph)

*See also resolution 2201 (2015), para. 9*

### Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan

Resolution [2138 \(2014\)](#)  
13 February 2014

Reaffirming its commitment to the cause of peace throughout the Sudan, to the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Sudan and to the full and timely implementation of resolution 1591 (2005), and recalling the importance of the principles of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and cooperation in the relations among States in the region (second preambular paragraph)

*See also resolution 2200 (2015), second preambular paragraph*

Resolution [2148 \(2014\)](#)  
3 April 2014

Recalling the importance of the principles of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, good-neighbourliness, non-interference and cooperation in the relations among States in the region (third preambular paragraph)

*See also resolution 2173 (2014), third preambular paragraph; and resolution 2228 (2015), third preambular paragraph*

Resolution [2155 \(2014\)](#)  
27 May 2014

Reaffirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and national unity of South Sudan, and recalling the importance of the principles of non-interference, good-neighbourliness, and regional cooperation (second preambular paragraph)

*See also resolution 2187 (2014), second preambular paragraph; resolution 2223 (2015), second preambular paragraph; resolution 2241 (2015), second preambular paragraph; and resolution 2252 (2015), second preambular paragraph*

Resolution [2156 \(2014\)](#)  
29 May 2014

Reaffirming its strong commitment to the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of the Sudan and South Sudan, and to the purposes and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and recalling the importance of the principles of good-neighbourliness, non-interference and regional cooperation (second preambular paragraph)

*See also resolution 2179 (2014), second preambular paragraph; resolution 2205 (2015), second preambular paragraph; resolution 2230 (2015), second preambular paragraph; and resolution 2251 (2015), second preambular paragraph*

---

**Calls for the cessation of support by States to armed groups engaged in destabilizing national and regional peace and security**

During the period under review, in several decisions concerning in particular the Central African region and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Council called upon Governments to cease support for illegal armed groups engaged in undermining peace and stability (see table 4).

Table 4

**Decisions calling for the cessation of support by States to armed groups engaged in destabilizing national and regional peace and security**

<i>Decision and date</i>	<i>Provision</i>
<b>Central African region</b>	
<a href="#">S/PRST/2014/25</a> 10 December 2014	The Council expresses concern about the statements in the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) <sup>a</sup> that the bulk of LRA has moved from the Central African Republic to the northeast of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, but continues to carry out attacks against communities in the east of the Central African Republic. The Council calls upon the affected States to ensure that LRA does not find safe haven in their territory, in accordance with international law. The Council takes note that the presence of some senior LRA leaders in the disputed Kafia Kingi enclave, on the border between the Central African Republic, South Sudan and the Sudan continues to be reported. The Council takes note that the Government of the Sudan has denied this. The Council welcomes the invitation extended to the African Union to verify reports of the presence of LRA in Kafia Kingi, and encourages the African Union Commission and the African Union Peace and Security Council to verify the allegations. The Council expresses its continued concern at the gravity of the national crisis in the Central African Republic and strongly condemns the Lord's Resistance Army's opportunistic cooperation in the Central African Republic with other armed groups including some ex-Séléka combatants (fifth paragraph)
<a href="#">S/PRST/2015/12</a> 11 June 2015	The Council expresses concern that LRA continues to pose a regional security threat, particularly in the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Council calls upon the affected States to ensure that LRA does not find safe haven in their territory, in accordance with international law. The Council takes note that the presence of some senior LRA leaders in the disputed Kafia Kingi enclave, on the border between the Central African Republic, South Sudan and the Sudan continues to be reported. The Council takes note that the Government of the Sudan has denied this. The Council welcomes the invitation extended to the African Union to verify reports of the presence of LRA in Kafia Kingi, and urges the African Union Commission and the African Union Peace and Security Council to verify the allegations. The Council expresses its continued concern at the gravity of the national crisis in the Central African Republic and strongly condemns the Lord's Resistance Army's opportunistic cooperation in the Central African Republic with other armed groups including some ex-Séléka combatants (tenth paragraph)
<b>The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2198 (2015)</a> 29 January 2015	Calls upon all States, especially those in the region, to take effective steps to ensure that there is no support, in and from their territories, for armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, stressing the need to address the networks of support, financing and recruitment of armed groups active in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as the need to address the ongoing collaboration between elements of the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and armed groups at a local level, and calls upon all States to take steps to hold accountable, where appropriate, leaders and members of the

Resolution [2211 \(2015\)](#)

26 March 2015

Forces démocratiques de libération du Rwanda and other armed groups residing in their countries (para. 12)

Reiterates the importance of implementing the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework to the achievement of long-term stability in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region, urges all signatory States to the Framework to continue to fully and promptly implement their commitments in good faith, including not harbouring war criminals, and calls upon the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has the primary responsibility for safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to make further meaningful progress in implementing its commitments under the Framework (para. 14)

<sup>a</sup> [S/2014/812](#).

