

Spring 2010

The More the Merrier: Collective Sanctions and the Modification of States' Behavior

Lauren J. Waldron

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Waldron, Lauren J., "The More the Merrier: Collective Sanctions and the Modification of States' Behavior" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 619.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/619>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

THE MORE THE MERRIER: COLLECTIVE SANCTIONS AND THE
MODIFICATION OF STATES' BEHAVIOR

by

LAUREN J. WALDRON

(Under the direction of Barry J. Balleck)

ABSTRACT

Sanctions in South Africa and Libya were successful episodes because there was a definite change in the behavior on the part of the target. These sanctions episodes were successful because they were collectively imposed by a collection of States, achieved a change in behavior, as well as containing the instability experienced within the target. Sanctions in India and Pakistan were unsuccessful episodes because they were unilaterally imposed by the United States. There was no change in behavior in India and Pakistan because the sanctions were not collectively imposed by multiple States. The instability in the region was not contained because the sanctions were not collectively imposed.

INDEX WORDS: Sanctions, Collective Sanctions, Containment, South Africa, Libya, India, Pakistan, Collective Security

THE MORE THE MERRIER: COLLECTIVE SANCTIONS AND THE
MODIFICATION OF STATES' BEHAVIOR

by

LAUREN J. WALDRON

B.S., Georgia Southern University, 2008

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in Partial

Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2010

©2010

LAUREN J. WALDRON

All Rights Reserved

THE MORE THE MERRIER: COLLECTIVE SANCTIONS AND THE
MODIFICATION OF STATES' BEHAVIOR

by

LAUREN J. WALDRON

Major Professor: Barry J. Balleck
Committee: Darin H. Van Tassell
Ted M. Brimeyer

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	7
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	8
Sanctions Controversy.....	8
Sanctions.....	12
History of Sanctions.....	18
Collective Security.....	23
Methodology.....	25
2 SOUTH AFRICA.....	29
History of Apartheid in South Africa.....	29
The Path to Sanctions.....	31
Sanctions.....	33
Collective Action.....	35
Economic Effects.....	39
Conclusion.....	40
3 LIBYA.....	42

History.....	43
The Path to Sanctions.....	45
Sanctions.....	47
Collective Action.....	49
Economic Effects.....	51
Conclusion.....	54
4 INDIA & PAKISTAN.....	58
Sibling Rivalry.....	59
Sanctions.....	64
Effects of Sanctions?.....	67
Conclusion.....	70
5 CONCLUSION.....	73
6 REFERENCES.....	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: League of Nations Sanctions Episodes, Including Threats of Sanctions and Meetings to Consider Sanctions*.....	21
Table 2: Apartheid Legislation*.....	30
Table 3: United States Disinvestment in South Africa.....	38

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sanctions Controversy

Sanctions are a controversial policy tool that governments use in response to instances of international law-breaking. There have been objections to sanctions made by scholars and policy makers, citing their inability to be successful. There are many reasons scholars and policy makers give for not supporting the use of sanctions but governments also need a response tool to foreign outrages that is between diplomacy and military force, leaving sanctions to be the only viable option (Schott 1998). The maintenance of peace in the international community is of the utmost importance to States as revealed by the Charter to the United Nations (UN). States' arsenal of policy tools need to contain a strong and clear sanctions policy in order to achieve in a change in behavior in the law-breaking State while avoiding the use of force. This study contends that sanctions are the best option for achieving a change in behavior in a law-breaking State if States collectively decide to impose sanctions.

There are some basic definitions that are necessary to put forth in order to have a complete understanding of the discussion on sanctions. A *sanctions episode* is a single instance of sanctions being imposed on a target state by the sender state(s). A *sender* in a sanctions episode is the state that is the principal author of the sanctions. A *target* in a sanctions episode is the State that is the immediate recipient of sanctions¹.

Although this study affirms the success that sanctions can achieve, there are those in academia that doubt the success of sanctions. Some argue that because electronic

¹ These terms are used throughout all of the research on sanctions and I have adopted them for the purposes of this study.

money transfers can be made so quickly, financial sanctions, more specifically, asset freezes are pointless (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). The truth is that advances in technology have produced interdiction software that makes it much easier to prevent States from making illicit transfers once they realize sanctions are on the horizon (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). The advances in interdiction software also solve the problem of multiple banks being involved in the transfer processes (Cortwright & Lopez 2002).

Another commonly raised objection to sanctions is that when States are attempting to freeze the assets of a target, the accounts are not in the name of the specific person being targeted. This problem is why the sender of the sanctions needs to cast a wide net; intelligence gathering is essential in order to insure that the correct accounts of the targeted individuals that are in charge of the State are found (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). Scholars, as well as policy makers, also argue that trade embargoes take a while to be effective, giving State elites time to hide their assets. The ability of States elites to hide their assets is precisely why sanctions, once decided upon, need to be implemented swiftly, leaving little time for the hiding of assets (Cortwright & Lopez 2002).

Sanctions are also criticized as being unsuccessful because the United States and UN Security Council have taken a disproportionate responsibility of international security and, therefore, over use sanctions, leading many to conclude they are ineffective (“India and World Peace” 1998). According to Michael Barkun (1968), a major problem with sanctions is that the “police” function has been placed upon the United States and the Security Council and both have fallen short of that task. Barkun (1968) suggests that this problem can be corrected if the United States and Security Council enforce international

rules and norms with greater regularity and with greater support from the international community. Barkun (1968) cites sanction episodes with India, Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea to suggest that sanctions would have been successful if rules and norms had been upheld and there had been a commitment to enforcement (Barkun 1968).

The UN also falls short because sanctions are not applicable in every breach of international law, leaving States shouldering the responsibility of enforcing the law, and deciding which instances to punish and which to ignore (Farrall 2007). The only body within the UN that has the ability to impose sanctions is the Security Council. Given that five Member States, the P-5, have the ability to veto any vote on sanctions, the Security Council, and UN as a whole, is not always the most effective avenue for implementing sanctions (Farrall 2007).

Richard Haass and Meghan O'Sullivan (2000) point out some risks of adopting an engagement policy that includes sanctions: (1) a problem State, by its very nature, may be beyond the influence of another State; (2) the type of influence that groups with economic interests and other actors exert on the foreign policy of the sender State may muddy the waters so-to-speak; (3) the process for making judgments when formulating a policy to respond to the conduct of a problem state is not clear, there needs to be clear guidelines; (4) there is a need for reliable intelligence assets and capabilities when implementing an engagement policy; (5) when dealing with authoritarian regimes, the sender needs to provide the initiative to the target State to decide whether or not to comply or resist engagement; and there is no road map for an engagement policy.

Haass and O'Sullivan (2000) point out that the senders need to carefully evaluate their engagement policies regularly. Haass and O'Sullivan (2000) also point out areas of consensus concerning the subject of sanctions. They maintain that sanctions almost always result in economic hardship and are often insufficient or unable to force the desired change. Sanctions can be costly for innocent bystanders who are usually the poorest people in the target State and for businessman and commercial interests in the sender and target States. Sanctions also evoke unintended consequences, like the strengthening of an obnoxious regime, as was the case with the North Korea (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000).

States have the ability to implement sanctions on their own, and it is the purpose of this study to suggest that sanctions episodes do have the ability to change States' behavior when sanctions are implemented collectively. States do not have to wait for the Security Council to impose sanctions. If States, most importantly the major powers, act swiftly, collectively, and with a strong commitment to sanctions they have the ability to change States' behavior and prevent the conflict from spreading outside the target State. The commitment to sanctions is often the most important of these necessities because successful sanctions take time to reach fruition. Sanctions episodes against South Africa and Libya were each successful episodes, however, they took decades to reach a point where there was a change in behavior on the part of the target regime. Sanctions do not work overnight because changing the behavior of a State, which is run by humans, is a difficult task that requires a strong commitment and endurance. Human behavior is extremely difficult to change.

Sanctions

Economic and financial sanctions are a widely studied controversial phenomenon in the field of International Relations. There is a definite division between scholars over the efficacy of sanctions which has already been discussed. Among those who support the idea that sanctions are a vital engagement tool in foreign policy, there is agreement that sanctions are effective in 35 percent of the sanctions episodes that have occurred since the founding of the UN (Hufbauer et al. 2008; Drezner 1999). Although 35 percent success in most studies is considered a low outcome, in this study it is a reasonably decent success rate, sanctions are, after all, charged with changing States' behavior.

This study will focus on why sanctions were successful in South Africa and Libya and not in India and Pakistan. This chapter will discuss the history of sanctions in terms of how they have been utilized by States as far back as ancient Greece. The discussion will then turn to how sanctions have been utilized and imposed by both the League of Nations and the UN. The discussion of sanctions rests firmly on the belief that sanctions work best as a form of containment if they are implemented by a collection of States. Therefore, both containment and collective security will also be explained in this chapter. UN sanctions against Iraq are one of the best examples of how collective sanctions were able to contain and secure an entire region. The final section will discuss methodology and reasons for choosing to focus this study on South Africa, Libya, Pakistan, and India.

Sanctions are considered a form of coercive diplomacy by the international community. Coercive diplomacy is a defensive strategy that utilizes the threat of force rather than the actual use of force.

The general intent of coercive diplomacy is to back a demand on an adversary with a threat of punishment for noncompliance that will be credible and potent enough to

persuade him that it is in his interest to comply with the demand (George & Simmons, 2, 1994).

Sanctions are most often used as a defensive strategy that can be used to persuade a target to stop or reverse some law-breaking action (George & Simmons 1994). Sanctions are always in response to a strategy already undertaken by the law-breaking state. Therefore, it is the assertion of this study that sanctions are the best option for containment and security because they are a strong alternative to military strategies. However, there are limits to coercive diplomacy. According to rational choice theory², this strategy of utilizing sanctions as a means of coercive diplomacy rests on the assumption that the target of sanctions is a rational actor that will weigh the costs and benefits of compliance (George & Simmons 1994; Guzman 2008).

Sanctions are generally designed to achieve one of two goals: (1) there are those designed to change a policy in the target state and (2) those which are designed to destabilize the target State (Dashti-Gibson et al. 1997). They are typically imposed through economic or financial means. Sanctions cause the most harm when they disrupt trade and the flow of foreign currency in the target State creating harsh economic conditions within their state. Those sanctions that interrupt trade often affect normal citizens the most while those that disrupt the flow of foreign currency affect leaders and elite members of society; those that affect the leaders and elite members of society are often times the most successful form of sanctions (Dashti-Gibson et al. 1997).

Globalization has made the use of economic sanctions a more attractive policy tool because of the interconnectedness of financial markets, making it easier to isolate a

² For further information on rational choice theory see:
Guzman, Andrew T. *How International Law Works: A Rational Choice Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

target economy (Davis & Engerman 2003). Economic sanctions are typically a tool utilized by wealthy States due to the fact that the sender's economy can withstand the costs of sanctions (Davis & Engerman 2003). There are also diplomatic sanctions, which do not carry the same weight as economic or financial sanctions. Diplomatic sanctions allow one state to protest against another through speeches given by diplomats and ambassadors. The success of diplomatic sanctions depends heavily on the importance of the protesting state and should be implemented by a collection of States (Royal Institute 1938). Diplomatic sanctions are rarely successful if they are not paired with economic and financial sanctions and there is only one protesting state due to their largely symbolic nature (Royal Institute 1938). The idea here is that diplomatic negotiations need to be paired with harsher sanctions in order to cause the most hardship in the target State.

One of the main reasons for imposing sanctions is to uphold international law. International law is derived from many sources, such as treaties, accords, precedents from international courts and tribunals and agreements signed by States. International norms are also upheld as forms of international law. The main goal of international law is to regulate the behavior of States to create order (Cassese 2005; Guzman 2008). The UN and international courts and tribunals are the main international bodies charged with upholding international law. However, given the problems of enforcement within these bodies, there is largely a lack of central authority. Member States of the UN are obligated to uphold international law as one of the tenets of their membership to the UN (Cassese 2005). The international community is largely anarchical; however, States function in good faith, meaning they trust that all States are upholding international law.

There is a collective responsibility among States to punish any breach of international law. Most States have incorporated international rules and norms into their own national legislation, providing a more concrete means of punishment for any infraction of international law, especially when committed by individuals (Cassese 2005; Guzman 2008). Sanctions have therefore become a means of punishment for international law-breaking rather than resorting to the use of States' military power.

