

Economic Terrorism from the Perspective of International Law

Yousof Hamzakhani¹, Peyman. Bolouri^{1*}, Mehdi. Khoshkhati²

¹ Department of Law, Za.C., Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

² Department of International Relation, Za.C., Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Boloori.pe@iau.ac.ir

Received: 2026-02-01

Revised: 2026-06-20

Accepted: 2026-06-27

Initial Publish: 2026-07-18

Final Publish: 2026-07-20

The use of sanctions as a familiar concept in the literature of law and international relations within the foreign policies of states is not a new phenomenon. Since at least the period following the First World War, sanctions have been employed as a powerful instrument of state foreign policy. The purpose of economic sanctions is to exert pressure on a country or its governing authority in order to compel compliance with a particular behavior or course of action. Unilateral sanctions imposed illegitimately by one state against another may, under certain circumstances, be regarded as economic terrorism. This emerging form of terrorism can be defined as “a comprehensive, extensive, or organized unlawful and illegitimate economic sanction that poses a threat to human life, causes pain and suffering, fear and intimidation, or violates the fundamental rights of individuals, with the objective of compelling a state or an international organization to perform or refrain from performing a particular act.” This article seeks, through an examination of the consequences and implications of unilateral United States sanctions against Iran, to investigate whether economic sanctions may be considered a form of economic terrorism from the perspective of international law. Based on the findings of this descriptive-analytical study, economic sanctions that are implemented on a widespread or organized scale, endanger the lives and health of civilians, and generate fear and intimidation may be classified as economic terrorism. Accordingly, it is necessary for the crime of economic terrorism to be defined as an international crime, giving rise both to individual criminal responsibility for the person or persons responsible and to the international responsibility of the state concerned.

Keywords: *Economic Sanctions; International Human Rights Law; Economic Terrorism; Iran; United States.*

How to cite this article:

Hamzakhani, Y., Bolouri, P., & Khoshkhati, M. (2026). Economic Terrorism from the Perspective of International Law. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics*, 5(5), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.503>

1. Introduction

The use of sanctions, as a familiar term in the literature of law and international relations and as an auxiliary instrument to military force, has been part of diplomatic skills for centuries. Moreover, at least since the First World War, sanctions have emerged as a powerful instrument in the foreign policy of states (Heydar Gholizadeh et al., 2025).

One of the characteristics of contemporary history is the emergence of the United States as a country highly

inclined to impose sanctions on target states in pursuit of its foreign policy objectives.

On May 8, 2018, the United States withdrew from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Subsequently, the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the U.S. Department of the Treasury announced that the sanctions that had been suspended or whose implementation had been halted under the JCPOA would be reimposed in two stages, within 90-day and 180-day periods (Ali Daei Ahmadi & Bazar, 2020).



From the beginning of the twenty-first century to the present, the debate over “economic sanctions” and their legality or illegality has become a current issue, and the subject of “sanctions” has become one of the most controversial topics in international law. The U.S. government has constantly attempted, through various methods, to compel other nations to comply with its political agenda. To achieve this objective, it has sometimes used overtly violent methods, such as war, and at other times apparently soft methods, such as sanctions. The measures adopted by the U.S. government against the Iranian people in different periods indicate that American fundamentalism is far more dangerous than ISIS or any other terrorist group (Nezhendi Manesh, 2020).

The United States has always sought, sometimes individually, sometimes by compelling other countries to impose sanctions, and sometimes through inducement and threats to create a global consensus in the Security Council against the Iranian people, to place the Iranian people under hardship and pressure, or more precisely, under suffering and distress, and thereby pursue the implementation of its policies. Violation of human rights or fundamental rules of international law is among the red lines whose transgression through sanctions undermines the legal validity of sanctions and may even transform the effects of resorting to sanctions into an instance of committing an international wrongful act or realizing an international crime, for example, as a crime against humanity (Zamani, 2016).

However, the present study raises the fundamental question of whether the U.S. economic sanctions against the Iranian people should be regarded merely as an act under international law and as a right of the U.S. government, or whether they constitute an act contrary to international law, reaching the threshold of economic terrorism.

Accordingly, the author first attempts to identify the conceptual diversity of terrorism (2), then addresses the diversity of terrorism based on terrorist instruments (3). After that, a brief overview is provided of sanctions as punishment against states or nations (4). Then, the definition of economic terrorism and an analysis of its elements are presented (5). Finally, the conclusion is provided (6).

