EVALUATING THE LEGAL AND PRACTICAL DIMENSIONS OF ECONOMIC BLOCKADES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

Khyati Singh, LL.B. (University of Delhi), LL.M. (National University for Study and Research in Law, Ranchi)

INTRODUCTION

The globe has witnessed the sudden rise of states and the fall of powerful, once unbeatable nations over the last 200 years or more, but these shifts in fortune have frequently been accompanied by conflict, which has formed a large portion of human history. These battles have resulted in the redrawing of territorial boundaries and the formation of new alliances; for many centuries, most nations have employed trade restrictions to advance their objectives in warfare. The usage of trade restrictions gained popularity following the use of ships and well-established trade routes between nations. The blockading country had complete control over the economic and daily life of the civilians in the opposing nations by essentially halting all trade to and from the country in question.

The following paper deals with the growing significance of trade restrictions and their potential negative effects on a country's civilians. The evolution of legislation pertaining to trade restrictions, including their legitimacy and the effects they have on various situations and the general public at large. This paper also examines how trade restrictions are becoming more and more popular as the world grows more interconnected and depends more on trade than self-sufficiency. This has increased the efficacy and potency of these types of trade restrictions. It is now a widely employed technique. This paper delves into the history of trade restrictions and also talks about various examples of trade restrictions by different nations like US trade restriction of Iraq, trade restriction of Gaza and so on.

Blockades have historically been employed when two states are at war, not merely when one state poses a threat to the security of another. Consequently, the international community must determine whether a trade restriction is acceptable when a large amount of civilian population suffers as a result, even while it is an efficient military tactic in preventing weapons that have the potential to cause grave harm from being smuggled through to combatants.

When a trade restriction is imposed in response to an immediate threat that could result in fatalities among the civilian population of the belligerent state, the boundaries also become hazy. Therefore, the international community must also decide how to strike a balance between a state's right to defend itself and its civilian population from harm, regardless of how severe, and when actions taken in self-defense amount to war crimes because they cause grave suffering to another civilian population.

BLOCKADE: MEANING

Blockade is defined as "a belligerent operation to prevent vessels and/or aircraft of all nations, enemy and neutral from entering or exiting specified ports, airports, or coastal areas belonging to, occupied by, or under the control of an enemy nation." Blockade is different from an embargo or penalties because the former is a legal prohibition on trade and is not absolute or restricted and are legal. A trade restriction, in contrast to a siege, is a far broader term that is not restricted to a specific territory or area.

A country is considered to be trade restrictiond when all the water transport to and from it is halted. The term 'trade restriction' also refers to the cessation of land-based transportation. Since the air force has been employed more frequently during the past century, airspace trade restrictions have become more frequent in order to keep them effective. A trade restriction also occurs when ports belonging to the opposing nation are constantly patrolled, preventing any ships or submarines from passing through.

Blockades have recently included breaking underwater cables and jamming radio signals to shut off electronic communications. When it comes to neutral nations, the blocking nation has the authority to impose a trade embargo that requires them to inspect their goods for prohibited goods, which can be arbitrarily and broadly defined. Although traditionally most trade restrictions occurred at sea, they can also be deployed on land to keep people out of a specific location.

BRIEF HISTORY

Historians acknowledge that the Dutch trade restriction of Flemish ports in 1584 was the first official trade restriction. The question of how belligerent states handle neutral states and their rights, such as the belligerent state giving due notice of a trade restrictiond port and the requirement that a trade restriction be impartial to all vessels, was raised by the trade restriction itself, even though at the time there was no official global legal framework on the legality of trade restrictions and their effects on neutral states.

Maritime trade restrictions were frequently employed during the 16th and 17th centuries and were seen by many states as a tactic of warfare. The English and continental European viewpoints on the law of trade restriction were reconciled during the Crimean War (1853–1856). The "Paris Declaration of 1856 provides that Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective, that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy.

1. Wolff Heintschel von Heinegg, Max Planck Encyclopedias of International Law [MPIL], Oxford Public International Law, (October 2015), Oxford Public International Law: Blockade (ouplaw.com).

2. Declaration respecting maritime law signed by the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, assembled in congress at Paris, (April 16, 1856).

