Scientific Research Publishing

Beijing Law Review, 2026, 17(4), 1257-1284
https://www.scirp.org/journal/blr
ISSN Online: 2159-4635
ISSN Print: 2159-4627

Towards Sovereignty and Accountability: Rethinking Economic Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific Region

Tanjirul Islam Tanim

School of International Law, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, Wuhan, China
Email: tanjirlaw@hotmail.com

How to cite this paper: Tanim, T. I. (2026). Towards Sovereignty and Accountability: Rethinking Economic Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Beijing Law Review, 17,* 1257-1284.
https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2026.174061

Received: October 27, 2026
Accepted: November 23, 2026
Published: November 26, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Open Access

Abstract

Emphasising sovereignty and accountability, this research analyses how the Asia-Pacific region implements economic sanctions and experiences their consequences. Through a thorough legal analysis, the paper examines the regional agreements and processes that support sanctions and evaluates their efficacy. Using case studies such as North Korea and Myanmar, it illustrates how policy dynamics, economic interdependencies, and human rights concerns interact. The findings suggest that current sanctions regimes worsen economic and social problems without necessarily achieving their stated goals. Rethinking economic sanctions is crucial to balancing coercive measures with state sovereignty and shifting from unilateral acts to cooperative, open, and equitable methods. Proposed essential measures to strengthen state sovereignty include capacity building to reduce reliance on vulnerable sectors, diplomatic engagement, and economic diversification. The effort also outlines ways to improve accountability. It emphasises independent review methods to ensure sanctions uphold human rights, comply with international law, and have a proportionate impact. By promoting openness and unbiased assessments, these systems may strengthen sanctions' credibility and effectiveness. Finally, the paper advocates changes that safeguard human dignity and advance regional peace and development, and calls for a thorough re-evaluation of economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific. The research aims to support current policy debates and initiatives toward a rules-based international order that upholds accountability and sovereignty by promoting a fairer, more sustainable, and equitable approach to sanctions.

Keywords

Economic Sanctions, Public International Law, Sovereignty and Accountability, Asia Pacific Region, Rethinking

1. Introduction

A flourishing social life is unattainable without sufficient stability in one's living circumstances; however, maintaining such fundamental security can be difficult in times of crisis or volatile conditions. The psychological toll of prolonged turmoil makes people long for a more stable lifestyle (Bodenheimer, 1973: p. 63). In this way, severe economic sanctions, often deployed in geopolitical and economic disputes, are a major obstacle to stable social life; thus, sovereignty and accountability must be ensured when considering sanctions. This research reconsiders economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region, emphasising accountability and sovereignty as paramount to the legitimacy and morality of sanctions. The Asia-Pacific region, known for its varied geopolitical terrain and vibrant commercial ties, is crucial to implementing economic sanctions. Sanctions serve as instruments of foreign policy and international governance, shaping state conduct, addressing security issues, and upholding global standards (Council on Foreign Relations, n.d.; The Economist, 2021). Nevertheless, implementing economic sanctions is complex, especially regarding sovereignty and accountability. While primarily aimed at pressuring governments to change unpopular policies or acts, economic sanctions may unintentionally worsen economic and humanitarian crises, disproportionately impacting civilian populations (Gutmann et al., 2023: pp. 5-6). The complex political alliances, economic interdependencies, and historical conflicts intensify this Asian predicament. Sanctions imposed by influential states or alliances often raise questions about violations of national sovereignty and the legitimacy of unilateral measures.

Particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, the efficacy and ethical implications of economic sanctions—which have recently become a diplomatic tool—remain strongly contested. How and why should accountability and sovereignty be ensured in economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region? This paper addresses this research question. As the research explores the moral and legal ramifications of economic sanctions in Asia, the primary issue is striking a middle ground between national sovereignty and international law. It examines regional accords and sanctions regimes, assesses their effectiveness, and identifies issues arising when applying them. Although many studies examine the financial consequences of sanctions, far less is known about their moral and legal consequences, particularly regarding human rights issues and national sovereignty. This paper examines legal regimes' adherence to international law to assess whether sanctioning them is justified. By analysing the circumstances in North Korea and Myanmar, this paper offers novel insights into the complex interaction among sanctions, sovereignty, and human rights concerns. Given the need to defend sovereignty and hold perpetrators accountable, reevaluating economic sanctions is imperative. This paper aims to develop a framework for economic sanctions that advances goals while preserving sovereignty and human dignity. This concept encourages collective strategies grounded in honesty, equity, and human rights considerations, rather than relying solely on coercive unilateral sanctions. I outline the methodology in

Section 2. Section 3 clarifies the legal basis of economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific; and Section 4 discusses their evolution, challenges and critiques. Section 5 is the main viewpoint: rethinking economic sanctions towards accountability and sovereignty. Section 6 sets the guidelines and proposes a mechanism for the solution. Section 7 concludes.

2. Methodology

This research uses the doctrinal method and a case study. The United Nations Charter, Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the legal documents of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, and relevant Security Council resolutions were selected as the legal instruments for their relevance and significance in conducting this research; these instruments have direct relevance in the Asia-Pacific sanctions perspective in shaping, authorising and tackling economic sanctions. As the two key sanctions regimes in the Asia-Pacific, the North Korea and Myanmar cases have been evaluated. This case study is not exhaustive in representing the wider Asia-Pacific, but it illustrates sanctions effects and dynamics in the region. North Korea is sanctioned mostly for nuclear proliferation, while Myanmar is sanctioned for human rights and democracy. However, this research examines not only the Asia-Pacific as a sanctioned region, but also the use of sanctions within and beyond it. The cases of North Korea and Myanmar are used to test the argument of the effectiveness of sanctions without affecting innocent people in the broader Asia-Pacific region.

3. Legal Basis of Economic Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific

An intricate system of international, regional, and national regulations governs economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific area (The Policy Circle, n.d.). These sanctions are crucial to addressing security problems, enforcing international standards, and influencing state conduct. When global stability is threatened (Gutmann et al., 2023: pp. 5-6), the Security Council may impose sanctions following Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter (Embassy of the Republic of Iraq, 2013; United Nations, 2008). Under this framework, sanctions are legally enforceable, meaning all member states—including those in the Asia-Pacific region—must implement them (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d.). For example, many resolutions passed by the Security Council have established sanctions on North Korea as a result of that state's nuclear weapons development (Arms Control Association, 2022). This demonstrates a solid legal basis for the sanctions and reflects broad international agreement.

Several regional procedures and agreements in the Asia-Pacific further shape the legal foundation of economic sanctions (European Commission, 2022). Foundational documents such as the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) (Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia, 1976) and the Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) outline the or-

ganisation's principles of sovereignty, non-interference, and peaceful dispute resolution (Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2007). ASEAN is a prominent regional organisation that prioritises these values; while it cannot impose sanctions directly, it is crucial in encouraging regional collaboration and discussion, shaping how member states take their stance on the matter. Regional norms and values shape the legal environment, and this regional focus on discussion and non-interference may occasionally contradict foreign calls for punishment.

Another significant regional organisation is the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). While APEC does not impose political sanctions per se, it indirectly shapes how the region handles sanctions by focusing on keeping trade and investment routes open (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, n.d.). APEC member economies' economic goals reflect a stronger regional preference for peace and progress over conflict, often prioritising cooperative and diplomatic solutions over punitive measures. The legal framework for sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region heavily relies on bilateral and international agreements (Wysong & Burney, 2023). By incorporating sanctions into more prominent economic and commercial ties, these accords provide a framework for addressing non-compliance and protecting regional economic interests.

Despite these plans, obstacles remain to enforcing economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region. Concerns about sovereignty and the principle of non-interference are common themes in legal criticism (Crawford, 2011; Jamnejad & Wood, 2009). Many legitimate legal and ethical questions arise when strong states or coalitions impose sanctions on other states without prior consultation (Crawford, 2011; Jamnejad & Wood, 2009). This coercion may be seen as an attempt to weaken the targeted state's independence (Sender, 2021). Concerns about the legitimacy and justice of sanctions stem from the lack of transparency and due process surrounding their implementation (Luban, 2008). Sanctions lose credibility and efficacy when they lack clear legal requirements and procedural protections to prevent arbitrary and unfair implementation (Moiseienko, 2023).

The impact on humanitarians is yet another vital issue surrounding economic sanctions (Bessler et al., 2004; VOICE, 2022). Restricting access to necessities such as food and medication and imposing broad sanctions may disproportionately affect civilian populations, worsening economic and humanitarian crises (Mallard et al., 2020: p. 124). A balanced strategy must achieve diplomatic and security goals while minimising negative impacts on human rights; this raises essential ethical and legal questions about the proportionality and necessity of sanctions as a policy instrument (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, n.d.; Mallard et al., 2020: p. 126). Economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific have a complex legal foundation, including bilateral agreements, regional standards, and international mandates (Carpenter, 2011; Taylor, 2009). Although these punitive and coercive measures are necessary to address security risks and uphold international standards, implementing them raises significant legal and ethical questions. For sanc-

tions to remain legitimate and effective, they must respect state sovereignty, adhere to justice and due process principles, and limit humanitarian impact (Luban, 2008; Sender, 2021). Balancing regional peace and prosperity with international law requires this sophisticated approach (Taylor, 2009).

