مجلة جامعة الشارقة للعلوم القانونية

اسم المقال: الحروب بالوكالة والقانون الدولي
اسم الكاتب: زايد علي زايد الغواري
رابط ثابت: https://political-encyclopedia.org/library/9863
تاريخ الاسترداد: 2026/11/22 18:36 +03

الموسوعة السياسيّة هي مبادرة أكاديمية غير هادفة للربح، تساعد الباحثين والطلاب على الوصول واستخدام وبناء مجموعات أوسع من المحتوى العلمي العربي في مجال علم السياسة واستخدامها في الأرشيف الرقمي الموثوق به لإغناء المحتوى العربي على الإنترنت.
لمزيد من المعلومات حول الموسوعة السياسيّة - Encyclopedia Political، يرجى التواصل على info@political-encyclopedia.org

استخدامكم لأرشيف مكتبة الموسوعة السياسيّة - Encyclopedia Political يعني موافقتك على شروط وأحكام الاستخدام المتاحة على الموقع https://political-encyclopedia.org/terms-of-use

تم الحصول على هذا المقال من موقع مجلة جامعة الشارقة للعلوم القانونية ورفده في مكتبة الموسوعة السياسيّة مستوفياً شروط حقوق الملكية الفكريّة ومتطلبات رخصة المشاع الإبداعي التي ينضوي المقال تحتها.

جامعة الشارقة
UNIVERSITY OF SHARJAH

University of Sharjah Journal of Law Sciences

A Refereed Scientific journal



Vol. 22, No. 3
Rabi' al-Awwal 1446 A.H. / September 2025 A.D.

ISSN : 2616-6526

https//:doi.org/10.36394/jls.v22.i3.18

Proxy Wars and the International Law

Zaid Ali Zaid(1)

Received on: 24-04-2024 **Accepted on: 15-05-2024**

Abstract:

The escalation of civil wars, resulting in the significant loss of thousands of human beings and materials prompted me to undertake this study. The research sought to examine proxy warfare through the lens of international law. The study employed the narrative literature review method and an exploratory design to investigate existing research. The study outcomes revealed that proxy wars are a widespread and primary tool by the USA, Iran, and Russia to interfere in the international affairs of different countries. The assessment concluded that while proxy conflicts are not explicitly prohibited under international law, the law provides an ethical framework aimed at reducing human suffering and material destruction. The research needs to be continued, and the primary methods should be applied to analyse the issue more deeply.

Keywords: Cause, Proxy Interest, Conflicts, Proxy War, International Humanitarian Law.

(1) College of Law - University of Sharjah (Sharjah – U.A.E.)
zzaid@sharjah.ac.ae

Introduction

Battle effects are broad regardless of aircraft, ground forces, waterborne vehicles, or spacecraft. Both short-term and long-term effects of these factors can cause major economic and political damage to this country's citizens. Similar to soldiers' experiences, conflicting children and women show ruthlessness and disregard for humanity. Almost the past twenty years, almost four million children have died in military conflicts (Alao, 2017). Many negative impacts occur concurrently or as long-term repercussions, hindering the economy. According to Bandeira & Alberto (2019), wars cost the world around $9 billion in 2015.

Disruptions to community or state activity destroy billions in property. Some city people's routines are disrupted, making it impossible to work or manage businesses. Many states may dedicate large amounts of money to military operations out of fear of losing the wars, leaving critical economic areas unfunded. However, save for World War II and the Great Depression, military war usually hurts a nation's finances. The Syrian refugee influx into Jordan burdens the economy by more than $3 billion annually. It represented 6% of Jordan's GDP and 1/3 of its income (BERMAN & LAKE, 2019). War can destroy vital organizations. After this, a major education, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure failure may cause major economic disruptions. Thus, destroying transportation infrastructure, especially one that harms the economy, may not work. War alters the country's labor quantity and population and kills many productive people. War questions the government structure and power brokers. Executive authority from the former administration usually ceases, and a new one takes over. As in the Second Liberian Civil War, rebels with UN support overthrew Charles Taylor and restored constitutional order, preventing

genocide (bloomsbury.com, 2016). Such a shift disrupts the country's labor process. A functioning and enduring political unit requires violence, which was once utilized to build solid states. The state also tends to strengthen the leader's motivations for creating a profitable tax system and make people seem to concur.

Proxy wars are weaker diplomatic interventions. Unlike the US, which utilizes troops and risks lives, other countries use drones, which are cheaper than military action. Proxy wars are better because proxy states spend less on fighting than on preparation for the costly direct conflict. Few individuals know that foreign powers supported Libya's proxy warfare. When a signatory state's proxies follow the partner's wishes, indirect battles can benefit third-party nations (Borghard, 2014). It may seem reasonable, but intermediate wars are often messy and expensive. They can promote a state's preferences abroad. However, this usually comes at a high cost to them and the locals.

1.0 Defining Proxy Wars

The term 'proxy wars' is not new; it has been written about historically. Very few of the war situations that have been the most influential were settled by proxy wars, which matters in some cities. These entities, termed international peacekeeping operations, were once described by President Dwight Eisenhower as the economic coverage of the world. The last Pakistani leader, Zia-Ul-Haq of that time, had to keep the pot boiling to avoid a fight with another country. The latter means wars are so seductive that they get as popular as proxy wars throughout History like the Cold War conflicts in Korea and Vietnam, the Soviet-Afghan War, and the ongoing civil war in Syria.

