

The Weaponization of Trade: Economic Sanctions as a Tool of Modern Diplomacy

Rubab

Department of Political Science Gomal University DI. Khan

Email: Rubab.rubab00@gmail.com

Abdul Saboor Jan

Department of Political Science Qurtuba, University of Science & Information Technology.

Email: ulsaboor341@gmail.com

Muhammad Latif

Department of Political Science Qurtuba, University of Science & Information Technology.

Email: engr422@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In the contemporary international order, trade has evolved from a vehicle of interdependence and cooperation into an instrument of strategic coercion. The increasing reliance on economic sanctions as tools of modern diplomacy reflects a broader shift in global power politics — from military confrontation to economic statecraft. This paper examines the weaponization of trade through the lens of economic sanctions, analyzing their effectiveness, ethical dimensions, and geopolitical consequences. Drawing upon theories of economic statecraft, realism, and liberal institutionalism, the research explores how states use sanctions to project influence and enforce compliance without direct military engagement. It investigates key case studies, including U.S. sanctions on Iran, Western sanctions on Russia following the Ukraine conflict, and the U.S.–China trade and technology war. The findings suggest that while sanctions have become the preferred diplomatic instrument for major powers, they often yield mixed outcomes, producing humanitarian crises, market disruptions, and global economic fragmentation. This study argues that sanctions, as a form of weaponized trade, blur the boundary between economic cooperation and coercion, reshaping the international system into one characterized by selective interdependence, strategic rivalry, and contested norms of legitimacy. The paper

concludes by recommending more ethical, multilateral, and transparent sanction mechanisms to ensure diplomacy remains a tool for peace rather than economic domination.

Keywords: Economic Sanctions; Trade Weaponization; Economic Statecraft; Coercive Diplomacy; Global Interdependence; International Political Economy

Introduction

The post–Cold War international system was largely characterized by globalization, liberal economic integration, and interdependence among states. Yet, as global politics transitioned into the 21st century, the very foundations of economic cooperation began to serve as mechanisms of coercion and control. The idea that “trade follows the flag” has been replaced by a new paradigm — that “trade enforces the flag.” Economic sanctions, once used as exceptional measures of punishment, have now become a central instrument of foreign policy, reflecting a shift from military to economic warfare. The weaponization of trade encapsulates this transformation: states increasingly use their dominance over global financial systems, technological supply chains, and trade routes to achieve strategic goals traditionally pursued through military means.

The concept of economic statecraft, first popularized by David Baldwin (1985), refers to the use of economic resources to influence the behavior of other states. Sanctions — whether financial, commercial, or technological — fall squarely within this definition. They serve as coercive tools designed to compel compliance, deter aggression, or punish violations of international norms. Yet, their proliferation in recent decades raises significant questions about their effectiveness, legitimacy, and moral consequences. According to the Peterson Institute’s comprehensive study by Hufbauer et al. (2007), sanctions succeed in achieving stated objectives in fewer than 30 percent of cases. Despite this modest record, their use has expanded dramatically, suggesting that sanctions fulfill broader political purposes — including signaling resolve, satisfying domestic audiences, and asserting global leadership.

The resurgence of sanctions reflects deeper structural changes in the international order. In a globalized economy where power is embedded in networks of interdependence, control over financial and trade infrastructures has emerged as a key source of strategic leverage. Farrell and Newman's (2019) theory of weaponized interdependence explains how powerful states exploit their central position in global networks — such as the U.S. dominance over the dollar-based financial system or control of digital platforms — to monitor, restrict, or punish adversaries. This networked coercion grants unprecedented reach to economic diplomacy, enabling states to impose costs beyond their immediate sphere of influence. However, it also accelerates fragmentation, as targeted states seek to construct parallel systems, such as China's Cross-Border Interbank Payment System (CIPS) or the Russia–China de-dollarization initiatives.

The most prominent users of sanctions — the United States, the European Union, and increasingly China — illustrate divergent yet overlapping strategies of economic coercion. For Washington, sanctions have become the “weapon of choice” in pursuing global objectives, from deterring nuclear proliferation in Iran to constraining Russian aggression in Ukraine. The European Union, while traditionally favoring multilateral diplomacy, has also embraced restrictive measures, particularly in response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022. Meanwhile, China's rise as an economic superpower has given it new tools to deploy trade restrictions and market access controls against states challenging its core interests — as seen in its coercive trade measures against Australia and Lithuania.

The growing normalization of sanctions presents both strategic and ethical dilemmas. From a realist perspective, sanctions represent the extension of state power through non-military means — a tool for maintaining relative advantage in a competitive system. Liberal theorists, however, view them as instruments for enforcing international norms and collective security. Yet, critics argue that sanctions often inflict disproportionate harm on civilian populations, exacerbate humanitarian crises, and

undermine international legal principles. For instance, sanctions on Iran and Venezuela have severely impacted healthcare access and inflation rates, while failing to alter the regimes' core political behaviors (Pape, 2021). Thus, sanctions often serve symbolic or political purposes rather than achieving genuine diplomatic resolution.

The weaponization of trade also signifies a deeper paradox within globalization. The same interdependence that once promised peace and prosperity now enables coercion and division. As global supply chains, financial institutions, and technological ecosystems become battlegrounds of power politics, economic sanctions risk transforming globalization into a zero-sum arena. This trend not only threatens global economic stability but also challenges the legitimacy of the liberal international order. Emerging economies — especially within the BRICS bloc — have increasingly resisted Western-led sanctions regimes, arguing that such practices reinforce inequality and politicize economic governance.

