



A Review on Boycott Legal System and its Issues in International Law

Mohammed Asadi

1. Department of Public Law, Bandar Abbas Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas, Iran

*Corresponding Author: Masadi702@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Boycott has always been considered as an instrument of pressure and coercion to achieve foreign policy goals of countries. Its literature is also one of the most controversial and inconclusive literature in international relations. Due to the present atmosphere in international relations about boycott, this study examines the legal system of boycott and deals with its issues in international law. Motivation for applying boycott may be a response to violation of a norm or prevention of its violation. In fact, the motivation to impose boycott may be the achievement of an objective in foreign policy or achievement of some concessions from the boycotted country. From an overall perspective, boycott includes every negative action or response to action or deed in the context of boycott targets.

Key words: Legal System- Boycott- International Law- Security Council

INTRODUCTION

Twentieth century must be counted as the beginning of a new movement in the use of economic instruments in foreign policy. From long past world economic powers used boycott instrument as one of pressure leverages. Boycott as an instrument of pressure and coercion to achieve foreign policy goals of countries, has a long and unknown history. With the creation of the League of Nations and subsequently United Nations, boycott has gained new significance in nature and implementation¹.

From an overall perspective, boycott includes every negative action or response to action or deed in the context of boycott targets. "Henry Benin" and "Robert Gilpin" describe boycott as manipulating economic relations to achieve political objectives. That is to say, to achieve the purpose of compelling the society to change its policy or government, it is threatened of economic punishment². This paper examines the legal system of boycott and deals with its issues in international law.

Definition of Boycott

Boycotts in international law and policy are the set of actions with required nature with the aim of forcing the governments, international actors, or disobedient people to respect the norms of international law or to follow the desired request or policy of the boycott issuer institution. From a technical perspective, this term is used for both military and nonmilitary efforts. However, primarily this term is used for nonmilitary actions³.

Boycotts, based on the power of the boycott applier, can be categorized into unilateral, multilateral and United Nations boycotts. Boycotts that are imposed by a country are called unilateral boycotts. Prominent examples of unilateral boycotts are those boycotts imposed by the United States against Cuba, Iran³. However, when boycotts are imposed by some countries as a group they are called multilateral boycotts. For example, the Haitian boycott by the Organization of American States and recently the Europe Union boycott against Syria and Iran are multilateral boycotts. Eventually, when restrictive measures are imposed under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter, these actions are called United Nations boycotts. In this paper, the main focus is on the boycott applied by the United Nations. The UN Charter does not use the term boycott. However, the term of UN boycott is generally used to refer to the unarmed, but mandatory and binding actions imposed by the UN Security Council against state or a particular non-state actor. According to Article 41 of the Charter, the measures may include complete or half-complete severance of economic ties, railway, waterway, airway, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations³.

UN boycotts that greatly increased after the Cold War have made concerns about the damaging effects on the innocent people of the country or other actors. The issue of various aspects of UN boycotts, particularly devastating effects on civilians and violations of human rights and international humanitarian law is the main subject of this paper. This will be discussed in the following sections, after referring briefly to the mechanism of boycott in the League of Nations³.

Mechanism of boycott in the League of Nations

At the end of World War I, the League of Nations was formed as a result of the Versailles peace plan. Principal organs of the League of Nations included the General Assembly, the Council and the Secretariat. The General Assembly convened once a year and was composed of representatives of all member countries and made decision about the organization's policies. The council consisted of four permanent members (Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan) and four (later nine) non-permanent members who were elected every three years by the General Assembly. Secretariat's task was to prepare the agenda and issue the reports of meetings. The League of Nations was lack of military force. To control the behavior of the member states it relied solely on boycott mechanism⁴.

