

Executive Summary

of

**“A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY NON-INTERNATIONAL
ARMED CONFLICTS AND APPLICABILITY OF
INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW: ISSUES AND
CHALLENGES”**

submitted to

THE MAHARAJA SAYAJIRAO UNIVERSITY OF BARODA

For The Award Of

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY [Ph.D]

IN LAW

Research Guide

Dr. Namrata Luhar

Research Scholar

Ms. Niyati Pandey

FACULTY OF LAW

THE MAHARAJA SAYAJIRAO UNIVERSITY OF BARODA

VADODARA-390 002

October 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PARTICULARS	Page No
Executive Summary	III
Table of Contents of PhD Thesis	VIII
Research Methodology	XV
Conclusions and Recommendations	XVI
Key Findings	XXXIX
Bibliography and Webliography	LV

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The title of current research is “*A Study of Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts and Applicability of International Humanitarian Law: Issues and Challenges*”. Neither war nor the rules of war are new to mankind. The ancient Indian scriptures like Mahabharat and Ramayan are classic examples of battles between Kings with elaborate instances of application of rule of war. However, the modern International Law finds its origin in the Treaty of Westphalia which in 1648 established the nation-States systems. These nation-State systems were sovereign in their internal and external matters and their interactions, in times of peace as well as in times of war, was governed by the rules of International Law. However, the scope of International Law was restricted to the ‘States’ and their relationship with other States. As modern International Law was concerned only with the States, it did not deal with conflicts that were internal in nature.

Gradually with the development of modern International Law, it also led to the development of the laws of war which are identified as International Humanitarian Law. The first chapter *Introduction* discusses the importance of International Humanitarian Law, its purpose and framework. The chapter also throws lights on the types of armed conflicts under Geneva Conventions and special reference to types of non-international armed conflicts. Further the chapter has also initiated the discussion on the issue of contemporary non-international armed conflicts and new wars and their characteristics which forms the core of current research problem. Apart from this, the first chapter also highlights the rational, object and hypothesis of the research and the review of most of the significant literature that is available in this filed.

In the second chapter *The Place of Non-International Armed Conflicts and International Humanitarian Law* of the research, the reader can find the deliberation on the term of war, its definition and concept and the shift to the term of armed conflict. It further delves into types of armed conflict and examines the kinds of armed conflicts, international armed conflict and non-international armed conflict, their meaning and threshold in detail. This chapter also has a deliberation on the distinction between the two legal regimes with focus on causes of distinction and its consequences on the applicability of international humanitarian law. Moreover, the chapter also discussed the recent trends that have resulted into the dilution and blurring of the distinction between the two regimes. The chapter concludes with a contention that distinction between the

international armed conflicts and non-international armed conflicts is still relevant due to the different status of fighters and rules relating to the detention of combatants and civilians in these two types of conflicts.

The third chapter *New Wars and Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts: The Emerging Trends* has attempted to analyse the nature of contemporary conflicts and try to answer whether they fall into the neat distinction prescribed by the international humanitarian law. It traces the trends, means and nature of war and armed conflicts from the times when wars were the monopoly of the State to the times when States have lost their prominent position in the theatre of war. Further, the chapter discusses various propositions on the nature of contemporary conflicts, the thesis of four generations of warfare and new wars, the evolving means and methods of warfare. It details as to how the evolving technologies and new weapons combined with the re-emergence of irregular warfare changed the nature of contemporary conflicts. Consequently, the chapter has identified the features of the modern conflicts like internationalization of conflicts and involvement of multiple parties, dominance of armed groups leading to asymmetry and hybridization, terrorism, organised violence and private militaries which have resulted to a mired theatre of conflicts in current times. The chapter also highlights how the nature of war and its determination is important to not just humanize wars but also mitigate its effects and bring to an end as soon as possible. The chapter has tried to answer that are we in the fourth-generation warfare.

The fourth chapter *Accommodating New Wars in Old Laws: Case Study* the research provides and indebt analysis of four different conflicts. First case study is on the Global War on Terror under which the genesis, historical background and the geographical scope has been discussed. A brief analysis of the parties like The United States, Al Qaeda and other bodies like United Nations and the NATO's role has been discussed. The classification of war on terror has been done on the criteria of international armed conflict, non-international armed conflict and also from the perspective of terrorism and counter-terrorism to determine the challenges posed by this conflict classification to international humanitarian law. Finally, an analysis as to global war on terror as a new war has been done. The second case study on Syrian conflict provides for the overview of the conflict and its contributing factors. The study also presents a brief analysis of multiple actors in the Syrian Conflict like Syrian government and its allies, Free Syrian Army, Islamic Front, ISIS,

Kurdish Popular Protection Units and US and other international actors. An analysis of the Syrian civil war leads to the existence of a non-international armed conflict and existence of several international actors makes it an international armed conflict. Further the new developments like war crimes in the Syrian conflict and the role of UN regarding the same has been discussed. Further, the study has been concluded by analysing it from the perspective of a new war. The third case study deals with the Kashmir issue. In the overview of the conflict, the study entails the history and the changing dimensions of the conflict. It further discusses the causes of conflict and recent developments that have brought the conflict again at the forefront. The study has identified various actors in the conflict including the States of India and Pakistan, several separatist organisations, and the United Nations. Moreover, the people of Kashmir have also played a significant role in the conflict changing its nature and hence their involvement has also been analysed. The case study has been further analysed under two classification of international and non-international armed conflicts. The Kashmir issue has also been analysed keeping in mind the recent developments that have happened so as to trigger the application of international humanitarian law like surgical strike and pre-emptive air strikes, use of human shields, direct participation of civilians and the use of pallet guns by the armed forces on the civilians. Finally, an analysis has been drawn to determine whether the Kashmir conflict qualifies as a new war or not. The fourth study is on the Naxal conflict in India where the history and surrounding factors have been discussed to provide the overview of the conflict. Further, actors in the conflict whose participation has been analysed are Indian State and its forces, Mao front forces, the tribal indigenous groups and also Salwa Jadum and other tribal anti-Naxal forces. The conflict has been studied under the classification as internal conflict, non-international armed conflict, and the implications of the same.

In chapter five ***Human Rights and Humanitarian Law: From a Victim's Perspective*** the concept of victim in the armed conflicts has been discussed keeping in mind the changes in the idea of victim that has been witnessed during the contemporary conflicts. Moreover, to analyse the violation of human rights in contemporary conflicts, certain dimensions have been identified like nature of conflicts and its impact on human rights, urban warfare and vulnerability of civilians, malicious use of digital technologies, environment impact of conflicts and the overall degradation of standard of life. Any conflict has serious impact on the victims and causes multi-faceted adverse

consequences. The major implications that have considered in this chapter are death, destruction of civilian objects, sexual violence, child soldiers, displacement, human trafficking, and human shields. Moreover, the chapter has looked into the interdependence of human rights violations and armed conflicts in the form of causes and symptoms, consequences or transformers of armed conflicts. Also, the chapter has looked into the place of human rights during armed conflicts specially during non-international armed conflicts, Moreover, the chapter has analysed the institutional protection accorded to human rights through various mechanism during an armed conflict like ICC and the other ad hoc tribunals. Besides, the chapter has also dealt with the human rights law protection that are available during an armed conflict like non-discrimination, humane treatment, prohibition on murder, and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and punishment. After discussing the theoretical framework the chapter has further researched into the issues that have emerged with respect to the application of international human rights framework during contemporary conflicts. in contemporary conflicts, where the distinction between international, non-international armed conflicts and sometimes even internal conflicts is not clear, three scenarios emerge, first where human rights law is the only applicable law, where humanitarian law is the sole framework or a third scenario where three-pronged approach deciphered by the ICJ in *The Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* case can be applied has been detailed in this chapter. Lastly, the chapter has detailed the trends in application of international human rights law during the armed conflict and the issues and challenges that have been faced due to contemporary conflicts like applicability of human rights law to non-State groups and the asymmetry between the parties have been discussed.

Finally, in chapter six ***Conclusion and Suggestions*** the conclusion, findings, major suggestions, and supplementary suggestions have been provided. The major conclusion of the research is that new wars and contemporary conflicts pose challenge to international humanitarian law. These challenges have further been streamlined where the impact of these trends have been discussed individually. The major consequence of these trends identified by the research are threefold, firstly, that the distinction between international and non-international armed conflicts is turning fictional, secondly the distinction between wartime and peacetime is difficult to determine, recognition of non-international armed conflict and non-compliance of humanitarian law by non-State armed

groups. Further the chapter lays down the findings of the research by answering the research questions and accordingly determining the hypothesis. Ultimately, based on the analysis and findings, a model protocol has been suggested and for understanding its scope and application a commentary has also been appended to the model protocol. Apart from these suggestions, certain supplementary proposals have been made with an intention to make the international legal regime, more democratic, accessible and accountable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF PHD THESIS

PARTICULARS	Page No
Certificate	I
Declaration	II
Acknowledgement	III
List of Abbreviations	V
List of Cases	VII
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 International Humanitarian Law: Importance	2
1.1.2 Purposes of IHL	3
1.1.3 Framework of International Humanitarian Law	3
1.1.4 International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	5
1.1.5 Types of Armed Conflicts under Geneva Conventions	5
1.1.6 Types of Non-International Armed Conflicts (NIAC)	6
1.1.7 Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts and New Wars	7
1.1.8 Characteristics of Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts	9
1.2 Statement of Problem	10
1.3 Rationale of the Study	11
1.4 Object of the Study	12
1.5 Scope and Delimitation	13
1.6 Hypothesis	14
1.7 Orientation to some Basic Concepts	14
1.8 Significance and Utility of the Study	22
1.9 Research Questions	24
1.10 Research Methodology	24
1.11 Scheme of the Study	25
1.12 Review of Related Literature	29

CHAPTER 2 NON-INTERNATIONAL ARMED CONFLICTS: THEIR PLACE IN INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW		
2.1	Introduction	48
2.2	War	50
	2.2.1 Legal Definitions	51
	2.2.2 Concept Diluted	53
2.3	Armed Conflict	55
	2.3.1 Development of Armed Conflict in International Law	56
	2.3.2 War to Armed Conflict	57
	2.3.3 Definition	61
	2.3.4 Kinds of Armed Conflict	63
2.4	International Armed Conflict	64
	2.4.1 Definition and Meaning	64
	2.4.2 Threshold	65
	2.4.3 Other Thresholds of International Armed Conflict	67
	2.4.3.1 Occupation	67
	2.4.3.2 Self-Determination	71
	2.4.3.3 Recognition of Belligerency	73
	2.4.4 Termination of Armed Conflict	74
	2.4.5 New State as a consequence	76
2.5	Non-International Armed Conflicts	77
	2.5.1 Definition and Meaning	77
	2.5.2 Thresholds of NIAC under various provisions	77
	2.5.2.1 Common Article 3	77
	2.5.2.2 Additional Protocol II	83
	2.5.2.3 A Third Threshold	86
2.6	Difference between the two legal regimes	87
	2.6.1 Causes of Distinction	87
	2.6.2 Consequences of Distinction	89
	2.6.3 Blurring of Distinction	90
2.7	Conclusion	91

CHAPTER 3 NEW WARS AND CONTEMPORARY NIACs: THE EMERGING TRENDS	
3.1 Introduction	93
3.2 Generations of Warfare: A Reflection on the Changes	94
3.2.1 Clausewitz Classical War	96
3.2.2 Fourth Generation of Warfare	97
3.2.2.1 William Lind	98
3.2.2.2 Thomas Hammes	100
3.2.2.3 John Robb	104
3.2.2.4 Critique of 4th Generation of Warfare	105
3.2.3 New Wars and Contemporary Conflicts	107
3.2.3.1 Criticisms	109
3.3 Evolving Means and Methods of Warfare	110
3.3.1 New and evolving technologies of weapons	111
3.3.2 Re-emergence of Irregular Warfare	112
3.4 Features of Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts and New Wars	114
3.4.1 Predominance of NIAC	116
3.4.2 Multinational Nature of Conflicts and Internationalisation	118
3.4.3 Presence of Multinational forces	120
3.4.4 Dominance of Armed Groups: Nature and Complexity	121
3.4.5 Asymmetric Warfare and Hybrid Conflicts	122
3.4.6 Urbanisation of Warfare-A Great Equaliser	124
3.4.7 New Technology and Modern Weapons	126
3.4.8 Terrorism and IHL	127
3.4.9 Private Militaries	128
3.4.10 Organised Crime and Armed Conflicts- Economics of War	129
3.5 Are we in Fourth Generation Warfare?	130
3.6 Conclusion	132
CHAPTER 4 ACCOMMODATING NEW WARS IN OLD LAW: CASE STUDY	
4.1 Case Study: Global War on Terror	134
4.1.1 Introduction	134