2. The Conceptual Diversity of Terrorism

The term terrorism, which entered Persian through French, derives from the Latin root *terror*, meaning “the feeling of fear.” Lexically, it means “creating fear and terror among people” or “intimidating others” (Elliott & Reginald, 1999). In the Oxford Dictionary, terrorism is defined as increasing terror, or a person or thing that produces increasing terror (Aghabakhshi, 2005).

Terrorism is one of the ambiguous terms in the international arena, and due to the complexity of its concept and instances, it faces a kind of “crisis of meaning” in terms of definition and the delimitation of its scope (Kadkhodaei & Saed, 2011).

The definitions provided for terrorism are diverse and numerous. In one study conducted in this regard, more than one hundred different definitions of this term were presented (Schmid, 1983). This semantic dispersion has reached such an extent that some have considered the possibility of reaching a single definition of terrorism to be zero (Naji Rad, 2008). When terrorism is discussed, two fundamental paradigms are generally applied. One paradigm regards terrorism as a type of military warfare, while the other considers it as a crime. In both paradigms, terrorism is regarded as an evil that requires a serious response from states. Although several conventions and international instruments concerning terrorism have been drafted, no definition has yet been universally accepted at the international level. Therefore, within the current legal framework, reaching a single definition of terrorism is difficult. For this reason, efforts are mostly made to take the common element of the existing definitions as the basis of discussion. What may be regarded as common to all definitions is that a terrorist act is generally committed with the aim of “creating fear, terror, and coercion” within society, and even involves the indiscriminate killing of innocent people with a non-personal motive (Nezhendi Manesh, 2019).

Another point concerning terrorism is fundamentalism and extremism. Extremism is one manifestation of fundamentalism; however, extremism possesses a dimension beyond fundamentalism that distinguishes it from fundamentalism. That dimension is violence. Extremists are those individuals or groups who generally resort to violence in order to impose their beliefs, ideology, or moral values on others. When

fundamentalism is accompanied by violence, it can constitute a terrorist act (Mohammadi, 2017).

Permanent and sustainable peace is regarded as an absolute necessity and one of the principal needs of individuals in society, such that without peace and stability, welfare, comfort, tranquility, growth, and human development can never be achieved in society. However, resorting to violence and creating terror in order to establish peace cannot be justified. The same applies to war or the use of violence to promote democracy.

3. The Diversity of Terrorism Based on Terrorist Instruments

Despite its inhuman nature, terrorism is a dynamic phenomenon. It is true that terrorists act immorally, brutally, and anti-humanly, but it must be acknowledged that they have always sought to use the latest achievements of human science to attain their objectives. Yesterday's terrorism is recognized through instruments that are now outdated. Although these instruments remain frightening, they do not possess significant destructive power. The use of a dagger, although still capable of creating fear, does not create much concern for today's political systems compared with advanced explosive weapons. The role of technology in terrorist acts is undeniable.

Although the nature of terrorist acts is unified and the objective of all of them is to create fear and terror in order to achieve specific goals, their modern forms or new types differ from one another according to the type of instrument or method they employ to create fear and terror (Kadkhodaei & Saed, 2011).

Terrorists use various instruments to create fear and terror among people. The study of terrorists' methods and instruments in different periods reveals the transformation and dynamism of these methods and instruments. Terrorist tactics have various forms: at one time, the individual assassination of important political, social, or religious figures was one of the most important methods of terrorists. Later, bombings in public places, hostage-taking, disruption of aviation security, and aircraft hijacking were witnessed (Nezhendi Manesh, 2019). In more advanced forms, nuclear and radiological terrorism, chemical terrorism, microbial and biological terrorism, cyberterrorism, and terrorism using advanced weapons and technologies have emerged. In