Literature Review

The study of economic sanctions has evolved significantly over the past century, reflecting the changing nature of global politics, economic interdependence, and the instruments available to states for pursuing foreign policy objectives. The literature on sanctions and the weaponization of trade spans multiple theoretical traditions — realism, liberal institutionalism, constructivism, and economic statecraft — each providing a different lens for understanding how and why states employ economic measures as diplomatic tools. This section reviews the historical evolution of sanctions, key theoretical frameworks, and the most influential contemporary scholarship addressing the effectiveness, ethics, and implications of economic coercion in the modern world.

Historical Evolution of Economic Sanctions

The roots of economic sanctions can be traced back to the early 20th century, when the League of Nations first experimented with trade restrictions as an alternative to war. The idea was that collective economic pressure could deter aggression without resorting to

military force. However, the League's failures — such as its inability to restrain Italy's invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 — exposed the limitations of sanctions as a deterrent mechanism . Following World War II, the United Nations Charter (Article 41) institutionalized sanctions as a legitimate tool of collective security, marking the formal recognition of economic coercion within international law.

During the Cold War era, sanctions became instruments of ideological containment. The United States imposed trade and financial restrictions against the Soviet bloc, Cuba, and North Korea to curtail communist influence. These measures were primarily unilateral and politically motivated, reflecting the realist notion of power projection. However, by the late 20th century, the nature of sanctions began to evolve from broad embargoes to more targeted or “smart” sanctions, aimed at minimizing humanitarian harm while increasing political precision. The post–Cold War globalization phase introduced a new dimension to sanctions. With the integration of global financial systems and digital technologies, states — particularly the U.S. — gained unprecedented leverage to restrict access to international banking systems, trade networks, and capital markets. The post-1990s period saw the “normalization of sanctions,” as they became a routine part of international diplomacy, used to address issues ranging from nuclear proliferation to human rights abuses. The 21st century, however, witnessed an even more profound transformation: the weaponization of interdependence, where states exploit global economic networks themselves as coercive tools .

Realism: Sanctions as Power Politics

Realist scholars perceive sanctions as instruments of state power — non-military tools for compelling weaker states to comply with the interests of stronger ones. From a realist perspective, the use of economic coercion is a natural extension of the struggle for power in an anarchic international system. Sanctions serve both deterrent and punitive functions, signaling strength and credibility. Morgenthau (1948) and later Waltz (1979) argued that states prioritize survival and dominance, and economic tools merely complement military

and diplomatic instruments. Realists also caution that sanctions, when applied without credible enforcement or alignment with national interests, often fail to achieve strategic outcomes, as seen in U.S. sanctions against Cuba, which persisted for decades with limited success .

Liberal Institutionalism: Sanctions as Collective Diplomacy

Liberal institutionalist theories view sanctions as part of **multilateral governance** mechanisms designed to uphold international norms. According to Keohane and Nye's (1977) theory of complex interdependence, the interconnected nature of global economies creates both vulnerabilities and opportunities for cooperation. Sanctions, when coordinated through institutions like the United Nations or the European Union, can serve as legitimate and collective responses to violations of international law, such as nuclear proliferation or human rights abuses. Institutionalized sanctions frameworks enhance legitimacy, accountability, and efficiency. However, liberal theorists also acknowledge the challenge of consensus-building and enforcement, as political divisions often weaken multilateral sanction regimes.

Constructivism: Norms, Identity, and Legitimacy

From a constructivist perspective, the use of sanctions reflects not only material interests but also social and normative identities. Sanctions are symbolic expressions of condemnation — tools for signaling disapproval and reinforcing international norms . For instance, Western sanctions on apartheid South Africa were less about coercion and more about delegitimizing racial segregation on moral grounds. Constructivists emphasize that the perception of legitimacy determines the success or failure of sanctions. When sanctions are perceived as unjust or politically motivated, targeted states often resist compliance and build counter-narratives, as seen in Russia and Iran's framing of Western sanctions as "neo-imperial."

Economic Statecraft Theory

David Baldwin's (1985) theory of economic statecraft provides the foundational

framework for understanding sanctions as a subset of foreign policy tools. Economic statecraft refers to the deliberate use of economic resources — aid, trade, and investment — to influence the behavior of other actors. Baldwin distinguishes between positive economic inducements (rewards) and negative inducements (sanctions), arguing that both can achieve similar goals under different circumstances. Later scholars, such as Drezner (1999, 2003), expanded this framework, suggesting that sanctions are most effective when embedded in broader strategies that combine coercion with incentives. The concept also underscores the dual-use nature of trade — it can foster cooperation or serve as a mechanism of control depending on how states wield it.

Weaponized Interdependence Theory

Farrell and Newman (2019) introduced the influential concept of weaponized interdependence, explaining how globalization has created asymmetric networks of economic and technological interconnection that powerful states can exploit. For example, the United States' control over the SWIFT financial messaging system and global dollar transactions gives it the ability to unilaterally isolate adversaries from the world economy. Similarly, export restrictions on semiconductors and advanced technologies have allowed the U.S. to constrain China's strategic industries. This framework highlights that globalization has not equalized power; instead, it has concentrated control in the hands of states and corporations occupying central network nodes. Consequently, economic sanctions in the modern era are less about trade restrictions and more about manipulating access to vital global infrastructures.