The proxy war concept has a lot of explanations, one that is ever-changing with the growth of technology. Many scholars have been equally educated on the definition of 'proxy war' for years. A proxy war is a form of conflict in which a third party act as a mediator and intervenes on behalf of the primary parties involved. The main objective of this intervention is to effectively alter the strategic outcome in favour of a specific outcome, typically one that aligns with the preferred agenda of the mediator or the party they represent. This concept is outlined in Mumford's book (2013) as a means of exerting influence and achieving desired outcomes without engaging in direct combat. The articulation of the other proxy war idea also emerged during the Cold War era (Mumford, 2013). This means that proxy wars involve two primary antagonists engaging in a confrontation through proxies instead of directly with each other. It also adds a dimension to our idea. The majority of substitute actors are from the small states. Nevertheless, the substitutes could be either state or non-state actors.

Another widespread definition was elaborated by Karl Deutsch back in 1964. The scholar says this is a situation in which two countries fight on behalf of the third, which we call a proxy war (Mumford, 2013). They are invariably presented as concerns of the local matters of the third country. During these wars, third-world countries' resources and labourers were usually exploited. While this definition is the most popular, it is criticised as being too state-centric without recognising the roles of non-state actors, especially in insurgent groups. These definitions help, but not to all possible extent, regarding these proxy wars. For example, they over-globalise proxy fights to the point that it is no longer needed (Bruner & Faix, 2018). However, this is justifiable because these definitions were planned after WWII and during the Second World War period. Further, they frequently

overlook the territorial issues that these conflicts exploit. Many of the most popular proxy wars of the past, similar to the roundabout mediation of the U.S. in Afghanistan during the 1980s, came about because of strains that were fit to exploitation (Bruner & Faix, 2018).

Proxy wars result from the connection between a contributor and a preferred, as a rule, with the state actor being outside the conflict attachment. On the other hand, the benefactor can be of any kind as a non-state actor. Next, they pick proxies that serve as fodder and pipelines for their weaponry, training, and finance business. These small but swift proxy wars will act as the next step for states that want to complete the goal of increasing their strategic status without getting directly involved in the military struggle.

Considering the variability in whether or not definitions and understanding of a proxy war are, it is significant that you realise what it is not to find what it is. In the first place, it is vital to mention that the proxy wars are not only the regional ones that lie down the more complex geopolitics that often have a broad international context related to the issues of the great powers that struggle for ideological domination. Sometimes, they are not considered cases where third parties provide direct military interventions, even if it happens explicitly. Proxy wars can be conducted secretively or even in the shadows; however, the core actions of the proxy war are still exerted directly by an indirect entity. A state principally engages the agents of a competing state, Small, to engage in its war affairs (Byman, 2018).

Non-state Actors

One of the well-known aspects of intermediate conflicts is the use of non-state actors, mainly confidential military groups. In the West, security and army techniques have progressively depended on confidential military project workers. These confidential military workers for hire participate in exercises, for example, securing weapons, preparing police and knowledge officials, and safeguarding regular citizen pioneers (Coker, 2009). The clarification of this statement is worth it here. During the Cold War, the leaders of many states were under an obligation to amend their war strategy, especially as there was a significant reduction of troops by 6 million, and this causal relationship happened to be in the 1990s. Among the other hardcore guys were professionals who readily integrated into this dreadful business. Second, there was a surge in so-called failed states, namely the Horn of Africa and the Balkans in particular, with the inception of the power vacuum of the Cold War. Naturally, it caused a more significant demand for private military personnel who had no resistance against the rise in their number.

In the 1990s, there was a dramatic change in how wars were conducted, which gave PMSCs more room to thrive in a more complicated and challenging environment. One aspect of the idea of the Revolution is the creation of high-precision technologies that mark the times of the Revolution in military sciences. The spread of the idea that commercial products would soon be available accentuated the popularity of this trend in Western countries. Through the private army actors, the situation is close enough to provide them with an opportunity to act as conflict scenario deputations for the regimes that, for some reason or another, may not be willing enough or even able to act in direct and open ways (Shearer, 1998).

Private military workers for hire are appealing as enterprises in the proxy war globe since they reduce dangers for numerous governments while retaining the authority to guard their welfare or advance their beliefs. For instance, they have a significant financial advantage, ostensibly considerably over the commonplace intermediary war that would involve dissimilar state entertainers as their intermediary. They have a lot of lower preceding expenses than the organisation of military authorities because the states generally don't need to give benefits and overt repetitiveness assets to these project workers (Clive & Dave, 2005). However, the main benefit of private military organisations is that they make minimal political gambles concerning the expected results of their contention circumstances. After the Vietnam War, the political aftermath of the conflict became a tremendous subject, with the U.S. and other significant nations frantic to escape from struggle circumstances similar to those pride.

There are no repatriation ceremonies for the confidential workers for hire that kick the bucket in clashes. No banner-hung caskets appear at home, and the public's emphasis shifts to the next victim's incrimination. They are, hence, the perfect proxy (Mumford, 2013). The recent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq serve as the perfect illustration of this. According to U.N. data, as many as 20,000 Afghans and 6,000 Westerners worked on private military projects in Afghanistan in 2007. The numbers were far more significant in Iraq, where from around 2008 onwards, up to 200,000 private soldierly free-lancers were engaged in operations. These statistics exceeded the number of allied forces stationed in these countries at that time (Engbrecht, 2010).

1.1. Cyber-Warfare for Proxy Wars

For instance, cyber warfare is an additional choice for states and entertainers who believe their hands should remain inconspicuous. In contemporary society, individuals depend more on innovation and mechanical frameworks than at any other time in recent memory. Cyber warfare, accordingly, gives an optimal road to assault and harm while offering the most extreme secrecy. This is because digital fighting culprits are famously challenging to follow. This severe level of obscurity squeezes into the customary qualities of intermediary wars, including diminished cost and risk (Mumford, 2013). In the 21st century, having substantial substitute militaries to execute the intermediary war is unimportant. All things being equal, advancements in innovation and correspondence have sometimes eliminated the requirement for boots on the pulverised, which was fundamental for intermediary wars. Nevertheless, in the 21st century, battles will probably be fought through proxy conflicts instead of intermediary powers.

