

<https://doi.org/10.59546/18290744-2025.1-3-168>

SIRANUSH GRIGORYAN

*Yerevan State University,
Faculty of Law, Chair of European and International Law,
PhD Student, Yerevan, Armenia*

ՍԻՐԱՆՈՒՇ ԳՐԻԳՈՐՅԱՆ

*Երևանի պետական համալսարան,
Իրավագիտության ֆակուլտետ, Եվրոպական և միջազգային
իրավունքի ամբիոն, հայցորդ, Հայաստան, Երևան*

СИРАНУШ ГРИГОРЯН

*Ереванский государственный университет
Юридический факультет, кафедра европейского и
Международного права, соискатель, Ереван, Армения
ORCHID ID: 0000-0003-1418-5643*

INNOVATIVE MECHANISMS TO PREVENT CIVIL HARM FROM SANCTIONS

ՊԱՏԺԱՄԻՋՈՑՆԵՐԻՑ ՔԱՂԱՔԱՑԻԱԿԱՆ ՎՆԱՍՆԵՐԻ ԿԱՆԽԱՐԳԵԼՄԱՆ ՆՈՐԱՐԱԿԱՆ ՄԵԽԱՆԻԶՄՆԵՐԸ

ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ МЕХАНИЗМЫ ПРЕДОТВРАЩЕНИЯ ГРАЖДАНСКОГО УЩЕРБА ОТ САНКЦИЙ

Introduction

Sanctions are a widely used tool in international diplomacy, aimed at pressuring states or non-state actors to change their behavior. While they can be effective in achieving political objectives, they often have unintended and severe consequences, particularly for civilian populations. Broad sanctions can disrupt essential services, deepen economic crises, and exacerbate humanitarian challenges, disproportionately affecting innocent people.

Traditional sanctions lack precise targeting mechanisms, relying heavily on broad economic pressure, which has led to significant civilian suffering. This highlights the urgent need for a new approach—one that balances political objectives with humanitarian safeguards to minimize unintended harm.

This paper proposes the establishment of an international institution to oversee and regulate sanctions, ensuring they are targeted, legally sound, and humanitarian-focused. Equipped with advanced filtering mechanisms, real-time monitoring, legal oversight, and humanitarian protections,

this institution would enhance precision, effectiveness, and ethical considerations in sanctions policy.

By addressing the shortcomings of traditional sanctions, this framework seeks to transform how sanctions are designed, implemented, and monitored, fostering a more humane and sustainable approach to international relations. The following sections will analyze current challenges, outline the proposed institution's key mechanisms, and explore its potential benefits in mitigating civilian harm while achieving strategic goals.

Basic research

The Impact of Sanctions on Civil Society

Sanctions, while intended to compel change, often disproportionately harm civilians by limiting access to healthcare, food, education, and energy. In Syria, restrictions on financial transactions caused medical supply shortages; in Venezuela, disrupted food imports led to widespread hunger. Although sanctions are deemed non-violent, their impact on ordinary populations raises questions of proportionality and collective punishment, especially when bureaucratic barriers undermine humanitarian exemptions.

Healthcare is typically hit first. Financial restrictions limit the import of vital medications and equipment, leaving hospitals unable to meet patient needs. Even exemptions for medical goods can be delayed, causing preventable deaths and placing an extra burden on already strained systems.

Food security also suffers. Nations relying on imports for seeds, fertilizers, or staple goods face shortages, price surges, and malnutrition. In Venezuela, for example, sanctions halted crucial agricultural inputs, increasing hunger and threatening overall social stability¹.

Education endures similar setbacks. Economic hardship often forces governments to cut funding for schools, resulting in overcrowded classrooms and closures. In Yemen, conflict combined with sanctions has effectively collapsed the education system, leaving millions of children without access to learning and perpetuating cycles of poverty.

Energy infrastructure also deteriorates under sanctions. Curtails on oil exports lead to fuel shortages and power outages, disrupting industries, healthcare facilities, and everyday life. Such shortages can be life-threatening in colder climates and further stall economic recovery.