Mechanism of boycott in United Nations

Former United Nations Secretary General, Boutros-Ghali in January 25, 1995 emphasized: "Boycott has generally been recognized as a powerful tool. Use of this strong weapon creates a moral point that whether the suffering of vulnerable people of the boycotted country is a legitimate way to put pressure on the politicians of that country, politicians whose behavior does not seem to change with the plight of their nationals. Boycotts always bring about undesirable consequences³. Like the League of Nations; the new World Organization that was founded after the Second World War (UN) had boycott mechanism for implementation of its decisions to maintain international peace and security. However, unlike the League of Nations that had a decentralized mechanism to decide on the boycott and allowed states to decide for them whether or not to implement boycott, Charter of the United Nations empowered Security Council to deal with the implementation of boycott and member states have an obligation to do the acts. Chapter V of the UN Charter enumerates the functions and powers of the Security Council. Article 24 (1) of the Charter states: "In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations its members leave the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security to the Security Council, and agree that the Security Council act on their behalf in carrying out the tasks entrusted by virtue of this responsibility."

Under Chapter VII of the Charter, the Security Council may adopt compulsory and obligatory measures to maintain or restore international peace and security. These measures include both economic and non-economic boycotts without the use of armed force as well as international

A Review on Boycott Legal System and ...

armed measures. In fact, Chapter VII, consisting of Articles 39 to 51 of the Charter, in comparison with the League of Nations, grants much more legal authority to the Security Council. Articles 39 and 41 are the essential principles governing the imposition of boycotts. Article 39 states :

"The Security Council retains the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and makes recommendations, or decides by what measures the international peace and security should be maintained or restored in accordance with Articles 41 and 42."

Article 41 enumerates unarmed mandatory measures that can be applied by the Security Council in dealing with threats to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression. According to this article :

"The Security Council may decide that for the Council decisions implementation, what measures are necessary that do not involve the use of armed force and it can ask the members of the United Nations to endeavor such actions. These actions may include complete or half-complete severance of economic ties, railway, waterway, airway, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations."

When the Security Council establishes the situation of aggression, threat to peace or breach of the peace, in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter it may impose the obligatory boycotts. A range of boycotts is available to the United Nations. If a state is indifferent to the UN Security Council decision, all members of the UN have legal commitment to implement the measures adopted by the Security Council. The legal commitment is derived from Article 25, 103 and 2 (5) of the Charter. Article 25 states: "Members of the United Nations agree to accept and implement the decisions of the Security Council under the present Charter."

Article 103 also requires Member States to give priority to the obligations of the UN Charter. "If there is a conflict between the obligations of members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter will be prior". This means that countries cannot apply their previous obligations as a justification for failure to perform Security Council ratifications. Paragraph 5 of Article 2 of the Charter asks the States to avoid helping countries that are under the measures of Article 41 and 42. "All members will give all types of assistance to the organization in any action that it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and they will refrain from assisting any country against which the United Nations imposes preventive or enforcement measures."

Regional organizations, in accordance with Article 52 of the Charter, have authorities for maintaining international peace and security. "None of the provisions of the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for issues related to the maintenance of international peace and security, which is proportional to the regional measures, provided that these arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of UN ."

During the Cold War, the Security Council imposed only two boycotts, which were the boycott against the government of John Smith in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and the boycott against the apartheid state in South Africa whose racist policies have been widely condemned .

In response to a unilateral declaration of Rhodesia independence from Britain in 1965, the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter imposed limited economic boycotts in 1966 for the first time in the history of the UN. The Security Council subsequently made its positions tougher against Rhodesia's white minority State through a ban on all exports and imports (with the exception of some food products, education materials and medicines), and in 1968 these boycotts became "immersive ."

Security Council boycott against South Africa began in 1963. At that time, the Security Council "strongly condemned South Africa's policy in committing racial segregation as an act contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations", and stated that "the South African situation has seriously put the international peace and security at risk."

Boycotts against Rhodesia and South Africa suggest that how the Security Council viewed the internal politics of a state as a threat to international peace and security, and consequently it has justified its measures in performing Chapter 7 of the Charter .

