MÂAREF ISSN 1112-7007 EISSN 6804-2600 | Volume: 21 / N°: 01 (Juin 2026), pp151-171

The International Criminal Responsibility of Perpetrators of Crimes Committed by Terrorist Organizations

Tassadit Chermali *

University of Bouira, State and Organized Crime Laboratory (Algeria), t.chermali@univ-bouira.dz

Received: 26/10/2025; Accepted: 30/11/2025; Published: 01/06/2026

Abstract:

Terrorist organizations pose a threat to the foundations and rules upon which the international community is based. Violating these rules leads to the establishment of international criminal responsibility for states. International criminal responsibility has undergone several stages and developments that have contributed to clarifying and defining its concept and scope of application, given the multiplicity of subjects in the international community. For international criminal responsibility to arise, several conditions must be met, and its proof leads to the imposition of a set of sanctions to ensure respect for the international laws and charters upon which the international community is based.

The establishment of international criminal responsibility for every violation and breach of international laws and conventions is a guarantee for stability and the preservation of international peace and security.

Keywords: Terrorist Organizations; International Criminal Responsibility; Rules of International Law; Sanctions; Compensation.

Introduction

International law creates binding obligations through treaties, customs, and general principles. Breaches of these obligations lead to **international responsibility**, ensuring compliance and accountability.

* Corresponding author.

Terrorist organizations threaten global peace, and their unlawful acts trigger states' duty to **prevent, punish, and cooperate** internationally.

International responsibility implies liability for violations of international obligations, requiring **reparation or sanctions**. It takes two forms:

- **Criminal responsibility** – personal punishment.
- **Civil responsibility** – financial compensation.

Criminal responsibility is key in maintaining global order and applies regardless of justification.

Research Question: To what extent can states be held criminally responsible for acts committed by terrorist organizations?

Section I: Concept, definition, and subjects of international criminal responsibility.

-Section II: Conditions and consequences of establishing international responsibility for terrorism-related crimes.

Section One: The Concept of International Criminal Responsibility

In this section, we will address the meaning of international criminal responsibility and examine the various doctrinal approaches that have sought to define its scope and establish a precise legal framework. We will also identify the categories of persons who may be subjects of international crimes and, consequently, of international accountability, as follows:

I. Definition of International Responsibility

Doctrinal definitions of international responsibility differ due to varying legal foundations. Two main approaches exist:

- **Traditional (classical)** – the earlier view of state responsibility.
- **Modern (contemporary)** – focuses on **international criminal responsibility**, shaped by recent developments in the field. Both approaches will be analyzed comparatively.

The traditional definition:[1]

In its narrow sense, the concept of international responsibility is founded on **three key principles**:

1. **State exclusivity** — only States were recognized as subjects of international law.

2. **Civil nature** — responsibility was limited to civil (State) liability, excluding any form of criminal accountability.

3. **Restricted scope** — it applied solely to acts expressly prohibited by international law, even if other harmful acts fell outside its reach.

Accordingly, international responsibility is defined as a **legal framework** under which a State committing an internationally wrongful act must make reparation to the injured State. This definition reflects that such responsibility is **purely civil in nature**, entailing the duty to provide compensation[2], as **criminal responsibility does not exist among States**.

International responsibility results from breaching an international obligation, requiring the violator to remedy the harm and granting the injured party the right to reparation.. [3]"

It has also been defined as:

"A legal system that seeks to provide reparation to one or more subjects of international law for the harm suffered as a result of conduct committed by one or more other subjects of international law."

Likewise, it has been defined as:

---

[1] Rousseau CH. : La responsabilité international، cours de droit international public de la faculté de droit paris,1959, 1960, p. 7.

[2] Al-Sayed Abu Atiya, *International Sanctions: Theory and Practice*, University Culture Foundation, Alexandria, 2000, p. 244.

[3] - Adnan Hadi Noor Ali Al-Asadi, *Crimes of Terrorist Organizations and the Extent of Criminal and International Responsibility – ISIS Crimes in Iraq as a Case Study*, Doctoral thesis in Law, Mansoura University, Egypt, 2019, p. 287.

"A legal situation under which a State, attributed with the commission of an internationally wrongful act, is obliged—pursuant to international law—to make reparation to the State against which that act was committed.".[1]"

Traditional definitions limited international responsibility to States and reparations, whereas the modern view extends it to individuals, legal entities, and international organizations, encompassing both civil and criminal liability for violations."[2]

International responsibility arises when a State or any subject of international law violates an international obligation through an act or omission, leading to sanctions or liability. The ILC similarly defines it as the attribution of a wrongful act to a subject of international law, creating an obligation to provide reparation or compensation for the resulting harm..".[3]"

International responsibility applies to all subjects of international law—States, organizations, and individuals—for any wrongful act, civil or criminal. It arises when harm is caused, requiring liability through compensation or criminal sanction to ensure reparation.""[4]

A State (or other international legal subject) bears international responsibility when its actions violate international law and cause harm, even if lawful domestically. An internationally wrongful act has two elements:

Personal (Subjective) Element: The act or omission must be attributable to the State or international actor, performed by individuals or bodies acting officially on its behalf...[5]

---

(1) - Adnan Hadi Noor Ali Al-Asadi, *Ibid.*, p. 288.

(2) Mohamed Talaat El-Ghoneimi, *General Provisions in the Law of Nations*, Al-Maaref Establishment, Alexandria, 1970, p. 303.

(3) United Nations International Law Commission, Session No. 2433, 9 January 1975

(4) Adnan Hadi Nour Ali Al-Asadi, *Ibid.*, p. 289.

(5) - Ahmed Abu Al-Wafa, *Al-Waseet fi Al-Qanoun Al-Dawli Al-Aam (The Mediator in Public International Law)*, 4th Edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 2004, p. 860.

A State is internationally responsible for:

- Acts attributable to a State include those of its official organs, entities exercising governmental authority, persons or groups acting under its direction or control (including organs placed at another State's disposal), and its failure to protect foreign nationals, diplomatic missions, or international organization premises within its territory when harm occurs.(1)

The objective element of an internationally wrongful act is the breach of a binding international obligation. A violation occurs only if:

- The obligation is in force at the time of the act.
- The act or omission fails to comply with the State's obligations under treaty, customary law, or jus cogens norms.

-For continuous conduct, the violation lasts only while the obligation remains binding.(2).

An international violation arises when a State fails to meet an international obligation, either by omission or by not achieving the required result.

- **Instantaneous violations:** Occur at a specific moment, though effects may last.
- **Continuing violations:** Last as long as the wrongful behavior persists.
- **Series of acts or omissions:** Completed upon the final act. *Example:* A State breaches international law if it supports, shelters, or allows terrorists to use its territory for attacks or to evade justice.(3).

(1) - Nabil Bashar, *International Responsibility in a Changing World*, 1st Edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, 1994, pp. 122–123.
(2) . Nizar Al-Anbaki, *International Humanitarian Law*, 1st Edition, Dar Wael, 2010, p. 461.
(3) Adnan Hadi Nour Ali Al-Asadi, *Ibid.*, p. 193.

A State can breach international obligations in two ways:

1. **Positive violation:** Actively aiding or supporting terrorist organizations.

2. **Negative violation:** Failing to prevent the use of its territory for terrorist activities.

Example: When authorities neglect preventive measures, enabling terrorist operations that harm another State or foreign nationals, the State incurs international responsibility if a causal link exists between its inaction and the resulting attacks.[1].

2. Subjects of International Criminal Responsibility

International criminal responsibility applies to both **individuals**—who directly commit international crimes—and **States**, whose involvement often enables such acts. This creates a form of **combined responsibility**, where both can be held accountable since international crimes typically result from the interaction of individual intent and State authority.[2].

• International criminal responsibility is increasingly applied in practice to align with the nature of international crimes. It is primarily **personal** and requires a **mental element**, but modern law sometimes extends it to **legal persons**, sparking doctrinal **debate.**

1. The debate over international criminal responsibility revolves around whether criminal liability applies to States or individuals. One view supports holding legal entities accountable, arguing it aligns with the goals of criminal justice. The opposing view maintains that only natural persons can bear such responsibility. Overall, three main positions emerge: (1) only the State bears criminal responsibility, (2)

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 294.

[2] Samia Yatouji, *International Criminal Responsibility for Violations of International Humanitarian Law*, Master's thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Law, specialization in Public International Law, University of Mohamed Khider, Biskra, 2011–2012, p. 34.

both the State and individuals share it, or (3) only individuals are criminally responsible, excluding States..[1].

The traditional view holds that **only the State** can bear international criminal responsibility, analogous to civil liability, while individuals cannot be held criminally accountable under international law due to the lack of a global enforcement system. .[2]**The Possibility of Attributing International Criminal Responsibility to the State Despite Its Abstract Nature**

While some argue that a legal person is a mere fiction incapable of criminal responsibility, proponents maintain that the State's juridical nature does not prevent it from bearing civil or criminal liability. They assert that the State remains a primary subject of international law, and denying its criminal accountability would threaten international peace and security.[3].

Supporters argue that **sovereignty does not grant immunity**; rather, it entails respect for international law. Therefore, a State incurs **international criminal responsibility** for unlawful acts that harm global order, **regardless of its sovereign status or immunities**.[4].

-The Compatibility of International Sanctions with the Nature of the State

This view holds that State criminal responsibility exists even without physical punishment; while States cannot be personally penalized, they may face sanctions—diplomatic, economic, or military—to enforce international law and deter violations.[5].

---

[1] - Same reference, p. 35.

[2] Abdullah Suleiman Suleiman, *Fundamental Principles of International Criminal Law*, Diwan of Basic

[3] - Ali Jamil Harb, *The System of International Sanctions*, First Edition, Beirut: Al-Halabi Legal Publications, 2010, p. 102-103.

[4] Ahmed Abdel Hamid Al-Rifai, *General Theory of International Criminal Responsibility*, Al-Toubyji Institution for Commerce, Printing, and Publishing, Cairo, 2005, p. 44.

[5] Tounsi Ben Amer, *International Responsibility*, Dahleb Publications, Algeria, 1995, p. 101

-Supporters of State criminal responsibility argue that the UN, through the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, has the authority to hold States accountable and impose sanctions for violations of fundamental international obligations, upholding its mandate to maintain international peace and security.(1).

State criminal responsibility does not imply collective guilt of its population; it concerns the State as a legal entity, not its citizens, ensuring accountability without collective punishment..(2).

A. Recognition of Dual International Criminal Responsibility of the State and the Individual

This approach holds both the State and individuals accountable for international crimes, arguing that State acts stem from human actions. Critics argue it conflicts with international law, as the State cannot have intent independently of individuals. Linking State liability to its members may revive discredited notions of collective criminal responsibility..(3).

C. The Exclusive International Criminal Responsibility of the Individual

Since World War I, international law holds individuals—not States—accountable for wrongful acts, making them the primary subjects of international criminal responsibility..(4)

D.Individual Criminal Responsibility in International Law

International law extends criminal responsibility to individuals, not only States. Treaties and jurisprudence confirm that individuals bear direct obligations and are personally accountable for international

(1) Samia Yatouji, *Ibid.*, p. 36.
(2) brahim Al-Darraji, *The Crime of Aggression and the Extent of International Legal Responsibility*, 1st edition, Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut
(3) Samia Yatouji, *previous reference*, pp. 37-38.
(4) Ahmed Abdel Hamid Mohamed Al-Rifai, *General Principles of International Criminal Responsibility: A Study in Light of International Humanitarian Law Provisions*, *Journal of Graduate Studies*, p. 46.

crimes. The Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals exemplified this by prosecuting natural persons for war crimes, demonstrating that enforcing international law depends on holding individuals responsible...[1].

International law holds both individuals and States accountable for serious international crimes. Individuals are prosecuted through instruments like the Nuremberg Principles and international tribunals, while States may also bear responsibility. This dual accountability ensures enforcement of international law and prevents impunity.[2].

3. The Legal Elements of International Criminal Responsibility

The Principle of Legality in International Criminal Responsibility

International criminal responsibility requires that crimes and punishments be clearly defined by international law. An act cannot be treated as an international crime unless it falls within a recognized criminalizing rule. The principle of legality relies on international custom, treaties, and judicial decisions due to the absence of a comprehensive international penal code. This ensures a lawful framework for criminalization, accountability, and punishment in the international legal order..[3].

Scholars propose reformulating the principle “no crime and no punishment without law” to include customary rules, ensuring it remains flexible and applicable to international criminal law while preserving its core meaning**."[4]**

---

[1] Abdullah Suleiman, *previous reference*, pp. 128-129.
[2] Samia Yatouji, *previous reference*, pp. 42-43..
[3] Jaafar Hammoum, *The Role of the International Court of Justice in Developing the Rules of International Criminal Law*, Master’s Thesis in International Criminal Law, Faculty of Law, Saad Dahlab University, Blida, 2005, p. 22.
[4] Samia Yatouji, *previous reference*, p. 11.

Customary international law underpins international criminal law, as key crimes like genocide and war crimes originated from custom before codification. The non-retroactivity principle bars applying laws retroactively but allows immediate enforcement and flexible interpretation to achieve justice.[1].

2. The Material Element of International Criminal Responsibility

The material element of international criminal responsibility requires a direct causal link between the perpetrator's conduct and the criminal act. This connection, similar to causation in domestic law, links the offender to the crime and its consequences. Without such a link, an individual cannot be held liable, as accountability depends on actual participation in the wrongful act.[2].

International criminal conduct, as the material element of responsibility, includes acts that harm or threaten international interests. It can be **positive** (actively committing a prohibited act) or **negative** (failing to fulfill a legal duty, e.g., preventing armed groups). Liability covers all contributors—primary or secondary—and extends to inchoate crimes such as planning, instigating, or conspiring to commit aggression..[3].

1. The Mental Element (Mens Rea) of International Criminal Responsibility

The mental element (mens rea) in international criminal law denotes the intent and knowledge behind a prohibited act, linking the crime to the perpetrator's awareness and free will. Determining mens rea is complex because many international crimes arise from state orders rather than personal motives. Direct intent is clear in crimes like aggression, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, while acts like

[1] Samia Yatouji, *previous reference*, pp. 11-12.
[2] Jaafar Hammoum, *previous reference*, p. 24
[3] - Samia Yatouji, *previous reference*, p. 12.

piracy, terrorism, and hostage-taking require deliberate intent.(1).

In all cases, the mental element of international criminal responsibility is based on **criminal intent (mens rea)**, defined as the legally blameworthy will to violate the law. It consists of two key components:

1. **Knowledge (Scientia):** Awareness and understanding of the facts and elements of the crime before acting.

2. **Will (Voluntas):** The conscious and deliberate decision to commit the act, directing one's behavior toward achieving the prohibited outcome.

Thus, international criminal responsibility requires not only the material act but also a proven psychological link between the perpetrator and the crime to establish culpability(2).

Section Two: The Conditions and Consequences of Establishing International Responsibility for Crimes Committed by Terrorist Organizations

International criminal responsibility acts as a deterrent mechanism to combat terrorist crimes such as war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Its establishment depends on meeting specific legal conditions to ensure fair accountability.

I. Conditions for Establishing International Criminal Responsibility for Terrorist Crimes

To attribute international criminal responsibility, the following essential conditions must be fulfilled:

1. **Commission of an Unlawful International Criminal Act:**

- **International Character:** The act must have an international dimension involving subjects, interests, or effects under international law.

(1) Jaafar Hammoum, *previous reference*, pp. 26-27.
(2) - Samia Yatouji, *previous reference*, p. 13.

- **Criminal Character:** The act must constitute a criminal violation under international law, not merely a civil or general breach of international obligations.

In sum, establishing international criminal responsibility for terrorist organizations requires proving that the act is internationally prohibited, criminal in nature, attributable to a responsible entity, and has caused harm to another subject of international law.(1)

1. Commission of an Unlawful Act by a Subject of International Criminal Responsibility

International criminal responsibility arises when a recognized subject of international law, usually an individual, commits an unlawful act. Members of terrorist organizations are held personally liable, while States rarely face direct sanctions. Establishing harm caused by the act is essential to determine responsibility and impose sanctions..(2)

Most scholars agree that harm is a necessary element for establishing international criminal responsibility, as confirmed by international courts. It must be real, certain, and result from an unlawful act, taking physical, economic, or moral forms that affect individuals, groups, or States. The Harvard Draft (1961) defines harm as any injury or loss from acts like killing or property destruction, while lawful resistance or self-determination struggles are excluded. A causal link between the unlawful act and the harm, whether direct or indirect, is also required to establish responsibility.(3)

For international criminal responsibility to arise, a criminal and unlawful act must be committed by a subject of international law causing harm to life or property. States that breach international obligations may face responsibility and sanctions, but peaceful remedies and victim compensation must be pursued first. They are also required to surrender perpetrators for trial, and persistent violations may

(1) Ahmed Abdel Hamid Al-Rifai, *previous reference*, p. 64..
(2) Adnan Hadi Nour Ali Al-Asadi, *previous reference*, p. 219.
(3) - Ibid., p. 220.

justify coercive measures to preserve international peace and security.[1].

The consequences of a State's international criminal responsibility vary according to the **gravity of the crime**, the **State's intent**, and the **extent of international cooperation** in enforcing accountability. Sanctions may include **financial compensation**, **economic or criminal penalties**, or **political isolation**.

1. Compensation:

Under international law, States must compensate for damages caused by international crimes. The *Chorzów Factory Case* (1927) established that full reparation is an inherent obligation for any breach of international duty. Compensation covers material, moral, and human losses, including war damages, deprivation of homeland, and physical or psychological harm, and requires restoring the situation to its pre-violation state.[2].

Imposition of Criminal Sanctions:
States are obliged to provide compensation proportionate to the harm caused, ensuring respect for international law and preventing future violations.
Scholars debate whether international responsibility should also include punitive sanctions beyond reparations.
The first approach limits consequences to reparation only, viewing international responsibility as a bilateral obligation between the offending and injured States..[3]

Three views exist on sanctions for internationally wrongful acts:

---

[1] Ahmed Abu Al-Wafa, *The General Theory of International Humanitarian Law in International Criminal Law and Islamic Sharia*, First Edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 2006, p. 634.

[2] عمر Omar Saadallah, *Dictionary of Contemporary International Law*, Second Edition, Diwan of University Publications, Algeria, 2007, p. 137..

[3] Samia Touji, *previous reference*, p. 115.

1. The first limits consequences to **reparation only**.

2. The second allows **enforcement by the injured State** but still sees reparation as the main outcome.

3. The third holds that such acts create **two relations**—one granting reparation to the victim and another empowering **judicial bodies to impose sanctions**.[1].

4. **Imposition of Criminal Sanctions :**

The International Law Commission (ILC) distinguishes between serious international crimes, which justify sanctions, and lesser delicts, which require only reparation.

Modern international law limits sanctions to those authorized by the UN to ensure legality and prevent abuse.

Individuals committing international crimes on behalf of a State are now subject to prosecution, as established in the Nuremberg, Tokyo, Yugoslavia, and Rwanda trials, and upheld by the International Criminal Court.[2]

The types of international punitive measures that may be imposed on states as a result of the establishment of their international criminal responsibility vary, and include the following:

A. Political International Sanctions

Political sanctions are non-military measures imposed on a state that violates international law, aiming to isolate it diplomatically. Their primary effect is to create international pressure through political exclusion rather than direct coercion. A key example is the **severance of diplomatic relations**, which involves restricting or cutting all official ties—such as closing embassies and consulates—due to serious political disputes, security threats, or acts of terrorism. Under the **UN**

[1] Ahmed Abdel Hamid Mohamed Al-Rifai, *previous reference*, p. 348.
[2] Samia Touji, *previous reference*, p. 116.

Charter, this measure is recognized as a lawful, non-military response to international wrongdoing."[1].

The purpose of imposing such a sanction is to demonstrate the international community's strong disapproval of the criminal actions committed by the state and to warn it that further punitive measures and international sanctions may be imposed if it continues to undermine international peace and security or to harm the interests of other states. This sanction may take the form of reducing the level of diplomatic representation, restricting the movement of diplomatic envoys to and from the offending state, or, at the very least, issuing a formal reprimand.[2].

Suspension of the Aggressor State's Membership in the United Nations

This refers to the temporary deprivation of the offending state's rights and privileges within the United Nations. Such suspension may vary from a complete suspension of all membership rights and privileges to a partial suspension, such as the deprivation of the right to vote in the General Assembly. Imposing membership suspension as a sanction prevents the offending state from exercising any of its membership rights in the main and subsidiary organs of the United Nations or in international conferences convened by it, without exempting the state from fulfilling its international obligations and duties arising from its membership. The suspension remains in effect for as long as the reasons necessitating it continue to exist.[3]

Suspension of the Aggressor State's Membership in the United Nations

This refers to the temporary deprivation of the offending state's rights and privileges within the United Nations. Such suspension may vary from a complete suspension of all membership rights and

[1] Article 41 of the United Nations Charter.
[2] Ahmed Abdel Hamid Mohamed Al-Rifai, *previous reference*, p. 350.
[3] Article 05-18 of the United Nations Charter.

privileges to a partial suspension, such as the deprivation of the right to vote in the General Assembly. Imposing membership suspension as a sanction prevents the offending state from exercising any of its membership rights in the main and subsidiary organs of the United Nations or in international conferences convened by it, without exempting the state from fulfilling its international obligations and duties arising from its membership. The suspension remains in effect for as long as the reasons necessitating it continue to exist.(1).

The United Nations Charter obliges member states to offer all possible assistance to the United Nations in any action it undertakes under the Charter, including refraining from aiding any state subject to measures of restraint or enforcement. This makes the non-recognition of any gains obtained by an aggressor state through its crimes the minimum international obligation that members of the international community must fulfill. Furthermore, the General Assembly Declaration on Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, adopted on 24 October 1956, codified the sanction of non-recognition. It stated that any territorial gains achieved through the use or threat of force, or through the commission of any international crime, cannot be recognized as lawful, providing that: *"Acts contrary to international law are null and void and do not constitute a source for acquiring civil rights by their perpetrators."*.(2)

A. International Economic Sanctions

Economic sanctions are key non-military tools used to enforce international criminal responsibility by pressuring states or entities to comply with international law and deter future violations. Provided for under the **UN Charter**, these measures target a state's economic and industrial interests to prevent aggression, protect other states' rights, and maintain global peace and security.

(1) Article 53 of the Draft Articles of the International Law Commission on State Responsibility, 1996.
(2) Articles 01 and 02/05 of the United Nations Charter.

Economic Embargo:

An economic embargo restricts trade and financial exchanges with a state that violates international law. It prohibits exports and imports to weaken the offending state's economy, create internal pressure, and compel it to cease its unlawful conduct. Such embargoes often include **peaceful blockades** and other trade restrictions designed to alter the state's behavior without resorting to armed force.(1)

-Economic Blockade

An economic blockade consists of the encirclement and economic isolation of the aggressor state through the voluntary individual or collective commitment of United Nations member states, aiming to compel the state to remedy the harm resulting from its violations of international law. It may take the form of:

1. **Naval Blockade:** Preventing ships from entering or leaving the ports of the aggressor state, with the objective of weakening its resources and severing its external connections.

2. **Military Blockade:** Prohibiting the aggressor state from obtaining weapons and military equipment, thereby restricting its capacity for armed conflict.(2).

3. Economic Boycott

An economic boycott is an international measure that restricts or suspends all economic and commercial relations with a state or entity that has violated international law or treaties. It involves halting trade, investment, and cooperation, and may include freezing assets or banning exports and imports.

Such measures can severely disrupt a state's economy by limiting access to foreign goods, export markets, and financial assistance, leading to long-term instability.

(1) Ahmed Abdel Hamid Mohamed Al-Rifai, *previous reference*, pp. 355-356.
(2) Ibid., pp. 356-357.

Economic boycotts take several forms:

-Unilateral: Imposed by a single state.

-Collective: Enforced by multiple states or international organizations.

-Negative: Aimed at preventing all direct or indirect economic and trade interactions with the targeted state.[1].

C- International Military Sanctions

International military sanctions are measures adopted by the international community or international organizations to impose restrictions on a state or specific entity due to violations of international laws and treaties. These sanctions aim to deter further violations and to protect international security. According to the United Nations Charter, international military sanctions refer to…[2] The lawful and direct use of armed force—by air, sea, or land—is a last-resort consequence of a State's violation of international law threatening peace and security. Military sanctions include **embargoes, blockades, and armed operations** undertaken under **UN Security Council supervision** when non-military measures under Article 41 of the UN Charter fail.

Their application requires three conditions:

1. The State has committed an **act of aggression** endangering international peace.

2. **Non-military sanctions** have been exhausted without success.

3. The **Security Council oversees** their implementation to prevent abuse.

Although rarely effective due to political interests and weak enforcement, coordinated international action could significantly strengthen deterrence and reduce impunity for serious violations of international law.[3]

[1] Ahmed Abdel Hamid Mohamed Al-Rifai, *previous reference*, p. 357.
[2] Article 42 of the United Nations Charter.
[3]Ibrahim Al-Darraji,ibid,p631.

Conclusion

The study shows that international criminal responsibility for terrorist organizations has evolved through doctrinal development and changing global realities. International tribunals enforce norms, prevent violations, and emphasize sanctions to maintain security. Effective accountability requires strong international cooperation, coordinated application of law, and improved mechanisms for investigating, prosecuting, and punishing perpetrators to strengthen peace, security, and combat impunity.

References List:

1- References in Arabi

A. Books

1. Ibrahim Al-Darraji, *The Crime of Aggression and the Extent of International Legal Responsibility*, 1st edition, Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut, 2005.

2. Ahmed Abu Al-Wafa, *Al-Waseet in Public International Law*, 4th edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 2004.

3. Ahmed Abu Al-Wafa, *General Theory of International Humanitarian Law in International Criminal Law and Islamic Sharia*, 1st edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 2006.

4. Ahmed Abdel-Hamid Al-Rifai, *General Theory of International Criminal Responsibility*, Al-Toubgi Institution for Trade, Printing, and Publishing, Cairo, 2005.

5. Tounsi Ben Amer, *International Responsibility*, Dahleb Publications, Algeria, 1995.

6. Hamed Sultan, *Public International Law in Peacetime*, 2nd edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, 1965.

7. Al-Sayyid Abu Atiya, *International Sanctions: Theory and Practice*, University Culture Foundation, Alexandria, 2000.

8. Abdullah Suleiman, *Foundations of International Criminal Law*, Basic Publications Office, Algeria, 1992.

9. Ali Jamil Harb, *International Penal System*, 1st edition, Al-Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut, 2010.

10. Omar Saad Allah, *Dictionary of Contemporary International Law*, 2nd edition, University Press, Algeria, 2007.

11. Mohamed Talaat Al-Ghanimi, *General Provisions in the Law of Nations*, Al-Maaref Establishment, Alexandria, 1970.

12. Nabil Bishr, *International Responsibility in a Changing World*, 1st edition, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, 1994.

13. Nizar Al-Anbaki, *International Humanitarian Law*, 1st edition, Dar Wael, 2010.

B. University Theses

1. Jaafar Hammoum, *The Role of the International Court of Justice in Developing International Criminal Law Rules*, Master's Thesis in International Criminal Law, Faculty of Law, Saad Dahlab University, Blida, 2005.

2. Samia Yatouji, *International Criminal Responsibility for Violations of International Humanitarian Law*, Master's Thesis in Law, Public International Law specialization, Mohamed Khider University, Biskra, 2011-2012.

3. Adnan Hadi Nour Ali Al-Asadi, *Crimes of Terrorist Organizations and the Extent of Their International and Criminal Responsibility – ISIS Crimes in Iraq as a Model*, PhD Thesis in Law, Mansoura University, Egypt, 2019.

C. Articles

Ahmed Abdel-Hamid Mohammed Al-Rifai, *General Principles of International Criminal Responsibility: A Study in Light of the Provisions of International Humanitarian Law*, Journal of Higher Studies, pp. 46-48.

D. International Conventions

1. United Nations Charter.

2. International Law Commission of the United Nations, Session No. 2433, 9 January 1975.

3. Article 53, Draft of the International Law Commission on State Responsibility, 1996.

2- References in Foreign Languages

1. Rousseau, CH. : *La responsabilité internationale*, Cours de droit international public de la Faculté de droit, Paris, 1959-1960, p. 7.