4.1.2	Background	134
4.1.2.1	History	135
4.1.2.2	Geographical scope	136
4.1.3	Actors in the Conflict	138
4.1.3.1	The United States	138
4.1.3.2	Al Qaeda	139
4.1.3.3	United Nations	144
4.1.3.4	Alliance in the Global War on Terror	145
4.1.4	Classification of the Conflict on War on Terror	145
4.1.4.1	International Armed Conflict	146
4.1.4.2	Non-International Armed Conflict	148
4.1.4.3	No armed conflict: Is Terrorism & Counterterrorism an Armed Conflict?	152
4.1.5	Challenges	153
4.1.6	Conclusion: Is Global War on Terror a New War?	159
4.2	Case Study: Syrian Conflict	161
4.2.1	Introduction	161
4.2.2	Background to the Conflict	162
4.2.2.1	Overview of the Syrian Conflict	162
4.2.2.2	Other Contributing Factors	163
4.2.3	Actors in Conflict	164
4.2.3.1	Syrian Government and its Allies	165
4.2.3.2	Free Syrian Army	165
4.2.3.3	Hay'at at Tahrir al-Sham	167
4.2.3.4	Islamic Front	168
4.2.3.5	ISIS	168
4.2.3.6	Kurdish Popular Protection Units	169
4.2.3.7	US and other International Actors	170
4.2.3.8	Summary	172
4.2.4	Classification of Syrian Conflict	172
4.2.4.1	Existence of Non-Intentional Armed Conflict in Syria: Civil War	172
4.2.4.2	Existence of International Armed Conflict in Syria	175
4.2.5	Key Developments: War Crimes and United Nations	176

4.2.6	Conclusion: Is Syria a New War?	177
4.3	Case Study: Kashmir Issue	179
4.3.1	Introduction	179
4.3.2	Overview of the Conflict	179
4.3.2.1	History	179
4.3.2.2	Changing Dimensions	181
4.3.2.3	Causes of the Conflict	182
4.3.2.4	Recent Developments	184
4.3.3	Actors	185
4.3.3.1	India	185
4.3.3.2	Pakistan	185
4.3.3.3	Separatist Organisations	186
4.3.3.4	People of Kashmir	189
4.3.3.5	UN and Kashmir Conflict	190
4.3.4	Classification	191
4.3.4.1	International Armed Conflict	191
4.3.4.2	Non-International Armed Conflict	194
4.3.5	Key Developments: Triggers to International Humanitarian Law	196
4.3.5.1	Surgical Strike and Pre-emptive Air Strikes	197
4.3.5.2	Use of Human Shields	199
4.3.5.3	Direct Participation in Hostilities: Civilians and Kashmir Conflict	200
4.3.5.4	Use of Pellet Guns	201
4.3.6	Conclusion: Is Kashmir Conflict a New War?	203
4.4	Case Study: Naxal Conflict in India	205
4.4.1	Introduction	205
4.4.2	Overview of the Conflict	205
4.4.2.1	History	205
4.4.2.2	Other Factors	207
4.4.3	Actors in Conflict	208
4.4.3.1	State of India	208
4.4.3.2	Mao Front Forces	209
4.4.3.3	Tribal and Indigenous Groups	211
4.4.3.4	Salwa Judum and other tribal anti-Naxal forces	211

4.4.4	Classification of the Conflict	213
	4.4.4.1 Internal Conflict	213
	4.4.4.2 Non-International Armed Conflict	215
	4.4.4.3 Implications	217
4.4.5	Conclusion	218
CHAPTER 5: HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN LAW: FROM A VICTIM'S PERSPECTIVE		
5.1	Introduction	219
5.2	Victim of Armed Conflict: A Shift in the Concept	220
5.3	Human Rights Violations in Contemporary Armed Conflicts	221
	5.3.1 Changing nature of armed conflict and HR violations	222
	5.3.2 Urban Warfare-high population density and vulnerability	222
	5.3.3 Development and Proliferation of Weapons Technology- increased risk for civilians	223
	5.3.4 Malicious use of digital technologies- additional risk to civilians	223
	5.3.5 Environmental impact of conflict and climate change- compounding civilian sufferings	224
	5.3.6 Overall degradation of standard of life	225
5.4	Conflicts and its consequence on Human Rights	225
	5.4.1 Death/Fatality	226
	5.4.2 Attack on Civilian Objects	227
	5.4.3 Sexual violence	227
	5.4.4 Child Soldiers	228
	5.4.5 Displacement	230
	5.4.6 Human Trafficking	231
	5.4.7 Human shields	231
5.5	The inter-dependence of armed conflicts and human rights violations	232
	5.5.1 Human Rights violations as causes and symptoms of violent conflict	232
	5.5.2 Human Rights violations as consequences of armed conflict	234
	5.5.3 Human Rights violations as transformers of conflict dynamics	234
5.6	Protection of human rights during conflicts: Place of HR in times of NIAC	235
	5.6.1 Protection of human rights during NIAC: IHL and human rights	237
	5.6.2 Institutional Protection to Human Rights: ICC and ad hoc tribunals	239
5.7	IHRL protections during armed conflict	240
	5.7.1 Non-Discrimination	241

5.7.2	Humane Treatment	241
5.7.3	Prohibition on Murder	242
5.7.4	Prohibition on cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment or punishment	242
5.8	Application of IHRL during Contemporary Conflicts: Issues	243
5.8.1	IHL as the only applicable law	243
5.8.2	IHRL as the only applicable law	244
5.8.3	The Three-Pronged Approach	245
5.9	Trends in application of IHRL during armed conflict	246
5.10	Application of IHRL during Contemporary Conflicts: Challenges	247
5.10.1	Applicability of IHRL to non-State groups	247
5.10.2	Asymmetry between parties in conflicts	250
5.11	Conclusion	252
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS		
6.1	Conclusion	253
6.1.1	New Wars and Contemporary Armed Conflicts pose challenge to International Humanitarian Law	253
6.1.2	Consequences of these trends on the International Humanitarian Law	266
6.1.2.1	Distinction between International Armed Conflict and Non-International Armed Conflict turning fictional	267
6.1.2.2	Distinction between wartime and peacetime and recognition of Non-International Armed Conflicts	268
6.1.2.3	Non-Compliance of International Humanitarian Law by Armed Groups	270
6.2	Findings	271
6.3	Suggestions	277
6.3.1	Model Protocol	280
6.3.2	Commentary to the Model Protocol	287
6.3.2	Other Suggestions	293
BIBLIOGRAPHY		i-xvii

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is based on secondary data. The secondary data is be library based, collected from various research, journals, articles, books, and publications. The present study is a doctrinal study. The foundation of the study rests on the international humanitarian law and its sources. The primary source of the research is the treaty law and its interpretation and application by the International Courts and Tribunals in various case laws. In some instances, domestic decisions have also been applied to analyse the transformation of international law into the local law and their complementarity. To further understand the scope and application of the laws, the researcher has investigated the *travaux preparatoires* and commentaries of international humanitarian law, reports by ICRC and UN Resolutions.

Hence, an analysis of the current legal framework, its application and the judicial decisions is discussed. Apart from legal analysis the research also comprises of examination of situation of armed violence as case studies in order explore the ways of classification and its consequences, the data for which is collected from various published sources. Not only this, but research conducted by various international scholars and legal luminaries has been examined in detail while conducting the study. International opinion and approach towards the issue plays a major role, so various sources have been referred.

Further, with respect to footnotes and references, ILI Style of Citation is adopted.

CONCLUSION

1. New Wars and Contemporary Armed Conflicts pose challenge to International Humanitarian Law

If in one sentence the core aim of the research is put forward, it would be to analyze the changing nature of warfare and its impact on the dichotomy of the two types of armed conflicts governed under the international humanitarian law that is international and non-international armed conflicts. To achieve the same, this research has tried to investigate the development and evaluation of methods of warfare, since the development of the nation State system which also coincides with the development of the modern International Law. The current generation is living in the fourth generation of warfare and while the laws made to combat the second and third generations of warfare are applied. The fourth generation of warfare has some distinct features which makes the war fought during these times as 'New Wars' or 'Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts'. Both the names have two diametrically opposite terms used; however, they signify the same thing.

'War' is generally used to describe the use of armed force between two or more States, example World Wars, and Non-International Armed Conflicts are those which are internal in nature, with only one State or sometimes even no State involved. But the irony of the current times is that these two terms 'New Wars' and 'Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts' are tantamount demonstrating the baffling nature of conflicts we are witnessing. The reasons for the same have been described by the features that have been identified in the third chapter of the research, "New Wars and Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts: The Emerging Trends". The trends identified in the chapter are mentioned below. The discussion below also discusses the challenge posed by these features to the application of international humanitarian law.

a. Predominance of Non-International Armed Conflicts: Since the end of the Second World War, the world has witnessed numerous conflicts, however the majority of which have been non-international or internal conflicts. Although, an initial inference will not highlight any problematic issue that needs attention, but when one zooms into the

practicalities involving the non-international armed conflicts and the law surrounding it, several challenges emerge that needs redressal. These challenges also are not uniform but are procedural as well as practical.

- **Conceptual Challenges:** Although, international humanitarian law had made a pathbreaking change by including non-international armed conflicts in the Geneva Conventions, theoretically, the law related to non-international armed conflicts is awfully limited. Formal law available in just Common Article 3 and the Additional Protocol II, the claim that it has been supplemented by customary International Law is not the complete truth. Several issues like detention, combatant immunity, status of prisoners of war are still ambiguous during a non-international armed conflict.
- **Practical Challenges:** The framework of international humanitarian law has been noticeably clear in the distinction between international armed conflicts and non-international armed conflicts and has been very straightforward while providing the threshold of an international armed conflict. However, the scope and applicability of the limited treaty provisions on non-international armed conflict are neither simple nor uniform. Three different provision, Common Article 3, Article 1 of Additional Protocol II and Article 8 of the Rome Statue, defining a non-international armed conflict provide three different thresholds for the classification of any hostilities as a non-international armed conflict thereby leaving room for confusion and ambiguity. Factual assessment of intensity of conflicts, categorization of non-State actors as armed groups has brought in too much subjectivity in the process of categorization of the armed conflict.

Thus, in light of the current developments, when most of the armed conflicts seem to be non-international in nature, these conceptual and practical challenges make the application of international humanitarian law difficult.

b. Multinational or Internationalised Non-International Armed Conflicts: An important aspect of the contemporary non-international armed conflicts is that they are local as well as global. A non-international armed conflict is internationalized due to foreign/other State or multinational intervention. These interventions can be direct and

indirect, rendering different classification in both the cases. As per the ruling in the *Tadic* case, an internal conflict can be internationalized in two scenarios:

- **Direct intervention:** When armed forces of other States intervene through their troops to intentionally support non-State armed groups
- **Indirect intervention:** When the non-State armed groups of a non-international armed conflict act on behalf of other State.¹

When a foreign State intervenes, even a minor military intervention would trigger the application of law of international armed conflict. If this intervention has no connection to the internal conflict, it will still be termed as an international armed conflict, alongside an existing internal conflict. The nature of the internal conflict will remain unaffected in spite of any unintentional support done to the non-State armed groups by the actions of a foreign State.

The categorization of the conflict becomes murky when a direct foreign intervention is intentional and with an aim to support the non-State armed groups. The “overall control test” used for determining the agency between the foreign State and the non-State actors has no clear-cut principles. A non-State actors will not be called as an agent of a foreign State in spite of being provided with military, financial and intelligence aid until and unless the other State has an overall control on the non-State armed groups having a visible impact on the conflict. Thus, due to lack of clarity in determining the effect of foreign military intervention has raised practical difficulties in application of law of armed conflict.

The same incoherent and confusing issues arise in the second type of intervention that is indirect in nature, where the primary test of “effective control” is applied to determine the foreign intervention that renders a conflict internationalized. Similar to the previous test, this test also measure the agency between the foreign State and the non-State actors and was laid down in the *Tadic* thus, famously known as the *Tadić Appeal Judgement’s test* and was also applied to determine US responsibility in the *Military and Paramilitary*

¹ Prosecutor v. Tadić (Judgement) [1999] T-94-1-A, para. 84 (Tadić Appeal Judgement).

*Activities in and against Nicaragua case*². Although, the test turned out to be ineffective and inconsistent as it failed to hold US responsible for the actions of the *contras* on the grounds that the violations committed by *contras* could be committed even without the control of US. Thus, the test was overruled a new test was laid down in the *Tadić Appeal Judgement* in which instead of a strict test three different standards were laid to determine the control so as to categorise a non-State entity as an agent of a State.

- **For acts of single individual or non-organised military groups:** *de facto* organ of State if specific instructions given or officially supported or endorsed *ex post facto*
- **For acts of subordinate armed forces, militias, or paramilitary units:** Over all control and not just mere military or financial aid. The State here may not give specific orders for individual operation, but organizes, plans and coordinates the actions of the military group.
- **Assimilation Test:** Individuals are asserted as agents of State due to their actual behaviour. No significant jurisprudential development has been seen with respect to this test.