2. Examples and History of Proxy Wars

2.1. The Proxy Wars and Cold War

The advancement of intermediary wars is inseparable from the Virus War and the Post-Cold Conflict period. One of the main qualities of the Virus War was that the contentions fundamentally revolved around contending belief systems, with socialism on one side and a majority rule government on the other. Specialists have proposed that this circumstance circumstance was crucial for atomic discouragement. It empowered the U.S. and the Soviet Union to contend through intermediaries, by implication, through contentions like the Vietnam War. In any case, it is important to remember

that the problems arising from the transitional conflicts did not necessarily stop with the conclusion of the Cold War. All things being equal, the Virus War is where intermediary battles began to get momentum as they are characterised today.

How the Cold War altered things was one of the ways that following this, worldwide clashes, for the most part, were more delayed and recalcitrant. Further, the fall of the Soviet Union prompted a sudden end to the philosophical fights that the world previously looked at. Proxy wars today are generally battled on new and combined philosophical standards. For example, when the U.S. went to Somalia, its support in the conflict depended on helpful guidance and mediation.

The Post-Cold War Era (1990-2000)

In the wake of the Cold War, the 1990s became the hotbed of many significant milestones that significantly affected the course of the debate between proxies. One of the critical trends was that many armed forces worldwide made cuts in the workforce. This instigated the evolution of the private military contractor industry, which has now reached a level where it may be considered a significant player in proxy battles. The second trend was that the Cold War resulted in inheritable power vacuums in several countries, with the Balkan region as a prominent example. This outcome created unstable and conflicting situations. The significance of this factor cannot be overemphasised in the course of proxy wars. At such a local level, these regional wars provide starting points and cover for outside countries to become involved that, in most cases, declare their participation in regional conflicts as involvement in the local wars.

2.2. The War on Terror (2000-2010)

One of the main reasons for the loss of trust in the power structures is the defeat in the Vietnam War and consequential disrespect for the U.S. and its allies. In succession, western governments became reluctant to send significant troops abroad as their home crowd no longer viewed such undertakings favourably. Yet these administrations still had to develop strategies of belonging to their nations by resisting the Viet Syndrome effect. The result was that some countries decided to use proxies to fight battles and protect their interests. Furthermore, the proxies of the 'war on terror' were primarily used in the early half of the 2000s (especially in the West). In addition, military departments also announced cuts in their budget. Their strategies, conversely, were to employ methods such as deploying private military forces and using cyber war means to carry out attacks and proxy wars (Mumford, 2013).

2.3. The Emergence of China and Economic Warfare

This time of the proxy wars has its roots in the transformation of China into an important political and economic player. China's rise has caused Western countries and those associated with the West to be concerned, primarily because they fear the new Chinese attitude towards power and the ability to influence others. The topic of China fascinates me because it relates to the proxy war arena, including cyber warfare and private military contracting. The preceding ten years have implicated China in conflicts or nearly a conflict like proxy wars. As another instance, the South China Sea maritime region was in ongoing disputes over Taiwan's sovereignty due to the assertive sea presence (Nye, 2010). The latest way of talking already focuses on pressures between Western nations like the U.S. and China,

many of which indicate heading the intermediary path of destruction with different state and non-state actors.

Examples of Proxy Wars

The proxy wars are supposed to be secret, and because of that, they should give away deniability needed by separate parties. We could have been involved in those proxy wars that no one knew about without understanding that the war was a proxy war. At the same time, there were those whose character was much more apparent to the observers. They are among the oldest and the most widely known.

The three-year Spanish Civil War broke out in 1936 and ended in 1939. The civil war started when the monarchy was no longer in charge, and the military junta took control of the country. Left-wing groups became dominant in the election of 1936, but they paid no heed, and the leaders of this group were arrested. The latter led to the collaboration of the left-wing groups who formed a revolt. This rebellion evolved into a full-scale armed conflict, where the dictator managed his opponents who wanted a communist republic, and he needed to maintain control. Due to their numerical disadvantage, the Soviet Union intervened and joined the rebels in this conflict. Although the National Germans desired to participate and experience the Russians' defeat, the Nazi Germans were enthusiastically involved in fighting the dictator's troops, which led to their participation in the conflict.

This civil war was a proximate conflict resulting from a more significant conflict between nationalist monarchists and leftists. Nepal, like Spain, was a state of monarchy in which the king exercised complete authority. While the Maoists toppled the monarchy and oppressive system of castes in

Nepal, their philosophy was also based on violence. Along with his Maoist comrades, Chin joined and became a sympathiser of the protestors. India was the second most significant power in the region, so being the only other option, India merged in and reinforced the monarchy. This prompted India to face a substantial rival, Pakistan, which came to the rebels' aid. Thus, since the civil war took place in a small country, this tiny nation became a battle arena in which people tried to settle scores with their competitors. The civil war in Nepal went on for as long as a decade, from 1996 to 2006.

2.3.1. The Afghan Civil War

This was one of the most famously used proxy war examples. Russia had to face the very unpleasant consequences as an outcome of the Civil War in Afghanistan, one of the most worrying. For ages, the existence of the Afghan state depended on the presence of the Soviets and their propping up of a communist government. However, the Taliban fighters overthrew the regime of the communist government and engaged themselves in governance. At that time, the United States was very active in delivering war supplies to the rebels opposing the Soviet-supported communist government.

