

The Trade-Sanction Nexus: Implications for Global Governance

Athirah Binti Abdul Rahman- Faculty of Law, University Kebangsaan, Malaysia.

Abdul Hadi Khairin Bin Mahdzir- Faculty of Law, University Kebangsaan, Malaysia.

Alaa Fadhil Khalaf- College of Law, Al-Bayan University, Iraq.

Qasim Mohammed Hantoosh- College of Law, Al-Mustaqbal University, Iraq.

Asma Hakimah Ab. Halim* - Faculty of Law, University Kebangsaan, Malaysia.

Received: 22/07/2025

Accepted: 18/12/2025

Abstract

Countries and international organizations now find sanction as the most popular way of responding to global political challenges without involving military action. This paper will discuss the relationship between sanctions and international trade as well as their influence on global governance. It describes various forms of sanctions including unilateral, multilateral, targeted, and comprehensive sanction. Moreover, it provides the way the measures affect trade by banning imports and exports, financial restrictions, and restrictions to technologies transfer. The other important issue that the paper ought to address is in relation to the fact that the growing practice of unilateral sanctions, particularly by dominant nations proves to be the concern in terms of fairness and legal clarity. These may undermine the position of the multilateral institutions like the UN and WTO, and jeopardize world trade. The situation of overlapping legislations and inconsistent regulations tends to confuse countries and companies. The paper ends with the need to make reforms in enhancing legal clarity and accountability of the sanctions. It expresses more transparent international regulations, tighter international supervision, and enhanced humanitarian protection. Seeing that sanctions as a tool that surrounds the world trade structure will keep on shaping the shape of this structure, it is valuable to not only comprehend how sanctions have influence in legal and political terms but also how it maintains the world order to be stable and fair.

Keywords: International Trade, Sanctions, Global Governance, Humanitarian Protection.

* E-mail: hakimah@ukm.edu.my

1. Introduction

A modern world is characterized by international trade and cooperation. Nations are at each other's mercy to trade goods, services and technology. This trading system assists countries to increase their economies, decrease poverty and sustain peaceful international affairs. Trade enables individual countries to specialize in what they do best and to receive in exchange what is necessary by others and in the process this raises up efficiency and productivity. International trade permits developing countries to enter bigger markets, to be attracted as investment prospects, and to increase their standard of living (Doornich & Raspotnik,2020:5). Simultaneously, the cooperation of the world at such institutions like the United Nations (UN) and World Trade Organization (WTO) is considered to facilitate ensuring that relations in trade and politics are regulated in an equitable and harmonious manner. They make laws and help to resolve differences among nations, facilitate peace, economic growth, and stability in these institutions. But the manner in which the nations in the world system exercise power is altering. The most notable modification involves the use of **economic sanctions**, which is growing. These are the types of restrictions, which one country or a group of countries imposes against trade, financial systems, or people of another country. Sanctions are most often employed to chastise or coerce a nation because of certain acts, including breaching international law, creating human rights abuse, or endangering international tranquility and safety. The unilateral action by wealthy nations that sanction others without prior consensus of the international community makes the whole spirit and power of international governance fall short. As an illustration, United States and the European Union have gone ahead to impose sanctions on nations such as Iran, North Korea, and Russia in efforts to respond to nuclear activities or military operations. These actions are frequently perceived to be a substitute of using of military force. Through them, states can act against threats or breaches and not engage in a war (Yang et al, 2009:1233).

Global governance also needs to be defined in order to get the bigger picture. Global governance contains all those systems, rules and organisations which assist in governing international problems and relationships among nations. These are trade, security, the environment and human rights. Organizations such as the UN, WTO and International Monetary Fund (IMF), are some of the institutions that assist countries to

collaborate and resolve issues with peace. It is presumed that these systems are just, open and grounded on international law. Nevertheless, when the actions of major states alone refer to sanctions without international consent, this undermines the good and soundness of global governance (Ko et al, 2024:2).

