ShodhSamajik: Journal of Social Studies
July-September 2026 3(2)
https://shodhsamajik.com/

Original Article

CROSS-BORDER TERRORISM AND THE ARMED ATTACK THRESHOLD: A DOCTRINAL ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND STATE PRACTICE ON SELF-DEFENCE UNDER ARTICLE 51 OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Diksha Bharti [1*], **Dr. Suresh Kumar** [2]
[1] Research Scholar, Department of Law, CT University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India
[2] Professor, Department of Law, CT University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India

ABSTRACT

Cross-border terrorism has unsettled the state-centric assumptions on which the international law of self-defence was built. In the case of an armed attack, the United Nations Charter also reserves the right of individual and collective self-defence without providing definitions of what constitutes an armed attack or whether an armed attack by non-state actors from abroad satisfies the threshold. This paper examines whether, and under what conditions, cross-border terrorism qualifies as an armed attack, and evaluates the resulting scope of lawful self-defence. The study uses a doctrinal legal approach, examining the text of the Charter and the Articles on State Responsibility of the International Law Commission, the International Court of Justice's judgments in the Nicaragua, Oil Platforms, Wall and Armed Activities cases, the decisions of the Appeals Chamber in Tadić, the practice of the United States, Israel and India following the 2001, and principal academic commentaries. It is striking, however, that on the one hand there is the restricting approach of judges who require gravity and attribution by a state, and on the other hand, there is the expanding approach of the state which considers large-scale terrorist violence to be an armed attack, even if the proof of attribution is lacking, and which uses the unable-or-unwilling test and anticipatory self-defence. The paper concludes that this lack of consensus regarding thresholds of attribution, evidence and imminence allows for abuses to be made and that this undermines territorial sovereignty. It suggests the establishment of principles of attribution and evidence, greater accountability on a multilateral level, including the United Nations, and careful enforcement of necessity and proportionality to ensure that counter-terrorism remains within the boundaries of international law.

Keywords: Armed Attack, Article 51, Armed Forces, Armed Groups, Armed Violence, Armed Use of Force, International Law, Non-State Actors, State Responsibility, Terrorism, Cross-Border Terrorism, Self-Defence

INTRODUCTION

Cross-border terrorism has become one of the most complex and rapidly changing challenges to the conventional understanding of the use of force and armed attack in international law. It may be defined as violence committed by non-state actors located on the territory of one state in order to cause harm in another state, in circumstances where the host state supports, tolerates or is simply unable to control those actors De Wet (2019). The right of self-defence was historically framed within a paradigm of inter-state conflict, but its meaning has shifted substantially since the adoption of the United Nations Charter in 1945. Article 51 recognises the

*Corresponding Author:
Email address: Diksha Bharti (dikshabharti2216@gmail.com)

Received: 29 July 2026; **Accepted:** 18 August 2026; **Published:** 11 September 2026
DOI: 10.29121/ShodhSamajik.v3.i2.2026.155
Page Number: 118-125
Journal Title: ShodhSamajik: Journal of Social Studies
Journal Abbreviation: ShodhSamajik J. Soc. Stud.
Online ISSN: 3049-2319, **Print ISSN:** 3108-2009
Publisher: Granthaalayah Publications and Printers, India
Conflict of Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
Authors' Contributions: Each author made an equal contribution to the conception and design of the study. All authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript for publication.
Transparency: The authors affirm that this manuscript presents an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study. All essential aspects have been included, and any deviations from the original study plan have been clearly explained. The writing process strictly adhered to established ethical standards.

inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs, yet it leaves the term armed attack undefined, and the resulting interpretive space has been filled by judicial decisions, state practice and scholarship United Nations. (1945).