The ethical implications of sanction-related harm to civilians are widely debated among scholars and human rights advocates. Although sanctions are promoted as a non-violent alternative to military intervention, their indirect harm can be equally devastating. Civilians who bear no responsibility for government actions frequently endure the harshest consequences. Critics point to potential collective punishment, in which entire populations suffer for the deeds of political elites, and call for more precise, humane measures that minimize collateral damage².

Humanitarian exemptions, intended to maintain flows of essential goods, often fall short in practice due to logistical and financial constraints. Delays or outright failures in delivering supplies leave vulnerable communities unprotected, underscoring the limits of existing sanction frameworks³.

In conclusion, sanctions can severely disrupt the fundamental pillars of civil society—

¹ Allen, Susan Hannah. «The Humanitarian Impact of Economic Sanctions: Reassessing the Theory and Evidence.» *International Affairs Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 2014, pp. 853-867.

² Zarate, Juan C. *Treasury's War: The Unleashing of a New Era of Financial Warfare*. PublicAffairs, 2013, pp. 102-118.

³ Drezner, Daniel W. «Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.

healthcare, food, education, and energy—while imposing disproportionate burdens on civilians. A more targeted and humanitarian approach is needed to achieve political goals without undermining the welfare of entire populations.

Existing Sanction Mechanisms and their Limitations

Sanctions have long been used by international actors as a non-military means to achieve political, economic, or security objectives. They are typically imposed by international organizations, regional bodies, and individual states to influence the behavior of other nations or entities. The United Nations Security Council, for example, frequently imposes sanctions in response to violations of international law, including acts of aggression, terrorism, and threats to global security⁴.

Despite their widespread use, sanctions often have unintended consequences. One of the primary challenges is their broad economic impact, which frequently extends beyond the intended targets. Measures targeting key industries such as energy, finance, or technology often disrupt entire economies, affecting not just political elites but also ordinary citizens. Comprehensive sanctions in the past have led to inflation, job losses, and shortages of essential goods⁵. While these measures aim to pressure governments, the civilian population frequently bears the most severe consequences, facing collapsing healthcare systems, disrupted food supply chains, and restricted access to necessities. The lack of precision in targeting specific individuals or institutions often turns sanctions into a blunt instrument, exacerbating humanitarian crises⁶.

Another major limitation is the difficulty in distinguishing between government-controlled entities and civilian infrastructure. In many countries, the state plays a dominant role in industries such as energy, finance, and telecommunications. As a result, sanctions intended to pressure governments may inadvertently harm private businesses, local economies, and essential services⁷. For instance, restrictions on state-owned enterprises managing oil exports can lead to fuel shortages and power outages that affect entire populations. This overlap complicates efforts to apply sanctions effectively while minimizing harm to civilians.

Additionally, humanitarian exemptions included in sanctions regimes are often insufficient or poorly implemented, leaving vulnerable populations exposed to the full brunt of economic restrictions. Although many sanctions include provisions allowing for the continued flow of essential goods such as food, medicine, and humanitarian supplies, these exemptions are frequently hampered by logistical and bureaucratic challenges. In some cases, financial institutions and supply chain networks are hesitant to engage with sanctioned countries, even when humanitarian exemptions are in place, due to concerns about legal or financial risks⁸.

Another challenge is the lack of a standardized approach to the implementation and enforcement of sanctions. Different international and regional bodies, as well as individual states, often impose

⁴ Gordon, Joy. *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions*. Harvard University Press, 2010, pp. 156-170.

⁵ Weiss, Thomas G., et al. «Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: History and Current Context.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, pp. 589-600.

⁶ Peksen, Dursun. «Better or Worse? The Effect of Economic Sanctions on Human Rights.» *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2009, pp. 59-77.

⁷ Allen, Susan Hannah. «The Humanitarian Impact of Economic Sanctions: Reassessing the Theory and Evidence.» *International Affairs Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 2014, pp. 853-867.

⁸ Lopez, George A. «The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s.» *International Journal*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2004, pp. 851-872.

unilateral measures, leading to inconsistencies and fragmentation⁹. This allows targeted entities to exploit alternative markets or financial systems, reducing the overall effectiveness of sanctions. For instance, a country facing unilateral sanctions from one state may continue trade with others that do not enforce similar restrictions, ultimately undermining the intended pressure on its leadership¹⁰.