Although sanctions have been applied in enforcing international norms, their growing and even unregulated deployment has been of grave concern. Sanctions have the potential of disturbing international trade through the interruption of supply chain and denying financial processes. They are also able to promote trade diversion so that trade is operated to other countries that are not included in the sanction, which can be harmful to the international trade balance and effectiveness (Ko et al,2024:12). An example is the European Union which imposed some sanction on Russia and Russia diverted its exports to other countries such as China and India. Foreign direct investment (FDI) is also likely to be decreased as a result of sanctions, particularly in states perceive to be risky or unstable due to sanctions in action (Nguyen & Ahmed,2023:82).

Moreover, sanctions are able to harm the economy and the institution of the country targeted. In most instances, the common man is the biggest loser because sanctions may cause inflation, lower drug and food availability as well as creating frailty in the services provided. It has also been demonstrated that sanctions may lower the quality of bureaucracy and government performance in developing nations, and the discharge of their services to their respective citizens becomes difficult (Ko et al,2024:11). Sanctions applied with anger or too many times may lead to resentment, exacerbation of inequalities, and ruining of relationships between countries.

International system is also influenced by sanctions. The fact that international institutions are disregarded as national states are doing it on their own makes the process of global governance weaker. It demonstrates how strong states are allowed to break the rules in their own interests and smaller nations have to obey the system. Such a state of disproportion diminishes the trust to such institutions as the WTO that seek to foster justice and collaboration. This tendency may result in a system in which the international law loses its significance, and the world turns out to be more unsafe when more countries take this course (Knobel et al,2019:154).

Countries should be more responsible in the use of sanctions to avoid such issues. They should indicate fair and clear regulations on when, how, and

which objectives should sanctions attain and how to cause less harm to the innocent individuals. International observation should also be employed so as to ensure sanctions are applied in good cause and not for benefit gain. One can discuss the importance of reforming the existing system that would serve the purpose of preserving global governance, minimizing unfair treatment, and enabling long-term peace and development (Ko et al,2024: 13).

This paper is a critical analysis of the intermediate nature between economic sanctions and international trade control. It examines the asymmetries of power, institutional failures and legal uncertainties that emerge where trade sanctions are employed as instruments of foreign policy. The principal thesis is that, besides creating disorder in economic stability, the proliferation in the application of sanctions in the trade policy threatens the very artifacts of multilateral trade system. Analysis indicates that more effective systems of accountability and unified law systems should be established to maintain integrity, legitimacy and effectiveness of the global governance institutions.

2. Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative, descriptive and analytical approach by analyzing the association between trade sanctions and global governance. As most of legal articles (Bagheri,2021), it mainly uses secondary data, such as peer-reviewed journal articles, legal sources, institutional research papers, and case studies of sanctions against Russia, Iran and China. These were chosen cases based on the different types of sanctions which include unilateral, multilateral, targeted and informal and in order to evaluate the political purpose of the sanctions and their effects on trade, as well as their legal basis. Its study centers on the impacts of sanctions in relation to trade flows, interruption of global value chains and also the way institutions like the United Nations and the World Trade Organization are affected. Other sources of laws that are also regarded in order to learn the validity of sanctions in international law include Chapter VII of the UN Charter and GATT Article XXI. Although narrowed by the guidelines of secondary material and absence of primary material, the approach is adequate to investigate the paradigm of the intricate interplay amid sanctions, economic statecraft, and international systems of governance.

3. Theoretical Framework

3-1. Understanding the Trade-Sanction Nexus

3-1-1. Types of Sanctions

Sanctions are one of the best instruments that the countries have used to ensure the other countries act in the way the countries want them to act. Sanctions are also described as a legal, non-violent tool of coercion under international law, used by the international community to push states to change unwanted behavior (Maha et al.,2024:149). They may be authorized through the UN Security Council, or by regional and national laws, and form part of foreign policy. Economically, sanctions reduce GDP, disrupt production, and limit access to imports, often hurting ordinary people as well as elites. Politically, they can weaken targeted regimes, but sometimes strengthen them by fueling nationalist support. The study highlights that trade sanctions, financial sanctions, asset freezes, and travel bans each have different effects. It also stresses that multilateral and well-targeted sanctions, combined with diplomacy, are more effective than unilateral or overly broad measures that often lead to evasion and new geopolitical alliances (Maha et al.,2024). In order to have a clear observation of what sanctions is all about and how it works the different categories of sanctions that are involved, its effect on trade and even the legal measures that are involved in this operation must be considered. It is possible to draw different types of sanctions depending on the authority setting them as well as their scope. These are two sets which are **unilateral** vs **multilateral** and **targeted** vs **comprehensive**.