Compare the narrow interpretation of the classical one, which was well-stated by International Court of Justice (ICJ). In the Nicaragua judgment the Court distinguished between a mere use of force and an armed attack on the basis of scale and effects, reserving the right of self-defence for the gravest forms of force International Court of Justice. (1986). The question of whether large-scale terrorist violence can cross this threshold and thus justify defensive force Tams (2009) has been rethought in light of transnational terrorism. The debate was given its decisive impetus after the events of 11 September 2001, when in the immediate aftermath of a terrorist attack the Security Council acknowledged the "inherent right of self-defence" United Nations Security Council. (2001a), United Nations Security Council. (2001b). The acceptance of the right of self-defence against non-state actors in certain situations has been accepted widely. Article 51 has proved flexible enough to accommodate emerging threats, but that flexibility is controversial precisely because of the concerns it raises about sovereignty, the risk of abuse and the lack of settled attribution criteria De Wet (2019), Lanovoy (2017), Tams (2009). The conceptual distinction between terrorism and armed attack, summarised in Table 1, turns on variables such as scale, intensity, attribution and legal consequence, and demonstrates why a context-sensitive analysis is required rather than a categorical answer International Court of Justice. (1986), Lanovoy (2017), Tams (2009).

Table 1

Table 1 Conceptual Distinction between Terrorism and Armed Attack

Criteria	Terrorism	Armed Attack
Definition	Use of violence by non-state actors to create fear and achieve political, ideological or religious objectives	Use of force of significant scale and effect that triggers the right of self-defence under international law
Actors involved	Primarily non-state actors (terrorist organisations, insurgent groups)	Traditionally state actors; now debated to include non-state actors
Legal framework	Governed by international counter-terrorism conventions and domestic criminal law	Regulated under Article 51 of the UN Charter and customary international law
Threshold of violence	May range from low- to high-intensity attacks	Requires high scale and gravity (as per ICJ interpretation)
Attribution	Often difficult; may involve indirect or covert state support	Requires clear attribution to a state or a qualifying non-state actor
Objective	Instil fear, destabilise governments or influence public policy	Military or strategic objective with significant impact
Recognition under international law	Not uniformly defined; lacks a single universal definition	Clearly recognised trigger for invoking self-defence
Response mechanism	Law enforcement, counter-terrorism operations, sanctions	Use of force in self-defence (individual or collective)
Examples	Bombings, suicide attacks, hostage-taking	Large-scale attacks such as military invasion or the 9/11 attacks (debated inclusion)

Source: Compiled by the authors from International Court of Justice. (1986) Lanovoy (2017) Tams (2009)

The number and prevalence of asymmetric conflict and the development of decentralised terrorist networks have created a grey area between a classic armed attack and a terrorist act Deeks (2012), Wilmshurst (2006). States increasingly assert that the doctrine of self-defence applies not only to attacks already under way but also to imminent threats from non-state actors across their borders Tsagourias (2016), Wilmshurst (2006). This is the backdrop where the unable-or-unwilling test has developed – where a State may use force on another State's territory if it has failed to prevent terrorist activity from that territory Brunnée and Toope (2018), Deeks (2012), Tsagourias (2016). Although these interpretations respond to genuine security needs, they generate serious legal controversy about the erosion of territorial sovereignty and the potential for abuse of force Brunnée and Toope (2018); International Law Association. (2018); Tsagourias (2016). Given the evolving nature of armed attack in the context of cross-border terrorism, it is necessary to establish legal parameters that can be used to reconcile the principles of international law International Law Association. (2018); Wilmshurst (2006) with effective counter-terrorism measures. In this context the following study aims are outlined. It first examines whether, and under which conditions, cross-border terrorism can be considered as an armed attack under

Article 51. Second, it considers the scope of self-defence in the Charter and customary international law, which includes the requirement of necessity, proportionality and imminence. Third, it reviews judicial decisions and state practice, including that of the United States, Israel and India, to see where practice has diverged from doctrine. The paper is structured according to the structure of the journal: In the method section (Section 2) the method is described, the results and discussion (Section 3) are presented and the conclusion (Section 4) is drawn.

