



ANALYZING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF IRAN

Mrs. Vimlesh

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science,

Mihir Bhoj P G College Dadri, Greater Noida

ABSTRACT

Using a qualitative methodology, this research provides a descriptive account of the phenomenon under investigation. The majority of the punishments are determined to not work as intended. Sanctions have terrible humanitarian consequences, and internal political pressures and nationalism are stronger than ever before. Its purpose is to assess the efficacy and cost of punishments. In addition, one of the goals is to clarify what makes punishments work or not. Here, data has been culled from secondary sources, such as books, journal papers, media reports, records of various organizations, etc. The analysis found that sanctions have limited efficacy if seen through an instrumentalist lens, that they have the potential to strengthen internal political forces, and that they seem to be impacting humanitarian operations in the target governments. All things considered, the results could be useful for global governance when deciding on sanctions policies. Politics and international relations majors will also benefit greatly from the data presented.

Key Words: Humanitarian crisis, Success, Effects, Target state, internal force

INTRODUCTION:

Over the course of the last several decades, economic and trade sanctions have grown more commonplace as instruments of economic statecraft. A wide variety of objectives have been pursued by the imposition of sanctions, including the containment of military aggression, the punishment of factional groups that breach ceasefires, the restoration of democracy, and the advancement of human rights. Strategies of induction have been used in order to restrict nuclear proliferation (in the case of North Korea and Iran), to support peace processes, and to aid the demobilization of the armed forces. The subject of global governance is directly relevant to each of the approaches that have been taken. Sanctions, on the other hand, have a considerably smaller scope of operation, despite the fact that they tend to aggravate regional tensions and the vulnerability of humanitarian organizations. From the beginning, sanctions have been a part of the process of global governance. In essence, they evolved as a primary tool in the global affairs of the regime that formed after the Cold War, despite the fact that at the time, they were considered to be a phrase of the government. Sanctions, in reality, are cooperative links that facilitate the resolution of a variety of compliance difficulties in international venues. In the context of the intricate collection of laws, processes, cooperative practices, and developing mores that make up global governance. States have the opportunity to execute both their purposeful goals and their

more narrowly defined foreign policy via the use of sanctions which provide both chances. Not only are sanctions sufficiently complicated, if not ambiguous, that they allow for maximum international institutionalization through the United Nations and regional bodies such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), but they also allow for the possibility that powerful single states, such as the United States, may simply take control of the strategy for their own purposes in terms of foreign policy. 1 and 2 It is generally accepted that any consideration of multilateral institutional problems and enforcement difficulties linked to global governance must take into account both positive and negative methods, as well as non-coercive and coercive techniques. When it comes to sanctioning, it has been found that inputs, views, and various coercive factors are taken into account in almost every instance. As a consequence of this, the majority of the situations, such as Cuba, Iran, North Korea, and others, are either less effective or unsuccessful. Instead, a variety of internal forces grow more powerful, and tensions in the area become much more heightened than they were before the events. Even humanitarian crises may reach higher phases, which might be a barrier to the peaceful resolution of global conflicts. At the end of the day, the goal of sanctions is defeated, which results in global relations that are more complicated. This is the reason why it has been chosen as a research case.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The primary purpose of this research is to evaluate the expenses that are associated with penalties. In addition to this, it seeks to provide light on the elements that determine whether or not penalties are applied successfully. Furthermore, there is a goal to explore the political stance of the internal forces that are working against the government.

METHODOLOGY

This study is an example of an explanatory sort of research that was carried out using a qualitative methodology methodology. The gathering of data, which is focused on content analysis, has been accomplished via the utilization of secondary sources. Data may be obtained from a variety of sources, including books, journal articles, records of government and nongovernment organizations, and stories from the media (including newspapers and television). Additionally, the use of empirical observation as the major source of data is included into this study. The data have been evaluated using a universal methodology.