Unilateral sanctions are taken by one state without the cooperation of other states or international organisations. Such sanctions tend to denote the national interest and foreign policy of that country. The United States, to illustrate, frequently resorts to unilateral sanctions against such countries as Iran and Venezuela, and it implements it with the help of its legal instruments, the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) (Cohen & Goldman,2019:149). Unilateral sanctions may work not as well since it does not have support of other countries, but may still leave a significant imprint as a result of the great power of its economy and its ability to control the financial networks across the globe (Djankov & Su,2025:2). Regional trade agreements (RTAs) like AFTA, CPTPP, and RCEP help protect countries from sanctions by opening access to other markets, reducing reliance on a single economy, and offering fair ways to settle disputes. This makes unilateral sanctions less powerful (Mohd Ripin et al.,2024:77). **Multilateral**

sanctions, on the contrary, are enacted by a number of countries or organisations: by the United Nations (UN), or the European Union (EU). As one study notes, multilateral sanctions enjoy greater legitimacy since they represent a shared responsibility of the international community, especially when authorized by the United Nations (Mohammad Rohimi et al.,2024:102). As an example, the UN Sanctions against North Korea to prevent the nuclear weapons program have the support of numerous other member states (Djankov & Su,2025:2). Initiatives like China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) illustrate how multilateral cooperation can instead build stronger trade ties and promote development. In Malaysia, for instance, the BRI has been seen as a driver of economic growth and connectivity, showing how multilateralism can also reinforce stability in global governance (Althabhwani et al,2024:186)

Sanctions may also be targeted or comprehensive. **Targeted sanctions** are focused against the activities, an individual, or firms. Assets of political leaders could be frozen or sale of arms to a specific group could be prohibited. These sanctions are used to curtail the number of humanitarian damages to civilians and are mostly favored by UN and EU (Tzanakopoulos,2019:137). **Comprehensive sanctions** on the other hand, target the entire economy of the target country across the board by completely halting trade and financial relations (Kim and others,2023:9). The sanctions can include trade curtains as a whole, financial system blockades or the non-presence of diplomatic relationships. Namely, comprehensive sanctions may be disastrous to the population of the country. As an illustration, the economy and access to medicine, food, and basic goods in Iraq were seriously harmed by the sanctions imposed in the 1990s (Eriksson,2016:318). These forms of sanctions have become uncommon and are usually denounced because of their great humanitarian cost (Heupel, 2017:134).

3-1-2. How Sanctions Affect Trade

Sanctions have direct impacts on trade and economic relations of nations. They may break trade circles and harm industries, as well as destroy financial systems. One of the most typical sanction outcomes is the **trade bans**. When nations are restricted to import or export some commodities, then volume of trade between the restricting and targeted nations is altered. An example is that the EU sanctions on Russia resulted in low agricultural

produce of Russia and the decline of its place in the global economy (Doornich & Raspotnik,2020:4). On the same note, trade restrictions tend to affect the energy and mining industries negatively.

The **financial constraints** are important as well. This can be in form of a freeze of bank accounts or constriction of international transactions or suspension of the global bank network. The countries which are unable to send money or borrow funds will find it difficult to trade. Such limitations tend to create more doubts on economic policies and affect business confidence. **Technology export control** is another form of sanction. Such sanctions restrict the access of the country to modern technology such as scientific equipment, software, or factory equipment. Innovation and development is delayed when countries are prohibited in importing such technology. To take just one example, limitations on the Chinese access to semiconductor technology compelled it to invest more in locally-sourced technologies (Dupont,2019:26).

3-1-3. Legal Foundation

International legal standards should be used when dealing with sanctions. Sanctions have three major legal frameworks. **Chapter VII of the UN Charter** states that the UN Security Council has a power to impose sanctions against the threat to international peace and security. These sanctions must be good for all the UN members, and are legally compliant (Dupont,2019: 25). Within the framework of the **World Trade Organization (WTO)**, the so-called **Article XXI of the general agreement on tariffs and trade (GATT)** gives the opportunity to the countries to neglect conventionally accepted trade rules in the name of national security. The article has gained increased use in the past years in justification of unilateral sanctions. Nonetheless, it is also ambiguous and WTO panels are yet to decide to what extent countries can act under that provision. At the **national level**, nations such as the United States have set their legal framework in terms of handling sanctions. The US has implemented the **Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC)** used as the national security policy on implementing sanctions. OFAC is capable of freezing property, prohibiting financial exchanges, and putting limitations on people or organizations (Cohen & Goldman,2019:149).