### **Calls upon parties to withdraw all military forces from a disputed area or occupied territories**

During the period under review, the Council, on 21 August 2015, urged the Government of Israel to expedite the withdraw of its army from northern Ghajar, located on the border between Israel and Lebanon.<sup>24</sup> In connection with the item entitled “Reports of the Secretary-General on the Sudan and South Sudan”, the Council adopted two resolutions in which it called for the progressive withdrawal of armed groups and foreign forces from South Sudan.<sup>25</sup>

## **B. Constitutional discussion relating to Article 2 (4)**

During the period under review, Article 2 (4) of the Charter was explicitly invoked five times during the course of five Council meetings. Those explicit references, as well as references to the principles of the non-use of force and non-interference were the subject of deliberations in the Council under the items entitled “Maintenance of international peace and security”<sup>26</sup> and “Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council ([S/2014/136](#))”<sup>27</sup> (see cases 3 and 4).

### **Case 3 Maintenance of international peace and security**

At the Council’s 7105th meeting, on 29 January 2014, the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo stated that, since the establishment of the United Nations, “war and the use of force were supposed to be banished from relations between States ... and Article 2, paragraph 4, establishes the principle of the prohibition of the use of force”. He added that “once one goes outside the framework of self-defence and Security Council-approved actions, any use of force becomes illegitimate and is a threat to peace, be it a breach of peace or an act of aggression under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.”<sup>28</sup> The representative of Brazil asserted that the Charter of the United Nations, with its key provisions on the use of force, represented the single most important conquest of the international community in preventing wars, and that the Security Council remained the central authority responsible for upholding those provisions.<sup>29</sup> The representative of Bangladesh regretted that, in the political field, the use or threat of the use of force, which were prohibited by the Charter, continued to sow scepticism in the minds of people regarding the effectiveness of the United Nations.<sup>30</sup>

At the 7389th meeting, on 23 February 2015, numerous speakers made reference to the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States, as enshrined in Article 2 (4).<sup>31</sup> The representative of

<sup>24</sup> Resolution [2236 \(2015\)](#), para. 9.

<sup>25</sup> Resolutions [2155 \(2014\)](#), twentieth preambular paragraph; and [2206 \(2015\)](#), para. 3.

<sup>26</sup> See [S/PV.7105](#), p. 71 (Democratic Republic of the Congo); and [S/PV.7389](#), p. 99 (Switzerland).

<sup>27</sup> See [S/PV.7134](#), p. 3 (Ukraine); [S/PV.7138](#), p. 6 (Lithuania); and [S/PV.7253](#), p. 3 (Lithuania).

<sup>28</sup> [S/PV.7105](#), p. 71.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 27–28.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

<sup>31</sup> See [S/PV.7389](#), pp. 4–5 (China); p. 6 (Russian Federation); pp. 7–8 (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela); p. 10 (Malaysia); pp. 12–13 (Nigeria); p.14 (United States); p. 17 (Spain); pp. 18–19 (Angola); p. 21 (Jordan); p. 23 (Chad); p. 24 (Chile); pp. 26–27 (Serbia); p. 28

Switzerland stated that “the prohibition of the use of force, as set out in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter is of fundamental importance”.<sup>32</sup> The representative of Ecuador stressed that efforts to achieve the purposes of the United Nations must be carried out in conformity with the principles set out in Article 2, in particular the principles of sovereign equality of States and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States; the first concern of the Council should be that those principles are respected.<sup>33</sup> The representative of Poland stated with reference to Ukraine that the country was facing “external military aggression” and that the values enshrined in the Preamble and in Article 2 of the Charter were “seriously compromised”.<sup>34</sup>