3.1. Regional Approaches

A series of regional agreements and organisations has formed the legal framework for enforcing economic sanctions, reflecting the intricate web of geopolitical dynamics and commercial ties in the Asia-Pacific region. ASEAN is a major player in this system. ASEAN's founding documents emphasise several essential values, including respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, and the peaceful resolution of disputes, as set out in the ASEAN Charter and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC). Each member state's autonomy, equality, territorial integrity, national identity, and independence are emphasised in the ASEAN Charter's principles stated in Chapter II, Article 2:

> [….] 2. ASEAN and its Member States shall act in accordance with the following Principles: a. respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all ASEAN Member States; b. shared commitment and collective responsibility in enhancing regional peace, security and prosperity; c. renunciation of aggression and of the threat or use of force or other actions in any manner inconsistent with international law; d. reliance on peaceful settlement of disputes; e. non-interference in the internal affairs of ASEAN Member States; f. respect for the right of every Member State to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion and coercion; g. enhanced consultations on matters seriously affecting the common interest of ASEAN; h. adherence to the rule of law, good governance, the principles of democracy and constitutional government; i. respect for fundamental freedoms, the promotion and protection of human rights, and the promotion of social justice; j. upholding the United Nations Charter and international law, including international humanitarian law, subscribed to by ASEAN Member States; k. abstention from participation in any policy or activity, including the use of its territory, pursued by any ASEAN Member State or non-ASEAN State or any non-State actor, which threatens the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political and economic stability of ASEAN Member States; […] (ASEAN, 2007: art. 2, para. 2).

In Chapter III, Article 5:

> 1. Member States shall have equal rights and obligations under this Charter. 2. Member States shall take all necessary measures, including the enactment of appropriate domestic legislation, to effectively implement the provisions of this Charter and to comply with all obligations of membership. 3. In the case of a serious breach of the Charter or non-compliance, the matter shall be referred to Article 20 (ASEAN, 2007: art. 5).

In Chapter IV, Article 10:

> 1. ASEAN Sectoral Ministerial Bodies shall: a. function in accordance with their respective established mandates; b. implement the agreements and decisions of the ASEAN Summit under their respective purview; c. strengthen cooperation in their respective fields in support of ASEAN integration and community building; and d. submit reports and recommendations to their respective Community Councils […] (ASEAN, 2007: art. 10, para. 1).

These ideals underline the significance of consensus-based decision-making and non-interference.

By adhering to these standards, ASEAN might potentially save its member states from facing sanctions on an individual basis. On the other hand, ASEAN's mission is to promote cooperation, communication, and agreement-building. ASEAN adopted this strategy in response to the political instability following the 2021 military coup in Myanmar (Shwe, 2024). Despite international pressure to impose sanctions, ASEAN has maintained its commitment to engagement and dialogue, indicating its intent to achieve regional stability on its own. The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) is a consensus-based consultative dialogue forum and lacks the power to impose or coordinate sanctions (e.g., Austrian Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs, n.d.; Chanto, 2004). ARF meetings provide a more conducive environment for discussing sanctions and other security and political issues (Severino, 2011). By fostering cooperation on regional security concerns and supporting a shared understanding of sanctions, the forum indirectly influences ASEAN member states' policies (Austrian Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs, n.d.; Chanto, 2004).

In Asia-Pacific economic sanctions policy, APEC is a major player (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, 2023a). In contrast, APEC has clarified that it will neither impose sanctions nor engage in political or national security issues (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, 2023b). Punitive measures may indirectly affect regional attitudes, given APEC's emphasis on stability and economic development (APEC Agreements and Declarations, 2006; Hernando et al., 2023; Hernando & Detroit, 2023). The APEC members include China, Russia, Japan, and the USA, four of the world's most powerful economies. APEC members prioritise diplomatic solutions over confrontational ones. Prioritising the economy will help reduce the impact of sanctions while encouraging collaboration and transparent communication (Hufbauer et al., 1997). The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and other relevant bodies largely determine the effectiveness of economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region. Chapter VII of the UN Charter allows the Security Council to impose sanctions when international peace and security are threatened. All UN members, including those in the Asia-Pacific region, must follow these sanctions. UNSC Resolution 1718 (2006) and subsequent resolutions imposed restrictions on North Korea as a result of the state's pursuit of nuclear weapons (Arms Control Association, 2022; UN Security Council, 2006). Sanctions on economic activity in the Asia-Pacific area have their legal footing in multilateral and bilateral agree-

ments. The CPTPP addresses labour rights, environmental protections, and intellectual property rights and encompasses eleven Asian and Pacific states (Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, 2018). CPTPP Chapter 28 deals with trade remedies—it allows for discussions, panel hearings, and, if there is non-compliance, suspension of concessions or other obligations; it includes no provision for sanctions or political consequences. By providing legal justification for sanctions in broader commercial activities, these regulations help enforce business agreements and compliance with established standards and norms.

Economic sanctions have solid legal grounds but face substantial obstacles in the Asia-Pacific region. Sovereignty and non-interference are central to legal criticism (Wysong et al., 2022). A common misconception is that powerful coalitions or individual states try to undermine a targeted state's sovereignty by imposing unilateral sanctions (Research Society of International Law Pakistan, 2023). This perspective is reinforced in a setting that values autonomy and non-intervention. Some question the fairness and legitimacy of sanctions because of their opaque application and the lack of adequate procedural protections. Sanctions lose legitimacy and effectiveness when there are no established legal standards and safeguards to prevent unjust and arbitrary use (Moiseienko, 2023; Observer Research Foundation, 2022). In addition, civilian populations may be hit even harder by widespread sanctions, which can exacerbate humanitarian and economic crises by cutting off access to food and medicine (Park & Choi, 2022). These conditions raise ethical and legal questions about the need for, and propriety of, using punitive measures as punishment. The following influences the regional approach to economic sanctions in the Asia Pacific—1) the non-interference and debate ideals supported by ASEAN; 2) the economic focus at APEC; 3) the legally binding nature of UN sanctions; and 4) the inclusion of enforcement measures in trade agreements. This legal framework ensures sanctions are implemented carefully and rationally by balancing the need to meet global standards with a state's independence, financial stability, and cooperation with neighbouring states (European External Action Service, 2026; Moiseienko, 2023). When the region faces complicated geopolitical and economic difficulties, these regional solutions may help apply economic sanctions in a methodical and morally justified way.

3.1.1. Mechanisms and Agreements

As discussed in Section 2.1 above, economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region are firmly grounded in various agreements and processes that combine international standards with local circumstances. The Pacific Islands Forum, formerly the South Pacific Forum, has significantly influenced the imposition of economic sanctions in the region (Ludvigsson, 2010; Piekos, 2024). The forum endorsed the Biketawa Declaration in 2000, which outlines a plan for a coordinated response in emergencies and includes punitive measures (Pacific Islands Forum, 2000; Pacific

Islands Forum, 2018). The Declaration emphasises effective leadership, openness, and commitment to democratic values. If these standards are violated, the forum may levy regional sanctions (Pacific Islands Forum, 2000). To further democratic reforms in Fiji's administration following the military coups in 2006 and 2009, the forum imposed specific sanctions. The UN Security Council enforces economic sanctions through a global legal framework that applies to all UN member states, including those in the Asia-Pacific region. The nuclear program of North Korea is the primary subject of UNSC Resolution 1718 and further comprehensive measures; every member state is required to enforce these prohibitions (Arms Control Association, 2022). These sanctions, including limits on commerce, finance, and movement, create a uniform global legal framework that requires regional collaboration to enforce them. In addition, bilateral agreements between states play a vital role in establishing the legal foundation for economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region. Typical components of such contracts include mechanisms to ensure compliance with these standards and penalties for violations. Non-compliance with labour standards, intellectual property rights, or other agreed-upon rules may lead to economic sanctions; this feature appears in several trade agreements between the United States and countries in the Asia-Pacific region. These frameworks aim to support the lawful implementation and enforcement of penalties and reflect the shared obligations of the states that signed them. The CPTPP, an international trade agreement, incorporates procedures to address disputes and ensure regulatory compliance (Business and Human Rights Centre, 2023). The list includes participants from Vietnam, Japan, and Australia. The agreement's clauses on intellectual property, labour, and the environment provide penalties for rule violators.