4. Research Results

4-1.Strategic Use of Sanctions in Modern Geopolitics

Sanctions represent strong means applied by states and international organisations in order to implement international norms and affect the behaviors of the other states. Though they are frequently more desirable as opposed to military intervention, the practical results of sanctions are ambiguous. The analysis of major cases against Australia by the informal policy of Russia, Iran, and China reveals that sanctions can cause a severe economic pressure, but fail to produce the intended political outcome. Political disputes themselves can reshape trade flows. Studies show that when political ties are positive, trade increases, but when disputes emerge, trade decreases, causing instability in global markets (Maha et al.,2024: 125). These examples show the possibility and shortcomings of sanctions in determining international governance.

The Russia sanction regimes after it annexed Crimea in 2014 and launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 are some of the broadest in the current era. The United States, Europe, and their partners introduced an extensive set of synchronized sanctions against most critical spheres of the Russian economy. These were the asset freezing of Russian banks, the prohibition of use of internationalized financial tools like SWIFT, the limitation on export of critical technologies and the travel ban and asset freezes imposed on oligarchs and government officials (Tsouloufas & Rochat,2023:4). The direct manifestation of the economy was obvious that in the economic aspect, inflation soared, the ruble was suddenly devalued and hundreds of foreign firms temporarily closed their activities in Russia. Nevertheless, as much as the sanctions were effective in bringing down the economy of Russia, they did not result in the termination of the war in Ukraine. Russia changed the direction of the trade to such countries as China and India, took over the approaches of import substitution and turned to domestic propaganda in order to receive strong support on the inside of the political structure (Tsouloufas & Rochat,2023:4). This case also shows how sanctions might not meet their primary political goals when the state concerned is able to turn to substitute markets and when it has authoritarian control.

Iran offers another story, in which the sanctions influenced the decision-making process abroad earlier on and in a more successful way. Iran was subjected to massive multilateral and unilateral sanctions in several decades,

particularly in its oil income and bank trading. They massively curtailed the accessibility of the country to global markets, induced significant inflation and resulted in social distress. Notably, the pressure also aided Iran to agree to negotiations that culminated in the 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), an agreement where Iran agreed to restraint on its nuclear programme in exchange for relief of the sanctions (Suzuki,2019:137). This explains how sanctions can help diplomacy where there is a definite goal and when one is ready to compromise. Nevertheless, it was washed away as the United States left the JCPOA in 2018 and imposed sanctions unilaterally. This was not only a blow to the nuclear agreement, but also the worsening of the trust between Iran and the West. The matter also depicts the importance of international coordination in the success of sanctions. The reaction of China, in its turn, indicated the sensitivity of the combination of adherence to the international standards and the safeguarding of national rather than the global interests. Although China agreed to some of the sanctions registered by the UN, it also did not stop trade with Iran, and it is clear that there is a geopolitics behind the implementation of sanctions (Scita,2022:5).

Another way of looking at how economic measures can be used in foreign policy can be illustrated by China's informal sanctions on Australia. In the year 2020, when the country of Australia sought an independent probe into the COVID-19 origins, China retaliated by setting up a series of unofficial trade restrictions. These were delays, tariffs and prohibition to the main Australian exports like wine, barley, coal and lobster. In contrast to conventional sanctions, they did not openly state that they were punitive action and thus were hard to contest according to the international law (Cafruny,2023:225). Still, they produced serious economic impacts. The Australian exporters suffered huge losses and certain industries needed to come up with alternative markets quickly. The most notable feature about the case is that it shows how economic pressure was used devoid of the legal and diplomatic processes hence common with formal sanctions. It tells us about the way in which mighty states can exert their influence as they play with trade dependencies, not depending on the rules and transparency. This casts serious doubt about fair play, accountability and the capacity of the existing institutions of global governance such as the WTO to govern informal coercion.