#### Case 4

##### **Letter dated 28 February 2014 from the Permanent Representative of Ukraine to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2014/136)**

On 3 March 2014, at the 7125th meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom, citing the principle enshrined in Article 2 (4), stated that “in assuming control of a sovereign part of Ukraine”, the Russian Federation had violated Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>35</sup> The representative of Nigeria called on all concerned to abide by the provisions of the Charter, particularly Article 2, and to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity of any State.<sup>36</sup> The representative of Argentina recalled the obligation of all States to settle international disputes in a peaceful fashion, respecting the principles contained in Article 2 of the Charter.<sup>37</sup>

At the 7134th meeting, on 13 March 2014, the representative of Ukraine, invited to participate under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure, expressed

(Ukraine); p. 32 (Sweden, Brazil); pp. 33-34 (Pakistan); p. 35 (European Union); p. 36 (Germany); p. 37 (Cuba); p. 38 (Colombia); p. 39 (Republic of Korea); p. 43 (Australia); p. 50 (Estonia, Syrian Arab Republic); p. 52 (South Africa); p. 53 (Kazakhstan); pp. 55-56 (Islamic Republic of Iran, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement); p. 57 (Zimbabwe, on behalf of the Southern African Development Community); p. 60 (Canada); p. 64 (Albania); p. 65 (Turkey); p. 69 (Romania); p. 71 (Thailand); p. 72 (Burundi); pp. 75-76 (Uruguay); p. 79 (Hungary); p. 80 (Egypt); p. 85 (Nicaragua); p. 86 (Viet Nam); p. 87 (Georgia); p. 90 (Azerbaijan); p. 91 (Latvia); p. 92 (Armenia); p. 98 (Kenya); and p. 100 (Morocco).

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>35</sup> S/PV.7125, p. 7.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

his strong belief that Article 2 (4) of the Charter was “not questioned by anyone” and that there was still “a chance to to resolve this conflict in a peaceful manner”.<sup>38</sup>

At the 7138th meeting, on 15 March 2014, a day prior to the referendum of Crimea, the Council having failed to adopt a draft resolution,<sup>39</sup> the representative of Lithuania, citing the text of Article 2 (4) in its entirety, stated that by vetoing the draft resolution, the Russian Federation was challenging the very principles on which the United Nations was built.<sup>40</sup> The representative of the United States opined that the draft resolution was grounded in principles that provided the foundation for international stability and law, Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, the prohibition of the use of force to acquire territory and respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Member States.<sup>41</sup> The representative of Luxembourg stated that the draft resolution, which recalled the purposes and principles of the United Nations, as set out in particular in Article 2 of the Charter, was intended to reaffirm the Security Council’s support for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Ukraine, and that the Security Council should be unanimous in upholding those principles.<sup>42</sup> Expressing similar sentiments, many other speakers noted that the draft resolution reflected the purposes and principles of the United Nations,<sup>43</sup> in particular the principle of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Member States,<sup>44</sup> as well as States’ obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations.<sup>45</sup> The representative of France opined that the Russian Federation’s vetoing of the draft resolution was tantamount to vetoing the Charter of the United Nations.<sup>46</sup>

While several speakers expressed explicit support for respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine<sup>47</sup> and non-interference in the country’s

<sup>38</sup> S/PV.7134, p. 3.

<sup>39</sup> S/2014/189; see also part III, sect. I.B.

<sup>40</sup> S/PV.7138, p. 6.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 8 (Chile, Argentina); p. 9 (Australia); and p.10 (Chad, Jordan, Luxembourg).

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 5 (United Kingdom); p. 6 (Lithuania); p. 7 (Rwanda); p. 8 (Chile, Argentina); p. 9 (Australia); and p.10 (Chad, Jordan, Luxembourg).

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 6 (Lithuania); p. 8 (Chile); p. 9 (Australia); and p.10 (Chad).

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 5 (France).

