

Case Studies in Economic Sanctions and Terrorism

Post-2000 Sanctions Episodes

Gary Clyde Hufbauer, Jeffrey J. Schott, Kimberly Ann Elliott, and Julia Muir
May 2012

© Peterson Institute for International Economics. All rights reserved.

Since the third edition of *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered* was published in 2007, new developments have taken place in several cases, and 17 new sanctions episodes have been initiated. The following table updates table 1A.2 from chapter 1, appendix 1A of *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered* (found [here](#)). The table provides a consolidated summary of all post-2000 sanctions episodes by reporting developments in ongoing cases and providing information on new cases initiated since the 2007 publication. In cases involving Burma, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Sudan, and Syria, more detailed analyses can be found [here](#).

Sender Country	Target Country	Years	Background, Objectives, Resolution, and Provisional Score ¹
New Cases			
European Union, United States	Haiti	2001–05	<p>Background and Objectives: The objectives of sanctions were to remove Jean-Bertrand Aristide from power and improve human rights. The European Union suspended government-to-government economic assistance to Haiti in January 2001 after the opposition party boycotted Haiti's November 2000 elections won by Jean-Bertrand Aristide, leader of the Lavalas party. The United States blocked \$500 million in loans from international financial institutions. Rebels took control of much of the country in February 2004, and President Jean-Bertrand Aristide went into exile. The United States and UN peacekeeping troops intervened to quell the ensuing violence. In March 2004, Aristide attempted to return to Haiti but was forced instead to go to Jamaica, and then to South Africa, where he gained asylum.</p> <p>Resolution: In July 2004, the United States resumed aid to support the Haitian people through the Interim Cooperation Framework. The European Union lifted its sanctions in September 2005, after the interim government made efforts to improve the human rights situation. In October 2006, the United States partially lifted the arms embargo against Haiti (imposed in 1991), allowing the Haitian police force to buy weapons, in recognition of the country's return to an elected democracy</p>

¹ A "provisional score" is calculated by multiplying the "policy result" times the "sanctions contribution." The "policy result" is scaled from 1 (negative, or failed outcome) to 4 (significant, or successful outcome). The "sanctions contributions" is also scaled from 1 (negative contribution) to 4 (decisive contribution). Multiplying these scores yields a "provisional score" scaled from 1 (outright failure) to 16 (significant success). Note that military intervention or covert action, for example, rather than sanctions, can explain a successful "policy result." A score of 9 or better is regarded as a successful outcome from the standpoint of the sender.

			<p>following presidential elections on February 7, 2006. The United States permits the export of defense articles and services.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 3 (policy result) x 3 (sanctions contribution) = 9 (success score)</p>
European Union, United States	Zimbabwe	2002–	<p>Background and Objectives: The objectives of sanctions were to halt political repression and allow free elections. In February 2002, the European Union imposed an embargo on arms sales, military assistance, and the supply of equipment capable of being used for internal repression, as well as a travel ban and an asset freeze affecting President Robert Mugabe and his top 19 officials. The measures were in response to the political violence targeted at supporters of Prime Minister Morgan Tsvangirai and his MDC Party in the run-up to the March 2002 elections. The United States barred Mugabe and senior members of his government and their families from entering the United States. In July 2002, the European Union extended its measures to cover 52 more government officials. The United States issued Executive Orders in 2003, 2005, and 2008, blocking property of individuals and institutions undermining the democratic process. In 2006 and 2008, the European Union extended sanctions against President Mugabe and members of his ZANU-PF government. Sanctions were renewed by the United States and the European Union in March 2008, following disputed presidential elections. Mugabe declared himself the winner despite widespread recognition of Tsvangirai as the winner. Mugabe agreed to a power-sharing agreement with Tsvangirai but appointed provincial leaders and took control of key ministries. In April 2012 Mugabe called for elections sometime in 2012, a year ahead of scheduled elections.</p> <p>Resolution: Mugabe remains in power. His regime is characterized by harassment, violence, and politically motivated arrest. US and EU sanctions remain in place, although the European Union has reduced the number of sanctioned individuals.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 2 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 4 (success score)</p>
United States	Guinea Bissau	2003–04	<p>Background and Objectives: The United States imposed sanctions in response to a coup in September 2003. General Verissimo Correia Seabra led the coup, on September 14, 2003, and overthrew elected president Kumba Yala. The United States halted government-to-government aid until elected officials took office.</p> <p>Resolution: The United States lifted sanctions after generally free and fair legislative elections were held in 2004.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 4 (policy result) x 3 (sanctions contribution) = 12 (success score)</p>