All the presented cases can teach much about the practical work of sanctions. The case of Russia demonstrates that sanctions may result in severe economic disturbance, but could fail politically with the targeted state being large, abundant in resources, and relatively politically protected. The case of Iran proves that violence may be helpful when supported with the clear diplomatic objectives and inter-state coordination, but the success is not sustainable without the long-term commitment. In the meantime, the Chinese punishment of the Australian country signifies the rise of informal sanctioning as the manifestation of geopolitical power with worry regarding the lack of transparency and the ability to bring to order international standards.

Collectively, the examples provided indicate that sanctions are not simple instruments since their efficiency requires a combination of legal, economic, and political aspects. Sanctions work best when they are included in a broader diplomatic framework, multilateral cooperation and have limited goals. Sanctions, however, when applied alone or in absence of international consensus, may backfire and appear as a method that strengthens the authoritarian regimes, complicates civilian lives, and diminishes the authority of international structures of governing.

To sum up, it can be seen in real-life practice that sanctions are not only economic measures, they are also political messages. Their strength is embedded in their applications whether to isolate a regime, to coerce negotiations, or to exert effect. To make sanctions worthy of world stability they should be utilized with concepts that meet international laws, security of civilians, and successful international relations. Otherwise, sanctions can as easily destabilise the international system as reinforce it.

5. Analysis and Discussions

5-1. Implications for Global Governance

5-1-1. Sanctions and the Global Order

The proliferation of unilateral trade sanctions has changed the world geopolitics. The application of sanction by major powers has been on the basis of their own authority as opposed to approval by the UN or WTO. As an example, Gu and Zhao mention that the United States is the most skilled nation in the usage of economic sanctions at the moment, the number of its sanctions programs reaching dozens and official outreach all over the world (Gu and Zhao, 2023:104). And such countries as the EU, the UK, Canada, and Australia have also developed legal frameworks to implement unilateral

sanctions and regularly used economic sanctions in the past few years (Gu and Zhao,2023:105). This is a trend that suggests that powerful states are no longer interested in multilateral order as they are employing sanctions as a weapon of strategic competition instead of pursuing mandates of the Security Council. Mallard and Sun explain that, nowadays, the US sanctions law is used as a virus with the aim to have the global corporations as an instrument of the US legal person and, in such a way, to multiply the United States rules across the globe (Mallard and Sun,2024:145). As the leading states tend to skip UN and WTO procedures, the validity of these international institutions is undermined as well. Unilateral actions trumping agreed-upon methods of operating within the UN or WTO sends a message that the credibility of the system founded on a set of rules, is invalid, and others can employ similar strategies (Mallard and Sun,2024:160-161).

5-1-2.Fragmentation of Norms and Legal Uncertainty

This scenario creates legal arbitrariness and inconsistency. At the moment, there is no universal and broadly accepted framework of the legal regulation of sanctions. Every nation has its regulations and steps. The existence of such a loophole in international law has compelled the target states to come up with their own forms of countermeasures. The absence of restrictive measures in the international law has stimulated countries to respond to the sanctions through the creation of domestic anti-sanction policies (Gu and Zhao,2023:106-107). This practically implies that the sanctions of one government can be contradictory to that of the other and the businesses have to negotiate with the jigsaw of combined lists and regulations. Sanctions have also not receded well with WTO system. The wholesale sanctions on Russia appear as infringements of the GATT rules of the WTO on paper, but through the security exception of the GATT Article XXI, member countries can defend them (Kawashima,2024:122). That is, several WTO countries have barred Russian trade on grounds of ban of trade, followed by an entitlement to trade using a vital security bypass. This poses difficult questions in which the WTO panels are currently being questioned on whether they have the capability of examining the national security claim of another country (Kawashima,2024:135-136). These controversies demonstrate the ambiguity that may be associated with the unilateral sanctions. When each nation will refer to their laws or security interest, international trade law will encounter chaos of competing standards. This

creates insecurity and even inconsistency which renders international trade even more risky and more politicized.