Thus, irrespective of several tests laid down, howsoever broad they may sound, they still remain incompatible to the mixed conflicts. The categorisation of Syrian Conflict, which while being internal followed the pattern of internationalised armed conflict. The Assad regime was supported by not just Syrian armed forces by foreign fighters of multiple States like Iran and armed groups like Hezbollah. The war caused violence in Syria's neighbouring country Turkey leading to the 'spill over' of conflict. All sorts of foreign interference like diplomatic, financial, logistics support was seen in Syria. Yet it was classified as non-international by the Commission of Inquiry on Syria, or some parts identified as non-International by the ICRC. Thus, irrespective of large-scale fighting, atrocities on civilians and multiple foreign interventions, it was not classified as an international armed conflict so as to attract the Geneva Conventions in entirety.

² *Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v United States, Merits) (Judgment)* [1986] ICJ Rep 14.

As, international humanitarian law does not provide for a quasi-categorization, a conflict either must be an international armed conflict or non-international armed conflict. A same conflict cannot be both at the same time. Thus, even though it has been recognised that internationalised armed conflicts are of common occurrence in contemporary conflicts, law of armed conflict cannot be applied until and unless the dichotomy and the distinction between the international and non-international armed conflict is done away with.

c. Multinational forces and International Humanitarian Law: The conflicts are internationalized also by the presence of multinational forces like NATO or ‘UN Peacekeeping’ forces. Since the inception of these forces, they were kept accountable under the international humanitarian law as they were neutral parties, not representing any individual party to the conflict but the international community as a whole deployed with an intention to maintain peace and security. They do not take active part in the hostilities but are mainly engaged to aid the territorial State with intelligence or logistical support. As their legal status remains unclear, their continuous deployment in areas of internal conflict has created lot of challenges to the applicability of the international humanitarian law. Although, kept outside the purview of the law, they are currently held accountable under the ‘support based approach’ in case where their help has a direct impact in increasing the capability of a party in a pre-existing non-international armed conflict. This test is of no help in cases where the classification of the conflict itself is unclear. If there is no consensus as to the nature of conflict, how will an multinational interference be looked upon.

A similar significant question that remains unanswered is the responsibility of wrongful acts committed by multinational forces. Answers to all these questions depend upon the categorisation of conflict which nonetheless is already internationalised worsening the exercise of classification and thus rendering the applicability of laws problematic.

d. Dominance of Armed Groups: As the non-international armed conflicts are the most prominent in contemporary times, the theatre of war is dominated by non-State actors. Apart for novel features like open groups with transnational presence and decentralized structure, armed groups pose several evergreen challenges to international humanitarian law. The Laws of Armed Conflict do regulate the actions of non-State actors, however their

increasing influence presses for better application, implementation, and compliance with the law. In times when, more than 90 percent of the conflicts have non-State actors as participants, the international humanitarian law is in jeopardy as on one side, with so many conflicts its prominence and importance is increasing day by day, however with majority being non-International its respect and compliance is endangered like never before. The cause for the same are multifold as mentioned:

- Primarily their illegitimacy in the domestic law enforcement law keeps them out of purview of State recognition.
- Secondly, high threshold to be qualified as a party under Common Article 3 restricts the recognition of many non-state armed groups as ‘armed groups’ for the purpose of Geneva Conventions.
- Even if they be recognised by States as ‘armed groups’, denial of responsibility towards humanitarian norms and secondly, seeking compliance and holding them accountable for the violations has been evergreen challenge.
- Further, expecting compliance from non-State actors is also somewhat ironical as they themselves don’t consent voluntarily to be bound by the Geneva Conventions, but instead are made legally bound because of being provided rights by the Conventions and by being *de facto* party to the conflict . Thus, there is an urgent need to seek respect and reciprocation of the rules of armed conflict from the non-State armed group participating in the armed conflicts.

e. Asymmetric Warfare and Hybrid Conflicts: If one looks closely at the international humanitarian law, one will find that it is based on the several assumptions, the primary being conflict is fought between two States alike or States and armed groups, non-State parties who possess some State-like features and thus are treated to be at par with State. However, modern conflicts are characterized by so many asymmetries.

On the legal front, this inherent asymmetry between the parties affects the compliance of laws of war. This occurs when the weaker party, to diminish or reduce this asymmetry and come at par with the State, violates the humanitarian principles and discourages the State parties to comply with the laws of war. Thus, because a non-State armed group is attacking

civilians and civilian objects to inflict injury on State, the States in response also disregards the law and relax their standards. This leads to a spiraling effect ultimately causing a blatant disrespect for the laws of war. As only States are expected to comply with the provisions of international humanitarian law, non-State actors systematically refuse to be bound by the rules, the States tend to feel that their hands are exclusively tied by the law. The result is both the parties believe that following the rules of law is detrimental to them, thus causing an all-round disregard for the laws. This at the end, leads to blatant violation of the elementary principles of international humanitarian law -distinction, proportionality and precaution leaving the civilian population most vulnerable to the effect of hostilities.

f. Urbanization of Warfare: Being one of the most distinguishing features of contemporary conflicts, urbanization of conflicts has changed the complete dynamics of war and the laws applicable thereto. With more fighting taking place in cities, the most fundamental principles of international humanitarian law like distinction, proportionality and precautions are violated.

- **Distinction:** The rules of international humanitarian law specifically mentioned under Article 48 and 52 of Additional Protocol 1 prohibit attack on civilians and civilian objects and infrastructure without distinction.
- **Proportion:** Article 51 prohibits attacks that are expected to cause incidental civilian harm excessive and not in proportion to the expected military advantage. Thus, indiscriminate attacks are not permitted.
- **Precaution:** Further, international humanitarian law requires parties to take precautions so as to protect the civilians from damage and effect of attacks. Article 57 and 58 provide that even during attack, all feasible i.e. practical precautions are to be taken to minimize the incidental damage to the civilians.

However, the challenges posed by urban warfare are vicious and difficult to tackle. As the urban infrastructure is interconnected, a single point failure can turn an incidental damage to an intensified, reverberated, and cumulative one making assessment difficult. Use of heavy explosive weapons lead to destruction of houses and residential areas, further aggravated by use of civilian properties for military objectives, causing civilians losing

their life, property, and livelihood. However, the most irreversible damage caused is the mental and psychological trauma which goes unacknowledged and unaddressed.

g. New Technology and modern weapons: The two major technologies and modern weapons considered under the research are cyber warfare and autonomous weapons. With respect to cyber warfare during armed conflict, it poses tremendous risk to civil and military infrastructure with no specific provision in laws of war that prohibit cyber-attack. To fall under the purview of Geneva Conventions it must happen during the armed conflict as part of an armed conflict.

Recently published Tallinn Manual, although non-binding provided for applicability of rules of international humanitarian law to cyber warfare. As per the manual, a cyber-attack will attract principles of laws of war if it has the potential to cause injury or death to persons or damage or destruction of objects irrespective of the operation being offensive or defensive. From the international humanitarian law perspective, any damage which hampers the functionality of an object will fall under the category of armed attack even if any kinetic force was used or not is a question that need deliberation.

However, there is consensus among States in applying the existing principles of law of armed conflict to cyber-attacks, characterizing and assessing any conflict on the grounds of distinction, proportionality, and precautions as a cyber-attack may not result in physical damage, but can cause escalation in the conflict. A larger question that remains is that whether damage to civilian data has the same value as damage to civilian life, property, or object. What standards would determine the proportionality of cyber-attack and what kind of precautions would be practically expected in cases of cyber warfare as by the very nature it is a clandestine war method. At the end international humanitarian law prohibits violence and equating cyber warfare to kinetic violence seems to more problematic when the attack has been initiated by a non-State group.

The next emerging technology that is being used during armed conflicts is the autonomous weapons systems and unmanned aerial vehicles. The most controversial aspect of this

technology is the loss of human control over use of force. Instead of a human, the autonomy to execute the attack has been moved to the machines which legally cannot be held responsible unlike a human. International humanitarian law can be applied to hold persons who plan and command the attack in cases of failure of judgment. Nonetheless, rules regarding human degree and permissible degree of human control needs to be determined and established under the broader principles of law of armed conflict to hold parties to an armed conflict morally and legally accountable.

Finally, with respect to biological warfare, pertinent in times of the COVID-19 pandemic, it raises genuine concerns of the use of biological weapons by actors in armed conflict. Although, as per Rule 73 of the customary international humanitarian law formalized under several conventions like Geneva Gas Protocol and the Biological Weapons Convention, use of biological weapons has been prohibited during an international armed conflict. However, loss of risk to a humanity can be posed in case of use of biological weapons by a non-state actor or by any State under a clandestine operation.

Thus, speaking legally of the application of these new technologies to warfare, these are not governed adequately under the international humanitarian law. Article 36 of Additional Protocol I drafted to regulate the arms race during the cold war casts duties on the State Parties to undertake legal review of any new weapon and warfare technology that the State is developing, acquiring or using during war. This legal review not just assesses the legality of the weapon but also measures the State's conduct of hostilities under its international obligations. However, there is no such provision for a non-State actor and expecting a similar accountability from them has less probabilities. With States failure to prevent non-State armed groups from acquiring and using emerging technologies, the challenge further deepens. Thus, non-State actors using these new technologies with no reason for accountability and responsibility pose a grave danger to international humanitarian law during the conduct of contemporary warfare.

h. Terrorism and International Humanitarian Law: Terrorism is one such issue that has showed mirror to the whole framework of laws of war and laws of peace. Terrorist

activities during times of peace fall within the domestic framework of any State. To ensure international cooperation, aid and assistance for acts of terrorism executed through multiple States, several conventions have come in place. During an armed conflict, international humanitarian law does prohibit certain acts that would be designated as terrorist acts if committed during peace time. Nonetheless, it does not completely isolate itself from terrorist actions. International humanitarian law prohibits terrorist activities committed during armed conflicts as war crimes and range of other activities that would be terrorist if committed outside armed conflict.

Usually States do not prefer to apply international humanitarian law to terrorist organisations as it would diminish their powers under counter-terrorism measures and provide unwarranted protections to the terrorists. Usually States are reluctant to treat terrorists as prisoners of war and provide them the same level of recognition as they would have while fighting an armed conflict. Further, application of Geneva Conventions will permit humanitarian action and access, which generally is forbidden under the counter-terrorism regime. Any humanitarian aid can be termed as an assistance to terrorist organisation, thereby penalising a humanitarian action.

Further, categorising counter-terrorism measures as a non-international armed conflict under Common Article 3 would require the essentials of intensity and organization of armed groups to be met first, otherwise, it remains outside the scope of international humanitarian law. Similar question was raised as to the legal status of 'war on terror' against Al Qaeda, that was claimed as a self-defence against armed attack by US post the 9/11 attack. By using the term 'war' it attracted the application of Geneva Conventions however, legally it was an over classification of a situation that would rather fall under the laws applied during peace. It raised questions pertaining to 'war' in legal sense and if it involved transnational networks which were difficult to be imputed to a particular State. Suggesting that law enforcement paradigm, local and international is inadequate to deal with emerging scenario as the magnitude of terrorist activities qualifies as acts of war and the judicial systems currently dealing with terrorist activities are unequipped to respond to an overwhelming situation of a terrorist attacks, transnational terrorist activities fall within the scope of

international humanitarian law. However, the phrase ‘war on terror’ created a “legal black hole” as it exonerated the US Government from the human right obligations and even limited their war protections.

It turns out that the international humanitarian law and terrorism regime are so much so at crossroads that under-application or over-application has triggered legal challenges.

i. Private Militaries: With wars being fought in territories of foreign States, at different fronts and in different regions, huge manpower, assistance, and operational tasks had become a challenge to sustain any conflict for a long duration. This requirement led to the development of private corporations that provide military survives not just to State but also non-State actors. Their emergence has raised dual challenges with respect to the status of private militaries to determine their rights and obligations and the State responsibility for the action of private militaries.

- **Legal Status of Private Militaries:** International humanitarian law applies only to participants of armed conflicts, and thus bringing the whole private military company within the purview of international humanitarian law would be overstepping its jurisdiction. Rather, making individual members of company responsible based on their role during an operation would be viable. Depending upon the control of the State under which they are acting, their status would be determined. If acting as a part of an armed group or a militia or a troop bearing the signs of a State and carrying weapons openly, the members of armed groups will fall under Article 4(A)(2) of the Third Geneva Convention, and when acting voluntarily under the responsible command of the State, they will fall under Article 4(A)(1). But, when these private military companies act as mere supply contractors, their status of protection is that of a civilian under Article 4(A)(4) of the Third Geneva Convention.
- **Responsibility of State:** Apart from the legal status of private military companies is concerned, the responsibility of the State to ensure respect for international humanitarian law and accountability for the actions of private armed forces is also a

pertinent question of international humanitarian law. Not just the State that hires private military but also the State on whose territory a private military company is operating needs to be held accountable for maintaining compliance to international humanitarian law. On top of it, States where the private military companies are registered and incorporated and whose citizens are associated to it, should also share the responsibility of ensuring respect for international humanitarian law by them.