The Paris Declaration of 1856 was not reaffirmed or expanded upon at the Second Hague Peace Conference of 1907, as the Third Commission was not authorised to do so. "Art. 2 of the Hague Convention on the Laying of Automatic Submarine Contact Mines, which forbids the laying of automatic contact mines off the coast and ports of the enemy, with the sole object of intercepting commercial shipping, was the only agreed-upon clause that could be taken into consideration when examining the law of trade restriction."

The London Naval Conference (1908 and 1909) ultimately established the law pertaining to naval trade restrictions. This Declaration of the Laws of Naval War had 21 articles pertaining to the subject. Since then, the declaration has gained tremendous authority in the field of maritime trade restriction. Various principles regarding the trade restriction were laid down by this declaration.

Some of the principles are-

"If a trade restriction is to be legally binding, it must be maintained by a force sufficient e to bar access to the enemy's coastline." A trade restriction remains in force in the trade-restricted country even if it is temporarily lifted owing to the current weather, as stated in Article 4 of the

London Declaration of 1909. Article 5 of the declaration stipulates that the trade restriction shall be imposed equally and totally on all ships from all nations that pass through its harbours. According to Articles 8, 10, and 11 of the Declaration, a trade restriction must be declared and notified in order for it to be enforceable. Either the naval authorities functioning on its behalf or the blockading country makes a statement. According to "Article 9, it must outline the start date of the trade restriction, the boundaries of the blocked coastline, and the time frame for neutral vessels to leave the area."

Despite being ratified, the London Declaration of 1909 was never implemented because the House of Lords opposed its adoption. However, the declaration's terms were upheld during the Balkan Wars and incorporated into national award policies. They were considered to have a typical character during World War I.

Trade suffered greatly during World War I, to the point where even neutral trade was heavily restricted. During this time, non-navy commerce ships were either taken prisoner.

Great Britain imposed trade restriction on Germany during 1st World War. This trade restriction was based on 2 council orders, which indicate that the King had issued the proclamation and that it was legitimate as a form of reprisal. With the intention of preventing any goods from entering or leaving Germany, including from entering any enemy ports, the British order in council adopted certain measures to prevent commodities of any kind from reaching or leaving Germany. The paths of intercepted vessels were redirected to ports controlled by the British or its allies. Additionally, until the contrary was proven, any vessel encountered at sea on her route to or from a port in any neutral nation that provides access to enemy territory without stopping at a port in British or Allied territory shall be presumed to be carrying goods with an enemy destination or of enemy origin and shall be brought in for inspection and, if necessary, for adjudication before the Prize Court.

In defiance of the London Declaration of 1909, Articles 17 and 19, nations implemented trade restrictions based on the continuous voyage theory. A ship cannot escape arrest by claiming it is headed to a neutral port, according to the British Order in Council Removing Certain Doubts in regard to and amending "The Declaration of London Order in Council No. 2, 1914."

Long-distance trade restrictions were employed in the Second World War, as they had been in the World War I, and were justified by the idea that it was a right of retaliation. The British

Order in Council dated July 31, 1940, stated that the absence of any navigator on board qualified the warships for seizure. Any neutral shipowners would not be allowed to use British facilities if they disregarded any of the rules that had been imposed on the ships. As a result, these council orders served to totally regulate trade and also neutral ships.

DEVELOPMENT OF ECONOMIC BLOCKADE

"International economic trade restrictions can be viewed as a type of economic weapon employed to control or influence a targeted nation or nations to behave in a way that benefits the blockading nation." Blockades are a sort of pressure, similar to penalties, and have become almost synonymous with other non-military measures over time. Despite being distinct ideas in theory and practice, they are now mistakenly viewed as one. For instance, a government or nations may implement diplomatic, economic, or military measures known as international economic blockage.

These international penalties involve a form of economic pressure aimed at influencing the other country's policies to align with the interests of the sanctioning nations. Since the international economic embargo employs many of the methods of economic warfare in order to accomplish its primary objectives, it is thought to be a restrictive definition of an economic war.

Contrarily, economic coercion refers to a collection of economic practices and strategies employed by various nations to uphold a minimal standard of an international systematic theology as well as to advance their own national interests or settle disputes that cannot be resolved through peaceful means. The limitations of the justifications for its implementation set economic coercion apart from international economic trade restrictions.

