

The Impact of Sanctions on Third States

Grigoryan Siranush S.

Phd Student, Faculty of Law, Chair of European and International Law,

Yerevan State University (Yerevan, RA)

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1418-5643>

siranush.grigoryan@ysu.am

UDC: 341; **EDN:** HNIARD

DOI: 10.58587/18292437-2025.2-36

Keywords & phrases: Sanctions; third states; economic impact; humanitarian impact; political consequences; international law; refugee crises; trade disruptions; diplomatic challenges; targeted sanctions

Պատժամիջոցների ազդեցությունը երրորդ կողմ պետությունների վրա **Գրիգորյան Սիրանուշ Ս.**

*հայցորդ, Եվրոպական և Միջազգային իրավունքի ամբիոն, Իրավագիտության ֆակուլտետ,
Երևանի պետական համալսարան (Երևան, ՀՀ)*

Ամփոփագիր. Պատժամիջոցները միջազգային իրավունքում լայնորեն կիրառվող գործիք են պետությունների կամ ոչ պետական դերակատարների վարքագծի վրա ազդելու համար՝ միջազգային նորմերի պահպանումն ապահովելու նպատակով: Այնուամենայնիվ, դրանց հետևանքները հաճախ դուրս են գալիս հիմնական նախատեսված նպատակներից՝ երրորդ կողմ պետությունների համար ստեղծելով էական իրավական, տնտեսական և սոցիալական խնդիրներ: Այս փաստաթուղթը վերաբերում է այդ պետությունների առջև ծառայած բարդ հետևանքներին, ներառյալ առևտրի խափանումները, ֆինանսական անկայունությունը, փախստականների ճգնաժամերը և դիվանագիտական լարվածությունը: Իրավական տեսանկյունից այն վերլուծում է երրորդ պետությունների իրավունքներն ու պարտականությունները միջազգային իրավունքի համաձայն՝ հատուկ ուշադրություն դարձնելով չմիջամտելու սկզբունքներին, մարդու իրավունքներին և մարդասիրական նկատառումներին: Օգտագործելով դեպքերի ուսումնասիրություններ՝ աշխատանքում ընդգծվում է պատժամիջոցների նկատմամբ ավելի նպատակային և իրավաբանորեն հիմնավորված մոտեցումների անհրաժեշտությունը: Դրանում առաջարկվում է ներառել բացառություններ մարդասիրական նկատառումներով, ուժեղացված իրավական երաշխիքներ եւ երրորդ կողմ հանդիսացող պետությունների աջակցության մեխանիզմներ, որոնք երաշխավորում են, որ պատժամիջոցները կլինեն արդյունավետ եւ կհամապատասխանեն միջազգային իրավունքում արդարության եւ համաչափության սկզբունքներին:

Հանգուցաբառեր և բառակապակցություններ՝ Պատժամիջոցներ; երրորդ պետություններ; տնտեսական ազդեցություն; մարդասիրական ազդեցություն; քաղաքական հետևանքներ; միջազգային իրավունք; փախստականների ճգնաժամեր; առևտրի խափանումներ; դիվանագիտական խնդիրներ; նպատակային պատժամիջոցներ

Воздействие санкций на третьи государства

Григорян Сирануш С.

*соискатель кафедры Европейского и Международного права, Юридический факультет,
Ереванский государственный университет (Ереван, РА)*

Аннотация. Санкции являются широко используемым инструментом в международном праве для воздействия на поведение государств или негосударственных субъектов с целью обеспечения соблюдения международных норм. Однако их последствия часто выходят за рамки основных целей, создавая значительные правовые, экономические и социальные проблемы для государств-третьих сторон. В данной работе рассматриваются сложные последствия, с которыми сталкиваются эти государства, включая сбои в торговле, финансовую нестабильность, кризисы с беженцами и дипломатическую напряженность. С юридической точки зрения в нем анализируются права и обязанности третьих государств по международному праву, при этом особое внимание уделяется принципам невмешательства, правам человека и гуманитарным соображениям. Используя тематические исследования, в документе подчеркивается необходимость более целенаправленных и юридически обоснованных подходов к санкциям. В нем рекомендуется включить исключения по гуманитарным соображениям, усиленные правовые гарантии и механизмы поддержки государств-третьих сторон, гарантирующие, что санкции будут эффективными и будут соответствовать принципам справедливости и соразмерности в международном праве.