2.3.2. Cambodian-Vietnamese War

In this instance, socialist Cambodia was evolving into a more hospitable society. Conflicts broke out between the two countries during this time, with Vietnam emerging victorious and the Cambodian government toppling. The Soviet Union supported the socialist Vietnamese during the struggle, which took place between 1977 and 1991. Meanwhile, the U.S. supported the Cambodians because of its rivalry with both the Soviet Union and the Vietnamese.

2.3.3. The Venezuelan Crisis

This was another well-known proxy conflict that transpired in a public setting. The crisis in Venezuela occurred during a protracted period between 1902 and 1903. European nations that cruised there, such as Germany, Italy, and Incredible England, hampered South America. It then turned into an intermediary battle with the inclusion of America, which reached out and acted as the hero of the Venezuelans. Spain later jumped into the conflict, tracking down motivation to subvert the U.S., which had crushed it in the Spanish-American conflict that had occurred in the first years. The conflict had finished the Spanish realm, having them fail to keep a grip on such nations as Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Philippine Islands, and Guam.

2.3.4. Syrian Proxy War

A few of the mentioned civil wars had already ended before 2010. One of the most recent and complicated civil wars is the one in Syria, which serves as an example of the dynamics of modern proxy wars in a global era of increasing interconnectedness. The Syrian conflict is even more complex than usual, where we find multiple players beyond the usual renowned "third party" that the definitions of the proxy war broadly refer to. The Syrian case, in itself, resembles what looks like an intrastate war between numerous combatants. Nonetheless, it should be noted that different competing interests exist in this matter. The initial two external national players are Iran and Israel. Iran, in the past, has always advocated and supported the Bashar al-Assad regime through its Hezbollah proxy.

However, it is notable that Israel has not attended the discussion open to the public. The intensification of the standoff between these countries took place after Israel's successful interception of a drone that crossed into

Israeli airspace, resulting in Israel's counter-attack that engaged Syrian and Iranian military positions. It concluded in a chain of unrelenting attacks and reprisals, even stretching to downing an Israeli plane. This conflict between Iran and Israel runs deep, with the two countries very close to war before.

The particularity of the Syrian proxy war is that it also involves Turkey and Kurds on the battlefield, where the private civil war occurs in the public domain. By joining the Syrian battlefield in 2015, Turkey responded to a bombing inside the town of Suruç, which took place for terrorist purposes near the border. But this alteration came during the point when Kurdish forces were embattling both ISIS and the Assad regime, which were making profound progress at the same time. Based on the descriptions from many of the associates of the armed forces, fighting in Syria was their primary source for the results of the conflict. However, Kurdish people who live in Turkey, despite being a minority population, still numbered 15 million. While some had joined the government to resolve the issues, others had been a resistance section of the People's Workers' Party. Reading through the lines, the number of souls lost during the interethnic violence among the Kurds and the Turks is in the tens of thousands. In addition, a sense of the success and strength caused by the Syrian Kurd armed group had stimulated the Kurds inside Turkey's borders, showing the same acts of revenge (Byman, 2018).

Turkey's attention to the Kurdish army in Syria pushes them into conflict with the U.S. According to U.S. reports, the northeaster region of Syria would require a boundary force of 30,000 soldiers. The more significant part of this number would be contained Syrian soldiers. Turkey passionately went against this, starting its Activity in Peace and offering

military hostility (Bremmer, 2018).

There are also hints of the long-standing dispute between the United States and Russia. Russia played a pivotal role in the conflict by establishing the Assad regime and providing assistance to Syria. Syria is an essential ally of Russia since it is home to Russia's principal Mediterranean-based marine facility. As a result, the Russians and Americans are now at odds. Moreover, Kurdish forces oppose Assad.

The Syrian circumstance is extraordinary and shows the different elements of intermediary and war. The number of others, frequently more remarkable, can exploit the neighbourhood and intrastate clash to dole out retributions among themselves.

3. Reasons for Proxy Wars

States have been using proxies for an extraordinary assortment of motives. One driving justification for utilising intermediaries is the cost associated with the entire activity. At the point when, say, the U.S. involves nearby intermediaries in a conflict, local people will endure losses and not the U.S. fighters. Further, using intermediaries implies that the nation included doesn't need to pay out annuities and advantages in the event of injury in the war zone or demise. This is one reason intermediary fights are frequently alluded to as battles for barely anything.

In conflicts, proxies are often used for strategic purposes. When knowledge collecting is necessary, using local proxies can be beneficial. Since they are local, they can readily be acknowledged by nearby networks. They are, consequently, bound to accumulate better data about foe agitators from the networks. The utilisation of intermediaries is likewise valuable

for lessening opposition. A great many people will be directly against, on nationalistic grounds, unfamiliar powers working in their nations. When intermediaries are utilised, however, they don't confront a similar sort of obstruction.

Further, the proxies will ordinarily have more fantastic information on the territory and scene and can mix in with the nearby populace in a manner that outsiders can't. The primary vital choices likewise reach out into circumstances where the country needs assets or has its important assets undermined. For example, even though Iran doesn't have a naval force or a huge airlift volume to support the soldiers in Yemen when they sustain the Houthis, they acquire impact in Yemen (Byman, 2018).

The kind of deniability that proxies offer prevents conflicts from getting worse faster. The states would frequently deny any suggestion that they back the proxies. There are many examples of these situations wherein states that deny their affiliation aim to keep tensions from rising despite rumours and perhaps evidence of their support for proxies. For instance, Israel and the Hezbollah organisation have been engaged in conflict on several fronts. There are indications that the Iranian government provides Hezbollah with prompt assistance. However, the fact that it is a proxy suggests that Israel is unable primarily to pursue Iran directly.