Thus, with so many States involved in private entity participating either actively or passively in war, creates challenges at several fronts when an attempt to regulate it comes into question. Several States have drafted national legislation governing the conduct of private militaries, but the multinational nature of the industry stands as a challenge for harmonizing several jurisdictions. Further, constant oversight and supervening authority over the conduct of private military is also a challenge for the States which makes it imperative for an international effort to be taken in this direction. In 2005, New U.N. Draft International Convention on The Regulation, Oversight and Monitoring of Private Military and Security Companies was put forth with no signs of it being taken forward. Moreover, the draft convention was too weak to just mention the principles with no framework for execution and implementation. Although it reflected the international sentiment it failed to address a grave issue and reach a conclusion.

j. Organized crime: Numerous armed conflicts have given rise to a parallel economy in conflict ridden States and regions. Funding and weapons are what makes the conflicts last and produce harm. Internationally, the Arms Trade Treaty of 2012 has failed to control the illicit transfer of arms and with the recent fallout of US, the regime has become weaker to regulate illegal trade of weapons.

Further, these gangs and mafias dealing with drugs, weapons, minerals, and flesh have established a symbiotic relationship with the actors especially non-State of the conflict thus systematically supporting each other and disturbing the legal order across the continents. These organized criminal groups fall in the grey zone of conflicts and thus cannot be categorized as non-State armed groups under international humanitarian law simply

because their actions do not qualify as an armed attack, and the intensity of violence does not reach the threshold of Common article 3 although they might be organized enough. Thus, States even if they intend to, cannot move against these groups under international humanitarian law.

Thus, this new category of non-state actors, that are not directly involved in combat but play an indispensable role for the sustenance of conflict escape from the purview of international humanitarian law. If they are deemed responsible for the conduct of the combatants, they can be held accountable under international humanitarian law, but it sounds to be abstract. Howsoever they may be responsible for several conflicts which would not have happened if they would not have been involved, they easily escape liability. A more systematic approach between the humanitarian framework, States and the UN Office on Drugs and Crime is required to break this nexus.

2. Consequences of these trends on the International Humanitarian Law:

The above discussion reflects the fluidity of contemporary conflicts. Multiple parties, with shifting alliances, are fighting on multiple fronts, with diverse and often opaque motives. Proliferation of radical non-State groups based on multiple identities, mobilize support through social media and thus globalises the participation. With indiscriminate use of modern weapons, mostly in civilian areas has led to flagrant violation of international humanitarian law worsened by readiness of armed groups to act on foreign soil, thus creating transnational character with regional repercussions. Lack of respect for international humanitarian law and lack of any viable solution makes these conflicts enduring and intense. These features are singular but are present in conflicts of Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Nigeria, Sudan, Somalia, Democratic Republic of Congo and in Afghanistan.

Thus, the consequences faced by them are multifold, some normative and some practical that are discussed below.

- **Distinction between International Armed Conflict and Non-International Armed Conflict turning fictional:** One of the basic tenets of international humanitarian

law is the distinction between international armed conflict and non-international armed conflict. The laws of war when formalised in 1949, the Geneva Conventions brought into its purview the armed conflicts of internal nature for the first time. Nonetheless, customary laws of war applied to recognised belligerency even before the adoption of Geneva Conventions. As already discussed in the previous chapter, States had varied opinions with respect to the inclusion of internal conflicts in the same set of regulations as international conflicts. However, irrespective of all the opposition, Common Article 3 dealing with armed conflicts not of international character was included in the four Geneva Conventions further supplemented by the Additional Protocol II of 1979. Nonetheless, the threshold of the application was different which formalised the distinction between conflicts governed by two distinct set of laws.

However, all the changes in nature of war and conflicts in the past seven decades have been revolutionary than the previous changes seen in the history. These changes have different strategic, tactical, military, political connotations, and significance, but legally their most important implication is the blurring of the distinction between the two kinds of armed conflicts. With all the features of contemporary conflicts discussed above, point to an important development that is weakening and eroding the distinction between the International and non-international armed conflicts.

As initially when the narrow set of rules for prohibited weapons were drafted, only States had the capacity to acquire them, which is not the case today as even non-State groups are in possession of weapons that are prohibited for States. This distinction has also been eroded in the contemporary warfare.

Most importantly, the internal conflicts falling under non-international armed conflict became so brutal due to multiple actors and foreign interference, that the narrow regime of non-international armed conflict is unable to deal with this new ‘internationalised armed conflict’ which has further diminished the distinction between the two types.

Moreover, the Adoption of Additional Protocol I in 1970 recognised several non-international armed conflicts as international armed conflicts like conflicts of self-determination, conflicts against colonial regime and racist regimes. Further, by virtue of State practice and International and regional resolutions for seeking respect for humanitarian law by all actors in a conflicts, State as well as non-State, major rules of international humanitarian law have now formed a part of customary international law thus being applicable in all kinds of conflicts irrespective of its kind.

- **Distinction between wartime and peacetime and recognition of Non-International Armed Conflicts:** Apart from the distinction between international armed conflict and non-international armed conflict, the international humanitarian law is also premised on the distinction between wartime and peace. It lays down certain thresholds to declare a hostile situation as an armed conflict, different for international armed conflict and non-international armed conflict. This implies that the qualification of peacetime and war is different in international armed conflicts and non-international armed conflicts. For international armed conflict the threshold is very low whereas for non-international armed conflicts it's not just high but also subjective. It has become subjective because of several reasons. Firstly, the recognition of non-international armed conflict is no longer factual but is factoral, based in the assessment of presence or absence of intensity and organization. Rather than looking at the whole conflict as a whole and assessing its impact in a holistic manner, individual elements are tested independently, which often lead to non-application of international humanitarian law even if the demand of the situation would be otherwise.

Thus, if any conflict does not qualify as a non-international armed conflict, laws of peace, domestic laws and law relating to human rights are applied. This has made the law relating to non-international armed conflict absolutely redundant in light of the changing nature of contemporary conflicts. In times, when non-international armed conflict is the predominant conflict causing most of the violence and destruction, a narrow inflexible test has delayed the application of international humanitarian law and further excluded many situations from being regulated under international humanitarian law thus leaving at the expense of international human rights law and domestic laws.

Even though, non-international armed conflicts found their place with the international armed conflicts, their place was too small with very few rules applicable to them. The distinction between the two regimes remained. This distinction may be merely with respect to the nature of the conflict and the status of combatants and non-combatants it is significant to trigger and invoke the application of the laws. Most importantly, States retained all the power to apply the Geneva Conventions in cases of non-international armed conflict with themselves. Thus, the associated consequence of the strict test to classification of non-international armed conflict is the powers of States to recognise the conflict and initiate the response.

With all the discretion with States in recognizing an internal hostility as a non-international armed conflict, no objectivity and consistency in such declaration is found. Most armed conflicts today would fall into the category of non-international armed conflicts, but the regime of the same is not yet fully developed. With scarce treaty rules, applying them by the States is also infrequent.

- **Non-Compliance of International Humanitarian Law by Armed Groups**

Apart from the existing discrepancies in the hard law, the failure of compliance and diminishing respect for international humanitarian law is also a consequence of the contemporary conflicts. There are more than six hundred provisions under the Geneva Conventions to regulate the conflicts, and hence what is required is its compliance. However, this primary concern of implementation is further aggravated in current times due to increase in conflicts involving non-States actors. Thus, the implementation is not just linked to the applicability, but also practical situations like failed states and armed groups. There are several reasons for armed groups not complying with the Geneva Conventions. Multiplication of armed groups in the same conflict, different ways of operation, lack of awareness makes it difficult to make them accountable or seek compliance of the rules. Moreover, armed groups find lack of incentive to abide by the rules.

However not just armed groups, even States' lack of political will has resulted into loss of respect for international humanitarian law. States deny applicability of international humanitarian law as they are reluctant to give any legitimacy to the armed groups by recognizing them as parties to armed conflicts. International interference makes it difficult to classify the conflict which further delays the application of international humanitarian law. Further, contemporary conflicts have made it practically impossible to apply international humanitarian law, like diminishing distinction between combatants and civilians, loss of protection due to direct participation in hostilities.

International humanitarian law, which assumes that both the sides are equal, have equal responsibilities, even if one party fails to do so, has lost relevance. States are not willing to recognise the armed groups to deny them protection under international humanitarian law but expect them to follow the rules of war is the challenging reality of today's times. This further worsened when military and humanitarian objects do not concur, for example the suicide bombers.

Also, due to asymmetric nature of contemporary conflicts, the principle of reciprocity has also lost its value. Rather, the negative reciprocity has become the order. Asymmetries in parties leads to violation of international humanitarian law principles which acts an excuse for the other party to abide by the same and thus leads to the spiral of violation.

Mechanisms to monitor compliance provided under Geneva Conventions like protecting powers, enquiry procedure, fact finding commissions, meeting of High Contracting parties have not been so effective other than ICRC. Many of these measures are either biased and political or they have not been used due to procedural difficulties.

3. Findings

To analyze the nature of contemporary conflicts and study the challenges posed by these conflicts for international humanitarian law this research was conducted extensively. This research was done with the following objectives:

1. To provide an account of the changing character of the contemporary violent conflict and related crises and to address theoretical debates, political approaches, and the law on the changing landscape of contemporary non-international armed conflicts.
2. To provide an overview of the challenges posed by contemporary non-international armed conflicts and New Wars for international humanitarian law.
3. To outline the challenges to the application of international humanitarian law in contemporary conflict zones and the inherent inadequacies in the law.
4. To generate broader reflection on those challenges and outline the ongoing or prospective actions under international humanitarian law.
5. To study past instances representing various emerging kinds of armed conflicts and take into account how these problems were addressed by UN and other international agencies.
6. To provide a comprehensive assessment of the current legal framework of the international human rights law and its implementation with respect to its reliability during non-international armed conflicts.
7. To study the difference that would have been made towards victim redressal if different definitions had been applied.
8. To understand the rigidity vis-à-vis flexibility of the existing international humanitarian law framework so as to accommodate the contemporary non-international armed conflicts.
9. To provide preliminary conclusions towards a normative and policy framework that could sufficiently address the challenge posed by contemporary armed conflicts.

To achieve these objectives, the research is divided into six major chapters. The second chapter titled *“Non-International Armed Conflicts: Their Place in International Law”* discusses the reason for the adoption of the term ‘armed conflict’ instead of ‘war’ and the historical debates with respect to the recognition of two kinds of armed conflicts which

eventually gave birth to the ‘non-international armed conflicts’. The chapter has discussed the laws pertaining to the two kinds of armed conflict, their application and has deliberated into the causes of this distinction and its significance.

The third chapter is one of the significant portions of the research and is titled, “*New Wars and Contemporary Non-International Armed Conflicts: The Emerging Trends*”. In this chapter the researcher has established a theoretical foundation for the contemporary non-international armed conflicts. This has been done by analysing the evolution and development of warfare since the inception of the modern International Law. By means of examining the changes in methods and means of warfare due to industrialization and irregular war, which has gradually led to the evolution of the four generation of warfare. The current or the fourth generation, is also recognized as new wars and has several new characteristics coupled with few old but in a different setting altogether. This chapter has discussed the significant trends associated to new wars and contemporary non-international armed conflicts.

The fourth chapter is titled, “*Accommodating New Wars in Old Law: Case Study*” where four different conflicts have been studied. The conflict in Syria, the global war on terror, Kashmir conflict and Naxal conflict have been examined to classify these conflict under the laws of war and to see how the conflict was classified by the States, the participants and UN and other institutions. The chapter has also discussed as to whether these conflicts are new wars or not.

The fifth chapter, “*Human Rights and Humanitarian Law: From a Victim’s Perspective*” discusses the applicability of human rights law during an armed conflict. It further analyses the reliability of the international human rights framework during the contemporary non-international armed conflicts and its relation vis-à-vis international humanitarian law.

The **objective No. 1** relating to the changing character of current conflicts and associated theoretical debates have been accomplished under chapter 3. The political approaches have been understood under chapter 4 by means of case studies through the stance taken by

various States and international organizations and institutions in classification of these conflicts.

The **objective No. 2** to analyse the challenges due to new wars on the current international humanitarian law framework has been discussed under chapter 3 and chapter 6.

The **objective No. 3** that aims to outline the challenges to the application of international humanitarian law in contemporary conflict zones and the adequacies in the law have been dealt under chapter 4 in detail by means of case studies of four different enduring conflicts. The **objective No. 4** that aims to throw light on the challenges and the actions taken by the international community has been discussed under chapter 6 where the researcher has successfully established that the international regime has failed to address the challenges thrown by these new conflicts to the existing framework of international humanitarian law.