Moreover, the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA) is a consultative defence framework for the foreign security of Malaysia and Singapore and has no sanctions or economic functions (Thayer, 2007). These guidelines facilitate member states' collaboration in responding effectively to security threats. For example, the ARF provides a platform for discussions on economic sanctions and other national security issues (Weber, 2009). The ideals of non-intervention, regional solidarity, and respect for sovereign states are central to the TAC's governing tenets (Natalegawa, 2018). ASEAN seldom utilises economic sanctions directly since it prioritises debate and consensus (Natalegawa, 2018). ASEAN has shown its commitment to mediation and diplomacy by prioritising diplomatic pressure and conversation above economic penalties when addressing regional crises like the Rohingya refugee crisis in Myanmar.

However, the Asia-Pacific region has established a comprehensive framework of regional mechanisms, multilateral agreements, and international commitments to authorise economic sanctions officially (East Asia Forum Quarterly, 2023). These approaches provide a systematic and morally sound way to implement sanctions in ways that align with international standards, respect national sovereignty, and promote peace in the region.

3.1.2. Analysis of the Effectiveness

To ascertain the effectiveness of these measures, a comprehensive examination of case studies, financial data, and geopolitical dynamics is necessary (Drezner, 2003; Hufbauer et al., 2009; Nephew, 2017; Pape, 1997). The international community often uses economic sanctions to pressure states to change their behaviour when they pursue policies or engage in undesirable acts. Sanctions on North Korea and Myanmar are two prime examples in the Asia-Pacific region (Psaledakis et al., 2021); as a result of the onerous restrictions imposed by the UN Security Council, North Korea's nuclear and missile programs have stalled (Arms Control Association, 2022). Because North Korea has persisted in developing its nuclear program despite these sanctions, it is clear that they have not been enough to achieve denuclearisation or force significant policy changes (Biersteker & Hudáková, 2021; Silberstein, 2023). The authoritarian regime has withstood external pressure and maintained its grip on power by engaging in illicit enterprises and adapting economically. With the expectation that it would reinstate democratic governance and safeguard human rights, the international community placed sanctions on Myanmar's military dictatorship; sanctions have kept the government economically and diplomatically isolated, but the military has kept power and continued inhumane torture and suppression of minority communities and civilians. It is difficult to disentangle the effects of sanctions from the civil war and domestic policies that ensued after the coup, but the fact that the military has maintained control and persisted in repression shows that the declared goals of reestablishing democratic rule and safeguarding human rights have not been accomplished. A state's ability to change its government depends on its internal dynamics and the regime's capacity to secure other sources of support; economic sanctions may exert significant pressure, but their effectiveness depends on the target state's dynamics (Cohen & Weinberg, 2019).

Sanctions affect the entire system (Hufbauer et al., 1997), including the targeted state's business partners and the broader regional economy (Hufbauer et al., 1997). Sanctions have reduced North Korea's exports and severely limited the state's access to international financial systems. North Korea's underground networks circumvent these restrictions and mitigate the economic impact via smuggling and cybercrime (O'Neill, 2024). Because criminal networks may easily circumvent restrictions, this adaptability emphasises the difficulty of punishing a global market. Sanctions have isolated the state and discouraged investment, worsening Myanmar's financial position. They also affect neighbouring states that do business with or invest in Myanmar. Sanctions may therefore trigger a chain reaction, disrupting industries and trade in neighbouring areas. Unforeseen humanitarian consequences arise because ordinary people are sometimes more severely affected by the economic repercussions of sanctions than political leaders (Peksen, 2023; Rodríguez, 2023).

The humanitarian harm that can come from economic sanctions is a big concern (Rodríguez, 2023). Sanctions may exacerbate the designated state's poverty,

food insecurity, and health problems. The humanitarian crisis in North Korea has turned into a full-blown economic disaster as a result of the sanctions; similarly, the sanctions-induced economic recession in Myanmar has disproportionately affected the poor and jobless. Because of these humanitarian implications, questions arise about the propriety and targeting of sanctions (Mallard et al., 2020: p. 122). Sanctioning regimes must balance pressuring political authorities with protecting civilian populations from unnecessary harm (Mallard et al., 2020: p. 126). Humanitarian exemptions and wealth-based fines for influential politicians and military leaders are two proposals put forward to mitigate these effects (Gillard, 2022). Other areas that economic sanctions might impact include regional stability and global relations. Sanctions imposed on North Korea have heightened regional tensions, especially between China and Pyongyang, which has substantial economic links to the former (Park & Swaine, 2018).

The effectiveness of sanctions regimes often depends on robust international collaboration. International cooperation, as shown by United Nations sanctions on North Korea, can increase legitimacy and enforcement. To achieve sanctions' intended outcomes while mitigating negative impacts on regional stability, it is essential to establish systems that promote stronger collaboration and compliance (European Commission, 2023). The efficacy of economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific area has generally varied depending on the circumstances of each case. While these two scenarios illustrate that sanctions have not achieved their intended objectives, they do not imply they are entirely ineffective; sanctions' success depends heavily on the targeted state's internal dynamics, the extent of foreign support it receives, and the regime's structure. Examining the broader humanitarian and economic consequences, and their implications for regional security, may improve sanctions' effectiveness and mitigate their damaging effects (Mallard et al., 2020: p. 129). As a result, measures to alleviate humanitarian suffering must be part of a comprehensive plan considering diplomatic engagement.

4. Evolution of Economic Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific Region

Economic sanctions have been shaped by expanding trade links in the Asia-Pacific, established cultural norms, and shifting geopolitical dynamics. The Asia-Pacific region has been struck by several problems, such as the spread of nuclear weapons, violations of human rights, and political unrest caused by economic sanctions. The Cold War's impact on global politics necessitated the employment of sanctions in the years immediately after the conflict (Kim, 2017). For instance, during the Korean War, sanctions on North Korea for developing nuclear weapons were fairly severe, but these limits have now softened (Kim, 2017). American leadership in imposing international sanctions on the North Korean regime was a key factor in discouraging the state's nuclear weapons development (Kim, 2017). North Korea's ability to shift tactics and build illicit trade networks has reduced sanctions' impact, casting doubt on their overall effectiveness (Kim, 2017).

As international politics and regional power dynamics evolved after the Cold War, so did the nature and use of sanctions (Stanzel, 2018). Regional groups like ASEAN have attempted to find common answers to political and security issues despite restrictions imposed by non-interference and divergent national interests (Hellquist, 2014: p. 30). Political instability and severe human rights violations have also led to sanctions in the region (Hellquist, 2014: p. 15). Myanmar is a prime example of a state where sanctions have evolved in response to political turmoil. Sanctions have had divisive and far-reaching humanitarian and economic consequences across the Asia-Pacific. Sanctions have produced severe monetary issues, affecting ordinary citizens more than the wealthy (Hellquist, 2014: p. 14), even while the North Korean government continues its unlawful activities (Human Rights Watch, 2024). Human suffering and social and economic chaos have reached crisis proportions as a consequence of sanctions, which have worsened the financial hardship caused by political instability in Myanmar.

4.1. Contextual Factors

Historical legacies, geopolitical dynamics, economic interdependencies, regional security concerns, and regional institutions and norms are just a few contextual factors that shape the creation and implementation of financial sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region. Colonialism, Cold War geopolitics, and post-colonial state-building shaped the Asia-Pacific region's historical context and continue to influence how people view economic sanctions (Hellquist, 2014: pp. 28-30). Colonial and Cold War views of foreign interference and regional sovereignty left a lasting mark. Many neighbouring states view sanctions with historical cynicism, having endured both colonisation and internal turmoil (Davis, 2005; Marston, 2022). Sanctions are not always well-received or practical due to this history, which many countries see as neo-imperialism or the continuation of previous exploitation. The USA intends to compete with China in the Asia-Pacific region (Lin et al., 2020). This competition significantly shapes how punishment is applied and what follows. States' decisions to align with or avoid punishment often reflect broader geopolitical goals and strategic alliances, shaping sanctions regimes. This geopolitical tug-of-war shapes sanctions' goals and targets and complicates their implementation and effectiveness (Lin et al., 2020). Internal strife, nuclear proliferation, and territorial disputes are all significant elements impacting the imposition of sanctions as they pertain to national security. The more comprehensive the security picture, the more successful sanctions are, even though they address particular security challenges. Sanctions aimed at discouraging North Korea from pursuing nuclear weapons, for example, must account for complex regional security dynamics, which often require the involvement of influential actors like China and Russia (Lin et al., 2020).

Regional organisations such as APEC, the East Asia Summit, and ASEAN have a significant impact (Beeson, 2009). These groups prioritise economic cooperation and diplomatic engagement over punitive action, based on principles of non-in-

terference and consensus (Taylor, 2009). They are committed to regional growth and stability but cannot support or implement comprehensive systems because of their cautious approach to sanctions. Sanctions must align with regional norms and goals within this institutional framework, which calls for a more cooperative and multilateral approach.