Ключевые слова и словосочетания: Санкции; третьи государства; экономическое воздействие; гуманитарное воздействие; политические последствия; международное право; кризисы с беженцами; сбои в торговле; дипломатические проблемы; целенаправленные санкции

INTRODUCTION

Sanctions are an important instrument in international law, often employed to influence the actions of nations, organizations, or individuals without resorting to military intervention. Designed to address issues such as human rights violations, aggression, or breaches of international law, sanctions typically take the form of trade restrictions, financial penalties, or travel bans. While these measures are intended to target specific entities, their impact often extends far beyond, creating significant economic, social, and political challenges for third-party states that are not directly involved.

Third states with economic, geographic, or political connections to sanctioned entities are particularly vulnerable to these secondary effects. For example, key trade partners may suffer financial losses from disrupted supply chains, while neighboring countries may face refugee inflows stemming from economic instability in the sanctioned state. These unintended consequences can destabilize the economies of third states, exacerbate humanitarian crises, and strain both domestic governance and international diplomatic relationships.

From a human rights perspective, the broad application of sanctions often exacerbates the vulnerability of populations in third states, raising serious concerns about their impact on basic rights, including access to food, healthcare, and education. Refugee crisis triggered by sanctions further highlights these issues, as the displaced often face poor living conditions and limited access to fundamental resources in host countries. These unintended humanitarian effects bring into question the compatibility of current sanctions regimes with international human rights standards, which emphasize the protection of economic, social, and cultural rights.

From a legal perspective, the effects of sanctions on third states raise critical concerns about equity and proportionality in international law. While sanctions are designed to compel specific actors to change their behavior, the collateral damage to uninvolved third parties often conflicts with fundamental principles such as non-interference, state sovereignty, and proportionality. International law mandates that punitive measures be crafted with precision to minimize harm to those not directly involved in the dispute. Sanctioning authorities bear a responsibility to uphold the economic, social, and political rights of third states while pursuing their policy goals.

This article explores the under examined impact of sanctions on third states, with a particular focus on the legal and humanitarian challenges they

encounter. Through an analysis of specific cases, it emphasizes the need for comprehensive frameworks and legal safeguards to mitigate unintended harm. By doing so, the study advocates for sanctions that are more targeted, balanced, and aligned with international legal principles.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES FOR THIRD STATES

Sanctions, while aimed at pressuring specific governments or individuals, often produce significant unintended economic consequences for third states. These states, though not directly targeted, frequently face disruptions in their trade networks, financial systems, and investment flows. One primary way sanctions affect third states is by disrupting global and regional trade networks. Nations economically linked to sanctioned countries, either through trade partnerships or supply chains, often experience reduced market access, decreased exports, and increased operational costs.

For instance, European countries heavily reliant on Russian energy imports encountered substantial economic challenges following sanctions on Russia. Energy-intensive industries saw operational costs escalation due to reduced access to Russian energy supplies. As energy prices rose, industries relying on stable and affordable energy reduced production, leading to inflation and slower economic growth across the continent. This chain effect highlights how third states, such as EU member nations, can experience significant economic fallout when sanctions target critical suppliers [10].

Furthermore, sanctions against Russia demonstrate how global supply chains can be thrown into confusion. European companies previously reliant on Russian natural gas were compelled to seek alternative, often costlier, energy sources. This shift placed additional strain on industries across various sectors, from manufacturing to transportation, intensifying the economic consequences beyond the intended scope of the sanctions [5, pp. 145-160].

Sanctions also bring financial challenges for third states affected by secondary sanctions, which penalize foreign banks and companies that conduct transactions with the sanctioned country. This creates a domino effect, especially for nations closely tied to the target country's financial systems. For example, Central Asian countries such as Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan faced financial disruption due to their economic links with Russia. Banks in these countries found themselves increasingly isolated from global financial markets, cautious of secondary sanctions. This isolation not only restricted international trade but also

discouraged foreign investment, which is crucial for their economic growth [11].

Financial restrictions imposed on sanctioned nations can also affect their trading partners. When sanctions were imposed on Iran, neighboring countries such as Iraq and the UAE faced significant disruptions. Iraq, relying on Iranian natural gas for energy, experienced power shortages and higher costs, demonstrating how sanctions can indirectly destabilize the economies of third states, sometimes pushing them into crises [6].