Defining Sanctions

Countries or international organizations may influence a state's or government's policies via the use of sanctions, which limit investment, commerce, and other forms of economic activity. Nations that violate human rights, engage in unfair economic practices, or are active in nuclear weapons development may face penalties. The seriousness of the infraction determines the extent of the punishment. Most Favored Nation (MFN) designation and import quotas are two names for the same kind of trade penalties imposed on a country. By imposing travel restrictions, freezing assets, prohibiting the transfer of cash and technology, and imposing a trade embargo, economic sanctions aim to isolate the target regime. Several nations, including Iran, Cuba, and North Korea, have been sanctioned by the US government via the UN. Sanctions have become commonplace recently, although their efficacy has been called into doubt by a number of academics and other interested parties. Sanctions, according to some, are useless tools

that will never produce the intended outcomes. Notable academics are of the same skeptical opinion. Sanctions will not be effective in significantly changing the target's diplomatic and military policy, according to Margaret Doxey, whose writings on the subject have been published in several editions. Instrumental term sanctions have little efficacy. In most cases, sanctions fail to significantly alter the target country's policies or weaken the military capabilities of a big power. However, sanctions have numerous functions, and they must be considered when determining their effect.

For Alan Dowty, "The 'success' of sanctions depends on what goals they are measured against" (1994, 192). There are two main types of sanctions: symbolic, which send a message of disapproval to the target government, and impositional, which safeguard the target state from future misconduct. International relations rely heavily on symbolic penalties, which primarily serve to promote democracy, human rights, and the non-proliferation process. Strict enforcement and execution are the major factors that determine the efficacy of punishments. Cooperation from countries doing business with the target governments is urgently needed, and regional security forces must be active for effective enforcement. In most instances, however, national interests—like in the Iran case—make many of them hesitant to join in the sanctions. China, India, and Russia initially did not cooperate with the coalition headed by the United Nations and the United States. Punishment enforcement in Haiti was hindered by inconsistency. The sanctions were successful in Yugoslavia because of the significant assistance provided by the European Union and NATO to their implementation. Accordingly, it is believed that the execution of penalties, which are often behind schedule, is primarily dependent on institutional, administrative, and legal competence. In addition, regional and international agreement is crucial for their effectiveness. It was a failure in the Nigerian instance because the OAU nations were hesitant to back a tougher action.

Effects on Target Regime

It is possible that sanctions may essentially strengthen the government that is the target of the sanctions, and that nationalist feelings will develop across the whole population, including the socio-political elites. Protective measures may be implemented by the target regime in order to enable them to avoid the difficulties that are associated with economic and corporate sanctions. Even they have the ability to shift the burden of suffering onto the social groupings and the masses of people who have developed a distinct mindset in opposition to the pressure. The sanctions imposed by the United Nations were met by this response in Iraq. There are many people who believe that political or national fragmentation will occur, while others believe that nationalism, political integration, and autarky will occur instead across the whole country, such as in Iran and Venezuela. In some instances, these elite groups are given more influence, and they proceed to establish tight relationships with the authorities. The fact that they cooperate with one another results in an environment that is good for all of the stakeholders, which makes it easier for the government to rule and justify the coercive actions it takes. When it comes to Haiti, black business organizations and marketers were able to coordinate their efforts with the governing class, which led to the sanctions being unsuccessful. There is a frequent situation in which prices go up and socioeconomic shortages occur, yet strong efforts taken by the government may readily overcome these challenges. Despite the fact that penalties may sometimes result in a rally-around-the-flag effect, they also have the potential to produce an internal opposition impact. Sanctions have the potential to strengthen political forces inside a country and make Tattler resistance to a regime's practices

that are seen unacceptable more effective. 5 Sanctions have the potential to deepen the internal opposition to the actions of the government, and the national government may react favorably to the sanctions. The African National Congress, which is the opposition party in South Africa, is a proponent of international sanctions, which would ultimately lead to the acceleration of political reform. 6. Sanctions on the Abacha government in Nigeria were obscured and less effective due to the absence of a strong and organized internal opposition. In addition, the political efficacy of international sanctions is boosted when they are supported by civic groups, mass people, and human rights movements on a global scale.