States interested in the preservation of peace typically use sanctions more often in order to avoid militarized action or use of force (Royal Institute 1938). The prevention of armed conflict is of the utmost importance in the international community, making sanctions a more and more widely used tool by many States, especially the major powers. The sending state imposes sanctions to secure a policy change in the target state because some international norm or law is not being upheld. This policy change happens in one of two ways in most cases: (1) sanctions destabilize the current leader and a more pliable leader comes to power or (2) the sending state is able to reach a compromise with the leader of the target state by offering to lift sanctions if some policy is changed. This compromise often means the sending state has to revise its initial expectations; however, this is an example of diplomacy at work (Marinov 2005).

Containment

“Good relations with great powers, like those with small ones, require constant attention and nurturing not only in crises but at all times.”³

It is important to first note that containment is not a military term. Containment is not a response to a military threat, but rather a response to a political or ideological threat

³ Kennan, George F. “The Shape of American Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: A Perspective Honed in the Twentieth Century.” *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 27: 167-169, 2005.

(Kennan 2005). It is an effort to stop the spread of instability in a region and to stop the spread of unlawful policies by a state. The Cold War is an example of containment. During World War II the United States made concessions to the Soviet Union which allowed them to overrun most of Eastern Europe and West Germany. These concessions were necessary in order to win the war (Kennan1987). However, once the war was won by the allies, containing the spread of Communism meant that the United States could make no further concessions to the Soviets (Kennan 1987).

Sanctions are the best means of containing a conflict, or potential conflict and punishing law-breaking States without resorting to militarized action. As Kennan (2005) points out, just because a state may have policies that are contradictory to the tenets of democracy and its ideals does not mean that state is out to destroy democratic societies. Rather than resorting to the use of force, sanctions can be a more effective first course of action once initial diplomatic negotiations have failed. The spread of democracy to all States in the world, which is the goal of many democratic States, will not be achieved in our lifetimes, if ever, and it is therefore the responsibility of leaders today to contain conflict areas and uphold international law in an effort to prevent the spread on instability into other regions (Kennan 2005).

If the UN or the United States and its allies wish to change the behavior of defiant States, sending States, must have intelligent, long-range policies that are just as resourceful and varied as those of the targets being punished. In order to achieve this change in behavior, sanctions should be included in the package of policies implemented to change a target's behavior. The sender States of sanctions, which are usually democratic States, need to be consistent in their policies towards the target (Kennan

1947). Kennan (1947) notes that vigilant containment of the expansion of a target's policies has nothing to do with threats and everything to do with consistent policies that take action. A loss of control by the sender signals weakness to the target.

Dictatorships are most often the targets of sanctions by democratic States and most of the time these dictatorships have weak economies and citizens that are already suffering as a result (Kennan 1947). This fact alone makes sanctions one of, if not the best options by States wishing to change the behavior of that target. While a change of behavior takes time, containment can be achieved in the interim. Containment is achieved through an unwavering counterforce for each and every sign of encroachment upon peace and stability, making the target's reputation look as bad as possible while making the sender's reputation sparkle, and creating a strained domestic situation for the target making it difficult for the regimes to carry out its daily activities (Kennan 1947). A change in behavior may then follow, but at the very least, the imposition of sanctions will prevent the spread of instability to neighboring regions.

The same can be said of Iraq once the 1991 Gulf War was over. Sanctions against Iraq had managed to contain the regime. Saddam Hussein was not invading any neighboring States or using weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) against them. Sanctions were working in Iraq. The regime had changed its behavior because it was not bullying its neighbors and was contained within its own borders until the use of force was once again brought into the equation. The situation quickly deteriorated in Iraq and has caused instability in the region that has spread into neighboring States. Sanctions provided containment in Iraq, the second war in Iraq has caused instability. There are

now many situations in the world in need of containment and this study maintains that sanctions are the most effective way to achieve it.

The weapons race is not all there is in this imperfect world that needs to be contained. There are many other sources of instability and trouble. There are local danger spots scattered about in the Third World. There is the dreadful situation in southern Africa. There is the grim phenomenon of a rise in several parts of the world of a fanatical and wildly destructive religious fundamentalism, and there is the terrorism to which that sort of fundamentalism so often resorts. There is the worldwide environmental crisis, the rapid depletion of the world's nonrenewable energy resources, the steady pollution of its atmosphere and its waters – the general deterioration of its environment as a support system for civilized living (Kennan 1987).

Kennan (1987) foresaw the conflict situations we would be dealing with in modern times and supported containment as a means for controlling these situations. The situation in southern African was resolved through the use of sanctions. The world is now dealing with the religious fundamentalism, mainly in the Middle East, he referred to and the terrorism used by these zealots. States are trying to discover the best way to deal with this situation, and this study suggests using Libya as a model. Although sanctions against Libya lasted over thirty years, they ended in success. Libya is contained and no longer a supporter of state-sponsored terrorism, as best as the international community can tell⁴. Sanctions are a proven form of containment and the best option for avoiding the use of force, however, in order for sanctions to contain a conflict area they must be in the form of multilateral sanctions.

History of Sanctions

Ancient Greece and United States Colonization

Sanctions have been utilized as a means of coercive diplomacy since 432 B.C. in ancient Greece when Pericles issued the Megarian Decree in an effort to limit access to

⁴ Refer to chapter 3

Megara's products; this was then known as a siege. Sieges are one of the earliest forms of economic sanctions and function by starving the target into submission. The Megarian Decree is the first documented example of peacetime economic sanctions in history. The imposition of these sanctions in the Megarian Decree eventually led to the Peloponnesian War. Given this fact one could challenge the success of these sanctions. However, the most important point here is that sanctions have been utilized since ancient Greece. This example of the Megarian Decree mirrors the events that took place in the United States during colonization.

The United States colonies imposed trade sanctions against Great Britain as a way of prosecuting war (Askari et al. 2003). Ideally sanctions preclude military action but as Askari et al. (2003) note, the American imposition of sanctions against Great Britain is an example of sanctions that would have been successful had the colonists had not also been fighting for independence. These two sanctions episodes highlight the fact that sanctions were still a fairly new phenomenon that had not yet been institutionalized; States did not know the rules of the game. States at the time did not know what to do after the sanctions were implemented and enforced. Sanctions were not followed by intense negotiation and diplomacy. Today States utilize their diplomats in order to negotiate the lifting of sanctions, whether that means offering concessions, inducements, or because demands have been met.

League of Nations Sanctions

The League of Nations was founded in 1920 in response to World War I in an effort to maintain international peace and security and uphold international law. The League was based on four main principles: (1) 'the acceptance of the obligation not to

resort to war’, (2) ‘the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations’, (3) ‘the firm establishment of the understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments’, and (4) ‘the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealing of organized people with one another’ (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 3, 1938). The League was the international organization responsible for ensuring that these principles were upheld. Its main instrument of coercion was the implementation of sanctions that had now been institutionalized (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1938).

In 1935 the definition of sanctions, as defined by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, was the specific penalty enacted in order to secure obedience to a law. According to the Royal Institute (1938) sanctions were originally thought of as a punishment or deterrent for starting a war which is technically a breach of international law. The League turned to sanctions as a means of coercion, rather than resorting to the use of force on 18 November 1935 when sanctions were multilaterally (50 States against one) imposed against Italy. In October 1935 Italy invaded Ethiopia to gain control of the area known as the WalWal because the Italian dictator Mussolini wanted power in East Africa (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1938). The League reacted by imposing sanctions against Italy citing Article XVI of the League Covenant that States all Member States will cut off trade and personal relationships with covenant-breaking States if sanctions are imposed, nationals of either state are to have no contact.

The success of the sanctions against Italy is debatable (Askari et al. 2003). Some argue that since the sanctions were only partially imposed it is not fair to say they failed while others argue that because they were not successful they should not be used. Either

way, the League of Nations imposed or threatened to impose sanctions eight times during its short existence (see Table 1) (Askari et al. 2003). The sanctions episodes involving Yugoslavia, Turkey, and Bulgaria are the only episodes out of the initial eight that are considered to be successful. This demonstrates that sanctions do have the potential for success considering that within the League of Nations alone there was a 37.5 percent success rate (Askari et al. 2003). Again, 37.5 percent is a high success rate when you consider the difficulty and likelihood of actually changing State behavior.

Table 1

*League of Nations Sanctions Episodes, Including Threats of Sanctions and Meetings to Consider Sanctions**

Target	Outcome
Threat of sanctions against Yugoslavia	Yugoslavia withdrew from Albania
Threat of sanctions against Greece	Greece withdrew from Bulgaria
League met to punish Japan	Nothing came of that meeting
Arms embargo against Paraguay over skirmish with Bolivia	Both parties reached a peaceful settlement
Weak sanctions imposed against Italy for invading Ethiopia	Sanctions were only partially imposed
Sanctions developed during Spanish Civil War	Sanctions were never adopted
Sanctions imposed against Bulgaria for illegal drug trafficking	Successful resolution
Sanctions against Turkey for illegal drug trafficking	Successful resolution

Note: Information provided in Askari, Hossein, John Forrer, Hildy Teegan and Jiawen Yang. *Economic Sanctions: Examining their Policy and Efficacy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 2003.

*This is a list of the major sanctions episodes in the League of Nations.

United Nations Sanctions

The UN was founded in 1945 after the dissolution of the League of Nations following World War II. The main purpose of the UN is to maintain peace and save proceeding generations from the ‘scourge of war.’ Article 41 of the UN Charter

provides for sanctions and States that “the Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations (Chapter 7, Article 41 of UN Charter).”

Sanctions have been a way for the UN to maintain peace and security in the 20th century. UN sanctions are defined as actions that aim to place physical restrictions upon the ability of a target to engage in the use of force itself, or to depict action which seeks to restrict the target’s freedom in other respects, such as in relations of an economic, financial, diplomatic or representative, sporting or cultural nature; sanctions are commonly used to coerce or punish; UN sanctions are binding, mandatory measures short of the use of force that are applied against particular States or Non-state actors by the UN Security Council (Chapter 7, Article 41 of UN Charter).

Farrall (2007) identifies nine types of sanctions, both economic and non-economic, generally utilized by the UN: (1) comprehensive economic sanctions; (2) particular economic sanctions; (3) financial sanctions; (4) diplomatic and representative sanctions; (5) transportation sanctions; (6) travel sanctions; (7) aviation sanctions; (8) sporting, cultural, scientific sanctions; and, (9) telecommunication sanctions. The UN Security Council is the main sender of sanctions within the UN and has increased its use of sanctions in the Post-Cold War world. Farrall (2007) argues that sanctions have been a prominent feature in International Relations because sanctions are the least unpleasant of all the coercive alternatives such as military force. UN sanctions in the 20th century have

had a one in three success rate (Hufbauer et al. 2003). Prior to the 1990s the Security Council had only imposed mandatory economic sanctions twice. Financial sanctions have been the most widely imposed type of sanctions by the Security Council having been imposed in 153 of 204 sanctions episodes. UN sanctions seek to uphold international law and the 35 percent success rate of Security Council sanctions provide evidence that sanctions are successful (Farrall 2007; Hufbauer et al. 2008).

Collective Security

In primitive societies groups played a much larger role than individuals and it was the responsibility of the group to offer punishment to any transgressors, the same can be said of the international community today (Cassese 2005). It is the responsibility of States to hold deviant States accountable for any law-breaking behavior according to Article 41 of the UN Charter. The idea of collective responsibility has trickled down throughout history which is why organizations such as the UN exist today. Collective responsibility means that not only is the entire international community responsible for punishing law-breaking States but the entire international community may suffer the consequences of that law-breaking behavior by the deviant state (Cassese 2005). The UN was founded on the idea of collective responsibility and all Member States agreed to the responsibility of maintaining peace and security when they signed the UN charter. The UN charter also obligates States to solve disputes peacefully, rather than resort to the use of force which is why collective sanctions are the best means of containing and potentially changing deviant behavior (Cassese 2005).

It has been stated throughout the literature on sanctions that the best results are obtained when sanctions are collectively imposed by major powers (Hufbauer et al. 2008;

Askari et al. 2003; Clark 1932; Hass & O'Sullivan 2000; Rodman 2001; Wolf 1980; Drezner 1999; Cassese 2005; Guzman 2008; Doxey 1999). This is the case because multilateral/collective sanctions send a much stronger message to the target and the global community while imposing much harsher penalties upon the target for noncompliance. "Every organized society is founded upon the principle that the enforcement of law is a function which belongs to the whole community and not to each interested member," as is the case in the international community (Clark, 88, 1932). It is the responsibility of law-abiding States to uphold international law to make law-breaking States accountable for their misdeeds, if not, the international community experiences more anarchy than is already in place. Iraq is the best example of collective action being taken by the international community through the use of sanctions in an effort to secure the region. Security Council sanctions against Iraq in 1991 are evidence that collective sanctions, do, in fact, constitute a form of collective security. Iraq suffered damages as a result of sanctions that brought its GNP to half of what it was pre-Gulf War (Drezner 1999). Sanctions contained the region, making it safer for all neighboring States in the region.