Before implementing economic sanctions, these contextual variables must be thoroughly addressed and understood in the Asia-Pacific region. Sanctions may be designed to accomplish diplomatic aims while respecting the region's particular characteristics and maintaining long-term stability by considering institutional, historical, geopolitical, economic, and security considerations.

4.2. Challenges in Implementation

Economic sanctions in Asia face geopolitical difficulties, enforcement challenges, financial consequences, humanitarian concerns, and legal ambiguity (Taylor, 2009). Illegal enterprises, vast seas, and weak borders hinder sanctions enforcement. Enforcement gaps stem from states' varying commitment to punitive measures, as some prioritise economic interests over compliance. Sanctions affect Asia-Pacific business, investment, and supply chains because these economies are interconnected. These upheavals threaten regional financial stability, weaken sanctions, and make sanctioned states more resistant. Although sanctions do not always achieve their intended political objectives, they worsen humanitarian problems and often harm innocent people (Mallard et al., 2020: p. 124). Sanctions on despots like North Korea have caused acute shortages of basic supplies, worsening the suffering of vulnerable Asia-Pacific communities (Korea Peace Now, n.d.). These humanitarian difficulties raise moral questions about sanctions' effectiveness and legality, drawing worldwide attention and deepening opposition (Korea Peace Now, n.d.). Because of different legal frameworks and enforcement strategies, Asia-Pacific sanctions are difficult to apply consistently. The lack of a regional legal framework leads to inconsistent interpretation and application of sanctions, enabling evasion. Standardising legislative criteria and improving enforcement cooperation can reinforce regional sanctions regimes (Hellquist, 2014).

Sanctions may harm international diplomacy, aggravate regional tensions, and impede collaboration on more critical issues (Hellquist, 2014: p. 18). Diplomatic crises may enhance regional instability and undermine international cooperation (Hellquist, 2014: p. 17). Effective economic sanctions in Asia require a comprehensive strategy addressing geopolitical issues, enforcement mechanisms, economic and humanitarian impacts, legislative frameworks, and diplomatic dialogue (Taylor, 2009).

4.3. Legal Critiques

Legal criticisms of economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific area include their extraterritorial reach, procedural fairness, human rights values, and accountability procedures (Hellquist, 2014: p. 29). The main legal criticism is whether sanctions

comply with international law—specifically, the principles of sovereignty, non-interference, and proportionality. Some who oppose unilateral sanctions argue they are extraterritorial overreach and violate the sovereignty of the targeted states. Concerns remain about the legal basis for sanctions under international law, particularly when the UN Security Council does not authorise them (D'Amato, 2010: p. 23). This absence of explicit permission calls into question the legitimacy and legality of such actions and may undermine the power of international organisations. However, in legal terms, this is not the only element to point to illegality; there are three categories—1) security council sanctions, 2) retorsion, 3) countermeasures. Security Council sanctions are binding on everyone, but the concern is whether those sanctions in application fully comply with international law and fairness or reflect selective influence by the permanent five members of the Security Council. Retorsion is lawful from a legal perspective (e.g., Ruys, 2016), but it is unfriendly and could affect civilians to some extent. On the other hand, countermeasures are illegal if they are disproportionate or fail to respect humanitarian concerns. For example, the ILC's Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts (ARSIWA) set limits on countermeasures (Chapter II, Articles 49-54). Countermeasures must not compromise the duties to safeguard fundamental human rights (United Nations General Assembly, 2001: art. 50).

The procedural justice of sanctions regimes—especially concerning identifying people or organisations subject to sanctions—is another critical factor (Shannon et al., 2025: pp. 38-50). Critics question the validity of sanctions, arguing that they lack due process rights—such as the right to be notified of charges, the ability to submit evidence, and the right to appeal (Mayer et al., 2016). This lack of procedural protections exposes sanctioned parties to reputational damage and financial hardship, with insufficient channels for redress (Mayer et al., 2016). Maintaining the rule of law and ensuring the validity of punitive measures requires stronger procedural fairness.

Legal criticism of economic sanctions often focuses on human rights issues, especially their compliance with international human rights law (Gasser, 1996: p. 874). Some opponents argue that sanctions often worsen humanitarian emergencies by causing shortages of necessities like food and medication, disproportionately affecting civilian populations. Maintaining human rights requires sanctions that do not unnecessarily hurt civilians. Some sanctions measures' extraterritorial reach creates severe legal and jurisdictional issues. Opponents argue that the extraterritorial implications of unilateral sanctions violate other states' sovereignty and tamper with their legal systems. In addition, when states negotiate competing legal accountabilities within domestic and international frameworks, extraterritorial sanctions can create legal ambiguity and disputes (Taylor, 2009). Maintaining the rule of law globally and reducing jurisdictional disputes requires clear legal limits on extraterritorial punishment.

Notable concerns include the lack of effective accountability systems and remedies for people or organisations affected by sanctions. Practical difficulties arise

in accessing international legal systems, as states must follow procedures to contest penalties before international courts like the International Court of Justice (ICJ) (Devaney, 2014). Furthermore, disadvantaged parties' ability to seek redress is limited by the lack of effective remedies for incorrect classifications or excessive punitive measures.

Legal criticisms emphasise, however, how crucial it is to ensure that economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific area follow international law, procedural fairness, humanitarian ideals, and accountability procedures (Taylor, 2009). A thorough strategy is needed to address these criticisms and balance punitive goals with upholding the law and human rights. Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific cannot be a legal and valuable instrument of foreign policy until such steps are taken.

5. Rethinking Economic Sanctions: Towards Sovereignty and Accountability

Within international law and morally sound diplomatic systems, the Asia-Pacific region must view economic sanctions differently, emphasising principles of accountability and sovereignty.

Economic sanctions have become increasingly significant in contemporary international relations as a statecraft instrument, used to pressure certain states to change their conduct (Rogers, 2007). However, rather than a hindrance, the Asia-Pacific's intricate and dynamic geopolitical environment offers an opportunity to reimagine economic sanctions through a lens of accountability and sovereignty. As a hub of global commerce and attraction, the region can serve as a beacon for recalibrating sanctions regimes in ways that prioritise accountability, sovereignty, and, critically, human rights protection.

5.1. Unilateral Sanctions and the Erosion of Regional Sovereignty

With varying degrees of clarity regarding the far-reaching repercussions for regional administration and sovereignty, various opinions and legal theories have responded to unilateral sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region.

Legality considerations primarily concern whether unilateral sanctions are justified under established international law principles (Ruys, 2016), such as those governing state sovereignty, non-interference, and the fair treatment of states. Conversely, supporters of unilateral sanctions argue that states are entitled to defend their interests and take targeted steps to promote regional stability. They contend that only unilateral sanctions can deal with violations of international norms, including human rights violations. If states implement sanctions unilaterally, they may demonstrate their commitment to protecting shared norms and principles and respond swiftly to emerging crises (Felbermayr et al., 2020). On the one hand, unilateral actions may exacerbate conflicts and jeopardise efforts at peaceful resolution; on the other, multilateral cooperation is required to address complex regional concerns (Rogers, 2007).

A governance challenge is that unilateral sanctions make it harder for regional

leaders to agree and collaborate (Hellquist, 2014: p. 27). By bypassing established channels for discussion and agreement, powerful states or coalitions impose sanctions without consulting regional partners, undermining sovereignty and self-determination (Hellquist, 2014: p. 27). If affected states lose regional autonomy, tensions and antagonism may make it harder for them to cooperate and understand one another (Hellquist, 2014: p. 27). Regional wealth and peace may suffer if unilateral limitations thwart economic development and integration efforts (Taylor, 2009).

The debate over unilateral sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region is, last but not least, a microcosm of the complex interaction among regional governance, security, and sovereignty. While some argue that unilateral action may address critical issues, others emphasise the importance of multilateralism and respect for international law. Ultimately, resolving these issues will require a complex approach that considers the legitimate concerns of different states and the vital need to preserve sovereignty, accountability, and shared governance.

Undermining Regional Decision-Making: The Struggle with Unilateral Sanctions

In the Asia-Pacific, unilateral sanctions are a major roadblock to decision-making (Taylor, 2009). Punitive measures implemented by one state or institution without the consent of other states or multilateral organisations are known as unilateral sanctions, and they are becoming more common in today's geopolitical landscape (Xia, 2024). By going against the principles of communal and cooperative governance outlined in international law, these actions put regional diplomacy and stability at risk (Xia, 2024). In the past, strong powers used unilateral sanctions to compel other states to achieve their diplomatic objectives or to convey their views on the activities of different states in the region. In response to what it views as human rights abuses, nuclear proliferation, and other transgressions of international standards, the USA has often imposed unilateral sanctions on Iran and North Korea (Amuzegar, 1997: p. 185; Council on Foreign Relations, 2022). The weakened sovereignty and independence of the targeted states is one argument against unilateral action (Hofer, 2020). This, in turn, increases tensions and complicates the diplomatic settlement of regional conflicts (Hofer, 2020). Proponents justify such policies as essential to safeguard national interests and maintain competitiveness worldwide.