In Venezuela’s case, sanctions have impacted both the country and its neighbors. Colombia, for example, has had to accommodate millions of Venezuelan refugees escaping economic collapse, stressing its social services and infrastructure.

Furthermore, disruptions in Venezuela’s oil exports have affected regional energy markets, forcing neighboring countries to seek alternative sources at higher costs. This has placed an economic burden on countries like Colombia, which are already addressing their own domestic challenges [7].

Additionally, sanctions on Venezuela’s oil industry have caused disruptions in regional energy supplies, contributing to instability in global oil prices. These fluctuations have affected countries beyond Venezuela, with many oil-importing nations facing rising prices and supply shortages. The following table summarizes specific cases of third states impacted by sanctions, highlighting key economic linkages and resulting consequences in trade and finance [9].

Table 1

Sanctioned Country	Affected Third State	Economic Linkages	Impact
Russia	European Union	Energy dependence	Energy price spikes, supply chain disruptions, inflation
Russia	Central Asian countries	Trade, remittances	Financial instability, disruption of regional trade
Iran	Iraq, UAE	Regional trade partnerships	Disruption in trade, access to markets
Venezuela	Colombia	Regional trade, migration	Economic disruption, refugee influx impacting resources

This table provides a snapshot of how third states, economically linked to sanctioned countries, can suffer significant economic consequences, from financial instability to supply chain disruptions.

The far-reaching effects of sanctions also impact food supply chains. Restrictions on agricultural exports from countries like Russia and Venezuela have disrupted global food markets, leading to shortages and inflation in states dependent on these imports. Rising food prices have heightened food insecurity in some regions, exacerbating existing humanitarian issues and forcing governments to divert resources from other critical needs [1].

While sanctions serve as tools of foreign policy, they often create unintended and widespread economic consequences for third states. These countries, economically tied to sanctioned nations, face disrupted trade, financial isolation, and reduced investment. As illustrated by the experiences of European states affected by sanctions on Russia, Central Asian nations linked to Russian financial systems, and countries neighboring Iran and Venezuela, the cascade effects of sanctions can create substantial economic hardship. Policymakers

should consider these broader impacts when designing sanctions regimes to minimize collateral damage to third states.

Policymakers should consider these broader impacts when designing sanctions regimes to minimize collateral damage to third states. Adopting targeted sanctions, supporting affected third states through international cooperation, and strengthening global mechanisms to address spillover effects can help reduce the unintended economic consequences of sanctions on uninvolved nations.

HUMANITARIAN IMPACT ON THIRD STATES

Sanctions, although aimed at specific countries, governments, or individuals, often lead to significant unintended humanitarian consequences that extend beyond their original purpose. Third states—especially those with close economic or social connections to the sanctioned nation—frequently experience adverse effects, including a sudden flood of refugees and increased pressure on healthcare systems and other social services.

One of the most visible impacts of sanctions is the worsening of refugee crises. As sanctions

degrade living conditions in the targeted country, millions are often forced to run away in search of safety and basic needs. Neighboring states, which may already be managing their own socio-economic challenges, can find themselves overwhelmed by large refugee populations, leading to severe humanitarian pressure.

The Syrian conflict offers a stark example. Sanctions on Syria, imposed in response to its internal conflict, severely affected the civilian population. As the conflict continued and economic conditions degraded, millions of Syrians fled to neighboring countries, creating one of the largest refugee crises in recent history. Jordan and Lebanon, with limited resources, were suddenly responsible for providing shelter, healthcare, and education to millions of displaced Syrians [4]. This led to overcrowded refugee camps, shortages of basic supplies, and overstressed public services, particularly in healthcare and education, which struggled to meet the needs of both refugees and local communities [10]. The situation became critical as international aid was often insufficient to address the growing demands placed on these third states.

From a human rights perspective, the imposition of broad economic sanctions often disproportionately affects vulnerable populations in both the targeted state and neighboring countries. Sanctions that disrupt access to essential goods, such as food and medicine, can lead to widespread violations of fundamental rights, including the right to life, health, and an adequate standard of living. Third states, overwhelmed by refugee inflows, are often forced to make difficult choices about resource allocation, exacerbating inequalities and leaving marginalized groups even more vulnerable to deprivation.