Although international economic trade restrictions have been around for a while, global legal framework has started to look it since 1980s. However, the global legal framework organisation established its fundamental legal precepts in 1887. These principles included requiring an official announcement of the trade restriction, enabling foreign merchants to pass freely despite its imposition, and apprehending neutral merchant marines who violate the trade restriction's legal requirements.

Throughout the course of the two World Wars, the coast forces' increased use of sophisticated control methods and technological advancements (such as torpedo boats, mines, sophisticated cannons, and military aircraft) resulted in a significant change in the methods of trade restrictions. This has lessened the necessity of placing military trade restrictions near to the harbours of the adversaries. The blockading marines conduct has been made easier by the introduction of wireless equipment, which has improved the efficacy of the trade restrictions.

Furthermore, the efficacy of night fights has increased because to the significant advancements in the use of radars, marine planes, and dives.

The trade restriction was renamed the "economic war" in 1939 to reflect all of the changes in its methods. Together with other economic weapons or tactics including trade agreements with neutral nations, import and export bans, black listing, pre-emption (or preclusive purchasing), and financial measures, the marine trade restriction became one tool of the economic war.

For the following reasons, the blockading nation or nations employ these weapons against another trade restrictiond nation:

Facing a direct threat to its economic or security advantages; that is, the international economic trade restrictions placed on Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait in 1990 and its war in the Persian Gulf, which were implemented to force Iraq to abide by the UN's cease-fire demands.

Reaching Moral or Ethical Objectives, that is, the Apartheid-era international economic trade restriction that were placed on South Africa in the eighteenth century and have been a permanent feature of South African history.

Imposing an economic sanction in response to another country's hostile policy towards the blockading country, such as the trade embargo, the United States of America placed on Brazil when it stopped importing American computers into that country. However, the primary goals of the aforementioned weapons are as follows: bringing about a slight alteration in the target's policies, causing political and economic instability in the target, and weakening the target's defences.

Defeating the target's possible defensive power planning.

Causing a significant shift in the target's policies.

As discussed above, many analysts characterise international economic trade restrictions as a collection of actions that a nation or nations may conduct against another nation for moral, political, or economic reasons in an effort to influence that nation's behaviour in a particular way.

TOOLS OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC BLOCKADE

International economic trade restrictions can be broadly classified as trade embargoes, financial embargoes, investment or disinvestment embargoes, and technological embargoes. There are various types of embargoes, and each has its own set of weapons.

Trade embargo: A trade embargo is the complete or partial suspension of a target nation's imports and/or exports. It employs a variety of methods, including as trade agreements, export and import restrictions, naval trade restrictions, and preclusive and pre- emption measures, to accomplish its objectives.

Export and import controls: These measures prohibit the import and export of the target country or restrict the export of goods to particular nations that back the target nation. This kind of trade restriction was implemented in 1939, at the start of World War II, when England demanded that the US reduce its supplies to Germany. This weapon has also been employed to prevent neutral nations from exporting goods in order to prevent them from obtaining foreign currency and funding their own country. The blockading nation may send its navy to the target's harbours to stop items from being smuggled into or out of the target nation in order to increase the efficacy of this weapon. But over time, this direct censorship has employed a variety of techniques. As a recent example, Sweden employed this weapon against South Africa in the middle of 1985 by refusing to allow the commodities to transit via neutral nations and by boycotting South African imports and exports in protest of the country's apartheid regime. Along with the American and English requests that Libya's neighbours refrain from doing business with the country, the western nations also utilised this weapon against Libya in 1991 following the 1988 Lockerby plane catastrophe.

Trade agreements: These are pacts made between neutral and blockading nations with the intention of restricting trade and, as a result, compelling the target country to abide by the terms set forth by the blockading nations. Two weapons are included in trade agreements as a means of countering trade embargoes: preclusive and pre-emption, as well as luring other nations to assist the country enforcing the trade restriction in achieving its goal. Purchasing particular products in large numbers from neutral nations before they are supplied to the target nation is the preclusive weapon. In order to entice neutral states to sell to them, the blockading nations overcharge for goods. During World War II, for example, the Germans employed this weapon against the British in an attempt to purchase all of Sweden's control tool items before the British could obtain them. Nevertheless, Sweden expanded the amount of these instruments it produced in order to satisfy German and British demand. Attracting a third nation or nations to work with the blockading nation or nations against the target is the opposite side of trade agreements. For example, in 1917 the United States of America blocked exports to Norway due to its neutral economic policies towards both of the First World War's adversaries. Norway restricted its exports to Germany in 1918 as a result.