On the other hand, if Iran were to attack Israel, Israel would be forced to retaliate. Russia is another example that has denied any role in the conflict situation in Ukraine, even in the face of evidence that it was providing funding to various groups and, somewhat shockingly, even arming them with authority. At the point when the public authority doesn't communicate its help openly, and there is no chance of knowing without a doubt, it gives

an exit plan for nations as the contention circumstance doesn't need to be raised (Byman, 2018).

Apart from cost and fighting power, there are other considerations. For instance, many proxy wars were fought on a philosophical balance, especially during the Cold War. In general, Russians would support and actively engage in socialist projects regularly. This would prompt their adversaries, the United States or the Nazi Germans, to intervene and challenge them and their influence. The proxy wars in Syria are fought on a philosophical front. While one side of the divide clings to Islamist aspirations for the nation, the other side places more faith in secularist perspectives. Another example is the conflict mediated by Iran and Israel, where a significant portion of Iran's intermediaries have a similar worldview.

One more justification behind using proxies or commitment to proxy wars is the upgrade of the public authority's credibility at home. However, in the Kurdish vs. Turkey issue, the government may be using the battle condition to subjugate the development and assurance of the Kurdish army on its grounds, getting the backing of those who back it at home (Byman, 2018). There is proof that nations in the Bedouin countries supported pioneers like Yasser Arafat even though they could have done without them. This bettered their validity at home among populaces, who considered the Palestinian reason a fundamental component of the Arab identity.

4. Implications of Proxy Wars

One should consider three groups of proxy war results: suggestions on the outsider express, the intermediary (state actors), and the people in conflict circumstances.

5. Implications for Intervening in the Third Party States

Using intermediaries provides the intervening states with three main advantages. They gain basic abilities to impact what is happening to their approval, get the labour force essential for the conflicts, and save their assets rather than the expense they would have caused by going into a full-scale war. Nonetheless, these collisions can likewise have undesirable consequences for the nations in question. The interceding state may be hauled into struggle circumstances to safeguard its standing. Many states wind up in circumstances they weren't guaranteed to make arrangements for in light of the conviction that reneging on this could legitimise a comparable way of behaving from partners from now on (SNYDER, 1997). Even though specialists have found that coalitions won't be restricted this way, proof proposes that many states honour their collusions even in bothersome circumstances.

Mutual reliance is the foundation of many alliances. One of the parties may be required to pay the costs. It is essential to clarify that the proxies are not hired combatants who are compensated for their efforts in the fighting. Each of these aspects has a political plan and is free. It's also important to remember that power differentials with one party are standard in many collisions. The outsider is usually far more potent than the other. One of the potential costs for the party mediating the dispute is that the proxies may withdraw from the fight after achieving their political goals. Such collisions that include critical power contrasts lessen the likelihood of deserting. Be that as it may, they move the vast majority of the expense for the substantially heartier side of the contention. Intermediaries have

recently deserted their obligation to the reason in the wake of accomplishing some proportion of adequate security (Lake, 1996). Proxies can also act as their desires indicate, even when they aren't guaranteed to leave the contention. There are numerous instances of this incident. For example, after the 9/11 attacks, there are rumours that the United States persuaded the Taliban Northern Coalition to hold off on taking over Kabul to ease worries and give authority to a group composed primarily of local people in Afghanistan. Regardless, the Northern Union ignored their requests and captured Kabul. They played a significant role as the U.S.'s ally or pawn in the fight against the Taliban—another plan called for the U.S. to eliminate Islamic competitors. At the same time, the neighbourhood intermediaries reclaimed their territory. The nearby intermediary countries, be that as it may, were content to neglect these warriors, not needing a slaughter. Such circumstances emerge from a situation for the overwhelming majority of the mediating countries (Byman, 2018). They frequently search for a stronger intermediary when they get into a contention utilising a proxy. However, the more solid a proxy is, the more probable they are to go with free choices.

Three categories can be used to categorise the costs incurred by the primary, the mediating party, the state, and the specialist, which, in this case, is the proxy. c. The main classification has been the ethical danger or secret activity class. This happens when the chief needs help to see or figure out the activities of its representatives. The proxy either winds up finishing the work in an unfortunate manner or evading their obligation through and through (Warhane & Freeeman, 1998). The second classification of costs required here is an unfavourable choice or secret data. Here, the specialist needs to have the quality or capacities it guarantees in the relationship, and

the head, then again, needs to be able to see the distinction.

Madison's stalemate alludes to the prices incurred when the assets or authority obtained by the proxy due to their connection are diverted against the mediators. These expenses frequently happen because the connection between the outsider state and the proxy is generally founded on accommodation instead of any authoritative arrangement between the two or more profound ties that support the harmony between the two, particularly after the contention circumstance closes (Kiewiet & McCubbins, 1991).

Globally, the ramifications for the mediating states are the obliteration of their standing and political power. Staying quiet or out of the open arena in the present interconnected world is complex. In states, notoriety is fundamental since it works in collaboration. Each state acts to its most significant advantage and is undoubtedly enticed to cheat to receive transient rewards. However, these states mostly keep from doing this since they dread having an unfortunate standing and wonder what this will mean for their possibilities. States participate in intermediary clashes, predominantly when this commitment follows ways different nations see as unsatisfactory. Supporting a proxy makes broad unfavourable impacts, driving the state to experience exchange, security, and discretionary circles (Press, 2001).

The Proxy

The repercussions for the proxy can occasionally be linked to the threats that the mediating nations pose. For example, the control dynamics make it easy for the intervening countries to end the partnership. In some cases, the cost of dispute resolution might be too expensive. Further, when their support is found or turns out to be more open, it may be to their most significant advantage to stop the relationship on a money-saving advantage premise.

