



EVALUATION OF UNHRC CANDIDATES FOR 2025-2027

This report evaluates the candidate countries seeking election to the UN Human Rights Council for the 2025-2027 term in the vote slated to be held at the General Assembly on October 9, 2024. Our evaluations apply the membership criteria established by UNGA Resolution 60/251, which requires members to “uphold the highest standards in the promotion and protection of human rights” and to “fully cooperate with the Council.” In particular, we examined each candidate’s (a) record of domestic human rights protection; and (b) UN voting record. The report finds as follows:

UNQUALIFIED

Five out of nineteen candidates have poor records and fail to qualify:

Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bolivia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia

QUESTIONABLE

Seven candidates have problematic human rights and/or UN voting records:

Benin, Colombia, Gambia, Kenya, Mexico, Macedonia, Thailand

QUALIFIED

Only seven out of nineteen candidate countries are qualified to be Council members:

Cyprus, Czech Republic, Iceland, Marshall Islands, South Korea, Spain, Switzerland

The absence of competition this year in four of the five regional slates undermines the very premise and rationale for holding elections. Nevertheless, this report emphasizes to UN member states that they have the legal right, and moral obligation, to refrain from voting for Unqualified candidates, even if those happen to be running on closed slates.

Instead, as detailed in the report, during the ballot member states can actually defeat unopposed candidacies, thereby freeing up the process for qualified alternatives to come forward. In regard to candidate countries deemed Questionable, they should, at a minimum, be asked to commit to redressing the shortcomings identified in this report.

AFRICAN GROUP

CLOSED SLATE: 5 CANDIDATES FOR 5 SEATS

Replacing: Benin, Cameroon, Eritrea, Gambia, Somalia

FH = Freedom House RSF = Reporters Sans Frontières Press Freedom Index

COUNTRY	FH RATING	ECONOMIST RATING	RSF RATING	UN VOTING RECORD	MEMBERSHIP SUITABILITY
Benin	Partly Free	Hybrid Regime	Problematic	Negative	Questionable
Democratic Republic of Congo	Not Free	Authoritarian	Difficult	Mixed	Unqualified
Ethiopia	Not Free	Authoritarian	Difficult	Negative	Unqualified
Gambia	Partly Free	Hybrid Regime	Problematic	Mixed	Questionable
Kenya	Partly Free	Hybrid Regime	Difficult	Mixed	Questionable

ASIAN GROUP

OPEN SLATE: 6 CANDIDATES FOR 5 SEATS

Replacing: India, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Qatar, United Arab Emirates

COUNTRY	FH RATING	ECONOMIST RATING	RSF RATING	UN VOTING RECORD	MEMBERSHIP SUITABILITY
Cyprus	Free	Flawed Democracy	Problematic	Positive	Qualified
Marshall Islands	Free	No Data	No Data	Positive	Qualified
Qatar	Not Free	Authoritarian	Problematic	Mixed	Unqualified
Saudi Arabia	Not Free	Authoritarian	Very Serious	Mixed	Unqualified
South Korea	Free	Full Democracy	Problematic	Positive	Qualified
Thailand	Partly Free	Flawed Democracy	Problematic	Mixed	Questionable

LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GROUP

CLOSED SLATE: 3 CANDIDATES FOR 3 SEATS

Replacing: Argentina, Honduras, Paraguay

COUNTRY	FH RATING	ECONOMIST RATING	RSF RATING	UN VOTING RECORD	MEMBERSHIP SUITABILITY
Bolivia	Partly Free	Hybrid Regime	Difficult	Negative	Unqualified
Colombia	Free	Flawed Democracy	Difficult	Mixed	Questionable
Mexico	Partly Free	Hybrid Regime	Difficult	Mixed	Questionable

WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHERS GROUP

CLOSED SLATE: 3 CANDIDATES FOR 3 SEATS

Replacing: Finland, Luxembourg, United States

COUNTRY	FH RATING	ECONOMIST RATING	RSF RATING	UN VOTING RECORD	MEMBERSHIP SUITABILITY
Iceland	Free	Full Democracy	Satisfactory	Positive	Qualified
Spain	Free	Full Democracy	Satisfactory	Positive	Qualified
Switzerland	Free	Full Democracy	Satisfactory	Positive	Qualified