While sanctions remain a crucial tool for addressing violations of international norms, their current mechanisms have notable limitations that reduce their effectiveness and, in many cases, exacerbate humanitarian challenges. The broad economic distress they cause, the difficulty in distinguishing between state and civilian sectors, and the inadequate implementation of humanitarian exemptions all contribute to unintended harm. A more precise, coordinated, and humane approach is essential to ensuring that sanctions achieve their political and security objectives without disproportionately affecting civilian populations.

Structure and Mechanism of the Proposed Institution to Prevent Civil Harm from Sanctions

Sanctions are a common tool for influencing government behavior, yet they often have unintended consequences, particularly for civilians. When applied too broadly, sanctions can disrupt essential services, cause economic instability, and deprive ordinary people of necessities. To address these issues, this paper proposes an international institution dedicated to ensuring that sanctions remain targeted and humanitarian concerns are prioritized. This institution would oversee sanction design, implementation, and continuous monitoring to minimize harm while achieving political and economic objectives.

The primary mandate of this proposed institution is to ensure that sanctions are designed and implemented in a way that targets the intended individuals or entities without negatively impacting the broader population. The institution would focus on providing centralized oversight for all sanctions regimes, ensuring that they are precisely targeted, that humanitarian concerns are integrated from the outset, and that the effects of sanctions are continuously monitored and adjusted as needed. This institution would consist of several specialized departments, each tasked with different responsibilities in designing, monitoring, legally reviewing, and adjusting sanctions in real time. The key areas of responsibility would include sanctions design, impact monitoring, legal review, humanitarian oversight, and multilateral coordination.

● Central Governing Body

The Central Governing Body would serve as the decision-making hub of the institution, responsible for overseeing the entire lifecycle of sanctions—from their design to their modification or removal. This governing body would consist of representatives from international organizations, experts in international law, economics, human rights, and humanitarian affairs. The governing body's composition would ensure that all decisions reflect a balance between achieving political objectives, respecting legal standards, and safeguarding humanitarian needs.

The Central Governing Body would have several core functions:

1. **Reviewing and Approving Sanctions:** All sanctions proposals would be subject to review by the

⁹ Drezner, Daniel W. «Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.

¹⁰ Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, et al. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*. 3rd ed., Peterson Institute for International Economics, 2009, pp. 145-160.

Central Governing Body. Before any sanctions are implemented, the governing body would evaluate whether the proposed measures meet the institution's standards of legality, proportionality, and necessity. This review process would assess the potential impacts on the target nation's economy, its essential services, and, most importantly, its civilian population.

2. Ongoing Adjustments and Reviews: After sanctions are implemented, the Central Governing Body would convene regular review sessions to evaluate their impact. This process would involve analyzing reports from the monitoring units to assess whether sanctions are achieving their intended political objectives without causing undue harm to civilians. If any unintended consequences, such as shortages of food or medicine, arise, the governing body would have the authority to recommend changes to the sanctions regime—whether by modifying, narrowing, or lifting specific measures.

3. Coordinating Humanitarian Concerns: A critical role of the governing body would be to ensure that sanctions are aligned with humanitarian principles. This would involve working closely with the institution's Humanitarian Oversight Division to guarantee that sanctions are imposed in ways that protect vulnerable populations from harm, and that exemptions for essential goods and services are rigorously enforced¹¹.

This body would also play a crucial role in sanction adjustments. If, after implementation, a sanctions regime is found to be causing unintended harm to civilian populations or failing to achieve its intended goals, the Central Governing Body would have the authority to recommend changes. These could include lifting certain sanctions, modifying their scope, or introducing new, more targeted measures. To ensure flexibility and adaptability, the governing body would hold regular review sessions to assess ongoing sanctions regimes. This would prevent sanctions from becoming static or overly punitive, allowing them to be fine-tuned as needed to meet their objectives without causing unnecessary harm¹².