The **objective No. 5** regarding past instances of armed conflict and how these were addressed by UN and other international actors and institutions have been discussed in detail in chapter 4 where several UN resolutions, NATO resolutions, UN reports on conflicts have been discussed to examine the actions taken so far. Apart from the legislative actions, the ad hoc International Criminal Tribunal judicial decisions have been investigated in various chapters. It must be mentioned that the major development happening in the jurisprudence of law of non-international armed conflict has happened due to the consistent efforts of the various tribunals established by the UN.

The **objective No. 6** pertaining to the analysis of the current framework of international humanitarian law and the law relating to non-international armed conflict has been discussed in detail under chapter 2.

The **objective No. 7** which aims to study the difference that would have been made towards victim redressal if different definitions had been applied has been discussed under chapter 4 and chapter 5. The objective has been achieved by analysing the classification of conflicts

made by the States and repercussions of the same on the participants as well as the victims of the conflict.

The **objective No. 8** aims to understand the readiness of the current framework to accommodate new wars and the researcher in the chapter 6 has discussed how major changes have taken place that have led to the blurring of the distinction between the unification the two types of armed conflicts armed conflicts and most of the provisions of international armed conflict have not been applied to non-international armed conflict. However, the status of combatants and prisoner of wars is one important aspect that still needs to be fixed to result in the complete application of the laws of international humanitarian law to non-international armed conflicts.

The **objective No. 9** that seeks to provide for a normative or a policy framework has been provided under chapter 6 of the research. The research provides for a model supplementary protocol to the Geneva Conventions so as to deal with new kinds of armed conflicts that do not fall into the neat classification of two armed conflicts.

Conclusions drawn on basis of Research Question/ Hypothesis

1.8.1 **Question No. 1:** Whether the various forms of contemporary non-international armed conflict need significant attention and legal definitions?

The answer of this research question is positive. The said Question has been affirmed by the inferences drawn in Chapter 3,4 and 6 of this study.

1.8.2 **Question No. 2:** Do ‘New Wars’ pose challenge to the application of the international humanitarian law?

The answer of this research question is confirmed. The said Question has been answered by the inferences drawn in Chapter 3 and 6 of this study.

1.8.3 **Question No. 3:** Whether ‘New Wars’ and contemporary non-international armed conflicts fit in existing framework of the international humanitarian law?

The answer to this research question is partly in negative as the contemporary non-international armed conflict do not exactly fit in the existing framework. The answer is based on inferences drawn in Chapters 3 and 4 of this study.

- 1.8.4 **Question No. 4:** Whether the role of UN in addressing the non-international armed conflicts has been satisfactory or not?

The said answer is in negative because compared to the expectation, UN has failed to maintain peace or negotiate peaceful ends to conflicts. These inferences are drawn from Chapters 4 and 6 of this study.

- 1.8.5 **Question No. 5:** Whether the dichotomy and categorisation of armed conflicts has posed biggest challenge to rights of victims?

The said Question has been affirmed by the inferences drawn in Chapter 3 and 6 of the research study.

- 1.8.6 **Question No. 6:** Whether international human rights law can be relied in times of non-international armed conflicts?

The said Question has been partly confirmed as international human rights law can be completely relied in times of conflicts by the inferences drawn in Chapter 5 of the research study.

- 1.8.7 **Question No. 7:** Has the distinction between international armed conflict and non-international armed conflict become insignificant?

The said Question has been answered affirmatively by the inferences drawn in Chapters 3 and 6 of the study.

- 1.8.8 **Question No. 8:** Whether the difference in definition of non-international armed conflicts leads to difficulty in implementing international humanitarian law?

The said Question has been positively established by the inferences drawn in Chapters 4 and 6 of this study.

1.8.9 **Question No. 9:** Do they need to be addressed with a set of new laws?

The said Question has been answered in affirmative and the research also provides alternatives in the way of Model Protocol. The inferences for this question have been drawn from chapter 3, 4 and 6 of the research study.

Hence, it can be concluded that News Wars and Contemporary Conflicts have led to the blurring of distinction between international and non-international armed conflicts. The current framework is not suitable to address the changes caused by the contemporary conflicts and thus new laws are required for new wars.

Thus, the researcher has suggested a possible model supplementary protocol so as to accommodate the new wars into the international humanitarian law framework and further concretize the unification of the laws of armed conflict.

SUGGESTIONS

As highlighted in the research, the means and methods of warfare have evolved dramatically, but the law has evolved at its own pace. No doubt it has tried to regulate the recent development but has not achieved enough success to humanize the conflicts. The most important reason identified for the failure of the international humanitarian law is that it has failed to regulate the non-international armed conflicts with same rigour and flexibility as it regulates international armed conflicts. With most of the conflicts today are internationalized non-international armed conflicts, bearing features of both types, the need for two sets of laws has become redundant. Various conventions, treaties and decisions have tried to remove the dichotomy between the two kinds armed conflicts to come to terms with the new wars and contemporary conflicts. Moreover, major success has also been achieved with respect to the unification of the normative framework. However, the implementation is still a roadblock. The major hurdle in the unification of the laws of armed conflict is the status of combatants or those who directly participate in the armed conflicts. This has been evidenced in cases of non-international armed conflicts, where States either under apply or over apply the international humanitarian law to avoid the recognition of a non-international armed conflict. A conflict that would have all the requisites of a non-international armed conflict will still no be recognized simply to deprive the non-State armed groups their due protection as combatants. This deviation by the States is restricting the expansion or the unification of the laws of armed conflicts. The major reason for the same is that the States do not wish to recognize the “right to rebel” compromising its sovereignty to the members of asymmetric armed groups indulging in transnational terrorist activities.

There are strong arguments in favour of unification of the law of armed conflict.

- *Firstly*, from humanitarian perspective applicability of the humanitarian law will act as a cushion to absorb the shock of any conflict and
- *Secondly*, even States can detain members of armed groups for an indefinite period rather than arresting them under domestic law wherein finally they end up being released by the judicial process to be found again on the battlefield.

- *Thirdly*, recognizing armed groups would generate reciprocation from the non-State actors thus bringing them one step closer to respect and follow the international humanitarian law.
- *Fourthly*, with both parties applying humanitarian principles, will lead to less human rights violations, decreased animosity and faster and fruitful peace negotiations.
- *Fifthly* and *finally*, this would expand the application of international humanitarian law to all kinds of conflicts irrespective of what their nature is, even encompassing terrorist activities, thus removing the human subjectivity from the legal application.

Thus, to bring in such changes, a model law has been proposed, with an attempt to fill the gap that still remains with respect to the application of international humanitarian law to non-international armed conflicts and accommodate the changes and the trends that change the nature of non-international armed conflicts. It is important to understand that this law is not uniformizing the international and non-international armed conflicts or giving the status of State to non-State armed groups, but is merely unifying the applicability of humanitarian principles during a conflict irrespective of its type.

**Model Protocol for the Applicability of principles of Humanitarian Law
in Non-International Armed Conflicts and its Peaceful Termination**

2020

Preamble

Conscious of numerous hostilities that threaten the peace, security, and wellbeing of the world,

Considering the definition of armed conflicts that encompasses every hostility that deserves international attention,

Recognizing the Martens Clause as the preemptory rule for the protection of combatants and non-combatants,

Recalling the principles of international humanitarian law embodied in the Geneva Conventions, the norm of general international law (jus cogens) and the Rome Statute,

Mindful that throughout history millions of children, women and men have been victims of armed conflicts that deeply shook the conscience of humanity,

Considering the rights of non-State parties to seek protection under international humanitarian law and their obligations to the same,

Affirming that violations of rules of international humanitarian law must be prevented,

Determined to put an end to impunity for those who violate the rules of international humanitarian law and thus to contribute to the prevention of such acts,

Considering also that, because violation of international humanitarian law must not go unpunished, the effective prosecution of such acts must be ensured by taking measures at the national and regional level and by enhancing international cooperation,

Recalling that it is the duty of every State to protect its citizens from the scourge of war and provide maximum protection and security during wars,

Reminding that it is the shared duty of every State and non-State actors, organisations and individuals to terminate the conflict and undertake peaceful negotiations and strive to maintain peace and humanity

...

Article 1

Scope and Application

The present model protocol applies to non-international armed conflicts occurring in the territories of Contracting State Parties.

Article 2

Non-State Armed Groups

Non-State armed groups under the present protocol will include any combatants and/or group of rebellions which have reached minimum organization to operate under responsible command structure and carry out sustained and concerted military operations, and

Are so recognized by a Humanitarian Law Commission set up under Article 3 of this Protocol.

Article 3

Constitution of Humanitarian Law Commission and Powers

Each State shall constitute Humanitarian Law Commission in its territory

1. In case of an ongoing conflicts, then within 6 months of signing of this Protocol,
2. or after 6 months of violence and hostility occurring on its territory irrespective of the intensity of the same.

Humanitarian Law Commission shall consist of such number of independent members as prescribed in Contracting State Parties' domestic framework.

Article 4

Powers of Humanitarian Law Commission

The Humanitarian Law Commission shall be empowered to recognize the existence of a non-international armed conflict upon receiving application from,

1. The Concerned State when it identifies the existence of non-international armed conflicts,
2. Non-State armed groups,

The Humanitarian Law Commission may *suo moto* assess the nature of hostilities in determination of existence of non-international armed conflicts.

Humanitarian Law Commission after assessing the hostilities and distinguish the same from internal disturbances, riots, and sporadic violence and recognize the existence of non-international armed conflicts by publication of Notification.

Humanitarian Law Commission is empowered to recognise the combatant status of non-State armed groups as per Article 5 and withdraw such recognition as per Article 6.

Humanitarian Law Commission shall also after being satisfied determine the termination of non-international armed conflicts.

Article 5

Declaration by Non-State Armed Groups

Every non-State armed groups participating in a non-international armed conflict can submit, to the Humanitarian Law Commission, a declaration expressing

intention to adhere to the rules of International Humanitarian Law and the provisions in this Protocol.

Provided it shall have to declare its capability to comply with the rules of international humanitarian law for which it can even seek assistance from State parties of this Protocol, Humanitarian Commission, United Nations, Regional Organizations, International Committee of the Red Cross or any other NGO.

Humanitarian Law Commission upon being satisfied shall recognize the non-State armed groups and may impose such terms and conditions as appropriate and thereby recognize the existence of non-international armed conflict as per the Article 4.

On such recognition, the State will be bound to apply the rules of international humanitarian law.

Article 6 Eligibility for protection as combatants

Member of armed groups shall be eligible for the protections provided under Geneva Conventions if,

1. The Humanitarian Law Commission recognizes the existence of non-international armed conflict.
2. The members of the non-State armed groups wear uniform, carry arms openly and act under responsible command.
3. The armed groups do not violate the rules of international humanitarian law or any terms and conditions which may be imposed.

Breach of any of the above conditions would make armed group ineligible for the status of combatants.

Article 7 Protection of Civilians

Civilians taking direct participation in hostilities shall lose their protection as non-combatants, except otherwise if acting under unorganized or spontaneous acts.

Article 8 Legal Status of Private Militaries

Private militaries and their members shall be eligible for the protection as combatants if they directly take part in hostilities.

Members of private militaries if not wear uniforms and carry weapons openly will lose the status of combatants.

Members of private militaries providing indirect support to the parties of the conflicts shall be protected as non-combatants.

Each party bears responsibility for the military and security activities of private entities operating under their command.

Article 9 Nexus of armed group with organized criminal gangs

States may apply to Humanitarian Law Commission to discontinue to treat armed groups as combatants if any nexus of the members with an organized criminal gang is proved.

Article 10 Intervention by Foreign State

Any foreign State, intervening militarily or otherwise on behalf of the State shall submit the consent of the State and a declaration to be bound by rules of international humanitarian law to the Humanitarian Law Commission.

Any foreign State, intervening militarily or otherwise on behalf of the non-State armed group shall have declare the reason and nature of intervention to the State of intervention.

In case such declaration is not made, the State can refrain the foreign State from intervening on grounds of Sovereignty and non-interference in internal matters and seek sanctions against intervening State from the UN or Regional Organisations.

Article 11 Special Judicial Committee: Constitution, Role and Functions

Each State party shall constitute, under a *sui generis* framework, a Special Judicial Committee as soon as the existence of non-international armed conflicts is recognised by the Humanitarian Law Commission under Article 5.

Once the Special Judicial Committee is constituted it must be notified by the State to the UN.

States and non-State actors, parties to the non-international armed conflict can approach and make complain against the other party for the violation of international humanitarian law. The Committee is empowered to take cognizance on similar complaints made by civilians and Humanitarian Law Commission.

The Special Judicial Committee shall have the power to investigate commission of violation of rules of international humanitarian law, conduct trials for the same and punish if found guilty.

Aggrieved party can approach United Nations which can constitute an Ad hoc Appellate Tribunal to hear appeals from all the matters related to the conflict.

In case where the decisions of the Special Judicial Committee are not respected by any of the parties, it can approach the United Nations for its execution which has powers to take necessary action under Article 13(b) of the Rome Statute.