EASTERN EUROPEAN GROUP

CLOSED SLATE: 2 CANDIDATES FOR 2 SEATS

Replacing: Lithuania, Montenegro

COUNTRY	FH RATING	ECONOMIST RATING	RSF RATING	UN VOTING RECORD	MEMBERSHIP SUITABILITY
Czech Republic	Free	Flawed Democracy	Satisfactory	Positive	Qualified
Macedonia	Partly Free	Flawed Democracy	Satisfactory	Positive	Questionable

METHODOLOGY

The presence of gross and systematic abusers of human rights on the UN Human Rights Council contradicts its own charter. According to UNGA Resolution 60/251, which established the Council in 2006, General Assembly members are obliged to elect states to the Council by considering “the candidates’ contribution to the promotion and protection of human rights and their voluntary pledges and commitments made thereto.” The resolution further provides that consideration ought to be given to whether the candidate can meet membership obligations (a) “to uphold the highest standards in the promotion and protection of human rights” and (b) to “fully cooperate with the Council.”

Guided by these criteria, this report evaluates each candidate’s suitability for election to the Human Rights Council by examining its record of human rights protection at home—and its record of human rights promotion at the UN. Under the criteria established by UNGA Resolution 60/251, it is clear that the UN should not elect any country to the Council which has either a poor record of respecting the human rights of its own people, or which is likely to use its Council membership by voting to frustrate the protection of human rights victims or to undermine the principles of individual human rights.

Citing these criteria, in June 2017, the Netherlands on behalf of 47 countries—including the U.S., UK, France, Germany, Italy, and Canada—issued a joint statement to further HRC membership requirements.¹ They pledged to “strive to ensure competitive HRC membership elections,” and to “engage in voting based on human rights considerations consistent with GA resolution 60/251.” The stated goal was to “help strengthen the Council’s effectiveness and credibility.” However, that pledge has not resulted in any change to the HRC election process. In fact, this year there is no competition whatsoever in four of the five regional slates.

The country evaluations in this report consider a totality of human rights indicators, including information, ratings, and analysis from the following sources:

- *The Economist Democracy Index (2023)*, which considers a country’s electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, government functioning, political participation, and political culture, and ranks it as: Full Democracy, Flawed Democracy, Hybrid Regime or Authoritarian Regime.
- *Reporters Sans Frontières Worldwide Press Freedom Index (2024)*, which measures the degree of freedom that journalists and news organizations enjoy in each country, and the efforts made by state authorities to respect and ensure respect for this freedom, ranking each country as Good, Satisfactory, Problematic, Difficult or Very Serious.
- *Freedom in the World (2024)*, the annual survey by Freedom House that measures political rights and civil liberties worldwide, ranking countries as: Free, Partly Free or Not Free.
- *Voting record at the UN General Assembly*, examining countries by how they voted at the UNGA on ten different thematic and country-specific human rights proposals (listed in the table below). Countries were credited with two points for voting to support human rights, zero points for opposing human rights and one point for abstaining or being absent. Countries scoring between 15 to 20 are ranked as having Positive voting records, those scoring 8 to 14 are Mixed and those scoring 0 to 7 are Negative.

¹ *Joint Statement by the Netherlands on behalf of 47 countries, Human Rights Council* (June 23, 2017), available at www.unwatch.org/joint-statement-improving-unhrc-membership/.