METHOD

The research method used in this study is doctrinal legal research (black-letter law) which is suitable to be used in a systematic analysis of the text of the treaty, judicial precedent and the principles of customary international law. The doctrinal approach involves finding the relevant rules, applying recognised methods of interpreting them, considering them in their logical consistency and adequacy to a given legal task or problem. The question here is whether the attacks by the terrorists involved in these incidents qualify as an 'armed attack' under Article 51, and if so, what restraints apply to any exercise of self-defence pursuant to the provision.

The most important primary sources are the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Articles 2(4) and 51 (UN, 1948), the ICJ judgments in Nicaragua (1986), Oil Platforms (2003), Wall (2004), and Armed Activities (2005), the ICJ Appeals Chamber judgment in Tadić (1999), and the Security Council Resolutions 1368 and 1373 (2001). These were records from state practices regarding publicly reported justifications for the use of force against non-state actors in other countries by the United States, Israel and India. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed scholarship in prestigious international law journals and reports from expert bodies, like the International Law Association and Chatham House.

This analysis was carried out in three steps. First, the concept of cross-border terrorism and the rules of attribution were explored in order to identify when the actions of non-state actors might involve the responsibility of a state. Second, the elements of lawful self-defence were clarified and contrasted with ICJ's analysis of the "armed attack" threshold. Third, the state practice and the Security Council resolutions were presented to the judicial standard in order to observe the convergence or divergence. This study is not of the empirical type with primary data collection; it is interpretive and normative and not statistical. The doctrinal criteria are combined into tables so that the comparison of the categories will be easily understandable and can be checked against the sources cited.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CROSS-BORDER TERRORISM: CONCEPT AND THE PROBLEM OF ATTRIBUTION

Cross-border terrorism is a serious threat to the contemporary international legal order, as it does not adhere to the territorial logic on which the international legal order is based, and as it has "layered" relations between states and non-state actors United Nations Security Council. (2001b). It is usually described as violence committed by individuals or organised groups operating from one state with the intention of instilling fear, destabilising a government or extracting policy concessions in another state. Its defining features are its transnational character, its political or ideological motivation, the central role of non-state actors, and the indirect or covert support structures, including financing, training and safe havens, that sustain it United Nations Security Council. (2001b). These features distinguish it from purely internal conflict and account for its wider consequences for international peace and security.

A central difficulty is the state/non-state distinction. Traditional international law regulates the conduct of states, whereas modern terrorism is carried out predominantly by non-state actors such as terrorist groups and insurgencies International Law Commission. (2001); United Nations Security Council. (2001b). Under certain circumstances, however, States can be held liable if they actively promote, direct or fail to prevent such activity on their territory International Law Commission. (2001).This raises the vexed question of attribution, which determines whether the acts of non-state actors can be legally ascribed to a state International Court of Justice. (1986), International Law Commission. (2001). In order to demonstrate a substantial degree of control, direction or support, there are two competing standards developed in judicial practice for attribution. The effective control test, formulated by the ICJ in Nicaragua and reflected in Article 8 of the ILC Articles, requires a high degree of direct state involvement in the specific operation International Court of Justice. (1986), International Law Commission. (2001). The overall control test, articulated by the Appeals Chamber in Tadić, permits attribution on the basis of broader coordination, organisation or assistance to the group as a whole (International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia International Criminal Tribual for the Former Yugoslavia. (1999). These different thresholds create uncertainty as to the scope of the state's responsibility and make the use of self-defence International Court of Justice. (1986), International Criminal Tribual for the Former Yugoslavia. (1999) difficult. As a result, the legal characterisation of cross-border terrorism remains contested, and a balance must be struck between the demands of state sovereignty and the realities of transnational security threats International Law Commission. (2001), Lanovoy (2017).