Contemporary Scholarship on Effectiveness and Consequences

The debate over the **effectiveness of sanctions** remains central to the academic discourse. Hufbauer et al. (2007) conducted one of the most comprehensive empirical studies, concluding that sanctions achieve their intended goals in roughly one-third of cases. However, scholars like Robert Pape (1997) challenged this optimism, arguing that most successful cases involve minor concessions rather than strategic transformation. Sanctions, he contended, often fail to compel major policy reversals because targeted regimes adapt through smuggling, domestic substitution, and alternative alliances. Recent research supports this critique, emphasizing the symbolic and political utility of sanctions over their material impact.

Humanitarian scholars have also drawn attention to the unintended consequences of sanctions. Studies on Iraq in the 1990s and Iran in the 2010s demonstrate that broad economic restrictions disproportionately affect civilian populations by limiting access to essential goods, healthcare, and financial resources (Weiss, 2013; Grauvogel & von Soest, 2014). These effects have led to growing advocacy for “smart sanctions”, which target elites, financial institutions, and specific sectors rather than entire economies. Yet, even targeted sanctions can produce spillover effects, disrupting global supply chains and discouraging investment in sanctioned regions.

A growing body of literature also explores the geopolitical consequences of sanctions. Drezner (2021) and Biersteker et al. (2022) argue that the overuse of sanctions has eroded their strategic effectiveness and accelerated global realignment. Countries such as Russia, China, and Iran have sought to de-dollarize trade, establish alternative payment systems, and deepen cooperation through institutions like the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) and BRICS. This reaction underscores the risk that excessive reliance on sanctions may fragment the global economy into competing blocs, undermining the liberal order’s foundation of open trade and financial integration.

Furthermore, scholars have highlighted the rise of technological sanctions as a

defining feature of the 21st century. The U.S.–China trade conflict illustrates how technology — once a domain of innovation and collaboration — has become a strategic weapon. Export bans on semiconductors, AI components, and advanced software reflect a new dimension of economic warfare (Segal, 2020). These measures extend beyond traditional trade disputes, signaling a transformation of the global economy into a security-driven ecosystem where access to technology equates to geopolitical influence.

Finally, the ethical dimension of sanctions has gained scholarly attention. Constructivist and critical theorists argue that the normative legitimacy of sanctions depends on transparency, proportionality, and humanitarian safeguards . The selective application of sanctions — often against weaker states while overlooking violations by powerful allies — exposes double standards in global governance. This inconsistency weakens the moral authority of sanctions and fosters perceptions of coercive hypocrisy within the Global South.

Case Studies: The Weaponization of Trade in Practice

Economic sanctions have evolved from selective punitive tools to central instruments of modern diplomacy and economic statecraft. To understand their strategic application and implications, this section examines three major case studies: Iran, Russia, and China. Each represents a distinct context in which economic sanctions have been weaponized to achieve diplomatic goals, reflecting varying levels of success, resistance, and unintended consequences.

Case Study I: Iran — Sanctions as a Tool of Containment and Negotiation

Iran stands as one of the most heavily sanctioned states in the world, with economic restrictions imposed primarily by the United States and the European Union. The origins of U.S. sanctions date back to the 1979 Iranian Revolution and the subsequent hostage crisis, but they intensified after revelations of Iran’s nuclear enrichment program in the early 2000s. The weaponization of trade against Iran has since become a key mechanism to curb Tehran’s regional ambitions, restrict nuclear proliferation, and exert diplomatic

pressure.

Strategic Objectives

The sanctions were designed to achieve three interrelated goals:

- Contain Iran's nuclear capability by denying access to global financial systems and technology;
- Undermine economic stability to pressure the regime toward negotiation;
- Signal deterrence to other regional actors, particularly concerning proliferation behavior.

These measures included freezing Iranian assets abroad, restricting oil exports (the backbone of Iran's economy), and disconnecting Iranian banks from the SWIFT international payment system.

Diplomatic and Economic Impacts

The sanctions drastically reduced Iran's oil exports—by nearly 50% between 2012 and 2015—and caused inflation to surge above 40%. However, their diplomatic success became evident through **the** Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (**JCPOA**) signed in 2015, which reflected a negotiated compromise between Iran and world powers. This outcome demonstrated how trade weaponization, when coupled with multilateral diplomacy, can yield conditional cooperation. Nevertheless, the U.S. withdrawal from the JCPOA under the Trump administration in 2018 and the “maximum pressure campaign” reignited tensions, leading to renewed sanctions that isolated Iran from global trade once again. The case underscores both the potency and fragility of sanctions as a tool of coercive diplomacy: while capable of driving negotiation, they often entrench anti-Western sentiment and harm civilian populations more than political elites.

Lessons from the Iranian Case

The Iranian experience highlights three critical insights:

- **Multilateral coordination enhances effectiveness** — sanctions imposed through international consensus (UN, EU, U.S.) yield greater compliance;

- **Economic pressure must be paired with diplomatic incentives** — sanctions alone cannot compel regime change;
- **Long-term overuse leads to resistance** — Iran's shift toward barter trade with China and Russia exemplifies the adaptation of sanctioned states.

