

Principles of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) as a Critical Framework for Mitigating the Impact of Armed Conflicts on Civilian Populations

Abstract:

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) serves as a critical framework for mitigating the impact of armed conflicts, focusing on protecting civilian populations and regulating the conduct of warfare. With the rise of modern warfare, including non-state actors, cyber warfare, and autonomous weapons, the IHL framework faces significant challenges. This paper explores these challenges and provides recommendations for strengthening IHL. Key areas include enhancing accountability mechanisms through national and international legal frameworks, promoting adherence to IHL among all conflict parties, and addressing new warfare technologies such as drones. The paper also emphasizes the importance of civilian protection measures, such as early warning systems and collaboration between military and humanitarian organizations. Furthermore, it highlights the necessity of revising IHL to remain effective in contemporary armed conflicts, ensuring its core principles—distinction, proportionality, and humanity—are upheld. Through capacity building and the enforcement of legal standards, IHL can continue to play a vital role in global peace and security.

1.0 Introduction to International Humanitarian Law (IHL)

International Humanitarian Law (IHL), also known as the "law of armed conflict" or "jus in bello," represents a cornerstone of international legal frameworks designed to regulate the conduct of warfare. Its central aim is to mitigate the suffering caused by armed conflicts, ensuring that warfare is conducted in a more humane manner. The law serves to protect those who are not directly involved in hostilities, such as civilians, prisoners of war, medical personnel, and individuals hors de combat (Borda, 2008). Furthermore, IHL places strict limitations on the means and methods of warfare, guiding the behavior of combatants and state actors to ensure compliance with international standards of morality and legality during times of conflict.

The scope of IHL extends across all forms of conflict, whether international or non-international, making its relevance particularly pronounced in the modern era. While traditional conflicts were primarily between states, contemporary warfare increasingly involves non-state actors such as armed groups, insurgents, and terrorist organizations. In addition to protecting those directly impacted by war, IHL also serves as a mechanism for ensuring that the actions of all parties in conflict—whether state or non-state actors—adhere to internationally accepted norms (Bartels, 2018). The changing nature of armed conflict, with its increasing reliance on technology and complex multi-actor dynamics, has necessitated a more comprehensive and nuanced application of IHL.

Definition of International Humanitarian Law (IHL)

At its core, International Humanitarian Law refers to a set of rules established by international treaties and customary international law, specifically designed to protect individuals who are not or no longer participating in hostilities. These rules also govern the permissible means and methods of warfare to prevent unnecessary suffering and destruction (Borda, 2008). The legal principles enshrined in IHL focus on balancing the necessity of military actions with the humanitarian need to minimize harm to civilians and ensure that combatants respect the lives of non-combatants and those no longer engaged in fighting.

The four Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols form the bedrock of IHL. These conventions lay out detailed protections for prisoners of war, wounded and sick soldiers, civilians in war zones, and medical personnel. Customary international law further supplements these conventions, creating binding norms that all nations, even those not signatories to the treaties, are expected to follow (Crawford & Pert, 2015). The broader framework also covers certain classes of weapons and tactics, including prohibitions on the use of chemical and biological weapons, as well as landmines. In essence, IHL serves to codify the notion that not all actions are permissible during warfare, regardless of the context.

Scope and Relevance of IHL in Contemporary Armed Conflicts

The relevance of IHL in contemporary armed conflicts has become increasingly apparent, especially in the context of modern warfare's evolving nature. Traditional interstate conflicts—once the primary focus of IHL—are now less frequent. In contrast, non-international armed conflicts, which involve state forces and non-state actors such as rebel groups, insurgents, or terrorist organizations, have become more common (Bartels, 2018). IHL's provisions are designed to apply to all such conflicts, regardless of their scale, nature, or level of official recognition. This is crucial in an era where conflicts often involve

transnational dimensions, including non-state actors who operate across national borders and engage in activities like cyber warfare and drone strikes (Oji, 2013).

One of the central principles of IHL is the distinction between combatants and non-combatants. This principle dictates that armed forces must distinguish at all times between legitimate military targets and civilians or civilian objects (Oji, 2013). However, this principle has come under increasing strain due to modern warfare tactics, where the line between military personnel and civilians is often blurred. For instance, non-state actors may disguise themselves as civilians or embed within civilian populations, complicating efforts to uphold the principle of distinction. The rise of asymmetrical warfare has only heightened this challenge, making the strict application of IHL even more critical to protecting human rights in conflict zones.

In addition to combat tactics, the means of warfare have also evolved significantly. Advances in technology, particularly in the fields of cyber operations, unmanned aerial vehicles (drones), and precision-guided munitions, have introduced new complexities into the application of IHL. These developments challenge the existing norms, as many traditional legal concepts do not readily translate to modern warfare technologies (Crawford & Pert, 2015). For example, cyber warfare, which may be launched from distant locations and can potentially affect civilian infrastructure without direct physical violence, presents a significant grey area in IHL. The law must continually evolve to address these challenges, ensuring that its principles remain relevant in an age of increasingly sophisticated and varied warfare.

Accountability and Enforcement of IHL

Another critical role of IHL is to provide a framework for accountability in the event of violations during armed conflicts. Breaches of IHL, such as war crimes and crimes against humanity, are prosecuted under the broader field of international criminal law (ICL). This interplay between IHL and ICL is crucial for maintaining the integrity of the international legal system and ensuring that perpetrators of war crimes are brought to justice. International criminal tribunals, such as the International Criminal Court (ICC), serve as vital mechanisms for holding individuals and state actors accountable for gross violations of IHL, thereby reinforcing its importance in contemporary warfare (Bartels, 2018).

War crimes, as defined under IHL, include acts such as intentionally targeting civilians, using prohibited weapons, or committing acts of torture against prisoners of war. The establishment of international tribunals has been a significant step forward in prosecuting these crimes, although challenges remain in ensuring the consistent application of justice across different conflicts. Additionally, non-state actors, who

increasingly play pivotal roles in modern conflicts, often operate outside the jurisdiction of international legal bodies, complicating efforts to enforce IHL provisions (Schoeberl, 2019).

Purpose of the Study

1. **Clarifying Legal Norms:** To investigate how IHL norms are interpreted and applied in contemporary conflicts, especially with the rise of non-state actors and complex international interventions.
2. **Addressing Violations:** To assess the effectiveness of IHL in preventing war crimes and ensuring accountability in international and non-international armed conflicts.
3. **Evaluating Relevance in Contemporary Warfare:** To examine the challenges IHL faces in modern conflicts, including cyber warfare, drone attacks, and hybrid warfare.
4. **Improving Protection Mechanisms:** To identify gaps in IHL's protection mechanisms, particularly for civilians and humanitarian workers, in light of evolving methods of warfare.