The end of the Cold War paved the way for the better use of available tools in Chapter 7 of the Charter for the permanent members of the Security Council. This new action was revealed well in the sharp increase of resolution issuance by the Security Council. Council issued only 683 Resolutions in its first 45 years of activity, whereas in the past 21 years to the end of 2011 this figure totaled over 1320 resolutions that were also associated with the increase in dispatch of peacekeeping and humanitarian operations missions. This trend has also led to greater use of binding economic boycotts by the Council. Use of the boycott tool was so expanded that two of outstanding scholars in international affairs, David Kurt Wright and George Lopez, have named 1990s as the "decade of boycott."

From 1990 to late 2011, the Security Council applied expanded boycotts against Iraq, the former Yugoslavia, Libya, Liberia, Somalia, Cambodia (Khmer Rouge), Haiti, Angola, Rwanda, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, Iran, Libya (2011) and the Taliban (2011).

The purpose of using binding boycotts has been announced as to impose pressure on a government or a non-governmental actor to force them to comply with the objectives of the Security Council without the use of military force. UN officials insist that economic boycotts are not punitive measures, but rather they are counted as measures of persuasion to adjust the behavior of those who are boycotted. Former UN Secretary General, Boutros-Ghali, believed that "the purpose of boycott is to modify the behavior of a party who has put international peace and security in jeopardy, not punishment or revenge." The current UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, also commented:

"Experience has shown that boycotts act as a means to encourage better performance rather than a way to punish. Being accompanied by sticks, boycott must have carrots too. They should not be only threat, but also be incentives for law obedience and observation. Those who are boycotted must know what things to do. Their complete or incomplete obedience must be associated with the reciprocal steps by the Council, such as to reduce or to cancel the boycotts."

The new model of using boycotts is significant not only because of the increased number, but also due to the variety of purposes of the Security Council to impose them. Security Council has applied boycott for alleged targets such as repelling aggression, democracy creation, condemnations of human rights violations, and punishment of regimes that give refuge to the terrorists and other groups that have been involved in international crimes. While the former boycotts have been used only against the States, Council in recent years has also moved to impose boycott against non-state actors, such as the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

Management and monitoring of boycotts

In order to ensure the implementation of boycotts by Member States, the Security Council has put more responsibility for the management and supervision of boycotts implementation on the Secretary General of UN and a range of dependent institutions. Article 29 of the Charter states: "the Security Council can establish any sub pillar that deems necessary for the performance of their duties". More authority for the establishment of subsidiary bodies can be inferred from Clause 28 of the Security Council's provisional agenda that says :

The Security Council may appoint a commission, committee or a reporter for a particular subject. Security Council established a number of subsidiary bodies to facilitate the implementation of boycotts, including boycott committees, disarmament commissions and commissions of inquiry, group of experts, and regulatory mechanisms.

A) Boycott Committees

Boycott committees are the most common type of subsidiary bodies that have been created to facilitate the management, monitoring and enforcement of boycotts. Boycott committees will be

A Review on Boycott Legal System and ...

consisting of one representative from each of Security Council Members and its president will rotate annually among the members. The chairman and two vice-chairs of the committee are elected at the beginning of each year.

Each of boycott committees has different functions. However, typically, the boycott committees are eligible for the following tasks :

-Reporting to the Council on the implementation of boycotts or their violation by the boycotted country or other member states

-Management of franchises

-Monitoring the boycotts

-Improving the enforcement of boycotts

-Management of lists in targeted boycotts

-The humanitarian impact of boycotts

For example, the 1737 Boycott Committee monitors and reports the boycott on Iran, including the implementation of the measures contained in resolutions (2006) 1737,(2007) 1747,(2009) 1803 and (2010) 1929. The committee is also tasked to review and take action in relation to information about possible cases of the above resolutions violations, to determine more individuals and entities, and to provide recommendations for strengthen the enforcement of measures.