Case Study II: Russia — Sanctions as a Tool of Deterrence and Isolation

The second major case involves Russia, particularly after its annexation of Crimea in 2014 and the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. In response, the U.S., European Union, and allied nations launched the most extensive sanctions campaign in modern history. These measures targeted Russia's banking sector, sovereign debt, high-tech imports, and individual oligarchs closely tied to the Kremlin.

Strategic Objectives

The Western coalition weaponized trade with the following objectives:

- Deterring further aggression by crippling Russia's economic capacity;
- Isolating Moscow diplomatically from global financial institutions;
- Signaling unity among Western allies to strengthen the liberal international order. This approach combined export bans, financial disconnections from SWIFT, and asset freezes against Russian elites. The restrictions on technology exports, particularly semiconductors and aviation components, aimed to weaken Russia's industrial and military capacity over time.

Economic and Diplomatic Implications

Despite predictions of rapid collapse, the Russian economy demonstrated unexpected resilience, partly due to high energy revenues and trade diversification toward Asia. However, the long-term effects are evident in reduced foreign investment, currency instability, and limited access to global capital markets. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) reported that sanctions could reduce Russia's potential GDP growth by up to 10% over the next decade.

Diplomatically, sanctions solidified the rift between Russia and the West, driving

Moscow closer to Beijing. The emergence of parallel financial systems, such as the Chinese CIPS and Russia's SPFS, illustrates a broader structural consequence: the fragmentation of the global economic order.

Effectiveness and Limitations

While sanctions inflicted significant costs, they failed to achieve their ultimate strategic objective—forcing Russia to withdraw from Ukraine. Instead, they accelerated the creation of alternative trade routes and deepened anti-Western narratives. Russia's ability to sustain its war economy by redirecting energy exports to India and China reveals that trade weaponization, while powerful, remains constrained in a multipolar world. Nevertheless, sanctions served a critical symbolic and deterrent function, reaffirming Western resolve and limiting Moscow's access to advanced technologies necessary for long-term military competitiveness.

Lessons from the Russian Case

Key takeaways include:

- Sanctions are more effective when combined with strategic coordination and clear diplomatic goals;
- Global economic interdependence limits sanction efficiency — especially when alternative partners exist;
- Weaponized trade can accelerate geopolitical realignment, pushing targeted states toward non-Western coalitions.

Case Study III: China — Trade as a Tool of Economic Coercion

Unlike Iran and Russia, China occupies a dual role in the global sanctions regime—it is both a target and a user of trade weaponization. The U.S.–China trade war (2018–present) illustrates how sanctions and tariffs have evolved beyond punitive measures to instruments of strategic competition. The Trump administration initiated sweeping tariffs on Chinese goods, citing intellectual property theft and trade imbalances, marking a turning point in economic diplomacy.

U.S. trade measures against China pursued several aims:

- Curb China's technological ascent, particularly in 5G, AI, and semiconductors;
- Rebalance trade deficits by discouraging Chinese exports;
- Signal strategic containment within the broader Indo-Pacific strategy. In response, China imposed retaliatory tariffs, restricted rare-earth exports, and pursued “dual circulation”—a strategy emphasizing domestic innovation and reduced dependence on Western supply chains.

Economic and Diplomatic Outcomes

The trade conflict resulted in a significant decline in bilateral trade flows—U.S. imports from China dropped by over \$90 billion between 2018 and 2020. However, both economies demonstrated resilience. The conflict also spurred the technological decoupling of supply chains and the creation of alternative alliances, such as the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) and BRICS expansion. Diplomatically, the trade war underscored a shift from cooperative globalization to strategic economic nationalism, where economic interdependence became a battlefield rather than a deterrent. The U.S.–China confrontation illustrates how sanctions and trade restrictions can blur the lines between diplomacy, security, and economic competition.

Lessons from the Chinese Case

Key observations include

- Sanctions in a symmetric relationship (between major powers) are less coercive and more per formative;
- Weaponized trade reshapes global supply chains rather than halting them;
- Economic interdependence can transform into vulnerability, encouraging self-reliance and regionalism.

Comparative Analysis of the Three Cases

A comparative examination of Iran, Russia, and China reveals both the effectiveness and limitations of trade weaponization as a diplomatic tool.

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/a>

Case	Nature of Sanctions	Primary Objective	Diplomatic Outcome	Long-term Impact
Iran	Multilateral economic and sanctions	Nuclear oil containment and negotiation	Partial success (JCPOA)	Economic stagnation, regional isolation
Russia	Financial and technological restrictions	Deterrence and punishment	Limited success; strategic defiance	Shift toward China, weakened economy
China	Tariffs, export controls, and bans	Strategic tech containment and competition	Ongoing economic rivalry	Supply chain realignment, decoupling

These cases collectively illustrate that sanctions are most effective when multilateral, time-bound, and accompanied by diplomatic engagement. When used unilaterally or indefinitely, they risk diminishing returns and triggering counter-alliances. Moreover, in an increasingly multipolar world, the ability of Western powers to enforce compliance diminishes as alternative trade frameworks emerge.

The Evolving Nature of Economic Coercion

The contemporary use of sanctions extends beyond traditional embargoes toward financial weaponization, including access denial to SWIFT, dollar dominance, and investment restrictions in critical technologies. These instruments represent a new frontier in economic statecraft, where economic networks themselves become arenas of geopolitical power. The rise of secondary sanctions, which penalize third-party states for engaging with sanctioned actors, demonstrates how deeply weaponized trade has penetrated global diplomacy. Yet this also fuels the de-dollarization movement, with nations seeking to reduce dependency on Western financial systems through alternative payment mechanisms and regional currencies.