Sanctions are best addressed as a means of collective security because they can illicit the cooperation of Multi-National Corporations (MNCs) as well as international organizations. Coalitions of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) can pressure MNCs to comply with sanctions, even if their home governments do not. NGOs and other international organizations act as a moral authority when exerting such pressure on MNCs (Rodman 2001). Pressure from NGOs and public opinion can lead municipalities to pass laws that discourage corporations from conducting business in law-breaking

States. This was the case when local municipalities within the US threatened to stop selling Pepsi products on college campuses in order to discourage PepsiCo from conducting business in Burma (Rodman 2001). This act was successful and PepsiCo divested from Burma. If ordinances cause more damage to the MNC than staying in the disputed area, cooperation is likely. The actions taken by PepsiCo and local municipalities are an example of collective action at all levels of the international community (Rodman 2001; Hufbauer, et al. 2008).

There are, of course, problems that occur when States and international organizations attempt to enforce collective sanctions. One of these issues that arise is the free-rider problem. States have the potential of incurring high costs when imposing sanctions. These high costs provide an incentive for States to wait for another to impose the sanctions in order to avoid incurring those high costs (Guzman 2005). However, reputations of States play a large role in their international dealings so this provides an incentive for States to collectively impose sanctions in order to maintain a good reputation. The solution to these problems is collective enforcement. When States collectively enforce sanctions, they share the burden and the costs of implementation (Rodman 2001).

Methodology

In order to support the argument that collective sanctions are the best means of changing a States' behavior without resorting to force, this study will utilize case studies of the sanctions imposed against South Africa, Libya, India, and Pakistan. Sanctions cases against South African and Libya will be analyzed in order to support the argument that collective sanctions do indeed contain law-breaking behavior, preventing the spread

of instability as well as leading to an eventual change in behavior. South Africa and Libya have been chosen because these are two sanctions episodes scholars widely agree were successful (Segal 1964, Nesbitt 2004, Doxey 1980, Farrall 2007, Rodman 2001, Eyler 2007, Ramphal 1990, Haass & O'Sullivan 2000, Cortwright & Lopez 2002, Bowen 2006, Rose 1998, Askari et al. 2003). Economic data will be offered to support the argument that collective sanctions did indeed work in both South Africa and Libya. The sanctions episodes against India and Pakistan will illustrate how, if sanctions had been applied differently, the outcomes could have been different. Pakistan now has the fastest growing nuclear arsenal in the world and the instability from Afghanistan is seeping into its borders. In the cases of both India and Pakistan, a collective commitment to the enforcement of sanctions may have led to a much different outcome in the region today.

Case studies are best suited for this analysis because they allow the researcher to examine a particular aspect of a historical episode in order to develop and examine historical explanations that may be generalized to other events, which is why this study is utilizing case studies. Researchers are able to look far more in depth into the events being examined than a quantitative study would allow. Case studies are strong where quantitative methods are weak: there is a high potential for conceptual validity (there is high validity among a small number of cases rather than lumping together dissimilar cases), outlier and deviant behavior leads to new hypotheses, there is also a high much higher capacity for addressing causal relationships, producing much more generalizable results. Case studies are structured and focused because there are general questions to be answered and the researcher only looks at certain aspects of a historical event (George & Bennett 2004).

Research Question:

- *Why did sanctions achieve a change in behavior occur in South Africa and Libya and not India and Pakistan?*

This study will only attempt to fill in the holes in the literature on collective sanctions. There are fewer instances of multilateral sanction implementation due to the fact they have been underutilized. This study will contend that if States collectively band together in an effort to uphold international law by imposing sanctions upon law-breaking States conflict areas will be contained and there will be fewer instances of the use of force. This matters now more than ever because of the situation in Afghanistan. Where does the international community go if States do not collectively agree to contain the problem through the use of sanctions? Do policy makers continue the war or do they attempt to contain the situation? The instability in Afghanistan is poisonous to the entire region (as seen in Pakistan) and containment through collective sanctions are the best option for stability and security in the region.

The succeeding chapters will examine each sanctions episode in depth and analyze the factors that contributed to the success or failure of each. Chapter two will focus on the sanctions against South Africa. Chapter three will focus on Libya, chapter four will focus on both India and Pakistan and chapter five will include the conclusions of this study as well as recommendations for future research. Each case study will provide an analysis of the various aspects of the sanctions episode. The study will focus on, collective enforcement, containment, economic hardship, as well as the final outcome of the sanctions whether that is success or failure. Economic data will provide an indicator of the economic effects experienced in each target state. Whether or not a regime change

or a change in policy occurred within each target state will provide evidence of the success of sanctions.

CHAPTER 2

SOUTH AFRICA

This chapter examines the sanctions episode against South Africa and suggest that sanctions were in fact successful based the regime's change in behavior. The chapter will begin by laying out some of the history of the events that took place in South Africa leading up to the imposition of sanctions. The discussion will then turn to how South Africa was able to survive sanctions for a period of time and then the discussion will turn to the various aspects of collective enforcement. Finally, the chapter will provide economic data that supports the argument that sanctions were successful within South Africa, helping to end apartheid and the nuclear program.

History of Apartheid in South Africa

Apartheid is the sum of all policies, methods, beliefs and attitudes employed to guarantee that the white minority dominated the black Africans within South Africa (Segal 1964). On the 26 May 1948, the white minority in South Africa won a majority of the seats in Parliament after running on a racist platform. Black Africans in South Africa were not viewed by the white minority as human beings and years of discrimination ensued (Nesbitt 2004). Apartheid became the official policy of South Africa in 1948 (Nesbitt 2004).

The government in South Africa was composed of strictly white citizens. The constitution in South Africa never declared that its citizens were equal. In fact, in 1983 a new constitution was drafted that co-opted minorities in order to keep blacks from having political representation (a more complete list of apartheid legislation is provided in table two) (Hass & O'Sullivan 2005). Only five percent of the blacks and colored citizens in

South Africa were registered to vote, while 86 percent of the white minority were registered (Segal 1964). When blacks did try to vote they were forced to pay a poll tax, discouraging black participation. Between 1946 and 1961 white wages in South Africa rose 35 percent while black wages rose a mere 11 percent (Segal 1964). During this period there were 2000 blacks jailed a day for no other reason than the color of their skin. The government went so far as to bulldoze entire neighborhoods forcing blacks to live in tenements that are similar to ghettos (Segal 1964).

Table 2

*Apartheid Legislation**

Act	Effect
Population Register Act, 1950	Divided the population into racial categories
Group Areas Act, 1950	Complete separation of territory
Separate Representation of Voters Act, 1951	Colored voters put on separate roll to elect four white representatives
Bantu Authorities Act, 1951	Tribal authorities only allowed in certain areas. Blacks in urban areas were considered aliens. Abolished parliamentary representation.
Native Laws Amendment, 1952	African born blacks can visit urban areas up to 72 hours with a permit.
Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, 1953	Legalized segregation
Native Labor Act, 1953	Blacks can only do certain types of work.
Bantu Education Act, 1953	Separate schools, universities, control given to Ministry of Native Affairs

Note: Information provided in Segal, Ronald. Sanctions against South Africa: International Conference on Economic Sanctions Against South Africa. London: Penguin Books, 1964.

*Institutionalized apartheid

A major reason that whites favored apartheid was that it kept black labor cheap. Four out of five black families were starving. The white life expectancy was 62-67 while the black life expectancy was only 37-42 (Segal 1964). The tax system in South Africa was also designed to ensure that the black majority stayed repressed. Nonwhites made up 99 percent of the unskilled labor force and 66 percent of the semiskilled labor force, making the agriculture and mining industries completely reliant on the black labor force

(Segal 1964). Whites controlled 99 percent of the mining capital, 94 percent of the industrial capital, 88 percent of the financial capital and 75 percent of the commercial capital (Segal 1964). It was also illegal for blacks to form labor unions, strike, or negotiate with employers, leaving the black population reliant on the white minority.

The Path to Sanctions

The campaign for sanctions against South Africa began in 1946 by India over the treatment of Indians in South Africa. In 1948 the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) was signed, legitimizing claims of mistreatment of the nonwhite ethnic groups in South Africa and also making apartheid illegal (Nesbitt 2004). In 1952 a group of African and Asian Member States to the UN wrote to the Secretary General regarding the discrimination that was then turning violent, taking place in South Africa pleading for action to be taken against South Africa (Nesbitt 2004).

The May Day Strikes of 1950 resulted in the violent suppression of black protestors. As a result of this violent suppression, grass roots campaigns in the US and abroad brought attention to the problems in South Africa (Nesbitt 2004). World leaders signed petitions and declarations in order to publicly protest the apartheid regime. The first call for sanctions came in 1959 from the African National Congress (ANC). The ANC called for a total boycott of South African goods. States including Ghana, Jamaica, Tunisia, Algeria, Rhodesia, Finland, Sweden, Norway and Sweden quickly lent support to the movement (Nesbitt 2004).

African nationalism had never been as violent as in the 1960 Sharpeville Massacre (Rodman 2001; Eyster 2007; Nesbitt 2004). In 1960, South African police

massacred 64 civilians when the government used force against the blacks and the blacks used counter-force in order to defend themselves (Segal 1964). The Security Council condemned the massacre in a resolution in April 1960. The massacre further mobilized domestic movements against apartheid that gained support from the international community (Nesbitt 2004). African American civil rights leaders linked their struggle with the struggle in South Africa, garnering needed support for the anti-apartheid movement.

As a result of the violence in South Africa, in 1964 the United States imposed nominal sanctions by restricting EX-IM bank loans availability, military hardware sales, continued until 1975, and then expanded (Eyler 2007). In July 1964, leaders in the anti-apartheid movement, including Nelson Mandela, were sentenced to life in prison. Also in 1964 a sanctions committee in the UN met and determined that South Africa would indeed be vulnerable to sanctions due to the fact that they imported 38 percent of their chemicals, 43 percent of its transportation and engineering equipment and 52 percent of its petroleum products (Nesbitt 2004).

The violence continued and the world was again stunned by a massacre of unarmed school children that occurred in 1976 (Nesbitt 2004). There was a nonviolent protest taking place against the imposition of the white language as the main instruction language in black schools. Policed fired 300 shots into the crowd killing 54 and wounding 300. Riots then spread throughout South Africa. By the end of this span of riots, 377 were killed and over 2400 were arrested (Nesbitt 2004). There was yet another call from the international community to implement stricter sanctions against South Africa.

In 1984 there was yet another violent uprising in South Africa that again brought the anti-apartheid movement back to the attention of the international community. The Rainbow Coalition, led by the American Reverend Jesse Jackson, was formed and brought this issue to forefront in the American political stage (Nesbitt 2004). On 21 November 1984, sit-ins took place all over the United States at South African consulates, coin shops, and federal buildings (Nesbitt 2004).

Also in 1984, South Africa made constitutional changes that opened the Parliament up to colored and Indian communities but still left the blacks out. As a result there were increased racial tensions, arrests and disorder within South Africa (Ramphal 1990). Soldiers were brought in to control the riots that were taking place. These events weakened investor confidence and increased pressure within the international community for the financial isolation of South Africa's economy (Ramphal 1990).

Sanctions

There was growing outrage all over the world in response to apartheid. The solution was to attack the problem on two fronts: (1) make it clear to the world the UN and its Member States would not tolerate apartheid and (2) the UN would support efforts to bring change to South Africa (Segal 1964). South Africa was a target for sanctions because its internal policies of apartheid and nuclear proliferation were a threat to international peace according to Article 39 of the UN Charter and because South Africa had a lot of gold which meant that sanctions would cause economic hardship (Segal 1964). In 1962 the General Assembly of the UN recommended that Member States: break diplomatic relations with South Africa or refrain from reestablishing them; close

ports to ships flying the South African flag; forbid their ships from entering South African ports; boycott South African trade; and refuse to land South African cargo shipments or shipments from any company based out of South Africa (Doxey 1980).

In 1960, the United States and Great Britain supported Security Council sanctions against South Africa after the Sharpeville Massacre. As a result of this resolution, the United States placed business restrictions on dual-use technology exports to South Africa (Rodman 2001). Local governments within the United States began to offer preferential treatment in bidding for city contracts to firms with no investments in South Africa (Rodman 2001).

By the end of 1963 the Security Council had twice determined that South Africa was a threat to peace (Segal 1964). With the repression of the majority of the population and the denial of self-determination, the situation in South Africa was indeed a threat to peace (Farrall 2007). The Security Council imposed sanctions and urged the South African government to end violence against its people and take urgent steps to eliminate apartheid and racial discrimination. This action taken by the Security Council did little more than merely condemn South Africa for its policies (Farrall 2007).