Article 12 Termination of Non-International Armed Conflicts

Every State party to a non-international armed conflict shall take measures to end the conflict and reach a peaceful agreement with the non-State groups or try to end the hostilities peacefully between two or more non-State groups.

Any armistice between two parties shall be submitted to the Humanitarian Law Commission who shall notify the termination of the conflict and the end of applicability of international humanitarian law.

6.3.2 Commentary to the Model Protocol

Article 1: The non-international armed conflicts under the model protocol shall have the same meaning as prescribed under Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. Thus, non-international armed conflicts under the protocol will come into existence, when

1. The Contracting State is engaged in armed conflicts against armed groups.
2. Armed groups engaged in armed conflicts against each other.
3. Any combination of the above two situations.

Article 2: As the law of non-international armed conflicts is silent as to the threshold to determine the existence of non-international armed conflicts, the most objective criteria laid down in the *Tadic* case has been chosen for the Model Protocol. The *Tadic* formula

has been widely accepted and removed the rigidity and the ambiguity from the definition of non-international armed conflict. The model protocol has applied the same formula to determine the existence of non-State armed groups, whose participation turns any hostility to a non-international armed conflict. There are three important changes suggested by this model protocol:

1. It removes the threshold of ‘occupation of territory’ that was included by the Additional Protocol II.
2. It also removes the requisite of ‘capability of armed groups to comply with the principles of humanitarian law’ as such a requirement sets the threshold too high to recognize any conflict as a non-international armed conflict. Although this important requirement has not been completely foregone by the model protocol, as non-State armed groups while making declaration under Article 5 can seek assistance from different bodies and organisations to comply with the principles of humanitarian law.
3. Moreover, the model protocol takes away the right of States to recognize the existence of non-international armed conflicts in their territory and hands it over to an independent national statutory body constituted by the State itself. Thus, this modus solves two pertinent problems faced currently. First, the States usually abstain from recognizing armed conflict they are engaged in and secondly, they do not want any international interference in the matter’s sovereign to them. This modus operandi will also be helpful in cases where States are not a party to a non-international armed conflict happening in its territory. Such situations, where two groups are fighting usually, States interference and decisions and be motivate by political interests and repercussions. In such a scenario an independent body can take a reasoned and an impartial decision for the determination of existence of an armed conflict.

However, this provision does not affect the status of non-State armed groups as stipulated under Common Article 3 of Geneva Conventions. The recognition of armed groups will neither diminish the sovereignty of the State nor will provide any legality to the armed group.

Article 3: To bring in transparency in the determination of existence of non-international armed conflicts it is especially important that States do not indulge in assessing such a situation. Further to avoid any international interference, the model protocol suggests constitution of an independent humanitarian commission that would deal with matters related to the application of international humanitarian law during any internal hostility taking place within the territory of any State. The model protocol suggests a *sui generis* system and gives States the liberty to constitute their own commissions which are truly independent from State control. An example of Human Rights Commissions established by States is exceptionally fine example of *sui generis* systems adopted by State to fulfil international aspirations and perform domestic obligations.

Article 3 further postulates a time limit of six months for the constitution of the commission, where it has contemplated two scenarios, States where conflicts are already going on, or States that may face conflicts in future. In the first scenario, the States must formulate a legislation and constitute within six months of the signing of the Protocol; and in the second scenario, the States shall constitute the commission with six months of starting of any hostility within the territory of the State. An important point that needs to be highlighted here is that States duty to constitute a commission shall not depend upon the intensity, scope, or frequency of attacks in the hostility. Before passing of six months since the tensions, riots, or incidents of violence, the States must from the commission to examine the situation.

Article 4: The Humanitarian Law Commission so constituted shall have powers to determine the existence of armed conflict and assess the end of armed conflicts thereby triggering or ending the application of non-international armed conflict. Thus, it can do so after receiving an application from States, armed groups or it can *suo moto* assess the nature of hostilities.

Article 5: This is one of the most needed provisions under international humanitarian law, which allows non-State actors to not to be just passive partaker but also active participant

in application of humanitarian principles. Keeping in mind the dispersed and latent nature of armed groups, assessing their requisites of their presence like organisation, command, hierarchy and capacity to inflict harm, this provision makes way where non-State armed groups can by themselves unilaterally declare to be bound by principles of humanitarian law on possessing such essential qualifications.

The Protocol by this Article removes the obstacle of capacity to apply principles of international humanitarian law which was the biggest hindrance in the recognition of presence of armed groups. It is not necessary for armed groups to possess all State like features to be capable of showing respect for the humanitarian law. Keeping in mind the loss of life and damage to civilian property during contemporary conflicts, it is high time that States should motivate armed groups to respect humanitarian principles in the conduct of hostilities. Thus, the protocol allows armed groups to seek assistance from various NGOs like ICRC or Amnesty International to provide humanitarian training, assistance to comply with the rules of armed conflicts. The assistance can be in manners to deal with captured combatants, wearing uniforms, understanding command responsibility, even negotiating with the State, among others.

However, an important aspect here is to understand that such unilateral declaration does not automatically trigger the application of humanitarian principles. But it allows the Humanitarian Law Commission to assess the situation with more clarity. Further, such a provision also avoids a situation where it might happen that the hostilities have not acquired the threshold of non-international armed conflicts and the non-State armed groups might wish to seek the combatant status under the Protocol which they are not worthy of.

Article 6: The major change brought by this model protocol is that it provides combatant status to the members of armed groups participating in a non-international armed conflict and thus lifts them from being mere criminals. However, the protocol follows the Geneva Conventions whereby there are certain rules to be followed so as to remain legal combatants and violations of the same would strip them off their status and make illegal combatants.

Article 7: A provision for direct participation in hostilities has been drafted to formalise a principle of customary international humanitarian law.

Article 8: The model protocol has made an attempt to bring an unaddressed issue of private militias and mercenaries, who are playing an active role in contemporary conflicts, within the purview of rules of armed conflict. Thus, by giving protection to private militaries as combatants, the command under which they operate can be held liable for violations of humanitarian law by any such member of private military. However, this protection of combatant status is available only when the private militaries participate directly to the hostilities that is by military activities and not in cases of peacekeeping or logistical and health support. While providing indirect support, they will be protected as non-combatants and cannot be targeted. To be identified as combatants they must wear uniforms and carry weapons openly while following other principles of humanitarian law.

Article 9: This protocol also addresses the issue of the nexus between armed group and organised criminal syndicates and gangs that will have the effect of discontinuance of status of combatants of armed groups. Humanitarian Law Commission has the power to take call in the matter at the insistence of the State.

Article 10: With respect to the most controversial issue of foreign State intervention faced by the contemporary non-international armed conflicts the protocol has brought regulation so as to secure the respect for the sovereignty of the State engaged in a conflict or in case a conflict on its territory between non-State armed groups. As per the protocol, any foreign State that finds the necessity for intervening in an ongoing non-international armed conflict cannot intervene, either militarily or otherwise, without the consent of the State, even if such an intervention is favourable for the State. Further, such State will be bound by the rules of humanitarian law and considered a party to the conflict and shall submit the declaration mentioning the same to the Humanitarian Law Commission.

Also, if the foreign State is intervening on behalf of non-State armed groups, it must mention the cause for such intervention, like protection of its citizens. If no such reasons are cited and the declaration is not made, the State can take necessary actions under International Law for breach of sovereignty.

Article 11: As Geneva Conventions have not provided for any implementing authority, it has become imperative that a body at domestic and international level is formulated that looks after the implementation of humanitarian law and punishes for breach of rules of armed conflicts. However, as States have always objected to foreign intervention, the present model protocol, mandates the contracting State parties to formulate a *sui generis* domestic framework to carry out judicial functions in implementation of international humanitarian law. This this solves two purposes, firstly States complain of foreign intervention can be addressed and secondly implementation can be done domestically ultimately taking the goal of humanitarian law to its appropriate culmination.

As per the Protocol, every State where the Humanitarian Law Commission has recognised the existence of the armed conflict has to constitute an independent Special Judicial Committee with powers and functions to investigate, conduct trial and punish for alleged acts of violation of humanitarian law.

In order to ensure that States fully perform the obligation under this Article, it is mandated that such States shall notify the constitution of the judicial committee to the United Nations.

Further, it also allows not just State but also armed groups and members thereof to approach the judicial committee and register their grievance. Further, it also opens its doors for civilian and can act at the insistence of Humanitarian Law Commission.

Anybody aggrieved of the decision of the judicial commission, can also approach United Nations which can constitute an *ad hoc* appellate tribunal or a tribunal under Rome Statue if the respective State is party to it.

Article 12: The model protocol mandates every State to take all measure to humanise the conflict and end it through peaceful negotiations. When such an agreement is made, it must be notified by the Humanitarian Commission which will terminate the conflict and end the application of humanitarian law.

6.1.2 Other Suggestions

Apart from these, there are other suggestion which the researcher seeks to provide for the peacetime.

- As inferred from the research, human rights violation, apart from being the consequences of armed conflicts are also cause and symptoms of an armed conflict. States and international community must strive to detect the undercurrents of the human rights violations and avoid any conflict before it reaches its boiling point.
- Further, its high time that United Nations take charge of international peace and order. As many roles and responsibilities added by this draft protocol, UN should democratize itself. An equal representation of all States should be made in the decision making process of such issues.
- Moreover, conflict ridden States should be given a seat in meeting where resolutions relating to the conflicts to which they are party or conflicts that are happening in their territory are being discussed and passed by United Nations.
- United Nations Security Council needs to be enlarged so as give equal representation to underrepresented States.
- As reforms at international level may take time in happening, regional organizations or States in a region must come together to end armed conflicts and bring peace in the region which is a must for the overall growth and development for States.

- At the national level, States must realize that maintaining peace and security within their territory is their foremost duty. With this it is also important that States must maintain and build peace not by using force but taking actions promoting well-being of the citizenry. Proactive role of States to protect civilians from hostilities should be done by minimalistic force used as defence. responsibility of State.
- States must integrate rules and principles of international humanitarian law in their military doctrine, educate their soldiers and spread awareness amongst the non-State armed groups.
- Ultimately, the whole argument to regulate non-international armed conflicts boils down to ‘Sovereignty’ of the States. However, it is important to understand for the States that sovereignty that is secured on the bodies of dead, who lost their lives in an internal conflict, will not last longer. States must determine to forgo their sovereignty for a while and try to humanize conflict to which it is party. As rightly said by Lord Shri Krishna in *Bhagwad Geeta* that -

“No one should abandon duties because he sees defects in them.”

-Ch 18, Verse 48, Bhagwat Geeta

सहजं कर्म कौन्तेय सदोषमपि न त्यजेत् |

सर्वारम्भा हि दोषेण धूमेनाग्निरिवावृताः || 48||

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

1. A. Cassese (ed.), *The Human Dimension of International Law: Selected Papers* (Oxford University Press, 2008).
2. Andrew Clapham and Paola Gaeta (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Law in Armed Conflict*, (Oxford Handbook Online, 1st ed. 2014).
3. Andrew Clapham, *Human Rights Obligations of Non-State Actors* (Oxford University Press 2006).
4. C Gray, *International Law and the Use of Force* (Oxford University Press 3rd ed. 2008).
5. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War* (Princeton University Press, 1989).
6. Christopher Greenwood, *The Law of War (International Humanitarian Law)* (Oxford 1st ed. 2003).
7. Chandra Lekha Sriram, Olga Martin-Ortega and Johanna Herman, *War, conflict and human rights: theory and practice* (Routledge, 3rd ed. 2017).
8. Christian Tomuschat, 'The applicability of human rights law to insurgent movements', in Horst Fischer, Dieter Fleck et al. (ed), *Crisis Management and Humanitarian Protection: Festschrift für Dieter Fleck*, (Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag 2004).
9. D. Fleck (ed.), *Protection of the Civilian Population* (The Handbook of International Humanitarian Law, 2007).
10. Dieter Fleck ed, *The Handbook of International Humanitarian Law* (Oxford 2nd ed. 2008).
11. Dieter Fleck, 'Humanitarian protection against non-state actors' in Johan Frowein et al. (eds), *Negotiating for Peace: Liber Amicorum Tono Eitel*, (Springer, 2003).
12. E. Riedel, 'Recognition of Belligerency' in R. Bernhardt (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, Vol. 4 (2000).
13. Elizabeth Wilmshurst (ed.), *International Law and The Classification Of Conflicts* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
14. Gaurav Khanna and Laura Zimmerman, *Development for Peace: The Decline of Naxalite Violence in India* (Oxford Research Group, 2017).