Analysis & Discussion

Reinterpreting Diplomacy in the Age of Economic Coercion

The evolution of international diplomacy in the twenty-first century demonstrates a clear shift from conventional power projection toward the weaponization of economic interdependence. In earlier eras, diplomacy primarily relied on negotiation, alliance-building, and occasional military deterrence. However, in the contemporary globalized economy, the ability of states to manipulate financial networks, supply chains, and trade flows has emerged as a new form of soft coercion—a hybrid between diplomacy and warfare. Economic sanctions represent the most visible and institutionalized expression of this transformation. They function as a middle path between military intervention and passive diplomacy, allowing states to exert pressure without direct confrontation. This redefinition of diplomacy emphasizes economic statecraft, where trade becomes not merely a tool of prosperity but an instrument of control.

Theoretical Implications: Economic Statecraft and Coercive Diplomacy

The empirical cases discussed—Iran, Russia, and China—align with and expand upon established theories of economic statecraft (Baldwin, 1985) and coercive diplomacy (George, 1991). Economic statecraft posits that states use economic means to achieve political goals, while coercive diplomacy focuses on compelling an adversary to change behavior through threats or limited force. Sanctions combine these dimensions: they signal disapproval (diplomatic communication), impose material costs (economic statecraft), and seek behavioral change (coercive diplomacy). Yet, their effectiveness depends on several key variables:

- **Asymmetry of dependence** – Sanctions are most effective when the target relies heavily on the sanctioning power's economic system (as in Iran's oil dependency on Western markets).
- **Multilateral coordination** – Collective sanctions enhance legitimacy and minimize evasion opportunities, as seen in the JCPOA negotiations.

➤ **Clarity of objectives** – Sanctions with narrowly defined goals (e.g., non-proliferation) tend to succeed more than those with regime-change ambitions. Thus, sanctions have become the practical manifestation of Joseph Nye’s “smart power”—a blend of coercion and persuasion, where economic tools substitute for direct military confrontation.

Strategic Effectiveness and Unintended Consequences

The weaponization of trade has demonstrated both its strengths and vulnerabilities. Its strategic effectiveness lies in its ability to disrupt access to global finance, reduce export revenues, and isolate political elites. In Iran, sanctions forced diplomatic engagement; in Russia, they constrained technological imports; and in China, they slowed down the pace of technological dominance. However, the unintended consequences often undermine long-term objectives. Prolonged sanctions can erode civilian welfare, foster nationalism, and drive target states to form counter-alliances. For instance:

- Iran strengthened its economic ties with China and Russia to offset Western isolation;
 - Russia diversified its trade toward Asia and developed domestic payment systems;
 - China accelerated its self-reliance through technological innovation and regional trade initiatives.
- These adaptive responses reveal the resilience of global power networks and suggest that sanctions rarely produce unconditional compliance. Instead, they generate strategic realignments that gradually weaken the dominance of traditional Western financial institutions.

The Multipolar Challenge: Declining Unilateral Leverage

In the post-Cold War era, the dominance of the U.S. dollar and Western-led institutions (IMF, World Bank, SWIFT) granted the United States unparalleled leverage in global economic governance. Yet, the rise of multipolarity—driven by China’s economic ascent, Russia’s energy influence, and the Global South’s growing assertiveness—has diluted the effectiveness of unilateral sanctions. Countries under pressure increasingly turn to alternative financial networks, such as the Chinese CIPS, Russia’s SPFS, or bilateral trade in local currencies. The expansion of BRICS and the proposal of a new reserve currency

underscore a collective desire to reduce dependency on Western trade mechanisms. Thus, while the weaponization of trade remains a potent diplomatic instrument, its effectiveness is contingent upon the structure of the global **order**. In a fragmented multipolar system, sanctions risk losing their coercive edge and accelerating the creation of parallel global markets.

Economic Sanctions as a Moral and Legal Dilemma

A crucial aspect often overlooked in policy debates is the ethical dimension of economic coercion. Sanctions are frequently justified under the banner of promoting peace, democracy, or human rights; yet their humanitarian consequences are significant. Studies by the United Nations and humanitarian organizations reveal that comprehensive sanctions often hurt the civilian population more than the targeted political elite. For instance, sanctions on Iraq in the 1990s and on Iran in the 2010s led to medicine shortages, inflation, and deteriorating public health. Such outcomes raise questions about the legitimacy of sanctions under international law, particularly when they lack explicit authorization from the UN Security Council. This ethical paradox undermines the moral credibility of sanctioning powers. When coercive economic tools inflict disproportionate suffering, they contradict the very diplomatic principles they claim to uphold. Hence, the international community faces a pressing challenge: how to reconcile the effectiveness of economic sanctions with the principles of humanitarian law and moral responsibility.