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 6 (Lithuania); p. 9 (Australia, Republic of Korea); and p. 10 (Chad, Jordan).

internal affairs,<sup>48</sup> the representative of China, who had abstained in the voting, stated that his country “always respects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all States”, while noting that “foreign interference is also a significant factor” contributing to the violence and crisis in Ukraine.<sup>49</sup> The representative of Nigeria said her country was “fundamentally opposed to the threat or use of force in settling international disputes” and to unilateral “secession or forceful excision of territory” designed to alter the configuration of States in their internationally recognized boundaries.<sup>50</sup> Similarly, the representative of Luxembourg stated that the referendum in Crimea was “intended to change the status of the Ukrainian territory against the will of Ukraine”.<sup>51</sup> Furthermore, she considered that the decision of the Council of the Russian Federation to authorize the use of the Russian armed forces on Ukrainian territory, and the subsequent actions undertaken, constituted “a flagrant violation of international law”.<sup>52</sup> The representatives of Lithuania and Australia urged the Russian Federation to withdraw its forces.<sup>53</sup>

### C. Invocation of the principle enshrined in Article 2 (4) in communications

The communications addressed to the Security Council in 2014 and 2015 included three explicit references to Article 2 (4) of the Charter and one reference to Article 2 in its entirety. In a letter dated 13 March 2014 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Permanent Representative of Ukraine transmitted an address in which the Parliament of Ukraine called upon the United Nations to examine the situation in Crimea. The address made reference to

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 8 (Argentina); and p. 9 (Republic of Korea).

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 7 (Lithuania); and p. 9 (Australia).

the violations by the Russian Federation of principles of international law stipulated in the Charter, citing Articles 2 (3) and (4) of the Charter among other Articles.<sup>54</sup>

In a letter dated 23 October 2014 to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates rejected allegations that the Islamic Republic of Iran had sovereignty over the islands of Lesser Tunb, Greater Tunb and Abu Musa, adding that the occupation of Greater Tunb and Lesser Tunb by Iranian forces was in contravention of the Charter, Article 2, paragraph 4.<sup>55</sup>

The Permanent Representative of Lebanon, in identical letters dated 10 June 2015 to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, indicated, with reference to certain allegations spread by Israeli officials, that those allegations contravened Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, “which provides that all Members shall refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations”.<sup>56</sup>

On 23 February 2015, the Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic addressed identical letters to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council, in which he stated that the use of military forces by the Government of Turkey to relocate the tomb of Sulayman Shah from Qal’at Ja’bar to a different location in the Syrian Arab Republic was a violation of international law and conventions, in particular Article 2 of the Charter, “under which the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, is prohibited”.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>54</sup> S/2014/186.

<sup>55</sup> S/2014/759.

<sup>56</sup> S/2015/132.

<sup>57</sup> S/2015/428.

## III. Obligation under Article 2, paragraph 5, to refrain from assisting the target of enforcement action

### *Article 2, paragraph 5*

*All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.*

### Note

Section III is pertinent to the practice of the Security Council with regard to the principle enshrined in Article 2 (5) of the Charter, in particular, the obligation of Member States to refrain from providing assistance to a State against which the United Nations



has taken preventive or enforcement action. During the period under review, no reference was made to Article 2 (5) in the deliberations of the Council that amounted to constitutional discussions, and the communications to the Council did not contain any material with an explicit or meaningful implicit bearing on Article 2 (5). This section therefore deals only with decisions relating to Article 2 (5).

### Decisions relating to Article 2 (5)

During the period under review, Article 2 (5) was explicitly invoked only once, in a resolution

concerning the protection of civilians in armed conflict, in which the Security Council reaffirmed its commitment to the principles as set out in Article 2, paragraphs 1 to 7, of the Charter.<sup>58</sup> The Council also adopted several decisions which may have an implicit bearing on the principle enshrined in Article 2 (5) (see table 5), in connection with the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the situation in Libya and threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts.

<sup>58</sup> Resolution 2222 (2015), third preambular paragraph; see also part III, sects. I.A, II.A and IV.A.