Voting Record: Table of UN General Assembly Resolutions

RESOLUTION	EXPLANATION	DESIRED VOTE
Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/RES/78/220)	Condemns Iran for widespread use of force against non-violent protesters, executions, and abuses against women.	Yes
Situation of human rights in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastapol, Ukraine (A/RES/78/221)	Condemns Russia's occupation of Crimea and its human rights abuses therein.	Yes
Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic (A/RES/78/222)	Condemns widespread and systematic gross violations of human rights by the Syrian regime.	Yes
Status of internally displaced persons and refugees from Abkhazia, Georgia, and the Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia, Georgia (A/RES/78/283)	Criticizes forced displacement of ethnic Georgians from their homes in connection with the 2008 conflict, calls for their return.	Yes
Suspension of the rights of membership of the Russian Federation in the Human Rights Council (A/RES/ES-11/3)	Expels Russia from the Human Rights Council.	Yes
Principles of the Charter of the United Nations underlying a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in Ukraine (A/RES/ES-11/6)	Condemns Russia for war in Ukraine.	Yes
Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order (A/RES/78/196)	Cuban-sponsored text undermines concept of individual human rights by promoting new collective rights that have no clear definition, such as "the right to international solidarity."	No
Human rights and unilateral coercive measures (A/RES/78/202)	NAM-sponsored text that shields human rights abusers by denying the right to sanction such regimes. Submitted by China, Russia, and Cuba.	No
Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all (A/RES/77/216)	Co-sponsored by Cuba, China, North Korea, Russia, Venezuela, and others, this resolution empowers regimes to violate human rights under the pretext of peace, implying that the absence of peace could justify violating human rights. No Western democracy supported the resolution.	No

RESOLUTION	EXPLANATION	DESIRED VOTE
The responsibility to protect and the prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity (A/RES/75/277)	Endorses responsibility of states to take steps to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.	Yes

CALL TO ACTION

OPPOSE UNQUALIFIED CANDIDATES

In the upcoming October 2024 election, the UN General Assembly's 193 member states will be asked to fill 18 of the 47 Human Rights Council seats.

We call upon member states to refrain from voting in favor of **Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bolivia, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Ethiopia**. These candidates' records—on respecting human rights at home and in UN voting—fail to meet the UN criteria for Council membership.

We also call on **Benin, Colombia, Gambia, Kenya, Mexico, Macedonia, and Thailand** to commit to improving their human rights and/or UN voting records before they can be deemed suitable.

CLOSED SLATES DEFEAT PURPOSE OF ELECTIONS

Regrettably, there is no competition in four of the five regional groups this year. Closed slates are typically the product of backroom deals fixing an equal number of candidates and available seats. The result deprives UN member states of the opportunity to exercise the responsibilities given to them by the 2006 UNGA resolution creating the Council.

Because of the poor records of many of this year's candidates, this election also threatens to further weaken the Council, which still struggles to improve on the reputation of its widely disparaged predecessor, the Commission on Human Rights.

PROCEDURE FOR OPPOSING UNQUALIFIED CANDIDATES ON CLOSED SLATES

Many UN member states mistakenly assume that their task is simply to ratify the pre-selections of the closed slates fixed by regional groups. The truth, however, is that nothing obliges any country to vote for any candidate, even if they appear on a non-competitive list. Moreover, it is equally true that every candidate, including those on closed slates, must receive the affirmative votes of 97 countries, being an absolute majority of the GA membership.

Accordingly, to allow the Human Rights Council to live up to the ideals expressed in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we urge UN member states to oppose all unqualified states in the secret ballot. For example, even though the African Group submitted a closed slate, UN member states should fulfill their duties under UNGA Resolution 60/251 by refraining to vote for Democratic Republic of Congo and Ethiopia.

This would allow other, better-qualified candidates to come forward. To successfully block an unqualified candidate, Rule 94 of the UNGA Rules of Procedure provides that a majority of states must vote against a candidate country on three successive ballots. As the Rule explains, "after the third inconclusive ballot, votes may be cast for any eligible person or Member." This would open the process to other states not already on the ballot. Moreover, by casting write-in votes for the best-qualified alternatives eligible, the UNGA could thereby convince hesitating governments that they would have a realistic prospect, thus encouraging them to present their candidacy.

ANALYSIS OF SAUDIA ARABIA AND QATAR

As an illustration of the human rights abuses of unqualified countries, following is our analysis for two of them.