African Union, European Union, United States	Central African Republic	2003–05	<p>Background and Objectives: The European Union opened consultations with the Central African Republic (CAR) in June 2003, in the aftermath of the military coup of March 15, 2003. In December 2003, the European Union partially restricted cooperation with, and aid to, the CAR. The sanctions applied to road building projects and macroeconomic aid under the 9th European Development Fund. Restoration of aid was contingent upon a return to democracy and the rule of law. The United States also blocked aid flows to the CAR government. The African Union suspended the CAR’s participation in the African Union.</p> <p>Resolution: The European Union lifted sanctions on July 1, 2005, after the CAR held presidential and legislative elections in March and May of 2005, respectively, which were recognized as generally free and fair by the African Union, the European Union, and the United States. The United States lifted its ban on government-to-government aid, and the African Union lifted its sanctions.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 4 (policy result) x 4 (sanctions contribution) = 16 (success score)</p>
United Nations	Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)	2003–	<p>Background and Objectives: In 2003, the United Nations imposed an arms embargo against the DRC and expanded its peacekeeping force in response to tribal fighting in the northeast. The main objective of sanctions was to stop human rights abuses. In July 2005, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1596, which extended the arms embargo and imposed a travel ban and asset freeze against those in violation of the arms embargo. Between 2003 and 2008, UN sanctions have been renewed annually due to continuous arms smuggling. In March 2008, sanctions were modified and applied only to nongovernmental persons and entities operating in eastern DRC, rather than the entire territory.</p> <p>Resolution: The DRC is divided into tribal areas with no effective central government. Criminal networks within the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of Congo (FARDC) are involved in the illegal exploitation of natural resources; the networks help fund the continuing armed conflicts and offset the economic impact of the sanctions.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 1 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 2 (success score)</p>
France, United Nations, United States, European Union	Ivory Coast	2004–	<p>Background and Objectives: In November 2004, the government broke an 18-month cease-fire by attacking rebels controlling the northern half of the country and a French military camp. The UN Security Council imposed a 12-month travel ban, asset freeze, and arms embargo on persons obstructing peace. In December 2005, the sanctions were extended to include a ban on imports of rough diamonds from the Ivory Coast. UN sanctions have been renewed annually since 2005, most recently in February 2012. The United States imposed sanctions in February 2006, prohibiting exports, imports, trade brokering, the financing and facilitation of trade, as well as financial transactions with persons or entities that contributed to the conflict. Sanctions have remained in</p>

			<p>place since then and were renewed most recently in 2010 after a disputed presidential election. Laurent Gbagbo refused to cede power to Alassane Ouattara, who won 54 percent of the vote in the November 2010 federal elections. Gbagbo's military assaulted civilians and opposition soldiers and civil infighting continued for months, taking an estimated 3,000 lives. In April 2011, the European Union imposed sanctions against Gbagbo's regime. Sanctions include an asset freeze and travel ban and a prohibition on EU members from buying bonds and providing loans to the Gbagbo regime.</p> <p>Resolution: In April 2011, the United Nations and the French military engaged in military strikes against Gbagbo's forces. Gbagbo was arrested by opposition troops and was transferred to the Hague in late 2011, where he is awaiting trial on charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 4 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 8 (success score)</p>
United States, European Union	Syria	2004–	<p>Background and Objectives: Post-2000 the United States imposed additional sanctions against Syria as part of ongoing Case 86-1 over Syria's support of terrorism and its pursuit of missiles and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs. In 2011, the US and European launched a new case of sanctions over the violent suppression of civilian demonstrations against the Assad regime. In the earlier case, in May 2004, President George W. Bush issued Executive Order 13338, implementing the provisions in the Syria Accountability Act, including a freeze of assets of specified individuals, a ban on munitions and dual use items, a ban on exports to Syria other than food and medicine, and a ban on Syrian aircraft landing in or overflying the United States. Sanctions also required US financial institutions to sever correspondent accounts with the Commercial Bank of Syria because of money laundering concerns. In April 2006, the United States designated the Commercial Bank of Syria as a financial institution of primary money laundering concern and ordered US banks to sever all ties with the institution. In February 2008, the United States imposed new sanctions against Syria, freezing the assets of additional individuals. The newest case of sanctions against Syria is directed against President Bashar al-Assad and his government, in response to the brutal use of force against civilians. Sanctions were implemented in April 2011 by the United States and in May 2011 by the European Union. A detailed analysis of the case is available here.</p>