Also in 1963, 110 Member States of the UN severed all ties with South Africa (Segal 1964). Again in 1963, the Security Council imposed an arms embargo against South Africa, France and Britain abstained from this vote (Doxey 1980). The arms buildup in South Africa was an extreme consequence of colonialism and demonstrated South Africa's defensive posture and willingness to use force if necessary (Segal 1964). Sanctions needed to be supported by all because South Africa had a very open economy

with many trading partners. Unfortunately, States figured out ways to circumvent this arms embargo by conducting illicit arms trades (Doxey 1980). The arms embargo was imposed because it was the arms trade that the Security Council deemed as the biggest threat to peace due to the instability that weapons trade could cause in the region (Doxey 1980). That resolution implementing the sanctions differentiated between arms used for internal suppression and external defense, making it easy for States to avoid adhering to sanctions, however, the new Labor government in Britain immediately banned all arms trade with South Africa (Doxey 1980).

South Africa's invasion of Namibia was also a concern that led to the initial implementation of sanctions. At the request of the Security Council, the International Court of Justice declared South Africa's presence in Namibia illegal (Doxey 1980). In 1973, OPEC imposed a total oil embargo against South Africa. These sanctions were implemented because South Africa was targeted by the UN to be most vulnerable to these specific sanctions (Doxey 1980). In 1974 both Great Britain and France vetoed a Security Resolution that would have expelled South Africa from the UN (Doxey 1980). In response to the 1983 constitution, bank loans to South Africa stopped and NGOs pulled out of the region. The United States treaty with South Africa was terminated and additional sanctions threatened if progress was not made (Hass & O'Sullivan 2000).

Collective Action

There was an international consensus on the issue of the antiapartheid movement at the ethical level (Doxey 1980). Most States agreed that apartheid was a threat to peace and needed to be stopped in order to bring stability back to the entire region. By 1986

most States had imposed sanctions against South Africa (Rodman 2001). The most damaging source of economic pressure came from the private credit boycott. In order for this type of capital flight to be successful, States need cooperation from private firms (Rodman 2001). In 1985, Chase Manhattan chose not to roll over its loans to South Africa and froze all lines of credit lending, other international banks followed suit (Rodman 2001). As a result of the capital flight that occurred and the trade embargoes that were put place, South Africa was cut off from private capital markets. Due to this economic hardship, South Africa was unable to achieve political or economic stability (Rodman 2001).

Grassroots efforts to end apartheid continued in the 1970s and intensified in the international community due to States' lack of action towards apartheid (Nesbitt 2004). During the early 1960s, South Africa lost foreign investment and import markets due to sanctions. South Africa had a stable economy until the oil prices increased in the 1970s. From 1964 to 1976 South Africa strengthened its reliance on United States goods and markets. In 1976, South Africa imported 22 percent of its goods from the United States and only exported 11 percent to the United States. In 1974, sanctions were strengthened when South Africa bought uranium and busted Rhodesian sanctions (Eyler 2007). Sanctions were then furthered strengthened in 1986 as a result of the development of nuclear weapons in South Africa that was considered a major threat to international peace and security. The sanctions now banned nuclear collaboration and new United States investment, prohibiting bank loans and computer sales (Eyler 2007).

There was a ban on all new lending and investment in South Africa (Ramphal 1990). South Africa was treated by the banks as a heavily indebted country which

restricted the banks' ability to make new loans (Ramphal 1990). The banks were encouraged to reschedule payment schedules one year at a time because of the lack of confidence in South Africa's ability to repay its debt, due to the economic downturn as a result of sanctions (Ramphal 1990).

Demonstrating their support for sanctions, the Swiss restricted all lending to South Africa in 1974 (Ramphal 1990). Banks in the United Kingdom followed suit in 1975. Dutch commercial banks discontinued all lending to South Africa in 1976 (Ramphal 1990). The Danish government terminated export credits, guarantees, and insurance of exports to South Africa in 1978 (Ramphal 1990). In 1977, some large United States banks ceased lending to South Africa while local governments within the United States sold its shares of South African companies (Ramphal 1990). Table 3 displays data on United States' disinvestment⁵ in South Africa as an example of how corporations all over the world got rid of their companies in South Africa.

⁵ Disinvestment is the withdrawal of foreign companies from their direct or indirect equity investments in South Africa. The goal of disinvestment is to accelerate the end of apartheid by isolating South Africa and putting real wealth under threat (Ramphal 1990). Disinvestment reduces the opposition to sanctions. If businesses have no stake in South Africa then they will not care about the economic impact of sanctions (Ramphal 1990).

Table 3

United States Disinvestment in South Africa

Percentage of US Companies	Result
36	Sold to South African companies
23	Sold to South African management and employees
17	Sold to other foreign companies
11	Closed down
6	Sold/donated assets to some form of trust
0.8	Moved to a neighboring country
0.8	Gave assets to a South African church
4	Disposed of assets in untraceable ways

Note: Information provided in Rodman, Kenneth A. *Sanctions Beyond Borders: Multinational Corporations and US Economic Statecraft*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001

Banks' refusal to lend to South Africa was the most significant sanction in restricting economic growth. Trade sanctions and disinvestment pressures played a supporting role in strangling the economy in South Africa (Ramphal 1990). As a result of disinvestment in the South African economy there was a poor outlook for new investments. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) would not originate new loans to South Africa and the international community was comfortable with the idea that continued sanctions would constrict the economy to the point the government would be forced to end apartheid (Ramphal 1990).

In 1983, the South African government was targeted with limited financial sanctions. The incentive for South Africa is the lifting of sanctions (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000). The road map for this action to take place was laid out in the CAAA and listed five doable actions for South Africa to achieve in order to lift sanctions. In order to lift sanctions, South Africa needed to: free Nelson Mandela, repeal the state of emergency, legalize proscribed political parties, repeal two apartheid laws and enter into good faith

negotiations without preconditions with representative members of the black majority (Hass & O'Sullivan 2000).

Economic Effects

As a result of sanctions, South Africa could not stop the unemployment rates from rising. South Africa had to either increase trade or pay back debts because foreign banks would not make new loans, foreign trade credits provide only a short-term increase in foreign borrowing, many capital-exporting States banned new investments in South Africa, and the potential for foreign investors were discouraged by uncertainties as a result of apartheid (Ramphal 1990). Gold, (South Africa's main export), faced increased supplies on the world market as well as uncertain prices and there were limited prospects to increase non-gold exports from South Africa (Ramphal 1990). South Africa had a poor economic outlook and the international community agreed that continued economic pressure would force South Africa to change its policies (Ramphal 1990).

The 1985 financial crisis due to foreign reactions to apartheid grew worse with the imposition of sanctions. The external debt to GDP ratio rose from 20 percent in 1980 to 46 percent in 1984, more than doubling in only four years (Ramphal 1990). South Africa's reliance on short-term private debt rose because it was classified as a problem debtor that was subject to rescheduling (Ramphal 1990). The Rand (South African currency) lost a third of its value between 1984 and 1985. The South African economy went from being classified as a safe economic classification to a high-risk third world economy (Ramphal 1990). In 1985, there was a withdrawal of voluntary spending which led to a hike in interest rates and taxes (Ramphal 1990). The exchange rate fell, altered

savings and investment flows, links to management and technology in the West was limited, reduced foreign business stake, black job loss was modest (suggesting that financial sanctions did effect the elites), and use by some disinvestors of franchising arrangements that may add opportunities for black businessman (Ramphal 1990).

A survey of banks all over the world revealed a lack of confidence in South Africa's long-term prospects without government reform (Ramphal 1990). By the end of 1987 MNCs in South Africa declined 40 percent from their peak (Ramphal 1990). With no rise in the price of gold, the production of gold and exports did not help fill the gap in the economy. In 1988, South Africa experienced the depreciation of the Rand when the trade-weighted exchange rate fell ten percent (Ramphal 1990). The President of South Africa announced plans to privatize many public enterprises and corporations in order to generate revenue (Ramphal 1990). South Africa's external debt in 1980 was seven billion USD and in 1984 it was 24 billion USD illustrating the strain that sanctions put on the economy (Ramphal 1990). From 1985 to 1992 the GDP in South Africa grew half a percent each year with 15 percent inflation (Eyler 2007). The strengthening of sanctions in 1985 is credited with helping to bring an end to apartheid (Eyler 2007).

Conclusion

As a direct result of sanctions, free elections were held in South Africa in 1994 after pressure from the United States domestic movements, international sanctions and Mandela's efforts (Nesbitt 2004). In 1994, Nelson Mandela was elected president of South Africa (Eyler 2007). One reason sanctions in South Africa were successful is because they restricted South Africa from finding substitute markets. The economy was

completely isolated thanks to the cooperation of the international community (Eyler 2007). By the 1980s, the international community was turning against South Africa, leaving fewer States willing to bust sanctions and conduct business transactions with South Africa (Eyler 2007).

The sanctions episode against South Africa demonstrates that sanctions are a successful tool of international policy. Sanctions against South Africa were implemented collectively, leaving the economy completely isolated. When sanctions are applied with a firm commitment to end a policy, by a collection of States, the probability of success increases. To this day, South Africa was the world's only racial autocracy (Kennan 1987). The instability that the policy of apartheid created within South Africa was undeniable. Fear that the instability would spread to other areas was legitimate given the invasion of Namibia. In order to avoid using any force the international community banded together to implement sanctions that isolated the economy to the point the government was forced to change its policies. While the grassroots efforts that took place across the world contributed, there is no doubt that sanctions also contributed to ending apartheid.

CHAPTER 3

LIBYA

Sanctions were successful in Libya, according to the majority of research on sanctions⁶. Some scholars suggest that sanctions against Libya were successful because they helped to spur secret negotiations that led to the surrender and conviction of multiple terrorists involved in the Lockerbie and UTA⁷ bombings and caused Libya to renounce terrorism as well as its nuclear program (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). The sanctions against Libya were imposed for numerous reasons, the main area of contention being Libya's support for terrorist activities as evidenced by the bombings of Pan Am flight 103 and UTA flight 772 (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000).

Libya fits the model of this research because the sanctions imposed were done so at first by just the United States, but eventually collectively by the international community and helped to contain the spread of Libya's policies. In order to provide an understanding of how and why sanctions were successful in Libya, this chapter will first give a brief history of Libya under the autocratic rule of Qaddafi, then turn to the imposition of the sanctions and provide economic data that supports the claim that sanctions weakened the economy to the point Libya had no other choice than to begin secret negotiations with the United States and United Kingdom (Bowen 2006; Rose 1998).

⁶ See references for further reading.

⁷ A French airliner.

History

In 1969 Qaddafi seized power in Libya and immediately sought to impose his will upon the state (Bowen 2006). Qaddafi declared that Libya was a republic and established the Revolutionary Command Council. Qaddafi and his colleagues ran the state with an autocratic rule (Bowen 2006). All the decisions of the state were made by Qaddafi and his small group of associates. His main priority was always the security and survival of the regime but in practice Qaddafi's approach to the external relations of the state was radical and unpredictable at best (Bowen 2006).

In order to ensure the survival of his autocratic regime, Qaddafi sought to spread his influence throughout the Arab World by uniting Arab States in a coalition that he would lead (Bowen 2006). Qaddafi began by creating a welfare state within Libya, which led to formation of a large public sector that was supported solely by the States' oil revenues (Bowen 2006). Qaddafi recognized that public support within Libya was essential to the survival of the state and thus took the necessary steps to ensure he gained their favor by creating a welfare State. Qaddafi then continued in his quest for the unification of the Arab World by supporting various regimes that fought against Israel as well as helping finance terror and the acquisition of nuclear weapons (Bowen 2006).

Qaddafi was the leader in the Arab World's fight against Israel, providing financial assistance to States (Egypt and Syria) that were fighting against Israel as well as funding the radical Palestinians, one of his first acts in the support of international terrorism (Bowen 2006). Libya viewed Israel's nuclear capability and long-range missile systems as a major threat to the Arab World and thus sought to obtain similar capabilities

(Bowen 2006). The urgency of this task increased in 1986 when the United States implemented air strikes against Libya in reaction to Libya's support for international terrorism (Bowen 2006). Libya recognized its deficiencies in terms of defense and sought to obtain capabilities that would deter its enemies. Libya also gave financial assistance to Pakistan's nuclear weapons program. Libya gave Pakistan upwards of \$500 million USD, hoping Pakistan would in turn share its technology. Libya was promised that the Pakistani government would share the technology they obtained. Technology sharing never occurred; Pakistan was able to exploit the Islamic nature of its program in order to gain funding from Libya (Bowen 2006).