The Case of Iran

In order to condemn Iran for engaging in nuclear activities that are illegal and to encourage Iran to address the concerns of the international community over its nuclear programs, the United States and other nations have placed sanctions on Iran that are not sought. The United States of America and other countries have imposed unprecedented sanctions on Iran as a response to Iran's ongoing illegal nuclear activities. The purpose of these sanctions is to censure Iran and prevent Iran from making any further progress in its prohibited nuclear activities. Additionally, these sanctions are intended to convince Tehran to address the concerns of the international community regarding its nuclear program. The United States of America, the member states of the European Union, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Canada, Australia, Norway, Switzerland, and other countries have imposed stringent and severe sanctions on Iran's nuclear, missile, energy, shipping, transportation, and financial sectors. These sanctions were imposed through the United Nations Security Council as well as regional or national authorities. The objectives of these measures are as follows: (1) to impose a blockade on the transfer of nuclear weapons, components, technology, and missile programs; (2) to exert pressure on the Iranian economy in relation to the proliferation of nuclear activities; and (3) to exert a strong pressure on Iran to participate constructively in the E3+3 process by engaging in discussions with the United States of America, China, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Russia in order to fulfill the nonproliferation obligations. Through the E3+3 procedures, it has become abundantly evident that Iran must be brought into the Nonproliferation Treaty in its entirety, and as a result, sanctions would be withdrawn.

A Number of Resolutions on Iran

A series of resolutions that imposed sanctions on Iran were passed by the United Nations Security Council in response to the reports that were made by the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency on Iran's nuclear program.

- I. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1696- Passed on 31 July, 2006.
- II. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1737–Passed on 23 December, 2006
- III. United Nations Security Council Regulation 1747-passed on 24 March, 2007.
- IV. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1803- Passed on March, 2008. v) United Nations Security Council Resolution 1835- Passed on March, 2008.
- V. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1929- Passed on 9 June, 2010.
- VI. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1884- Passed on 9 June, 2011.

VII. United Nations Security Council Resolution 2049- Passed on 7 June, 2012.

In addition, sanctions have been placed on Iran's financial commerce and technology services by the United States of America, the European Union, Australia, Canada, India, Israel, Japan, and South Korea. In the present moment, there is no evidence to suggest that Iran is working on the development of nuclear weapons. According to the testimony that was given by James Clapper, the director of national intelligence for the United States of America, in March of 2011, he has a high level of confidence that Iran has not even taken such a choice. Obviously, open source verification of this remark is not feasible since the Iranian government has blocked access to any outside interest, with the exception of those who are in contact with the regime. According to Hans Blix (2012), who was once the director of the International Atomic Energy Agency and is now the chairman of Blix and Associates, Iran has not had any violations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) up to this point, and there is presently no evidence that implies Iran is building nuclear weapons.

Effective Scale of Sanctions on Iran

In point of fact, the judgment of high-profile military professionals about the effectiveness of heavy sanctions against Iran is that they are ineffective. Among them, famous people are the top commander of the United States, Adam Levine, and General Janus Mattis. However, they are unanimous in their support for the continuation of the sanctions process as well as alternative possibilities. The Secretary of State, John Kerry, is one of the few people who favors diplomatic solutions above military choices. When he was interviewed for the first time by CNN, he said that he is prepared to have a talk with Iran and that the door is always open. The United Kingdom, France, and Germany have all asked for more sanctions to be imposed by the European Union; however, there is no likelihood of imposing additional penalties by the United Nations since Russia and China are not in support of these steps. Moscow has always been opposed to the imposition of unilateral sanctions on Tehran. Despite their reluctance, Russia and China have supported all of the rounds of United Nations sanctions. However, they have been working hard to undermine the punishment process via discussions with the United Nations.