● **Data Analytics and Monitoring Unit**

The Data Analytics and Monitoring Unit would be integral to the institution's ability to manage sanctions dynamically and in real-time. This unit would gather and analyze data on the impact of sanctions, both before and after they are implemented. By using advanced data analytics tools, the unit would provide predictive insights on how sanctions are likely to affect different sectors of a target nation's economy, with a particular focus on essential services such as healthcare, food, energy, and education.

In addition to its predictive capabilities, the unit would monitor the real-world effects of sanctions once they are in place. By working with humanitarian organizations, financial institutions, and other partners, the Data Analytics and Monitoring Unit would collect data on how sanctions are impacting civilian life, including access to essential goods and services. This information would then be fed back to the Central Governing Body, allowing for continuous assessment and adjustment of sanctions to prevent unintended harm.

Moreover, the unit would develop predictive models using historical data and trends to forecast the likely outcomes of proposed sanctions regimes. This would allow the institution to proactively identify potential areas of concern, such as the disruption of food supplies or medical shortages, and take preemptive action to mitigate those risks¹³.

¹¹ Gordon, Joy. *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions*. Harvard University Press, 2010, pp. 156-170.

¹² Weiss, Thomas G., et al. «Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: History and Current Context.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, pp. 589-600.

¹³ Wallace, Michael. «Sanctions and International Human Rights.» *Global Policy Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2016, pp. 421-434.

● Independent Review Boards

To ensure accountability and enhance transparency, the institution would establish Independent Review Boards. These boards would be composed of experts in international law, human rights, economics, and humanitarian affairs, tasked with conducting regular assessments of the sanctions regimes overseen by the institution. Their principal responsibility would be to evaluate the humanitarian impact of sanctions and recommend adjustments when necessary.¹⁴

The Independent Review Boards would serve two main functions:

- **Public Reporting:** One of the board's key roles would be to issue public reports on the effectiveness and impact of the sanctions regimes. These reports would provide transparency on whether the sanctions are achieving their political objectives without causing excessive harm to civilians. The reports would be available to member states, international organizations, and the general public, allowing for an open evaluation of the institution's work.

- **Investigating Complaints and Concerns:** The Independent Review Boards would also serve as a platform for receiving and investigating complaints from affected populations, humanitarian organizations, or other stakeholders. If a sanctions regime is found to be disproportionately impacting civilians, the board would investigate the claims and make recommendations to the Central Governing Body for adjustments or modifications.

By incorporating these independent review mechanisms, the institution would ensure that sanctions remain aligned with both their legal objectives and humanitarian considerations throughout their enforcement.

● Multilateral Coordination Office

The Multilateral Coordination Office would be responsible for ensuring that sanctions regimes are applied consistently and in a coordinated manner across the international community. One of the major challenges with current sanctions regimes is their fragmented nature. Often, different states or regional bodies impose sanctions unilaterally, which can result in inconsistencies and loopholes that allow targeted entities to avoid the sanctions.

The Multilateral Coordination Office would address this by working to harmonize sanctions policies across various jurisdictions. It would coordinate with international organizations, financial institutions, and governments to ensure that sanctions are enforced consistently and effectively. This office would also play a key role in ensuring that humanitarian exemptions are respected globally, facilitating the delivery of essential goods like food and medicine to civilian populations in sanctioned countries.

The coordination office would also be tasked with working closely with the institution's Legal Review and Enforcement Department to ensure that all sanctions regimes comply with international legal standards and that enforcement is both consistent and legally sound.

The proposed international institution represents a comprehensive approach to managing sanctions in a way that maximizes their effectiveness while minimizing harm to civilians. By establishing specialized departments such as the Central Governing Body, Data Analytics and Monitoring Unit, Independent Review Boards, and the Multilateral Coordination Office, this institution would ensure that sanctions are implemented with precision, constantly monitored for impact, and adjusted to prevent any unnecessary harm. This structure provides a framework that balances the political

¹⁴ Galtung, Johan. «On the Effects of International Economic Sanctions: With Examples from the Case of Rhodesia.» *World Politics*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1967, pp. 378-416.

objectives of sanctions with the imperative to protect human rights and maintain humanitarian standards.