Once the unification of the Arab World failed, Qaddafi's new goal was to take down the Arab governments that he deemed to be unacceptable and replace them with acceptable ones (Bowen 2006). In order to gain the power needed for such a venture, Qaddafi began the process of gaining chemical and nuclear weapons, otherwise known as Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs). Ultimately, it was Qaddafi's desire to spread his influence and avoid conflict that fueled the desire to obtain chemical and nuclear weapons (Bowen 2006).

Qaddafi determined that the mere possession of nuclear and chemical weapons would act as a deterrent for States seeking to use force against Libya. Libya's inability to halt aggression from the outside, due to its limited military force, made them want to at least give the impression that they had nuclear weapons (Bowen 2006). Qaddafi claimed that nuclear technology was for peaceful purposes, but on several occasions he

contradicted that notion with his references to an ‘Arab Bomb’⁸ (Bowen 2006). Qaddafi used his rhetoric on nuclear weapons as political propaganda, believing that mere words would deter his enemies (Bowen 2006). Libya approached China, France, India, Pakistan, and the former Soviet Union in an effort to obtain assistance in gaining nuclear weapons (Bowen 2006). In 1975, Moscow provided Libya with a nuclear research reactor (Bowen 2006). Libya’s relations with Moscow allowed them to gain more sophisticated weaponry which they then supplied to other governments in the developing world in order to spread their influence, paving the way for Libya’s future relations with many African States (Bowen 2006).

The Path to Sanctions

Libyan relations with the United States and United Kingdom first began to sour when Libyan operatives assassinated dissidents living in Europe under the orders of Qaddafi to kill any “stray dogs” of the revolution in May 1980 (Bowen 2006). In January 1986 airport bombings in both Rome and Vienna were linked to Libya, leading the United States to impose comprehensive economic sanctions. The United States then began a campaign to garner international support for sanctions in an effort to isolate Libya from the international community (Bowen 2006; Eyster 2007).

In June 1981, United States President Ronald Reagan named Libya as the world’s “most prominent state sponsor of and participant in international terrorism” and sought international support for a sanctions campaign against Libya (Bowen, 14, 2006). Initially, the United States’ allies and firms did not support sanctions because: (1) the

⁸ See Bowen, Wyn Q. “Libya and Nuclear Proliferation: Stepping Back From the Brink.” New York: Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2006.

United States told its allies that it would not make concessions with United States and international firms who were forced to abandon Libya; (2) private firms wanted to maintain trade and investments with Libya; (3) many European allies were dependent on Libya for imports (mainly oil) and thought the United States was inflating the problem; and, (4) five independent oil companies worked with Libya, some operated through United Kingdom subsidiaries in order to maintain business (Rodman 2001). It was not until the two bombings of the airliners that the international community took notice of the threat posed by Libya.

In April 1986, there was another bombing in a West Berlin nightclub for which Libya was responsible (Bowen 2006). In December 1988, there was yet another bombing over Lockerbie, Scotland of Pan Am flight 103 that killed 259 people, mostly American and British nationals (Bowen 2006; Rose 1998). On 19 September 1989 a French airliner UTA flight 772 exploded over Niger in Africa killing 171 people (Rose 1998). Investigations into both airline bombings revealed that both were the work of Libyan intelligence operatives (Rose 1998). In October 1991, a Parisian judge issued warrants for the arrest of four Libyan intelligence officers. Two weeks later, the United States and United Kingdom followed suit, issuing warrants for two intelligence officers responsible for the Lockerbie bombing (Bowen 2006; Rose 1998). Libya also allowed terrorists to burn the United States Embassy in Tripoli (Bowen 2006). The United States viewed the fact that Libya did nothing to stop the Embassy attack as blatant support for terrorism.

On the 7 January 1986 the United States banned all trade with Libya and ordered departure of all United States' oil companies with investments in Libya (Rodman 2001). In March 1986, the United States had two events in the Mediterranean involving Libya

where two Libyan gunboats sank and a missile site was destroyed by United States warships, but Qaddafi was warned first. The United States received international criticism for these operations. The United States maintained that it was only taking retaliatory action and only France lent its support (Eyler 2007).

Sanctions

The United States was the first state to impose the full gamut of sanctions against Libya (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000). Due to its support for terrorist groups, the United States sanctioned Libyan arm sales in 1978 and those particular sanctions lasted until 2004 (Eyler 2007). The Reagan administration ushered in an era of heated relations with Libya and a string of terrorist attacks occurred during this period that were all traced back to Libya (Bowen 2006). In 1982 the United States embargoed Libyan oil imports to keep profits from funding terrorist activities (Eyler 2007). A State Department Report in 1986 stated that Libya was "meddling" in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and South/Southeast Asia, signaling a potential spread of instability (Bowen 2006). The report was titled "Character of Libyan Policy," and stated that Libya's "use of political economic and military resources in support of anti-Western activities worldwide may be surpassed only by the Soviet Union, its East European allies, and possibly North Korea and Cuba" (Bowen, 15, 2006).

On 8 January 1986 the United States froze Libya's assets in foreign and domestic American banks (Rodman 2001). The United States imposed comprehensive sanctions against Libya covering all commercial and financial transactions (Bowen 2006). Libya struggled as a result of these sanctions, but was still surviving, highlighting the need for

international cooperation. Sanctions, from the United States perspective, were imposed against Libya to coerce the government to change its behavior in three specific areas: (1) a change in attitude towards Israel; (2) renounce support for international terrorist and extremist movements; and, (3) halt its efforts to obtain WMDs (Hass & O'Sullivan 2000). Sanctions were a way to destabilize the regime by limiting the resources available to it (Rodman 2001). Aid packages, including monetary aid, country-to-country student exchanges, telephone links, and lifting restrictions on NGOs were offered as inducements for compliance with sanctions (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000).

In 1992, the UN imposed full sanctions on air travel and arms sales to Libya in Security Council resolutions 748 and 883 (Eyler 2007). Security Council resolution 748 demanded Libya extradite two suspects in the bombing of Pan Am flight 103, renounce terrorism, and assist the French in the UTA bombing investigation (Bowen 2006; Eyler 2007). These sanctions also imposed arms and air embargoes against Libya. Aviation sanctions were intended to isolate Libya in order to contain its policies and not cause trouble for others in the region, as well as cause mild economic hardship (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). These sanctions prevented planes from taking off or landing in Libya, reduced the diplomatic presence in Libya, there were no insurance pay outs for the airlines, and no aviation equipment could be bought or sold (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). Libya violated these sanctions a few times, but was still very isolated from the rest of the world. Security Council Resolution 883 froze government assets abroad and froze some oil-transporting equipment (Askari et al. 2003; Cortwright & Lopez 2002). The lack of oil-transporting equipment would later cripple the Libyan oil industry.

There were religious exemptions from sanctions placed against Libya; travel bans were lifted for pilgrimages to Mecca (Cortwright & Lopez 2000). These exemptions were included in the sanctions package in order to avoid any accusations of human rights violations on the part of the UN (Cortwright & Lopez 2000). UN sanctions were designed to be targeted rather than crippling in order to diminish the effect sanctions may have on bystanders within Libya and abroad (Bowen 2006). The public did however experience hardship and a decreased standard of living during the sanctions era.

In 1996, the United States named Libya, along with Iran, in a new law that penalized domestic and international companies for doing business within their borders. This new law, named the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA), further isolated Libya economically (Eyler 2007). American and international companies did not stop doing business in Libya until they were legally required to do so by this law (Rodman 2001). ILSA called for the imposition of sanctions on any American or foreign company which made investments that directly contributed to the development of petroleum or natural gas resources in Iran or Libya. Due to European Union (EU) opposition, the United States agreed to waive ILSA on the first deal made by companies that violated the act (Bowen 2006).

Collective Action

The EU was initially resistant to the imposition of sanctions on Libya mostly because they imported 20 percent of their oil from Libya (Rodman 2001). It was not until 1988, when Libya was directly tied to the Pan Am bombing of flight 103 that the EU, as well as the rest of the international community took notice of the threat displayed

by Libya. This act of terrorism garnered international support for sanctions; however, the United States was still the main sender (Eyler 2007). As the investigation into the airline bombing in Scotland uncovered, Libya was home to two of the terrorists responsible. Because a majority of the victims were American and British nationals, the United States and United Kingdom were the leaders in the sanctions campaign that would eventually lead to the prosecution of the terrorists responsible (Bowen 2006; Rose 1998).

In November 1991 the United States, United Kingdom, and France issued a joint declaration calling for Libya to comply with all their demands. This declaration garnered the support of the EU and the UN (as evidence of Resolution 731) (Rose 1998). In January 1992 the UN Security Council Resolution 731 called on Libya to provide a full and effective response to the British and American investigation, and to a French investigation into the UTA airliner bombing over Africa. Resolution 731 specifically called for Libya to surrender the accused persons involved in the two bombings, accept responsibility for the events, pay compensation, renounce terrorism, and provide details about the Lockerbie attack (Bowen 2006). Resolution 748 was issued by the Security Council in March 1992 after Libya ignored the previous resolution. Resolution 748 imposed sanctions on Libya and the sanctions were strengthened in November 1993 when the Security Council drafted Resolution 883 (Bowen 2006).

Secret negotiations took place in the 1990s between the United States, United Kingdom, and Libya concerning the extradition of the two terror suspects (Bowen 2006; Rose 1998). Libya wanted to extradite the two suspects in the Pan Am bombing to a neutral court. Negotiations were at a stalemate until 1998, when negotiating parties agreed to extradite the suspects to The Hague to face prosecution (Cortwright & Lopez

2002). Early attempts at negotiations in the 1990s suggest that Qaddafi's nuclear aspirations may have begun to change when multilateral UN sanctions were imposed on Libya in 1992 (Bowen 2006). Qaddafi's willingness to negotiate may suggest that his policies and goals for the state were beginning to change. According to some experts, sanctions may have ended much sooner had the United States and United Kingdom not been so intent on prosecuting the terror suspects at one of its own courts (Rose 1998).

Economic Effects

Most of the sanctions against Libya were dropped in 2004 because the goals of the sanctions were met; however, a few did still remain in place. The UN lifted sanctions in 2004 once Libya turned over the terrorists responsible for the Lockerbie bombing and spoke out against terrorism which was one of the goals of the sanctions that were imposed (Eyler 2007). Some argue that success is limited because Qaddafi is still in power and there is no way of knowing for sure whether or not he still supports terrorists, but there is no evidence to suggest that there have been any terrorist activities (Eyler 2007). Reports suggest that UN sanctions cost the regime an estimated \$27 billion USD between 1992-1993 and 2001 (Bowen 2006).

In order to fully understand the economic effects that sanctions had on Libya it is essential to note that in the 1970s and 1980s Qaddafi used profits from the oil boom to gain and maintain popular support by creating the welfare state (Bowen 2006). Libya had an ineffective socialist economy and oversized public sector which made it vulnerable to sanctions in the first place (Bowen 2006). Libya's economy was completely reliant on its oil revenues, and without those revenues, the economy would

suffer. In the 1990s, UN sanctions, coupled with decreasing oil prices caused Libyan oil exports and revenues to be reduced by half their previous levels (Bowen 2006). ILSA further constrained the oil sector by limiting production (Bowen 2006). Libyan oil production in 2003 was half the levels of the 1970s and was unable to expand its economy because the sanctions limited access to resources (Bowen 2006).

The economic effects sanctions had on Libya included high inflation, high unemployment, and a decrease in the standard of living. The regime bore the burden of supporting the population in order to avoid poor humanitarian conditions (Eyler 2007). Libya claims to have lost \$378 million USD due to the sanctions placed upon them (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). These losses were reported to have been in the agricultural sectors. Libya reported a \$250 million USD loss in crop production, \$5 billion USD loss in livestock production and a ten percent crop loss (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). There was a 75 percent reduction in government spending. The public sector pay remained frozen from 1982 to 2003 and 60 percent of government expenditures went to paying wages as inflation rose (Bowen 2006). Unemployment in 2003 was 25 percent while the workforce was growing at four percent every 12 months (Bowen 2006). There were dwindling living conditions in Libya which led to growing dissatisfaction with the regime (Bowen 2006). Because of the travel sanctions that were imposed, Libyan planes were turned away from airports all over the world, isolating Libya even further. Europe's reliance on Libyan oil made travel bans the easiest to enforce (Rose 1998).