Sanctions imposed without due consultation may seriously jeopardise the region's peace and security (Hofer, 2020). By eschewing established multilateral institutions, unilateral acts risk alienating other regional players and undermining confidence in the international system (United Nations, 2022). Deteriorating diplomatic relations raises the risk of miscalculation or escalation of hostilities. The limitation of necessities, which might worsen civil unrest and economic suffering in the targeted country, is another unanticipated humanitarian effect of unilateral sanctions. The compatibility of unilateral sanctions with international law and the ideas of state sovereignty is complicated (Rogers, 2007). In self-defence, the use of

force must be justified and proportionate, as laid down in Article 51 of the UN Charter (United Nations, 1945: art. 51). The underlying conception of non-discrimination is replicated in both ICCPR and ICESCR (United Nations General Assembly, 1966a: art. 2, para. 1; United Nations General Assembly, 1966b: art. 2, para. 2). Without regard for these guidelines, unilateral sanctions risk being considered illegal under international law, which would diminish their efficacy and usefulness as a diplomatic instrument (Baran, 2022).

However, parties in the region need to reaffirm their commitment to multilateralism and communication to address the problems caused by unilateral sanctions. In this context, regional organisations such as ASEAN and APEC must be strengthened to enable positive interaction and communication among member states. Furthermore, actions should ensure that punishments are supported by solid evidence and can be independently reviewed, encouraging greater accountability and transparency in their implementation (Baran, 2022). Addressing fundamental issues and promoting mutual understanding are essential to prioritising diplomatic outreach and engagement with those imposing sanctions unilaterally (Baran, 2022). Stakeholders in the region seeking an inclusive, consensus-building culture may pursue peaceful conflict resolution. As such, peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region will increase.

5.2. The Economic Costs of Sanctions and Regional Development Challenges

Economic sanctions profoundly affect the socio-economic circumstances of the Asia-Pacific region. Beyond their outrageous fees, they significantly hinder local growth (Rogers, 2007). Sanctions have also affected the regional economy in more complex ways, including shifts in trade dynamics, investment patterns, and development paths. Sanctions severely harm targeted states' economies (Rogers, 2007), sever long-standing trade networks and restrict access to essential resources. Sanctions impede economic growth, increase inflationary pressures, jeopardise the local currency's stability, and limit imports, exports, and financial activity (Rogers, 2007). The present economic uncertainty affects regional economies, resulting in supply chain interruptions, declining consumer confidence, and depressed entrepreneurial endeavours (Ozili, 2021).

While these measures harm states' economic figures, sanctions also harm their social structures (Neuenkirch & Neumeier, 2015). Sanctions make it harder for afflicted states to overcome widespread poverty, inequality in development, and social injustice (Neuenkirch & Neumeier, 2015). Because sanctions cut off essential supplies like medication, humanitarian aid, and school materials, they worsen socio-economic issues, cause health problems, lower academic performance, and increase socio-economic disparities (O'Driscoll, 2017). Because the investment environment is increasingly uncertain, multinational corporations and foreign investors are deterred from investing in sanctioned regimes (Lastauskas et al., 2023). The alleged risks of doing business in sanctioned countries hinder capital outflows

and long-term economic growth (Goldbach & Nitsch, 2023: p. 19). This fear of investment keeps the economy reliant and stagnant, exacerbates developmental inequalities, and preserves regional disparities (Goldbach & Nitsch, 2023: p. 19).

To address these concerns and create prosperity for everyone, stakeholders in the Asia-Pacific region need to develop a comprehensive and purposeful approach to mitigate the adverse consequences of sanctions. As such, they should cooperate to broaden economies, strengthen them against external shocks, promote sustainable development pathways, and emphasise social inclusion, environmental protection, and equitable income distribution (European Commission, n.d.). Building and prospering in the Asia-Pacific region requires creating an environment where people can respect one another, communicate, and collaborate (Yi, 2022).

Beyond National Borders: The Regional Economic Impact of Sanctions

The legitimacy, extraterritorial scope, and compliance with international law of economic sanctions are highly contentious issues (Coomans, 2011). Since economic sanctions are not limited to borders, these concerns also affect neighbouring states (Coomans, 2011). This section examines the legal facets of sanctions' regional economic impact in the Asia-Pacific, focusing on the interplay among state sovereignty, international obligations, and regional cooperation. The principle of state sovereignty ensures that states can manage their domestic policies as they see fit, a cornerstone of international law (Besson, 2011). When one state imposes economic sanctions on another, it raises questions regarding the traditional boundaries of sovereignty and the extraterritorial scope of domestic legislation. A complex legal framework is needed to resolve the tension between national sovereignty and the extraterritorial scope of punishment, balancing individual states' rights with the broader need for regional cooperation and stability (Kennedy & Warren, 2020).

When determining sanctions in compliance with international law, consider treaty duties, customary standards (Weisburd, 1995), and *jus cogens* (Schwarzenberger, 1964). International law requires sanctioning states to uphold the principles of necessity, proportionality, and non-discrimination. Sanction systems must be regularly reviewed and monitored to prevent unanticipated repercussions and guarantee legal compliance (Martin, 2021). Sanctions' regional economic effects also raise questions about regional dispute mediation and conflict resolution groups and processes. Organisations like ASEAN and APEC help the Asia-Pacific region to advance collaboration, mutual understanding, and conflict resolution (Ma, 2025). Through a platform for member states to interact, collaborate, and address common issues, these organisations support regional stability and the spread of sound legal practices (Ma, 2025).

Without a thorough legal framework that considers the interactions among state sovereignty, international law, and regional cooperation, it is not practicable to adequately analyse the economic impact of sanctions on the Asia-Pacific region. Those involved in economic sanctions should follow the law and engage in constructive dialogue within regional frameworks to navigate these complexities.

6. Strengthening Sovereignty and Accountability: Mechanisms for Review and Reform of Economic Sanctions

To achieve sovereignty and ensure accountability in economic sanctions, the region needs robust frameworks tailored to the Asia-Pacific's distinct characteristics. This section examines the institutional and legal frameworks essential to ensuring that economic sanctions are created, implemented, and evaluated transparently, equitably, and legitimately, in compliance with international law.

Transparent and inclusive decision-making processes are essential to this endeavour. States should engage in inclusive, transparent dialogue on sanctions in regional and global forums. Sanctions should be appropriate, necessary, and based on well-founded facts. They should also adhere to legal requirements. By promoting transparency, stakeholders can strengthen the rule of law and international norms, thereby bolstering public confidence in the legitimacy of sanctions.

Moreover, impartial monitoring procedures must be established to ensure accountability and prevent mistreatment throughout the sanctioning process. Independent bodies such as expert panels or international courts may objectively evaluate sanctions regimes to assess their effectiveness, legality, and human rights implications (Portela & Olsen, 2023). Fundamental to concepts of fairness and equality, these procedures are vital defences against arbitrary or unfair behaviour. Accountability in developing and applying sanctions also requires meaningful engagement with affected populations, non-state entities, and civil society. Several entities may help legislators understand the social and economic ramifications of sanctions, including human rights organisations and local communities (United Nations Development Programme, 2015). This approach fosters legitimacy and ownership by actively including affected communities in decision-making. It also guarantees that policies are focused, reasonable, and efficient.

The intent is to establish an equitable, egalitarian, and regulation-driven global framework in the Asia-Pacific region, and it is imperative to implement measures that enhance sovereignty and accountability regarding economic sanctions. Stakeholders may promote regional peace and development while defending fundamental rights and freedoms by upholding the values of independence, openness, and inclusion, and navigating the challenges posed by sanctions (International Telecommunication Union, 2019).

6.1. Strategies for Enhancing State Sovereignty

While navigating the maze of economic sanctions, Asia-Pacific states will need to adopt strategic measures to protect and strengthen their sovereignty.

States should take deliberate steps to diversify their economies to reduce their dependence on any economic sector and their exposure to external factors. By promoting economic resilience and self-sufficiency, states can preserve more decision-making autonomy and become less vulnerable to coercive measures (Sedwill et al., 2021). Developing local industries, investing in tech and innovation,

and forming new trade alliances are all part of this strategy to lessen the impact of sanctions on already vulnerable sectors.

Diplomatic engagement and coalition building are essential measures to further protect national sovereignty; states can use regional and international venues to voice concerns, rally like-minded partners, and coordinate diplomatic efforts to counter coercive tactics. The world stage is a platform where countries can make their voices heard and establish their sovereignty when forming diplomatic initiatives and alliances. Strengthening state sovereignty and reducing vulnerabilities also requires investments in capacity-building and resilient institutions. Further strengthening state sovereignty and resilience against foreign threats may be achieved by mobilizing internal support and solidarity and promoting national unity.