			<p>Resolution: The Assad regime continues to use force against civilians. In April 2012, the United Nations brokered a cease-fire and UN military observers were sent to Syria to monitor compliance. Syria did not comply with the cease-fire and, on April 19, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon announced that Syria had failed to implement every aspect of the peace plan. The Syrian military continues to use deadly force against civilians.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 1 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 2 (success score) (for the new case)</p>
United Nations, United States	Sudan	2004–	<p>Background and Objectives: Post-2000 the United States imposed additional sanctions against Sudan as part of ongoing Case 89-3 over continuing human rights abuses (see here). The new round of sanctions imposed post-2000 was in response to the conflict in the western region of Darfur that broke out in 2003. The armed conflict was led by two rebel groups; the Sudan Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). The opposition movement was headed by the Janjaweed, composed of local rival tribes, and the Government of Sudan Armed Forces (SAF). The conflict in Darfur is separate from the ongoing civil war in Sudan that started in the early 1980s. In July 2004, the UN Security Council imposed an arms embargo on all nongovernmental entities and individuals operating in north, south, and west Darfur, in an effort to halt human rights abuses and genocide in the western region of Darfur. In 2006, sanctions were expanded and additional measures were imposed including a travel ban and asset freeze on certain military personnel responsible for violence in the northern, southern, and western regions of Darfur. In April 2006 the United States issued Executive Order 13400 and signed the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act, which targeted individuals involved in the genocide. Sanctions included an asset freeze and travel ban on designated individuals. In April 2006, the United Nations issued Resolution 1672, condemning the continued violations of human rights and determined that the violence in Darfur constituted a threat to international peace and security. In 2010, the arms embargo was expanded to include not only the supply of arms and related material but also technical training and assistance to all nongovernmental entities and persons operating in the three designated regions of Darfur, including the Janjaweed (militia members of the nomadic Arab tribes in Sudan) and all parties to the N'djamena Ceasefire Agreement. The N'djamena Agreement was signed between the main rebel group, JEM, and the government of Sudan. UN sanctions remain in place. Most recently the focus in Sudan has been on intensified fighting between the Sudan and South Sudan over disputed oil-rich border territory. The fighting has been continuing, at a lower level of intensity, since South Sudan seceded from the North in July 2011.²</p>

² South Sudan gained independence, after a January 2011 referendum where 98 percent of the vote was in favor of secession. The referendum was held as part of the January 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, which granted the southern region of Sudan six years of autonomy, followed by a referendum on independence from Sudan.

			<p>Resolution: In May 2006 the Sudanese government signed a peace agreement with the SLM/A. However, the SLM/A withdrew from the agreement in 2010. In July 2011 the Doha Document for Peace was signed with the Liberation and Justice Movement (an umbrella organization of rebel groups). However, some rebel groups have refused to negotiate with the government of Sudan. Armed conflict continues between government forces and rebel groups, and between tribes in Darfur. Arms and ammunition continue to enter Darfur. On May 2, 2012, the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution that deemed the situation between Sudan and South Sudan “a serious threat to international peace and security.” The council resolution called on the two countries to immediately cease all hostilities, withdraw their armed forces on either side of the border, and enter into negotiations which should be concluded within three months. The resolution gives Sudan and South Sudan 48 hours to commit to the listed conditions or face sanctions.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 2 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 4 (success score)</p>
European Union	Guinea	2005–10	<p>Background and Objectives: In April 2005, the European Union reduced its disbursement of aid to Guinea through the 9th European Development Fund (2002–07) by 65 million euros. Sanctions were imposed in response to the violent oppression of protesters (150 of whom were killed) and condemned military leader Captain Moussa Dadis Camara’s announcement that he intended to remain in power. Camara had seized power after president Lansana Conté died in 2008 and had vowed to serve only as an interim leader. The European Union expressed concern about the integrity of elections and political processes in Guinea but continued to fund programs designed to strengthen civil society and political transparency. In November 2009, the European Union implemented an arms embargo and in December 2009, increased the number of persons subject to a freeze on financial assets and travel restrictions. In 2009 the United States and the African Union also implemented sanctions on Captain Camara and his military junta. Sanctions included a travel ban and a freeze on assets of Captain Camara and 41 members of his junta.</p> <p>Resolution: In January 2010 Captain Camara went into exile following an assassination attempt in December 2009. Before he left, Captain Camara appointed Jean-Marie Dore as prime minister and in December 2010, Guinea held its first democratic elections. Alpha Conde won 52.2 percent of the vote and was declared president. In response, the African Union lifted its sanctions the same month. In March 2011, the European Union amended sanctions so that the asset freeze applies only to persons identified as responsible for the violent crackdown on the protest in September 2009. The United States removed sanctions against Captain Camara’s regime; however, the United States maintains sanctions on certain individuals through the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act. The Kingpin Act blocks all property and interests in property of persons involved in drug trafficking and prohibits US persons from engaging in any financial transactions and trade with the kingpins.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 4 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 8 (success score)</p>