2.5.1. The Citizens

The most significant individual impact of these proxy wars is commonly on the residents in the nations where the conflicts occur. There are two fundamental motivations behind this situation. In the first place, while the mediating states pull out all the stops, it no longer becomes about the genuine clash but the contending interests of the intervening countries. This lessens the interest of the now numerous gatherings in settling the question, having them instead centre around how to pursue one another. As a result, innocent individuals get caught in the conflict, causing blowback. Perhaps the most spectacular case is the supposed downing of a flight in Ukraine. According to sources, the rebels in that nation should categorise the aircraft as a tactical vehicle plane (Borghard, 2014). The unstructured and clandestine character of the connection between the intervening government and the proxy is another reason why the inhabitants bear the most burden. This outcome is when the mediating state can't follow or direct the proxy's activities. The more significant part of the harm in such circumstances is on the residents concerning loss of lives, uprooting, loss of occupation, and injury.

2.5.2.c Proxy Wars and International Laws

Surprisingly, little international law or resolution is expounded on the norms in a proxy war. While there are various instances of global regulation precluding the state funding of an unfamiliar non-state entertainer, the significant difficulty is that no legal norm in international law that ought to stop or forbid proxy warfare, which occurs clandestinely and casually. In any case, it is crucial to note that global regulation perceives proxy laws exist and that participating in the battle for one more party can, in any case, be decided under the legitimate classes of war. Worldwide regulation

characterizes the personality of an intermediary battle as a roundabout contribution to the conflict by a third party wishing to seek its essential results (Chinkin & Kaldor, 2017). In this point of view, the term 'indirect' represents the replacement by the proxy of the capabilities the chief must give, so the cycle ought to find true success.

From this definition, there are two situations in which worldwide legal authorizations are applicable. The concept of "indirect" battles suggests two types of proxy relationships. In the first, the proxy engages in a contest of the outer state's claims on their behalf. When Serbian Republic soldiers were used in the Bosnian conflict, it was the perfect example of this concept (Chinkin & Kaldor, 2017). In the additional framework, the proxy is granted permission by the third-party state to achieve additional objectives that align with their interests (Chinkin & Kaldor, 2017). The contrast between these two is important since, in terms of global law, they have different legal ramifications. At the very least, the proxy connection should be purposeful, which requires the donor to devise strategies to assist the local organization and the local group to use those strategies. The judgment of moral responsibility—that is, who should be held accountable or whoever should carry a specific type of blame—depends on this intentionality.

International law mandates that when participating in such proxy partnerships, the persons involved must adhere to moral and ethical criteria. Just cause, balance, lawful administration, public statement, just intent, final appeal, and a reasonable probability of success are some of these requirements. According to the just cause view, battles can only be justified if they are waged for a cause with strong enough moral support. If the sponsoring state wants to utilize proxies, it must provide evidence of a legitimate reason. Wars waged to protect vulnerable groups, including

children, are becoming more and more accepted in contemporary culture. Justifications for proxy wars include defending oneself after a well-known figure is killed, attacking the state's prestige, economy, or religion, acting as a preemptive strike, defending an ally that has been invaded, violating human rights, and retaliating against acts of aggression. All of these causes are supported by international law.

The principle of proportionality in proxy warfare must be strictly followed and emphasized. The notion of proportionality derives from the international law principle, which stipulates that the cruelty of a proxy conflict must correspond to the severity of the crime perpetrated. Furthermore, considering the devastation of catastrophes, they or their proxies are confronted. For instance, the various states concerned must decide if using military force in response to a particular act of aggression is justified. The concept imposes moral and legal limitations on the first use of force to protect people from harm or death as well as from damage to civilian property. Therefore, the participants in a proxy relationship must guarantee that lethal force is used sparingly. If not, lawsuits involving these parties may be brought before international humanitarian courts. The international law on proxy conflicts stipulates that only legally recognized public entities have the right to use lethal force against their intended targets (Chinkin & Kaldor, 2017). This will make it impossible for any illegal political organization to attack the general populace. It further states that the relevant authorities must grant the official authority to initiate the war via the correct routes.

International laws that oversee intermediary wars additionally express that the public statement of war ought to come after the participants officially advise that the matter is severe and that central military mediation

can bring order. The statement allows the guilty party to discredit the cases before the conflict can start while simultaneously giving an open door to the networks to decide if they are prepared to bear the expenses and harms of the conflict (Teson, 1998). If they cannot do this, they should voice their interests to the decision-makers so that they can rethink their position on the forthcoming issues.

Lastly, the last resort paradigm needs to be taken into account. This principle requires the inciting state to seek after any remaining non-hurtful roads before starting a conflict with the unfamiliar state. The embodiment of this strategy is to forestall a brutal showdown on an issue that may not be as important as it appears (Teson, 1998). Furthermore, it permits the state to decide whether there is a sensible likelihood of coming out on top in obtaining the objectives after deadly power has been applied. The final hotel worldview is fundamental when the conflict or military activity is to recover explicit targets or accomplish explicit goals. Assuming that even conflict or military activity wouldn't achieve the different objectives, the states included would have no ethical standing.

Though it seems straightforward, the implementation procedure is not that easy. A few hindrances or obstructions frequently restrain the application of global regulation principles in proxy warfare. Such issues create uncertainty for the separation of savage contentions, the quickly changing conflict entertainers, issues with uneven fighting, obstacles of negative correspondence, and a compelled capacity to include all rivals in the struggle. In addition, the wasteful idea of the global framework and the absence of arrangements for new helpful strategies limit the pertinence of worldwide regulations in proxy wars. As per the set worldwide regulations, these states participate in proxy battles yet possibly spurn the principles.

When governments invade intra-state conflict zones to serve their objectives, they are another facet of the challenges or gaps in international law regarding proxy conflicts. Even if the offences are apparent to everyone, intentionality is less evident in certain circumstances. As a result, attribution is the issue facing international law. Given the nature of combat in the modern era, this scenario is highly complex. Advances in communications, information, and military technologies have made it simpler to launch assaults or hit targets across international borders. For example, government, military, and civilian systems are especially susceptible to cyberattacks and cyberwarfare because they rely on information and communication technologies.