Legal Review and Enforcement Department

The Legal Review and Enforcement Department serves as a critical pillar of the proposed institution, ensuring that sanctions adhere to international legal standards while safeguarding humanitarian protections. This department applies core legal principles such as proportionality, necessity, and non-discrimination, preventing sanctions from disproportionately harming civilians. It operates through legal review, oversight, and enforcement mechanisms to ensure compliance with human rights and international humanitarian law¹⁵.

● Mandate and Legal Framework

The primary mandate of the Legal Review and Enforcement Department would be to develop and enforce a comprehensive legal framework for reviewing all sanctions proposals. This framework would set out clear legal criteria that every sanction regime must meet before receiving approval from the Central Governing Body. The framework would be designed to ensure that sanctions are legally sound and do not infringe on basic human rights¹⁶.

The key components of this legal framework would include:

1. Human Rights Compliance: Each sanctions regime would be assessed to ensure it does not violate fundamental human rights, such as the rights to food, healthcare, and education¹⁷. The department would ensure that sanctions do not lead to violations of protected rights under international treaties, including the right to life and freedom from inhuman treatment¹⁸.

2. Proportionality and Necessity: Sanctions must be proportionate to the seriousness of the offense and necessary to achieve the intended political or economic objectives. The department would evaluate whether the sanctions are excessive relative to the violation and whether less harmful alternatives could achieve the same goals.

3. Non-Discrimination: The department would ensure that sanctions do not disproportionately impact vulnerable groups, including children, the elderly, or marginalized communities¹⁹. Sanction regimes would be carefully reviewed to ensure they are fair and do not exacerbate existing inequalities or hardships.

4. Humanitarian Exemptions: The department would ensure that sanctions include robust humanitarian exemptions for essential goods and services, particularly for food, medicine, and medical supplies²⁰. These exemptions would protect civilian populations and ensure that basic humanitarian needs are met even under sanctions.

By applying this comprehensive legal framework, the Legal Review and Enforcement Department would conduct a thorough and consistent review of all sanctions proposals, ensuring they meet the

¹⁵ Allen, Susan Hannah. «The Humanitarian Impact of Economic Sanctions: Reassessing the Theory and Evidence.» *International Affairs Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 2014, pp. 853-867.

¹⁶ Drezner, Daniel W. «Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.

¹⁷ Galtung, Johan. «On the Effects of International Economic Sanctions: With Examples from the Case of Rhodesia.» *World Politics*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1967, pp. 378-416.

¹⁸ Gordon, Joy. *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions*. Harvard University Press, 2010, pp. 156-170.

¹⁹ Joy Gordon, *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions* (Harvard University Press, 2010), pp. 156-170.

²⁰ Juan C. Zarate, *Treasury's War: The Unleashing of a New Era of Financial Warfare* (Public Affairs, 2013), pp. 102-118.

highest legal standards before being implemented.

- **Legal Evaluation of Sanctions Proposals**

One of the core responsibilities of the Legal Review and Enforcement Department would be to evaluate the legality of sanction proposals before they are submitted to the Central Governing Body for final approval. This evaluation would involve an in-depth legal analysis to determine whether the sanctions proposal follows international law, including human rights law, international humanitarian law, and customary international law²¹.

In conducting these reviews, the department would ensure that each sanctions regime targets the appropriate actors (such as government officials, corporations, or other responsible entities) and avoids causing unnecessary harm to civilians. If a sanctions proposal is found to be legally deficient—either too broad or too damaging—the department would recommend revisions or propose alternative sanctions that are more targeted²².

For example, sanctions targeting sectors such as energy or finance could disrupt critical services for civilians, such as access to electricity or banking. In these cases, the department would examine whether the sanctions unjustly affect essential infrastructure and would suggest more precise measures, such as targeted sanctions aimed at individuals, companies, or specific transactions²³.

- **Establishing a Legal Review Process**

To ensure consistency and careful review in its work, the Legal Review and Enforcement Department would establish a formal legal review process for sanctions proposals. This process would consist of several stages:

1. Initial Legal Screening: Every sanction proposal would undergo an initial screening to determine whether it meets the basic legal requirements set out in the legal framework. This step would ensure that the sanctions regime is in line with the institution's principles before moving forward.