Saudi Arabia's Human Rights Record

Saudi Arabia commits serious human rights violations, including:² arbitrary or unlawful killings, including extrajudicial killings; enforced disappearance; torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment by government agents; harsh and life-threatening prison conditions; arbitrary arrest and detention; serious problems with the independence of the judiciary; political prisoners or detainees; transnational repression against individuals in another country; arbitrary or unlawful interference with privacy; punishment of family members for alleged offenses by a relative; serious restrictions on freedom of expression and media freedom, including violence or threats of violence against journalists, unjustified arrests or prosecutions of journalists, and censorship; serious restrictions on internet freedom; substantial interference with the freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of association, including overly restrictive laws on the organization, funding, or operation of nongovernmental and civil society organizations; restrictions of religious freedom; restrictions on freedom of movement and residence within the territory of a state and on the right to leave the country; refoulement of refugees to a country where they would face torture or persecution; inability of citizens to change their government peacefully through free and fair elections; serious and unreasonable restrictions on political participation; serious government restrictions on domestic and international human rights organizations; crimes involving violence or threats of violence targeting migrants and refugees, especially of Ethiopian origin; laws criminalizing consensual same-sex sexual conduct between adults; crimes involving violence or threats of violence targeting LGBT persons; and prohibiting independent trade unions or significant restrictions on workers' freedom of association

Saudi Arabia is an absolute monarchy. Limited elections are held only at the municipal level. However, just a fraction of the population votes, and the officials have no real influence. While a small number of women serve in government, they are not equally represented. Moreover, dissent is not tolerated, and members of the political opposition are subjected to arbitrary arrest and lengthy prison terms. Some face the death penalty.³

There is no freedom of expression in Saudi Arabia. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, 10 journalists were imprisoned in Saudi Arabia as of 2023.⁴ Retired teacher Muhammad al-Ghamdi was sentenced to death in 2023 for his social media posts.⁵ Saudi surveillance is extensive, including outside

² *2023 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices: Saudi Arabia*, **U.S. State Department** (April 22, 2024), <https://www.state.gov/reports/2023-country-reports-on-human-rights-practices/saudi-arabia/>.

³ *Freedom in the World 2024: Saudi Arabia*, **Freedom House** (February 2024), <https://freedomhouse.org/country/saudi-arabia/freedom-world/2024>.

⁴ *10 Journalists Imprisoned in Saudi Arabia as of December 1, 2023*, **CJP** (December 1, 2023), https://cjp.org/data/imprisoned/2023/?status=Imprisoned&cc_fips%5B%5D=SA&start_year=2023&end_year=2023&group_by=location.

⁵ *Saudi Arabia: Revoke death penalty for social media activity, UN experts urge*, **OHCHR** (September 15, 2023), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2023/09/saudi-arabia-revoke-death-penalty-social-media-activity-un-experts-urge>.

of Saudi Arabia. Accordingly, self-censorship is common. Moreover, even after serving long prison terms, dissidents like Raif Badawi and Saad Ibrahim Almadhi face lengthy travel bans upon their release.⁶

Despite recent reforms, women in Saudi Arabia continue to face extensive discrimination, particularly due to the entrenched guardianship system requiring male approval for many activities. Additionally, the June 2022 personal status law, touted by the Crown Prince as a “leap” forward, codifies discrimination against women in family life and includes many of the negative aspects of the guardianship system.⁷

Several prominent women’s rights activists are currently being arbitrarily detained by Saudi Arabia for criticizing the government and advocating for greater freedoms for women, including on social media. In 2023, academic Salma al-Shehab was sentenced to 27 years in prison and a 27-year travel ban for her social media activity, while Nourah al-Qahtani was sentenced to 45 years in prison with a 45-year travel ban.⁸ Saudi fitness instructor Manahel al-Otaibi, who was held incommunicado for five months after being detained in November 2023, was recently convicted of terrorism crimes and sentenced to 11 years in jail for posting photos of herself without an abaya and advocating to end the guardianship system.⁹

Other basic rights are also denied, including freedom of religion and due process rights. Torture, including flogging, is common. The death penalty is applied for a wide range of offenses, including drug offenses, and is enforced against child offenders.¹⁰ The number of executions increased three-fold from 2021 to 2022. In 2023, Saudi Arabia was notorious for being among the top three countries for executions with at least 170 people having been executed.¹¹ In the first half of 2024 alone more than 100 people were executed.¹²

UN Voting Record

Mixed: Saudi Arabia was last a member of the Human Rights Council from 2017 to 2019. During that time, it opposed resolutions speaking out for human rights victims in Burundi, Eritrea, and the Philippines and failed to support resolutions for human rights victims in Belarus and Venezuela. It also supported counterproductive resolutions that undermined individual human rights or addressed issues beyond the competency of the Council.