any case, violence, the creation of fear and terror, and political motivation are considered the common characteristics of all terrorist acts (Zamani et al., 2016). In other words, the instrument may vary according to time, place, and even the type of actor. Moreover, "this feeling of fear and terror may arise from anything," including economic sanctions (Savari, 2003). In the past, terrorism was understood only within the framework of the use of simple instruments of violence. However, after the Second World War, and under the new conditions that prevailed in the world, especially during the 1960s, this phenomenon entered a new stage through advanced technological instruments and means of communication, a stage known as "new terrorism." Since states are independent and legally equal under international law, no state may exercise its jurisdiction over the territory of another state without its consent (Gharibabadi, 2018). Therefore, the use of armed force against a state may, at least in the eyes of public opinion, constitute a manifest violation of the rule of law and an act of aggression or the crime of aggression. For this reason, states attempt to achieve their objectives by resorting to methods or instruments that either lie in a legal gray zone or regarding which the law has not yet spoken explicitly. The use of economic pressure or economic force is a weapon that powerful and coercive states have sometimes used against other states to achieve their political objectives, and its use has a long history.

Nevertheless, the use of economic force in the form of secondary unilateral sanctions to create fear and terror among people and to encourage them to turn away from their lawful government and political system is a relatively new method, the result of which may be harmful to the territorial integrity or political independence of that country, or may even be inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations Charter. Therefore, the use of sanctions as an unlawful method that creates fear and terror among people, through which the sanctioning actor seeks to compel the state or even the people to perform or refrain from performing a specific act, can constitute a new form of sanctions. In any event, economic sanctions can serve as an instrument for imposing, deepening, and implementing policy.

4. Sanctions: Punishment of States or Nations?

It is clear and evident that the application of coercive measures, due to the unavoidable social relations that exist between the designated targets and innocent parties, causes collateral damage. There is no doubt that human life, whether in the individual or collective sphere, is a combination of coercion and cooperation. Therefore, it is not inaccurate to state that in the sphere of international life, "coercion" is part of the system governing the behavior of actors. For this reason, in every legal system, including international law, coercion is considered a kind of driving force for the implementation of rules or as a sanctioning mechanism. Sanctions are one of the most effective methods for compelling the sanctioned state to comply with the intentions of the international community or the sanctioning state (Ziaei & Mohammadi Motlagh, 2014). The use of sanctions as a foreign policy instrument appears, at first glance, to violate the principles and norms of international law. Modern international law, which, compared with domestic law, remains structurally primitive and young, has authorized its subjects, through mechanisms such as sanctions, to rise against the breach of obligations or the commission of wrongful acts, and in this respect has been able to compensate for the vacuum arising from structural deficiencies. Nevertheless, such authorization is not absolute, and although it may be exercised in multilateral or unilateral forms, it is itself subject to legal methods and frameworks. Violation of human rights or fundamental rules of international law is among the red lines whose transgression through sanctions undermines the legal validity of sanctions (Zamani, 2016).

The term "economic sanctions" is a highly important term in the field of international law (Zamani & Gharibabadi, 2017).

From the beginning of the twenty-first century to the present, as in the previous century, economic sanctions have continued to be regarded as an important foreign policy and as a "deadly weapon" replacing war. "Sanctions" are part of the international diplomacy governing the contemporary world and are imposed by sanctioning states as a non-military instrument to compel the governments of target countries to adopt the desired response (Zamani & Gharibabadi, 2017). The

view that unauthorized unilateral and secondary sanctions are impermissible, unjustifiable, and violate specific principles of international law is neither a new nor a unique view (Zarif & Mirzaei, 1996).

Therefore, even if a state has the right to use sanctions, it cannot use this instrument to harm the life and health of people. Likewise, even when international law authorizes states to use armed force, it subjects such use to certain conditions. Today, an important part of international law concerns the means and methods of warfare, as well as the protection of civilians.

5. Economic Terrorism: Economy as an Instrument for Creating Fear and Terror

For some time, terrorism, in addition to its traditional definition, has also entered the economic sphere and has been referred to as "economic terrorism," similar to what has been imposed on Iran from the Trump era to the present.

"Sanction" is a word intertwined with the name of the United States, and upon hearing this word, the name of this hostile country involuntarily comes to mind (Heydar Gholizadeh et al., 2025).

Economic terrorism can be regarded as a new interpretation of unlawful, illegitimate, continuous, and comprehensive unilateral sanctions against the civilian population. The United States has always displayed creativity in innovation and law-breaking. In the present discussion, the use of economic sanctions against civilians constitutes a new form of terrorism.

5.1. Definition of Economic Terrorism

The Business Dictionary defines sanctions as a set of punitive or restrictive measures that are usually imposed by several countries in a coordinated manner in order to pressure a country to change specific policies (Vakil & Tahsili, 2013).

Amir Saed Vakil defines sanctions as the deliberate withdrawal, or threat of withdrawal, from ordinary commercial or financial relations at the initiative of a state. In his view, the term economic sanctions may be used to refer to those non-military measures that negatively affect the flow of goods, services, or financial assets of a particular state in order to punish it or compel it to adopt specific political objectives (Vakil & Tahsili, 2013).

Undoubtedly, economic sanctions will lead to economic terrorism. Economic terrorism is “any unlawful or illegitimate and comprehensive economic act that causes pain and suffering, fear and terror, or the violation of the fundamental rights of individuals, and is carried out with the motive of intimidating or coercing the civilian population, influencing the policy of a state, or affecting the conduct of a state; in other words, its purpose is to compel a state or an international organization to perform or refrain from performing an act” (Nezhendi Manesh, 2019).

Based on the above definition, economic terrorism goes beyond economic sanctions. However, the present discussion focuses on how economic sanctions can be regarded as economic terrorism. To answer this question, the next section explains the elements of the definition.

5.2. *The Elements of the Definition of Economic Terrorism*

This section examines the elements of the definition.

A. The act must be unlawful or illegitimate.

The legality of an act or policy is assessed by reference to legal texts and practices, whereas legitimacy is fluid and variable and depends, to some extent, on perceptions and outcomes. Legitimacy does not necessarily replace legality; rather, it plays a fundamental role in strengthening and supporting law. In fact, laws, institutions, and legal processes that lack legitimacy will not enjoy significant validity. Legitimacy can reinforce legality and the rules arising from treaties or custom. The legitimacy of a law is weakened by its inability to respond to urgent problems. When laws are limited, obsolete, or harmful to people, legitimacy can be corrective. Legitimacy needs law, and law needs legitimacy; if a law is illegitimate, it will not be respected, while resort to legitimacy must also be based on law in order to prevent opportunism. NATO’s military intervention in Kosovo in 1999 was unlawful under international law, but many viewed it as a legitimate intervention. The U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 was both unlawful and illegitimate, although unilateral efforts were made to legitimize it. The Security Council sanctions against Iraq after the 2003 invasion were lawful, but were regarded by many states as illegitimate (Popovski & Turner, 2008).

Some countries, such as the United States, in order to carry out measures that are technically and legally

unlawful, seek to justify them from the perspective of international legitimacy. These countries, in order to prove their approach, refer to Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter, which describes the threat or use of force as inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations and establishes a general prohibition. Yet, on the other hand, they acknowledge that states, in their practice and by relying on Article 1 of the Charter, including the elimination of threats to peace, have repeatedly resorted to the use of force (Zamani & Gharibabadi, 2017).

There is no doubt that the actions of the U.S. government in imposing sanctions against the Iranian people are, at the very least, unlawful due to the 1955 Treaty of Amity and Security Council Resolution 2231. The International Court of Justice, in its provisional measures order in the case of Iran against the United States concerning the violation of the Treaty of Amity through the imposition of post-JCPOA sanctions, confirmed that sanctions should not be imposed on the importation and purchase of goods required for humanitarian needs, such as medicine, foodstuffs, and medical equipment, because such sanctions cause serious and irreparable harm to the health and lives of individuals (Gharibabadi, 2018). Therefore, unilateral and secondary sanctions are not only unlawful, but also lack the necessary legitimacy. Of course, the prohibition and limitation of unilateral sanctions have never been delegitimized in such a way that certain states could rely on them to prove their practice concerning the legality of unilateral sanctions (Zamani & Gharibabadi, 2017).

B. The act must be dangerous and harmful to the life of people and even to the survival of the lawful state.

Sanctions are an instrument for which various purposes can be envisaged, just as they may be used by different authorities and for different objectives (Farrall, 2007).

In international law, the imposition of sanctions is not subject to an absolute prohibition. Indeed, since sanctions may be used as an alternative to war and military action, they have been welcomed (Kondoch, 2001).

Sanctions are like a double-edged sword: they may be adopted to compel a delinquent state to implement international law, but at the same time, they may have severe negative consequences for the fundamental human rights of individuals. The effects of economic sanctions on the human rights of individuals cannot be

ignored, because sanctions, by disrupting the economic fabric of society, undermine the capacity of citizens to have a normal and ordinary life. Beyond that, by restricting access to medicine, treatment, and other humanitarian needs, sanctions may cause physical and psychological harm to civilians. For instance, the post-JCPOA U.S. sanctions against Iran, on the one hand, caused a decrease in the value of the rial, an inflationary surge, and economic disorder, thereby depriving people of the ability to have a normal and ordinary life (Zakerhossein, 2021).

On the other hand, by reducing access to medicine and medical services, these sanctions have harmed the health of the Iranian people. One example is the bitter account of the death of "Ava," a young girl suffering from EB, or epidermolysis bullosa, known as butterfly disease, which drew the attention of Kelly Craft, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Human Rights Watch, in its report on the adverse effects of U.S. sanctions against Iran, stated that certain therapeutic and medical equipment, such as equipped ambulances, special masks, and sterilization equipment, were among the sanctioned goods and items (Zakerhossein, 2021). It should be noted that in economic terrorism, unlike other types of terrorism, everyone is a target and no one is safe. Iran has long been a victim of U.S. unilateral sanctions. These organized sanctions are not merely directed against the Iranian state; rather, they have also targeted Iranians. Sanctions are part of the United States' grand strategy to compel ordinary Iranian people to demand and request a change in the behavior of their statesmen (Zakerhossein, 2021). In this path, according to U.S. officials themselves, the most painful sanctions, as well as the largest sanctions in U.S. history against its enemies, have been employed (Zakerhossein, 2021). The imposition and implementation of these sanctions have been pursued within the framework of the United States' broader strategy to change the behavior of the Iranian government (Zakerhossein, 2021). The policy of the U.S. government in imposing broad and organized sanctions against the Iranian people has been openly declared. U.S. officials have officially unveiled the "maximum pressure policy." This policy does not merely target the Iranian state; ordinary people are also targeted. Human Rights Watch, in its report on the U.S. maximum pressure policy against Iran, stated that U.S. sanctions and its maximum pressure policy against Iran constitute collective

punishment and violate the human rights of Iranians (Zakerhossein, 2021). This is not conjecture or mere allegation; rather, senior U.S. officials have also explicitly confirmed the universal scope of the maximum pressure policy and its targeting of the Iranian people (Zakerhossein, 2021). In fact, the apparent primary target of the sanctions may have been the Iranian state, not the people as civilians. However, their destructive effects are tangibly observable in the daily lives of ordinary people, to the extent that the civilian population of Iran can be regarded as their primary target (Ali Daei Ahmadi & Bazar, 2020). For instance, in an interview in February 2019, the former U.S. Secretary of State, referring to the fact that conditions would become worse and harder for Iranians due to sanctions, stated that the United States believed that such hardship would cause Iranians to rise up and compel their government to change its behavior (Zakerhossein, 2021). Elsewhere, U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo emphasized that if Iran wanted its people to eat, it had to listen to the United States.

Therefore, the policy of the U.S. government is to pressure the Iranian people, whether with the aim of inciting and encouraging them to revolt against the government or as punishment for their support and inaction.

The effects of comprehensive economic sanctions may be gradual, but they can be more dangerous than terrorist acts. The sound of an explosion may not be heard, but one cannot ignore the cries of patients suffering in pain, or the suffering of individuals who lose their loved ones due to lack of access to medicine or as a result of unsafe aviation. On this basis, the International Court of Justice has held that the importation of goods essential for humanitarian needs and international aviation safety must not be disregarded, even under the pretext of national security interests (Nezhendi Manesh, 2019).

C. The act must be committed with the purpose of intimidating people and compelling a state or an international organization to perform or refrain from performing an act.

It is true that the nature of terrorist acts is unified and that the objective of all of them is violence, creating fear and terror, seriously disrupting public order and security, and endangering the lives and health of citizens, namely civilians (Abdollahi, 2009). However, this issue must also be examined from the perspective of effect.

Because of the different practical effects of economic sanctions and traditional violent terrorist acts, policymakers have different attitudes toward these two issues. Economic sanctions may not initially appear as violent as traditional terrorist acts, but in terms of effect, they can go beyond traditional terrorist acts. The effects of comprehensive economic sanctions can be gradual, yet more dangerous than those of terrorist acts, because in economic terrorism, unlike other forms of terrorism, everyone is a target and no one is safe. On the other hand, the effects of economic sanctions are so extensive that there are few human rights that are not exposed to the risk of violation as a result of their imposition (Gharibabadi, 2018).

Moreover, economic sanctions can produce effects comparable to, and even broader and more lasting than, the destructive effects of military measures. Under such circumstances, the civilian population, in order to enjoy its human rights, must be protected from the destructive effects of sanctions as much as possible, just as in times of war. There is no reason why civilians, especially more vulnerable groups, should not enjoy at least the same protections recognized for them during armed conflicts (Montaz, 2008).

The former United Nations Special Rapporteur on the negative impact of sanctions on human rights once declared that citizens of sanctioned societies should be covered by the protections provided under the four Geneva Conventions (Montaz, 2008). On this basis, the Government of the United States has attempted, through the “continuous use of economic force” or “continuous economic sanctions,” to compel the Iranian people and even the Iranian state to behave in a manner desired by the United States. This is contrary to international law, international humanitarian law, the United Nations Charter, and the principles governing peaceful relations among states (Gharibabadi, 2018). Judge Koroma, former Vice-President of the International Court of Justice from 1994 to 2012, stated at the International Symposium on Unilateral Sanctions and International Law that this type of sanctions is completely contrary to international law. In his view, unilateral sanctions are inconsistent with international law and therefore constitute a challenge to the international legal order affirmed in the United Nations Charter (Marossi & Bassett, 2015). Therefore, economic sanctions can be regarded as a form of economic terrorism.

6. Conclusion

Illegal factors and phenomena are highly diverse and multiple. Some of them endanger individual rights, some endanger collective rights, and a limited number of them, in addition to threatening a considerable number of individual and collective rights, also endanger peace and security, which are the foundations of a legal system, and consequently threaten the existence of any legal order. “Terrorism” possesses such a characteristic. Terrorists, by seriously disrupting public order and security and creating fear and terror, seek to depict society as insecure and to pressure the government in order to achieve their political and ideological interests. Terrorism is not a new phenomenon. The history of nations testifies to the claim that exploiting an atmosphere of fear and terror resulting from terror has always been part of the inhuman and relatively effective mechanisms used by human beings in previous eras.

The use of sanctions, although not in itself considered unlawful, cannot be justified when used comprehensively against the life and health of the people of a country in such a way that it can produce effects broader and deeper than several explosions. A state may use sanctions only to the extent that this does not undermine its other obligations under international law. In the modern international order and system based on the doctrines of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Security Council is the only authority competent to impose economic sanctions against states, groups, and individuals. The basis of this authority is Article 41 of the Charter. According to this article, sanctions are among the legitimate instruments of the Security Council for maintaining international peace and security. From this perspective, “unilateral sanctions” have been regarded as a departure from the established international system and a disruption of its existing order (Zakerhossein, 2021).

Unilateral sanctions are mostly imposed and implemented with the aim of changing the behavior and policy of another state. This is while states, due to sovereign equality, lack the right and authority to change the domestic policies and practices of other states, which fall within their sovereign affairs and internal matters, through coercive measures such as sanctions.

The illegitimate and unlawful use by the United States of comprehensive economic sanctions has undoubtedly

had, among other things, a highly negative impact on the Iranian people's right to life, their right to health and medical care, their right to development, and their right to work. These negative effects have caused a kind of fear and terror among the people. A traditional terrorist act, such as an explosion, can also have such effects. Sometimes, the effect of a terrorist attack in the narrow sense affects only part of the population of a neighborhood, whereas continuous and comprehensive economic sanctions, or what U.S. officials call the "maximum pressure policy," affect all people of a country on a much broader scale, because sanctions always have unintended effects.

The crime of economic terrorism can be defined as an international crime that entails responsibility for the individual or individuals who effectively exercise control over the direction of such an act, and this act may constitute a manifest violation of the United Nations Charter, especially the purposes and principles of the United Nations. At the same time, as an act of state, it may also give rise to the international responsibility of the state. Therefore, as the final conclusion of this article, blind, comprehensive, and pervasive economic sanctions against a nation that deprive its people of the necessities of life and cause pain and suffering, fear and terror, or the violation of the fundamental rights of individuals may, under Article 7(1)(k) of the Rome Statute, be considered conduct constituting crimes against humanity within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Court and, from this perspective, may be prosecutable (Zakerhossein, 2021).