2.0 Historical Development of International Humanitarian Law (IHL)

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) has a deep and complex history that evolved over centuries, shaped by customary practices of warfare, key humanitarian movements, and the impact of global conflicts. The evolution of IHL reflects the changing nature of warfare and the international community's growing commitment to limit the suffering caused by armed conflicts. This section explores the historical trajectory of IHL, tracing its origins from ancient practices to its current codified form.

1. Origins of IHL in Customary Warfare Practices

The roots of IHL lie in the customary warfare practices that were observed in various ancient civilizations. These practices often included sparing certain groups from the consequences of warfare, such as civilians, women, children, and the elderly. Many cultures also observed restrictions on the methods and means of warfare, such as avoiding unnecessary destruction and limiting the use of certain weapons. For instance, ancient Indian texts like the "Mahabharata" contained rules about the humane treatment of prisoners and non-combatants during war (Orehowsky, 2020).

However, these customary practices were informal and not universally followed, leading to varying levels of protection for those involved in conflicts. It was not until the 19th century that efforts to formalize

these practices began to take shape, primarily driven by humanitarian movements. One pivotal moment was the experience of Henri Dunant, a Swiss businessman who witnessed the suffering of soldiers at the Battle of Solferino in 1859. His observations inspired the creation of the International Red Cross and led to the establishment of the first formal conventions aimed at mitigating the horrors of war, marking a crucial step in the development of modern IHL (Orehowsky, 2020).

The Geneva Conventions (1864–1949) and Their Protocols

1864: First Geneva Convention and Its Provisions for the Wounded and Sick

The first significant milestone in the formalization of IHL was the 1864 Geneva Convention. This convention marked the first time that states agreed to a binding international treaty aimed at improving the care of the wounded and sick in armed conflict. The 1864 Geneva Convention was primarily concerned with the treatment of soldiers injured on the battlefield and established the principle that they should be treated humanely, regardless of which side they fought for (Orehowsky, 2020). The role of the Red Cross, founded by Dunant, was crucial in the drafting and implementation of this convention, and it laid the foundation for future developments in humanitarian law.

1906–1949: Evolution and Expansion of the Geneva Conventions

The Geneva Conventions expanded significantly during the first half of the 20th century, driven by the atrocities of World War I and World War II. The 1906 revisions focused on naval warfare, while the 1929 Convention introduced new protections for prisoners of war. However, it was after World War II that the Geneva Conventions underwent their most significant expansion. The 1949 Geneva Conventions were comprehensive treaties that addressed various aspects of armed conflict, including the treatment of prisoners of war, the protection of civilians, and the care of the wounded (van Dijk, 2019).

The 1949 Conventions introduced a broader framework for protecting individuals who were not directly participating in hostilities. These conventions were instrumental in shaping modern IHL and set the stage for the development of additional protocols to address emerging challenges in warfare. The influence of both Western and Soviet actors was significant in shaping these conventions, although there were ongoing challenges in ensuring compliance and enforcement.

Additional Protocols I and II (1977): Addressing New Forms of Conflict

The 1977 Additional Protocols I and II marked another major step in the evolution of IHL, particularly in response to the changing nature of warfare. These protocols addressed the complexities of modern conflicts, including internal conflicts and guerrilla warfare, which had become increasingly prevalent in

the postcolonial world. Additional Protocol I extended protections to civilians in international conflicts, while Additional Protocol II focused on internal conflicts, expanding protections for civilians and non-combatants (Alexander, 2016).

These protocols were contentious at the time of their introduction, with debates over the definition of combatants and the scope of protections. Nevertheless, they have since become essential components of customary international law and have played a key role in ensuring that IHL remains relevant in the face of evolving conflict dynamics.

The Role of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in IHL Development

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has been a central actor in the development and implementation of IHL since its inception. The ICRC not only facilitated the drafting of the Geneva Conventions but has also continued to monitor their implementation and promote their ratification by states. During peacetime, the ICRC works to ensure that states implement IHL treaties domestically, while during conflicts, it plays a crucial role in protecting civilians, monitoring compliance with humanitarian norms, and advocating for the humane treatment of the wounded and prisoners of war (Lozinska & Kiryk, 2023).

The ICRC's enduring commitment to upholding the principles of IHL has been fundamental in shaping modern humanitarian law. Its advocacy and operational activities have helped to ensure that the core values of IHL are upheld even in the most challenging circumstances.

Milestones in International Tribunals: Nuremberg Trials, ICTY, ICTR

The post-World War II Nuremberg Trials were a landmark event in the history of IHL, setting a precedent for holding individuals accountable for war crimes and crimes against humanity. These trials established the principle that individuals, including state leaders, could be held criminally responsible for violations of IHL (Clegg, 2020). The establishment of the International Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and Rwanda (ICTR) in the 1990s further reinforced the principles of IHL by prosecuting war crimes committed in internal and international conflicts.

These tribunals played a crucial role in reaffirming the importance of accountability for war crimes and contributed to the development of international criminal law.

Modern Developments: Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court (ICC)

The adoption of the Rome Statute in 1998 marked a new era in the enforcement of IHL with the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC). The ICC is a permanent institution that prosecutes individuals for the most serious international crimes, including genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity (Alexander, 2015). The creation of the ICC represents a significant development in the enforcement of IHL, as it provides a permanent mechanism for addressing atrocities committed during conflicts.

The ICC continues to play a critical role in ensuring accountability for violations of IHL, reflecting the international community's commitment to upholding humanitarian law and preventing impunity for serious crimes.

3.0 Core Principles of International Humanitarian Law

1. Principle of Distinction

The principle of distinction is one of the most fundamental components of IHL. It mandates that parties in an armed conflict must differentiate between combatants and civilians, ensuring that military operations only target legitimate military objectives. This principle is essential for protecting civilians and civilian objects from the effects of hostilities.

Protecting Civilian Populations and Objects from Hostilities

According to Rosert & Sauer (2019), this principle emphasizes that civilians and civilian objects should never be the target of military attacks. A key factor in upholding this principle is determining the role of individuals in hostilities. Combatants, defined as those directly participating in hostilities, are legitimate targets, whereas civilians who do not take direct part in hostilities must be protected. However, in modern warfare, particularly with the emergence of lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), the ability to maintain a clear distinction between combatants and civilians has been called into question. As these autonomous systems are increasingly integrated into military operations, concerns have arisen about their potential to misidentify targets, leading to unintended civilian casualties. This has prompted scholars and policymakers alike to advocate for a ban on LAWS, as these technologies threaten to undermine the principle of distinction and human dignity (Rosert & Sauer, 2019).