Shipping controls, also known as naval trade restriction: The marines of the nation enforcing the trade restriction have utilised this form of direct trade restriction to isolate a particular port on the target nation's coast in order to obstruct travel to or from the target nation. For example, when the Japanese marines imposed trade restrictions on Port Arthur's harbour in 1904–1905, Japan utilised this weapon against Russia. The marine trade restriction was reinforced by an air trade restriction as military tactics changed over time. The Security Council authorised naval power to halt commercial ships travelling to and from Iraq on August 25, 1990. This move followed the installation of an additional air trade restriction against Iraq on September 25, 1990. As a result, the naval trade restriction has been deployed against Iraq recently.

Financial, technological, and investment embargoes: An investment or capital embargo entails the liquidation of financial and material assets, the removal of human capital, and the blocking nation's inability to make any more investments in the target country.

The selling of financial assets owned by foreigners in the target country is known as liquidation of financial assets; the dismantling and liquidation of foreign plants and equipment is known as liquidation of physical assets; and the removal of skilled management, foreign scientists, and entrepreneurs from the target country by the blockading nation is known as liquidation of human capital. In the past, this kind of weapon was employed by blacklisting embargoed businesses that took on contracts with the target country. The blacklist was referred to as the announced list against particular individuals (as well as embargoed institutions and organisations) in the United States and the constitutionality list in Britain.

A complete capital embargo was recently imposed by the western nations, for example, against South Africa in the middle of 1985. Conversely, the financial embargo denotes a series of actions implemented by the country imposing the trade restriction in order to induce a liquidity crisis within the country being targeted.

Financial embargo measures include prohibiting the target country from taking out any loans or credits to finance its imports, preventing the target country from obtaining cheap loans from international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), freezing the target country's foreign bank accounts, removing foreign deposits from the target country's banks, demanding prompt payment of foreign interest, and stopping any grants and aids to the target country. For example, the United States threatened to withhold help from Holland in 1948 when Holland was reluctant to grant Indonesia its independence, which prompted negotiations between Holland and Indonesia towards Indonesia's independence. Because of the Apartheid system that was in place there, the United States recently employed this kind of trade restriction against South Africa in 1986. It was also employed, as has been reported, against Libya in 1986 as punishment for Libya's backing of terrorism and against Iran in 1980 due to hostage crises in Iran.

A technological embargo is defined as prohibiting the export of technical machinery, methods, equipment, and designs that involve advanced technical knowledge to the target country, as well as prohibiting technical licencing to the target country and any agreements for additional technical training. For example, in response to the Lockerbie events, the Security Council placed a technical embargo on Libya at the end of 1993. As explained above, international economic trade restrictions consist of a series of actions and policies implemented by a nation or nations blocking another nation for political, economic, or moral reasons with the goal of pressuring that country to alter its course. These policies and procedures are broken down into three categories: trade, investment, financial, and technology embargoes. Each of these categories includes a variety of weapons.

INSTANCES OF USE OF ECONOMIC BLOCKADES

There are various examples where Economic Blockades has been employed by a country on some other country. Some of the examples are mentioned below:

Germany Blockade (1914-1919):

Considered to be among the greatest tragedies of the 20th century. The most widely recognised aspects of the First World War are its extreme cruelty and the way it involved the participation of civilians and national economies in the military effort. The use of machines and contemporary technology in combat was wreaking havoc and inflicting unspeakable agony, as had never been witnessed before.

The European armies were locked in a war for national survival, using up resources and supplies so quickly that the support of the war effort took precedence over other concerns in the economies of the participating nations.

Belligerents came to view the economies of their opponents as military targets as the economies were a vital tool of the war effort. Workers in farms, factories, and other industries where it appeared they were aiding in the war effort were also deemed as appropriate targets because they were viewed as equally complicit. Thus, the idea of total war emerged in the contemporary period.