B) Expert panel

Security Council will also typically form a panel of experts to support boycott committees. The task of these panels is the evaluation, documentary and impartially analysis, and presenting recommendations to improve the implementation of boycotts. Now expert groups of UN boycotts have been formed on Ivory Coast, Liberia, North Korea, Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia / Eritrea, Sudan, Iran and al Qaeda / Taliban. Members of the expert group are appointed by the Secretary-General in consultation with the relevant boycott committees.

Types of Boycotts

UN boycotts are included a vast range of measures from economic boycotts to diplomatic relations severance as written in Article 41 of the Charter. A summary categorization of boycotts types are presented as following:

A) Economic Boycotts

Economic boycotts are the most common type of boycotts. There are two main types of economic boycotts .

a): **Commercial boycotts:** commercial boycotts limit the imports to the boycotted country and the exports of that country. This limitation may be comprehensive, such as boycott on Iraq or it may be selective that limits only some specific commodities. Comprehensive boycotts against Iraq in August and September 1990 were applied to force it to withdraw from Kuwait. The comprehensive boycott against the country was imposed once again in April 1992 for the implementation of Security Council Resolution 687 after Desert Storm Operation. The comprehensive boycotts were also applied against Yugoslavia (1991-1996) and Serbia and Montenegro (1992-1996) and Haiti (1993).

b) **Financial Boycotts:** Financial boycotts have a close relationship with economic boycotts, but they focus on the prohibition of monetary flow and funds into or out of the boycotted country. Financial boycotts, as investigated in the Interlaken process, can be including freezing the assets of the state, restricting the access to financial markets, credit and loan constraints, limiting international financial exchange, and restricting the sale and trade outside the country. Financial boycotts are part of all UN boycotts against the targeted countries.

B) Non-economic boycotts

A) **Travel boycotts:** Travel boycotts can include the boycotts against the travel of some individuals or groups, and it may include a special type of transport. Travel boycotts are measures that seek to prohibit or deter the individuals associated with the boycott purpose from international travel. Travel boycott has been imposed against certain individuals, such as travel bans against troops of Sierra Leone in 1998, as well as travel boycott against nongovernmental

groups such as the leaders of National Unity for the Alliance of Angola in 1997. The UN Security Council, in the boycott against Rhodesia, issued travel ban for all citizens of the country. Particular kind of air travel ban including any aircraft landing or flying by the Taliban was imposed in 1999, through Resolution 1267 of the Security Council against the Taliban.

B) Air Boycotts: Air boycotts include a ban on flights to and from the target country or limitation of the boycotted country ability to use internal flights within the zone of influence. This type of boycott has been applied against Iraq, Libya and Haiti .

C) Military boycotts: Military boycotts may include arms embargoes, termination of military or training assistance, as well as the boycott against weapons of mass destruction. Almost all UN boycotts include a ban on arms. The Security Council also has adopted particular measures against the weapons of mass destruction of the target countries .

D) Diplomatic boycotts: Diplomatic boycotts directly target the country's officials. Diplomats and political leaders may not receive visas and banned from participating in international organizations.

Other steps towards diplomatic isolation include calling diplomatic cadres and international organizations from the country that is under boycott. Security Council has used diplomatic boycotts against Libya, Sudan, Southern Rhodesia, the former Yugoslavia, Uinta and Afghanistan / Taliban / Al Qaeda .

E) International criminal proceedings: In 1993, the Security Council under Article 41 of the Charter formed the International Criminal Court to prosecute individuals responsible for war crimes in Yugoslavia. Subsequently, in 1994, another trial was set up to try judicially those accused of genocide in Rwanda .

Since the formation of these trials was conducted in the framework of Article 41 of the Charter, they can be considered as a form of boycott, although the term boycott is not used for them.

Boycott Restrictions

The most significant impact of international law, in particular human rights and humanitarian law on the boycotts is to make restrictions in imposing the boycotts (Bossuyt, 2000: 7). Therefore, as it was mentioned in the introduction, the Security Council measures have legal restrictions based upon the UN Charter or the sources outside the Charter, such as the common law and public international law, which are presented as follows:

Boycott and the United Nations Charter

A) The constraints arising from Article 39 of the Charter: Article 39 of the UN Charter allows the Security Council to apply Article 41 of the Charter to "maintain or restore international peace and security" only in the case of establishing "threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression". As a result, the boycotts can only be applied against a government when the state or non-state actors are able to threaten international peace and security or they are threatening the international peace and security.