Differentiation between Combatants and Non-Combatants

The challenge of distinguishing between combatants and non-combatants is particularly pronounced in asymmetric warfare. In conflicts where combatants are embedded within civilian populations, or where non-state actors employ tactics such as the use of human shields, adhering to the principle of distinction

becomes exceedingly difficult. A study by van Schaack (2016) points out that this tactic complicates the application of IHL, as military forces may be forced to engage targets that are deeply intertwined with civilian settings, increasing the risk of harm to non-combatants. Asymmetric warfare thus poses one of the most significant challenges to the principle of distinction in modern conflicts.

2. Principle of Proportionality

The principle of proportionality in IHL restricts excessive harm to civilians during military operations. It requires that any attack must balance the anticipated military advantage with the harm likely to be inflicted on civilian life and property. This principle ensures that collateral damage does not outweigh the military necessity of an operation.

Limiting Collateral Damage and Balancing Military Advantage

According to Cohen & Zlotogorski (2021), proportionality is designed to prevent indiscriminate harm to civilians. Attacks must be proportionate to the military objective at hand, ensuring that any harm inflicted on civilians is not excessive relative to the anticipated advantage. This principle is particularly relevant in the context of asymmetric warfare, where military targets are often located in densely populated civilian areas. In such situations, the risk of disproportionate harm is high, and the use of certain weapons or tactics may result in excessive civilian casualties.

Recent advances in targeting precision, as well as the use of autonomous systems, have further complicated the proportionality calculus. Knuckey et al. (2020) argue that while modern technology has the potential to improve precision, it also introduces new risks. Autonomous systems, for example, may not always adhere to the proportionality principle, particularly in complex combat environments where the distinction between combatants and civilians is not easily discernible.

Mental and Physical Harm

When assessing proportionality, it is essential to consider not only the physical damage inflicted on civilians but also the psychological harm. Knuckey et al. (2020) highlight the growing recognition of the mental health impacts of armed conflict, which should be incorporated into proportionality assessments. This is a relatively new but increasingly relevant factor in modern warfare, as the psychological trauma experienced by civilians can have long-lasting effects on communities.

3. Principle of Necessity

The principle of necessity in IHL dictates that force should only be used to achieve legitimate military objectives and that no more force than necessary should be employed. This principle ensures that military actions are justified by necessity and that excessive force is not used, particularly in ways that cause unnecessary suffering.

Restricting Force to What Is Necessary for Military Objectives

According to Dremljuga (2020), the principle of necessity requires that military actions be essential to the achievement of legitimate military objectives. This means that force should not be used indiscriminately or excessively. For example, a military operation aimed at capturing a specific target should not involve the destruction of an entire city if such destruction is not necessary to achieve the military goal. The principle of necessity is vital in preventing the use of excessive force, particularly in conflicts where advanced weaponry, such as autonomous systems, can blur the lines between what is considered necessary and excessive force (Cohen & Zlotogorski, 2021).

4. Principle of Humanity

The principle of humanity prohibits inhumane treatment and unnecessary suffering in armed conflict. It is grounded in the belief that even in war, there are limits to the suffering that can be inflicted on combatants and civilians alike.

Prohibition of Inhumane Treatment of Persons Hors de Combat

This principle ensures that those who are no longer participating in hostilities, such as wounded soldiers or prisoners of war, are treated humanely. Lvova (2022) explains that IHL explicitly forbids practices such as torture, cruel treatment, and degrading treatment. These prohibitions are reinforced by various international conventions, including the Geneva Conventions, which outline the rights of combatants who are hors de combat (out of the fight). Violations of these prohibitions are considered war crimes, and recent conflicts have underscored the importance of enforcing these standards to prevent atrocities.

Prohibition of Certain Weapons and Tactics

According to Atti & Arquilla (2019), IHL prohibits the use of certain weapons and tactics that cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering. This includes the use of chemical and biological weapons, which are banned under various international treaties, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention. Despite these prohibitions, the use of chemical weapons in conflicts such as Syria and Yemen has highlighted significant challenges in enforcing this principle. The resurgence of these banned weapons underscores

the need for stronger enforcement mechanisms and accountability measures to prevent the use of inhumane weapons in conflict (Atti & Arquilla, 2019).

4.0 Impact of Armed Conflicts on Civilian Populations

Armed conflicts have long-lasting and devastating effects on civilian populations. These conflicts lead to significant casualties, displacement, destruction of infrastructure, disruption of essential services, and severe psychological consequences for affected populations. Women, children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable groups. The consequences of war ripple across various aspects of civilian life, leaving a profound and often irreversible impact. This essay explores these effects in detail, drawing on various studies to provide an in-depth analysis of how armed conflicts impact civilians.

Civilian Casualties and Displacement

One of the most immediate impacts of armed conflict is the large number of civilian casualties and the widespread displacement of populations. According to various studies, conflicts result in both direct and indirect deaths among civilians. Direct casualties occur as a result of bombings, shootings, and other forms of violence. Indirect casualties, however, result from the breakdown of healthcare systems, malnutrition, and the spread of infectious diseases. For instance, it is estimated that millions of civilians have died as a result of conflicts worldwide, with children being especially vulnerable to these effects. Between 1995 and 2015, more than 10 million children lost their lives due to the direct and indirect impacts of armed conflicts (Bendavid et al., 2021). The long-term consequences for children are not limited to mortality alone; children who survive often face psychological trauma, displacement, and a disruption to their education, which can have lasting impacts on their lives and future opportunities.

Women and children, in particular, face heightened risks during conflicts. According to a study by Kadir et al. (2018), over 10% of the world's children are affected by armed conflict. The consequences for these children extend beyond physical harm; they also experience long-term mental health issues, psychological trauma, and displacement. Displacement further exacerbates their vulnerabilities as they are forced to flee their homes, often losing access to healthcare, education, and safety. In conflict zones, women and children also face an increased risk of malnutrition and infectious diseases, particularly in environments where healthcare infrastructure has been destroyed or severely compromised.

Destruction of Infrastructure and Livelihoods

Another critical consequence of armed conflicts is the destruction of essential infrastructure, which has a cascading effect on civilian livelihoods. The devastation of infrastructure in conflict zones disrupts the delivery of critical services such as healthcare, education, and economic systems. As noted by Daw et al. (2015), the conflict in Libya led to widespread infrastructural damage, which in turn caused massive displacement and a significant rise in mortality rates. The destruction of healthcare infrastructure, for instance, severely limits access to medical services, leaving displaced populations more vulnerable to illnesses and injuries. Moreover, damage to transportation, sanitation, and communication systems hampers the ability of humanitarian organizations to deliver aid to affected populations, exacerbating the crisis.