Adverse Impacts on Socio-economy

With a GDP of \$352 billion, Iran is the oil-domesticated country that suffers the most from the sanctions. The export of Iranian oil-products has been declining, according to the Iranian Central Bank (first three quarters of 2010/2011: 79.8%, 2006/2007: 84.9%, 2007/2008: 86.5%, 2008/2009: 85.5%).⁹ A negative effect of the sanctions on the "Iran nuclear program" has been the inability to handle the program's specialized supplies and equipment. Many oil corporations withdrew from Iran, leading to a precipitous drop in oil output, since the country's energy and oil industries are unable to meet domestic demand for their goods and technologies. Undersecretary of State for the United States William Burns has estimated that Iran might be losing \$60 billion in energy investments per year.¹⁰ Children and women in Iran have been particularly hard struck by US sanctions, which have also posed health risks due to the ban on vital products and civil planes. Since the fall of 2011, the value of the Iranian Rial has fallen by as much as 80%, with a further 10% drop following the imposing of the oil embargo, which caused considerable concern among the Iranian populace. The US Department of State has invested millions of dollars in recent years on facilitating the export of internet technology, freedom, and trainings.

Web hosting and communication technology export bans in sanctioned nations remain a major point of contention, nevertheless. When major web hosting companies like Google, Yahoo!, and Twitter pull their services out of Iran, it has a chilling effect on human rights and pro-democracy activities in the country. The European Union imposed sanctions that caused several European companies to cut off services to about 30 Iranian banks. Additionally, as a result of sanctions, Iranian people have limited access to a variety of digital technologies. A prominent case in point is the incident when an Apple salesperson in the United States forbade a lady of Iranian descent from purchasing an iPad after overhearing her speak Farsi, the Iranian language. An American embargo on the selling of some technological items to Iran was mentioned by the salesman.¹² Although pharmaceuticals and medical equipment are exempt from international sanctions, Iran is still unable to access international payment systems, leading to drug shortages that affect 30 different diseases and conditions. These include cancer, heart disease, breathing difficulties, thalassemia, and multiple sclerosis (MS). Sanctions have caused a severe scarcity of medication, which led to the death of a male kid suffering from hemophilia. Iran is seeing a significant impact on the supply of several vital agro-items. Despite the scarcity of chemotherapy and radiation, Reuters estimated that 85,000 cancer patients still need these treatments in 2013. Due to the unavailability of important medications like deferroximine, about 8,000 Iranians are beginning to die from thalassemia and blood disorders.

Civil Movement against Sanctions:

Two famous Iranian economists, Dr. Mousa Ghaninejad, an economist at Tehran's Petroleum University of Technology, and Dr. Mohammad Mehdi Behkish, an economist at Tehran's Allameh Tabatabaei University, were the ones who came up with the idea for the Civil Movement on July 14, 2013. The sanctions were described by the two economists as a tool that was both unfair and unreasonable for the Iranian people. The global community need to make room for rational discourse in light of the fact that the free market economy is an important issue. A free economy has the potential to foster better connections between countries, rather than fostering animosity. Indeed, political actions need to be carried out for the purpose of promoting economic development and maintaining peace on a worldwide scale. A purely free market economy has the potential to boost growth rates, which would be to the advantage of the general populace. The people of sanctioned countries, as well as the people of trade partner nations, are the ones who are forced to suffer the consequences of sanctions imposed on any country. A significant amount of support for this movement came from intellectuals, members of civil society, professors, human rights campaigners, attorneys, journalists, and other individuals. In September 2013, the International Chamber of Commerce-Iran published an open letter that was signed by 157 Iranian economists, lawyers, and journalists. In the letter, they expressed their dissatisfaction with the humanitarian consequences of sanctions and urged their colleagues from all over the world to support the humanitarian campaign against sanctions on Iran and to convince their governments to take action to resolve the underlying conflict.