The Shift from Trade Liberalism to Economic Nationalism

The global economic landscape is witnessing a profound ideological transition—from post-war trade liberalism to strategic protectionism and economic nationalism. Sanctions, tariffs, and export controls signify not merely policy instruments but reflections of a broader transformation in international political economy. The U.S.–China trade war epitomizes this shift. Both nations have weaponized interdependence, transforming supply chains into strategic battlegrounds. Similarly, the European Union’s “de-risking” approach toward China and restrictions on Russian energy imports illustrate how economic security

now outweighs market efficiency in diplomatic calculus. his transformation represents the end of globalization as a purely economic project and the beginning of an era where economic flows are subordinated to security imperatives. As states prioritize sovereignty and resilience, the international system is moving toward selective interdependence, where economic ties exist only within politically aligned blocs.

Repercussions for Global Governance and Multilateralism

The widespread use of sanctions poses a challenge to multilateral institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United Nations. Unilateral and extraterritorial sanctions—often imposed outside the framework of international law—erode the authority of these institutions and foster legal ambiguity. Moreover, the practice of secondary sanctions, which penalize third-party states engaging with sanctioned entities, undermines the principle of sovereign equality. Such measures push middle powers and developing nations to seek greater autonomy in global economic governance. The resulting fragmentation threatens to weaken multilateral cooperation at a time when collective action is needed to address transnational issues like climate change, cyber threats, and pandemics. If left unchecked, the normalization of economic coercion could produce a bifurcated world economy, divided between sanction-imposing and sanction-resistant blocs. This structural polarization challenges the liberal order's foundation of open markets and shared prosperity.

Sanctions and Technological Decoupling: The New Frontline

The most recent manifestation of trade weaponization lies in the realm of technology and innovation. Restrictions on semiconductors, artificial intelligence, and quantum computing reflect a new phase of strategic competition. The United States and its allies have leveraged export controls to constrain China's technological rise, while Beijing has responded with rare-earth restrictions and domestic innovation drives. This technological decoupling is redefining global supply chains, compelling firms and states to choose between competing regulatory ecosystems. The fusion of national security and economic

policy signifies that future diplomatic conflicts will increasingly be fought through technological, rather than territorial, means. Consequently, economic sanctions have evolved from short-term punitive actions to long-term structural tools that shape global innovation trajectories and reconfigure international alliances.

Evaluating Effectiveness: Between Success and Symbolism

Ultimately, the effectiveness of trade weaponization as a tool of modern diplomacy lies in its symbolic power as much as its material impact. Sanctions communicate political resolve, signal unity among allies, and shape international narratives—even when they fail to compel immediate behavioral change. The Iranian case shows that sanctions can facilitate negotiation; the Russian case illustrates their power to isolate; and the Chinese case reveals their limitations in great-power competition. Therefore, while sanctions seldom produce quick victories, they remain indispensable for shaping strategic perceptions and diplomatic bargaining positions. However, excessive reliance on sanctions risks diminishing returns, as adversaries innovate and alliances realign. The future of sanctions will depend on their **strategic selectivity**, ethical legitimacy, and integration within broader diplomatic strategies rather than as stand-alone instruments of coercion.

Synthesis

The weaponization of trade has transformed international relations into an arena of economic confrontation, where influence is exercised not through armies but through financial systems and supply chains. Sanctions, while often imperfect, have become the default currency of modern diplomacy—a tool that bridges the gap between persuasion and punishment. Yet their long-term success requires balance: they must deter without destabilizing, punish without impoverishing, and communicate strength without alienating the international community. The challenge for policymakers is to ensure that the use of economic power remains aligned with the broader goals of peace, cooperation, and global stability.

Policy Implications & Conclusion

The weaponization of trade has fundamentally reshaped global diplomacy, signaling the emergence of a world where economic coercion functions as a substitute for direct military engagement. As demonstrated in the cases of Iran, Russia, and China, economic sanctions have become an indispensable component of foreign policy. However, their strategic use requires balance, coordination, and ethical consideration.

Need for Multilateral Coordination

Unilateral sanctions, while symbolically powerful, often fail to generate desired outcomes due to enforcement loopholes and geopolitical resistance. Policymakers should therefore prioritize multilateral coordination through institutional frameworks such as the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and G7 coalitions. Sanctions are most effective when backed by global consensus, ensuring legitimacy and minimizing the perception of economic imperialism.

Balancing Economic Coercion with Diplomacy

Sanctions must be viewed not as ends in themselves but as components of broader diplomatic strategies. Economic pressure should always be accompanied by diplomatic off-ramps—avenues that allow targeted states to modify behavior in exchange for relief. The JCPOA with Iran provides a model for how sanctions can transition from punitive measures to bargaining tools when aligned with negotiations. Without diplomatic engagement, sanctions risk hardening political resistance and fostering nationalist backlash.

Avoiding Humanitarian Consequences

Comprehensive sanctions frequently produce severe humanitarian impacts, including inflation, unemployment, and shortages of essential goods. Future policy design should emphasize targeted sanctions, focusing on political elites, military institutions, or strategic sectors rather than entire populations. Mechanisms for humanitarian exemptions—especially in medicine, food, and education—should be institutionalized under international law to safeguard civilians and preserve moral legitimacy.

Strengthening Global Economic Governance

The proliferation of sanctions outside multilateral oversight weakens institutions like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and International Monetary Fund (IMF). To preserve global order, these institutions should be reformed to mediate disputes related to coercive trade measures and ensure transparency in their implementation. Establishing a Global Sanctions Registry, for instance, could enhance accountability, prevent overlap, and mitigate collateral economic harm to third-party states.