At the General Assembly, Saudi Arabia failed to support resolutions on behalf of human rights victims in Iran, Syria, Crimea, and Georgia by abstaining. It would have received a negative score had it voted against

⁶ *Freedom in the World 2024: Saudi Arabia*, **Freedom House** (February 2024), <https://freedomhouse.org/country/saudi-arabia/freedom-world/2024>.

⁷ *Civil society reiterates their call on Saudi authorities to release jailed women’s rights activists*, **ISHR** (March 8, 2024), <https://ishr.ch/latest-updates/civil-society-reiterates-their-call-on-saudi-authorities-to-release-jailed-womens-rights-activists/>.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Manahel al-Otaibi: Saudi women’s rights activist jailed for 11 years*, **BBC** (May 1, 2024), <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-68934913>;

¹⁰ *Saudi Arabia: UN expert alarmed by imminent execution of child defendant*, **OHCHR** (October 16, 2023), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2023/10/saudi-arabia-un-expert-alarmed-imminent-execution-child-defendant>.

¹¹ *Freedom in the World 2024: Saudi Arabia*, **Freedom House** (February 2024), <https://freedomhouse.org/country/saudi-arabia/freedom-world/2024>.

¹² *Saudi Arabia has executed over 100 people so far in 2024*, **The New Arab** (July 18, 2024), <https://www.newarab.com/news/saudi-arabia-has-executed-over-100-people-so-far-2024>.

these resolutions. Saudi Arabia also supported counterproductive resolutions that undermined individual human rights by elevating vague and undefined rights such as the “right to peace” above universally recognized individual human rights and shielded human rights abusers through a resolution denying the right to sanction such regimes.

Qatar’s Human Rights Record

Qatar commits serious human rights violations, including:¹³ enforced disappearance; arbitrary arrest; political prisoners; serious restrictions on free expression, including the existence of criminal libel laws; substantial interference with the freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of association, including overly restrictive laws on the organization, funding, or operation of nongovernmental organizations and civil society organizations; restrictions on freedom of movement; inability of citizens to change their government peacefully in free and fair elections; serious and unreasonable restrictions on political participation; extensive gender-based violence; existence of laws criminalizing consensual same-sex sexual conduct, which were not systematically enforced; and the prohibition of independent trade unions and significant or systematic restrictions on workers’ freedom of association.

Qatar is ruled by a hereditary emir who controls all branches of government. Citizens have few political rights. Moreover, most of the population consists of non-citizens with no rights and limited economic opportunities.¹⁴ These foreigners are subject to a variety of economic abuses including withholding of wages and contract manipulation.

According to *The Guardian*, as many as 6,500 migrants died working on construction for the 2022 World Cup.¹⁵ Despite recent reforms, two years after the World Cup, economic exploitation of migrants is still a problem, including passports being confiscated, salaries not being paid, working long hours under harsh conditions, and no or difficult accommodations.¹⁶ In its April 2024 review of Qatar, the UN Committee on Elimination of Racial Discrimination criticized these abuses.¹⁷

There is no independent media in Qatar. Although Al Jazeera is privately held, its operating costs are paid for by the government. During the 2022 World Cup, there were several reports of journalists being

¹³ *2023 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices: Qatar*, **U.S. State Department** (April 22, 2024), <https://www.state.gov/reports/2023-country-reports-on-human-rights-practices/qatar/>.

¹⁴ *Freedom in the World 2024: Qatar*, **Freedom House** (February 2024), <https://freedomhouse.org/country/qatar/freedom-world/2024>.

¹⁵ *Revealed: 6,500 migrant workers have died in Qatar since World Cup awarded*, **The Guardian** (February 23, 2021), <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/feb/23/revealed-migrant-worker-deaths-qatar-fifa-world-cup-2022>.