5-1-3. Impact on the Rule-Based International System

The application of sanctions is too frequent, which strains the international rule system. The more countries resort to sanctions as a sort of daily tool of politics, the more the international law loses its force. Sanctions instead of being employed to answer to grave misconduct, thereby, may turn into the method with which the strong nations dominate others. Over several years, the US has employed the use of sanctions in the form that appears more of a domination strategy. These sanctions are used as means of coercing the other nations into behaving in a particular way, and they hardly do any damage to the country that has applied them. Meanwhile, they may severely hurt the population and economies of the respective countries of interest (Bali,2023:4). Sanctions tend to enable influential nations to cause distresses to poor nations without getting anything but negative effects themselves. This then will give a skewed condition where a country can cause hefty damage to the people, and economy of another nation with little or no penalties. Such pressure has been termed as a new form of siege warfare whereby the aim is to incinerate a country economically as opposed to bombing it militarily (Bali,2023:4).

Too much reliance by countries on this type of tactic particularly in political or strategic necessity may erode the respect accorded to the international law by others. Rather than using neutral legal systems of solving problems, nations will begin to respond with revenge and retaliation. Such an extraterritorial jurisdiction makes the world economy seem a map of power politics, which destroys the vision of a disinterested legal system. When a country fully relies on sanctions, they may look forward to using it as an instrument to penalize other nations and not as an instrument that is seldom utilized but only when it is needed at all costs. It will end up to be a way of revenge or blackmail to other nations instead of maintaining justice. In as much as grave mistakes can be addressed by employing sanctions, its utilization as a political tool or instrument will have implications on the basic rules and principles that could be supported by the international law (Bali,2023:445).

5-2.The Need for Reform and Clear Legal Standards

That being the case, it is with these adversities that many analysts perceive the necessity of reform and clarified norms. It has to be spelled, in what cases the sanctions are justified by the law, who should be allowed to impose them, and safety to be provided to civilians in the cross-fire. A distinct rule has been suggested on how to decide when sanctions can occur. This involves examinations that would ensure sanctions are accompanied by sound evidence, applied only when there is a genuine need, and proportional to the harm it is intending to avert. Rules of checking sanctions regularly and activating time limits to avoid their eternity without cause are dealt with as well (Gbadebo,2024:910). A proposal is also on offer to establish a global sanctions monitoring body that would assist in monitoring the use of sanctions and their conformity to the international law. Such a body would have an ability to propose changes or stop sanctions which prove to be unjust. Part of engaging in new international treaty would involve such reforms to ensure sanctions are used in a manner more consistent and lawful (Gbadebo,2024:11).

An international body could be formed that played the role of controlling the information regarding sanctions as well as ensuring that nations work in accordance with agreed upon body of regulations as is the case with arms control agency or human rights agencies. Other scholars say that WTO needs to be more proactive like studying whether the trade sanctions are meeting the security benchmarks as been envisaged by the international laws governing trade. Reformation efforts entail penalties not being applied to civilians and having all the time an exception of aid and relief agencies. Making the global system fair and stable requires the sanctions to be more transparent, consistent, and founded on distinct legal principles. A list of all the sanctions imposed in the world could also be compiled or a world-wide supervision structure could be set up so the task would be more organized and predictable (Gbadebo,2024:1012). International law is not served by the world agreeing to more transparent standards and the review process so that the world can place pressure on the wrongdoers without impairing its own standing through illegitimate procedures.

6. Conclusion

This paper indicates that economic sanctions have emerged as strong weapons affecting international trade as well as international politics. Sanctions are now not only applied in foreign policy. They have become the

common use of powerful nations to coerce others nowadays, even when they lack legitimacy on the part of international organizations such as the UN or WTO. This power change has posed challenges on international law and international trade regulations. There are various types of sanctions that include unilateral and multilateral, targeted and broad. Although they will enable powerful political messages to be sent and prevent military clashes, they also introduce a legal haze. Each country can impose sanctions based on the laws of their country, but this is done by different countries with different systems. This has resulted in overlapping and at times conflicting laws which makes it more difficult to the countries and businesses to know what becomes legal.