THE FRAMEWORK OF SELF-DEFENCE UNDER ARTICLE 51 AND CUSTOMARY LAW

Self-defence is among the most important principles of international law, permitting states to use force in response to threats to their sovereignty and territorial integrity. The right is codified principally in Article 51 of the Charter, which preserves the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs, subject to conditions and limitations United Nations. (1945). Although Article 51 supplies the legal foundation, its practical operation is shaped by customary international law developed through state practice and judicial interpretation Ruys (2010). Those principles establish that the right is not absolute and must satisfy defined legal conditions to be lawful. The condition of existence of an armed attack of adequate size and severity is the threshold condition, which gives rise to necessity, proportionality, immediacy, reporting to the Security Council and the temporary nature of the defensive action International Court of Justice. (1986), International Court of Justice. (2003), Wilmshurst (2006).

Table 2

Table 2 Conditions for Lawful Self-Defence

Condition	Explanation	Legal Basis / Interpretation
Armed attack requirement	Self-defence may be invoked only in response to an armed attack of sufficient scale and gravity	Article 51 of the UN Charter; ICJ jurisprudence
Necessity	Force must be essential and unavoidable to repel or prevent the attack; no peaceful alternative is available	Customary international law (Caroline formula)
Proportionality	The defensive response must be proportionate to the scale and intensity of the attack; excessive force is prohibited	ICJ judgments (Nicaragua; Oil Platforms)
Immediacy (urgency)	The response must follow promptly, maintaining a direct link between threat and action	Customary international law
Reporting requirement	States must report measures taken in self-defence to the UN Security Council	Article 51 of the UN Charter
Collective self-defence	States may act in defence of another state, upon its request, when it is under armed attack	Article 51 of the UN Charter; Nicaragua
Target limitation	Action must be directed only against the source of the attack and not against unrelated entities	Principles of distinction and necessity
Temporary nature	Self-defence is permitted only until the Security Council takes the measures necessary	Article 51 of the UN Charter
Good-faith application	Self-defence must be exercised honestly and not as a pretext for aggression	General principles of international law

Source: Compiled by the authors from United Nations. (1945), International Court of Justice. (1986), International Court of Justice. (2003) Wilmshurst (2006)

If there are no peaceful methods of resolving a threat, then force must be used, necessity dictateing this.Proportionality ensures that the scale and intensity of the response correspond to the nature of the attack and precludes excessive or retaliatory force International Court of Justice. (2003). Immediacy demands that the defensive response occur within a reasonable time and retain a direct connection to the attack. States acting in self-defence must also report their measures to the Security Council and must confine those measures to the period before the Council acts United Nations. (1945). Collective self-defence allows states to aid a "victim" state as long as a request is made by the state that is being attacked International Court of Justice. (1986). Taken together, these conditions form the legal architecture of self-defence and are decisive in reconciling the legitimate security interests of states with the maintenance of international peace and stability Ruys (2010), Wilmshurst (2006).

THE ARMED ATTACK THRESHOLD AND TERRORIST VIOLENCE

Whether cross-border terrorism constitutes an armed attack is one of the most difficult and dynamic questions in the interpretation of Article 51 United Nations. (1945). Historically an armed attack was conceived as force applied by one state against another, but contemporary security conditions have broadened the concept to encompass large-scale violence by non-state entities across borders Ruys (2010), Tams (2009). The ICJ has consistently distinguished between the use of force and an armed attack according to the gravity and magnitude of the act, holding that only the most serious forms of force amount to an armed attack capable of triggering self-defence International Court of Justice. (1986), International Court of Justice. (2003). As Table 3 shows, every armed attack is a use of force, but not every use of force attains the severity and consequences required to justify defensive force; the result is a hierarchy of force graded by scale and effects International Court of Justice. (1986).