According to the opinion of the International Court of Justice in the case Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua vs. United States of America), a state may be responsible for the actions of third parties, which it supports only if specific criteria are met. These criteria include the U. N. International Law Commission's determination that the individual's act goes beyond their authority or instructions, that the individual is otherwise authorized to use governmental powers or proceeds without them, that the government controls or coordinates their activities, that the activities are carried out by revolutionaries, who can assert power over that state and finally, that the state acknowledges and accepts responsibility for the actions of the individual. This legal doctrine, the attribution problem, provides the basis for state liability when it supports a conflict party. These requirements established by the U. N. International Law Commission are:

- The individual's actions are consistent with the objectives of the supporting state.

- The person is given help or money from the government for their activities.
- The citizen is performing something under the authority of the state.
- The state especiallyhandles the third-party organizations by supplying them with training or finances.

6. Conclusions

Proxy wars are nothing new and have been around for quite a long time. After the enormous spotlight on direct fighting in the past era, however, the end of the Cold War introduced a period where many militaries focused on additional styles of war that were not the hard and fast struggles one would anticipate. This is a stark contrast compared to the usual conflict, in which a state of this kind would send air, land, and naval forces to subjugate the nation. It's reasonable to assume that this is the official war movement, particularly considering the grievous impacts of war and previous encounters. The idea of war is quickly and continually advancing, and with numerous nations presently having nuclear rockets available to them, the possible damage and destruction from ordinary assaults can be gigantic. This could be why nations attack new regions without genuinely going to the target country's land. For example, the Syrian Civil Conflict is one of the deadliest in recent memory, but the world's superpowers and Syria's neighbours own a large portion of the guilt. Iran, France, Russia, Israel, Jordan, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States have all taken a specific role in the battle by bombing their adversaries, giving money and weapons to the rebel groups, and providing training.

Additionally, they have developed their cause, provided warriors with a place to stay, and used their power to support local organisations that represent their interests. Syria's experience is not unique; similar situations have occurred in Ukraine, Yemen, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Regretfully, even while regulations specifying the means of waging proxy wars exist, circumstances involving proxies do not always fall into categories that allow effective litigation against worldwide law.

There are different kinds of proxy wars or connected circumstances. The United States cooperation with Kabul to wipe out what is left of the Taliban isn't an intermediary battle, at least not as discussed predominantly in this paper. This present circumstance is much nearer to traditional conflict, considering that the nation is seeing continuous airstrikes and the presence of hundreds of American ground forces (Sanders, 2016). Moreover, Iran's adjacent liaison with Houthi protesters in Yemen meets the necessities of a proxy war, principally because Iran supplies monetary assets and weaponry. However, its powers are generally not situated in that country (Sanders, 2016).

In a helpful sense, a war between proxies is a variant, and in a conflict zone, the peace between the forces of an external nation and a proxy frequently breaks down. For example, in Vietnam, the U.S. progressed from pushing the South Vietnamese brigade in 1959 to the deployment of more than 500,000 US forces in 196840. If the vast popularity of the state's tactical exercises is achieved through an intermediary rather than its troops, the title of the intermediary war works impeccably. In any case, the degrees of direct military help that can be considered are in numerous areas and open for conversation and further examination.

There is confusion about which test ought to be utilized, where, and if the assessments may be utilized concurrently. Furthermore, the many entities responsible for judging such problems are pressured to use these tests. Even with these standards, the concept of multiple proxy battles suggests that it is difficult to determine the legitimate link between performers, making attribution impossible. Furthermore, the victim country frequently has the burden of proving anything.

6. Recommendations

The consequences of war are terrible, and more often than not, individuals who experience enduring impacts are innocent observers and residents. Along these lines, it is essential to have regulations against intermediary wars that are all around as solid as possible. One potential course is to change the obligation to prove any claims from something the casualty nations would need to manage to the supposed culprit nations. For instance, the Syrian Nationwide conflict may be complicated regarding crediting fault and distinguishing the casualty bunch. Nevertheless, in different situations, the casualty state isn't excessively involved. Further, no matter what obligation state entertainers bear in the contention, at last, individuals who endure are the population. Shifting the responsibility for security onto the alleged perpetrators provides them with protection and can also serve as a restriction.

Secondly, the regulations should be stiffened at the U.N. level, and systems smoothed out so that there are no circumstances where gatherings associated with struggle circumstances can go without being considered responsible. Further, legislatures ought to foster legitimate or, in any case, structures that shield regular citizens from struggle and their belongings.

In doing so, they should also evaluate how the concept of war and troops has evolved. With threats from non-governmental entities and cyber-warfare, rules should be developed to address these issues. Nations should foster activity plans for support against the assurance of regular citizens, guaranteeing responsibility for serious common liberties infringement and finishing exemption.