The loss of infrastructure also affects the economic wellbeing of civilians, particularly in countries where conflict leads to the destruction of farms, factories, and businesses. The breakdown of economic systems leaves many civilians without employment, leading to poverty and further exacerbating the challenges faced by those in conflict-affected areas. The inability to rebuild infrastructure and livelihoods during or after a conflict contributes to a prolonged recovery process, trapping affected populations in a cycle of poverty and vulnerability.

Disruption of Essential Services: Healthcare, Education, and Food Security

The disruption of essential services, particularly healthcare, education, and food security, is a key consequence of armed conflicts. In conflict-affected areas, the destruction of hospitals, clinics, and schools severely limits civilians' access to necessary services. Healthcare services, including maternal care, vaccinations, and treatment for diseases, often collapse during conflicts, leading to higher mortality rates. A study conducted by Jawad et al. (2021) found that in 181 countries, maternal mortality rates increased significantly, and vaccination coverage declined as a result of armed conflicts. This decline in healthcare services disproportionately affects women and children, who rely heavily on maternal and child health services.

Education is another essential service that is disrupted by armed conflicts. Schools are often damaged or destroyed, or they are used as military bases, rendering them inaccessible to students. The disruption of education has long-term consequences for the development and future prospects of children in conflict zones. In addition, food security is severely compromised during conflicts, as agricultural activities are disrupted, and supply chains are damaged. This leads to food shortages, which in turn contribute to malnutrition and increased mortality rates among displaced populations.

Psychological and Social Consequences for Affected Populations

The psychological and social impacts of armed conflict are profound, particularly for refugees and internally displaced persons. Exposure to violence, displacement, and the breakdown of social structures results in widespread mental health disorders such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and anxiety. These conditions are particularly prevalent among women and children who have been exposed to war. According to Carpiniello (2023), women and children are especially vulnerable to the psychological impacts of armed conflicts, as they often experience violence, displacement, and loss of family members. The trauma of these experiences can result in long-term mental health issues, making it difficult for individuals to reintegrate into society and rebuild their lives after the conflict has ended.

Prolonged exposure to war-related stressors also contributes to long-term mental health consequences. Miller and Rasmussen (2016) suggest that displaced populations, particularly refugees, often experience chronic stress, which can have lasting effects on their mental health and well-being. The lack of mental health services in conflict-affected areas further exacerbates the situation, as affected populations are unable to access the support they need to cope with the trauma they have experienced.

Vulnerable Groups: Women, Children, Elderly, and Persons with Disabilities

Certain groups, including women, children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities, are disproportionately affected by armed conflicts. Women, for instance, face a higher risk of mortality in conflict zones, particularly in high-intensity conflict areas. Wagner et al. (2019) report that women living near intense conflict zones are up to three times more likely to die compared to women in peaceful regions. Additionally, women and girls are at increased risk of sexual violence and exploitation during armed conflicts, further compounding the challenges they face.

Children are similarly vulnerable, often losing one or both parents during conflicts. This loss of family structure leaves children more exposed to the risks of malnutrition, exploitation, and abuse. Ba and Bhopal (2017) highlight that displaced children face significant challenges in accessing basic services, such as education and healthcare, which can have long-lasting impacts on their development. The elderly and persons with disabilities also face unique challenges during armed conflicts, as they are often unable to flee violence and may lack access to the care and support they need to survive.

5.0 Challenges in the Enforcement of International Humanitarian Law (IHL)

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) serves as the legal framework governing the conduct of armed conflicts, aiming to protect those not participating in hostilities and to limit the means and methods of warfare. However, the enforcement of IHL presents significant challenges, compounded by political, legal, and operational obstacles. Despite its pivotal role in safeguarding humanity during warfare, several

factors continue to undermine its implementation. The enforcement of IHL is particularly hindered by a lack of political will, inconsistent state compliance, the challenges posed by non-state armed groups (NSAGs), modern warfare developments, and inadequate accountability mechanisms.

Lack of Political Will

Political will is crucial for the effective enforcement of IHL. However, in many cases, it is often absent or insufficient, particularly in conflicts where state interests are involved. The absence of political will is seen most clearly in situations where governments prioritize political and strategic interests over humanitarian obligations. For instance, according to Steible (2020), the European Union has attempted to promote IHL compliance, but the decentralized nature of IHL enforcement mechanisms and the reluctance of states to hold each other accountable remain formidable barriers. The Yemen conflict offers a pertinent example of how the lack of political will can undermine IHL enforcement. Despite widespread violations of IHL by all parties involved, there has been little accountability, and political interests have often taken precedence over humanitarian considerations (Alqahtani et al., 2022). This situation highlights the need for stronger international enforcement mechanisms that can operate independently of political influences.

Inconsistencies in State Compliance with IHL Norms

States exhibit significant variability in their willingness and ability to comply with IHL norms. According to Alley (2021), many states, particularly those experiencing ongoing or past conflicts, lack the judicial and institutional capacity to effectively enforce IHL. This issue is especially prevalent in disadvantaged states, where fragile legal and institutional systems hinder compliance. For example, in Syria, widespread violations of IHL occurred due to the absence of robust enforcement mechanisms and the failure to impose meaningful sanctions on violators (Xu, 2023). This case illustrates how inconsistencies in state compliance with IHL norms can exacerbate the humanitarian toll of conflicts and prolong suffering.

The divergence in compliance is further complicated by the fact that some states deliberately avoid fulfilling their IHL obligations. For example, state actors may resist recognizing a situation as an armed conflict to evade the application of IHL (Heffes, 2018). Such actions demonstrate how political interests often overshadow humanitarian considerations, creating a challenging environment for the enforcement of IHL.

Challenges in Enforcing IHL Among Non-State Armed Groups (NSAGs)

Non-state armed groups (NSAGs) present a unique challenge to the enforcement of IHL. Unlike state actors, NSAGs are not typically party to international treaties, making it difficult to hold them accountable for violations of IHL. Rodenhäuser (2020) notes that efforts to engage NSAGs in upholding IHL have yielded mixed results. While some groups have demonstrated a willingness to comply with humanitarian norms, others have remained resistant, often due to the lack of recognition or enforcement mechanisms that apply to them. According to Jo (2018), improving compliance mechanisms for NSAGs requires innovative policy solutions and more systematic evaluations of existing approaches. This includes initiatives aimed at persuading NSAGs to adhere to IHL principles through dialogue, capacity-building, and incentives for compliance.

