BRENNA BIRD
ATTORNEY GENERAL

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

1305 E. WALNUT ST.
DES MOINES, IA 50319
515-281-5164
www.iowaattorneygeneral.gov

November 5, 2026

Hon. Birgitta Tazelaar
Ambassador of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
to the United States of America
4200 Linnean Avenue
Washington, DC 20008

Hon. Christian Turner
Ambassador of the United Kingdon
to the United States of America
3100 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008

Re: Anti-Israel Sanctions Imposed by the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom

Dear Ambassador Tazelaar and Ambassador Turner:

We write in our capacities as the Attorneys General of the States of Iowa, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, and South Carolina. Recently, your nations have each imposed or announced intent to impose trade sanctions targeting economic activity involving certain communities in Israel. Those sanctions reflect a misguided attempt to control the domestic policy of another sovereign nation. They also impose potentially severe economic harm on individuals and businesses in other nations—including those within our States—and align your nations with the objectives of terrorist organizations that fundamentally oppose your political systems—and ours. We respectfully urge both the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to abandon those harmful anti-Israel sanctions.

Your nations' anti-Israel sanctions impermissibly seek to control the internal political processes of Israel and to regulate conduct occurring entirely within another country. Those efforts conflict with Israel's sovereignty. And they conflict with many of our States' sovereignty. Your nations would never

tolerate a similar effort to control your own sovereign actions or to directly regulate conduct occurring entirely within your borders. *See, e.g.*, European Council Regulation 2271/96, Protecting Against the Effects of the Extra-Territorial Application of Legislation Adopted by a Third Country, and Actions Based Thereon or Resulting Therefrom, 1996 O.J. (L 309) 1 (EC); Protection of Trading Interests Act, 1980, c. 11 (U.K.). To reflect the principles enshrined in your own laws, your nations may not interfere in Israel's internal affairs or seek to extraterritorially regulate conduct occurring within Israel. The sanctions that your nations have imposed violate those fundamental principles.

Unfortunately, this is not the first time that the European Union—of which the Kingdom of the Netherlands is a member—has engaged in extraterritorial regulation that conflicts with its own anti-blocking statute. For example, the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive ("CSRD"), Directive 2022/2464, and the Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive ("CSDDD"), Directive 2024/1760, both purport to apply a wide range of burdensome regulatory requirements to conduct occurring entirely outside the borders of the European Union. Like the anti-Israel sanctions at issue here, the CSRD and CSDDD violate fundamental principles of sovereignty, cause unnecessary economic harm around the world, and impermissibly interfere with international trade and commerce. This pattern of extraterritorial regulation is unacceptable. Both the anti-Israel sanctions at issue here and all other attempts to export misguided European policies to the rest of the world must be end.

Your nations' anti-Israel sanctions will also impose substantial harm on economic actors around the world, including those within our States. Forcing companies to boycott Israel will bring those companies into conflict with U.S. law. *See* 15 C.F.R. § 760.2; *see also* 50 U.S.C. §§ 4841-4843. Thus, your anti-Israel sanctions may prevent many U.S. companies—who must comply with U.S. law—from providing goods and services to your citizens. As a result, your anti-Israel sanctions may deprive your own citizens of goods, services, and technology that are essential to their everyday lives and their economic well-being. Excluding U.S. companies from your domestic markets also harms our States, where many of the affected companies are based or have employees.

Indeed, the economic harm that you are threatening on our States and our citizens may warrant remedies under U.S. trade law. *See*, *e.g.*, 19 U.S.C.

§ 2411. We reserve our right to pursue such remedies if you persist in your anti-Israel campaign.

Many of our States have also enacted laws that either prohibit governmental entities from contracting with companies that boycott Israel or require divestment of state funds from such companies.[1] Your anti-Israel sanctions may thus disqualify companies from your nations from contracting with our States, or require our States to divest from your companies, which both deprives your citizens of potentially valuable economic opportunities and deprives our States of potentially valuable goods and services. These unnecessary economic harms derive entirely from your unilateral decision to impose unlawful sanctions on Israel.


Beyond the economic harms that your anti-Israel sanctions have created, your nations have also aligned themselves with the policy objectives of terrorist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah. The sanctions directly advance the policies that these terrorist organizations have sought to achieve through brutal violence against civilians, women, and children. Moreover, your sanctions could be seen to provide a veneer of legitimacy to the policy aims of these terrorist organizations, suggesting that prominent European nations share them. Hamas, Hezbollah, and their ilk do not share your nation's values. They do not respect your political systems. Your nations' policies thus should not advance those organizations' objectives.

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully urge the Netherlands and the United Kingdom to rescind or halt implementation of the recently enacted trade sanctions against Israel or any component of Israel. We hope that you will join our States in their stand against terrorism and antisemitism.

Respectfully,

---

[1] *See, e.g.*, Ala. Code § 41-16-5; Alaska Admin. Order No. 352 (Feb. 5, 2024); Ark. Code Ann. §§ 25-1-501 *et seq.*; Fla. Stat. § 215.4725; Ga. Code Ann. § 50-5-85; Idaho Code Ann. § 67-2346; Ind. Code §§ 5-10.2-11-1 *et seq.*; Iowa Code §§ 12J.1 *et seq.*; Kan. Stat. Ann. §§ 75-3740e *et seq.*; Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 45A.607; La. Stat. Ann. § 39:1602.1; Miss. Code Ann. §§ 27-117-1 *et seq.*; § 34.600, RSMo; N.D. Cent. Code § 54-44.4-15; Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 9.76; Okla. Stat. tit. 74, §§ 582; S.C. Code Ann. § 11-35-5300; Tenn. Code Ann. § 12-4-119; Tex. Gov't Code Ann. §§ 2271.001 *et seq.*; Tex. Gov't Code Ann. §§ 808.001 *et seq.*; Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-27-102 *et seq.*; W. Va. Code § 5A-3-63.



Brenna Bird
Attorney General of Iowa




Steve Marshall
Attorney General of Alabama



Tim Griffin
Attorney General of Arkansas



James Uthmeier
Attorney General of Florida



Chris Carr
Attorney General of Georgia



Kris Kobach
Attorney General of Kansas



Liz Murrill
Attorney General of Louisiana



Lynn Fitch
Attorney General of Mississippi



Catherine Hanaway
Attorney General of Missouri




Austin Knudsen
Attorney General of Montana



Andy Wilson
Attorney General of Ohio



Gentner Drummond
Attorney General of Oklahoma



Alan Wilson
Attorney General of South Carolina