Table 5

### Decisions of the Security Council containing provisions relating to Article 2 (5)

<i>Decision and date</i>	<i>Provision</i>
<b>The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo</b>	
<a href="#">S/PRST/2014/22</a> 5 November 2014	The Council further recalls that the swift neutralization of the Forces démocratiques de libération du Rwanda (FDLR) is a top priority in bringing stability to and protecting the civilians of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Great Lakes region, in line with the wider commitments made in the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Region. The Council recalls that leaders and members of FDLR were among the perpetrators of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda, during which Hutu and others who opposed the genocide were also killed, and recalled that FDLR is a group under United Nations sanctions, operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has continued to promote and commit ethnically based and other killings in Rwanda and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Council reiterates its call upon the region to comply with the commitments under the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework and to neither tolerate nor provide assistance or support of any kind to armed groups and to neither harbour nor provide protection of any kind to persons accused of violations of international humanitarian law and violations and abuses of human rights, in particular war crimes, crimes against humanity, acts of genocide, or persons falling under the United Nations sanctions regime. The Council further reiterates its readiness to consider targeted sanctions against any individual or entity found to be supporting FDLR or any other armed group in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (second paragraph)
<b>The situation in Libya</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2214 (2015)</a> 27 March 2015	Reaffirming its resolution 1373 (2001) and in particular its decisions that all States shall prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts and refrain from providing any form of support, active or passive, to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts, including by suppressing recruitment of members of terrorist groups and eliminating the supply of weapons to terrorists (eighth preambular paragraph)
<b>Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts</b>	
Resolution <a href="#">2133 (2014)</a> 27 January 2014	Reaffirms its resolution 1373 (2001) and in particular its decisions that all States shall prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts and refrain from providing any form of support, active or passive, to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts, including by suppressing recruitment of members of terrorist groups and eliminating the supply of weapons to terrorists (para. 1)
	See also resolution 2170 (2014), para. 11; resolution 2199 (2015), eleventh preambular paragraph; and resolution 2253 (2015), tenth preambular paragraph

	<p>Also reaffirms its decision taken in resolution 1373 (2001) that all States shall prohibit their nationals or any persons and entities within their territories from making any funds, financial assets or economic resources or financial or other related services available, directly or indirectly, for the benefit of persons who commit or attempt to commit or facilitate or participate in the commission of terrorist acts, of entities owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by such persons and of persons and entities acting on behalf of or at the direction of such persons (para. 2)</p>
<p>Resolution <a href="#">2170 (2014)</a> 15 August 2014</p>	<p>Recalls its decision in resolution 2161 (2014) that all States shall ensure that no funds, financial assets or economic resources are made available, directly or indirectly for the benefit of Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, Al-Nusrah Front, or any other individuals, groups, undertakings and entities associated with Al-Qaida, by their nationals or by persons within their territory, and reaffirms its decision in resolution 1373 (2001) that all States shall prohibit their nationals or any persons and entities within their territories from making any funds, financial assets or economic resources or financial or other related services available, directly or indirectly, for the benefit of persons who commit or attempt to commit or facilitate or participate in the commission of terrorist acts, or for the benefit of entities owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by such persons and of persons and entities acting on behalf of or at the direction of such persons (para. 12)</p>

#### IV. Non-intervention in the internal affairs of States by the United Nations under Article 2, paragraph 7

##### Article 2, paragraph 7

*Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.*

##### Note

Section IV concerns the practice of the Security Council with regard to the principle of non-intervention of the United Nations in the internal affairs of States enshrined in Article 2 (7) of the Charter. In the period 2014-2015, the Council made one explicit reference as well as several implicit references to Article 2 (7) in its decisions, as illustrated in subsection A below. Subsection B features the deliberations of the Council touching upon the principle enshrined in Article 2 (7). Subsection C provides a brief summary of explicit references to Article 2 (7) in communications addressed to the Council.

##### A. Decisions relating to Article 2 (7)

In 2014 and 2015, Article 2 (7) was explicitly referred to only once, in a resolution concerning the protection of civilians in armed conflict.<sup>59</sup> There were no implicit references to Article 2 (7) in the decisions taken by the Council during the period under review.

##### B. Constitutional discussion relating to Article 2 (7)

In 2014 and 2015, Article 2 (7) was explicitly invoked twice in the Council's deliberations. During a discussion under the item entitled "Maintenance of international peace and security", the representative of Papua New Guinea reaffirmed his country's "support for the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States, as noted in Article 2, paragraph 7".<sup>60</sup> At another meeting, under the item entitled "Implementation of the note by the President of the Security Council (S/2010/507)", the observer of the Holy See noted that the search for effective juridical means for practical applications of the principle of the responsibility to protect must be one

<sup>59</sup> Resolution [2222 \(2015\)](#), third preambular paragraph; see also part III, sects. I.A, II.A and III.