Current Status

A framework agreement was achieved between the P5+1 and Iran in Switzerland not too long ago, and the last round of treaty will be signed by the 30th of June. According to the terms of the agreement, Iran would cut its stockpile of low-enriched uranium and reduce the number of centrifuges that it has

installed, which are used to enrich uranium two-thirds. A storage facility will be established for the centrifuges that are no longer in operation, and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will be responsible for monitoring their storage. In spite of the fact that the parties have been able to reach an agreement after extensive discussion, the process of finalizing the agreement is still unclear owing to the absence of distrust between the parties. As far as the goal of the trade is concerned, every investor finds at least one kind of fraudulence. When the United States Department of State said shortly after the framework accords that the sanctions imposed by Iran would be gradually removed, the final treaty began to become more complicated and ambiguous in a short amount of time. Since the 26th of March, the Saudi-led Collective Alliance has begun its attacks on Yemen, which has the effect of making the Iran nuclear accord more complicated. This is due to the fact that Iran has been providing support to Yemeni rebel groups for a considerable amount of time.

RESULTS

In the course of the research, a number of results have been discovered. This includes the fact that the effectiveness of instrumental penalties is, in fact, insufficient.

- The inability to reach an agreement both on a global or regional scale prevented the efficient use of
- Sanctions are imposed. Internal political forces and civil society may be strengthened by sanctions; even mass nationalism may become more powerful as a result of sanctions, as is the case in Iran.
- Sanctions seem to be having an effect on humanitarian operations and circumstances in the nations that are the targets of the sanctions.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the research make it abundantly clear that the efficacy of sanctions is, in fact, restricted in authoritarian and nationalist regimes, but in liberal democratic countries, this remains unaffected. As a result of Iran's sense of nationalism, sanctions are not having the desired effect on the country. A further point to consider is that sanctions may make their resistance to regimes that are politically unpalatable more effective. However, it seems that they are having an impact on humanitarian efforts. There is a possibility that this research may be useful for decision making in global governance. Even nation governments have the ability to exercise awareness about the consequences of sanctions. The students and scholars who are interested in the social sciences would find this study to be very useful.

REFERENCES

- [1] Martin, P. (1988), *Resolving Disputes between Nations: Coercion or Conciliation?* Durham: Duke University Press.
- [2] Mansfield, E. (1995), *International Institutions and Economic, World Politics*, V.47, no (4): 575-605.
- [3] Doxey, M. P. (1987), *International Sanctions in Contemporary Perspective*, New York: St. Martin's.

- [4] Hufbauer, Schott, J., and Elliot K. A. (1990), *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered: History and Current Policy*, Washington, D.C: Institute for International Economics.
- [5] Eland, Lvan, (1995), *Economic Sanctions as Tools of Foreign Policy in Economic Sanctions: Panacea or Peace building in a Post- Cold War World* ed. David Cortright and George A. Lopez, Boulder: West view, 29-42.
- [6] Davis, J. (1995), *Sanctions and Apartheid: The Economic Challenge to DisCrimination*. In *Economic, Sanctions: Panacea or Peace building in a Post—Cold War World* (ed.) David Cortright and George Lope, Houlder; West view, 173-86.
- [7] Hutchinson, J. (10February 2012), *Iran Government Cuts off Internet Access as Hard line Regime Makes a Stand*, Accessed from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2099549/Iran-government- cuts- internetaccess-hardline-regime-makes-stand>.
- [8] Blix, H. (22 February 2012), *The Road to Hell*, *The New Statesman*, Retrieved 17 March 2013.
- [9] Iranian Central Bank (2010/2011), *Economic Trends No.62, Third Quarter 1389(2010/2011), Balance of Payments*, p.16.
- [10] Flavia, Krause—Jackson, (1 December 2010), *Sanctions Cost Iran \$60 Billion in Oil Investments, Burn Says*, *Bloomberg*, Retrieved 13 February2012.
- [11] Al Arabiya (23 January 2012), *Iran’s Rial Drops 10 Percent as EU Bans Oil Imports*; Retrieved 27 January 2012
- [12]]12. www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/07/2012727581444417.html
- [13] Dehghan, S. k.(14 November 2012), *Haemophilic Iranian Boy Dies after Sanctions Disrupt Medicines Supplies*, London: *The Guardian*.
- [14] ICC-Iran (2013), *A Call by Iranian Economists, Lawyers, and Journalists to their Colleagues across the Globe for Support of the Campaign against Sanctions on Iran*, Tehran: ICC- Iran