The problem of the misuse of the national security arguments applied to sanctions by countries is one of the largest legal issues. According to WTO, under Article XXI, security provides justification to trade restriction, nevertheless what security means remains undetermined. This means that some countries tend to lay this reason too frequently, which may undermine international trust in the system of trade. A world that is left to determine security threats on their own finds itself in a less stable and politicised system. The increased application of the unilateral sanctions also damages the presence of multilateral organisations. Acting as a single nation that cares about no one, powerful countries simply fail to acknowledge the rules, agreed on by all others. This hurts the equity and harmony of international law. It could also strike weaker nations, which lack that capability to retaliate. Sanctions at other times destroy and victimize the civilians rather than the governments. This is highly moral and humanitarian-wise.

Due to such problems, numerous researchers present an opinion that reforms are urgently needed. They should have definite rules regarding the use of sanctions and international mechanisms that ensure that sanctions are employed impartially. An international watchdog group would assist in checking the sanctions as well as make sure that individuals are not victimized. Such changes would lead to increased uniformity, openness of using the sanctions, and the validity of the law. Concisely, sanctions will remain a significant part of the international political proceedings, but it should be applied responsibly. In the absence of adequate regulations and control they can easily undermine the legal systems which they are meant to help. The sanctions are a manifestation of hypocrisy, and the world requires

a more co-operative, simpler and more equitable approach to safeguard the integrity of international law and a stable international order.

7. Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their profound gratitude to Al-Bayan University, Iraq and Al-Mustaqbal University, Iraq, for their invaluable support in facilitating this research and for its generous financial assistance. This funding has significantly contributed to the advancement of our work and the successful realization of our objectives.

References

1. Althabhwawi, Nabeel Mahdi; Cheng Jia Hui; Hew Min Min; Li Xue; Parviz Bagheri; Oli Saad Ali Al-Jubouri (2024). "An Analysis of the Impact of China's Belt and Road Initiative towards Malaysia," *Geopolitics Quarterly* 20, special issue (Winter 2024): 183–209.
2. Bagheri, P; Althabhwawi, N; Moslemzadeh, P. (2021). *Legal Issues Tsunami in the Wake of COVID -19 and Contractual Breach*. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 17(Special Issue), 123-135.
3. Bâli, Asli. (2024). "Weapons against the Weak: International Law and the Political Economy of Coercion†." *Yale Journal of International Law*, <https://yjil.yale.edu/posts/2024-06-12-weapons-against-the-weak-international-law-and-the-political-economy-of-coercion>.
4. Cafruny, Alan. (2023). "The U.S. Sanctions Offensive." *Routledge EBooks*, September 12, 2023, 223–33. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003327448-23>.
5. Cohen, David S; Zachary K. Goldman. (2019). "Like It or Not, Unilateral Sanctions Are Here to Stay." *AJIL Unbound* 113 (2019): 146–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aju.2019.24>.
6. Djankov, Simeon; Meng Su. (2025). "The Targeting of Economic Sanctions." *Economics Letters* 248 (March 2025): 112235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2025.112235>.
7. Doornich, June Borge; Andreas Raspotnik. (2020). "Economic Sanctions Disruption on International Trade Patterns and Global Trade Dynamics: Analyzing the Effects of the European Union's Sanctions on Russia." *Journal of East-West Business* 26, no. 4 (October 12, 2020): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10669868.2020.1830912>.
8. Dupont, Pierre-Emmanuel. (2019). "United Nations and Sanctions." *Routledge EBooks*, November 7, 2019, 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429052989-3>.
9. Eriksson, Mikael. (2106). "Targeting Peace," April 1, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315611860>.
10. Gbadebo, Simisola. (2025). "Economic Coercion and State Sovereignty: Unilateral Sanctions under International Law," January 1, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5252612>.
11. Gordon, Joy. (2011). "Smart Sanctions Revisited." *Ethics & International Affairs* 25, no. 3 (2011): 315–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0892679411000323>.
12. Gu, Tianjie; Jun Zhao. (2023). "Beyond Sanctions and Anti-Sanctions: Examining the Impact on Sustainable Competition and China's Responses." *International Journal of Legal Discourse* 8, no. 1 (April 25, 2023): 95–119. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2023-2005>.