15. Georg E. Frerks, 'Human Rights Violations and Contemporary Violent Conflict: an Inquiry into Causes and Remedies' in Ineke Boerefijn (ed) *Human Rights and Conflict: Essays in Honour of Bas de Gaay Fortman* (Intersentia 2012).
16. H. Lauterpacht(ed.), *International Law* (Cambridge University Press 7th ed. 2017).
17. I.A. Shearer, *Starke's International Law* (LexisNexis UK, 11th ed. 1994).
18. J.S. Picket, *Commentary to the First Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field* (ICRC, Geneva, 1952).
19. Jack Goldsmith, *The Terror Presidency 64-65* (W.W. Norton & company, 1st ed. 2007).
20. James Crawford, *The Creation of States in International Law*, (Oxford University Press, 2 ed. 2014).
21. L Moir, *Law of Internal Armed Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1st ed. 2002).
22. L. Oppenheim, *International Law, Vol. I: The Law of Peace* (2nd ed. 1912).
23. L. Oppenheim, *International Law, Vol. II: Disputes, War and Neutrality* (2nd ed. 1912).
24. Liesbeth Zegveld, *Accountability of Armed Opposition Groups in International Law*, (Cambridge University Press, 2002).
25. Louise Arimatsu & Mohbuba Choudhury, *The legal classification of the armed conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Libya* (Chatham House, 2014).
26. M Mary Ellen O'Connell (Ed.), *What is War? An Investigation in the Wake of 9/11* (Martins Nijhoff Publishers, Boston, 2012).
27. Marco Sassoli, *Transnational Armed Groups and International Humanitarian Law*, 8 *Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research* (Harvard University Occasional Paper Series Winter 2006 number 6)
28. Mary Ellen O'Connell, "Ad Hoc War" in *Krisensicherung und Humanitarer Schutz – Crisis Management and Humanitarian Protection* (Horst Fischer, 2004).
29. Mary Ellen O'Connell, *International Law and the Use of Force, Cases and Materials* (Foundation Press, 2nd ed. 2005).
30. Misra A., 'Politics of civil wars: conflict, intervention and resolution' (London: Routledge, 2008).
31. Noam Lubell, *Extraterritorial Use of Force Against Non-State Actors* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1st ed. 2010).

32. O. Ben-Naftali (ed.), *International Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law, Pas de Deux* (Oxford University Press, 2011).
33. Rajat Ganguly, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute* (Asian Studies Institute, 1st ed. 1998).
34. Reid, *The Civil War and the Wars of 19th Century* (Smithsonian NY, 1999).
35. P. V. Ramana, D. Raja, et.al., *The Naxal Challenge: Causes, Linkages, and Policy Options*, (Pearson Education, New Delhi, 2008).
36. Ruchir Garg, 'The Case of Dandakaranya', in P. V. Ramana (ed.), *The Naxal Challenge: Causes, Linkages, and Policy Options* (Pearson Education India, 2008).
37. Thomas X. Hammes, *Insurgency: Modern Warfare Evolves into a Fourth Generation* (Institute for National Strategic Studies, 1st ed. 2005).
38. Thomas X. Hammes, *The Sling and The Stone: On War in the 21st Century* 16 (Zenith Press, 6th ed. 2004).
39. William K. Lietzau, 'Combating Terrorism: Law Enforcement or War?', in Michael N. Schmitt and Gian Luca Beruto, eds., *Terrorism and International Law, Challenges and Responses*, (San Remo: International Institute of Humanitarian Law and George Marshall European Center for Security Studies, 2002).
40. Y. Dinstein, *War, Aggression and Self-Defense* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 3rd ed. 2002).

Articles

1. Aldrich, 'Prospects for United States Ratification of Additional Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Conventions' 85 *American Journal of International Law* (1991).
2. Ali Khan, 'The Kashmir Dispute: A Plan for Regional Cooperation' 31 *Colum Journal Transnational Law* (2004).
3. Alison Duxbury, 'Drawing Lines in the Sand - Characterizing Conflicts for the Purposes of Teaching International Humanitarian Law' 8 *Melbourne Journal of International Law* (2007).
4. Amnon Rubinstein, Yaniv Roznai, 'Human shields in modern armed conflicts: the need for a proportionate proportionality', 22 *Sandford Law & Policy Review* (1993).

5. Antonio Cassese, 'Terrorism is Also Disrupting Some Crucial Legal Categories of International Law', 12 *European Journal of International Law* (2001).
6. Antulio J. Echevarria, II, 'Fourth Generation War and Other Myths', *U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute*, (2005).
7. Aron Lund, 'The Political Geography of Syria's War: An Interview with Fabrice Balanche', *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (2015).
8. Aron Lund, 'The Politics of the Islamic Front, Part 1: Structure and Support', *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (2015).
9. Australian Red Cross, 'The Changing Face of Warfare in the 21st Century', 4 *International Humanitarian Law Magazine*, (2012).
10. Bassiouni, 'The New Wars and the Crisis of Compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict by Non-State Actors' 98 *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (2007).
11. Beshai A, 'The Boundless War: Challenging the Notion of a Global Armed Conflict Against al-Qaeda and Its Affiliates' 48 *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review* (2015)
12. Carmen Márquez Carrasco Laura Iñigo Alvarez, 'Human Rights violations in Conflict Settings', *FRAME*, (2014).
13. Chantal De Jonge Oudraat, 'The United Nations and the Campaign against Terrorism', 1 *Disarmament Forum*, (2004).
14. Christopher Phillips, 'After the Arab Spring: Power Shift in the Middle East? Syria's Bloody Arab Spring', *London School of Economics* (2012).
15. Corn, G.S., 'Hamdan, Lebanon, and the Regulation of Armed Hostilities: The Need to Recognize a Hybrid Category of Armed Conflict', 40 *Vanderbilt Transnational Law Journal* (2006).
16. Schindler, 'The Different Types of Armed Conflicts According to the Geneva Conventions and Protocols' 163 *Recueil des cours* (1979).
17. David Wallace, et al, 'Trying to Make Sense of the Senseless: Classifying the Syrian War under the Law of Armed Conflict', 25.3 *Michigan State Law Review* (2017).
18. DCAF, Geneva Call, 'Armed Non-State Actors: Current Trends & Future Challenges,' *The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces*, (2011).
19. Dietrich Schindler, 'International Humanitarian Law and Internationalized Internal Armed Conflicts' 22 *International Review of the Red Cross* (1982).

20. ¹Dietrich Schindler, 'The Different Types of Armed Conflict according to the Geneva Convention and Protocols', 63 *Recueil Des Cours* (1979).
21. *Doctrine of Sub-Conventional Operations (New Delhi) Integrated Headquarters of Ministry of Defense (Army)*, December 2006.
22. Fakiha Khan, 'Nuking Kashmir: Legal Implications of Nuclear Testing by Pakistan and India in the Context of the Kashmir Dispute', 29: 362 *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law* (2001).
23. Gabor Rona, 'International Law under Fire – Interesting Times for International Humanitarian Law: Challenges from the 'War on Terror'', 27 *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, (2003).
24. Goodman R., Rationales for Detention: Security Threats and Intelligence Value, 85 *International Legal Studies, Harvard Law School* (2006).
25. Greenwood, 'International Law and the Pre-emptive Use of Force: Afghanistan, Al-Qaida, and Iraq', 4 *San Diego International Law Journal* (2003).
26. Grignon, 'The beginning of application of international humanitarian law: A discussion of a few challenges' 96 *International Review of The Red Cross* (2015).
27. Helen Keller and Magdalena Forowicz, A Tightrope Walk Between Legality and Legitimacy: An Analysis of the Israeli Supreme Court's Judgment on Targeted Killing, 21 *Leiden Journal of International Law* (2008).
28. Herfried Münkler, 'The Wars of the 21st Century' 849 *International Review of the Red Cross* (2003).
29. James G Stewart, 'Towards a Single Definition of Armed Conflict in International Humanitarian Law: A Critique of Internationalized Armed Conflict' 850 *International Review of the Red Cross* (2003)
30. Jelena Pejic, 'Terrorist Acts and Groups: A Role for International Law?', 75 *British Yearbook of International Law* (2004).
31. Jinks D., 'September 11 and the Laws of War' 28 *Yale Journal of International Law* (2003).
32. Julia Grignon, 'The beginning of application of international humanitarian law: A discussion of a few challenges' 96 *International Review of the Red Cross* (2014).

33. Kevin Jon Heller, 'Three Thoughts on the Preliminary Detention Report', *Opinio Juris*, (2009).
34. Laurie R. Blank & Benjamin R. Farley, 'Identifying the Start of Conflict: Conflict Recognition, Operational Realities and Accountability in the Post-9/11 World', 36 *Michigan Journal of International Law* (2015).
35. Lesley Swanson, 'The Era of Cyber Warfare: Applying International Humanitarian Law to the 2008 Russian-Georgian Cyber Conflict', 32 *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review* (2010).
36. M Cherif Bassiouni, 'New Wars and Crises of Compliance', 98 *Cardozo Law Review* (2008).
37. Margaret T. Artz, 'A Chink in The Armor: How A Uniform Approach To Proportionality Analysis Can End The Use Of Human Shield?', *Hein Online*, (2014).
38. Mary Ellen O'Connell, 'The Legal Case Against Global War on Terror Cases and Materials', 36 *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* (2004).
39. Mary Kaldor, 'New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era', *London School of Economic, Polity Press* (2006).
40. Mats Berdal, 'How 'New' Are 'New Wars'? Global Economic Change and the Study of Civil War', 9 *Global Governance*, (2003).
41. Michael L Feeley 'Apocalypse Now? Resolving India's and Pakistan's Testing Crisis' 23 *Suffolk Transnational Law Review*, (2000).
42. P. Alston, J. Morgan-Foster, and W. Abresch, 'The Competence of the un Human Rights Council and its Special Procedures in relation to Armed Conflicts: Extrajudicial Execution in the 'War on Terror'', 19 *European Journal of International Law*, (2008).
43. Paulus and M. Vashakmadze, 'Assymetrical War and the Notion of Armed Conflict—A Tentative Conceptualization' 95 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (2009).
44. Pejic, 'Status of Armed Conflicts' in E. Wilmshurst and S. Breau (eds), *Perspectives on the ICRC Study on Customary International Humanitarian Law* (2007) 85–6 (Pejic, Status of Armed Conflicts).
45. Pictet, J. 'The principles of international humanitarian law', 66 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (1966).

46. R Bartles, 'Timelines, Borderlines and conflicts: The Historical Evolution of the Legal Divide Between International and Non-International Armed conflicts' 91 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (2009).
47. R. Geiss, 'Armed Violence in Fragile States: Low Intensity Conflicts, Spill Over Conflicts, and Sporadic Law Enforcement Operations by External Actors' 91 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (2009).
48. Robert Kolb, 'The relationship between international humanitarian law and human rights law: A brief history of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1949 Geneva Conventions', 324 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (1998).
49. Roberts, 'What is Military Occupation?' 249 *British Yearbook of International Law*, (1984).
50. Rupert Ticehurst, 'The Martens Clause and the Laws of Armed Conflict' 317 *International Review of the Red Cross*, (1997).
51. S. Banerjee, 'Naxalbari: Between Past and Future', 37(22) *Economic and Political Weekly*, (2002).
52. S. Vite, 'Typology of armed conflicts in international humanitarian law: legal concepts and actual situations' 91 *International Review of the Red Cross* (2009).
53. S. Williamson, 'From Fourth Generation Warfare to Hybrid War', *Strategy Research Project* (2009).
54. Sandeep Dubey, 'Maoist Movement in India: An Overview', *Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses*, (2013).
55. Stewart, J., 'The UN Commission of Inquiry on Lebanon: A Legal Appraisal', 5 *Journal of International Criminal Justice* (2007).
56. T. Hoffmann, 'Squaring the Circle? International Humanitarian Law and Transnational Armed Conflicts', *Hague Academy of International Law*, (2011).
57. Terry D Gill, 'Classifying the Conflict in Syria' 92 *International Law Studies* (2016).
58. Thomas X. Hammes, '4GW: Our Enemies Play to Their Strengths,' *Armed Forces Journal* (2004).
59. Thoms, Oskar NT, and James Ron. 'Do human rights violations cause internal conflict?' 7 *Human Rights Quarterly* (2007).

60. Tomuschat, 'Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law', 21 *European Journal of International Law* (2010)
61. V.S. Mani, 'International Humanitarian Law: an Indo-Asian Perspective' 83 *International Review of the Red Cross* (2001).