As a result of sanctions, Libya also changed its position on terrorism. The United States State Department released a report in 2002 that stated there are "no credible reports of Libyan involvement in terrorism since 1994" and again in 2003 they stated that "close

official and independent observers of Libyan behavior are hard-pressed to find evidence of terrorist involvement in the last decade (Bowen 2006).” The changes in Libyan behavior were directly in line with Security Council Resolution 731 (Bowen 2006). Libya reached an agreement with the United States and United Kingdom to turn over the suspects in the Lockerbie bombing. In 1998, through secret negotiations, that were stalled for years, these three States agreed that the suspects would be prosecuted at The Hague under Scottish law (Bowen 2006). As a result, Security Council Resolution 1192 was drafted and called for the suspension of all sanctions once the suspects were handed over in April 1999 (Bowen 2006).

The main goal of sanctions was to get the two Lockerbie suspects extradited to face prosecution. Once the sanctions were issued in November 1992, they were renewed every three months. However, in November 1992 the United States, United Kingdom, and France issued a declaration “pushing to strengthen sanctions unless suspects are turned over”; there was no change in the situation (Rose 1998). In November 1993, Security Council Resolution 883 strengthened sanctions against Libya (Rose 1998). The multilateral embargo was suspended and American, as well as the remaining UN sanctions stayed in place and the removal depended on continuing cooperation with the Lockerbie and UTA investigations (Bowen 2006).

Libya also disengaged from the Middle East and garnered allies in Africa who all opposed continued UN sanctions. In June 1998, the African Union threatened to ignore sanctions if the Lockerbie issue was not resolved in three months. This was the clincher in the United States, United Kingdom, and Libya agreeing to prosecute the offenders at The Hague (Bowen 2006). In 2004, UN sanctions were completely lifted because Libya

had met all the demands laid out in 1992 by Resolution 731 (Bowen 2006). The United States also lifted sanctions in 2004.

Conclusion

There have been no reports of terror attacks involving Libya since the imposition of sanctions, leading many to conclude that sanctions were in fact, successful (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). Sanctions would have also ended sooner had the United States and United Kingdom been able to reach an agreement over the neutral court issue in the Lockerbie case (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). The era of multilateral sanctions led to a period of change in Libya's external policies which constitutes a success. Sanctions led to cooperation and resolution to the Lockerbie issue, the renunciation of terrorism, and foregoing its nuclear program (Bowen 2006). Sanctions were also successful in containing Libya's desire to spread its influence by isolating the entire the state, creating one less problem State in the Middle East.

On 19 December 2003 Libya announced that it was abandoning its nuclear and chemical weapons programs and took responsibility for its past actions (Bowen 2006; Haass & O'Sullivan 2000). Libya was somehow far more technologically advanced in 2003 than was previously suspected. It was assumed that because of sanctions, Libya was unable to obtain the technology that would have allowed them to produce nuclear or chemical weapons (Bowen 2006). In December 2003, when Qaddafi opted to halt the production of a nuclear weapon, it had already obtained all the pieces of the jigsaw to build the weapon (Bowen 2006). There are four reasons the Libyan nuclear program fell apart: (1) the program was not well managed; (2) the state experienced brain drain due to

the sanctions that were imposed; (3) the suppliers were unreliable; and (4) secret negotiations with United States and United Kingdom had reached fruition (Bowen 2006).

According to the Libyan government the nuclear program ended because it was no longer in line with Libya's security interests. In a statement given to the Security Council in December 2003, Libya claimed "the arms race is conducive neither to its own security nor that of the region and runs counter to its strong desire for a world blessed with security and peace (Bowen, 48, 2006)." In a speech given at the March 2004 meeting of the African Union, Qaddafi's son stated that "the security of Libya does not come from the nuclear bomb; the nuclear bomb represents a danger to the country which has [it]. The nuclear arms race is a crazy and destructive policy for economy and life (Bowen, 48, 2006)." These statements alone suggest that Libya did in fact have a change in policy which is essential in determining the success of sanctions.

From the British perspective, Libya chose to end its nuclear program because diplomacy and negotiations prevailed. Libya's desire to rejoin the international community was greater than its desire for nuclear weapons (Bowen 2006). From the American perspective, Libya chose to end its nuclear weapons program because sanctions were enforced and because the Iraq War sent a strong message (Bowen 2006). The Iraq War was an interesting anomaly in the sanctions episode. It has been suggested that the Iraq War was viewed by Libya as an example of what was to come if they did not cooperate, leading the state to change its policies (Bowen 2006; Rose 1998).

Sanctions worked in Libya because they targeted the States' dependence on oil to finance the public sector, were supported by the UN, and discouraged foreign companies

involvement in the Libyan economy (Bowen 2006). It is interesting to note that sanctions were not supported by the UN and international community until the Lockerbie incident, despite Libya's long history of support for international terrorism. There are five main reasons why the UN imposed sanctions over the Lockerbie incident: (1) the scale of the Lockerbie and UTA attacks were dramatically higher than previous incidents involving Libya; (2) the victims included American, British, and French victims insuring their cooperation with the United States for UN sanctions; (3) evidence in these cases was more damning than in the past; (4) Europeans realized sanctions were best way to avoid the use of force⁹; and, (5) the end of the Cold War meant that Western States could more easily utilize the Security Council (Rose 1998). Lesser factors for why the UN imposed sanctions include the changing Western attitudes towards terrorism and the demise of the Soviet bloc made action against Libya less controversial within the international community (Rose 1998).

In practice the entire international community supported sanctions against Libya, surprisingly even Iran and the Arab World and these sanctions did not have to be reinforced with a military threat (Rose 1998). The Libyan episode confirms the ineffectiveness of "slow, publicly signaled, and incremental sanctions (Rose 1998)." Threats do not work, the imposition of sanctions must be swift and there must be a strong commitment to enforcement as displayed in the Libyan episode (Rose 1998). Changes in behavior, along with pressures from American commercial interests eager to do business in Libya now that UN sanctions were being lifted, provided rationale and motive for reassessment of policies (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000). The Libyan model provides

⁹ The EU recognized the United States' "war eagle" mentality and wanted to avoid any military action, leading them to support sanctions (Rose 1998).

evidence that when sanctions are enforced by a collection of States the possibility for success is high. The success in Libya is undeniable. Qaddafi's policies have completely changed; there has been no spread of terror from Libya, and they have halted their nuclear program. Do sanctions work? If policy makers follow the Libyan model, then yes, sanctions work.

Chapter four will discuss why the sanctions episodes against India and Pakistan were unsuccessful. As briefly mentioned in this chapter, both India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons and both first tested those nuclear weapons in 1998 (Stern 1998). Both nuclear weapons programs were illegal by international standards (Haass & O'Sullivan 2000). Sanctions were imposed in both instances; however, they were not imposed in ways that bring success. The South African and Libyan models of sanctions offer support for the notion that sanctions are effective. If those models were followed in the instances of India and Pakistan, the outcomes may have been different. Chapter four will analyze the histories of both States and their weapons programs. The analyses will then turn to the sanctions themselves and explore reasons why they were not successful and finally explore how sanctions could have been successful.

CHAPTER 4

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

The 1960s were a frightening time in history. The proliferation of nuclear weapons was a very real fear in the international community, fueled by the realities of The Cold War (Stern 1999). As a result, The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was drafted, signed, and ratified by many States in the international community in the 1960s, and entered into force in 1970 (Stern 1999). India and Pakistan, however, are two States that refrained from both signing and ratifying the NPT, citing the discriminatory nature of the treaty, believing there are different rules for States with weapons and States without weapons (Stern 1999). The end result, as we now know, is that by not signing the NPT, India and Pakistan were able to develop and test nuclear weapons (Stern 1999). Since the NPT entered into force in 1970, four States have acquired nuclear weapons: Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea; only India, Pakistan, and North Korea were subject to sanctions (Hufbauer et al. 2007).

The reasons for each State's nuclear program are similar and the reactions by the international community to each nuclear program and subsequent testing also follow similar paths. Nuclear tests by each State took place in the same month and year and in reaction to the other so they are grouped together in most discussions on sanctions against them. This chapter will discuss the actions taken by India and Pakistan in the process of building their nuclear weapons and the reactions by the international community. This chapter will analyze the reactions by the international community to the instances of nuclear testing by India and Pakistan and discuss how, if the international community had

reacted in unison, the reality of proliferation may be different today. This chapter will suggest that if the sanctions episodes against India and Pakistan were implemented with the same commitment to bringing a change in behavior as was the case in South Africa and Libya, that the international community would have two fewer nuclear powers. This chapter will frame the situation around both India and Pakistan's nuclear programs by analyzing the relationship between India and Pakistan as well as both States' relationship with the United States. The discussion will then turn to an analysis of the sanctions episodes that in turn followed and offer suggestions as to why the sanctions in these two cases were unsuccessful.

Sibling Rivalry

Overview

There is a long and tumultuous history between India and Pakistan, that can be best described as sibling rivalry. India and Pakistan have gone to war three times: 1948, 1965, and 1971 (Ahmed 2000). The inception of the Pakistan nuclear program in the 1960s was in response to India's expansion of its nuclear infrastructure. It was in 1971 that Pakistan officially made the decision to pursue a nuclear weapons program after their defeat by India in the 1971 war (Ahmed 2000). Tensions between India and Pakistan rose in the 1980s because Pakistan accused India of supporting insurgents in Sindh and because of the escalation of Kashmiri militancy that India blamed on Pakistani intervention (Ahmed 2000). In the 1960s Pakistan wanted to match India's ability and prestige and thus began its pursuit of nuclear weapons (Ahmed 2000).

In 1965, in response to Pakistan's rumblings about beginning a nuclear program, the United States imposed an arms embargo against the State in an effort to curtail its ability to gain supplies needed to continue with their nuclear program (Ahmed 2000). As a result of this arms embargo, Pakistan turned to China for its arms supplies, triggering international suspicion which was already peeked by Pakistan's refusal to sign the NPT (Ahmed 2000). In 1974, India conducted its first nuclear test and the United States pressured both India and Pakistan to end their nuclear programs (Ahmed 2000). In 1980, the Pakistani policy of ambiguity surrounding the nuclear program was implemented. Pakistan cited the need for the program as a protection/defense mechanism to counter India's program (Ahmed 2000). Pakistani nuclear weapons were meant to balance the power in the region, creating power parity (Ahmed 2000). In 1990, economic assistance was halted and an arms embargo on Pakistan was imposed; however, they were limited in scope and not sustained (Ahmed 2000).

In May 1998, India was the first to test their nuclear weapon. India claimed an underground nuclear test was over concern for the relationship between Pakistan and China, as well as Pakistan's support for terrorism in the Kashmir region (Crow 1998). Pakistani leaders did not trust India so they responded to Indian nuclear tests with tests of their own (Ahmed 2000). Pakistan made an extremely calculated decision to retaliate. Pakistan studied the reaction by the international community to India's tests, mainly the P-5 and G-8, and saw how divided they were and chose to test its weapons as well, assuming international retaliation would be minimal (Ahmed 2000). Pakistan also knew the international community overlooked both theirs and India's nuclear programs because of Pakistan's standing during the 1980s and India's strategic location. Pakistan knew

they would not be treated like Iraq or North Korea (Ahmed 2000). India and Pakistan posed no security threat to the United States, so many of their activities were overlooked for decades (Ahmed 2000).

After India and Pakistan tested their respective nuclear weapons in 1998, the United States considered a restriction on grain exports (Hufbauer et al. 2007). The 1994 Glenn Amendment to the Arms Export Control Act required the president of the United States to cut off agricultural exports and financial assistance to India and Pakistan, however, cutting off grain shipments would have hurt the United States' economy, so new legislation passed in 1999 that allowed the President to waive the Glenn Amendment for one year (Hufbauer et al. 2007). India and Pakistan were also both suspected of producing chemical weapons despite the fact both have ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention (Stern 1999). The United States' goal in India and Pakistan was to disrupt a possible military adventure through sanctions (Hufbauer et al. 2007).

Acting under the Glenn Amendment, the United States automatically imposed official-level sanctions after India's detonation of five nuclear weapons in May 1998 ("India and World Peace" 1998). The act itself was a huge setback to the nonproliferation movement and sanctions were a necessary step to send a strong message that this action was not acceptable. However, the international community did not follow suit and the United States was left to go it alone.

India's Nuclear Program

In the 1960s, the United States manipulated food and economic aid to India in an effort to halt India's nuclear aspirations. This effort failed and India consequently

conducted nuclear tests in the face of threatened United States sanctions (Hufbauer et al. 2007). In the 1970s, the economic health and political stability of India was strong and stable, as classified by Hufbauer et al. (2007). The government was in firm control and the economy experienced the normal range of inflation, unemployment and similar economic patterns (Hufbauer et al. 2007). India was a British colony and never became a major power post-colonization. India is classified in the 'other' category amongst world powers because it is also not a least-developed country (Cassese 2005). Internationally, India tends to align itself with Western States, making itself an ally of the United States (Cassese 2005). It has been suggested throughout the literature on sanctions against India, that its alignment with the West is a major reason why there was never a strong commitment to sanctions on the part of the United States and the rest of the international community.