Urban Warfare and Asymmetric Conflicts

The changing nature of warfare, particularly the rise of urban and asymmetric conflicts, further complicates the enforcement of IHL. Modern conflicts often occur in densely populated urban areas, where combatants may blend with civilians, making it difficult to distinguish between legitimate military targets and protected civilians. According to Voenekey (2020), the challenges posed by urban warfare strain the ability of belligerents to uphold IHL norms, as the risk of collateral damage increases in these settings. Asymmetric conflicts, in which state and non-state actors engage in warfare with vastly unequal resources, also present difficulties for the application of IHL. In these scenarios, weaker parties may resort to tactics that deliberately violate IHL, such as the use of human shields or indiscriminate attacks.

Technological Advances in Warfare

Technological advances in warfare, including the use of autonomous weapons and cyber warfare, introduce new challenges to the enforcement of IHL. The development of autonomous weapons, in particular, raises ethical and legal questions regarding accountability for IHL violations. According to Hassan and Ali (2023), there is a pressing need for updated legal frameworks that can address the complexities introduced by these new technologies while ensuring that they are used in ways consistent with IHL principles. Autonomous weapons, which can operate without direct human control, complicate the issue of accountability, as it becomes unclear who bears responsibility for violations of IHL norms (Voenekey, 2020).

Cyber warfare also presents significant challenges to IHL enforcement. Unlike traditional warfare, cyber operations can be conducted anonymously and from a great distance, making it difficult to attribute responsibility for attacks that violate IHL. Moreover, the current legal framework for IHL was not

designed to address the complexities of cyber warfare, creating gaps in the applicability of IHL to this new domain of conflict.

Impunity and Accountability

Impunity for war crimes and other IHL violations remains a major obstacle to the effective enforcement of IHL. Perpetrators of war crimes, particularly in conflicts involving powerful states or NSAGs, often escape accountability due to political and legal limitations. According to Heffes (2018), the International Criminal Court (ICC) and other international tribunals face significant challenges in prosecuting these crimes, particularly when dealing with states that have not ratified the Rome Statute or wield significant diplomatic power. The situation in Yemen, where widespread IHL violations have gone unpunished, illustrates how impunity can perpetuate conflict and hinder peace efforts (Alqahtani et al., 2022).

International Cooperation and Judicial Limitations

While international courts and tribunals play a vital role in enforcing IHL, their effectiveness is often hampered by political and diplomatic challenges. The enforcement of IHL becomes especially difficult when powerful states, such as those with veto power at the United Nations Security Council, are involved (Guřan, 2022). For instance, Russia's invasion of Ukraine has led to significant breaches of IHL, but efforts to hold Russia accountable have faced diplomatic hurdles due to Russia's veto power at the UN. Similarly, the African Great Lakes region provides insights into how international cooperation can be improved to ensure compliance with IHL. According to Krieger (2018), involving regional human rights bodies in enforcing IHL can enhance international efforts to address violations and promote accountability.

The Effectiveness of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) in Mitigating Harm to Civilians

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is designed to protect civilians during armed conflict and mitigate the harm caused to non-combatants. The primary goals of IHL include limiting the effects of armed conflicts and ensuring the humane treatment of individuals who are not participating in hostilities, including civilians. While IHL has been instrumental in shaping the rules of engagement in modern warfare, its effectiveness is contingent on the commitment of states, non-state actors, and international institutions to uphold these standards. A critical examination of its application in various contexts, particularly through case studies, reveals both the successes and failures of IHL in mitigating harm to civilians.

6.0 Case Studies: Effectiveness of IHL in Mitigating Harm to Civilians

IHL plays a significant role in urban warfare, where the density of civilian populations often leads to higher risks of collateral damage. One notable example is the U.S. military's use of precise targeting procedures, which are designed to minimize harm to civilians. These procedures adhere to the principle of distinction, a core tenet of IHL that mandates the differentiation between military objectives and civilian entities. According to Durhin (2016), U.S. military operations have increasingly utilized advanced intelligence and surveillance systems to ensure that only legitimate military targets are engaged, minimizing unintended harm to civilians. The use of precision-guided munitions has further enhanced the effectiveness of these procedures in urban environments.

Precautionary measures are another key aspect of IHL, aimed at reducing civilian casualties during military operations. This is particularly evident in the realm of cyber warfare, where the potential for indirect civilian harm can be significant. A study by Corn (2019) highlights how cyber operations, which target critical infrastructure such as power grids and communication systems, necessitate strict adherence to the principle of precaution under IHL. States and militaries involved in cyber warfare are required to evaluate the potential harm to civilians before launching an attack, ensuring that the anticipated military advantage outweighs any risks to civilian life. In this context, IHL has proven effective in mitigating civilian harm, but its success depends on the proactive implementation of precautionary measures by military actors. According to the International Committee of the Red Cross (2021), minimizing civilian harm in cyber operations requires rigorous adherence to these precautionary principles, and case studies of U.S. military cyber operations underscore the importance of such precautions.

Application of IHL in Historical and Recent Armed Conflicts

The evolving nature of warfare, especially with the rise of non-state actors, has presented challenges to the interpretation and application of IHL. In asymmetric conflicts, traditional protections for civilians can be undermined, raising concerns about the adequacy of existing legal frameworks. The U.S. interpretation of Article 52 of the Geneva Conventions, which permits the targeting of war-sustaining objects, exemplifies the complexities involved in applying IHL to modern conflicts. Chertoff and Manfredi (2017) argue that this interpretation has been controversial, as it expands the scope of permissible targets beyond traditional military objectives, potentially placing civilians at greater risk. The debate surrounding the legality of targeting economic infrastructure highlights the ongoing struggle to balance military necessity with civilian protection.

In Syria, the violation of IHL has been widespread, particularly in the use of chemical weapons against civilian populations. Despite the clear prohibition of chemical weapons under IHL, their use in Syria illustrates the difficulties in enforcing international legal norms. According to Atti and Arquilla (2019),

the international community's inability to hold perpetrators accountable for chemical attacks reflects the broader challenges in ensuring compliance with IHL in the context of civil wars and internal conflicts. The failure to prevent or punish such violations has undermined the credibility of IHL and eroded its protective capacity.

The use of child soldiers further complicates the applicability of IHL, as these children occupy a dual status as both victims and combatants. Groome (2016) points out that IHL provides specific protections for children during armed conflict, but these provisions are often insufficient to address the unique vulnerabilities faced by child soldiers. In many cases, these children are forced into combat roles, blurring the lines between civilian and combatant status and raising questions about whether current laws adequately protect the most vulnerable populations in conflict zones.

Success Stories: Where IHL Provisions Effectively Protected Civilians

Despite its challenges, IHL has been effective in protecting civilians in certain instances. A notable success story is the U.S. military's development of "no-strike lists," which identify civilian and cultural sites that are off-limits to military attacks. These lists are compiled in accordance with the principle of distinction and are designed to protect key civilian infrastructures, such as hospitals and schools, from being targeted during military operations. Margulies (2017) notes that the use of no-strike lists has been particularly effective in reducing collateral damage, ensuring that military actions are directed solely at legitimate targets.