2. Detailed Legal Analysis: Once the initial screening is complete, the department would conduct a detailed legal analysis, examining the potential impact of the sanctions on civilians and key infrastructure. This stage would also involve collaboration with legal experts, international organizations, and humanitarian groups to assess the real-world implications of the sanctions²⁴.

3. Consultation and Revision: If the department identifies legal concerns with a proposal, it will work with the proposing entity to revise the sanctions regime. This could involve narrowing the scope of the sanctions or introducing exemptions to reduce civilian harm.

4. Final Legal Approval: After revisions are complete, the department would submit the proposal for final approval by the Central Governing Body, ensuring that the legal standards have been fully met²⁵.

- **Targeted Sanctions and Legal Alternatives**

A core function of the department would be to recommend targeted sanctions that focus

²¹ Daniel W. Drezner, «Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice,» *International Studies Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.

²² Michael Wallace, «Sanctions and International Human Rights,» *Global Policy Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2016, pp. 421-434.

²³ George A. Lopez, «The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s,» *International Journal*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2004, pp. 851-872.

²⁴ Thomas G. Weiss et al., «Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: History and Current Context,» *International Studies Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, pp. 589-600.

²⁵ Dursun Peksen, «Better or Worse? The Effect of Economic Sanctions on Human Rights,» *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2009, pp. 59-77.

on specific individuals, companies, or entities directly responsible for the violation, rather than imposing broad, sweeping sanctions on entire sectors²⁶. This approach, often referred to as smart sanctions, would allow the institution to apply pressure on violators without disproportionately affecting the civilian population.

In cases where broad sanctions are proposed, the department would assess whether they unfairly impact essential services, such as healthcare or energy²⁷. For instance, if sanctions are imposed on a country's energy sector, the department might suggest alternatives that target specific transactions or entities involved in the offense, rather than disrupting an entire sector that provides vital services to civilians.

The department would also ensure that sanctions regimes include humanitarian exemptions to allow for the continued flow of critical goods, such as food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies, to protect civilian populations from the unintended consequences of sanctions²⁸.

- **Ongoing Legal Oversight and Adjustments**

In addition to reviewing sanctions before implementation, the Legal Review and Enforcement Department would be responsible for ongoing legal oversight of all active sanction regimes. The department would conduct regular reviews to ensure that sanctions remain effective, proportional, and compliant with international law. If a sanctions regime is found to be causing excessive harm to civilians or is no longer achieving its objectives, the department would recommend adjustments or modifications²⁹.

The department would also handle complaints and appeals from affected states, humanitarian organizations, or civil society groups. In such cases, it would conduct independent investigations to determine whether the sanctions are violating international law or causing disproportionate harm and would recommend any necessary adjustments³⁰.

- **Collaboration with Other Departments**

The Legal Review and Enforcement Department would collaborate closely with other departments to ensure that legal reviews are informed by real-time data and humanitarian concerns. For example:

1. **Data Analytics and Monitoring Unit:** The legal department would use data on the impact of sanctions to make informed legal judgments. If data shows that sanctions are causing unintended harm, the department will review the regime and recommend immediate changes.

2. **Humanitarian Oversight Division:** The legal department would ensure that humanitarian exemptions are effectively integrated into every sanction's regime. It would work with humanitarian organizations to ensure that exemptions are upheld and that critical supplies reach civilian populations³¹.

- **Transparency and Accountability**

To ensure accountability and promote transparency, the Legal Review and Enforcement

²⁶ Susan Hannah Allen, «The Humanitarian Impact of Economic Sanctions: Reassessing the Theory and Evidence,» *International Affairs Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 2014, pp. 853-867.

²⁷ George A. Lopez, «The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s,» *International Journal*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2004, pp. 851-872.

²⁸ Daniel W. Drezner, «Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice,» *International Studies Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.

²⁹ Juan C. Zarate, *Treasury's War: The Unleashing of a New Era of Financial Warfare* (PublicAffairs, 2013), pp. 102-118.

³⁰ Joy Gordon, *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions* (Harvard University Press, 2010), pp. 156-170.

³¹ Thomas G. Weiss et al., «Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: History and Current Context,» *International Studies Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, pp. 589-600.