European Union, Switzerland, United States	Uzbekistan	2005–09	<p>Background and Objectives: In October 2005, the European Union banned arms sales to Uzbekistan and travel to the European Union by Uzbek officials in response to that country's refusal to allow an international investigation into the government's crackdown on a protest in May 2005, which killed hundreds of unarmed people. Switzerland adopted a policy emulating the EU restrictions in January 2006. The United States blocked a payment of \$23 million for two years' usage of an Uzbek air base to which it was subsequently denied access. In 2006, the European Union decided to extend the arms embargo for another year and the travel ban on 12 senior government officials for another 6 months. The European Union did, however, agree to lift the freeze on technical meetings at the ministerial level, allowing Uzbekistan and the European Union to discuss the events that took place in 2005, as well as President Islam Karimov's policies.</p> <p>Resolution: In October 2008, the European Union removed the visa ban on government officials, and in October 2009 lifted the remaining sanctions, which included an arms embargo. The United States followed suit, as did Switzerland. Sanctions were removed in response to Uzbekistan's improvement of human rights and democracy, demonstrated by the release of a number of political prisoners and abolition of the death penalty.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 3 (policy result) x 3 (sanctions contribution) = 9 (success score)</p>
European Union, United States	Belarus	2006–08; 2010–	<p>Background and Objectives: The European Union and the United States deemed the March 2006 presidential election fraudulent. Alexander Lukashenko, head of state since 1994, claimed victory. The European Union and the United States imposed travel restrictions and asset freezes on Lukashenko and officials who collaborated in electoral manipulation.</p> <p>Resolution: In September 2008, the United States lifted sanctions against two subsidiaries of the state-owned petrochemical conglomerate Belneftekhim. The easing of sanctions was in response to the release of the political prisoner Alaksander Kazulin, an opposition candidate in the 2006 elections who was jailed for organizing protests. In October 2008, the European Union partially lifted sanctions by removing the travel ban for six months. However, in December 2010 the United States and European Union imposed new sanctions in response to the fraudulent re-election of Alexander Lukashenko. Lukashenko's government officials laid criminal charges on and detained seven out of nine opposition candidates. US and EU sanctions include travel bans, asset freeze and the revocation of the authorization to engage in business transactions with Belneftekhim.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 2 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 4 (success score)</p>