The naval powers had the ability to seriously harm each other's economies by enforcing trade restrictions and attacking neutral shipping that was headed for enemy ports, even though the technology at the time prevented the belligerents from directly attacking each other's industrial complexes. A level of strategic importance never before seen in naval warfare was placed on control of the seas and maritime trade. At the start of World War One, the Royal Navy was the biggest and most potent naval force in the world.

As was previously said, not all of the terms included in the London Declaration held up throughout the first few months of World War I. The trade restriction of Germany was one of the bloodiest campaigns of the First World War due to the collapse of the contraband system and the Royal Navy's adherence of the philosophy of continuous journey.

On November 3, 1914, the British declared the North Sea to be a trade restriction region, much to the dismay of many neutrals. In response to this proclamation, the Royal Navy built an unbreakable barrier across the North Sea at the beginning of 1915. Throughout the war, the blockading force, which was made up of a combination of naval warships and antiship mines, prevented almost all neutral shipping from arriving at Germany's ports. A quick look at the German economy before to World War II reveals that a third of the nation's food came from imports. In addition to creating shortages of essential raw resources like coal and certain non-ferrous metals, the trade restriction stopped the flow of fertiliser, which was essential to German agriculture. While several government officials in Germany cautioned at the beginning of the war about the possibility of food shortages in the event of a lengthy struggle, Germany's main priorities in 1914 were military supplies and the maintenance of soldiers in the field.

Not many people understood how much devastation would occur over the next four years when the conflict broke out in August. The need to keep a fit and combat-ready military took precedence over the general welfare of the civilian populace, as is the case in almost every conflict. This rule applied to Germany as well. Civilians were forced to make do with what was left over as the conflict went on and supplies ran out.

The effect of the food became apparent to the civilian population as the war progressed and the trade restriction of Germany intensified. By 1915, bread rationing had started and German imports had dropped by 55% from pre-war levels. In 1916, the German populace subsisted on a scant diet consisting of turnips, dark bread, fat-free sausage slices and a weekly allotment of three pounds of potatoes. The turnips were the only ones that were plentiful.

The trade restriction of Germany continued after the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918. Instead, the allies intensified the food trade restriction on Germany as part of a plan to force the terms of the Versailles Treaty upon the German government. As it has come to be known, the Hunger Blockade continued from November 1918 until the Treaty of Versailles was signed in July 1919.

Iraq Blockade:

The longest trade restriction campaign in modern history began with Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990. UNSCR 661, adopted by the UN Security Council on August 6, 1990, with unanimous consent, permitted the prohibition of all items entering and leaving Iraq, with the exception of "supplies intended strictly for medical purposes, and, in humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs." The Security Council first denounced the invasion of Iraq.

The Security Council became increasingly forceful in its measures in the autumn of 1990.

Security Council Resolution 661, dated August 6, 1990, established the first economic penalties. It said that “all states shall prevent the import into their territories of any commodities and products originating in Iraq or Kuwait exported therefrom. In response to pressure from the US, the Security Council adopted Resolution 665 on August 25, 1990, approving the use of naval force to halt all Iraqi inward and outward maritime shipping.”

The naval trade restriction at the end of September was extended to cover all means of transport.

Twenty-one more nations joined the US and British navies in enforcing the embargo. Iraq was essentially shut off from the outside world by the end of September. The navies of numerous nations, including Canada, monitored marine activity in the Arabian Gulf region as part of the tight and efficient enforcement of the embargo against Iraq. A Sanctions Committee was established under resolution 687, with the power to allow Iraq to export petroleum in order to finance the importation of necessities for civilian use, such as food and medicine. The UNSCR’s provisions persisted until the Second Gulf War’s conclusion in 2003. Iraq was especially vulnerable to the effects of the trade restriction because of the destruction of its infrastructure during the Gulf War and its reliance on oil revenues as its primary source of income. Reporting on the 1999 penalties imposed by the UN, the

According to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Iraq’s ability to feed its people depends on the importation of agricultural gear, fertilisers, and food items. Iraq experienced an acute and severe food crisis as a result of the embargo on all of these goods. In addition, the Iraqi government found itself in a position where it could not buy medications and other necessities for its people once its oil earnings were cut off. The majority of Iraq is uninhabitable desert. Consequently, the nation mainly depends on imported food to feed its people.