13. Heupel, Monika. (2017). "EU Sanctions Policy and the Protection of Due Process Rights: Judicial Lawmaking by the Court of Justice of the EU." Cambridge University Press eBooks, January 1, 2017, 129–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316756843.006>.
14. Kawashima, Fujio. (2024). "Trade Sanctions against Russia and Their WTO Consistency: Focusing on Justification under National Security Exceptions." *International Community Law Review* 26, no. 1-2 (April 1, 2024): 121–50. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18719732-12341497>.
15. Kim, Chang Min; Dae Eui Kim; Song Soo Lim. (2023). "Assessing the Seafood Trade Diversion Arising from Economic Sanctions: Evidence from Russia and Western Countries." *Foods (Basel, Switzerland)* 12, no. 21 (October 27, 2023): 3934. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods12213934>.
16. Knobel, A.Y; K.A. Proka; K.M. Bagdasaryan. (2019). "The Theory and Practice of International Economic Sanctions." *Journal of the New Economic Association* 43, no. 3 (2019): 152–62. <https://doi.org/10.31737/2221-2264-2019-43-3-7>.
17. Ko, Jeremy; Chun Kai Leung; Chitao Yu. (2024). "Reinforcing Inequalities: A Critical Examination of International Sanctions and Bureaucratic Decline in the Global South." *Research in Globalization* 9 (December 2024): 100258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resglo.2024.100258>.
18. Larch, Mario; Jeff Luckstead; Yoto V Yotov. (2024). "Economic Sanctions and Agricultural Trade." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 106, no. 4 (May 19, 2024): 1477–1517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajae.12473>.
19. Maha, A.M; Yusli, A.H.L; Zulkafli, A.L; Hasman, I.M; Hassim, J.Z; W Abd Rahman,W.F.I; Al-Janabi, A.M.S. (2024). The Implication of International Disputes on the International Trade: Malaysia as a Case Study. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 20(Special Issue), 117-139. Doi: 10.22034/igq.2024.475845.1944.
20. Mallard, Grégoire; Jin Sun. (2024). "International Law, Security, and Sanctions: A Decolonial Perspective on the Transnational Legal Order of Sanctions." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 20 (April 29, 2024):97-116 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-042022-111630>.
21. Mohammad Rohimi; Arif Husaini; Muhammad Faiq; Afifi Norulhelmi; Nurhannah Mahyudin; Ravineesh Apurushothaman; Izzat Mohd; Mohd Amsyar; Arif. (2024). "Malaysia's Regional Trade Agreements: The Law, Geopolitics, and Impact on the Multilateral Trading System." *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 2024.
22. Mohd Ripin, A.S; Magendran, P; Syek Daud, S; binti Rosli, N.A; MD SAID, M.H; Ghali Hamzah, A. (2024). Free Trade as a Force of Political Stability: The Case of Malaysia. *Geopolitics Quarterly*, 20 (Special Issue), 61-86. Doi: 10.22034/igq.2024.475209.1939.
23. Nguyen, Loan Quynh Thi; Rizwan Ahmed. (2023). "The Impact of Economic

- Sanctions on Foreign Direct Investment: Empirical Evidence from Global Data.” *Journal of Economics and Development* 25, no. 1 (February 7, 2023): 79–99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jed-10-2022-0206>.
24. Scita, Jacopo. (2022). “CHINA-IRAN RELATIONS through the PRISM of SANCTIONS.” *Asian Affairs*, February 9, 2022, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03068374.2022.2029060>.
 25. Suzuki, Kazuto. (2019). “Implementation of Sanctions.” Routledge EBooks, November 7, 2019, 136–54. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429052989-10>.
 26. Tsouloufas, George; Matthew Roach. (2023). “Revisiting the Effectiveness of Economic Sanctions in the Context of Russia’s Invasion of Ukraine.” *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 29, no. 3 (May 17, 2023): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.2023.2198247>.
 27. Tzanakopoulos, Antonios. (2019). “State Responsibility for ‘Targeted Sanctions.’” *AJIL Unbound* 113 (2019): 135–39. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aju.2019.22>.
 28. Yang, Jiawen; Hossein Askari; John Forrer; Lili Zhu. (2009). “How Do US Economic Sanctions Affect EU’s Trade with Target Countries?” *World Economy* 32, no. 8 (August 2009): 1223–44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9701.2009.01190.x>.

COPYRIGHTS

©2023 by the authors. Published by the Iranian Association of Geopolitics. This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

