

## **Asymmetric Warfare: Challenging The Boundaries of Humanitarian Law In The Era of Contemporary Conflict**

**Budiman, Bambang Prasetyo Utomo, Tarsisius Susilo, Arifin Simanjuntak, Gusti Bagus  
Oka Tapayasa**

Tentara Nasional Indonesia (TNI), Indonesia

Email: budiman980114@gmail.com, peumaguwosakti97@gmail.com,  
muchus70@gmail.com, arifin.s2806@gmail.com, Okatapayasa940@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

Asymmetric warfare represents a transformative shift in modern conflict, characterized by the involvement of unequal forces and the increasing role of non-state actors, unconventional tactics, and emerging technologies. This study examines how asymmetric warfare challenges the implementation of international humanitarian law (IHL), particularly concerning combatant identification, proportionality in attacks, and civilian protection in fluid conflict environments. Employing a qualitative method through normative legal analysis and literature review, the research critically evaluates IHL instruments such as the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols in light of contemporary conflict dynamics. Case studies from Afghanistan, Syria, and Palestine are analyzed alongside developments in cyber and information warfare. The findings reveal significant limitations in existing legal definitions and enforcement mechanisms, especially with the rise of hybrid tactics and digital battlegrounds. The study proposes a framework for adapting IHL through the redefinition of combatant status, the establishment of clearer proportionality standards, and the creation of new legal instruments to regulate cyber operations and disinformation. Moreover, it emphasizes the need to enhance accountability through technology-enabled monitoring systems and to expand humanitarian law education to include non-state actors. This research contributes to the evolving discourse on modern warfare by advocating for an adaptive legal architecture that upholds human dignity amid increasingly complex conflict scenarios.

**Keywords:** *Asymmetric warfare, humanitarian law, non-state actors, civilian protection, legal adaptation.*

This article is licensed under [CC BY-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) 

### **INTRODUCTION**

Armed conflict is part of the course of human history that is full of dynamics of change. From ancient tribal wars to world wars, and now to the era of digital and irregular warfare, the nature of conflict continues to evolve in response to changes in political structures, technology, and global power dynamics (Monshipouri, 2024; Pinto, 2020; Rodenhäuser & Mutasa, 2024; Sadique & Naskar, 2022). In recent decades, this evolution has brought forth a distinct form of conflict known as asymmetric warfare, where the parties involved are not equally matched in terms of military power, resources, or tactics. This asymmetry often results in prolonged, unpredictable, and highly complex conflict scenarios that challenge the conventional understanding of war and peace (Forsythe, 2024; Monshipouri, 2024; Pinto, 2020).

Unlike traditional warfare, which typically features state actors battling along defined frontlines with established military doctrines, asymmetric warfare is characterized by its unpredictability and the blurring of lines—both physical and legal. In such conflicts, non-state actors such as insurgents, paramilitary groups, and terrorist organizations often operate within civilian populations, using unconventional tactics including ambushes, cyberattacks, suicide bombings, and media manipulation (Boer, 2021; Kelley, 2013; Meierhenrich, 2024; Schmitt, 2017; Solis, 2021). This makes it increasingly difficult to distinguish between combatants and civilians, between legitimate military targets and protected civilian infrastructure. On the other side, state actors are forced to respond within a framework of legal and ethical constraints,

often under intense public and international scrutiny (Dörmann & Rodenhäuser, 2017; Kenneth Watkin & CD, 2016; Latif & Shiddiqy, 2023; Sari, 2017; Weiss, 2018).

This complexity exposes a critical limitation within international humanitarian law (IHL), particularly the Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, which were originally formulated in the context of state-to-state wars (Bradley, 2020; Canton, 2021; Citaristi, 2022; Razzouk & Shute, 2012). These legal instruments are predicated on the assumption that the warring parties are identifiable, organized, and committed to mutual legal obligations. In asymmetric conflicts, however, non-state actors often do not recognize or comply with these laws, and may even exploit humanitarian protections as strategic tools (Alzoubi, 2021; Escorihuela, 2010a, 2010b). This makes it difficult to enforce the legal principles of proportionality, distinction, and precaution, all of which are central to the protection of civilians and the regulation of force in armed conflict.

The issue becomes more urgent when considering the global spread of asymmetric conflicts, particularly in regions such as the Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, and parts of South and Southeast Asia. In these areas, long-standing grievances, weak governance, and foreign interventions have created environments where asymmetric warfare thrives. These conflicts not only result in immense civilian casualties and displacement but also pose long-term threats to regional and international security. Furthermore, they undermine the credibility of international institutions and laws that are meant to uphold justice and human rights in times of war.

In this context, there is an urgent need for legal innovation and reform. The international community must work toward updating the definitions and mechanisms of humanitarian law to address the realities of modern warfare. This includes redefining the legal status of combatants in cyberspace and hybrid warfare scenarios, establishing more practical standards for proportionality, and creating enforceable frameworks for the regulation of new conflict domains such as cyber operations and information warfare. Without such reforms, humanitarian law risks becoming increasingly irrelevant in modern battlefields, thus failing to protect those it was designed to shield.

