

**An Analysis of the Ineffectiveness of the Legal Framework in Addressing the Crime of Aggression: An Exploration of the Evolution of the Concept of Aggression in International Criminal Law (Original Research)**

**Seyyed Fazlollah Mousavi\***  
**Amir Lohrasbi\*\***

**Persian Text pp. 125-148**

**(DOI): 10.22066/cilamag.2025.2067930.2769**

Date Received: 14 Aug.2025

Date Accepted: 27 Sep.2025

**Extended Abstract**

Despite the elevated normative status of the prohibition of the use of force in the international legal order—enshrined most notably in Article 2(4) of the UN Charter—its practical enforcement remains gravely compromised. This discrepancy between norm and implementation has persisted for decades and is shaped by a combination of conceptual ambiguities, structural limitations, and political dynamics that have collectively undermined the universality and impartiality of accountability mechanisms for acts of aggression.

Historically, the criminalization of aggression has suffered from a lack of definitional clarity and institutional coherence. From the early post-World War I period—marked by the Treaty of Versailles—to the establishment of the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals, and eventually to the adoption of the Rome Statute and its Kampala Amendments, attempts to codify aggression as a crime under international law have been incomplete, contested, or politically constrained. Although the Nuremberg Charter identified aggression (then framed as “crimes against peace”) as a punishable offense, its jurisprudence relied on a rudimentary and politically constructed definition, without offering a stable legal framework for future application.

The situation did not substantially improve with the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC). While the Rome Statute ultimately included aggression as one of the core international crimes, its operationalization was

---

\* Corresponding Author, Prof., Public Law Department, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. [fmousavi@ut.ac.ir](mailto:fmousavi@ut.ac.ir)

\*\* Ph.D. Student in International Law, Faculty of Law and Political Sciences, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. [lohrasbi.amir110@gmail.com](mailto:lohrasbi.amir110@gmail.com)



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>); which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

significantly delayed and diluted. The 2010 Kampala Amendments sought to clarify the definition and jurisdictional conditions for prosecuting the crime of aggression. However, the implementation framework they introduced is marked by serious limitations. One of the most important one among them is the requirement that only acts of aggression committed by high-level state officials qualify for prosecution. Moreover, the amendments allow state parties to opt out of the Court's jurisdiction over aggression, thereby weakening the principle of universality that should underpin international criminal law. These provisions, in effect, shield powerful States and their leaders from meaningful accountability and prosecution.

Another structural impediment lies in the exclusive authority of the UN Security Council to determine the existence of an act of aggression. This mechanism, although aimed at preserving global order, has in practice politicized responses to aggression and rendered them highly selective. The five permanent members of the Security Council, equipped with veto powers, often prioritize strategic interests over legal principles. As a result, acts of aggression committed by or involving major powers frequently escape condemnation or prosecution, deepening perceptions of impunity and inequality in international law enforcement.

This study contends that the current architecture of international criminal law—particularly in relation to aggression—fails to offer an effective or just framework for accountability. The combination of jurisdictional loopholes, definitional ambiguities, and geopolitical asymmetries has produced a system in which the legal prohibition of aggression exists more as a rhetorical ideal than a functional legal constraint.

In response to these gaps, the study proposes a twofold strategy: first, to reconceptualize aggression within the broader framework of crimes against humanity; and second, to incorporate non-judicial mechanisms such as truth commissions as complementary tools for addressing unlawful uses of force. Reframing aggression in this way serves both normative and practical goals. On the normative level, it challenges the artificial separation between different categories of international crimes and highlights the human cost of aggressive wars—particularly their widespread and systematic impact on civilian populations. On a practical level, it bypasses some of the procedural and jurisdictional barriers that have hamstrung formal prosecution efforts, offering alternative pathways for recognition, truth-telling, and even limited forms of accountability.

A central argument advanced in this study is the importance of resisting expansive interpretations of the self-defense exception under Article 51 of the UN Charter. In recent decades, several states have invoked broad, preemptive, or preventive justifications for the use of force, often in contexts where no actual armed attack had occurred. These practices undermine the integrity of the Charter framework and create legal gray zones that may be

exploited to justify aggressive behavior under the guise of defense. A more restrictive reading of Article 51—anchored in textual fidelity, customary law, and judicial precedent—is essential to restore the normative force of the prohibition on the use of force.

The study also examines the potential of truth commissions and other transitional justice mechanisms to address aggression, especially in contexts where judicial remedies are politically or logistically infeasible. Truth commissions, while lacking the coercive power of courts, can play a critical role in documenting violations, recognizing victims, and shaping collective memory. Their application to cases of aggression—particularly where such acts lead to widespread civilian suffering—can help fill the justice gap left by the paralysis of formal institutions.

In sum, the article highlights the persistent deficiencies in the international legal response to aggression, while offering concrete theoretical and institutional alternatives. It argues that the selective enforcement of aggression prohibitions not only erodes legal legitimacy but also poses a serious threat to global peace and human dignity. Without effective deterrents or avenues for accountability, the risk of acts of aggression becoming normalized, thereby destabilizing the very foundations of the international legal order. To counter this trend, the study advocates for a principled realignment of legal doctrine, institutional practice, and political will—grounded in the indivisibility of international crimes and the universal aspiration for justice.

### Keywords

Aggression, *Jus ad Bellum*, International Law on the Use of Force, International Criminal Law, International Humanitarian Law, Self-Defense

### References

#### - Books

1. Asgari, Yadollah. *Responsibility to Protect: The Evolution of Sovereignty in Light of Human Rights Movements*. Tehran: Mizan Publishing, 2017. (In Persian)
2. Boister, Neil, and Robert Cryer. *The Tokyo International Military Tribunal: A Reappraisal*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
3. Falsafi, Hedayatollah. *The Course of Reason in the System of International Law*. Tehran: Farhang-e Nashr-e No, 2020. (In Persian)
4. O'Connell, Mary Ellen. "Historical Development and Legal Basis". In *The Handbook of International Humanitarian Law*, 3rd ed., edited by Dieter Fleck, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
5. Elohi Nazari, Hamid. *Humanitarian Approach in the Judgments of the International Court of Justice*. Tehran: Dadgostar Publishing, 2010. (In Persian)

6. Rieff, David. "The Hypocrisy of Humanitarian Intervention". In *International Peacekeeping: The Yearbook of International Peace Operations*, vol.7, ed. Michael Bothe and Boris Kondoch, The Netherlands and Boston, Brill | Nijhoff, 2011
7. Sadat, Leila Nadya. *Seeking Accountability for the Unlawful Use of Force*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
8. Sellars, Kirsten. *Crimes against Peace and International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
9. Tibori-Szabó, Kinga. "The Relationship of the Law on the Use of Force with the Law of Armed Conflict and Human Rights Law". In *The Use of Force and the International Legal System*, edited by Terry D. Gill and Kinga Tibori-Szabó, 315–346. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

**- Articles**

1. Aghae Janatmakan, Hossein. "Definition, Elements, and Conditions for the Exercise of the International Criminal Court's Jurisdiction over the Crime of Aggression with a Focus on the Kampala Agreement." *International Law Review* 28, no. 44 (2011). (In Persian)
2. Barriga, Stefan, and Leena Grover. "A Historic Breakthrough on the Crime of Aggression." *American Journal of International Law* 105, no. 3 (2011).
3. Bassiouni, M. Cherif. "World War I: 'The War to End All Wars' and the Birth of a Handicapped International Criminal Justice System." *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* 30 (2002).
4. Blokker, Niels, and Claus Kreß. "A Consensus Agreement on the Crime of Aggression: Impressions from Kampala." *Leiden Journal of International Law* 23, no.4 (2010).
5. Ečer, Bohuslav. "The Crime of Aggressive War." In *London International Assembly, Reports on Punishment of War Crimes* (1943).
6. Federica D'Alessandra, "UN Accountability Mandates in International Justice," *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 21, no. 3 (2023).
7. Ferencz, Benjamin B. "Ending Impunity for the Crime of Aggression." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 41, no.1 (2009).
8. Helal, Mohamed S. "Justifying War and the Limits of Humanitarianism." *Fordham International Law Journal* 37 (2014).
9. Heydarian, Mohammad Javad Dowlatabadi, and Rasoul Mazaheri Kouhanestani. "Limitations of National Courts in Exercising Universal Jurisdiction over the Crime of Aggression." *Culmination of Law* 5, no. 2 (2019): 29–53. (In Persian)
10. Luban, David. "The Crime of Aggression: Its Nature, the Leadership Clause, and the Paradox of Immunity." *Georgetown University Law Center Research Paper* no. 29 (2024).

11. McMahan, Jeff. "Morality, Law, and the Relation Between *Jus ad Bellum* and *Jus in Bello*." *American Society of International Law Proceedings* 100 (2006).
12. Mitchell, Ryan. "Sovereignty and Normative Conflict: International Legal Realism as a Theory of Uncertainty." *Harvard International Law Journal* 58, no.2 (2017).
13. Mousazadeh, Reza, and Sara Hosseinzadeh. "Evaluation of the United Nations Security Council's Performance in Utilizing the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine." *The Public Law Studies Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (2020): 431–451. (In Persian)
14. Reisman, W. Michael. "The Cult of Custom in the Late 20th Century." *California Western International Law Journal* 17 (1987).
15. Schmitt, Michael N. "Military Necessity and Humanity in International Humanitarian Law: Preserving the Delicate Balance." *Virginia Journal of International Law* 50, no. 3 (2010).
16. Sefriani. "The Dichotomy of Jus Ad Bellum and Jus Ad Bello in the 21st Century: Its Relevance and Reconstruction." *Padjadjaran Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 9, no. 2 (2022).
17. Van den Herik, Larissa J. "An Inquiry into the Role of Commissions of Inquiry in International Law: Navigating the Tensions Between Fact-Finding and Application of International Law." *Chinese Journal of International Law* 13, no.1 (2014).
18. Yazdaniyan, Alireza, and Omid Mahmoudi Qehsareh. "Comparative Study of the Role of Civil Liability in Effective Compensation for Human Rights Violations with Emphasis on the Resolution on Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to Remedy and Reparation." *Journal of Comparative Law* 8, no. 2 (2021): 7–30. (In Persian)

**- Instrument**

1. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, U.N.Doc. A/CONF.183/9 (July17,1998). <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/260261?ln=en&v=pdf>

**- Documents**

1. Definition of Aggression, G.A.Res.3314 (XXIX), annex, U.N.Doc. A/RES/3314(XXIX) (Dec.14,1974). <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/190983?ln=en&v=pdf>
2. Draft Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Mankind, Rep. of the Int'l Law Commission to the Gen. Assembly, U.N.Doc.A/51/10. [https://legal.un.org/ilc/documentation/english/reports/a\\_51\\_10.pdf](https://legal.un.org/ilc/documentation/english/reports/a_51_10.pdf)
3. UN. Secretary-General, "Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident", para.3 (Sept.2,2011). <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/720841?ln=en&v=pdf>

**- Cases**

1. *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1996.*
2. ICTY, *Prosecutor v. Gotovina*, Trial Judgment, Case No. IT-09-90-T (Apr.15,2011).