



Derecho Internacional Humanitario y nuevas formas de violencia

International Humanitarian Law and new forms of violence

Michelle Cervantes Figueroa

Universidad Hemisferios, michellec@uhemisferios.edu.ec, <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1503-4464>.
Michelle Cervantes Figueroa es profesora universitaria en la Universidad Hemisferios, en Ecuador. Posee un doctorado en Empresa por la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), España, así como una maestría en Relaciones Internacionales por la Universidad Pompeu Fabra y otra en Economía y Gestión por la UAB. Ha trabajado en instituciones públicas y privadas en Ecuador y ha realizado investigaciones para varias de estas organizaciones.

Isaac Plaza Peña,

Consulado General del Ecuador en Perú, jplaza@cancilleria.gob.ec
John Isaac Plaza Peña es un internacionalista ecuatoriano vinculado al Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Movilidad Humana del Ecuador. Actualmente, se encuentra como tercer secretario en el Consulado General del Ecuador en Perú. Obtuvo su título de maestría en la Universidad de Milán. Combina su sólida formación académica en relaciones internacionales con experiencia en la gestión pública y la diplomacia ecuatoriana.

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes the evolution and contemporary challenges of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) in the context of 21st-century armed conflicts, marked by transnational terrorism, non-state actors, cyberattacks, and the use of artificial intelligence (AI). Since the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Additional Protocols, IHL has sought to protect civilian populations and limit methods of warfare, but technological transformations and the emergence of asymmetric wars have revealed regulatory gaps that hinder its effective application. The study emphasizes that contemporary terrorism—decentralized and globalized—constitutes one of the greatest challenges for this legal framework, as it violates the principles of distinction and proportionality. Following the attacks of September

11, 2001, international instruments such as UN Security Council Resolution 1373 and the Inter-American Convention Against Terrorism were strengthened to curb the financing and expansion of extremist networks. However, new threats such as lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS) and cyberattacks have transformed the nature of conflict, questioning the validity of traditional humanitarian principles. Although AI can aid in detecting and preventing threats, it also raises ethical and legal dilemmas due to the lack of human control and the potential violation of fundamental rights. In this context, the article proposes strengthening international cooperation, integrating IHL with international criminal law and human rights, and creating technological governance mechanisms that ensure algorithmic transparency, meaningful human oversight, and the protection of civilians. In conclusion, the future effectiveness of IHL will depend on its ability to adapt and innovate in response to the multidimensional challenges of modern warfare, consolidating itself as a dynamic system that combines legal regulation with humanitarian ethics and the responsible use of technology.

RESUMEN

Este estudio examina el progreso y los retos actuales del Derecho Internacional Humanitario (DIH) ante los conflictos armados del siglo XXI, marcados por el terrorismo transnacional, los actores no estatales, los ciberataques y el uso de la inteligencia artificial (IA). Desde los Convenios de Ginebra de 1949 y los Protocolos Adicionales de 1977, el DIH ha buscado proteger a la población civil y limitar los métodos de guerra, pero las transformaciones tecnológicas y el surgimiento de guerras asimétricas han evidenciado vacíos normativos que dificultan su aplicación efectiva. El estudio destaca que el terrorismo contemporáneo, descentralizado y global, constituye uno de los mayores desafíos para este marco legal, ya que transgrede los principios de distinción y proporcionalidad. Tras los atentados del 11 de septiembre de 2001, se fortalecieron instrumentos internacionales como la Resolución 1373 de la ONU y la Convención Interamericana contra el Terrorismo, orientados a frenar el financiamiento y la expansión de redes extremistas. Sin embargo, la aparición de nuevas amenazas, como los sistemas de armas autónomas letales (LAWS) y los ataques cibernéticos, ha transformado la naturaleza de los conflictos, cuestionando la vigencia de los principios humanitarios tradicionales. La IA, aunque útil para la detección y prevención de amenazas, también plantea dilemas

éticos y jurídicos por la ausencia de control humano y la posible vulneración de derechos fundamentales. En este contexto, el artículo propone fortalecer la cooperación internacional, integrar el DIH con el derecho penal internacional y los derechos humanos, y crear mecanismos de gobernanza tecnológica que garanticen la transparencia algorítmica, el control humano significativo y la protección de los civiles. En conclusión, la efectividad futura del DIH dependerá de su capacidad de adaptarse e innovar frente a los desafíos multidimensionales de la guerra moderna, consolidándose como un sistema dinámico que combine la regulación jurídica con la ética humanitaria y el uso responsable de la tecnología.

Keywords

“International Humanitarian Law”, “terrorism”, “armed conflicts”, “cyberattacks”, “artificial intelligence”.

“Derecho Internacional Humanitario”, “terrorismo”, “conflictos armados”, “ciberataques”, “inteligencia artificial”.

Introduction

The literature consistently demonstrates that, while international humanitarian law (IHL) is widely accepted as applicable to new challenges such as cyberwarfare, autonomous weapons, drones, and non-state armed groups, there are significant doctrinal, practical, and enforcement gaps that limit its effectiveness. These gaps hinder its ability to fully address the complexity, speed, and particular risks of 21st-century conflicts, especially with regard to the protection of civilians, technological unpredictability, and legal accountability.