6.2. Mechanisms for Enhancing Accountability

Maintaining respect for human rights (Moret, 2015: p. 120), advancing regional peace, and ensuring adherence to legal standards depend on accountability in applying economic sanctions. Based on legal principles and global best practices, this section examines processes to strengthen accountability in the Asia-Pacific region.

Making decisions openly is a crucial step in increasing accountability (News, 2019). State sanctions ought to be based on trustworthy, coherent, and reasonable facts that align with international legal frameworks. Moreover, independent monitoring mechanisms significantly improve accountability and the rule of law. International courts, specialised committees, or authorised monitoring agencies may impartially examine sanctions regimes to determine whether they comply with legal requirements, human rights standards, and proportionality standards. Through these processes, which provide unbiased evaluations to avoid unjust or disproportionate sanctions, the rule of law and accountability are strengthened in sanctions implementation. Interacting meaningfully with affected communities and civil society is crucial to advancing accountability and transparency in sanctioning. States should actively seek input from a range of groups, including residents and human rights organisations, to better understand sanctions' social and economic implications. By incorporating diverse perspectives into decision-making, states can increase the legitimacy, accountability, and effectiveness of sanctions regimes.

6.3. Independent Review Mechanisms

The legal framework for economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region could rely on an independent review panel (IRP), which I propose to ensure transparency, accountability, and compliance with legal requirements. I argue for independent review processes that ensure sanctions are evaluated fairly and impartially for efficacy, proportionality, and legality. This IRP could comprise experts in public international law and human rights law, and selected recognised local monitoring bodies that uphold the rule of law and accountability through unbiased assess-

ments, ensuring sanctions are neither too harsh nor unfair and comply with human rights standards and international legal norms. These systems will examine sanctions measures against relevant treaty requirements, customary international law, and *jus cogens* norms, ensuring sanctions regimes adhere to legal norms and safeguard fundamental rights and freedoms.

IRP could be a vital safeguard that can promote transparency, accountability, and adherence to legal obligations in the Asia Pacific region, operating within the framework of economic sanctions legislation. These processes conduct impartial evaluations, ensure adherence to international legal norms, and enable stakeholder participation, which is essential to upholding the rule of law and safeguarding fundamental rights and freedoms throughout sanctions implementation. I propose that the mandate of this IRP be established by a resolution of the UN General Assembly, and that affected states, non-governmental organisations, and UN working organisations be the parties to file a complaint with the panel, and, after investigation and justification, it could recommend delisting, granting humanitarian exceptions, and compensation for violations of the guidelines provided for the countermeasures by the ARSIWA and international law framework for the unilateral sanctions. If the panel finds no violation or non-compliance, it could recommend continuing the sanctions. However, because the General Assembly resolution is not binding, the IRP will primarily serve as a body of independent review and recommendation.

7. Conclusion

This research has carefully examined economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region, concentrating on the complex interactions between sovereignty, accountability, and the need for change. Although economic sanctions are often used in international governance and statecraft, this academic investigation shows that they pose serious problems for state sovereignty, regional stability, and compliance with legal standards.

After explaining the legal foundations of economic sanctions in the Asia-Pacific region, the paper examined regional strategies and processes governing their application. It became clear that sanctions are sometimes ineffective in achieving their stated goals of addressing security imperatives and influencing state conduct due to implementation challenges, legal criticisms, and concerns about their social and economic effects. It followed an examination of the development of economic sanctions in the area, which exposed complicated legal issues, implementation hurdles, and subtle contextual considerations. North Korea and Myanmar are the only two case evaluations that demonstrate the complex interplay among political needs, economic interests, and human rights concerns in Asia.

At its core, the discussion revolved around a proposal to reconsider economic sanctions in light of the need to strengthen sovereignty and accountability. After identifying critical obstacles, including weakened regional decision-making due to unilateral sanctions and their adverse economic effects, the group called for

strategic realignment. The research identified economic diversification, diplomatic engagement, and institutional fortification as measures to strengthen sovereignty in response to these threats. The research proposed transparent decision-making procedures, independent scrutiny, and broad civil society engagement as essential measures to improve accountability.

In light of these insights, recalibrating economic sanctions in the Asia Pacific is imperative, underpinned by a renewed commitment to sovereignty, accountability, and adherence to legal precepts. Through concerted, collaborative endeavours grounded in academic rigor, stakeholders can navigate the intricate terrain of economic sanctions while fostering regional stability, prosperity, and respect for the rule of law. In conclusion, this research contributes to the expanding corpus of research and policy debates on economic sanctions reform in the Asia Pacific—to create a more just, fair, and long-lasting international order based on respect for sovereignty, accountability, and the rule of law by promoting transparency, meaningful connection, and adherence to legal standards.

Author Contributions

The sole author, T. I. T., performed conceptualization, methodology, software, validation, formal analysis, investigation, resources, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing, and visualization. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Amuzegar, J. (1997). Iran's Economy and the US Sanctions. *Middle East Journal, 51,* 185-199.

APEC Agreements and Declarations (2006). *APEC Economic Policy Report*. Asian Legal Information Institute. http://www.asianlii.org/apec/other/agrmt/aepr250/

Arms Control Association (2022). *UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea*. https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/UN-Security-Council-Resolutions-on-North-Korea

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (2023a). *2023 APEC Economic Policy Report*. https://www.apec.org/publications/2023/11/2023-apec-economic-policy-report

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (2023b). *Chair's Statement of the 29th APEC Small and Medium Enterprises Ministerial Meeting*. https://www.apec.org/meeting-papers/sectoral-ministerial-meetings/small-and-medium-enterprise/chair-s-statement-of-the-29th-apec-small-and-medium-enterprises-ministerial-meeting

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (n.d.). *Achievements and Benefits*. https://www.apec.org/about-us/about-apec/achievements-and-benefits

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (n.d.). *About Sanctions*. https://www.dfat.gov.au/international-relations/security/sanctions/about-sanctions

Austrian Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs (n.d.). *Regional Fora*. https://www.bmeia.gv.at/en/european-foreign-policy/foreign-policy/the-asia-pacific-region/regional-fora

Baran, D. (2022). *What Is the International Law on Unilateral Sanctions? Examining the Case of Unilateral Sanctions Imposed on Russia*. Al Sharq Strategic Research. https://research.sharqforum.org/2022/04/22/unilateral-sanctions/

Beeson, M. (2009). *Institutions of the Asia-Pacific: ASEAN, APEC, and Beyond*. Routledge.

Bessler, M., Garfield, R., & Hugh, G. M. (2004). *Sanctions Assessment Handbook*. UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/sites/default/files/migrated/2014-12/OCHA-SanctionsAssessmentHandbook-DRAFT-MAY04.pdf

Besson, S. (2011). *Sovereignty*. Oxford Public International Law. https://opil.ouplaw.com/display/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e1472

Biersteker, T., & Hudáková, Z. (2021). *Are Sanctions on North Korea Working*? Global Asia, 16. https://www.globalasia.org/v16no3/cover/are-sanctions-on-north-korea-working_thomas-biersteker-zuzana-hud%C3%A1kov%C3%A1

Bodenheimer, E. (1973). *Power, Law, and Society: A Study of the Will to Power and the Will to Law*. Crane, Russak.

Business and Human Rights Centre (2023). *How Do UK Trade Agreements Measure Up on Human Rights*? https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/from-us/briefings/how-do-uk-trade-agreements-measure-up-on-human-rights/

Carpenter, T. G. (2011). *Book Review: American Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific*. CATO Institute. https://www.cato.org/commentary/book-review-american-sanctions-asia-pacific

Chanto, S. D. (2004). *The ASEAN Regional Forum—The Emergence of "Soft Security": Improving the Functionality of the ASEAN Security*. Semantic Scholar. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-ASEAN-Regional-Forum-%E2%80%93-The-Emergence-of-%E2%80%98-Soft-Chanto/7eba71811af13d50869996bed90c0504288609a8

Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (2007). Opened for Signature November 20, 2007, 2624 UNTS 223 (entered into force 15 December 2008).

Cohen, D. S., & Weinberg, Z. A. Y. (2019). *Sanctions Can't Spark Regime Change.* Foreign Affairs. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2019-04-29/sanctions-cant-spark-regime-change

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (2018). Opened for Signature, March 8, 2018 (entered into force 30 December 2018). https://www.iilj.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CPTPP-consolidated.pdf

Coomans, F. (2011). The Extraterritorial Scope of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the Work of the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. *Human Rights Law Review, 11,* 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngq055

Council on Foreign Relations (2022). *What to Know about Sanctions on North Korea*. https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/north-korea-sanctions-un-nuclear-weapons

Council on Foreign Relations (n.d.). *What Are Economic Sanctions*?

https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-are-economic-sanctions

Crawford, J. (2011). State. In *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*. Oxford University Press.