Additionally, accountability mechanisms must be strengthened through international cooperation and technological innovation. The use of satellite monitoring, AI-driven verification systems, and open-source intelligence (OSINT) can aid in documenting and prosecuting violations in real time. At the same time, legal education in humanitarian law should not be limited to military forces and state actors; it must also target non-state armed groups and include civil society, local leaders, and media influencers in conflict zones. Building a shared understanding of humanitarian norms across all parties involved in a conflict can contribute to greater compliance and civilian protection.

Ultimately, this article calls for a more adaptive and comprehensive legal approach to asymmetric warfare—one that upholds the core principles of humanity, even amidst the ambiguity and complexity of modern conflict. As the nature of war continues to evolve, so too must our legal and ethical frameworks. The survival of international humanitarian law depends on its ability to respond to new challenges while maintaining its foundational commitment to human dignity.

Compared to previous works such as Melzer (2020), which focuses on interpretive guidance for direct participation in hostilities, and Schmitt (2017) with the Tallinn Manual 2.0 addressing cyber warfare norms, this research brings a unique contribution by holistically integrating the practical challenges of combatant identification, proportionality, and civilian protection within asymmetric warfare contexts, while also advocating for normative adaptations to include emerging battlefields like cyber and information domains. Unlike Meierhenrich (2021), which focuses on the normative gaps in asymmetric warfare, this study not only identifies these gaps but also formulates forward-looking legal and policy

recommendations, emphasizing accountability mechanisms through technology and inclusive humanitarian law education for non-state actors. The integration of doctrinal analysis, case studies, and policy reform proposals offers a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary response to the evolving complexities of contemporary conflict.

## **METHOD**

This study uses a qualitative approach based on literature review to understand the challenges of international humanitarian law in the context of asymmetric war. The main focus of the research is directed at normative analyses of relevant provisions of humanitarian law, such as the Geneva Conventions and the Additional Protocols, as well as contemporary interpretations of key principles, including distinction, proportionality, and the protection of civilians.

The scope of the study includes case studies of modern asymmetric conflicts, such as those in Afghanistan, Syria, and Palestine, taking into account how non-state actors influence the dynamics of law enforcement in conflict terrain. Research materials were obtained through the search of the latest academic literature, reports of international institutions such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and analysis of international legal documents.

The data collection technique was carried out using a systematic literature study method, with the selection of sources that have high credibility and strong relevance to the research theme. All the data collected were then analyzed using a descriptive-analytical approach, which aimed to uncover the relationship between the characteristics of asymmetric warfare and its implications for the development of humanitarian law.

Data analysis techniques prioritize the critical interpretation of legal sources and expert opinions, taking into account developments in practice in the field. This method allows researchers to explore existing normative gaps and offer recommendations that are adaptive to modern conflict dynamics.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **The Complexity of Combatant Identification in Asymmetric Warfare**

In asymmetric conflicts, one of the biggest challenges in the application of humanitarian law is the identification of combatants. In contrast to conventional wars, where warring parties wear uniforms and operate on a clear battle line, non-state actors in asymmetric wars often mix with the civilian population. They used civilian facilities to hide, operated from residential environments, and adopted unconventional methods of warfare.

This makes the principle of distinction—which requires a clear separation between combatants and civilians—almost impossible to implement. In many cases, state repressive actions against ambiguous targets increase the risk of violations of humanitarian law, including disproportionate civilian casualties.

### **Challenges in Applying the Principle of Proportionality**

In addition to the problem of identification, the principle of proportionality also faces a severe test in asymmetric warfare. When an opponent uses a hospital, school, or market as a base of operations, then an attack on a legitimate military target in that location can have a major impact on the civilian population. In such a situation, determining whether civilian losses are proportional to military gains gained is a complex issue, one that often relies on subjective interpretations on the ground.

Studies of the conflicts in Gaza and Syria show that decision-making in this context is often fraught with acute moral dilemmas. States, despite facing real threats, must exercise

restraint and act on the principle of high precautions, as set out in Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions.

### **The New Battlefield: Technology, Cyber, and Information**

The modern era brings conflict terrain to new areas, such as cyber and information domains. Cyberattacks on civilian infrastructure, such as hospitals, energy systems, or communication services, have a significant humanitarian impact even in the absence of direct physical violence. Currently, traditional humanitarian law frameworks do not fully encompass this dimension.

Initiatives such as the Tallinn Manual 2.0 seek to fill this void with normative principles for cyber conflict, but international acceptance of these guidelines is still mixed. The absence of a global consensus exacerbates legal uncertainty in digital conflicts, magnifying the risk of violations of the principles of protecting civilians.