European Union, United States, Israel	Hamas-led Palestinian Authority	2006–07	<p>Background and Objectives: The United States and the European Union imposed financial sanctions on the Palestinian administration in the Gaza strip after the electoral victory, in January 2006, by Hamas, which the US government considers a terrorist organization. The United States and the European Union demanded that Hamas renounce violence, recognize Israel, and abide by past commitments made by the Palestinian Authority. To further these goals, the United States and the European Union stopped their aid flows. The United States also pressured banks in neighboring countries to freeze transfers to the Palestinian Authority.</p> <p>Resolution: In 2007, the United States lifted sanctions against the Hamas-led Palestinian Authority, in response to the election of Prime Minister Salam Fayyad and President Salam Mahmoud, and several ministers who are not affiliated with Hamas. US persons are authorized to engage in all transactions with the Palestinian Authority. The Palestinian Authority is defined for these purposes as Prime Minister Fayyad, President Mahmoud, and all ministries and branches. At the same time, the European Union decided to lift its ban on financial assistance, allowing the European Union to reinstate aid to the region. Since 1971, the European Union has been the largest donor of development aid to the Palestinian Authority.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 3 (policy result) x 4 (sanctions contribution) = 12 (success score)</p>
Russia	Georgia	2006–	<p>Background and Objectives: In April 2006, Russia imposed an import ban on Georgia’s key agricultural exports (wine, water, and fruits) in response to the dispute over South Ossetia and Abkhazia, two breakaway enclaves with large Russian populations that seek secession from Georgia. Russia’s objective is to secure Georgia’s recognition of independence for South Ossetia and Abkhazia. In response, Georgia announced it would block Russia’s World Trade Organization (WTO) accession until sanctions were lifted. Russia halted all transport to and from Georgia, imposed an aviation and postal blockade, deported more than 1,000 illegal immigrants, and increased the price of oil exported to Georgia. In August 2008, military conflict broke out in South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Russia recognized the two regions as independent and broke off diplomatic ties with Georgia.</p> <p>Resolution: Diplomatic relations between the two countries have modestly improved. In January 2010, Russia and Georgia reopened air traffic between the two countries for the first time since the 2008 war, and in November 2011, the countries concluded an agreement on monitoring trade flows across their disputed borders. Georgia withdrew its objection to Russia’s membership in the WTO. The embargo against Georgian agricultural exports remains in place and Georgia claims South Ossetia and Abkhazia as parts of its sovereign territory. Recently however, the two countries began negotiations to allow some beverages from Georgia to be exported to Russia.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 2 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 4 (success score)</p>

Australia, New Zealand, European Union, United States	Fiji	2006–	<p>Background and Objectives: In response to a military attempt to overthrow the elected government in Fiji, the United States denied \$3 million aid to Fiji. Australia and New Zealand suspended military ties with Fiji, imposed a travel ban, and suspended aid. Power was then returned to President Ratu Josefa Iloilo, who appointed Commodore Frank Bainimarama (leader of the attempted military coup) as prime minister. Australia and New Zealand lifted their trade sanctions. However, in 2007, New Zealand reinstated expanded sanctions after the government of Bainimarama expelled New Zealand’s high commissioner to Fiji. New Zealand imposed a travel ban on the military regime, their families, and some civilians. The European Union withdrew 200 million euros of aid, and the United States and Australia extended their own sanctions. All four governments said they would keep sanctions in place until Bainimarama’s government holds elections in 2009. In 2009, Bainimarama was reinstated as prime minister, despite a court ruling that his government was illegal. Bainimarama declared there would be no new elections until 2014. In response, Australia, the European Union, New Zealand, and the United States extended sanctions.</p> <p>Resolution: Bainimarama remains in power and shows no sign of holding elections before 2014.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 1 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 2 (success score)</p>
United States, European Union, Organization of American States (OAS)	Honduras	June– November 2009	<p>Background and Objectives: The United States suspended foreign assistance and implemented a travel ban on members and supporters of the Micheletti government. Roberto Micheletti replaced President Manuel Zelaya after the military-backed coup d’état in June 2009, in response to the referendum held by Zelaya that would have modified the Constitution to allow him to run for another term. The referendum was ruled illegal by the Supreme Court of Honduras. In response to these events, the European Union stopped aid to Honduras and withdrew its ambassador from Tegucigalpa. In July 2009, the Organization of American States (OAS) suspended Honduras’s membership.</p> <p>Resolution: In November 2009, Honduras held presidential elections in which Porfirio Lobo was elected president. In response, the United States and European Union restored aid to the country. In June 2011, the OAS voted to allow Honduras to resume its membership in the organization.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 3 (policy result) x 3 (sanctions contribution) = 9 (success score)</p>
United States	Somalia	2010–	<p>Background and Objectives: In April 2010 President Barack Obama signed Executive Order 13536 declaring a national emergency to deal with the persistent chaos and violence in Somalia, including acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea, and the violation of the Somalia arms embargo imposed by the United Nations in 1992. Sanctions include freeze on assets of specific persons and entities involved in acts that threaten the peace, security, and stability of Somalia; that obstruct the</p>