D'Amato, A. (2010). *The Moral and Legal Basis for Sanctions*. Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Faculty Working Paper No. 95, 23. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/facultyworkingpapers/95/

Davis, M. C. (2005). Sovereignty and the State in Asia: The Challenges of the Emerging International Order. In *ASIL Proceedings* (pp. 411-423). https://home.uchicago.edu/~tginsburg/pdf/articles/TheStateOfSovereigntyInSouth-eastAsia.pdf

Devaney, J. (2014). *The Law and Practice of Fact-Finding before the International Court of Justice*. Doctoral Dissertation, European University Institute.

Drezner, D. W. (2003). The Hidden Hand of Economic Coercion. *International Organization, 57,* 643-659. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020818303573052

East Asia Forum Quarterly (2023). *An Age of Sanctions*. Hinrich Foundation. https://www.hinrichfoundation.com/research/wp/trade-geopolitics/an-age-of-sanctions

Embassy of the Republic of Iraq (2013). *U.N. Security Council Votes to Remove Iraq from Chapter VII Sanctions*. https://www.iraqiembassy.us/article/un-security-council-votes-to-remove-iraq-from-chapter-vii-sanctions

European Commission (2022). *Asia and the Pacific Regional Multi-Annual Indicative Programme 2021-2027*. https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2022-01/mip-2021-c2021-9251-asia-pacific-annex_en.pdf

European Commission (2023). *U.S. and EU Sanctions Teams Enhance Bilateral Partnership*. https://finance.ec.europa.eu/news/us-and-eu-sanctions-teams-enhance-bilateral-partnership-2023-05-16_en

European Commission (n.d.). *Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument—Global Europe—Performance*. https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/eu-budget/performance-and-reporting/programme-performance-statements/neighbourhood-development-and-international-cooperation-instrument-global-europe-performance_en

European External Action Service (2026). *European Union Sanctions*. https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/european-union-sanctions_en

Felbermayr, G., Kirilakha, A., Syropoulos, C., Yalcin, E., & Yotov, Y. V. (2020). The Global Sanctions Data Base. *European Economic Review, 129,* Article ID: 103561. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2020.103561

Gasser, H. (1996). Collective Economic Sanctions and International Humanitarian Law. *Zeitschrift für Ausländisches Öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht, 56,* 871-904. https://www.zaoerv.de/56_1996/56_1996_4_a_871_904.pdf

Gillard, E. (2022). *Humanitarian Exceptions: A Turning Point in UN Sanctions*. Chatham House. https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/12/humanitarian-exceptions-turning-point-un-sanctions/

Goldbach, S., & Nitsch, V. (2023). On the Economic Effects of Financial Sanctions. *EconPol Forum, 24,* 19-22.

Gutmann, J., Neuenkirch, M., & Neumeier, F. (2023). The Impact of Economic Sanctions on Target Countries: A Review of the Empirical Evidence (2023). *EconPol Forum, 24,* 5-9.

Hellquist, E. (2014). *Regional Organizations and Sanctions against Members: Explaining the Different Trajectories of the African Union, the League of Arab States, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*. KFG Working Paper No. 59, 30. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/37365/ssoar-2014-hellquist-Regional_Organizations_and_Sanctions_Against.pdf?sequence=1

Hernando, R. C., & Detroit, C. K. (2023). *Uneven Recovery in the APEC Region amid Uncertainty*. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. https://www.apec.org/press/blogs/2023/uneven-recovery-in-the-apec-region-amid-uncertainty

Hernando, R. C., Vasquez, G. N. A., & Kuriyama, C. (2023). *Overcoming Challenges in APEC's Post-Pandemic Recovery*. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. https://www.apec.org/press/blogs/2023/overcoming-challenges-in-apec-s-post-pandemic-recovery

Hofer, A. (2020). The Proportionality of Unilateral "Targeted" Sanctions: Whose Interests Should Count? *Nordic Journal of International Law, 89,* 399-421. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-89030008

Hufbauer, G. C., Elliott, K. N., Cyrus, T., & Winston, E. (1997). *US Economic Sanctions: Their Impact on Trade, Jobs, and Wages*. Peterson Institute for International Economics, Working Paper 97, 3. https://www.piie.com/publications/working-papers/us-economic-sanctions-their-impact-trade-jobs-and-wages

Hufbauer, G. C., Schott, J. J., Elliott, K. A., & Oegg, B. (2009). *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered* (3rd ed.). Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Human Rights Watch (2024). *World Report 2024: North Korea*. https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2024/country-chapters/north-korea

International Telecommunication Union (2019). *Digital Infrastructure Policy and Regulation in the Asia-Pacific Region*. https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Regional-Presence/AsiaPacific/SiteAssets/Pages/Events/2019/RRITP2019/ASP/ITU_2019_Digital_Infrastructure_5Sep2019FNL.pdf

Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (n.d.). *Ethics of Economic Sanctions*. https://iep.utm.edu/ethics-of-economic-sanctions/

Jamnejad, M., & Wood, M. (2009). The Principle of Non-Intervention. *Leiden Journal of International Law, 22,* 345-381. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0922156509005858

Kennedy, S., & Warren, I. (2020). The Legal Geographies of Extradition and Sovereign Power. *Internet Policy Review,* 9, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.14763/2020.3.1496

Kim, V. (2017). *The Effectiveness of UNSC Sanctions: The Case of North Korea*. Syracuse University Honors Program Capstone Projects 1045. https://surface.syr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2041&context=honors_capstone

Korea Peace Now (n.d.). *The Humanitarian Impact of Sanctions on North Korea*. https://koreapeacenow.org/resources/the-humanitarian-impact-of-sanctions-on-north-ko-rea-2/#:~:text=In%20direct%20contravention%20of%20the,important%20part%20of%20the%20kit

Lastauskas, P., Proskute, A., Zaldokas, A., Juust, M., & Berzins, J. (2023). *How Firms Adjust to Economic Sanctions*. VoxEU. https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/how-firms-adjust-economic-sanctions

Lin, B., Chase, M. S., Blank, J., Cooper, C. A. III, Grossman, D., Harold, S. W. et al. (2020). *Regional Responses to U.S.-China Competition in the Indo-Pacific*. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR4400/RR4412/RAND_RR4412.pdf

Luban, D. J. (2008). Fairness to Rightness: Jurisdiction, Legality, and the Legitimacy of International Criminal Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1154177

Ludvigsson, K. (2010). *Reflections on the Effectiveness of Targeted Sanctions in the Case of Fiji*. Thesis, Lund University. https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=1608127&fileOId=1612335

Ma, E. (2025). Researching the Trading Systems in the Asian-Pacific Region—APEC, ASEAN, TPP, CPTPP, RCEP and Their Members. GlobaLex. https://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/apec_asean1.html#:~:text=The%20Asia%2DPacific%20Economic%20Cooperation%20(APEC)%20and%20the,regional%20peace%2C%20stability%2C%20and%20rule%20of%20law

Mallard, G., Sabet, F., & Sun, J. (2020). The Humanitarian Gap in the Global Sanctions Regime. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations, 26,* 121-153. https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-02601003

Marston, H. (2022). The Struggle for Autonomy amidst Great Power Rivalry in the Asia-Pacific. In *the Era of Great Power Competition in the Indo-Pacific Region* (pp. 22-34). National Institute for Defense Studies. https://www.nids.mod.go.jp/english/publication/joint_research/series21/pdf/Chapter2_HunterMarston.pdf

Martin, C. (2021). *Economic Sanctions Under International Law: A Guide for Canadian Policy*. University of Ottawa: Research Report. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3973142

Mayer, C., Polo, A., & Armour, J. (2016). *Regulatory Sanctions and Reputational Damage in Financial Markets*. Center for Economic Policy Research. https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/regulatory-sanctions-and-reputational-damage-financial-markets

Moiseienko, A. (2023). Sanctions, Confiscation, and the Rule of Law. *Revue Européenne du Droit, 4,* 33-39. https://geopolitique.eu/en/articles/sanctions-confiscation-and-the-rule-of-law/

Moret, E. S. (2015). Humanitarian Impacts of Economic Sanctions on Iran and Syria. *European Security, 24,* 120-140. https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2014.893427

Natalegawa, M. (2018). *Does ASEAN Matter? A View from Within*. ISEAS Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1355/9789814786751

Nephew, R. (2017). *The Art of Sanctions: A View from the Field*. Columbia University Press.

Neuenkirch, M., & Neumeier, F. (2015). *The Impact of UN and US Economic Sanctions on GDP Growth*. FIW Working Paper No. 138.