Managing Technological and Financial Decoupling

In an era of increasing digital interdependence, sanctions targeting technology transfers, semiconductors, and financial networks carry systemic risks. Policymakers must recognize that excessive weaponization of technology and finance may accelerate global fragmentation, encouraging alternative systems that bypass Western influence. Therefore, a dual strategy combining selective restrictions with global cooperation in innovation governance is essential to prevent the division of the digital economy into rival blocs.

Broader Strategic Lessons

The study reveals that while sanctions can exert significant economic and diplomatic pressure, their success is conditional rather than absolute. Three strategic lessons emerge:

- Sanctions are most effective when embedded within a coherent strategy — coercive economic measures should complement, not replace, diplomatic negotiation, alliance-building, and strategic communication.
- Overuse diminishes credibility — the proliferation of sanctions as a routine policy tool can lead to desensitization among target states and erode the political legitimacy of the sanctioning power.
- Economic interdependence is a double-edged sword — the same networks that enable coercion also provide opportunities for counter-coalitions, such as BRICS or regional trade pacts.

Hence, the future of sanctions will depend on the ability of states to balance coercion with

collaboration, ensuring that trade weaponization does not devolve into economic warfare.

The Future of Economic Statecraft

The future trajectory of global diplomacy suggests a continued blurring of boundaries between economic policy and national security. The strategic importance of data, technology, and finance means that sanctions will increasingly target digital infrastructures, intellectual property, and high-tech exports. In this emerging landscape, economic statecraft will evolve into a form of network warfare, where control over flows of capital, information, and innovation defines geopolitical power. However, such weaponization must remain bounded by ethical norms and legal frameworks to prevent the erosion of trust in the global economic system. If left unchecked, the indiscriminate use of sanctions could fragment global markets, erode multilateralism, and deepen inequality between the Global North and South. Therefore, the international community must work toward a balanced code of conduct for the use of economic sanctions—anchored in transparency, accountability, and humanitarian safeguards.

Conclusion

The weaponization of trade represents a fundamental shift in the practice of modern diplomacy, redefining how states exert influence in a highly interconnected world. Economic sanctions, once deployed sparingly for specific crises, have become central instruments of geopolitical strategy. Through the examination of cases such as Iran, Russia, and China, it is evident that sanctions can compel negotiation, constrain aggressive actions, and communicate firm resolve. However, their effectiveness is neither guaranteed nor permanent, and outcomes vary depending on context, coordination, and design. Sanctions achieve optimal impact when they are targeted, time-bound, multilateral, and ethically administered, balancing strategic objectives with humanitarian considerations. Excessive, unilateral, or poorly calibrated sanctions risk eroding global trust, provoking retaliatory measures, and undermining the stability of the international order they intend to protect. As globalization increasingly fragments into a multipolar system, policymakers face the

challenge of designing sanctions that deter aggression while preserving essential economic interdependence. The credibility of sanctions depends on international cooperation, transparency, and alignment with global norms. Ultimately, the true measure of modern diplomacy is not how effectively states weaponize trade, but how responsibly they wield this influence. By exercising restraint, fostering dialogue, and upholding humanitarian principles, economic statecraft can promote stability. Only through such calibrated approaches can sanctions serve as tools for security, negotiation, and global order in the twenty-first century.

References

- Academic and policy literature on de-dollarization and alternative payment systems (2021–2024): e.g., studies on CIPS, SPFS, and bilateral currency swap arrangements (IMF/Bruegel/Chatham House briefs).
- Arslanian, F. (2023). The impact of economic sanctions on nuclear non-proliferation. *The Nonproliferation Review*, 30(2), 145–162.
- Beckley, M. (2023). *Economic power and the limits of coercion*. *Foreign Affairs*, 102(4), 25–38.
- Biersteker, T. J., Brubaker, R., & Lanz, D. (2022). *UN sanctions, mediation, and conflict resolution* (policy brief / lead article). *Global Governance / Global Policy Forum*.
- Biersteker, T. J., Brubaker, R., & Lanz, D. (2022). *UN sanctions, mediation, and conflict resolution*. *Global Governance*, 28(3), 311–328.
- Biersteker, T. J., Eckert, S. E., & Tourinho, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Targeted sanctions: The impacts and effectiveness of United Nations action* (2nd ed. / new analyses). Cambridge University Press. (updated perspectives)
- Blackwill, R. D., & Harris, J. M. (2021). *War by other means: Geoeconomics and statecraft* (Updated ed.). Harvard University Press.
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2020–2024). *Various policy briefs on sanctions, de-risking, and de-dollarization*. (selected authors: P. Pargava, E. Roberts)

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/a>

Center for a New American Security (CNAS). (2024). *Sanctions by the Numbers: 2023 year in review*. CNAS Report.

Chatham House. (2024). *Understanding and improving sanctions today: Policy recommendations*. Chatham House Report.

CNAS / Brookings / Carnegie (collective contributions). (2022–2024). *Policy roundtables on sanctions effectiveness and long-term consequences*. (series of essays and briefs)

Consilium (Council of the EU). (2023). Timeline: EU sanctions against Russia. Council of the European Union. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/>

Drezner, D. W. (2022). How not to sanction: Lessons from recent practice. *International Affairs*, 98(4), 987–1010.