India built its nuclear weapons in the Nehru era (Narkilar 2007). Despite its supposed commitment to disarmament internationally, India conducted a 'peaceful nuclear explosion' in 1974 at Pokhran and again in 1998, referred to as Pokhran II (Narlikar 2007). In 1978 the United States imposed its first round of sanctions against India (Status of Sanctions 2001). In 1997, India's Ministry of Atomic Energy concluded a deal to build a nuclear station in India (Stern 1999). India then tested its first nuclear weapon in May 1998 (Stern 1999). India acted after seeing the United States fumble over Iranian sanctions and its support for China, whom India saw as a major military threat due to its support for Pakistan ("India and World Peace" 1998). There was minor international cooperation with the United States imposition of sanctions against Indian, mainly in the form of symbolic speech and some token restraints (Hufbauer et al. 2007).

The United States applied sanctions against India around the same time it decided not to impose sanctions against Iran. The United States terminated all foreign trade except for food and other agricultural commodities and defense aid, blocked United States' banks and federal agencies from offering loans, credit guarantees, or any other financial aid, all in response to the underground nuclear tests conducted by India in 1998 (Crow 1998).

Pakistan's Nuclear Program

Pakistan began developing nuclear weapons in the 1970s. Due to the ambiguity of the Pakistani nuclear program it was able to withstand international nonproliferation measures for decades (Ahmed 2000). The United States imposed sanctions on Pakistan originally because of their relations with China. According to intelligence, Pakistan was receiving its missile technology from China. Pakistan, of course, called these sanctions "unwarranted and unjustified ("Pakistan's Moment": 1998; France-Pressé 2000)." In 1995, Russian physicists reportedly provided consulting services for Pakistan's missile and nuclear weapons programs (Stern 1999).

Pakistan was initially angered by India's nuclear test in May 1998 ("Pakistan's Moment" 1998). Pakistan was then further disgusted when sanctions did not follow the outrage displayed by the international community, with the exception of Japan and the United States. Pakistan wanted the international community's actions to match their words ("Pakistan's Moment" 1998). After weighing the options, and knowing the international response would be minimal as it was with India, Pakistan conducted nuclear tests, displaying what many in the international community viewed as "sibling rivalry

(“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998).” India welcomed Pakistani tests to deflect attention away from their test (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998).

Pakistan had the opportunity to turn the political tides and use India’s bad behavior to make their own actions look better. Instead, Pakistan reacted negatively and made themselves look like the bad “little brother (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998).” The world opened the door for Pakistan to become another nuclear power by not imposing collective sanctions against India (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998). Pakistan saw the way the international community reacted, or lack thereof, to India’s nuclear tests and knew the same reactions would be garnered by their own nuclear tests.

Sanctions

The international community felt a great need to restrain India and Pakistan’s nuclear programs after they each detonated nuclear weapons in May 1998, but were unwilling to collectively implement sanctions (Ahmed 2000). The nuclear programs were not new, however, the 1998 nuclear tests proved successful and the international community now had two new nuclear powers. In 1974, Canada acted to prevent India and Pakistan from producing nuclear weapons by trying to control the reprocessing of spent fuel (Hufbauer et al. 2007). This effort proved unsuccessful because both India and Pakistan were able to gain necessary materials elsewhere. Pakistan had already fallen under United States sanctions in 1990 under the Pressler Amendment when President H. W. Bush was unable to confirm that Pakistan did not have a nuclear device (Damrosch 2002). Because of this, the United States imposed an embargo on military sales in Pakistan over the nuclear issue (France-Pressé 2000). Further penalties were imposed in

1998 in response to the Pakistan's nuclear tests. Japan was the only other State to follow suit and impose sanctions against Pakistan. Japan froze financial assistance to Pakistan which amounted to \$600 million USD annually (France-Press 2000).

Both India and Pakistan were subject to sanctions under United States law (Hufbauer et al. 2007). Under United States' law India was subject to two sets of sanctions: (1) Glenn Amendment Sanctions because of the testing of their nuclear weapons; and (2) non-statutory sanctions imposed as a policy tool after the tests were conducted (Spector 2001). Nuclear cooperation and exports were already restricted by the IAEA, and had been since 1978 when India began pursuing nuclear capabilities (Spector 2001). The 1978 sanctions remained in effect, but obviously did not deter India from gaining nuclear weapons (Spector 2001).

The United States was obligated to impose mandatory sanctions after the 1998 nuclear tests under the 1994 Glenn Amendment (aka Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act) which called for the termination of US foreign aid and military exports, the denial of new financing assistance from United States' Export-Import Bank, OPIC, TDA, World Bank, and most other international financial institutions as well as freezing all loans and credit from the United States' banks (Spector 2001). Sanctions were implemented with such flexibility that their potential harshness was never experienced (Spector 2001). In 1998 and 1999 the Brownback Amendments I and II permitted the President to waive most of the Glenn Amendment sanctions (Spector 2001). Initially no Presidential waiver was permitted, however, in 1999, Congress granted the waiver to the President and sanctions were completely lifted for both States after 9/11 (Hufbauer et al. 2007). In October 1999, President Clinton took advantage of the Brownback Amendments and waived the

harshest sanctions against India and some against Pakistan (Spector 2001). Non-statutory sanctions, meaning diplomatic sanctions, were also eased.

Pakistan was subject to all of the same sanctions as India as well as restrictions on economic and military aid under the Symington and Pressler Amendments. Pakistan was also subject to sanctions for importing medium-range missiles from China in the mid-1990s and sanctions for the 1999 military coup (Spector 2001). The United States imposed a two year ban on the imports of certain technologies against the Ministry of Defense and the Space and Upper Atmosphere Research Commission in India (France-Press 2000). Pakistan was subject to harsher sanctions than India, however, because it imported most of the elements of their nuclear weapons and missiles. The sanctions were aimed at stopping the illicit transfers. Indian missile and nuclear programs were thought to be indigenous (Spector 2001).

In 2001 Bush wanted to lift sanctions off India and Pakistan. The United States wanted nuclear ties with India despite international rules on conducting business with non-NPT members (“Price of Friendship” 2001). The United States needed better relations with India to balance China’s power in the region and counter Pakistan’s nuclear ability (“Price of Friendship” 2001). India and Pakistan knew the United States’ sanctions would not gain international support because they both were strategic players in States’ foreign policies, including the United States (Schott 1998).

The Security Council condemned the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan through statements and a resolution. The Security Council did not impose sanctions under Article VII of the UN Charter, but did “encourage all States to prevent the export of equipment,

materials or technology that could in any way assist programs in India or Pakistan for nuclear weapons or for ballistic missiles capable of delivering such weapons, and welcome (d) national policies adopted and declared in this respect (Damrosch 2002).”

The P-5 members’ leaders declared support for the policy on 4 June 1998 in Geneva, but did not impose sanctions or take any legitimate action to show this support (Damrosch 2002). The G-8 “planned” sanctions, but never got around to implementing them (Damrosch 2002). European States put on hold future aid programs in India but did not withhold any other aid (Kumar 1998).

Effects of Sanctions?

The United States exported electric power to India totaling \$300 million USD in 1997 as well as \$105 million USD in oil and gas field equipment and supplies (Crow 1998). The United States would not halt this trade and knew that the way it chose to impose sanctions would only “sting” the Indian economy without the support of the international community (Crow 1998). Without the expectation of long-term international support for sanctions, the United States figured it pointless to display a strong commitment to sanctions that would only fail. The sanctions against India were more a protest than an actual effort to garner change. In defiance of the sanctions placed upon them, the Indian government proposed large budget increases in the 1998-1999 fiscal year totaling a 34 percent increase in health care, 50 percent increase in education, and 91 percent increase in public welfare (Kumar 1998).

The aid-dependent health programs suffered because of the sanctions placed upon India due to its nuclear tests (Kumar 1998). Overall, sanctions were liberally imposed

against India and were gradually lifted, having a very small impact (Spector 2001). The Indian economy grew six percent each year in the period from 1980 to 2002 and eight percent in the years following sanctions from 2002 to 2006 (Narlikar 2007). India now has the fourth largest economy in the world which is more evidence that sanctions were unsuccessful (Narkilar 2007).

One United States official admitted that “the new sanctions will actually have very limited economic effect, but they do send a strong signal the US oppose these countries’ missiles programs (France-Pressé 2000).” Maximizing armed conflict with Pakistan at the time of its nuclear testing also made sense because the military in Pakistan is a key institution; however, another military venture on the part of the United States was a viable option at that time (Haass et al. 2000). The United States knew that it need not upset its relationship with Pakistan too much because policy makers knew the value of that relationship, which proved to be the case post-9/11 (Haass et al. 2000).

Pakistan supported the Taliban and al-Qaeda for five years and then suddenly decided to support the War on Terror, some suggest was only to persuade the United States to lift sanctions against them (“Not a Pariah, a Friend” 2002). Pakistan fired key military officers in an effort to “combat terrorism” domestically (“Not a Pariah, a Friend” 2002). As a reward for its cooperation, sanctions on Pakistan were lifted and banks rescheduled \$13 billion USD in loans and the United States, along with the European Union, reduced tariffs with Pakistan. The United States provided \$600 million USD in economic poverty alleviation and wrote off more \$11 billion USD in debt (“Not a Pariah, a Friend” 2002). After 9/11, the stock market in Pakistan rose some 45 percent, while Musharraf’s personal stock rose more drastically (“Not a Pariah, a Friend” 2002).

Even in the face of Taliban insurgency in Pakistan, President Bush still conceded the Pakistanis were friends. Pakistan supports the Taliban because that is its defense against India (Owen 2002). Pakistan reaped the benefits of the United States campaign against the Taliban, its former “client,” by marginalizing India through its support for the United States (Owen 2002). The GDP in Pakistan in 2000 was 1.8 percent, down from 4.7 percent in 1998. During sanctions Pakistan experienced a 15.6 percent rise in inflation in 2000, however, becoming “friends” with the United States only experienced a 2.5 percent increase in inflation in 2001 (Owen 2002).

Post 9/11 Pakistan saw sanctions lifted after the 1998 nuclear tests and 1999 military coup (Owen 2002). Pakistan also saw huge debt relief from the European Union, Switzerland, and Japan (The Paris Club) that also accelerated reprofiling giving Pakistan a ten year grace period for repayment of debts (Owen 2002). Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) were also expected to increase due to Pakistan’s newfound status in the international community (Owen 2002). There was also a plan set in place to bring an oil pipeline to Pakistan (Owen 2002).

The United States ultimately lifted sanctions to gain an ally in the Middle East; however, polls show Pakistan to be the most anti-American State in the region (Hathaway 2008). Pakistan has quickly become the ‘center of Islamic terrorism (Hathaway 2008).’ Musharaff broke ties with the Taliban in the days following 9/11, leading President Bush to waive sanctions, forgive debt, reimplement American aid, and more importantly, reimburse Pakistan for the costs imposed by helping in the War on Terror (Hathaway 2008). There are now more Taliban sympathizers in Pakistan than any other State in the world (Hathaway 2008). The United States’ relationship with Musharaff legitimized him

and had no need to restore democracy to Pakistan as long as the United States supported the regime. This was not the agreement that the two States had; however, the United States turned a blind eye to the rigged elections that took place (Hathaway 2008).

Bush wanted to drop sanctions because he himself refused to sign the CTBT and end the United States' production of nuclear weapons ("Price of Friendship" 2001). The United States defied international law as well in this manner. Bush promoted India and Pakistan learning to live peacefully with their bombs ("Price of Friendship" 2001). On the 22 September 2001, President George W. Bush of the United States lifted sanctions on both India and Pakistan (International Law Update 2001).

Conclusion

In the case of India and Pakistan no efforts were ever made for confidence building measures between the United States, India and Pakistan. There is still a race to see who can build the longest range missile (India or Pakistan) and the United States only created more turmoil between the States by dropping the issue ("Price of Friendship" 2001). Both States now deem it acceptable to pursue such avenues because they never suffered severe enough consequences for their original misbehavior.

Sanctions did not deter India or Pakistan from building nuclear bombs. No doubt sanctions lengthened the process, but government leaders made acquiring weapons their state's main goal, making the coercive effect of sanctions ineffective (Hufbauer et al. 2007). Regime change was not the goal of either sanctions episode in India or Pakistan (Hufbauer et al. 2007).