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

- Abdollahi, M. (2009). *Terrorism, Human Rights, and Humanitarian Law* (1st ed.). Shahr-e Danesh Institute for Legal Studies and Research.
- Aghabakhshi, A. (2005). *Dictionary of Political Science* (3rd ed.). Tondar Publications.
- Ali Daei Ahmadi, M., & Bazar, V. (2020). Feasibility of Prosecuting U.S. Officials Who Imposed Sanctions against the Islamic Republic of Iran before the International Criminal Court. *International Criminal Law Quarterly*, 1(1), 70-90.
- Elliott, J. M., & Reginald, R. (1999). *Dictionary of Political and Strategic Terms* (M. H. Raeeszadeh, Trans.). Moein Publishing.
- Farrall, J. (2007). *United Nations and the Rule of Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gharibabadi, K. (2018). *Unilateral Sanctions and International Law* (1st ed.). University of Judicial Sciences and Administrative Services Press.
- Heydar Gholizadeh, J., Jalali, M., & Raeisi, L. (2025). Unilateral Sanctions as an Instance of Economic Terrorism in International Law. *Public Law Studies Quarterly*, 1(2), 1362.
- Kadkhodaei, A., & Saed, N. (2011). *Terrorism and Countering It*. World Assembly for Islamic Peace Publications.
- Kondoch, B. (2001). The Limits of Economic Sanctions under International Law: The Case of Iraq. *The Yearbook of International Peace Operations*, 267-295.
- Marossi, A. Z., & Bassett, M. R. (2015). *Economic Sanctions under International Law*. Asser Press.
- Mohammadi, M. (2017). Examining the Identity-Building Factors of Extremist Fundamentalism in Pakistan Based on Constructivist Theory. *Regional Studies Quarterly*, 5(16), 77-104.
- Momtaz, J. (2008). Compatibility of Security Council Economic Sanctions with Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law. *Law Quarterly*, 38(4), 341-349.
- Naji Rad, M. A. (2008). *Globalization of Terrorism* (1st ed.). Printing and Publishing Center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Nezhendi Manesh, H. (2019). Illegitimate Economic Sanctions as Economic Terrorism. International Conference on the Global Economy and Sanctions, Tehran.
- Nezhendi Manesh, H. (2020). Legal Feasibility of Characterizing the Assassination of General Soleimani and Others as a Crime against Humanity. *Comparative Research Quarterly of Islamic and Western Law*, 7(2), 248.

- Popovski, W., & Turner, N. (2008). *Legality and Legitimacy in International Order*. United Nations University.
- Savari, H. (2003). Combating Terrorism and International Law: Risks and Opportunities. *Legal Journal, Journal of the International Legal Services Office of the Islamic Republic of Iran*(29), 331-334.
- Schmid, A. (1983). *Political Terrorism: A Research Guide to Concepts, Theories, Data Bases and Literature*. Transaction Books.
- Vakil, A. S., & Tahsili, Z. (2013). *Iran and International Sanctions* (1st ed.). Majd Publications.
- Zakerhossein, M. H. (2021). Prosecuting Economic Sanctions as a Crime against Humanity. *Public Law Studies Quarterly*(2), 575-594.
- Zamani, S. G. (2016). *Twenty-One Essays on International Human Rights Law* (1st ed.). Khorsandi Publications.
- Zamani, S. G., Farahi, H., & Shahbari, A. (2016). Unilateral Sanctions against Iran from the Perspective of International Criminal Law: Crime against Humanity. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology Research*, 1(7), 87-106.
- Zamani, S. G., & Gharibabadi, K. (2017). Sanctions as a Violation of States' International Obligations to Protect Human Rights. *Medical Law Quarterly*, 11(40), 113-134.
- Zarif, M. J., & Mirzaei, S. (1996). U.S. Unilateral Sanctions against Iran. *Foreign Policy*, 11(1), 92-106.
- Ziaei, S. Y., & Mohammadi Motlagh, A. (2014). Sanctions against Natural Persons from the Perspective of International Law with Emphasis on Sanctions against Some Iranian Nationals. *Judicial Law Journal*, 78(88), 151-186.