In addition, the "threat" should not be established based on the hidden political motives. For boycott imposition, there must be real and serious threat against international peace and security and the incentives to apply it should not be political and domestic considerations of one or a group of states. Unfortunately, in practice, the Security Council members establish the existence of threat based on their own interests and foreign policy priorities .

In the international debates, different opinions have been expressed about whether the Security Council authorities can be restricted under Article 39 of the Charter to establish the threat. Some believe that the Security Council has limited powers to establish a threat to peace. While others believe that the Security Council has full authority to evaluate on the basis of Article 39, and judicial review is not possible.

B) The limitations resulting from Article 24: Article 24 of the Charter asks the Security Council to "act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations". As a

A Review on Boycott Legal System and ...

result, none of the Security Council actions can be outside the framework of the objectives and principles of the United Nations. Although the cases written in the UN principles and purposes are much expanded, abstract and subject to various interpretations, some scholars of international law have defined the purposes and principles into concrete and practical terms that can be restrictive in practice for Security Council action. For example, the Security Council cannot ignore the autonomy right or ought to respect fundamental human rights and do their responsibilities with good intention.

C) The restrictions arising from Article 1 of the Charter: Section A of Article I of the Charter necessitates that boycott or other appropriate measures adopted by the Council to maintain international peace and security shall be based on the principles of justice and international law. Therefore, boycotts should be assessed to be neither unfair, nor international law breaching.

Second paragraph of Article I of the Charter requires that the Security Council boycott or any other actions be based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. Third paragraph of Article I emphasizes the international cooperation in solving international problems and to promote and encourage respect for human rights .

These principles limit the scope of the Security Council measures regarding boycott. Therefore, Security Council cannot ignore the interference of human rights in its boycotts regime and it must always consider the human rights of people of countries under boycott .

Restrictions under Article 55: Article 55 of the UN Charter emphasizes human rights restrictions written in paragraph 3 of article I that says UN should promote the following:

A) Giving promotion to standards of living, providing employment to achieve progress and development conditions of economic and social system ;

B) Solving international economic, social, health and related issues and international cultural and educational cooperation ;

C) Universal and influential respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, gender, language or religion

Therefore, UN boycotts that have brought down the level of economic life, created health problems and disrupted human rights violate Article 55 of the Charter as well.

Operational issues of boycotts

The veto issue and Inequalities: under the title of veto right, a special privilege is given to the five permanent members of the Security Council among the present 193 members of UN and in fact, it is the biggest problem in the decision making process, in Security Council, particularly its decisions on boycotts.

Subject of veto in San Francisco conference led to large discussions and negotiations. In addition, the prerogative that is inconsistent with equality of states sovereignty is objected to a number of countries .

Australia Foreign Minister, Herbert Iowat, who participated in the San Francisco conference, has stated: "Proposal Council is a clear indication for considering the sole benefit of big powers... and intends to guarantee the prerogatives for which these powers know themselves deserved due to their involvement in World War II win.

Finally, the tremendous power and prerogatives of the Security Council adopted despite some oppositions. According to one Canadian publication, "in San Francisco conference, everyone was doing his/her job. Smaller nations voiced their ultimate protest; despite the great powers take their prerogatives". According to the New York Times at that time, "most countries reluctantly accepted the idea of a global dictatorship by major powers". Veto is designed as a safety valve to protect the fundamental interests of the great powers and not as a tool to achieve the ideal solution .

In the framework of UN boycotts, equality of countries requires that in the similar terms and conditions, equal boycotts be imposed against the governments without applying any political considerations.

However, up to now, the Council performance has illustrated a quite different and selective situation that is a function of double standards !