Table 3

Table 3 Armed Attack versus Use of Force

Criteria	Use of Force	Armed Attack
Definition	Any form of force used by a state against another state, prohibited under Article 2(4) of the UN Charter	The gravest form of the use of force, triggering the right of self-defence under Article 51
Threshold	Low to moderate intensity	High threshold involving significant scale and effects
Severity	May include minor incidents such as border skirmishes or limited strikes	Involves large-scale violence, destruction or loss of life
Legal consequence	Generally unlawful unless justified under a recognised exception	Justifies invocation of self-defence
Actors involved	Traditionally state actors; may include indirect involvement of non-state actors	Traditionally state actors; increasingly held to include non-state actors (debated)
Examples	Minor cross-border firing, limited incursions	Large-scale military invasion; the 9/11 attacks (regarded by many as an armed attack)
ICJ interpretation	Recognised but distinguished from armed attack on the basis of gravity	Defined as the gravest form of force (Nicaragua)
Response permitted	Diplomatic measures, countermeasures, sanctions	Use of force in self-defence (individual or collective)
Attribution requirement	Attribution to a state may be less strict	Requires strong attribution or significant impact (debated for non-state actors)
Impact on international peace	May disrupt peace, but limited in scope	Serious threat to international peace and security

Source: Compiled by the authors from United Nations. (1945), International Court of Justice. (2003) and Ruys (2010).

The involvement of non-state actors worsens this scenario as terrorist groups are rarely controlled by a state and command structures are hard to trace Lanovoy (2017). Nonetheless, contemporary state practice and a substantial body of scholarship now accept that large-scale cross-border terrorist operations, particularly those causing extensive destruction and loss of life, can amount to armed attacks even without direct state involvement Bethlehem (2012), Tams (2009). This shift reflects a more pragmatic reading of international law that concentrates on the effects of the act rather than the identity of its author. The case of the Wall advisory opinion, however, left the question of purely non-state attacks unanswered at the judicial level, in that Article 51 explicitly speaks of an "armed attack" against a State International Court of Justice. (2004). In this uncertainty, the idea of self-defence has been extended, for example, by the concept of anticipatory self-defence and the unable-or-unwilling test, which allow for reaction to an anticipated threat coming from a state that is unable or unwilling to prevent terrorist attacks on its own territory Bethlehem (2012), Deeks (2012). This expansion is opposed as being ripe for abuse, will impinge upon territorial sovereignty and will challenge an established legal principle Tladi (2013). The identification of cross-border terrorism as an armed attack therefore depends on a careful threshold analysis that balances effective security measures against compliance with the principles of international law.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND STATE PRACTICE

Judicial decisions and state practice are decisive in interpreting and applying international law to cross-border terrorism and self-defence. The ICJ, as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, has shaped the meaning of armed attack and the lawful scope of self-defence through a series of landmark rulings. In Nicaragua v. United States (1986) the Court distinguished the use of force from an armed attack and held that only acts of sufficient gravity could justify self-defence International Court of Justice. (1986). In Oil Platforms (2003) and Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (2005) the Court reaffirmed the requirements of necessity and proportionality, yet remained cautious about extending self-defence to action against non-state actors in the absence of clear attribution to a state International Court of Justice. (2003), International Court of Justice. (2005).

This restrained judicial approach has been met by a growing tendency in state practice to adopt a broader conception of self-defence in response to cross-border terrorism. The United States invoked the right of self-defence after the attacks of 11 September

2001 to justify military action against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, thereby establishing a widely cited precedent for treating large-scale terrorist attacks as armed attacks Tams (2009). Israel has repeatedly invoked self-defence against non-state forces such as Hezbollah and Hamas, frequently relying on pre-emptive or anticipatory justifications Hakimi (2015). India has likewise asserted a right of self-defence in response to cross-border terrorism, notably through surgical strikes and air strikes directed at terrorist facilities across its borders, framing such measures as non-military pre-emptive action against imminent threats rather than as action against the host state. These instances suggest a pattern where states are more interested in security concerns and more liberal a construction of international law to address new threats Wilmshurst (2006).

The Security Council resolutions have also played a key role in providing the legal basis for the responses to terrorism. Resolutions 1368 and 1373, adopted in the immediate aftermath of the 2001 attacks, recognised the inherent right of self-defence in the context of terrorist attacks and called upon states to combat international terrorism collectively United Nations Security Council. (2001a), United Nations Security Council. (2001b). Although these resolutions do not redefine armed attack, they have contributed to the gradual acceptance of self-defence against non-state actors Brunnée and Toope (2018). The persistent gap between judicial interpretation and state practice nevertheless leaves international law in a state of ambiguity, underscoring the need for clearer principles that reconcile sovereignty with the realities of cross-border terrorism.