The United States hoped, that the sanctions it did impose would “cause major US companies and financial institutions to rethink entirely their presence and operations in India (Crow 1998).” As we well know, this did not happen. The United States never imposed consequences upon companies and financial institutions that chose not to support sanctions, leading them to conduct and start new business within India all throughout the sanctions episode (Crow 1998). It can also be offered that sanctions did not work because Clinton wilted at India’s refusal to roll-back its nuclear program and sign the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) (“Price of Friendship” 2001).

The fact remains that “it is easier to start a nuclear chain reaction than to stop one once it has started (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998).” If the United States had the support of the international community when India and Pakistan first began developing their nuclear programs, or at least once the tests were performed, there would be two fewer nuclear powers. It also would have helped to deter Pakistan if the punishments to India were matched by aid to Pakistan (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998). The European Union thought further isolation of Pakistan would only worsen the problem (France-Press 2000). America and Japan were expected to impose the same sanctions against Pakistan as India if they also tested nuclear weapons. Sanctions were expected to Pakistan harder because they were more in debt. India could afford to ignore sanctions while Pakistan could not (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998). If the international community, especially Britain, had applied sanctions, Pakistan would have felt more secure. The more India suffered economically, the more reassured Pakistan would have been (“Pakistan’s Moment” 1998).

In the nuclear proliferation cases in India and Pakistan, the denial of key hardware was an integral part of the sanctions package, but since sanctioned components were sold to them by other States offering alternative supplies, the goal of nonproliferation in both India and Pakistan proved to be unachievable (Hufbauer et al. 2007). The ability of both States to find alternative avenues for obtaining weapons components highlights the need for collective sanctions. Western powers were able to prevent South Korea, Taiwan, Brazil, Libya, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan from obtaining nuclear weapons because they were denied key ingredients needed in producing such a weapon and had the cooperation of the international community (Hufbauer et al. 2007). These multilateral efforts were successful in most of the cases; however, no such efforts were made to prevent India and Pakistan from producing and testing a nuclear weapon (Hufbauer et al. 2007).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

It is true that sanctions, in and of themselves, when implemented by a lone state, are usually unsuccessful as displayed in the case studies of India and Pakistan. The literature on sanctions has cited this fact, time and time again. It is also true, that in the instances when sanctions have been successful, they have been implemented by a collection of States, contained the spread of instability, and changed the behavior of the regime in power or served as a catalyst for regime change, as displayed by the case studies on South Africa and Libya. The purpose in this study is not to suggest that sanctions are the only reason that apartheid ended in South Africa and that Libya renounced its support for terrorism, but to suggest that sanctions were a valuable and strong tool in the arsenals of the States that imposed them against those two regimes. In both South Africa and Libya, sanctions were a mitigating factor in the eventual change in behavior experienced in both States. War was avoided and this, by the standards of this study, is one reason to decree success on the part of the sending States. Sanctions against South Africa and Libya may have lasted decades, but an eventual change in behavior occurred. States are run by human beings, and human behavior does not change overnight.

If sanctions can be implemented, war or some other use of force can be avoided, and a change in behavior or some concession that is deemed reasonable is made, then it seems logical to conclude that sanctions do indeed work and should be utilized in an achievable manner. There are guidelines for implementing sanctions that are apparent

after studying the cases of success in South Africa and Libya. First, as contended throughout this study, sanctions need to be implemented by a collection of States. As was displayed in the cases of India and Pakistan, no one State can go it alone. Sanctions imposed by a single (or a few) States leave room for the target to find alternatives to sanctioned goods and services (Haass et al. 2000; Askari et al. 2003). If the major powers do not collectively impose sanctions, there is no hope for success because the economies in the target States will not suffer. There needs to be little room for the target to find alternatives in for order the economy to dwindle enough to cause a change in behavior.

Collective sanctions also send a stronger message and as a result of multiple States participating, there is much stronger enforcement (Clark 1932). When sanctions have the support of multiple States, the targets have no place to appeal the sanctions because there is no strong authority that is not a participant in the implementation of the sanctions (Doxey 1999). This is especially true when sanctions are implemented by superpowers, as well as when regional blocs have the cooperation of superpowers (Doxey 1999). It is a rare instance when one State can alone significantly affect the economy of the target State (Askari et al. 2003).

States also need to be willing to commit to sanctions over the long-run. Sanctions do not work overnight, as evidenced by episodes of successful sanctions in this study. Although, some experts cite this as a reason why sanctions are unsuccessful, this is still a cheaper alternative than war, and lives are spared (Cortwright & Lopez 2002). States must weigh the costs and benefits of imposing sanctions. Yes, they may take years, decades even, but there is light at the end of the tunnel. The objectives of the sending

States can in fact be achieved with patience and strong commitment. The unfortunate truth is war is extremely costly. The current Iraq War is an example of such an instance. The sanctions against Iraq after the first Gulf War were working. Saddam Hussein was contained, not supporting terrorists, and not using chemical weapons on neighboring States. However, since the start of the war in 2003, there has been increased instability in the region, billions of dollars spent to the detriment of the United States budget, and thousands of soldiers and civilians killed.

Finally, sanctions need to be implemented swiftly (DeSouza 2000). The more time that lapses between the actual transgression of the target and when sanctions are actually imposed, the less effective financial sanctions will be (DeSouza 2000). When sanctions are implemented swiftly, States' leaders have less time to hide their assets, giving sanctions more of an opportunity to economically affect the elites in the target State (Hass et al. 2000). The goal of sanctions should first be to hit the wallets of those in charge in an effort to increase the likelihood of success. It makes sense that if the leaders of a State are suffering economically, the more likely they will be to concede to the demands being made the sending States, or at least begin the negotiation process.

The logical conclusion now becomes that the creation of a G-20 sanctions group needs to be considered in order to avoid future uses of force and unsolved conflict. This group would meet annually at the G-20 summit and develop a coordinated plan of action for potential trouble spots in the world. This consultation would ensure that a joint effort is possible and swift when States break international law. Knowing that the G-20 has a resolute plan of action in place for instances of law-breaking could also potentially act as a deterrent for States that are considering breaking the law. The ability of the G-20 to

present a unified force has the potential to be a strong security policy in the international community. Also, once smaller States recognize the G-20's commitment to sanctions, they too may have more incentive to join in the implementation of sanctions. "A disease which can be cured in its early stages must not be allowed to continue its ravages until the limb is mortified before treatment has begun," instances of international law – breaking needs immediate attention and sanctions should be one of the first steps taken by the major powers to deal with the problem (Royal Institute 1938).

When an instance of international law-breaking occurs, citizens look their governments for solutions. Iran is an instance of this reaction. People want something to be done! "The imposition of sanctions absorbs the initial public reaction that something needs to be done (Drezner 1999)." By imposing sanctions, States send the public a message that they are handling the situation. The public wants reasonable action to be taken, and sanctions are that acceptable avenue of punishment. Enforcing the law is a critical principle in every organized society, both internationally and domestically; the enforcement of this critical principle the responsibility of the State in order to maintain law and order (Clark 1932). Sanctions are, as pointed out by former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, a "necessary middle ground between war and words (Farrall 2007)."

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Samina. "Security Dilemmas of Nuclear-armed Pakistan." *Third World Quarterly*, 21(5): 781-793, 2000.
- Askari, Hossein, John Forrer, Hildy Teegen and Jiawen Yang. *Economic Sanctions: Examining their Philosophy and Efficacy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 2003.
- Barkun, Michael. *Law Without Sanctions*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Cassese, Antonio. *International Law*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Clark, Evans. *Boycotts and Peace*. A Report by the Committee on Economic Sanctions. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932.
- Cortwright, David and George A. Lopez. *Smart Sanctions: Targeting Economic Statecraft*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2002.
- Crow, Patrick. "Sanctions on India." *Oil and Gas Journal*, 1998.
- Damrosch, Lori F. "The Permanent Five as Enforcers of Controls on Weapons of Mass Destruction: Building on the Iraq 'Precedent'?" *European Journal of International Law*, 13(1): 305-321, 2002.
- Dashti-Gibson, Jaleh, Patricia Davis and Benjamin Radcliff. "On the Determinants of Success of Economic Sanctions: An Empirical Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(2): 608-618.
- Davis, Lance and Stanley Engerman. "History Lessons: Sanctions-Neither War Nor Peace." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(2): 187-197.
- DeSouza, PJ. *Economic Strategy and National Security*. Colorado: Westview Press, Inc., 2000.
- Doxey, Margaret P. *Economic Sanctions and International Enforcement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1980.
- Drezner, Daniel W. *The Sanctions Paradox: Economic Statecraft and International Sanctions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Eyler, Robert. *Economic Sanctions: International Policy and Political Economy at Work*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.
- Farrall, Jeremy Matam. *United Nations Sanctions and the Rule of Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- France-Presse, Agence. "Pakistan Decries US Sanctions." *Christian Science Monitor*, 93(1), 2000.
- George, Alexander L. and William E. Simmons. *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press Inc., 1994.
- Guzman, Andrew T. *How International Law Works: A Rationale Choice Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Haass, Richard N. and Meghan O'Sullivan. *Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions and Foreign Policy*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.
- Hathaway, Robert M. "Leverage and Largesse: Pakistan's post-9/11 Partnership with America." *Contemporary South Asia*, 16(1): 11-24, 2008.
- Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, Jeffrey J. Schott and Kimberly Ann Elliot. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*. Washington D.C.: Peterson Institute, 2008.
- "India and World Peace." *Oil and Gas Journal*, 1998.
- "Department of Commerce Removes Sanctions on India and Pakistan." *International Law Update*, vol. 7, 2001.
- Kennan, George F. "The Shape of American Foreign Policy in the Post Cold-War Era: A Perspective Honed in the Twentieth Century." *American Foreign Policy Interests*, 27: 167-169, 2005.
- Kennan, George F. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs*, 25(4): 566-582, 1947.
- Kennan, George F. "Containment Then and Now." *Foreign Affairs*, 65(4): 885-890, 1987.
- Kumar, Sanjay. "India to Raise Health Spending to Counteract Foreign Aid Sanctions." *Lancet*, 351(918).
- Marinov, Nicolay. "Do Economic Sanctions Destabilize Country Leaders?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3):564-576.
- McGillivray, Fiona. "Political Institutions, Coercive Diplomacy, and Duration of Economic Sanctions." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48(2):154-172.
- Miller, Edward S. *Bankrupting the Enemy: The US Financial Siege of Japan Before Pearl Harbor*. Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 2007.

- Morgan, TC and Schwebach, VL. "Fools Suffer Gladly: the Use of Economic Sanctions in International Crisis." *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(1).
- Narkilar, Amrita. "All That Glitters is Not Gold: India's Rise to Power." *Third World Quarterly*, 28(5): 983-996, 2007.
- Nesbitt, Njubi. *Race for Sanctions: African American Against Apartheid 1946-1994*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- "Not a Pariah, A Friend." *The Economist*, 362(8263), 2002.
- Owen, Tom. "Sanctions, Aid, and Pipeline Prospects." *Middle East*, 319:25, 2002.
- "Pakistan's Moment." *The Economist*, 347(69):17-18.
- Ramphal, Shridath. *Banking on Apartheid: The Financial Links Report: Prepared for Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on South Africa*. Minnesota: Heinemann, 1990.
- Rodman, Kenneth A. *Sanctions Beyond Borders: Multinational Corporations and US Economic Statecraft*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2001.
- Rose, Gideon. "Libya" in Richard Haass (Ed.). *Economic Sanctions and American Diplomacy*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1998.
- Royal Institute of International Affairs. *International Sanctions: A Report*. London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Schott, Jeffrey J. Peterson Institute for International Economics. 1998. "US Economic Sanctions: Good Intentions, Bad Execution." Statement before the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives.
- Segal, Ronald. *Sanctions Against South Africa: International Conference on Economic Sanctions Against South Africa*. London: Penguin Books, 1964.
- Spector, Leonard S. *Deputy Director, CNS, Washington, D.C.* 2001. "Status of US Sanctions Imposed on India and Pakistan." Report to Congress.
- Stern, Jessica. *The Ultimate Terrorists*. Cambridge: MA: Howard University Press, 1999.
- "The Price of Friendship." *The Economist*, 360(8236), 2001.
- Thompson, Michael. "Security and Solidarity: An Anti-Reductionist Analysis of Environmental Policy." *Living With Nature*, 1(9): 135-151.

U-Jin Ang, Adrian and Dursun Peksen. "When Do Economic Sanctions Work: Asymmetric Perceptions, Issue Salience and Outcomes." *Political Research Quarterly*, 60(1):135-145.

Wallensteen, Peter and Carina Staibano. *International Sanctions: Between Words and Wars in the Global System*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.

Wolf, Charles Jr. *International Economic Sanctions*. Rand.org, 1980.