			<p>delivery of humanitarian assistance; that supply arms or related material; or that support any of the listed activities.</p> <p>Resolution: Somalia continues to be a lawless country, divided among warlords, without an effective central government.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 1 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 2 (success score)</p>
United States, Canada, Australia United Nations	Libya	February– October 2011	<p>Background and Objectives: In reaction to the violent suppression of protests in Libya in late February 2011, Australia, Canada, the United Nations, and United States imposed sanctions on Colonel Muammar Gaddafi and his regime. The first objective was to stop the armed suppression; the second objective was to remove Gaddafi, his family, and associates from power. Australia imposed travel bans and a freeze on the financial assets of Gaddafi and 22 members of his government. Canada froze assets and banned any financial transactions with Gaddafi and his government and all its agencies and institutions, including the central bank. In February 2011, the United States imposed a freeze on Gaddafi assets, cut military assistance to the country, and blocked \$30 billion of assets under US jurisdiction. The United Nations voted unanimously to impose a freeze on assets and travel ban on Gaddafi, his family, and his top 10 associates. The United Nations also adopted an arms embargo against the Gaddafi regime. Following Gaddafi's refusal to relinquish power and the violent crackdown on opposition supporters, the United Nations authorized air strikes and the imposition of a no-fly zone. In April 2011 the United States expanded sanctions on Libya, adding additional government officials and government-controlled entities to the list. The United States, the United Kingdom, and France provided military advisors and covert assistance to rebels, and NATO conducted air strikes.</p> <p>Resolution: By October, rebel forces had taken command of nearly every city aside from Sirte and Bani Walid, the last remaining pro-Gaddafi strongholds. With the assistance of NATO air strikes, rebel fighters were able to kill Gaddafi and capture his son Mutassim on October 20, 2011 in Sirte. The second, and not universally shared objective, of removing Gaddafi and his associates from power was achieved, but the protection of civilians in Libya was not fully realized. Following Gaddafi's death, the National Transitional Council faces a tremendous challenge of disarming rival militias nationwide and uniting them under one national security force.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 4 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 8 (success score)</p>

Ongoing Cases³			
United States, European Union, Australia, Canada	Burma	2000–	<p>Background and Objectives: The objective of sanctions against Burma is to foster democratic elections and secure the release of Aung San Suu Kyi from house arrest. On April 10, 2000, the European Union added new measures to its sanctions regime against the Burmese government. The full range of measures includes an arms embargo, a ban on financial support of state-owned enterprises, a travel ban, and a freeze on assets and economic resources of certain individuals and the Burmese government. In July 2003, the United States issued Executive Order 13310, implementing an asset freeze and prohibiting financial transactions with the government and imports from Burma. Sanctions were imposed in response to the attempted assassination of Aung San Suu Kyi, and an attack on members of her political party. In June 2003, Japan suspended all economic assistance to Burma, but not retroactively. Australia implemented sanctions, in October 2003, against members of the Burmese regime and certain supporters. Sanctions included a travel ban, an arms embargo, and a restriction on financial transactions. In December 2003, Canada sanctioned the Burmese government, banning all exports to the country, and placed restrictions on the provision of financial services. Sanctions were imposed in response to the regime's violent oppression of protesters in the Saffron Revolution, the largest mass protest against the ruling party since 1988. Japan cancelled \$4.7 million worth of aid directed at a business education center at Yangon University. The United States has prohibited the importation of jadeite and rubies from Burma, and purchases through third parties.</p> <p>Resolution: On November 13, 2010, Aung San Suu Kyi was released from her 13-year house arrest, and a civilian government replaced the military rule. Elections were held on April 1, 2012, in which Aung San Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy won 40 seats of the 45 seats contested for Parliament. However, the military junta remains in control and US sanctions remain in place. On April 23, 2012 the European Union announced it will lift sanctions against Burma in recognition of democratic reform. Japan has also suspended sanctions.</p> <p>Provisional score: 3 (policy result) x 3 (sanctions contribution) = 9 (success score)</p>
United States, United Nations, Japan, Australia, South Korea	North Korea	2000–	<p>Background and Objectives: In April 2000, the United States implemented sanctions on the North Korean government and companies knowingly engaged in the export of military technology. In August 2002, the United States implemented similar sanctions in response to North Korea selling missile components to Yemen. In September 2006, Japan and Australia imposed financial sanctions on certain North Korean entities and persons suspected of being involved in the missile and nuclear program. Japanese and Australian banks blocked all transactions with listed entities and persons. In October 2006, North Korea announced its intention to test its first nuclear weapon. In response the</p>

³ These sanctions episodes do not constitute new cases. Sanctions against these countries were implemented during the 20th century. Here we provide information on developments in the cases since 2000.

			<p>United States passed the North Korean Nonproliferation Act of 2006, which added North Korea to the Iran and Syria Nonproliferation Act of 2000, renamed INKSNA. INKSNA imposes penalties on entities and individuals who transfer or acquire missile technology from North Korea. The United Nations took action by passing Resolution 1718, banning the export of luxury goods, arms and related material to North Korea. The United Nations also froze the assets of designated entities. In February 2007, North Korea agreed (through the six-party talks) to disable its plutonium nuclear facilities in Yongbyon and provide the United States with a complete account of its nuclear program. On June 26, 2008, North Korea submitted a declaration of its nuclear program and dismantled the operating capability of Yongbyon. In response the United States lifted its sanctions under the Trading with the Enemy Act (first imposed in 1950 and most recently continued in 2007). At the same time, the United States announced that the risk of proliferation of weapons grade fissile material constituted a threat to national security and will therefore continue to impose certain sanctions through Executive Order 13466, which blocks all property and interests in property of North Korea or North Korean nationals. Sanctions also block US persons from using vessels registered in North Korea, as well as prohibiting the lease, operation, or insurance of North Korean vessels. In April 2009, North Korea tested a long range missile. In response the United Nations and South Korea imposed sanctions. South Korean sanctions include a ban on financial transactions with three companies. UN sanctions ban arms-related trade, financial transactions related to arms, and technical training. In March 2010 North Korea launched an unprovoked attack against a South Korean Navy ship (Cheonan), which resulted in the death of 46 sailors. North Korea also announced that it would test a nuclear device. In response South Korea cut all trade with North Korea outside of the Kaesong industrial zone. In August 2010, the United States expanded the scope of the national emergency declared in 2006, adding new restrictions, and in April 2011 expanded these sanctions further in response to North Korea's continued intransigence on issues related to regional security.</p> <p>Resolution: On December 17, 2011, Kim Jong-il died and was succeeded by his youngest son, Kim Jong-un. In February 2012, the United States and North Korea held bilateral talks in Beijing. North Korea announced a suspension on long-range missile launches, nuclear tests, and its uranium enrichment activity at Yongbyon, and agreed to allow IAEA inspectors to monitor the moratorium on uranium enrichment. However, in April 2012, North Korea attempted (but failed) to launch a satellite using ballistic missile technology. There is renewed concern that North Korea will conduct a nuclear test similar to those in 2006 and 2009.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 2 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 4 (success score)</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>United States, United Nations, European Union, Canada</p>	<p>Iran</p>	<p>2010–</p>	<p>Background and Objectives: The principal objectives of sanctions against Iran are to stop Iran’s pursuit of nuclear weapons, and isolate Iran from the world financial network, thereby impeding its exports of petroleum. On July 1, 2010, the United States enacted the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions Accountability and Divestment Act (CISADA). CISADA does not constitute a new case; rather it supplements sanctions that have been in place since 1984. The principal objectives are to stop Iran’s pursuit of nuclear weapons and to end Iran’s support of Hezbollah. Sanctions include an embargo on trade and investment by US persons, and the prohibition of involvement in the development of Iran’s petroleum sector. The 2010 CISADA substantially strengthens existing sanctions and covers not only US entities engaging in sanctionable activity but also the parent company and affiliates or subsidiaries, even if foreign entities. The UN Security Council also imposed sanctions in June 2010. In July 2010, the European Union and Canada also imposed sanctions targeting trade, financial services, and energy. Sanctions focus on Iranian banks, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and Iran’s shipping lines. In late 2011, the US Congress passed additional sanctions against Iran, including against the central bank, and the European Union approved gradual implementation of an oil boycott. In early 2012 the European Union banned new contracts of oil imports, and implemented a total embargo of Iranian crude by mid-year. US policy requires Iran’s customers to substantially reduce their purchases of Iranian crude or be banned from the US financial sector. The US law provides the president with some discretion to exempt countries that are cooperating with US policy or if it is in the US national interest. In March 2012 the European Union and Japan were granted exemptions.</p> <p>Resolution: Iran is increasingly isolated and is feeling the economic pinch from more severe sanctions. In addition, there is widespread talk of a military strike against Iran’s nuclear assets. Possibly as a result, Iran has agreed to a new round of talks in Istanbul. At the time of writing, sanctions have failed to change Iran’s core goal of acquiring nuclear weapons, but they have probably put significant new obstacles in its path.</p> <p>Provisional Score: 2 (policy result) x 2 (sanctions contribution) = 4 (success score)</p>
--	-------------	--------------	--