Almost no food was imported when the UN trade restriction was put in place. Although the government enforced quick rationing, which prevented mass hunger, the majority of Iraqi civilians were left with a poor food that was barely enough to sustain their lives. The United Kingdom’s Parliament was advised in 1998 that since economic penalties were placed on Iraq in 1990, “the country’s humanitarian situation had gotten worse and that there were 960,000 chronically malnourished children in Iraq, a 72% increase since 1991. The next year, under-5 mortality more than quadrupled from 56 deaths per 1000 live births (1984–1989) to 131 deaths per 1000 live births (1994–1999), according to a report from the United Nations Children's

Emergency Fund. In the same period, there was an increase in infant mortality, which is the term employed to describe the death of children in their first year of life, from 47 per 1000 live births to 108 per 1000 live births."

"That there would have been half a million fewer deaths of children under-five in the country as a whole during the eight year period 1991 to 1998 if the substantial reduction in child mortality throughout Iraq during the 1980s had continued through the 1990s," stated UNICEF executive director Ms. Carol Bellamy in the same report. In retrospect, it is evident from reviewing UNSCRs 661 and 687, which established the embargo against Iraq, that there was "a clear hierarchy in the goals of the Security Council in favour of military objectives over and above humanitarian concerns" by making humanitarian aid provision subject to "the policies and practices of the Government of Iraq, including the implementation of all relevant resolutions of the Council." Considering that the resolutions civilian population of Iraq would inevitably become pawns in a deadly game of brinksmanship.

Gaza Blockade:

Israel imposed the trade restriction of Gaza in response to the Hamas party's victory in the general election held in Gaza in February 2006. Israel announced that Hamas is a terrorist group that has taken over the Gaza Strip and transformed it into hostile territory shortly after Hamas came to power in June 2007. Israel, which controls Gaza's eastern and northern borders, imposed severe restrictions on the flow of all products into and out of Gaza by land, including food, electricity, gasoline, and building materials, in reaction to an uptick in rocket assaults coming from within the region.

Additionally, the Israeli government maintained a seaward trade restriction of Gaza, effectively blocking off the region from any outside commerce, in what UN Undersecretary General for Humanitarian Affairs John Holmes has called as a collective punishment of the people of Gaza. Aiming to encourage the people of Gaza to force Hamas to change its attitude towards Israel or alternatively, force Hamas out of government, as well as to keep the Gazan economy just shy of collapse but not quite over the edge, since its founding in 2007, Israel has kept up a fair and efficient trade restriction of Gaza.

Even Israel's closest allies are concerned about the indiscriminate approach taken to counter Hamas extremist attacks at the strategic level, despite the fact that it is undeniable that Israel has the right under global legal framework to defend itself and its civilians from attacks coming from within Gaza. Israel started limiting Gazan fishing vessels' ability to operate beyond three miles from the coast in January 2009, in violation of the terms of Hague XI, which is widely acknowledged as customary global legal framework.

The main result of this limitation is that it prevents Palestinian fishermen from accessing their most fruitful deep sea fishing grounds, despite Israeli claims that it is intended to prevent fishermen from smuggling weapons and terrorists.

Since the start of “Cast Lead” in January 2008, the IDF has prohibited Palestinians from fishing farther than three nautical miles (nm) from the shore, undermining the amount of fishing catch—the majority of which is located in deeper waters than 3 nm—as the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs noted in its special report of August 2009. This ban came when the fishing zone was decreased from 12 to 6 nm in October of 2006.A third of the entire number of fish that was available in the market in April 2007 was represented by the 79 million tonnes of fishing catch that was taken in during April of 2009.

The degradation of living conditions in the Gaza Strip, primarily due to the Israeli siege, remained concerning, according to a UNOCHA study from April 2010. Additionally, a United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) survey on poverty revealed that since the trade restriction was imposed, the number of Palestine refugees who are completely unable to secure access to food and lack the means to purchase even the most basic items, such as soap, school stationary, and safe drinking water, has tripled. This is known as ‘abject poverty’.

Although Israel did loosen some of the penalties against Gaza after its attack on the Turkish ship MS Mavi Marmara. The majority of the essential components of Israel’s trade restriction were still in effect as of May 31, 2010. In order to maintain normal growth and development as well as an active and healthy life, one third of Palestinians, or 1.43 million individuals, did not have secure access to adequate amounts of safe and nutritious food as of the end of 2010.