Article II of the UN Charter states that United Nations is based on the principle of sovereignty equality of all its members". However, in practice, the equality idea has been altered intensity with Articles 23 and 27 of the Charter.

Members of the UN have always pointed out the problem of inequality in the process of Security Council decision making, in particular, making decisions regarding boycotts .

The imbalanced presence of countries in the principal organs of the United Nations such as the Security Council represents another aspect of inequality in United Nations. The Security Council consists of 15 members including 5 permanent members and 10 other members elected by the General Assembly. Three of five countries that have veto right are from Western countries. The composition of the council members and imbalances in the distribution of legal powers between the members have negative impact on the boycott regimes of Security Council and is one of the major problems associated with boycotts.

Structural failure of the Security Council that is veto right is the main obstacle in real reform of boycott issue. Veto is an underlying basis by which the UN has been founded, and it has caused the frustration of all international efforts to reform the United Nations structure. Because the permanent members of the Security Council can veto any effort to create normative restrictions regard to their power imposition under Chapter VII of the Charter. Former UN Secretary General Boutros-Ghali in his memoir about Security Council boycotts against Libya in 1993 writes :

"As the UN Secretary-General I was obliged to implement Security Council resolutions, but as an old student of international law I was sorry for this situation. Because it would lead to international law invalidation, and it would show the United Nations not as equal sovereignty organization but as a political tool of the great powers"³ .

The lack of transparency in the decision making process regarding boycott

In the context of decision making regarding UN boycott, concerns have been expressed about the lack of transparency in the mechanisms of boycott. Issues concerning the exchange of information and lack of transparency in boycott regimes have been studied during three multilateral processes (which was mentioned in the introduction).

Although the Security Council's responsibility is to establish a situation as a threat to peace or breach of peace for imposing boycott and implementing it, the responsibility for the daily implementation of boycotts is delegated to boycott committee, which acts as a subsidiary organ of the Security Council. Most of the activities of the boycott committee are taken place in informal advisory meetings behind closed doors and without agenda.

Boycott Committees decisions rarely contain explanations or justifications of the reasons for making the decision and in many cases even the relevant parties are not notified of the adoption of the boycott. There have been several cases where people under boycott ho are placed on the boycott list by the Boycott Committee have achieved their information from unofficial sources. Countries that are not members of Boycott Committee, including individuals or governments under the boycott have no way to evaluate guideline principals of Boycott Committee decisions. This has led to describe decision-making process in these committees as being political that sometimes surprises the observers.

In the early days of the Security Council activity, it was common that the members of the Security Council were discussing in an open and public meetings. Over time, the Security Council preferred to hold its substantive sessions in private. Consultation between members of the Security Council became a private and interior affair that is not officially registered and attending the meetings is strictly controlled.

According to the fact that decisions of the Security Council under Chapter 7 of the Charter have deep and wide effects on the members of the United Nations, and the mentioned decisions based on Article 25 of the Charter are considered as the obligations of all states, all members

A Review on Boycott Legal System and ...

have the right to expect that the majority of councils or negotiations be held in open session, or the negotiations agenda be available to all⁴.

The process of deciding on boycott committees of the Security Council lacks the necessary transparency. These committees tend to hold meetings behind closed doors and have no record of the proceedings to the public.

Recognizing this, the Chairperson of the Security Council in March 1995 issued a memorandum with the goal of increasing the transparency. Following the memorandum, other proposals were presented in 1999. In 2006, "Informal Working Group of Security Council proposed specific measures on General Issues of Boycotts" to increase the transparency of the boycott committees³.

This working group reported: "information exchange increase in the process of boycotts has increased the transparency and will contribute to better implementation of the boycott measures. In addition, presenting more information to people of the countries under boycott about the scope and purposes of the boycotts will reduce their vulnerability against the advertising contrary to boycotts⁵.

Legal restrictions of boycott imposing

Applying any rule in law and particularly, in international law must be based on legal principles and rules. These rules are based on general principles of law and imperious principles of law in international law system⁴. UN Security Council that is a formal and well-known international organization in the international system has the responsibility for boycott imposing.