Department would publish regular reports on the legality and humanitarian impact of sanctions regimes. These reports would be made available to the public, providing an open assessment of how the institution is upholding international legal standards and protecting civilian populations.

The department would also contribute to broader efforts within the institution to establish independent review mechanisms, allowing for ongoing evaluations of sanctions regimes and providing channels for appeals and complaints from affected stakeholders³².

The Legal Review and Enforcement Department would serve as the legal backbone of the institution, ensuring that all sanctions regimes are compliant with international law and respect humanitarian principles. Through its comprehensive legal reviews, targeted sanctions recommendations, and ongoing oversight, the department would help balance the enforcement of international norms with the protection of civilian populations, ensuring that sanctions are both effective and humane.

Conclusion

Sanctions are a key tool for influencing political and economic behavior, yet they often disproportionately impact civilians, especially in essential sectors like healthcare, food security, education, and energy. While designed to pressure governments and individuals, sanctions frequently harm the general population more than those in power, raising serious ethical and humanitarian concerns.

The widespread unintended consequences of sanctions underscore the need for a more targeted and humane approach. International human rights law rejects collective punishment, making it imperative to design and implement sanctions that achieve political objectives without causing undue suffering.

The proposed international institution provides a structured, legal, and humanitarian approach to sanctions. Through real-time monitoring, independent review, and legal oversight, it would minimize civilian harm while maintaining political effectiveness. Departments such as the Central Governing Body, Data Analytics and Monitoring Unit, Independent Review Boards, and Legal Review and Enforcement Department would work together to ensure that sanctions remain compliant with international law and prioritize humanitarian protections.

A key pillar of this institution is the Legal Review and Enforcement Department, which would ensure proportionality, necessity, and legal compliance in all sanction regimes. By focusing on targeted sanctions rather than broad economic restrictions, this approach would prevent unnecessary suffering and uphold fundamental rights.

Ultimately, while sanctions are vital for upholding international norms and addressing violations, they must be refined to avoid harming innocent civilians. The proposed institution offers a balanced, adaptive, and legally sound framework that enhances accountability, safeguards human rights, and ensures sanctions remain an effective yet humane foreign policy tool.

Annotation. In an increasingly interconnected world, economic and political measures are frequently employed to shape global interactions, maintain stability, and enforce compliance with international norms. However, such measures can often produce unintended consequences, particularly for vulnerable populations. Policies designed to influence

³² Michael Wallace, «Sanctions and International Human Rights,» *Global Policy Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2016, pp. 421-434.

the behavior of states, organizations, and individuals must therefore be accompanied by mechanisms that ensure their effectiveness while minimizing collateral harm.

This work proposes the creation of an international institution with advanced filtering mechanisms, real-time monitoring, and legal oversight. A key feature of this framework is the Legal Review and Enforcement Department, which would ensure that sanctions comply with international law and human rights protections. The proposed structure aims to improve the effectiveness of sanctions while safeguarding civilian well-being through more targeted and adaptable approaches.

Ամփոփագիր: Փոխկապակցված աշխարհում տնտեսական և քաղաքական միջոցառումները հաճախ օգտագործվում են զլորալ փոխազդեցություններ ձևավորելու, կայունություն պահպանելու և միջազգային նորմերին համապատասխանեցնելու համար: Այնուամենայնիվ, նմանօրինակ գործողությունները հաճախ կարող են հանգեցնել անկանխատեսելի հետևանքների հատկապես խոցելի բնակչության համար: Հետևաբար, պետությունների, կազմակերպությունների և անհատների վարքագծի վրա ազդելու քաղաքականությունը պետք է ուղեկցվի մեխանիզմներով, որոնք ապահովում են դրա արդյունավետությունը՝ միաժամանակ նվազագույնի հասցնելով ուղեկցող վնասը:

Աշխատանքում առաջարկվում է ստեղծել միջազգային կազմակերպություն՝ ֆիլտրման, իրական ժամանակի մոնիթորինգի և իրավական վերահսկողության առաջադեմ մեխանիզմներով: Այս կառույցի առանցքային առանձնահատկությունն իրավական վերահսկողության և իրավապահ մարմինների վարչությունն է, որը կապահովի պատժամիջոցների համապատասխանությունը միջազգային իրավունքին և մարդու իրավունքների պաշտպանությանը: Առաջարկվող կառույցն ուղղված է պատժամիջոցների արդյունավետության բարձրացմանը՝ միաժամանակ ապահովելով քաղաքացիական բնակչության բարեկեցությունը՝ ավելի նպատակային և հարմարվող մոտեցման միջոցով:

Аннотация. Во все более взаимосвязанном мире экономические и политические меры часто используются для формирования глобальных взаимодействий, поддержания стабильности и обеспечения соблюдения международных норм. Однако такие меры часто могут привести к непредвиденным последствиям, особенно для уязвимых групп населения. Поэтому политика, направленная на то, чтобы влиять на поведение государств, организаций и отдельных лиц, должна сопровождаться механизмами, обеспечивающими ее эффективность при минимизации сопутствующего ущерба.

В данной работе предлагается создать международную организацию с передовыми механизмами фильтрации, мониторинга в режиме реального времени и юридического надзора. Ключевой особенностью этой структуры является Департамент правового контроля и правоприменения, который будет обеспечивать соответствие санкций международному праву и защиту прав человека. Предлагаемая структура направлена на повышение эффективности санкций при одновременном обеспечении благополучия гражданского населения с помощью более целенаправленных и адаптируемых подходов.

Keywords: *civilian act, humanitarian safeguards, targeted sanctions, legal review, proportional sanctions, civilian protection, law compliance, filtering mechanisms, real-time monitoring, human rights.*

Բանալի բառեր - ազդեցություն քաղաքացիական բնակչության վրա, մարդասիրական երաշխիքներ, նպատակային պատժամիջոցներ, իրավական վերահսկում, համամասնական պատժամիջոցներ, քաղաքացիական բնակչության պաշտպանություն, օրենքների պահպանում, ֆիլտրման մեխանիզմներ, իրական ժամանակի մոնիթորինգ, մարդու իրավունքներ:

Ключевые слова: *воздействие на гражданское население; гуманитарные гарантии; целенаправленные санкции; юридический обзор; пропорциональные санкции; защита гражданского населения; соблюдение законов; механизмы фильтрации; мониторинг в режиме реального времени; права человека.*

Bibliography

1. Allen, Susan Hannah. «The Humanitarian Impact of Economic Sanctions: Reassessing the Theory and Evidence.» *International Affairs Review*, vol. 90, no. 4, 2014, pp. 853-867.
2. Drezner, Daniel W. «Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.
3. Galtung, Johan. «On the Effects of International Economic Sanctions: With Examples from the Case of Rhodesia.» *World Politics*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1967, pp. 378-416.
4. Gordon, Joy. *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions*. Harvard University Press, 2010, pp. 156-170.
5. Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, et al. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*. 3rd ed., Peterson Institute for International Economics, 2009, pp. 145-160.
6. Lopez, George A. «The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s.» *International Journal*, vol. 59, no. 4, 2004, pp. 851-872.
7. Pape, Robert A. «Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work.» *International Security*, vol. 22, no. 2, 1997, pp. 90-136.
8. Peksen, Dursun. «Better or Worse? The Effect of Economic Sanctions on Human Rights.» *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2009, pp. 59-77.
9. Wallace, Michael. «Sanctions and International Human Rights.» *Global Policy Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2016, pp. 421-434.
10. Weiss, Thomas G., et al. «Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: History and Current Context.» *International Studies Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, pp. 589-600.
11. Zarate, Juan C. *Treasury's War: The Unleashing of a New Era of Financial Warfare*. PublicAffairs, 2013, pp. 102-118.

Grigoryan S. - Yerevan State University Faculty of Law, Chair of European and International Law, PhD Student, e-mail: siranush.grigoryan@ysu.am.

Ներկայացվել է խմբագրություն 04.02.2025 թ., տրվել է գրախոսության 29.10.2024 թ., երաշխավորվել է իրավաբանական գիտությունների թեկնածու, դոցենտ Վ. Քոչարյանի կողմից, ընդունվել է տպագրության 22.04.2025 թ.: