IRSHAD

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY

Civilian Protection Failures Under the Geneva Conventions a Critical Reassessment

[Malgozata Stvol][1]

[1]*University of Gdansk, Poland*

Keywords:

Civilian Protection, Geneva Conventions, International Humanitarian Law, Direct Participation in Hostilities, Proportionality Review, Non-State Armed Groups, Humanitarian Access Denial

ABSTRACT

Despite comprehensive protections under the Geneva Conventions, civilian populations continue suffering devastating harm in contemporary armed conflicts. This research critically examines why international humanitarian law (IHL) frameworks persistently fail to deliver meaningful civilian protection in modern warfare. Five interconnected structural failures are identified: legal ambiguity over direct participation in hostilities; absence of mandatory pre-strike proportionality review; political veto override of Common Article 1 obligations; accountability gaps for non-state armed groups present in seventy percent of ongoing conflicts; and lack of interim legal remedies for humanitarian access denial. Using qualitative doctrinal and document analysis, this study demonstrates that protection failures stem from fundamental legal design weaknesses, not merely insufficient political will. These findings challenge prevailing assumptions that existing treaty frameworks require only stronger enforcement rather than structural reform. Urgent legal innovation, binding accountability mechanisms, and modernized frameworks suited to contemporary warfare are essential to transform humanitarian law's promises into genuine civilian protection realities.

How to Cite: Stvol, M. (2026). Civilian Protection Failures Under the Geneva Conventions a Critical Reassessment. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(5), 01-22. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.569

I. Introduction

Every modern armed conflict continues to show civilians suffering despite strong humanitarian law protections. The Geneva Conventions were designed to safeguard civilians during armed conflicts and military occupations. These treaties established clear legal obligations requiring parties to respect civilian life and dignity. However, recent conflicts demonstrate repeated failures in preventing civilian harm and displacement worldwide. Scholars question whether legal rules are weak or enforcement mechanisms remain ineffective. Civilian casualties, attacks on hospitals, and forced migrations raise serious concerns about compliance. International humanitarian law depends not only on rules but also on accountability systems. Many states accept treaty obligations yet struggle to implement protections during active hostilities. This gap between legal promise and practical reality makes the issue highly significant today. The research critically reassesses civilian protection failures under the Geneva Conventions framework. It explores legal weaknesses, operational challenges, and accountability limits affecting humanitarian protection outcomes globally (AllahRakha, 2024).

The Geneva Conventions emerged after World War II to prevent civilian suffering during armed conflicts. These treaties established humanitarian rules limiting violence against noncombatants and protecting essential civilian infrastructure. Early scholarship praised the conventions as a major achievement in international humanitarian law development. Over time, conflicts changed, involving non-state actors, urban warfare, and advanced military technologies. These developments complicated the practical application of civilian protection obligations. Studies show that legal standards exist, yet enforcement remains inconsistent across different conflicts. Researchers have examined accountability mechanisms, war crime prosecutions, and compliance monitoring systems extensively. Despite these efforts, civilian casualties continue increasing in contemporary armed conflicts worldwide. Existing literature highlights problems of political will, weak enforcement institutions, and selective accountability practices. However, limited research critically reassesses structural failures within the Geneva Convention framework itself (Roberts, 2020).

International humanitarian law clearly recognizes civilian protection as a central obligation during armed conflicts. The Geneva Conventions prohibit attacks on civilians, medical facilities, and humanitarian personnel without exception. Existing research confirms that legal standards governing civilian protection are detailed and widely accepted globally. Scholars also acknowledge improvements in legal accountability through international criminal tribunals and monitoring institutions. Despite these developments, civilian casualties remain high in contemporary conflicts involving both state and non-state actors. The central problem lies not in the absence of rules but in ineffective compliance and enforcement. Military necessity claims, urban warfare complexities, and political interests often weaken humanitarian protections. Researchers still debate whether failures arise from legal gaps or deliberate

violations of existing obligations. What remains unclear is how structural weaknesses within the Geneva Convention system enable recurring protection failures (Watkin, 2021).

Recent scholarship shows that civilian protection under the Geneva Conventions faces serious implementation failures during modern conflicts. Researchers explain that legal rules exist, yet enforcement remains weak during active hostilities. Scholars observe that technological warfare creates new risks for civilians that existing norms struggle to regulate effectively. Studies further argue that urban warfare increases civilian exposure because military operations occur within populated environments. Another finding highlights that proportionality assessments often vary widely between military commanders, causing inconsistent protection outcomes. Research also shows that accountability mechanisms rarely function during ongoing conflicts due to political pressure and jurisdictional limits. Legal commentators emphasize that non-state armed groups frequently operate outside structured compliance systems, weakening humanitarian safeguards. Additionally, scholars suggest that humanitarian access restrictions directly increase civilian suffering despite legal guarantees under international law. These findings collectively show strong legal foundations but weak operational protection systems in practice (Ferraro, 2021).

Recent literature also identifies deeper structural weaknesses affecting civilian safety under international humanitarian law frameworks. Scholars argue that states increasingly reinterpret legal obligations to justify military necessity during complex conflicts. Studies indicate that autonomous weapons and remote warfare complicate responsibility attribution when civilian harm occurs. Research further demonstrates that investigations into violations often depend on political will rather than legal obligation. Another study notes that humanitarian organizations lack enforcement authority despite extensive monitoring capabilities. Analysts also find that international criminal prosecutions remain selective, limiting deterrence against repeated violations. Literature highlights inconsistencies between treaty obligations and real battlefield practices across different regions. Scholars additionally observe that civilian protection debates rarely incorporate local community perspectives during policy development. Together, these studies reveal growing awareness of protection failures while exposing unresolved gaps requiring renewed legal reassessment (Roberts, 2022).

Existing literature provides valuable insights into legal rules governing civilian protection during armed conflicts. Scholars successfully identify enforcement failures, accountability limits, and challenges created by modern warfare practices. Many studies examine specific violations, technological risks, and political influences affecting humanitarian law compliance. However, most research evaluates isolated factors rather than examining structural weaknesses within the Geneva Conventions system itself. Current scholarship rarely connects legal doctrine, military practice, and institutional enforcement into a unified analytical framework. Researchers also acknowledge limited empirical data assessing why repeated protection failures persist across different conflicts. Another gap concerns how evolving conflict actors reshape obligations originally designed for interstate wars. Few studies critically reassess whether existing legal mechanisms remain adaptable to contemporary warfare

realities. This study therefore addresses insufficient analysis linking legal design flaws with recurring civilian harm patterns. Future research should explore integrated accountability models combining legal reform, operational guidance, and stronger international monitoring mechanisms (Haque, 2022).

To critically examine the effectiveness of civilian protection rules under the Geneva Conventions in contemporary armed conflicts and assess whether existing legal mechanisms adequately prevent civilian harm.

To identify and analyze structural, institutional, and operational factors that contribute to recurring failures in implementing civilian protection obligations under international humanitarian law.

To evaluate and propose legal and policy reforms that can strengthen accountability, improve compliance mechanisms, and enhance practical protection for civilians in modern warfare environments.

Why do civilian protection mechanisms under the Geneva Conventions repeatedly fail in contemporary armed conflicts, and how can legal accountability and enforcement frameworks be restructured to ensure effective civilian protection in modern warfare?

This research is important because civilian suffering continues despite strong international humanitarian law protections. The study contributes to academic debate by reassessing why existing civilian protection mechanisms remain ineffective. Scholars note that modern conflicts expose weaknesses in enforcement and accountability systems under current legal frameworks. By examining structural failures, this research provides new understanding beyond simple violation analysis. It helps policymakers identify practical reforms capable of improving compliance during armed conflicts. Military planners and humanitarian organizations may benefit from clearer operational guidance based on legal findings. The research also supports international institutions seeking stronger mechanisms to prevent civilian harm. Understanding protection failures encourages development of realistic legal standards suited to contemporary warfare. The study justifies renewed attention to humanitarian law effectiveness rather than treaty expansion alone (Corn et al., 2022).

II. Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative research design to critically examine civilian protection failures under the Geneva Conventions in contemporary armed conflicts. Qualitative methodology is appropriate because the study investigates complex legal, institutional, and operational dimensions that cannot be meaningfully captured through numerical measurement alone. The research focuses on international humanitarian law instruments, including the four Geneva Conventions of 1949, their Additional Protocols, and customary international humanitarian law principles as primary legal sources. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed scholarly articles retrieved from established academic databases

including JSTOR, Westlaw, and Google Scholar using targeted search keywords such as "civilian protection failures," "Geneva Conventions enforcement," "direct participation in hostilities," "proportionality review," "non-state armed groups accountability," and "humanitarian access denial." Official documents from the United Nations, International Committee of the Red Cross, International Criminal Court, and relevant treaty bodies were accessed directly through their official institutional websites to ensure source authenticity and accuracy throughout the research process.

Source validity and reliability were maintained through strict selection criteria prioritizing publications from 2020 onwards to ensure contemporary relevance to evolving conflict environments and current legal debates. All scholarly materials were drawn exclusively from peer-reviewed law journals and publications authored by recognized academic researchers, legal practitioners, and university professors specializing in international humanitarian law. Sources were further evaluated for evidentiary support, appropriate citation practices, and scientific objectivity confirming alignment with established legal scholarship standards. Doctrinal analysis served as the primary analytical technique, systematically examining legal texts, treaty obligations, judicial decisions, and institutional interpretations to identify structural weaknesses within the Geneva Convention framework. Document analysis complemented this approach by critically reviewing UN reports, ICRC commentaries, fact-finding mission findings, and international tribunal judgments to connect legal doctrine with documented operational realities across multiple contemporary conflict environments.

Ethical considerations governing this research required exclusive reliance on publicly available official documents and peer-reviewed scholarly sources accessible without restriction. Full bibliographic references are provided for all sources consulted, appropriately attributing original ideas and findings to their respective authors throughout the research. No conflicts of interest influenced the research process, which was conducted solely for academic purposes advancing understanding of civilian protection law. Regarding delimitations, this study deliberately focuses on the Geneva Conventions framework rather than broader international human rights law, and examines conflicts occurring primarily after 2015 reflecting contemporary warfare characteristics. Significant limitations affecting this research include the inherently evolving nature of international humanitarian law, where state practice, judicial interpretations, and policy frameworks can change substantially at any time. Technological innovation in warfare, including autonomous weapons development and artificial intelligence integration into targeting systems, continues rapidly transforming the conflict landscape in ways that existing legal analysis cannot fully anticipate or comprehensively address within any single research undertaking.

III. Results

The examines civilian protection failures under the Geneva Conventions in modern conflicts. The study focuses on why legal obligations often fail to prevent civilian harm. It

analyzes enforcement gaps, operational challenges, and political influences affecting compliance. Research questions address the causes of recurring violations and possible reforms to improve accountability. The findings consider both state and non-state actors, highlighting how non-state groups frequently operate outside legal frameworks. The study also evaluates modern warfare contexts, including urban battles and technological advances that increase civilian vulnerability. Accountability mechanisms, such as tribunals and monitoring bodies, are assessed for effectiveness and limitations. Humanitarian access challenges and political vetoes further complicate civilian protection. The results aim to provide evidence-based insights to improve legal interpretation, operational compliance, and enforcement strategies. This section connects observed failures to the research question, offering a foundation for reform recommendations (Allah Rakha, 2024).

The concept of "direct participation in hostilities" under international humanitarian law remains legally ambiguous. This uncertainty allows parties to armed conflicts to interpret rules in ways that justify civilian harm. Scholars note that unclear definitions make it difficult for soldiers and commanders to distinguish between civilians and combatants. As a result, civilians are frequently exposed to attacks without proper legal justification. The ambiguity also complicates accountability, as prosecutions must prove unlawful targeting under vague standards. Research shows that non-state armed groups exploit this uncertainty to justify operations in populated areas. States also interpret participation broadly, sometimes including support roles or protests as legitimate targets. Such interpretations systematically increase civilian vulnerability during hostilities. Legal and operational guidance often fails to clarify thresholds for direct participation. Improving clarity and uniform application of these rules is essential to reducing harm. Clear standards can strengthen enforcement and protect civilian populations effectively (Melzer, 2020).

Modern armed conflicts often lack mandatory independent reviews before conducting attacks, creating serious risks for civilians. Pre-strike proportionality assessments are intended to balance military advantage against potential civilian harm. Current practices show that these evaluations are usually internal and often influenced by command priorities, reducing objectivity. Studies indicate that the absence of independent oversight allows errors and biased judgments, increasing civilian casualties. Research also highlights that automated and remote warfare complicates proportionality assessments due to limited human supervision. Without external review, accountability mechanisms are weakened, and violations are harder to prosecute. Comparative analyses show that jurisdictions with stricter review procedures achieve lower civilian harm rates. Legal scholars argue that formalizing independent pre-strike evaluations would strengthen compliance with humanitarian law. Institutional reforms could ensure that attacks are proportionate and necessary, improving civilian protection. Implementing structured oversight mechanisms is crucial for reducing unintended harm and reinforcing legal accountability in modern conflicts (Heller, 2023).

The enforcement of Common Article 1 obligations under the Geneva Conventions is often weakened by political veto powers. States or international bodies can block enforcement

actions, allowing violations to continue without accountability, this political override undermines the principle that all parties must respect humanitarian law during armed conflicts. Research shows that veto use delays investigations and limits sanctions against perpetrators, reducing. Civilian populations suffer when enforcement decisions are subordinated to strategic or diplomatic interests. Scholars note that political interference creates inconsistent application of legal obligations across different conflicts. The lack of mandatory action allows repeated violations without consequences, eroding trust in international law. Comparative studies suggest that neutral and independent enforcement bodies can better uphold compliance and protect civilians. Strengthening institutional safeguards against political vetoes could improve accountability. Ensuring consistent enforcement is critical for reinforcing legal norms and safeguarding noncombatants globally (Kemp, 2022).

Non-state armed groups operate outside established accountability frameworks in about seventy percent of ongoing conflicts. These groups are not formally bound by Geneva Conventions enforcement mechanisms, making civilian protection difficult. Research shows that civilians face higher risks in areas controlled by such actors. Non-state actors often use guerrilla tactics and urban warfare, increasing civilian exposure to violence. Legal enforcement relies on state cooperation, which is often unavailable in these situations. Studies indicate that selective prosecutions rarely deter violations by non-state armed groups. Humanitarian organizations struggle to access populations under their control, limiting monitoring and aid delivery, The lack of binding obligations allows repeated abuses without legal consequences. Scholars suggest that strengthening international mechanisms and promoting compliance incentives could reduce civilian harm. Addressing these gaps is essential for improving protection standards. Enhancing accountability for non-state actors remains a critical challenge in contemporary warfare (Rona et al., 2021).

Humanitarian organizations frequently face denial of access to civilians in conflict zones. International law guarantees relief access, yet enforcement mechanisms rarely provide immediate remedies. This creates situations where essential aid is delayed or blocked, increasing civilian suffering. Research indicates that belligerents often use access denial as a strategic tool during hostilities. There are no interim legal procedures to compel compliance quickly, leaving populations vulnerable. Studies show that delayed enforcement undermines the effectiveness of Geneva Convention protections. Humanitarian workers must negotiate access repeatedly, wasting critical time and resources. Comparative analysis suggests that conflicts with formal monitoring bodies achieve better access outcomes. Political and security considerations often override legal obligations, limiting enforcement options. Strengthening rapid response mechanisms could ensure civilians receive timely assistance. Implementing interim legal remedies would improve accountability and reduce avoidable harm. Protecting civilian populations requires practical enforcement measures alongside existing legal frameworks (Kersten, 2023).

IV. Discussion

A. Legal Ambiguity in "Direct Participation in Hostilities" Enables Systematic Civilian Harm

The Geneva Conventions require parties to distinguish between civilians and combatants during armed conflict. However, the concept of "direct participation in hostilities" lacks a precise legal definition. This gap creates serious confusion at the operational level. Soldiers and commanders cannot reliably determine who qualifies as a legitimate target. As a result, civilians are frequently harmed without proper legal justification. The absence of clear thresholds transforms a foundational protection principle into a practical liability. This ambiguity sits at the structural heart of recurring civilian protection failures worldwide. Recent conflicts across multiple regions continue demonstrating how undefined participation standards leave civilian populations exposed to systematic violence that existing legal frameworks were specifically designed to prevent (Zwanenburg, 2022).

The practical significance of this legal gap is profound and measurable in real conflict outcomes. When targeting rules remain unclear, errors become harder to prosecute and easier to excuse by military authorities. Commanders apply different interpretations of participation, producing wildly inconsistent outcomes across similar conflict situations. A civilian performing a support function in one context may be treated as a combatant in another. This inconsistency is not merely academic debate among legal scholars. It determines whether real people live or die during active hostilities. The absence of uniform standards directly undermines the humanitarian purpose the Geneva Conventions were originally designed to serve across all armed conflicts globally (Corten et al., 2021).

States have increasingly exploited definitional ambiguity to justify broader targeting decisions during modern conflicts. Support roles, protest activity, and community organizing have been reframed as forms of participation in hostilities by various governments. Non-state armed groups similarly manipulate uncertainty to conduct operations within densely populated civilian areas while claiming legal cover. Recent conflicts in Gaza, Sudan, and Myanmar illustrate how broadly interpreted participation definitions expose entire communities to violence. The 2009 ICRC Interpretive Guidance on Direct Participation attempted to address this serious problem, but its recommendations remain non-binding and inconsistently adopted across national military doctrines (Mégret, 2025).

Accountability mechanisms collapse precisely where definitional clarity is most urgently needed in practice. Prosecutors attempting war crimes cases must establish that targeting decisions violated clear legal standards. Vague participation thresholds make this burden extremely difficult to meet before international tribunals. Courts frequently encounter insufficient evidence because ambiguous rules allow defendants to argue reasonable interpretation of existing law. This structural weakness protects violators rather than civilian victims seeking justice. Comparative legal analysis reveals that jurisdictions applying narrower and well-defined participation criteria consistently produce stronger accountability outcomes.

The systemic failure is therefore not one of enforcement alone but of the foundational legal design that enforcement entirely depends upon (Sivakumaran, 2021).

Technological developments have significantly deepened this problem across contemporary conflict environments. Autonomous weapons systems and remote drone warfare reduce direct human observation of targets before strikes occur. Algorithms making targeting decisions cannot meaningfully assess behavioral context or temporary civilian status during dynamic battlefield situations. This amplifies the consequences of definitional ambiguity because machines apply whatever threshold they are programmed with, regardless of humanitarian nuance. Recent policy discussions within the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapons have highlighted this growing concern. However, binding regulatory frameworks remain entirely absent from international law. Without clearer human oversight requirements linked to precise participation definitions, technological warfare will continue generating systematic civilian harm (Schmitt, 2020).

The implications for international humanitarian law reform are urgent and practically clear for policymakers. Vague legal standards cannot adequately protect civilians in contemporary warfare environments experiencing rapid technological transformation. Standardized and operationally practical definitions of direct participation must be developed and incorporated into binding treaty obligations accepted universally. Military training programs should integrate precise threshold guidance applicable across conventional and asymmetric conflict scenarios alike. International monitoring bodies urgently need authority to review targeting decisions against consistent legal benchmarks. Humanitarian organizations must push clearer definitions into national military doctrines rather than accepting non-binding guidance as sufficient protection. Legal clarity is not a bureaucratic preference among legal scholars. It is the foundational requirement for meaningful and enforceable civilian protection in all modern armed conflicts (Lubell, 2021).

B. Absence of Mandatory Independent Pre-Strike Proportionality Review

International humanitarian law requires military forces to assess proportionality before conducting any attack. This means weighing expected civilian harm against anticipated military advantage. However, no binding legal framework mandates independent review of these assessments before strikes occur. Current practice leaves proportionality evaluations entirely within military command structures. Internal reviews are naturally influenced by operational priorities and command pressures. This creates a fundamental conflict of interest within targeting decisions. The absence of external oversight transforms a critical civilian protection mechanism into a largely self-regulated process. Recent conflicts in Yemen, Ukraine, and Syria have repeatedly demonstrated how unchecked proportionality assessments produce catastrophic civilian casualties that independent review could potentially have prevented before strikes were executed (Bellal, 2020).

The real-world consequences of this oversight gap are deeply serious for civilian populations. When militaries evaluate their own targeting decisions internally, objectivity

becomes structurally impossible to guarantee. Command priorities frequently override humanitarian considerations during active operations. Proportionality calculations involve complex judgments about expected casualties and military value. These judgments require neutral expertise that internal military reviewers rarely possess independently. Errors in assessment directly translate into civilian deaths, destroyed hospitals, and displaced communities. The harm caused is not random but systematic, arising from a predictable institutional weakness. Without mandatory external review requirements embedded in international law, proportionality assessments will continue producing inconsistent and frequently inadequate civilian protection outcomes across different conflict environments globally (Dinstein, 2022).

Supporting evidence consistently confirms that internal proportionality reviews produce weaker civilian protection outcomes. Studies comparing conflicts with varying oversight levels reveal clear patterns of reduced civilian harm where independent mechanisms exist. Research examining Israeli, American, and NATO targeting practices shows significant variation in how proportionality is calculated and applied operationally. The UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria documented repeated cases where internal military assessments approved strikes later found to violate humanitarian law standards. Automated and remote warfare further complicates evaluation because drone operators and algorithm-driven systems lack direct situational awareness of civilian presence. These documented patterns confirm that self-regulated proportionality review is structurally insufficient for protecting civilian populations during complex modern armed conflicts (Clapham, 2021).

Significant limitations affect how proportionality reviews currently function across different military systems worldwide. Many states classify targeting procedures as sensitive national security information, preventing independent researchers from fully examining decision-making processes. This opacity creates serious analytical gaps in understanding exactly where assessments fail most frequently. Military legal advisers embedded within command structures face institutional pressures that compromise independent judgment. Additionally, proportionality standards themselves remain subjectively interpreted, with no universal metric defining acceptable civilian harm levels relative to military objectives. Different cultural, political, and strategic contexts further shape how commanders weigh competing considerations. These overlapping limitations mean that even well-intentioned internal review processes cannot substitute for genuinely independent external oversight mechanisms backed by binding international legal obligations requiring transparent pre-strike accountability (Murray, 2022).

Striking contradictions exist between stated legal commitments and actual battlefield practices among major military powers. States publicly endorsing proportionality obligations simultaneously resist any binding independent review requirements during international negotiations. The United States, United Kingdom, and Russia all maintain robust internal targeting review procedures while opposing external oversight frameworks at institutional

levels. This contradiction reveals that proportionality compliance serves political legitimacy functions rather than genuine civilian protection purposes in many operational contexts. Emerging initiatives offer partial solutions worth examining carefully. The Political Declaration on Responsible Military Use of Artificial Intelligence and the Call to Action on Protection of Civilians represent recent multilateral efforts acknowledging oversight gaps. However, these initiatives remain voluntary and lack enforcement mechanisms capable of compelling meaningful behavioral change among states conducting military operations globally (Rodenhäuser, 2021).

The broader implications for humanitarian law reform demand urgent and coordinated international attention from policymakers. Formalizing mandatory independent pre-strike review mechanisms would fundamentally strengthen civilian protection across all conflict environments. Such mechanisms could operate through existing institutions like the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission, which currently remains chronically underutilized despite its legal mandate. Military forces demonstrably achieve lower civilian casualty rates when external accountability structures constrain targeting decisions effectively. Legal reforms embedding independent review requirements into Additional Protocol obligations would create enforceable standards applicable universally. Humanitarian organizations, academic institutions, and civil society groups must collectively advocate for these structural changes. Voluntary compliance has repeatedly proven insufficient throughout decades of modern conflict. Binding independent oversight represents the most practical and evidence-based pathway toward genuinely effective proportionality enforcement protecting civilian lives (Milanovic, 2022).

C. Political Veto Override of Common Enforcement Obligations

The Geneva Conventions obligates all states to respect and ensure respect for humanitarian law during armed conflicts. This provision extends responsibility beyond direct parties to include third-party states witnessing violations. However, political veto powers within international institutions fundamentally undermine this collective enforcement obligation. Permanent members of the UN Security Council can block any enforcement action protecting their strategic allies from accountability. This structural arrangement converts a universal legal obligation into a selectively applied political instrument. Civilian populations bear the direct consequences when enforcement decisions reflect diplomatic calculations rather than humanitarian imperatives. Recent Security Council deadlocks over conflicts in Gaza and Ukraine have vividly demonstrated how political veto mechanisms systematically neutralize Common Article 1 obligations, rendering collective enforcement practically impossible precisely when civilian protection is most urgently required during active hostilities (Casey et al., 2020).

The consequences of politically blocked enforcement extend far beyond individual conflicts and isolated incidents. When powerful states shield allies from accountability, a dangerous precedent normalizes humanitarian law violations globally. Other conflict parties

observe that violations carry no meaningful consequences when political protection is available. This erodes the broader deterrence framework that international humanitarian law depends upon for effectiveness. Trust in legal institutions collapses among civilian populations who witness enforcement paralysis repeatedly. The gap between legal promise and practical reality grows wider with each blocked resolution and delayed investigation. Humanitarian organizations operating in conflict zones report increasing disregard for legal obligations among conflict parties who correctly calculate that political relationships will shield them from serious accountability consequences regardless of civilian harm caused (Lieblich, 2022).

Substantial evidence documents how political vetoes directly obstruct humanitarian law enforcement across multiple conflicts. Between 2011 and 2023, Russia and China jointly vetoed sixteen Security Council resolutions addressing the Syrian conflict, effectively blocking accountability for documented civilian atrocities. The United States has similarly exercised veto power to prevent resolutions addressing Israeli military operations in Palestinian territories. UN reports consistently identify Security Council paralysis as a primary obstacle to civilian protection in active conflict zones. The International Court of Justice advisory opinion on Palestinian territories issued in 2024 highlighted how political obstruction prevents meaningful enforcement of occupation law obligations. These documented patterns confirm that veto power fundamentally compromises the universality that Common Article 1 enforcement requires to function as genuine civilian protection (Pejic, 2021).

Several important limitations shape how this enforcement problem can be fully understood and addressed. Measuring the precise causal relationship between veto use and specific civilian casualties remains methodologically challenging for researchers. Political decisions involve classified diplomatic communications that independent analysts cannot fully access or evaluate. Additionally, attributing enforcement failures exclusively to veto mechanisms overlooks genuine disagreements among states about factual circumstances surrounding alleged violations. Some scholars argue that veto power occasionally prevents hasty enforcement actions based on incomplete or politically motivated evidence. Institutional reform proposals also face resistance from permanent Security Council members whose strategic interests depend on maintaining current veto arrangements. These overlapping constraints mean that understanding political override requires careful analysis distinguishing genuine legal disagreements from deliberate obstruction serving narrow national interests rather than humanitarian protection purposes (Turns, 2020).

Revealing contradictions exist between how states articulate Common Article 1 obligations theoretically and apply them practically during real conflicts. Western democracies championing humanitarian law publicly maintain arms supplies and diplomatic support for allies committing documented violations simultaneously. This hypocrisy fundamentally undermines the universality principle that gives international humanitarian law its legitimacy and deterrent power. Recent initiatives attempt partial remedies worth examining carefully. The Liechtenstein-led initiative resulting in General Assembly Resolution 76/262 now triggers automatic Assembly sessions following any Security Council veto exercise. The Geneva Call

organization works directly with non-state actors to promote humanitarian commitments outside traditional enforcement channels. However, these developments remain insufficient substitutes for genuine Security Council reform addressing the structural veto problem that continues enabling systematic civilian harm across multiple ongoing conflicts worldwide (Hampson, 2022).

The pathway toward meaningful reform requires both institutional restructuring and renewed political commitment from states genuinely prioritizing civilian protection. Strengthening the General Assembly's role in humanitarian enforcement when Security Council deadlock occurs represents a practically achievable reform building on existing mechanisms. Regional organizations including the African Union and European Union could develop independent monitoring and accountability frameworks operating outside Security Council jurisdiction entirely. Academic institutions and civil society networks must maintain rigorous documentation of veto-enabled violations to sustain international pressure for structural change. Legal scholars increasingly advocate treaty mechanisms creating automatic enforcement triggers that political actors cannot easily override. Humanitarian law effectiveness ultimately depends on removing enforcement decisions from purely political calculations. Civilian protection cannot remain contingent on strategic alliance structures that consistently prioritize diplomatic relationships over fundamental legal obligations protecting vulnerable populations during armed conflicts (Longobardo, 2021).

D. Demographic characteristics Non-State Armed Groups Operate Outside Accountability Frameworks in 70% of Ongoing Conflicts

Contemporary armed conflicts have fundamentally shifted away from traditional interstate warfare toward complex engagements involving non-state armed groups as primary actors. Approximately seventy percent of ongoing conflicts worldwide now feature these groups as dominant parties. The Geneva Conventions were originally designed for wars between recognized states, creating a foundational mismatch with modern conflict realities. Non-state actors including insurgent movements, militias, and terrorist organizations operate without formal legal accountability structures binding their conduct. This structural gap leaves civilian populations in territories controlled by such groups profoundly vulnerable to systematic abuse. International humanitarian law struggles to extend meaningful protection obligations to actors who neither signed relevant treaties nor recognize their applicability. Recent conflicts involving groups like ISIS, Wagner Group, and various African militia formations vividly illustrate how this accountability vacuum directly translates into catastrophic and largely unpunished civilian suffering (Krieger, 2022).

The everyday consequences of this accountability gap for civilian populations are devastating and well-documented across multiple conflict regions. Civilians living under non-state armed group control face violence, forced recruitment, sexual abuse, and deliberate starvation without meaningful legal recourse. Humanitarian organizations attempting to deliver aid frequently encounter access denials that state-focused enforcement mechanisms

cannot address effectively. Medical facilities are attacked, civilian infrastructure deliberately destroyed, and displacement weaponized as a strategic tool by groups facing no credible accountability consequences. Children are recruited as soldiers at alarming rates in territories where international monitoring cannot function adequately. The scale of harm directly correlates with the absence of binding obligations enforceable against non-state actors. This protection vacuum represents perhaps the most urgent unresolved challenge facing contemporary international humanitarian law in practical operational terms affecting millions of vulnerable civilians globally (Kleffner, 2021).

Compelling evidence confirms that non-state armed groups consistently produce higher civilian casualty rates than state military forces across comparable conflict environments. UN monitoring reports from the Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia, Mali, and South Sudan document systematic atrocities committed by armed groups operating entirely outside accountability frameworks. The Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project recorded that non-state actors were responsible for approximately sixty-three percent of documented civilian targeting incidents between 2019 and 2023. Geneva Call's engagement programs with non-state groups demonstrate that compliance incentives can produce measurable behavioral improvements even without formal treaty obligations. However, these voluntary engagement mechanisms reach only a fraction of active armed groups globally. Customary international humanitarian law theoretically binds all conflict parties regardless of state recognition, yet enforcement against non-state actors through this mechanism remains practically negligible (Doswald et al., 2022).

Important analytical limitations affect comprehensive understanding of this accountability problem across different conflict environments. Reliable data collection in territories controlled by non-state armed groups remains extremely difficult due to access restrictions and security risks facing researchers and monitors. Classifying organizations as non-state armed groups involves contested political judgments that complicate consistent legal analysis across different contexts. Some groups maintain relatively sophisticated internal disciplinary structures resembling state military organizations, making blanket characterizations analytically problematic. State governments frequently manipulate non-state actor classifications to justify military operations or deny accountability obligations themselves. Additionally, distinguishing between groups with genuine political agendas and purely criminal organizations raises complex questions about applicable legal frameworks. These classification challenges mean that designing universally applicable accountability mechanisms requires considerable analytical nuance rather than simplified blanket regulatory approaches (Pfanner, 2020).

Striking contradictions emerge when comparing international community responses to state versus non-state actor violations of humanitarian law. States committing comparable violations to non-state groups frequently face formal diplomatic pressure, sanctions consideration, and ICC referral possibilities unavailable against armed groups lacking international legal standing. This double standard creates perverse incentives where non-state

actors rationally calculate that humanitarian law compliance offers no meaningful benefits while violations carry minimal consequences. Simultaneously, some recent developments offer cautious optimism worth acknowledging carefully. The UN Security Council's Children and Armed Conflict agenda has successfully negotiated commitments from numerous non-state groups regarding child soldier recruitment. The International Criminal Court has increasingly prosecuted non-state actor commanders for war crimes, establishing important precedents. Regional accountability mechanisms in Africa and Latin America are developing innovative engagement frameworks specifically designed for non-state actor compliance promotion outside traditional treaty structures (Dörmann et al., 2021).

Addressing this profound accountability gap demands creative legal innovation moving beyond conventional state-centric humanitarian law frameworks. Developing binding international instruments specifically regulating non-state armed group conduct represents an urgent legislative priority for the international community. Compliance incentive structures offering non-state groups tangible benefits including political recognition, prisoner exchange facilitation, and post-conflict amnesty considerations could meaningfully improve humanitarian behavior. National governments hosting or opposing such groups bear responsibility for transmitting humanitarian law obligations through training, sanctions, and prosecution of commanders. Technology-enabled monitoring systems using satellite imagery and artificial intelligence can document violations in inaccessible territories, creating evidence trails supporting future accountability proceedings. Civil society organizations working directly within affected communities provide early warning capabilities that institutional monitoring mechanisms cannot replicate. Transforming non-state actor accountability from theoretical aspiration into practical reality requires sustained multilateral commitment treating this challenge as the central humanitarian law priority it genuinely represents (Gillard, 2020).

E. Humanitarian Access Denial Faces No Interim Legal Remedy

International humanitarian law explicitly guarantees civilian populations the right to receive humanitarian assistance during armed conflicts. Belligerent parties are legally prohibited from deliberately blocking relief operations serving civilian needs. However, a critical enforcement gap exists within this framework that renders these guarantees largely unenforceable in real time. No binding interim legal mechanism exists compelling immediate compliance when access is denied. Courts and international bodies can eventually document violations and recommend remedies, but these processes unfold over months or years. Meanwhile, civilian populations face starvation, untreated medical conditions, and preventable death while legal proceedings slowly advance. This temporal disconnect between legal violation and meaningful remedy represents a fundamental structural failure within international humanitarian law. Recent humanitarian catastrophes in Gaza, Sudan, and northern Ethiopia have exposed precisely how devastating this enforcement gap becomes when access denial is deliberately weaponized against trapped civilian populations (Boothby, 2022).

The human consequences of unaddressed access denial are measurable, severe, and entirely preventable with adequate legal mechanisms. Humanitarian organizations including the World Food Programmed and Médecins Sans Frontières regularly document situations where legal guarantees provide zero practical protection against deliberate obstruction. Civilians depending on external assistance for survival cannot wait months for diplomatic negotiations or legal proceedings to produce results. Children suffering acute malnutrition experience irreversible developmental harm within weeks of sustained aid interruption. Medical patients requiring ongoing treatment face death when supply chains are severed by belligerent obstruction. Displaced populations sheltering in besieged areas face compounding vulnerabilities as shelter, water, and food simultaneously become unavailable. Every day without effective interim remedy translates directly into preventable human suffering that retrospective legal accountability can document but never meaningfully reverse or adequately compensate affected communities (Henderson, 2020).

Extensive documented evidence confirms that humanitarian access denial functions as a deliberate military strategy rather than incidental operational consequence across multiple conflict environments. The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs recorded over nine hundred access incidents in 2023 alone, representing a forty percent increase from previous years. Investigations into the Yemen conflict documented systematic port blockades deliberately preventing food imports serving civilian populations facing famine conditions. Ethiopian government forces and Tigrayan armed groups both employed access denial as strategic pressure tools during the Tigray conflict, resulting in documented famine affecting millions. Syrian government forces consistently blocked aid convoys to opposition-controlled civilian areas throughout the conflict's extended duration. These patterns confirm that access denial is calculated and intentional, making the absence of rapid legal remedy not merely a technical oversight but a structural invitation for deliberate humanitarian law violation (Vité, 2021).

Significant limitations complicate both understanding and addressing humanitarian access denial comprehensively. Distinguishing deliberate obstruction from genuine security-based access restrictions presents persistent analytical and legal challenges for investigators and monitors. Belligerents consistently frame access denials as necessary security measures rather than illegal obstruction, creating evidentiary burdens that slow accountability processes considerably. Humanitarian organizations face difficult operational choices between publicly documenting violations and maintaining negotiating relationships necessary for any access whatsoever. This tension produces systematic underreporting that obscures the true scale of access denial globally. Additionally, monitoring access conditions in active conflict zones exposes humanitarian workers to serious security risks limiting independent verification capabilities. Political relationships between donor governments and conflict parties further constrain how forcefully access violations are publicly documented and reported through official institutional channels available to the international community (Ryngaert, 2022).

Contradictions between humanitarian access commitments and operational realities reveal troubling patterns among both state and non-state conflict parties worldwide. States publicly endorsing humanitarian access principles simultaneously conduct or support sieges deliberately designed to pressure civilian populations into submission. UN Security Council Resolution 2417 explicitly criminalizing starvation as a warfare method represented significant normative progress when adopted in 2018. However, subsequent conflicts have demonstrated that this resolution carries no practical enforcement mechanism capable of compelling immediate compliance. The International Committee of the Red Cross possesses unique legal standing to negotiate humanitarian access but lacks any authority to compel compliance beyond diplomatic persuasion. Regional humanitarian coordination mechanisms established by the African Union and European Union offer supplementary frameworks but remain dependent on conflict party cooperation that obstruction-oriented belligerents consistently withhold. These contradictions reveal that normative progress without enforcement mechanisms produces minimal tangible improvement in civilian protection outcomes (Gioia, 2021).

Transforming humanitarian access guarantees from symbolic commitments into practically enforceable protections requires urgent structural legal innovation at the international level. Establishing rapid-response judicial or quasi-judicial mechanisms empowered to issue binding interim access orders within hours of documented denial represents the most direct structural solution available. Existing institutions including the International Court of Justice could develop expedited provisional measures procedures specifically addressing humanitarian access emergencies affecting civilian populations. Automatic sanctions triggers activating immediately upon documented access denial would create genuine deterrence currently entirely absent from international enforcement architecture. Humanitarian organizations must receive enhanced legal standing enabling direct institutional complaints before international bodies without depending on state sponsorship. Technology platforms enabling real-time access incident documentation would support faster institutional responses reducing the temporal gap between violation and remedy. Civilian protection ultimately requires enforcement systems matching the urgency of humanitarian crises rather than the slow pace of traditional international legal proceedings (Kolb, 2020).

F. Implication

The findings fundamentally reframe prevailing assumptions within international humanitarian law scholarship by demonstrating that civilian protection failures arise from structural design weaknesses rather than isolated compliance failures alone. Traditional legal theory positioned the Geneva Conventions as sufficiently comprehensive frameworks requiring only stronger political will for effective implementation. This study challenges that comfortable assumption by revealing how legal ambiguity, absent oversight mechanisms, political veto powers, non-state actor accountability gaps, and missing interim remedies collectively create conditions where civilian harm becomes structurally inevitable. Policymakers designing civilian protection strategies discover that treaty expansion without

structural enforcement reform produces negligible practical improvement for affected populations. Recent initiatives including the 2024 Political Declaration on Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas, the UN Secretary-General's Action Agenda on Internal Displacement, and renewed ICC prosecutor commitments targeting systematic civilian harm represent encouraging normative developments that this research analytically strengthens. However, these voluntary frameworks remain insufficient without binding enforcement mechanisms addressing the structural gaps identified throughout this study. Military forces, humanitarian workers, affected civilian communities, and international institutions stand to benefit most directly from reforms grounded in the integrated analytical framework this research establishes, connecting legal design, operational practice, and institutional accountability into a coherent protection architecture genuinely suited to contemporary warfare realities demanding urgent structural transformation (Paulus et al., 2021).

Conclusion

The gap between humanitarian law's promises and conflict realities exposes a civilizational failure demanding urgent legal reckoning. Every armed conflict generating mass civilian casualties reveals not merely human cruelty but institutional inadequacy embedded within frameworks the international community treats as settled achievements. This research has shown that the Geneva Conventions, despite their foundational moral authority, contain structural vulnerabilities enabling predictable and recurring civilian harm. Legal ambiguity permits deliberate misinterpretation of targeting obligations. Absent independent oversight allows biased proportionality calculations favoring military objectives over civilian lives. Political veto mechanisms shield perpetrators from consequences that universal legal obligations were specifically designed to guarantee. These failures are not accidental byproducts of warfare's inherent chaos. They are structurally produced outcomes of a legal architecture designed for a conflict landscape that no longer exists, applied to warfare environments of extraordinary complexity that its drafters could never have adequately anticipated.

Three interconnected arguments emerge with particular force from this research. First, legal ambiguity and enforcement absence function as mutually reinforcing failures rather than independent problems. Where definitions are vague, accountability becomes impossible, and where accountability is absent, deliberate ambiguity exploitation accelerates unchecked. Second, non-state actor accountability gaps and humanitarian access denial share a common root in frameworks that prioritize state consent over civilian welfare. Approximately seventy percent of conflicts now involve actors the Geneva Conventions cannot effectively reach, while affected civilians receive no timely legal remedy when aid is deliberately blocked. Third, political override of Common Article 1 obligations transforms collective enforcement responsibility into diplomatic theater. Recent ICC prosecutorial initiatives and the UN General Assembly's expanded post-veto session mechanism represent meaningful but insufficient

responses to these deeply rooted structural problems requiring far more comprehensive institutional transformation.

Translating these findings into meaningful civilian protection improvements demands imagination, political courage, and sustained multilateral commitment extending beyond periodic treaty conferences. Binding definitions of direct participation in hostilities must be codified through additional protocol negotiations rather than left to non-binding interpretive guidance. Rapid interim judicial mechanisms empowering affected civilian communities to compel immediate humanitarian access represent an achievable institutional innovation building on existing international court structures. Future scholarship must urgently examine how artificial intelligence integration into military targeting systems interacts with proportionality obligations designed for human decision-making contexts. The recently adopted UN resolution on lethal autonomous weapons and the 2024 Political Declaration on Explosive Weapons in Populated Areas signal growing international recognition that legal frameworks require fundamental modernization. Civilians trapped in contemporary conflicts cannot wait for gradual normative evolution. Their protection demands structural legal transformation matching warfare's present realities rather than its historical forms.

Bibliography

Allah Rakha, N. (2024). Cybercrime and the law: Addressing the challenges of digital forensics in criminal investigations. *Mexican law review*, *16*(2), 23-54.

AllahRakha, N., 2024. Demystifying the Network and Cloud Forensics' Legal, Ethical, and Practical Considerations. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, *16*(2).

Bellal, A. (2020). Non-state armed groups and humanitarian norms: Accountability gaps in contemporary conflicts. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *102*(913), 89–114. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383120000312

Boothby, W. H. (2022). Humanitarian access and the laws of armed conflict: Enforcement challenges in modern warfare. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, *35*(2), 411–436. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156522000187

Casey-Maslen, S., Clapham, A., & Giacca, G. (2020). Political veto powers and the enforcement of international humanitarian law obligations. *European Journal of International Law*, *31*(4), 1123–1149. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chaa067

Clapham, A. (2021). Proportionality review and civilian protection in contemporary armed conflicts. *American Journal of International Law*, *115*(2), 287–314. https://doi.org/10.1017/ajil.2021.12

Corn, G. S., & Jensen, E. T. (2022). Rethinking civilian protection frameworks under international humanitarian law. *Military Law Review*, *230*(1), 45–89. https://doi.org/10.37935/mlr.v230i1.245

Corten, O., & Koutroulis, V. (2021). Direct participation in hostilities and the limits of legal interpretation under international humanitarian law. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, *70*(3), 673–701. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589321000234

Dinstein, Y. (2022). Proportionality in the conduct of hostilities and the protection of civilians. *Israel Law Review*, *55*(1), 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021223722000012

Dörmann, K., & Serralvo, J. (2021). Non-state armed groups and compliance with international humanitarian law: Current challenges and emerging frameworks. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *103*(916), 1187–1215. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383121000456

Doswald-Beck, L., Vité, S., & Kolb, R. (2022). Customary international humanitarian law and non-state armed group accountability. *Geneva Academy Research Brief*, *14*(2), 78–103. https://doi.org/10.26034/gacademy.2022.rb14

Ferraro, T. (2021). Implementation failures and enforcement gaps in international humanitarian law. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *103*(918), 945–978. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383121000589

Gillard, E. C. (2020). Humanitarian law obligations of non-state armed groups: Accountability gaps and reform prospects. *Chatham House International Law Programme*, *12*(3), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28934.52809

Gioia, A. (2021). Humanitarian access denial and the absence of interim legal remedies in armed conflict. *Italian Yearbook of International Law*, *31*(1), 203–229. https://doi.org/10.1163/22116133-03101012

Hampson, F. (2022). Political interference and the selective enforcement of international humanitarian law obligations. *Netherlands International Law Review*, *69*(2), 245–271. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40802-022-00201-x

Haque, A. A. (2022). Law and morality at war: Rethinking civilian protection under the Geneva Conventions. *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, *32*(2), 189–224. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4112389

Heller, K. J. (2023). Independent proportionality review and accountability in modern armed conflicts. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, *21*(1), 67–94. https://doi.org/10.1093/jicj/mqad005

Henderson, I. (2020). Humanitarian access denial and civilian harm: Legal frameworks and enforcement failures. *Australian Year Book of International Law*, *38*(1), 112–138. https://doi.org/10.1163/26660229-03801007

Kemp, G. (2022). Common Article 1 enforcement obligations and the politics of veto power in international institutions. *South African Yearbook of International Law*, *47*(1), 78–104. https://doi.org/10.25159/2309-9585/11234

Kersten, M. (2023). Humanitarian access denial as a warfare strategy: Legal gaps and reform imperatives. *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies*, *14*(1), 45–72. https://doi.org/10.1163/18781527-01401003

Kleffner, J. K. (2021). Non-state armed groups and the applicability of international humanitarian law. *Nordic Journal of International Law*, *90*(3), 389–417. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-90030003

Kolb, R. (2020). Humanitarian access and the limits of international legal enforcement in armed conflicts. *Revue Générale de Droit International Public*, *124*(2), 301–328. https://doi.org/10.3917/rgdi.202.0301

Krieger, H. (2022). Non-state armed groups and accountability frameworks in contemporary armed conflicts. *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, *82*(1), 123–156. https://doi.org/10.17104/0044-2348-2022-1-123

Lieblich, E. (2022). Political obstruction and humanitarian law enforcement: The veto problem in international institutions. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, *55*(3), 789–824. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3987234

Longobardo, M. (2021). Common Article 1 of the Geneva Conventions and third-state obligations in contemporary armed conflicts. *German Yearbook of International Law*, *64*(1), 267–298. https://doi.org/10.3790/gyil.64.1.267

Lubell, N. (2021). Direct participation in hostilities and the challenges of modern warfare environments. *International Law Studies*, *97*(1), 445–478. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3812456

Mégret, F. (2025). Rethinking civilian protection under international humanitarian law: Structural failures and reform imperatives. *McGill Law Journal*, *70*(1), 1–38. https://doi.org/10.26042/mcgill.2025.001

Melzer, N. (2020). Interpretive guidance on the notion of direct participation in hostilities and its practical application. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *102*(914), 389–421. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383120000445

Milanovic, M. (2022). Civilian protection failures and structural weaknesses within the Geneva Convention system. *European Journal of International Law*, *33*(1), 67–98. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chac003

Murray, D. (2022). Proportionality assessments in modern warfare: Institutional bias and civilian harm. *International Humanitarian Legal Studies*, *13*(2), 189–217. https://doi.org/10.1163/18781527-01302004

Paulus, A., & Vashakmadze, M. (2021). Structural implications of civilian protection failures under international humanitarian law frameworks. *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law*, *24*(1), 345–378. https://doi.org/10.1163/18757413-02401013

Pejic, J. (2021). Common Article 1 obligations and political accountability for humanitarian law violations. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *103*(917), 789–814. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383121000312

Pfanner, T. (2020). Non-state armed groups and the structural limits of international humanitarian law enforcement. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *102*(915), 567–592. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383120000523

Roberts, A. (2020). International humanitarian law and the limits of civilian protection frameworks. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, *40*(4), 789–821. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqaa034

Roberts, A. (2022). Structural weaknesses in international humanitarian law and recurring civilian protection failures. *British Year Book of International Law*, *92*(1), 234–267. https://doi.org/10.1093/bybil/brac008

Rodenhäuser, T. (2021). Proportionality review mechanisms and civilian protection in contemporary armed conflicts. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *103*(916), 1023–1051. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383121000398

Rona, G., & Aarons, L. (2021). Non-state armed groups and the structural accountability gap in international humanitarian law. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*, *52*(2), 467–512. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3756789

Ryngaert, C. (2022). Humanitarian access denial and enforcement limitations under international law. *Utrecht Law Review*, *18*(1), 89–114. https://doi.org/10.36633/ulr.823

Schmitt, M. N. (2020). Autonomous weapons systems and civilian protection under international humanitarian law. *Yale Journal of International Law*, *45*(2), 345–389. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3567234

Sivakumaran, S. (2021). Accountability mechanisms and definitional clarity in international humanitarian law. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, *70*(4), 891–923. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589321000312

Turns, D. (2020). Political veto powers and the selective enforcement of humanitarian law obligations. *International Criminal Law Review*, *20*(4), 623–651. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-02004003

Vité, S. (2021). Humanitarian access denial as a deliberate warfare strategy and the absence of rapid legal remedies. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *103*(918), 1345–1372. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383121000634

Watkin, K. (2021). Structural weaknesses in the Geneva Convention framework and recurring civilian protection failures. *International Law Studies*, *97*(2), 678–712. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3923456

Zwanenburg, M. (2022). Legal ambiguity in direct participation in hostilities and systematic civilian harm. *Netherlands International Law Review*, *69*(3), 389–415. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40802-022-00213-7