CHALLENGES AND CONTROVERSIES

The invocation of self-defence against cross-border terrorism raises a series of unresolved controversies. The first is about attribution and the level of evidence. There can be no sure link between non-state actors and a specific state. Terrorist organisations generally function in a decentralised manner – it is hard to determine whether states have exercised control over such organisations, whether they have helped them, or simply failed to prevent them from operating on their territory Lanovoy (2017). The problem is exacerbated by the fact that there is no consensus regarding the attribution standards. There are two different tests: effective control and overall control International Court of Justice. (1986), International Criminal Tribual for the Former Yugoslavia. (1999). The evidentiary question is closely related: states often rely on classified intelligence or other unpublished sources, which raises concerns about transparency, accountability and the risk of misrepresentation Hakimi (2015).

A second debate is the doctrine of self-defence, which could be used as a casue for states to go to war in pursuit of strategic or political goals that have nothing to do with security threats. This risk has been heightened by the growth of anticipatory self-defence and the unable-or-unwilling doctrine, both of which permit force where no actual armed attack has occurred and thereby blur the distinction between lawful defensive force and unlawful aggression Bethlehem (2012), Tladi (2013). Such doctrines open the door to unilateral measures that may circumvent the collective security mechanisms established by the Charter Bethlehem (2012).

A third controversy is the tension between state sovereignty and security. Although states are entitled to protect their citizens from terrorist threats, the use of force on the territory of another state without its consent tests the principles of territorial integrity and non-intervention. The challenge is severe when the host state challenges the need for the action and/or its legitimacy, triggering diplomatic crises and potential escalation Tladi (2013). The balance between the need to act effectively against terror and respecting the fundamental principles of international law is not yet decided. These controversies point to the urgent need for clearer legal standards, more effective accountability mechanisms and deeper international cooperation so that the evolving character of cross-border terrorism can be addressed without undermining the integrity of the international legal order International Law Association. (2018), Tladi (2013).

DIRECTIONS FOR LEGAL REFORM

The dynamic character of cross-border terrorism requires the development of more precise international legal norms that would supply consistency and prevent abuse of the right of self-defence. The most important reform is a clearer articulation of the concept of armed attack in relation to non-state actors, since uncertainty in this area remains a legal grey zone that produces divergent state practice International Law Association. (2018), Ruys (2010). International agreed thresholds and criteria involving scale, attribution and evidence would bring down the interpretive disagreements and enhance the legitimacy of the state action.

The second route relates to international cooperation. Self-help strategies are rarely effective against threats that are themselves transnational, and enhanced coordination through intelligence sharing, joint operations and multilateral structures can improve the effectiveness of counter-terrorism without compromising legal standards United Nations Security Council. (2001b). International institutions, particularly the United Nations, should take a more active role in coordinating responses and ensuring accountability, including through a more rigorous application of the reporting requirement in Article 51 United Nations. (1945).

A third direction is the reinforcement of existing legal frameworks by strengthening the authority of international institutions, improving dispute-resolution mechanisms and insisting on adherence to the principles of necessity, proportionality and sovereignty Wilmshurst (2006). More precise guidance on anticipatory self-defence and on the unable-or-unwilling standard would help to prevent arbitrary application of these doctrines Bethlehem (2012), Deeks (2012), Tladi (2013). Future legal reform should aim at a workable compromise between the capacity of states to respond effectively to security threats and the preservation of the fundamental principles of international law, thereby advancing both global security and the rule of law.

CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that cross-border terrorism has profoundly challenged the conventional paradigm of international law on the meaning of armed attack and the scope of self-defence under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Classical interpretations confined armed attack to the state-centric use of force, but the changing nature of international security threats, and the prominence of non-state actors in particular, has required a broader and more adaptable reading. Judicial interpretation, especially that of the ICJ, has remained conservative in its insistence on gravity, necessity, proportionality and attribution, whereas state practice has moved towards a more pragmatic position that recognises large-scale terrorist attacks as armed attacks even in the absence of direct state responsibility.