The role of boycotts in changing the behavior of governments

United Nations and especially the Security Council is one of the major pillars of the organization that is responsible for ensuring international peace and security. When it diagnoses a situation as a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, it may adopt maneuvers, including multiple economic and political penalties against the targeted country or countries, in order to prevent the continuation of the policies and practices of the country or countries by imposing pressure that ultimately aims to reduce the coefficient of resorting to force and military action. In this regard, Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, including Article 40, asks the parties to take or leave some concrete measures to provide conditions for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. Resorting to this Article may cause the Security Council entrance to the domain of imposing heavier political and economic penalties in the framework of Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. During the Cold War, the Security Council imposed only two boycotts against governments. The first case was in 1966 against Southern Rhodesia and the other in 1977 against the apartheid regime in South Africa³. At the end of the Cold War, the Security Council following the Iraq invasion of Kuwait and the commencement of Persian Gulf War, widely approved the boycotts against Iraq that continued 12 years and left an abundance of effects. However, it should be noted that Iraq is still under the boycott of Security Council resolutions. After Iraq, the Security Council has imposed several boycotts against countries, individuals and groups, including Liberia (2003), Democratic Republic of the Congo (2004), terrorist groups and non-state actors (2004), Ivory Coast (2004), Sudan (2004), suspects in Hariri murder (2005), People's Democratic Republic of Korea (2006) and Iran (2006)⁶.

Boycotts are usually imposed in two forms of bilateral and multilateral (international) by governments against rival or enemy countries, through which the boycotter government or governments achieve their political goals. The purpose of boycott imposing, particularly multilateral boycotts in the international arena, is to provide the context for making the inappropriate behavior subject to change through national and international isolation of the target country, the government, individuals or groups. In domestic domain, the boycotts are to put different parts of the society under pressure and stimulation to provide the context for changing the behavior of the related government. In the international domain, boycotts

enactment may bring about the political and economic isolation of the target government, individuals and groups, and question their international legitimacy and challenge them.

Now, with regard to the problems and challenges facing boycotts from many years ago, such as extensive and repeated violations of boycotts by some countries to meet strategic goals; repeated pressure imposition on different and vulnerable parts of the target country, and the further trend of UN Security Council to impose more boycotts on countries caused the Security Council to conduct reviews on this international instrument. Smart and targeted boycotts are the result of the reviews on the issue of boycott by the Security Council. New boycotts as put pressure on domestic authorities and decision-makers through a travel ban, freezing bank accounts of authorities and decision makers, threatening to impose further penalties, as well as creating principals for penal prosecution of decision makers in the context of special courts and the International Criminal Court, do not have the effects of the previous boycotts. They are applied for cases and against the major decision-makers. However, speaking about the positive and negative effects of new boycotts takes time and revealing their efficiency and success in the achieving goals of boycott⁶.

REFERENCES

1. Valizadeh, A. (2011). Approaches and theories of the effectiveness of boycott in International Political Economy, *Journal of Politics, Journal of the Faculty of Law and Political Science*; 41(1): 349-365.
2. Zahrani, M. (1997). Economic boycott from theory to practice, *Foreign Policy Magazine*; 9(1).
3. Zahrani, M. & Dolatkhah, Z. (2010). Comparison of boycott against Iran and North Korea at the UN Security Council; 55(9): 140-170.
4. Farokh Seiri, M. (2008). Legal restrictions of the Security Council in imposing economic boycotts, *the International Law Journal, the magazine of the Centre for International Legal Affairs, Vice President for Legal and Parliamentary Affairs*; 25(9) : 58-67.
5. Mertus, Julie A. (2009). *The UN and Human Rights: A guide for a new era*, Routledge, 2 Edition.
6. Zarif ,M. J. & Sadjadpour, M. K. (2008). *Multilateral Diplomacy: Theory and practice of regional and international organizations*, Tehran (order of) Collage of International Relations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; 2.