Beyond refugee crises, sanctions can also have a serious impact on the healthcare systems of third states. Refugees often arrive with untreated medical conditions, including chronic illnesses, due to the collapse of healthcare services in their home country. For third states with fragile healthcare infrastructures, the flood of refugees in need of medical care can quickly overwhelm resources.

Colombia's experience with the Venezuelan refugee crisis is a powerful example. Sanctions on Venezuela's oil industry contributed to an economic collapse, forcing millions of Venezuelans to seek refuge in neighboring countries, with Colombia taking in the largest share [11]. Despite significant efforts, Colombia faced major challenges in providing healthcare to the influx of Venezuelan refugees, many of whom arrived with conditions like malnutrition and infectious diseases [7]. Hospitals and clinics in border regions were quickly

overwhelmed, and shortages of medical supplies and personnel exacerbated the situation [1]. This strain on Colombia's healthcare system illustrates how sanctions, though intended to pressure a specific government, can impose substantial humanitarian costs on neighboring countries.

Human rights organizations have frequently criticized the lack of humanitarian safeguards in sanctions regimes, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that sanctions do not infringe on the economic, social, and cultural rights of affected populations. International law, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), obliges states to protect these rights, even in the context of economic coercion. The absence of robust mechanisms to monitor and mitigate the humanitarian fallout of sanctions often leads to systemic violations of these rights, as seen in the cases of Syria, Venezuela, and North Korea.

In addition to healthcare, the stream of refugees places pressure on social services, including housing, education, and employment. Third states, particularly those already facing economic hardships, struggle to meet this sudden increase in demand. In Lebanon, for example, the Syrian refugee crisis has led to a rise in rents, displacing vulnerable Lebanese families from their homes [2]. Educational services are also overstretched, leaving many refugee children without formal schooling, creating a generation of displaced individuals without the education or skills needed for future social integration and economic contribution [8].

Sanctions can also disrupt regional trade networks, creating spillover effects on neighboring economies. When sanctions target specific industries in one country, they can cause shortages and inflation in third states that rely on trade with the sanctioned nation. This is particularly evident when the targeted country is a major regional supplier in sectors like energy or agriculture.

For example, long-standing international sanctions on North Korea have created economic and humanitarian challenges for its neighbors, particularly China and South Korea. While sanctions aim to limit North Korea's nuclear capabilities, they have also reduced cross-border trade, especially with China, which historically has been North Korea's largest trading partner [9]. This reduction in trade has led to economic strain in Chinese regions closely linked to North Korean industries, especially in agriculture and small-scale manufacturing [6]. South Korea also faces challenges, particularly in humanitarian terms, as it often supports aid efforts for North Korean citizens affected by food shortages and other crises stemming from sanctions [3].

The unintended human rights implications of sanctions on third states call for urgent reforms in the design and implementation of these measures. Policymakers must prioritize the inclusion of humanitarian exemptions in sanctions regimes, ensuring access to essential goods and services. Moreover, international institutions should establish independent monitoring mechanisms to assess the impact of sanctions on human rights and recommend adjustments to minimize harm to affected populations. Addressing these gaps is essential for aligning sanctions practices with international human rights law and preventing further collateral damage.

While sanctions remain a critical tool of international diplomacy, their humanitarian impact on third states is substantial and cannot be overlooked. Strain on healthcare systems, social services, and regional economies highlights the unintended consequences that neighboring countries frequently bear. Policymakers must consider these broader humanitarian impacts when designing sanctions regimes and work to minimize collateral damage to third states. By focusing on targeted sanctions and providing support to affected third states, the international community can help reduce unintended suffering caused by these measures.

DIPLOMATIC AND POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF SANCTIONS ON THIRD STATES: A LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

Sanctions, intended to pressure specific targets, can have far-reaching consequences for third-party states. These nations, while not directly involved in the underlying conflict, often face complex diplomatic challenges, domestic political instability, and legal dilemmas stemming from their interactions with both the sanctioned and sanctioning states. This section examines how sanctions impact third states' sovereignty, international relations, and internal political dynamics.

A central challenge for third states is the delicate balancing act required to maintain diplomatic relations with both the sanctioning and sanctioned states. This balancing act can be particularly complex when economic ties, historical relationships, or geopolitical considerations are involved. For instance, India's reliance on Iranian oil, coupled with its strategic partnership with the United States, forced it to navigate a complex web of sanctions and counter-sanctions [4].