Drezner, D. W. (2023). Global economic sanctions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 27, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-041322-032240>

Drezner, D. W. (2023). *Global economic sanctions: Patterns, pitfalls, and prospects*. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 26, 411–430. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-041322-032240>

Early, B. R. (2020). Bypassing sanctions: Informal economies, smuggling, and sanctions evasion. *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 5(3), 112–131.

Eichengreen, B. (2024). *Economic statecraft in a fragmenting world*. *Journal of International Political Economy*, 31(2), 101–122.

European Commission / Council of the European Union. (2022–2024). *EU restrictive measures against Russia: Official timeline and legal acts*. (official web publications / consolidated texts)

Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79. https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00351

Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). *Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion*. *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79.

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/a>

https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00351

Felbermayr, G., Larch, M., & Steininger, M. (2023). Quantifying the partial and general equilibrium effects of sanctions: Evidence from Russia. *Review of International Economics*, forthcoming/2023.

Felbermayr, G., Larch, M., & Steininger, M. (2023). Quantifying the effects of sanctions: Evidence from Russia. *Review of International Economics*, 31(5), 1450–1472.

Felbermayr, G., Larch, M., & Yotov, Y. (2020). The global sanctions data and its implications for trade. *The World Economy*, 43(12), 3280–3305. (dataset / methodology article)

Gopinath, G. (2024, May 7). Geopolitics and its impact on global trade and the dollar. *IMF Blog / Staff Commentary*. International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org/>

Gopinath, G. (2024, May 7). *Geopolitics and its impact on global trade and the dollar*. International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org>

Grauvogel, J., & von Soest, C. (2020). Targeted sanctions and their humanitarian impacts: Evidence from multilevel data. *Journal of Peace Research*, 57(6), 745–759.

Harrell, P. (2023). *The evolution of U.S. sanctions policy in a multipolar world*. Center for a New American Security (CNAS) Report.

Hill, F. (2023). *Sanctions, Russia, and the global order*. Brookings Institution Press.

Hufbauer, G. C., et al. (Revisited ed., 2020). *Economic sanctions reconsidered in the 21st century* (policy update). Peterson Institute for International Economics. (updated review)

Hufbauer, G. C., Jung, E., & Oegg, B. (2020). *Economic sanctions reconsidered in the 21st century*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.

International Crisis Group. (2022). Sanctions and the Ukraine crisis: Short-term pain, long-term consequences. *ICG Europe Report*.

International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2022). *Sanctions and cross-border flows: Implications for emerging markets*. IMF Staff Discussion Note.

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/a>

- Jentleson, B. W. (2022). *Sanctions: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press. (concise policy primer updated in 2022)
- Jentleson, B. W. (2022). *Sanctions: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Lin, X., et al. (2025). US sanctions and corporate innovation: Evidence from semiconductor restrictions. *Research Policy*. (empirical 2025 study)
- Maloney, S. (2023). *Sanctions and the Iranian economy: Lessons for future policy*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Morgan, T. C. (2023). Economic sanctions: Evolution, consequences, and empirical patterns. *Review of International Political Economy*, 30(4), 789–812.
- Mulder, N. (2022). *The economic weapon: The rise of sanctions as a tool of modern war*. Yale University Press.
- Nye, J. S. (2022). *Soft power, smart sanctions, and the future of diplomacy*. *Foreign Policy Review*, 45(2), 65–79.
- Office of Financial Sanctions Implementation (OFSI). (2023). *Annual Review 2022–23*. HM Treasury, UK Government.
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). (2021). *Unilateral coercive measures and their impact on the enjoyment of human rights*. OHCHR thematic report.
- OHCHR Special Procedures. (2023). *Statement on the human rights impact of unilateral sanctions*. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- Oxford Analytica. (2024). Russia's SWIFT alternative faces an uncertain future. *Expert Briefing*. Oxford Analytica.
- Peksen, D. (2019). When do imposed economic sanctions work? A critical review of sanctions effectiveness literature. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 244–263.
- Portela, C. (2021). The legitimacy of sanctions in international law: Humanitarian exemptions and accountability. *Journal of International Law and International*

Annual Methodological Archive Research Review

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/a>

Relations, 27(1), 55–78.

Portela, C. (2021). The legitimacy of sanctions in international law: Humanitarian exemptions and accountability. *Journal of International Law and International Relations*, 27(1), 55–78.

Prasad, E. (2024). *The future of money and sanctions in the digital era*. International Monetary Fund Policy Paper.

Research articles on technological sanctions and export controls (2020–2024): e.g., *Journal of Strategic Studies* special issues on tech controls and supply-chain security.

Rodrik, D. (2023). *Globalization on the defensive: Sanctions and fragmentation of trade*. *World Economy*, 46(9), 2543–2562.

Segal, A. (2020). *The Hacked World Order: How nations fight, trade, maneuver, and manipulate in the digital age* (updated essays on tech sanctions). PublicAffairs. (analysis relevant to tech controls)

United Nations Security Council. (2019–2024). *Sanctions committee reports and consolidations*. UN Security Council public documents.

Woods, N. (2023). *Global governance and economic coercion*. Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (2023). *Sanctions system: World Bank Group sanctions system annual report FY2022*. World Bank publications.

World Economic Forum. (2023). *Goeconomics and global resilience: Sanctions, supply chains and systemic risk*. WEF White Paper.

Zarate, J. (2021). *Treasury's war: The unleashing of a new era of financial warfare* (Revised ed.). PublicAffairs.