News Paper and Journals

1. *Uzbek rebel "killed" in Pakistan*, BBC News, Oct 2, 2009.
2. *Understanding explosive weapons with wide area effects*, PAX, Oct 2016.
3. Somini Sengupta, *U.S. Invokes Iraq's Defense in Legal Justification of Syria Strikes*, The New York Times, Sept 23, 2014.
4. Scott Shane, Mark Mazzetti, *et.al*, *Secret Assault on Terrorism Widens on Two Continents*, The New York Times, Aug 14, 2010.
5. Schmitt E., *Iraqi Qaeda Group Shifts to Remain a Threat*, The New York Times, Dec 20, 2009.
6. PTI, *Modi Govt to Name Naxalite Areas 'Most Dangerous Zone'; Plans Special Benefits for Troops*, Zee News India, Jun 7, 2014.
7. PTI, *India Protests over UN Chief's Report*, *The Hindu*, Aug 3, 2019.
8. *Profile: Al-Qaeda in North Africa*, BBC News, Jan 17, 2013.
9. Press Information Bureau, Government of India, Ministry of Defence, *Ceasefire Violations by Pakistan*, Nov 18, 2019.
10. Press Briefing by Senior Administration Officials on the *Killing of Osama bin Laden*, Office of the Press Secretary, The White House.
11. Mahim Pratap Singh, *Basit blames India over LoC firing*, *The Hindu*, April 22, 2016.
12. Mark Mazzetti, *Spy Agencies Say Iraq War Worsens Terrorism Threat*, The New York Times, September 24, 2006, p. A1, citing the leaked National Intelligence Estimate of 2006.
13. Mariam Karouny, *'Saudi Edges Qatar to Control Syrian Rebel Support'*, REUTERS (2013).
14. Nic Robertson & Laura Smith-Spark, *Heavy Shelling Rocks Golan Heights Area Between Syria, Israel*, CNN, Feb 21, 2014.

15. UN puts Pakistani armed group chief Masood Azhar on 'terror' list” *Al Jazeera*, May 1, 2019.
16. *Operation Inherent Resolve: Targeted Operations against ISIL Terrorists*, U.S. Department of Defense, Apr 26, 2016.
17. Laura Smith-Spark, *Israel Says It Shot Down Syrian Warplane Over Golan Heights*, CNN, Sept 23, 2014.
18. PTI, *Naxalism biggest threat to internal security: Manmohan*, *The Hindu*, May 24, 2010.
19. ET Bureau, *Chidambaram All Praise for SPOs*, *Economic Times*, Jan. 8, 2009.
20. David Blair, *Qatar and Saudi Arabia 'Have Ignited Time Bomb by Funding Global Spread of Radical Islam,'* *Telegraph*, 2014.
21. Daveed Gartenstein-Ross & Phillip Smyth, *How Syria's Jihadists Win Friends and Influence People*, *Atlantic*, Aug 22, 2013.
22. Aman Sethi, *Green Hunt: The Anatomy of an Operation*, *The Hindu*, Feb. 6, 2010.
23. D. Tierney, *The Twenty Years' War*, *The Atlantic*, Aug 23, 2016.
24. *After Smart Weapons, Smart Soldiers*, *The Economist*, Oct 27, 2007.
25. Abdullah Rebhy, *Syrian Opposition Groups Reach Unity Deal*, *Seattle Times*, Nov 22, 2019.
26. 2019 recorded highest ever ceasefire violations by Pakistan in Jammu and Kashmir in the last 16 years”, *Economic Times*, Jan 5, 2020.
27. Aymenn Jawad al-Tamimi, *Al-Qa'ida Uncoupling: Jabhat al-Nusra's Rebranding as Jabhat Feteah al-Sham*, *Middle East Forum*, Aug 22, 2016.
28. D. Akande, *'Afghanistan accedes to Additional Protocols to Geneva Conventions: Will AP II govern the conflict in Afghanistan?'* *EJIL Talk*, June 30, 2009.
29. Elliot Friedland & Serabian, *Who's Who in the Syrian Civil War*, *The Clarion Project* Feb 20, 2017.
30. Marc Fisher, *In Tunisia, Act of One Fruit Vendor Sparks Wave of Revolution Through Arab World*, *The Washington Post*, Mar 26, 2011.
31. Lubold G.& Strobel W.P., *U.S. Targets Yemen Al Qaeda Leader in Drone Strike*, *The Wall Street Journal*, Jan 31, 2020.
32. Moises Nairn, *The Five Wars of Globalization*, *Foreign Policy*, Jan.-Feb. 2003.

33. Richard Johnson, *Visualizing the 220,000 Lives Lost in Syria*, The Washington Post, Mar 29, 2015.
34. William R. Polk, *Understanding Syria: From Pre-Civil War to Post-Assad*, The Atlantic, December 10, 2013.
35. Chang, 'How to Stop North Korea's Weapons Proliferation' *Wall Street Journal* (1 July 2009).
36. Jordain Carney, 'US Targets the Khorasan Group with a New Round of Airstrikes', DEFENSEONE (Nov. 6, 2014).

Reports

1. Action on Armed Violence, *Report on Explosive Violence in 2019* (January 2020).
2. African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, *Addressing Human Rights Issues in Conflict Situations* (2019).
3. Amnesty International, *Lives blown apart: Crimes against Women in times of Conflict: Stop Violence against women* (Amnesty, London, 2002).
4. Amnesty International, *Report on Syria: Smothering freedom of expression: The detention of Peaceful Critics* (2002).
5. Congressional Research Service, *Report on Armed Conflict in Syria: Overview and U.S. Response* (July 27, 2020).
6. Ekaterina Stepanova, *Trends in armed conflicts: one-sided violence against civilians* (Stockholm Peace Research Institute Yearbook, 2009).
7. Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, *The War Report 2018* (April 2019).
8. Government of India, *Report on Socio-economic conditions of Scheduled Tribes Workers*, (Ministry of Labour & Employment, 2007).
9. Human Rights Watch, *Being Neutral is Our Biggest Crime Government, Vigilante and Naxalite Abuses in India's Chhattisgarh State* (2008).
10. Human Rights Watch, *India: End State Support for Vigilantes* (2008).
11. ICRC, *Annual Report* (1997).
12. ICRC, *International Humanitarian Law and the challenges of contemporary armed conflicts*, 30IC/07/8.4 (2007).

13. ICRC, *International Humanitarian Law and the challenges of contemporary armed conflicts - Recommitting to Protection in Armed Conflict on The 70th Anniversary Of The Geneva Conventions*, 33IC/19/9.7 (2019).
14. ICRC, *International Humanitarian Law and The Challenges of Contemporary Armed Conflicts*, 31IC/11/5.1.2 (2011).
15. ICRC, *International Humanitarian Law: A Comprehensive Introduction* (2016).
16. ICRC, *Report on International Humanitarian Law and the challenges of contemporary armed conflicts - Recommitting To Protection In Armed Conflict On The 70th Anniversary Of The Geneva Conventions*, 33IC/19/9.7 (Dec, 2019).
17. ICRC, *Report on International Humanitarian Law and the challenges of contemporary armed conflicts*, 31IC/11/5.1.2 49 (Dec 2011).
18. ICRC, *Urban Services During Protracted Armed Conflict* (2015).
19. International Law Association, 'Final Report of the Meaning of Armed Conflict in International Law' (2010). Norwegian Red Cross, *Report on Overlapping Vulnerabilities: The Impacts of Climate Change on Humanitarian Needs* (May,2019).
20. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Report on Global Humanitarian Overview 2020* (December 2019).
21. Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel of 1979, *International Law Materials*.
22. Stuart Casey Masley (ed), *The War Report 2012* (Oxford 2013).
23. *Transnationality, War and the Law, A Report on a Roundtable on the Transformation of Warfare, International Law, and the Role of Transnational Armed Groups*, Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, Harvard University (April 2006).
24. UN Children's Fund, *The Paris Principles: Principles and Guidelines on Children Associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups*, (2017).
25. UN Commission for India and Pakistan, *Report of the Commission for India and Pakistan*, UNCIP, UN Doc. 5/1196 (January 5, 1949).
26. UN General Assembly, *Study on Secret Detention*, UN GAOR, UN Doc A/HRC/13/42 (May 20, 2010).
27. UNGA, *Annual Report of the Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict*, A/72/865-S/2018/465, GAOR, UN Doc A/72/865-S/2018/465 (May 16, 2018).

28. UNHRC, *Report of the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic A/HRC/31/685* (February 11, 2013).
29. UNHRC, *Report of the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011* (Aug, 2018).
30. United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, *International Legal Protection of Human Rights in Armed Conflict*, (2011).
31. United Nations, *Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Act, Yearbook of the International Law Commission*, (vol. II, 2001).
32. UNSC, *Final Report of the Commission of Experts Established Pursuant to Security Council Resolution* (1992).
33. UNSC, *Report of The Secretary-General on The Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict*, S/2005/740 (28 November 2005).
34. UNSC, *Report of The Secretary-General on The Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict*, S/2013/689 (November 22, 2013).
35. *US Senate Foreign Relations Committee Al Qaeda in Yemen and Somalia: A Ticking Time Bomb: Report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*, S. Rep. No. 111, 111th Congress, 2nd Session 5.
36. White House, Memorandum of February 7, 2002, Appendix C to Independent Panel to Review DoD Detention Operations, Chairman the Honorable James R. Schlesinger to US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, August 24, 2004.

Table Of Treaties, Legislations, and International Documents

- African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights 1981 American Convention on Human Rights 1989
- American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man 1948 Arab Charter on Human Rights 1994/2000
- Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation 2005(UN)

- Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary 1995 (UN)
- Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers 1990 (UN)
- Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners 1990 (UN)
- Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment 1988 (UN)
- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union 2000 Charter of the United Nations 1945 (UN)
- Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials 1979 (UN)
- Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984 (UN)
- Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded in Armies in the Field (Geneva Convention of 1864) 1864
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women 1979 (UN)
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide 1948 (UN)
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Ottawa Convention) 1997
- Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects 1980 (Conventional Weapons Convention) (UN)
 - Protocol (I) on Non-Detectable Fragments
 - Protocol (II) on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Used of Mines, Booby- Traps and Other Devices (amended on 3 May 1996)
 - Protocol (III) on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons
 - Protocol (IV) on Blinding Laser Weapons Protocol (V) on Explosive Remnants of War 2003
- Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951 (UN)
- Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (1929 Geneva Convention) 1929 Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power 1985 (UN)
- Declaration of Minimum Humanitarian Standards 1990

- Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation of States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations 1970 (UN)
- Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances 1992 (UN)
- Geneva Convention (I) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field, of 12 August 1949
- Geneva Convention (II) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea, of 12 August 1949
- Geneva Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, of 12 August 1949
Geneva Convention (IV) Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949
- Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors 1990 (UN)
- Hague Convention IV Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land 1907
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination 1965 (UN)
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966 (UN) International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966 (UN)
- Instructions for the Government of Armies of the US in the Field, promulgated as General Orders No. 100 (Lieber Code) 24 April 1863
- Oxford Manual of the Laws of War on Land 1880
- Principles on the Effective Prevention and Investigation of Extra-Legal, Arbitrary and Summary Executions 1989 (UN)
- Principles of Medical Ethics Relevant to the Role of Health Personnel, Particularly Physicians, in the Protection of Prisoners and Detainees Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment and Punishment 1982 (UN)
- Project of an International Declaration concerning the Laws and Customs of War, Brussels Conference of 1874
- Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, of 8 June 1977
- Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the

Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts, of 8 June 1977

- Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War or Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (Geneva Gas Protocol) 1925
- Protocols to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms
- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court 1998
- Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of Those Facing the Death Penalty 1984 (UN)
- Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners 1955 (UN) Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures 1990 (UN) Statute of the International Court of Justice
- Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia 1993 Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda 1994
- Statute of the Special Court of Sierra Leone 2000 Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948
- UN Secretary-General's Bulletin on Observance by United Nations Forces of International Humanitarian Law 1999

India:

- The Constitution of India, 1950
- Geneva Convention Act, 1960
- Criminal Procedure Code, 1973
- Armed Forces (Special Powers Act), 1958
- Public Safety Act, 1978

Unpublished works:

1. Rabbiraj. C, '*Implementation of International Humanitarian Law with Special Reference to India –A Critical Study*' (2011) (University of Madras)
2. Pegah Malek-Ahmadi, *Human Rights in Non-International Armed Conflicts* (2018) (Columbia University).

Webliography:

1. <http://oneworld.org/2012/12/10/afghanistan-the-end-of-humanitarianism>
2. <http://web.stanford.edu/group/mappingmilitants/cgi-bin/groups/view/493>
3. https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/id/eprint/125074/1/International_and_Non_International_Armed_Conflict.
4. <http://humantraffickingsearch.org/>
5. <https://www.satp.org>
6. [https://www.mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl/31089/Statement by Foreign Secretary on 26 February 2019 on the Strike on JeM training camp at Balakot](https://www.mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl/31089/Statement_by_Foreign_Secretary_on_26_February_2019_on_the_Strike_on_JeM_training_camp_at_Balakot)
7. https://www.satp.org/satporgrp/countries/india/states/jandk/terrorist_outfits/terrorists_list_j&k.htm
8. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/syria/overview>
9. https://www.ohchr.org/documents/publications/hr_in_armed_conflict.pdf
10. <https://aoav.org.uk/>
11. <https://pilac.law.harvard.edu/mcac-report//2-key-concepts-in-the-laws-of-armed-conflict-and-counterterrorism-frameworks>
12. www.defenselink.mil/news/Aug2004/d20040824finalreport.pdf.
13. <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/politics/2013/05/syrian-conflict-failed-sectarian-analysis.html>