In addition to no-strike lists, the advancement of military technology has played a significant role in enhancing the effectiveness of IHL. Situational Awareness Technology (SAT) allows for real-time tracking of civilian movements and military targets, enabling commanders to make informed decisions that minimize civilian harm. According to Margulies (2019), SAT has greatly improved the precision of military operations, reducing the likelihood of civilian casualties and ensuring greater compliance with IHL's principles of distinction and proportionality.

Failures of IHL: Examination of Major Humanitarian Catastrophes

Despite these successes, there have been significant failures in the application of IHL, leading to devastating humanitarian consequences. In Yemen and Syria, for instance, repeated attacks on medical facilities and personnel have occurred despite the clear protections afforded to such entities under IHL. Atti and Arquilla (2019) argue that the failure to prevent or punish these attacks reflects systemic weaknesses in the enforcement of IHL. The targeting of hospitals and medical workers, who are explicitly

protected under the Geneva Conventions, represents a gross violation of international law, yet accountability mechanisms have often been lacking.

The U.S. Department of Defense's 2015 attack on a Medecins Sans Frontieres hospital in Afghanistan is another case where IHL was not adequately followed, resulting in catastrophic civilian casualties. Margulies (2017) suggests that the failure to adhere to precautionary measures, such as verifying the target's status as a civilian or military objective, contributed to this tragic incident. The attack highlights the limitations of IHL in preventing harm when military actors fail to implement established procedures.

Additionally, the use of starvation as a tactic in siege warfare remains a significant violation of IHL, yet enforcement of the prohibition against this practice has been weak. Mendis (2021) points out that the deliberate targeting of civilian populations through starvation is a war crime under IHL, but the international community has struggled to hold perpetrators accountable for such actions.

7.0 Recommendations for Strengthening International Humanitarian Law (IHL)

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) plays a critical role in regulating conduct during armed conflicts, protecting individuals who are not participating in hostilities, and limiting the means and methods of warfare. However, the challenges of modern warfare, the proliferation of non-state actors, and the emergence of new technologies have necessitated the strengthening and adaptation of IHL frameworks. This comprehensive analysis provides recommendations to enhance IHL's effectiveness, accountability mechanisms, and protection for civilians, while considering the evolving nature of armed conflicts.

Enhancing Accountability Mechanisms

One of the primary steps toward reinforcing IHL involves strengthening accountability mechanisms at both national and international levels. A robust system for prosecuting violations is crucial for ensuring that parties to conflicts adhere to the law. According to Zyberi (2018), states must commit to thoroughly investigating war crimes and prosecuting perpetrators in domestic courts. When national systems are unable or unwilling to act, collaboration with international bodies, such as the International Criminal Court (ICC), becomes necessary. By harmonizing national legal frameworks with international standards, states can ensure that investigations and prosecutions of IHL violations are consistent and effective.

A study suggests that to reinforce these mechanisms, it is essential for states to incorporate IHL principles into their national legislation, providing a legal basis for prosecuting individuals responsible for war crimes. Without this legal framework, national courts often face challenges in applying IHL, leading to

impunity for violators (Zyberi, 2018). Additionally, international bodies should offer technical assistance to countries lacking the capacity to investigate and prosecute war crimes effectively.

Strengthening International Courts and Tribunals for War Crimes

International courts and tribunals, such as the ICC and the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), have played vital roles in addressing atrocities committed during armed conflicts. These institutions provide a permanent platform for prosecuting war crimes and crimes against humanity, particularly when national governments fail to act. According to Levi et al. (2016), the success of these tribunals highlights the need for a stronger international judicial system to deal with violations of IHL.

However, the effectiveness of these courts is often influenced by geopolitical contexts. Many states, especially powerful ones, may be reluctant to cooperate with international tribunals, limiting their ability to hold perpetrators accountable. A study suggests that ensuring greater political and financial support for these institutions from the international community could improve their ability to prosecute war crimes (Levi et al., 2016). Moreover, states should work toward ratifying the Rome Statute, which governs the ICC, to bolster the court's jurisdiction and facilitate its investigations.

Increasing State and Non-State Actor Engagement

In today's conflicts, non-state armed groups play a prominent role, especially in non-international armed conflicts. Engaging these groups in IHL compliance is crucial to mitigate civilian suffering and ensure respect for international law. According to Koh (2019), organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and Geneva Call have been instrumental in establishing dialogues with non-state actors to promote adherence to IHL.

A study suggests that engaging non-state actors through frameworks like Geneva Call's Deeds of Commitment can encourage them to respect IHL norms, such as the protection of civilians and the prohibition of certain weapons (Koh, 2019). States and international bodies should continue supporting these initiatives while developing new strategies to integrate non-state actors into the global IHL framework.

Promoting Adherence to IHL Among All Conflict Parties

Promoting compliance with IHL among all conflict parties, including non-state groups, is essential for ensuring the protection of civilians and the proper conduct of hostilities. A study suggests that mechanisms such as the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on Children Affected by Armed Conflict have been successful in holding non-state actors accountable for violations (Koh, 2019). Expanding these

types of mechanisms to cover a broader range of IHL violations could further enhance accountability for all parties involved in conflicts.

Revising IHL to Address Modern Warfare Challenges

The nature of warfare is evolving, with the rise of new technologies such as cyber warfare and autonomous weapons systems. As these technologies become more prevalent, it is crucial to revise IHL to address the unique challenges they pose. According to Bartels (2018), the current legal principles governing warfare must be updated to provide clearer guidelines on state and non-state responsibilities in the context of new technologies.

A study suggests that states should work together to develop treaties and agreements that regulate the use of these emerging technologies, ensuring they comply with IHL's core principles, such as distinction and proportionality (Bartels, 2018). Without clear regulations, there is a risk that new technologies will be used in ways that violate IHL, leading to increased civilian harm.

Adapting IHL Norms to New Technologies (Drones, Cyber Warfare, Autonomous Weapons)

The rise of technologies like drones and autonomous weapons has raised concerns about their compliance with IHL. States must ensure that these technologies are used in ways that respect the principles of distinction, which requires parties to differentiate between combatants and civilians, and proportionality, which limits excessive harm in relation to the military advantage gained. According to Bartels (2018), clear guidelines are needed to regulate the use of these technologies in both international and non-international conflicts.