News (2019). *Four Steps to Driving Accountability*. University of Minnesota Office of Human Resources Supervisory Development Program. https://hr.umn.edu/supervising/news/Four-Steps-Driving-Accountability

O'Driscoll, D. (2017). *Impact of Economic Sanctions on Poverty and Economic Growth*. K4D Helpdesk Report. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5bace471ed915d259c43d848/136_Im-

pact_of_Economic_sanctions_on_poverty_and_economic_growth.pdf

O'Neill, A. (2024). *Upholding North Korea Sanctions in the Age of Decentralised Finance*. RUSI Occasional Paper, Royal United Services Institute. https://static.rusi.org/north-korea-sanctions-and-cryptomixers-op-march-2024.pdf

Observer Research Foundation (2022). *Questioning the Legality of Unilateral Economic Sanctions*. https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/questioning-the-legality-of-unilateral-economic-sanctions/

Ozili, P. K. (2021). Economic Policy Uncertainty: Are There Regional and Country Correlations? *International Review of Applied Economics, 35,* 714-728. https://doi.org/10.1080/02692171.2020.1853075

Pacific Islands Forum (2018). *Boe Declaration on Regional Security*. https://forumsec.org/publications/boe-declaration-regional-security

Pacific Islands Forum (2000). *Biketawa Declaration*. https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/violenceagainstwomen/publications/biketawa-declaration

Pape, R. A. (1997). Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work. *International Security, 22,* 90-136. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec.22.2.90

Park, J., & Choi, H. J. (2022). Are Smart Sanctions Smart Enough? An Inquiry into When Leaders Oppress Civilians under UN Targeted Sanctions. *International Political Science Review, 43,* 433-449. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120931957

Park, J., & Swaine, M. (2018). *Bitter Allies: China and North Korea*. Asia Society. https://asiasociety.org/new-york/events/bitter-allies-china-and-north-korea

Peksen, D. D. (2023). *The Human Rights Effect of Economic Sanctions*. ReliefWeb. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/human-rights-effect-economic-sanctions

Piekos, W. (2024). *In the Pacific Islands, US Delay Is an Invitation for China to Step In*. Atlantic Council. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/in-the-pacific-islands-us-delay-is-an-invitation-for-china-to-step-in/

Portela, C., & Olsen, K. B. (2023). *Implementation and Monitoring of the EU Sanctions' Regimes, Including Recommendations to Reinforce the EU's Capacities to Implement and Monitor Sanctions*. European Union Parliament Policy. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2023/702603/EXPO_STU(2023)702603_EN.pdf

Psaledakis, D., Brunnstrom, D., & Lewis, S. (2021). *U.S. Imposes Sweeping Human Rights Sanctions on China, Myanmar, and North Korea*. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/us-issues-human-rights-related-sanctions-adds-sensetime-blacklist-2021-12-10/

Research Society of International Law Pakistan (2023). *Extraterritorial Unilateral Sanctions, Third States and Collateral Damage*. https://rsilpak.org/2023/extraterritorial-unilateral-sanctions-third-states-and-collateral-damage/

Rodríguez, F. (2023). *The Human Consequences of Economic Sanctions*. Center for Economic and Policy Research. https://cepr.net/publications/the-human-consequences-of-economic-sanctions/

Rogers, E. S. (2007). Using Economic Sanctions to Control Regional Conflicts. *Security Studies, 5,* 43-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/09636419608429288

Ruys, T. (2016). Sanctions, Retorsions and Countermeasures: Concepts and International

Legal Framework. In L. van den Herik (Ed.), *Research Handbook on UN Sanctions and International Law*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Schwarzenberger, G. (1964). International Jus Cogens. *Texas Law Review, 43,* 455.

Sedwill, M., Wilkins, C., Philippon, T., Mildner, S-A., Mazzucato, M., Kanehara, N. et al. (ed.) (2021). *Global Economic Resilience: Building Forward Better: The Cornwall Consensus and Policy Recommendation*. G7 Panel on Economic Resilience. https://cms.marianamazzucato.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/CCS118_CCS0821093480-003_G7-Economic-Resilience-Panel-Report_PRINT.pdf

Sender, O. (2021). Coercion. In *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*. Oxford University Press. https://opil.ouplaw.com/display/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e1749

Severino, R. (2011). *ASEAN Regional Forum Confronts Difficult Issues*. East Asia Forum. https://eastasiaforum.org/2011/07/20/asean-regional-forum-expected-to-take-up-vital-regional-issues/

Shannon, S., Harris, A., Smith, T., Pattillo, M., Martin, K., Slavinski, I. et al. (2025). "It's like a Reverse Robin Hood—We All Know They Can't Pay": How Court Actors Navigate the Logics of Monetary Sanctions. *Criminology, 63,* 26-57. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12400

Shwe, T. (2024). *Addressing the 2021 Myanmar Coup: A New Strategy for ASEAN*. Australian Institute of International Affairs. https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/addressing-the-2021-myanmar-coup-a-new-strategy-for-asean/

Silberstein, B. K. (2023). *The Complicated Truth about Sanctions on North Korea*. East Asia Forum, 15. https://eastasiaforum.org/2023/07/05/the-complicated-truth-about-sanctions-on-north-korea/

Stanzel, V. (ed.) (2018). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. German Institute for International and Security Affairs. https://www.swp-berlin.org/en/publication/new-realities-in-foreign-affairs-diplomacy-in-the-21st-century

Taylor, B. (2009). *American Sanctions in the Asia-Pacific*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203866818

Thayer, C. A. (2007). The Five Power Defence Arrangements: The Quiet Achiever. *Security Challenges, 3,* 79-96.

The Economist (2021). *Sanctions Are Now a Central Tool of Governments' Foreign Policy.* https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2021/04/22/sanctions-are-now-a-central-tool-of-governments-foreign-policy

The Policy Circle (n.d.). *Foreign Policy: Asia Pacific*. https://www.thepolicycircle.org/briefs/u-s-foreign-policy-asia-pacific-region/

Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (1976). Opened for Signature February 24, 1976, 1025 UNTS 297 (entered into force June 21, 1976). https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201025/volume-1025-I-15063-English.pdf

UN Security Council (2006). *Resolution 1718 [On Measures against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) in Connection with Its Nuclear Weapon Tests] (S/RES/1718).* https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/584729/files/S_RES_1718%282006%29-EN.pdf

United Nations (1945). *Charter of the United Nations.* https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text

United Nations (2008). *Security Council Action Under Chapter VII: Myths and Realities (Special Research Report No. 1, 23 June 2008).* https://www.securitycouncilreport.org/research-reports/lookup-c-glkwlemtisg-b-4202671.php

United Nations (2022). *Today's Challenges Require More Effective and Inclusive Global Governance, Secretary-General Tells Security Council in Briefing on Reforming Multilateral System*. Reliefweb. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/todays-challenges-require-more-effective-and-inclusive-global-cooperation-secretary-general-tells-security-council-debate-multilateralism

United Nations Development Programme (2015). *Towards Green and Inclusive Prosperity-Building Green Economies That Deliver on Poverty Reduction*. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/Towards%20Green%20and%20inclusive%20prosperity.pdf

United Nations General Assembly (1966a). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. 999 UNTS 171.

United Nations General Assembly (1966b). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. 993 UNTS 3.

United Nations General Assembly (2001). *Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts*. Res 56/83, UN Doc. A/56/83, Annex, Art. 50.

VOICE (2022). *Adding to the Evidence: The Impacts of Sanctions and Restrictive Measures on Humanitarian Action*. https://voiceeu.org/publications/adding-to-the-evidence-the-impact-of-sanctions-and-restrictive-measures-on-humanitarian-action.pdf

Weber, K. (2009). The ASEAN Regional Forum and Security Governance in Asia-Pacific [Paper Presentation]. In *European Union Studies Association Eleventh Biennial International Conference*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228814950_The_ASEAN_Regional_Forum_and_Security_Governance_in_Asia-Pacific

Weisburd, A. M. (1995). The Effect of Treaties and Other Formal International Acts on the Customary Law of Human Rights. *Georgia Journal of International & Comparative Law, 25,* 99.

Wysong, W., & Burney, A. (2023). *Impact of US, UK and EU Sanctions and Export Controls in the Asia-Pacific Region*. Global Investigation Review. https://globalinvestigationsreview.com/guide/the-guide-sanctions/fourth-edition/article/impact-of-us-uk-and-eu-sanctions-and-export-controls-in-the-asia-pacific-region

Wysong, W., Burney, A., & Turner, N. (2022). *Sanctions and Export Controls in the Asia-Pacific Region*. Global Investigations Review. https://globalinvestigationsreview.com/guide/the-guide-sanctions/third-edition/article/sanctions-and-export-controls-in-the-asia-pacific-region

Xia, H. (ed.) (2024). *Unilateral Sanctions against China Not Justifiable as Countermeasures: UN Expert*. Xinhuanet. https://english.news.cn/20240517/f5d0296b49b546e597953d4555486222/c.html

Yi, W. (2022). *Jointly Building an Asia-Pacific Community with a Shared Future*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China. https://www.mfa.gov.cn/mfa_eng./xw/zyjh/202405/t20240530_11341624.html