<sup>60</sup> [S/PV.7389](#), p. 76.



of the most urgent priorities of the United Nations, but that actions taken under that principle could “lead to conflicts with a strictly literal interpretation” of the principle of non-intervention, as enshrined in paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter.<sup>61</sup>

In 2014 and 2015, Member States made numerous statements of relevance to the interpretation and application of Article 2 (7) of the Charter, but the majority of them did not lead to constitutional discussions.<sup>62</sup> At a meeting held under the item entitled “Protection of civilians in armed conflict”, Member States did invoke the tension existing between the principle of the responsibility to protect and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States (see case 5).

### Case 5 Protection of civilians in armed conflict

At its 7109th meeting, held on 12 February 2014 under the item entitled “Protection of civilians in armed conflict”, the Council heard, among others, a briefing by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, who stated that peacekeeping was viable ultimately only with the consent of the host Government and that the protection of civilians “should never be confused with non-consensual intervention” under the responsibility to protect framework.<sup>63</sup> Many speakers affirmed that the responsibility to protect civilians rested primarily with the State.<sup>64</sup> The representatives of Australia and Chile opined that the international community had a responsibility to protect civilians when States failed or were unable to do so.<sup>65</sup> The representative of Australia added that such a responsibility should be upheld by

the Security Council.<sup>66</sup> Similarly, the representative of Italy noted that, when States were too weak or unable to deliver protection, the United Nations needed to “grab hold of the reins”, should Member States so permit.<sup>67</sup>

The representative of the Sudan stated that the principle of the responsibility to protect was open to different interpretations, and noted its contradiction with the “principle enshrined in the Charter, namely, respect for national sovereignty and States’ primary responsibility for the protection of their civilians”.<sup>68</sup> The representative of Cuba stated that authorizing field missions to use offensive actions was a delicate and contentious issue, in the light of the basic principles governing the operation of peacekeeping missions, including respect for the sovereign equality, political independence and territorial integrity of all States, and non-interference in their internal affairs. He stressed that Member States must ensure that those principles were strictly upheld and remove any barriers to their application.<sup>69</sup> The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, pointing out that the issue of protection of civilians in armed conflict “continued to be used selectively”, emphasized that the State concerned was the only actor mandated to maintain security and stability on its territory, and that the issue of protection of civilians in armed conflict could not be settled except through full commitment to the principles of international law and the provisions of the Charter, including the principles of the sovereign equality of States and non-interference in internal affairs.<sup>70</sup>

### C. Invocation of the principle enshrined in Article 2 (7) in communications

During the period under review, the principle enshrined in Article 2 (7) of the Charter was explicitly invoked in three communications to the Security Council, relating to the events in Ukraine, humanitarian deliveries in the Syrian Arab Republic, and the expulsion of two United Nations staff members from the Sudan.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>61</sup> [S/PV.7539 \(Resumption1\)](#), p. 8.

<sup>62</sup> See, for example, in relation to the situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question, [S/PV.7096 \(Resumption1\)](#), p. 22 (Qatar); and [S/PV.7540](#), pp. 5-7 (Palestine); in relation to United Nations peacekeeping operations, [S/PV.7464](#), p. 21 (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela); in relation to the situation in the Middle East, [S/PV.7476](#), pp. 4 and 6 (Syrian Arab Republic); in relation to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, [S/PV.7481](#), p. 10 (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela); and p. 19 (Angola); and in relation to the situation in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, [S/PV.7575](#), p. 16 (Malaysia).

<sup>63</sup> [S/PV.7109](#), p. 7.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17 (China); p. 18 (Chile); p. 22 (Rwanda); p. 25 (Jordan); p. 27 (Nigeria, Lithuania); p. 30 (Estonia); p. 39 (Switzerland); p. 47 (Pakistan); p. 48 (Syrian Arab Republic); p. 51 (Thailand); p. 53 (Italy); p. 61 (Cuba); p. 64 (Botswana); p. 65 (Turkey); p. 73 (Morocco); and p. 80 (Sudan).

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13 (Australia); and p. 18 (Chile).

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 61–62.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>71</sup> In relation to the events in Ukraine, see [S/2014/331](#), annex; in relation to humanitarian deliveries in the Syrian Arab Republic, see [S/2014/426](#), annex; in relation to the expulsion of United Nations staff from the Sudan, see [S/2014/951](#), annex (two references).