India's strategy of seeking waivers from the U.S. government while diversifying its energy sources highlights the complexity of navigating legal extraterritoriality, which raises questions about the principle of non-interference and the interplay between national sovereignty and powerful external forces. The legal tension between compliance with U.S. sanctions and adherence to India's domestic

energy laws underscores the broader challenge of reconciling competing legal frameworks under international law [2].

Extraterritoriality, the principle by which a nation can extend its laws beyond its borders, is a key legal issue arising from sanctions. This can lead to significant challenges for third states, as they may be compelled to comply with foreign laws that conflict with their domestic legal frameworks. Secondary sanctions, which target entities in third states that engage in business with the sanctioned country, can have a devastating impact on their economies. The lack of clear international legal standards governing such practices raises concerns about the balance of power and potential overreach by sanction-imposing states, particularly when these measures conflict with the principle of sovereign equality under the United Nations Charter [6].

Another important legal aspect is the question of proportionality in sanctions regimes. While international law acknowledges the use of sanctions as a legitimate tool to enforce compliance with international norms, their application must align with principles of necessity and proportionality. Third states often argue that secondary sanctions impose disproportionate burdens on their economies and legal systems, particularly when they are compelled to sever critical trade or financial relationships. This tension underscores the need for legal mechanisms to evaluate and mitigate the collateral damage caused by sanctions on third states.

Another significant diplomatic and political challenge is the destabilizing effect sanctions can have on internal governance. In many cases, governments of third states may face pressure from domestic groups that either support or oppose their stance on the sanctions. For instance, in Iraq, the sanctions imposed on Iran created a diplomatic and political dilemma. Iraq, which shares deep historical, economic, and political ties with Iran, faced pressure from both the United States and Iran over its economic and political relations with Tehran. This led to divisions within Iraq's government, as factions debated their response to the sanctions. Some groups supported closer relations with Iran, while others feared alienating the United States. This fragmentation not only complicated governance but also hindered efforts to address pressing economic and social challenges [10].

The political consequences of sanctions on Iran were also felt domestically in Iraq, as factions within the Iraqi government debated their response. Some political groups, particularly those with ties to Iran, supported closer relations with Tehran despite the sanctions. Other factions feared alienating the

United States, leading to further political fragmentation within Iraq. This division complicated the government's ability to address pressing economic and social challenges [11]. Legally, Iraq faced challenges navigating international trade laws, given its reliance on both U.S. and Iranian markets for critical imports, such as energy [3].

From a legal perspective, sanctions on third states raise questions about extraterritoriality and sovereignty. Secondary sanctions, which penalize entities that transact with sanctioned countries, often have extensive legal implications for third states. For example, businesses and financial institutions in third states not party to the original sanctions may be penalized for trading with the targeted country. This creates legal uncertainty for third states, as they must comply with the domestic laws of sanction-imposing countries, which may conflict with their own legal frameworks [5]. The principle of jurisdictional overreach is frequently invoked in such disputes, as third states question the legitimacy of foreign powers enforcing their domestic laws extraterritorially. Courts in several jurisdictions have highlighted the importance of reconciling competing claims of jurisdiction under international law to ensure equitable outcomes for affected states [11].

Furthermore, sanctions raise critical concerns about legal accountability and dispute resolution. The absence of an overarching international legal framework leaves third states with limited avenues for redress. Multilateral bodies such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) could play a larger role in mediating disputes arising from the extraterritorial application of sanctions, but such mechanisms remain underutilized. The lack of clear, binding resolutions contributes to the fragmentation of international legal norms and undermines trust in multilateral systems.

The cases of India, Lebanon, and Iraq illustrate the complex interplay of legal, diplomatic, and political challenges that sanctions impose on third states. These examples underscore the necessity of a more nuanced and legally consistent approach to sanctions. Policymakers must prioritize clarity and fairness in international sanctions regimes, ensuring that third states are not disproportionately burdened by measures targeting others. Establishing clear humanitarian safeguards and legal guidelines can help minimize unintended consequences while promoting stability and adherence to international norms.