At the same time, the extension of self-defence through anticipatory self-defence and the unable-or-unwilling doctrine has raised serious concerns about abuse, the erosion of state sovereignty and the weakening of established rules on the use of force. The absence of explicit and universally accepted norms continues to produce confusion and inconsistency in the interpretation and application of the law. An intermediate and codified level of standards is thus required, which can adapt to new security situations without compromising international law. Strengthened international cooperation, clearer legal limits and institutional reaffirmation are required so that the right of self-defence is exercised prudently and lawfully. The primary goal of international law today, to "balance" effective counter-terrorism measures with the maintenance of international peace and stability is the main concern of the ongoing discourse on international law, and future research could profitably reflect on the crystallization of the customary norms in this field in the emerging state practice, especially in South Asia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Bethlehem, D. (2012). Self-Defense Against an Imminent or Actual Armed Attack by Nonstate Actors. American Journal of International Law, 106(4), 770–777. https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.106.4.0770

Brunnée, J., and Toope, S. J. (2018). Self-Defence Against Non-State Actors: Are Powerful States Willing but Unable to Change International Law? International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 67(2), 263–286. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589317000495

De Wet, E. (2019). The Invocation of the Right to Self-Defence in Response to Armed Attacks Conducted by Armed Groups: Implications for Attribution. Leiden Journal of International Law, 32(1), 91–110. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156518000687

Deeks, A. S. (2012). “Unwilling or Unable”: Toward a Normative Framework for Extraterritorial Self-Defense. Virginia Journal of International Law, 52(3), 483–550.

Hakimi, M. (2015). Defensive Force Against Non-State Actors: The State of Play. International Law Studies, 91, 1–31.

International Court of Justice. (1986). Military and Paramilitary Activities in and Against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America), Merits, Judgment. ICJ Reports 1986, 14.

International Court of Justice. (2003). Oil Platforms (Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America), Judgment. ICJ Reports 2003, 161.

International Court of Justice. (2004). Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Advisory Opinion. ICJ Reports 2004, 136.

International Court of Justice. (2005). Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda), Judgment. ICJ Reports 2005, 168.

International Criminal Tribual for the Former Yugoslavia. (1999). Prosecutor v. Duško Tadić*, Case No. IT-94-1-A, Appeals Chamber Judgment, 15 July 1999.

International Law Association. (2018). Final Report on Aggression and the Use of Force. Sydney Conference, International Law Association.

International Law Commission. (2001). Draft Articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, with Commentaries. Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 2001, Vol. II, Part Two. United Nations.

Lanovoy, V. (2017). The use of Force by Non-State Actors and the Limits of Attribution of Conduct. European Journal of International Law, 28(2), 563–585. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chx026

Ruys, T. (2010). ‘Armed attack’ and Article 51 of the UN Charter: Evolutions in customary law and practice. Cambridge University Press.

Tams, C. J. (2009). The use of Force Against terrorists. European Journal of International Law, 20*(2), 359–397. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chp031

Tladi, D. (2013). The Nonconsenting Innocent state: The Problem with Bethlehem's Principle 12. American Journal of International Law, 107(3), 570–576. https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.107.3.0570

Tsagourias, N. (2016). Self-Defence Against Non-State Actors: The Interaction Between Self-Defence as a Primary rule and Self-Defence as a Secondary Rule. Leiden Journal of International Law, 29(3), 801–825. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156516000327

United Nations Security Council. (2001a). Resolution 1368 (2001), S/RES/1368, 12 September 2001.

United Nations Security Council. (2001b). Resolution 1373 (2001), S/RES/1373, 28 September 2001.

United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations, 24 October 1945, 1 UNTS XVI.

Wilmshurst, E. (2006). The Chatham House Principles of International law on the use of Force in Self-Defence. International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 55(4), 963–972. https://doi.org/10.1093/iclq/lei137