¹⁶ *Freedom in the World 2024: Qatar*, **Freedom House** (February 2024), <https://freedomhouse.org/country/qatar/freedom-world/2024>; *For Migrant Workers Qatar World Cup Leaves Behind Legacy of Suffering*, **Forbes** (February 29, 2024), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/samindrakunti/2024/02/29/for-migrant-workers-the-legacy-of-the-qatar-world-cup-is-suffering/>; *Workers’ rights were touted to be part of the Qatar World Cup’s legacy. One year on, what has changed?* **The Guardian** (November 16, 2023), <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2023/nov/16/workers-rights-were-touted-to-be-part-of-the-qatar-world-cups-legacy-one-year-on-what-has-changed>.

¹⁷ *UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination publishes findings on Albania, Mexico, Qatar, Moldova and San Marino*, **OHCHR** (April 29, 2024), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2024/04/un-committee-elimination-racial-discrimination-publishes-findings-albania>.

detained, harassed, and threatened.¹⁸ Journalists practice self-censorship because they can face jail time for defamation and other offenses. In addition, the government monitors personal communications.

Qatar does not have an independent judiciary and does not guarantee due process to detainees.¹⁹ In 2022, Qatari human rights lawyers Hazza and Rashed al-Marri were sentenced to life in prison following a closed-door trial marked by due process violations.²⁰

Qatar applies Sharia law which discriminates against women. Qatari women do not have equal rights in inheritance and personal status laws and are subjected to the restrictive male guardianship system. In addition, Qatari law does not protect women against sexual crimes, instead treating the female victims as criminals and encouraging them to marry their rapists. There have been cases of foreign women being arrested after they filed complaints of rape.²¹

Finally, Qatar is a leading supporter of terrorism. It provides hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the Hamas terrorist organization, whose genocidal Charter calls to raise “the banner of Jihad” and “obliterate” Israel. Hamas has perpetrated countless terrorist attacks against Jews and Israelis, including the horrific atrocities of October 7, 2023—the worst massacre of Jews in a single day since the Holocaust. Qatar hosts Hamas’s political office and provides safe haven for its leaders, who live in luxury in pricey Doha hotels.²² In addition, Qatar’s state-supported Al Jazeera news service, regularly publishes Hamas propaganda.²³

UN Voting Record

Mixed: Qatar is currently a member of the Council. In that capacity, it opposed a resolution speaking out for human rights victims in Sudan and failed to support resolutions for human rights victims in Belarus, Burundi, Eritrea, Iran, Nicaragua, Russia, South Sudan, and Venezuela. It also supported counterproductive resolutions that undermined individual human rights or addressed issues beyond the competency of the Council.

At the General Assembly, Qatar failed to support resolutions on behalf of human rights victims in Iran, Crimea, and Georgia by abstaining. It would have received a negative score had it voted against these resolutions. Qatar also supported counterproductive resolutions that undermined individual human rights by elevating vague and undefined rights such as the “right to peace” above universally recognized

¹⁸ *Fact Check: Are Press in World Cup host Qatar truly free?* **Deutsche Welle** (November 18, 2022), <https://www.dw.com/en/fact-check-are-press-in-world-cup-host-qatar-truly-free/a-63815283>.

¹⁹ *Qatar’s Human Rights Record in the World’s Spotlight: White Paper with Policy Recommendations*, **Human Rights Foundation** (November 18, 2022), <https://hrf.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Qatar-Human-Rights-Report-FINAL.pdf>.

²⁰ *Freedom in the World 2024: Qatar*, **Freedom House** (February 2024), <https://freedomhouse.org/country/qatar/freedom-world/2024>.

²¹ *How are women treated in Qatar?* **El Pais** (December 14, 2022), <https://english.elpais.com/society/2022-12-14/how-are-women-treated-in-qatar.html>.

²² *10 Things to know about Hamas and Qatar*, **FDD** (December 19, 2023), <https://www.fdd.org/analysis/2023/12/19/10-things-to-know-about-hamas-and-qatar/>.

²³ @EFischberger, **Twitter** (September 2, 2024, 2:03 PM), <https://x.com/EFischberger/status/1830562060603666717>.

individual human rights and shielded human rights abusers through a resolution denying the right to sanction such regimes.