CONCLUSION

This analysis highlights the extensive and often unintended consequences of international sanctions, emphasizing their profound impact on third-party states. These nations, which are typically linked to the targeted entity through economic, geographic, or

political connections, often face disruptions that extend across trade networks, financial systems, and social infrastructures. While the primary purpose of sanctions is to influence the behavior of specific governments or individuals, their cascading effects can undermine the stability, sovereignty, and well-being of uninvolved states. These challenges expose gaps in the current international legal frameworks that aim to address such unintended outcomes.

The economic challenges experienced by third states are multifaceted, encompassing disruptions in trade, inflation, financial exclusion, and reduced foreign investment opportunities. Additionally, humanitarian systems in these states are under significant pressure as they struggle to accommodate displaced populations caused by the instability resulting from sanctioned countries. The strain is evident in essential services such as healthcare, education, and housing, which are often overwhelmed by sudden surges in demand. Political stability within these third states can also be threatened, as governments are forced to balance diplomatic pressures with internal economic and social challenges.

These findings underscore the urgent need to rethink how sanctions are designed and enforced. To reduce their harmful effects, the international community must prioritize the creation of targeted and equitable sanctions frameworks. This includes implementing humanitarian exemptions to ensure that critical goods like food, medicine, and healthcare are not inadvertently restricted by sanctions. Additionally, establishing economic support mechanisms could provide assistance to third states impacted by the secondary effects of sanctions, helping to stabilize their economies and maintain vital public services. Strengthening legal frameworks is also essential to ensure fairness, proportionality, and accountability in the application of sanctions.

Furthermore, international cooperation involving organizations, regional actors, and donor states is vital to develop comprehensive responses. Such cooperation should focus on addressing immediate humanitarian needs, stabilizing economies, and providing emergency aid to mitigate the strain on social services and infrastructure.

Future research should explore the structural vulnerabilities of third states, examining how factors such as reliance on global supply chains, regional trade interdependence, and financial market integration heighten their exposure to the unintended effects of sanctions.

A more strategic and well-informed approach to sanctions — one that integrates both legal principles and humanitarian considerations — can ensure that they achieve their intended policy goals

without destabilizing or harming the rights and sovereignty of uninvolved nations. This approach would represent a step toward a fairer, more balanced, and responsible use of sanctions within the international legal system while aligning with human rights principles and equitable solutions.

Bibliography

1. **Allen, Susan Hannah.** *The Humanitarian Impact of Economic Sanctions: Reassessing the Theory and Evidence.* // International Affairs Review, vol. 90, no. 4, 2014, pp. 853-867.
2. **Drezner, Daniel W.** *Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice.* // International Studies Review, vol. 13, no. 1, 2011, pp. 96-108.
3. **Galtung, Johan.** *On the Effects of International Economic Sanctions: With Examples from the Case of Rhodesia.* // World Politics, vol. 19, no. 3, 1967, pp. 378-416.
4. **Gordon, Joy.** *Invisible War: The United States and the Iraq Sanctions.* // Harvard University Press, 2010, pp. 156-170.
5. **Hufbauer, Gary Clyde, et al.** *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered.* 3rd ed., Peterson Institute for International Economics, 2009, pp. 145-160.
6. **Lopez, George A.** *The Sanctions Decade: Assessing UN Strategies in the 1990s.* // International Journal, vol. 59, no. 4, 2004, pp. 851-872.
7. **Pape, Robert A.** *Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work.* // International Security, vol. 22, no. 2, 1997, pp. 90-136.
8. **Peksen, Dursun.** *Better or Worse? The Effect of Economic Sanctions on Human Rights.* // Journal of Peace Research, vol. 46, no. 1, 2009, pp. 59-77.
9. **Wallace, Michael.** *Sanctions and International Human Rights.* // Global Policy Journal, vol. 7, no. 4, 2016, pp. 421-434.
10. **Weiss, Thomas G., et al.** *Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: History and Current Context.* // International Studies Review, vol. 18, no. 4, 2016, pp. 589-600.
11. **Zarate, Juan C.** *Treasury's War: The Unleashing of a New Era of Financial Warfare.* // PublicAffairs, 2013, pp. 102-118.

Сдана/Հանձնվել է՝ 25.02.2025

Рецензирована/Գրախոսվել է՝ 04.03.2025

Принята/Ընդունվել է՝ 11.03.2025