References:

Alao,A.(2017).TheBurdenofCollectiveGoodwill.https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315240909 https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315240909

Bandeira, M., & Alberto, L. (2019). Ukrainian Regime Change, Civil War, and the USA-Russia Proxy War. Springer EBooks, 223-233. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03204-3_19 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03204-3_19

BERMAN, E., & LAKE, D. A. (2019). Proxy Wars by Eli Berman | Paperback. Cornell Universi-ty Press. https://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/book/9781501733062/proxy-wars/ https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501733093

bloomsbury.com. (2016). Syria in Ruins. Bloomsbury. https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/syria-in-ruins-9781440838361/

Borghard, E. D. (2014). Proxy war can have dangerous consequences. Www.washingtonpost.com. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2014/07/25/proxy-war-can-have-dangerous-consequences/

Bremmer, I. (2018, February 16). These 5 Proxy Battles Are Making Syria's Civil War Increasing-ly Complicated. TIME; Time. https://time.com/5162409/syria-civil-war-proxy-battles

BRUNER, T., & FAIX, M. (2018). THE ATTRIBUTION PROBLEM AS A TOOL OF LAW-FARE. Obrana a Strategie (Defence and Strategy), 18(1), 079-094. https://doi.org/10.3849/1802-7199.18.2018.01.079-094 https://doi.org/10.3849/1802-7199.18.2018.01.079-094

Byman, D. L. (2018, May 21). Why engage in proxy war? A state's perspective. Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/05/21/why-engage-in-proxy-war-a-states-perspective

Chinkin, C., & Kaldor, M. (2017). International Law and New Wars. In Cambridge University Press. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/international-law-and-new-wars/24BDAF25289439847296D00B0DA4B3A4

Clive, W., & Dave, W. (2005). CONTRACTING OUT WAR?: PRIVATE MILITARY COMPANIES, LAW AND REGULATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM. International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 54(3), 651-689. https://doi.org/10.1093/iclq/lei021 https://doi.org/10.1093/iclq/lei021

Coker, & Christopher. (2009). War in an Age of Risk - Coker, Christopher: 9780745642871 - AbeBooks. Www.abebooks.com. https://www.abebooks.com/9780745642871/Age-Risk-Coker-Christopher-074564287X/plp

Doocy, S., Lyles, E., Akhu-Zaheya, L., Burton, A., & Burnham, G. (2016). Health service access and utilization among Syrian refugees in Jordan. International Journal for Equity in Health, 15(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-016-0399-4 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-016-0399-4

Engbrecht, S. (2010). America's Covert Warriors: Inside the World of Private Military Contrac-tors. In Amazon. POTOMAC BOOKS. https://www.amazon.com/Americas-Covert-Warriors-Military-Contractors/dp/159797238X

Kiewiet , D. R., & McCubbins, M. D. (1991). The Logic of Delegation. In press.uchicago.edu. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/L/bo3629025.html

Lake, D. A. (1996). Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations. International Organization, 50(1), 1-33. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706997 https://doi.org/10.1017/S002081830000165X

Marshall, A. (2016). From civil war to proxy war: past history and current dilemmas. Small Wars & Insurgencies, 27(2), 183-195. https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2015.1129172 https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2015.1129172

Mumford, A. (2013). Proxy Warfare and the Future of Conflict. The RUSI Journal, 158(2), 40-46. https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2013.787733 https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2013.787733

Nye, J. S. (2010). American and Chinese Power after the Financial Crisis. The Washington Quar-terly, 33(4), 143-153. https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660x.2010.516634 https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2010.516634

Press, D. G. (2001). Power, Reputation, and Assessments of Credibility during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Www.researchgate.net. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daryl_Press/publication/228770322_Power_Reputation_and_Assessments_of_Credibility_During_the_Cuban_Missile_Crisis/links/587f7e7608ae4445c072586b/Power-Reputation-and-Assessments-of-Credibility-During-the-Cuban-Missile-Crisis.pdf

Sanders, R. (2016). Norm Proxy War and Resistance Through Outsourcing: The Dynamics of Transnational Human Rights Contestation. Human Rights Review, 17(2), 165-191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-016-0399-1 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-016-0399-1

Shearer, D. (1998). Private Armies and Military Intervention. Routledge & CRC Press. https://www.routledge.com/Private-Armies-and-Military-Intervention/Shearer/p/book/9780198294405

SNYDER, G. H. (1997). Product Details. Cornell University Press. https://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/book/9780801434020/alliance-politics/#bookTabs=1

Teson, F. (1998). A Philosophy of International Law. In PhilPapers. Westview Press. https://philpapers.org/rec/TESAPO

Warhane, P. H., & Freeeman, R. E. (1998). THE BLACKWELL ENCYCLOPEDIA OF MAN-AGEMENT BUSINESS ETHICS. http://dspace.vnbrims.org:13000/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4410/1/The%20Blackwell%20Encyclope-dia%20of%20Management%2C%20Business%20Ethics%20%28Blackwell%20Encyclopaedia%20of%20Management%29%20%28Volume%202%29.pdf

الحروب بالوكالة والقانون الدولي

زايد علي زايد الغواري[1]

ملخص البحث:

إن تصاعد الحروب الأهلية وما خلفته من خسائر كبيرة في الأرواح البشرية والمادية دفعني إلى طرح فكرة إجراء هذه الدراسة. سعى البحث إلى دراسة الحرب بالوكالة من خلال عدسة القانون الدولي. استخدمت الدراسة طريقة مراجعة الأدبيات السردية والتصميم الاستكشافي للتحقيق في الأبحاث الموجودة. وأظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن الحروب بالوكالة هي أداة واسعة النطاق ورئيسية تستخدمها الولايات المتحدة وإيران وروسيا للتدخل في الشؤون الدولية لمختلف البلدان. وخلص التقييم إلى أن الصراعات بالوكالة ليست محظورة بموجب القانون الدولي، بل يوفر القانون الدولي إطارًا أخلاقيًا للتخفيف من المعاناة الإنسانية والأضرار المادية. يجب أن يستمر البحث، وينبغي تطبيق الأساليب الأساسية لتحليل القضية بشكل أعمق

الكلمات الدالة: السبب، المصلحة بالوكالة، الصراعات، الحرب بالوكالة، القانون الدولي الإنساني

(1) كلية القانون – جامعة الشارقة (الشارقة – الإمارات العربية المتحدة)

zzaid@sharjah.ac.ae