Additionally, the high unemployment rate brought on by Gaza’s economic isolation along with the region’s limited fish supply have gradually changed Gazans’ diets from expensive, high-protein foods like fruits, vegetables, and animal products to inexpensive.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Special Report foods high in carbohydrates, such as sugar, oil, and grains, which can cause micronutrient deficiencies, especially in youngsters and expectant mothers.14 The situation facing Gaza's people is a lot like that of the people living in European ghettos during World War II. Gaza's population has been cut off from the outside world, drastically disrupting their access to food and other needs of life. Gaza's civilian population is gradually going hungry.

Unofficial Nepal Blockading:

On September 23, 2015, India enforced an unofficial trade restriction that lasted for four and a half months. At the India border, all vehicles carrying crucial supplies and oil tankers bound for Nepal were stopped. When the embargo began, the country was still getting over the damage caused by the April 25, 2015, earthquake. Almost 9,000 individuals had died and over 700,000 homes had been devastated by the 7.8 magnitude earthquake. There was an odd rationale behind the trade restriction. The Nepalese constitution assembly's new constitution was approved in a manner that infuriated India. This incredible speed of work, unimaginable until a month ago, leaves many political pundits, and even several actors, flustered.

CONCLUSION

Blockades are a well-known technology, and for many years, they have been employed extensively. The study's startling conclusion was that trade restrictions have had a disastrous effect on the modern-day nations that have encountered them. Today's world is overly dependent on trade to meet people's basic wants and comforts, so it is certain that a trade restriction will have a negative effect on a country and lead to a population decline.

Blockades are meant to stop certain kinds of commodities from entering or leaving a country, leading to shortages that, as said earlier, could seriously affect the country and its people. Blockades appear to be having more negative effects now that they are more common, and their legitimacy is now under question. This study explores the effects of neighbouring nations' illegal embargo of Armenia, which has caused a severe economic downturn and the biggest losses for many of its civilians.

Blockades must be properly regulated by international organisations and national governments using treaties and legislation because they are such an effective weapon of war. The need for such regulation is increasing as the negative effects of trade restrictions become more pronounced.

The international community may also eventually have to decide whether or not the use of a trade restriction is warranted in and of itself. Almost every instance in which trade restrictions have been employed has resulted in humanitarian suffering, either from a lack of food that causes widespread starvation or from a shortage of medical supplies that significantly increases the number of casualties among the civilian population. This includes those who will die from disease because there isn’t enough food for sanitation or from a lack of medicine and equipment for those who are already hospitalised. This is because trade restrictions are designed to prevent any and all supplies from entering the port of entry. Stopping supplies from entering is the actions' sole goal. The procedure prolongs the time it takes for relief to reach the civilians who are most in need, even when other points of entry are offered. As previously indicated, only lately has the global legal framework of trade restrictions recognised that trade restrictions are inherently responsible for humanitarian crises, and only a small number of nations have agreed to this fact.

Many contend that trade restrictions inherently violate the Geneva Convention regardless of the circumstances since a civilian population experiences significant suffering as a result of military activity. Of course, compliance with the Geneva Convention is contingent upon a nation’s membership in a particular protocol. The global legal framework of trade restrictions places responsibility for responding in the event that a humanitarian catastrophe arises as a result of the trade restriction’s implementation on the belligerent state, rather than outright making trade restrictions illegal under humanitarian law.

REFERENCES

Conventions, Declarations, Reports, and Treaties

Declaration respecting maritime law signed by the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey, assembled in congress at Paris, April 16, 1856 (1856).

Declaration concerning the Laws of Naval War. London, signed on 26 February 1909, https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/ihl/INTRO/255?OpenDocument.

Hague Convention on the Laying of Automatic Submarine Contact Mines, 18 October 1907.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Special Report, August 2009.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 661, 6th August 1990.

United Nations Security Council, Resolution 687 (1991), 3 April 1991, S/RES/687 (1991)

ARTICLES

Dan Izenberg, Analysis: Is There a Humanitarian Crisis in Ghaza, The Jerusalem Post, March 22 2010.

Karki, Tej, Political Blackmailing: A Case Study of India’s Unofficial Blockade on Nepal (August 22, 2022).