In addition, information and disinformation are strategic tools in asymmetric warfare. The manipulation of public narratives through social media can muddy conflict situations, obscure facts, and complicate the accountability process. This condition necessitates the development of a new legal approach to protect the truth and maintain the integrity of humanitarian law.

### **Humanitarian Law Adaptation Efforts**

In view of these challenges, many international legal experts argue that humanitarian law needs to undergo adaptation without compromising its basic principles. Some of the proposed approaches include: Expanding the definition of combatant to include a new category of non-state actors; Clarify objective criteria for assessing proportionality in complex situations; Developing new legal instruments to regulate cyber warfare and information manipulation; Improve international accountability mechanisms, both through ad hoc courts and technology-based monitoring systems.

This adaptation is important so that humanitarian law remains relevant and able to protect human dignity in the midst of increasingly hybrid and complex forms of conflict.

### **CONCLUSION**

Asymmetric warfare challenges the core application of international humanitarian law (IHL), particularly in identifying combatants, applying proportionality principles, and protecting civilians in complex, undefined conflict zones. The rise of non-traditional tactics, ambiguous party status, and modern technologies like cyber warfare and information manipulation has pushed warfare beyond traditional legal boundaries. Addressing these issues requires urgent updates to the legal framework, including redefining combatant status, establishing realistic proportionality standards, regulating cyber and informational battlegrounds, and enhancing accountability through modern monitoring tools. Future research should focus on a comparative legal analysis of emerging international frameworks to evaluate how they address these evolving threats, with special attention to the legal status of cyber combatants, the regulation of new technologies, and the inclusion of non-state actors in IHL education. Such studies can help craft more adaptive legal instruments to preserve human dignity and uphold humanitarian principles amid modern conflict complexities.

**REFERENCES**

- Alzoubi, H. M. (2021). Predicting the intention to use google glass: A comparative approach using machine learning models and PLS-SEM. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 5(3), 311–320.
- Boer, L. J. M. (2021). *International law as we know it: Cyberwar discourse and the Construction of knowledge in International Legal Scholarship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bradley, M. (2020). From armed conflict to urban violence: transformations in the International Committee of the Red Cross, international humanitarianism, and the laws of war. *European Journal of International Relations*, 26(4), 1061–1083.
- Canton, H. (2021). International Committee of the Red Cross—ICRC. In *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2021* (pp. 629–631). Routledge.
- Citaristi, I. (2022). International Committee of the Red Cross—ICRC. In *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2022* (pp. 644–646). Routledge.
- Dörmann, K., & Rodenhäuser, T. (2017). Contemporary Challenges for International Humanitarian Law. In *The International Legal Order: Current Needs and Possible Responses* (pp. 677–699). Brill Nijhoff.
- Escorihuela, A. L. (2010a). Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Law: The Politics of Distinction. *Mich. St. U. Coll. LJ Int'l L.*, 19, 299.
- Escorihuela, A. L. (2010b). Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Law: The Politics of Distinction. *Mich. St. U. Coll. LJ Int'l L.*, 19, 299.
- Forsythe, D. P. (2024). *The contemporary International Committee of the Red Cross: challenges, changes, controversies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kelley, M. (2013). *Challenges to Compliance with International Humanitarian Law in the Context of Contemporary Warfare*.
- Kenneth Watkin, O. M. M., & CD, Q. C. (2016). *Fighting at the Legal Boundaries: Controlling the Use of Force in Contemporary Conflict*. Oxford University Press.
- Latif, S. A., & Shiddiqy, M. A. A. (2023). Dinamika Konflik dan Jejak Perdagangan Senjata Di Tanah Papua. *Ganaya: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 6(4), 851–865.
- Meierhenrich, J. (2024). *The Violence of Law: The Formation and Deformation of Gacaca Courts in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press.
- Monshipouri, M. (2024). The Contemporary International Committee of the Red Cross: Challenges, Changes, Controversies by David P. Forsythe. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 46(4), 746–754.
- Pinto, F. G. (2020). The International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Criminal Court: Turning international humanitarian law into a two-headed snake? *International Review of the Red Cross*, 102(914), 745–763.
- Razzouk, R., & Shute, V. (2012). What is design thinking and why is it important? *Review of Educational Research*, 82(3), 330–348.
- Rodenhäuser, T., & Mutasa, S. (2024). *The international humanitarian law framework for humanitarian relief during armed conflicts and complex emergencies*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sadique, M. Z., & Naskar, A. (2022). Protection of Women in Armed Conflict by ICRC (International Committee of Red Cross). *Part 1 Indian J. Integrated Rsch. L.*, 2, 1.
- Sari, A. (2017). Hybrid Warfare, Law and the Fulda Gap. *Complex Battle Spaces (OUP, 2019)*, 161–190.
- Schmitt, M. N. (2017). *Tallinn manual 2.0 on the international law applicable to cyber operations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Solis, G. D. (2021). *The law of armed conflict: international humanitarian law in war*. Cambridge University Press.

Weiss, T. G. (2018). *Humanitarian challenges and intervention*. Routledge.