Improving Civilian Protection Measures

Protecting civilians during armed conflicts is a fundamental tenet of IHL. However, civilian casualties remain high in many contemporary conflicts. According to Zyberi (2018), mechanisms that can rapidly assess IHL violations, such as fact-finding missions, are crucial for preventing harm to civilians and holding perpetrators accountable.

A study suggests that international bodies should invest in strengthening these mechanisms to provide timely responses to violations and ensure that civilian protection remains a priority during conflicts (Zyberi, 2018). States should also enhance their cooperation with humanitarian organizations to ensure that civilian needs are addressed in conflict zones.

Strengthening Early Warning Systems and Humanitarian Response Frameworks

Early warning systems can help predict potential violations of IHL and allow for timely humanitarian interventions. According to Syed Khan and Majinge (2021), enhancing collaboration between military forces and humanitarian organizations is crucial for improving early warning and response mechanisms. Strengthening these systems would enable faster interventions, reducing civilian casualties and ensuring compliance with IHL.

Capacity Building for IHL Enforcement

Building national and international capacity for enforcing IHL is essential for improving accountability and compliance. According to Musila (2016), states should focus on establishing legal institutions that can address war crimes efficiently. Aligning national laws with IHL standards is also necessary to ensure that violations are prosecuted effectively at the domestic level.

Enhancing Training for Military and Non-Military Actors on IHL Compliance

Finally, comprehensive training on IHL for military personnel and civilian authorities is vital for ensuring compliance. According to Muhammad (2022), well-trained forces are more likely to adhere to IHL principles, reducing the likelihood of violations. States should invest in ongoing training programs to improve the understanding of IHL among all actors involved in armed conflicts.

8.0 Conclusion

Summary of Key Findings

The examination of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) has highlighted its crucial role in mitigating the human cost of armed conflicts. Its principles, particularly those of distinction, proportionality, necessity, and humanity, are designed to safeguard non-combatants and limit unnecessary suffering. However, as modern warfare evolves, with the involvement of non-state actors and the advent of new technologies such as drones and cyber warfare, the effectiveness of IHL is increasingly challenged. Additionally, enforcing IHL remains difficult, with inconsistencies in state compliance, the involvement of non-state actors, and the complexities introduced by asymmetric and urban conflicts further complicating its application.

Despite these challenges, the need for a robust IHL framework has never been more important. The law's capacity to protect civilians has been demonstrated in several case studies where compliance with its core principles has resulted in reduced civilian casualties. However, significant failures, such as the use of chemical weapons and attacks on medical facilities, underscore the gaps in enforcement and accountability that still need to be addressed.

The Future of IHL in Mitigating Civilian Harm

The future of IHL must adapt to the realities of modern warfare to continue its mission of mitigating civilian harm. One of the most pressing areas for development is the adaptation of IHL to the use of new technologies, such as autonomous weapons and cyber warfare. According to Bartels (2018), these technologies present unprecedented challenges, and without clear guidelines, their use could lead to increased civilian casualties. Thus, international bodies and states must collaborate to develop new treaties and legal frameworks that address these emerging threats while upholding IHL's core principles of distinction and proportionality.

Equally important is the engagement of non-state actors in the IHL framework. As Koh (2019) suggests, involving these groups in dialogues and encouraging their adherence to IHL principles are essential steps in ensuring that all parties to a conflict, not just state actors, respect the law. Furthermore, the increasing use of asymmetric tactics and urban warfare requires more precise mechanisms for the protection of civilians, as these types of conflicts make it difficult to uphold traditional IHL principles.

Final Thoughts on Strengthening the IHL Framework for Global Peace and Security

To strengthen IHL and ensure its continued relevance in promoting global peace and security, several key recommendations must be implemented. First, accountability mechanisms at both national and international levels must be enhanced to ensure that violators of IHL are brought to justice. Strengthening the capacities of international courts, such as the International Criminal Court (ICC), as well as national legal systems, is vital for ensuring that war crimes are thoroughly investigated and prosecuted. According to Zyberi (2018), this will require harmonizing national legal frameworks with international standards and providing technical assistance to states that lack the necessary legal infrastructure.

In addition, there is an urgent need to promote adherence to IHL among all conflict parties, including non-state groups. Mechanisms such as the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on Children Affected by Armed Conflict have proven effective in holding non-state actors accountable, and expanding these initiatives could further enhance compliance. Moreover, revising IHL to address the challenges posed by new technologies and modern warfare tactics is essential for maintaining its relevance. As Bartels (2018) argues, states should work together to develop new treaties that regulate the use of technologies like autonomous weapons and cyber warfare, ensuring that their use aligns with IHL's humanitarian goals.

Finally, the international community must invest in capacity-building initiatives to strengthen the enforcement of IHL. This includes providing training for military personnel and non-military actors to ensure they understand and adhere to IHL principles. By enhancing training programs and building

stronger legal institutions, states can improve their ability to enforce IHL and protect civilians during armed conflicts.

Referencing

Alexander, A. (2016). International humanitarian law, postcolonialism and the 1977 'Geneva Protocol I'. *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, 17, 15.

Alley, R. (2021). Humanitarian Law Compliance. *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/18781527-BJA10032>.

Alqahtani, M., Nordin, R., & Jalil, F. (2022). Non-Adherence to Human Rights and Humanitarian Laws in the Conduct of Armed Conflict in Yemen. *Sriwijaya Law Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.vol6.iss1.1459.pp143-162>.

Atti, S., & Arquilla, B. (2019). International Humanitarian Law and Review of Recurrent Violations Including Chemical Weapons Use. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 34, s32 - s32.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X19000827>.

Ba, I., & Bhopal, R. (2017). Physical, mental and social consequences in civilians who have experienced war-related sexual violence: a systematic review (1981-2014). *Public health*, 142, 121-135 .
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2016.07.019>.

Bakhsh, D. (2019). SCOPE OF THE APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW (IHL) IN SITUATIONS OF NON-INTERNATIONAL ARMED CONFLICTS: EXTENDED APPLICABILITY OF COMMON ARTICLE.3. *Journal of Law & Social Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.52279/jlss.01.02.99105>.

Bartels, R. (2018). When Do Terrorist Organisations Qualify as “Parties to an Armed Conflict” under International Humanitarian Law?. *The Military Law and the Law of War Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3209305>.

Bendavid, E., Boerma, T., Akseer, N., Langer, A., Malembaka, E., Okiro, E., Wise, P., Heft-Neal, S., Black, R., Bhutta, Z., Bhutta, Z., Black, R., Blanchet, K., Gaffey, M., Spiegel, P., Waldman, R., & Wise, P. (2021). The effects of armed conflict on the health of women and children. *The Lancet*, 397, 522-532.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00131-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00131-8).

Carpiniello, B. (2023). Psychopathological consequences of war and armed conflicts. *European Psychiatry*, 66, S49 - S49. <https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2023.178>.

Chertoff, E., & Manfredi, Z. (2017). Deadly Ambiguity: IHL's Prohibition on Targeting Civilian Objects and the Risks of Decentered Interpretation. *Texas International Law Journal*, 53, 239. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2997274>.

Clegg, L. (2020). The International Committee of the Red Cross and the protection of world war dead. *Forensic science international*, 319, 110648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2020.110648>.

Cohen, A., & Zlotogorski, D. (2021). Proportionality in International Humanitarian Law. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OSO/9780197556726.001.0001>.

Corn, G. (2019). The Invaluable Civilian Risk Mitigation Contribution of Recognizing the Value of Precautionary Measures. , 223-238. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198842965.003.0012>.

Crawford, E., & Pert, A. (2015). The Contemporary Legal Basis of International Humanitarian Law and Its Fundamental Principles. *International Humanitarian Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781316337028.004>.

Daw, M., El-Bouzedi, A., & Dau, A. (2015). Libyan armed conflict 2011: Mortality, injury and population displacement. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 5, 101-107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AFJEM.2015.02.002>.

Dijk, B. (2019). "The Great Humanitarian": The Soviet Union, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the Geneva Conventions of 1949. *Law and History Review*, 37, 209 - 235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0738248019000014>.

Dremluiga, R. (2020). The use of Autonomous weapons from the perspective of the principles of international humanitarian law. *Advances in Law Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.29039/2409-5087-2020-8-5-64-71>.

Durhin, N. (2016). Protecting civilians in urban areas: A military perspective on the application of international humanitarian law. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 98, 177 - 199. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383117000029>.

Groome, D. (2016). Child Soldiers - Both Victims and Combatants: Is There Anything IHL Can Do?. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2869484>.

Hassan, S., & Ali, S. (2023). Limitations On Warfare Methods: A Brief Examination Under International Humanitarian Law. *Journal of Advances in Humanities Research*. <https://doi.org/10.56868/jadhur.v2i4.189>.

Heffes, E. (2018). Book Review: Heike Krieger (ed.), *Inducing Compliance with International Humanitarian Law. Lessons from the African Great Lakes Region*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015. Social Science Research Network.

Jawad, M., Hone, T., Vamos, E., Cetorelli, V., & Millett, C. (2021). Implications of armed conflict for maternal and child health: A regression analysis of data from 181 countries for 2000–2019. *PLoS Medicine*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003810>.

Kadir, A., Shenoda, S., Goldhagen, J., & Pitterman, S. (2018). The Effects of Armed Conflict on Children. *Pediatrics*, 142. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2018-2586>.

Khan, Y., & Majinge, C. (2021). Advancing the Rule of Law and Human Rights Protection through United Nations Mandated Mechanisms. *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law Online*. https://doi.org/10.1163/18757413_02401011.

Knuckey, S., Moorehead, A., McCalley, A., & Brown, A. (2020). The Proportionality Rule and Mental Harm in War. , 367-408. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197537374.003.0013>.

Koh, T. (2019). Building a New Legal Order for the Oceans. . <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv136c5rx>.

Krieger, H. (2018). *Inducing Compliance with International Humanitarian Law: Lessons from the African Great Lakes Region*. . <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316182369>.

Levi, R., Hagan, J., & Dezalay, S. (2016). International courts in atypical political environments: The interplay of prosecutorial strategy, evidence, and court authority in International Criminal law. *Law and contemporary problems*, 79, 289-314.

Lozinska, S., & Kiryk, A. (2023). Contribution of the International committee of the Red Cross in development and implementation of international humanitarian law. *Economics. Finances. Law*. <https://doi.org/10.37634/efp.2023.6.18>.

Lvova, O. (2022). Moral and legal principles of protection of civilians during the war (in the context of Russian aggression in 2022). *ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF THE LEGAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CONDITIONS OF WAR AND THE POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION OF THE STATE*. <https://doi.org/10.33663/2524-017x-2022-13-40>.

Margulies, P. (2019). *The Other Side of Autonomous Weapons. The Impact of Emerging Technologies on the Law of Armed Conflict*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190915322.003.0006>.

Mendis, N. (2021). SIEGE WARFARE AND THE PROHIBITION OF INTENTIONAL STARVATION OF CIVILIANS: THE CONVERGENCE OF IHL AND BUDDHIST ETHICS. *Contemporary Buddhism*, 22, 252 - 280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14639947.2022.2080362>.

Miller, K., & Rasmussen, A. (2016). The mental health of civilians displaced by armed conflict: an ecological model of refugee distress. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, 26, 129 - 138. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796016000172>.

Muhammad, D. (2022). INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW BETWEEN WAR AND PEACE. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES*. <https://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.041>.

Musila, G. (2016). The Special Criminal Court and Other Options for Accountability in the Central African Republic: Legal and Policy Recommendations. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2762813>.

Oji, E. (2013). The problem with international humanitarian law: Distinguishing targets in armed conflict. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, 4, 1-11.

Orehowsky, W. (2020). THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW IN THE XIX CENTURY. *Innovative solutions in modern science*, 2, 94-103. [https://doi.org/10.26886/2414-634X.2\(38\)2020.8](https://doi.org/10.26886/2414-634X.2(38)2020.8).

Rosert, E., & Sauer, F. (2019). Prohibiting Autonomous Weapons: Put Human Dignity First. *Global Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12691>.

Schaack, B. (2016). Human Shields: Complementary Duties under IHL. *AJIL Unbound*, 110, 317 - 322. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aju.2016.5>.

Schoeberl, K. (2019). The geographical scope of application of international humanitarian law. . <https://doi.org/10.13097/ARCHIVE-OUVERTE/UNIGE:121816>.

Steible, B. (2020). Ensuring compliance with International Humanitarian Law: the EU, France, and Spain. . <https://doi.org/10.48035/978-84-9769-359-2>.

Voenky, S. (2020). Implementation and Enforcement of International Humanitarian Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3571181>.

Wagner, Z., Heft-Neal, S., Wise, P., Black, R., Burke, M., Boerma, T., Bhutta, Z., & Bendavid, E. (2019). Women and children living in areas of armed conflict in Africa: a geospatial analysis of mortality and orphanhood. *The Lancet. Global Health*, 7, e1622 - e1631. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(19\)30407-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(19)30407-3).

Xu, X. (2023). The Effectiveness of International Humanitarian Law in Protecting Civilians in Syria's Non-International Armed Conflicts. *Journal of Student Research*. <https://doi.org/10.47611/jsr.v12i2.1921>.

Zyberi, G. (2018). Enforcement of International Humanitarian Law. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5206-4_14.