The process of developing and achieving universal acceptance of the principles and rules of international law has been long and complicated. One of the most significant problems is reaching consensus on the definition. However, the literature agrees that the most widely accepted concept of international humanitarian law comes from the Red Cross:

"To be precise, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) understands international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts to mean international rules, whether conventional or customary, specifically intended to solve humanitarian problems arising directly from armed conflicts, whether international or not,

and limiting, for humanitarian reasons, the right of the parties to the conflict to use the methods and means of warfare of their choice and protect persons and property affected or likely to be affected by the conflict (Gussing-Sapina, 2007)."

The conceptualization spread especially in the 20th century, both in the context of international humanitarian law and in the spheres of human rights and international criminal law. Fernández de Casadevante (2009) argues that the consideration of the person or individual as a victim of a violation has only taken place very recently and in specific sectors of the international legal system.

Thus, for example, countless conceptualizations of humanitarian law have emerged, but the vast majority of them have the same essence. In this research, international humanitarian law will be understood as the set of rules whose purpose, in times of armed conflict, is, on the one hand, to protect persons who do not participate or are unable to participate in hostilities and, on the other hand, to limit the methods and means of waging war (International Committee of the Red Cross, 2004).

The history of IHL begins with a state phase if one wishes to establish a historical path for international humanitarian law. For example, military leaders instructed their troops to honor the lives of captured adversaries, treat them with dignity, and avoid attacks on the enemy civilian population (Kalshoven & Zegveld, 2012).

Kalshoven & Zegveld (2012) highlight that the codification of IHL began with the efforts of figures such as Henry Dunant, whose testimony of the suffering of wounded soldiers at the Battle of Solferino in 1859 led to the creation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and, subsequently, to the signing of the first Geneva Convention in 1864. This convention laid the foundations for modern IHL by establishing rules for the protection of the wounded and medical personnel on the battlefield.

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, IHL continued to develop with the adoption of the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907. These conventions introduced rules for the conduct of hostilities, including the prohibition of certain types of weapons and tactics considered inhumane. Swinarski (1984) points out that these conventions marked a significant advance by addressing not only the protection of

wounded combatants, but also the regulation of the methods and means of warfare.

With the passage of time and the emergence of more complex conflicts, especially during the First and Second World Wars, it became clear that IHL needed to be revised and expanded to effectively address the realities of modern warfare. This need led to the revision of the Geneva Conventions in 1949, which extended protection to prisoners of war, shipwrecked sailors, and, for the first time, the civilian population, establishing a broader and more up-to-date regulatory framework.

The second half of the 20th century saw the most significant advance in IHL with the adoption of the Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions in 1977. These instruments extended the scope and reach of IHL, for example, by including the protection of victims of non-international armed conflicts, an aspect that had not previously received attention in conventional law literature.

According to Kalshoven and Zegveld (2012), the Additional Protocols responded to the growing relevance of internal conflicts and the involvement of non-state actors, reinforcing the need to ensure broader humanitarian protection and establishing rules on the distinction between combatants and civilians, as well as on the prohibition of indiscriminate attacks.

Over the past few decades, IHL has attempted to evolve to respond to emerging challenges, such as the use of new weapons technologies, including drones and autonomous weapons, and the proliferation of non-state actors.

Artificial intelligence (AI) has also become a transformative force in international security and contemporary military operations. In the field of counterterrorism, its applications range from predictive surveillance and social media analysis to the deployment of autonomous systems on the battlefield. However, its use poses unprecedented challenges for international humanitarian law (IHL)

Likewise, the creation of international criminal tribunals, such as the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Court (ICC), has strengthened the application of IHL by holding individuals accountable for serious violations, such as war crimes and crimes against humanity,

demonstrating an attempt to consolidate enforcement and sanctioning mechanisms.

However, there is currently unprecedented non-traditional conflict. There is no doubt that today's civilian population suffers greater consequences from armed conflict than in other periods of history.

Indeed, while it is known that international humanitarian law (IHL) seeks to limit the consequences of armed conflict on people and regulate the means and procedures of combat, it is challenged when new forms of armed violence emerge.

Therefore, this analysis argues that IHL has been slow to adapt to new challenges of violence such as terrorism, new weapons technologies, and non-state armed groups, which, in hindsight, test its effectiveness and scope.

It will therefore be important to provide a deductive and exploratory approach to the emergence of IHL and the legal bodies issued in this regard, and to apply a critical and synthetic analysis of the evolution of scenarios of armed violence.

New scenarios of armed violence

As mentioned by Ibarz, Enric s/f, the international system is currently dominated by hard-line political considerations such as: redefinition of security, strategic interests, military campaigns, allies, and enemies (Ibarz). Consequently, it is the states themselves that have constructed and continue to construct international norms, with the primary objective of protecting the interests and general objectives of the state (Fernández de Casadevante Romaní, 2009).

Certainly, there is much talk today about new conflicts. According to Abad (2009), most of these are internal in nature, although this does not prevent them from having transnational or internationalized elements. Similarly, they can be asymmetrical, unlike in the past when wars were fought between states with military apparatuses that had a certain degree of equality. Finally, unconventional weapons and methods of combat

such as terrorism, which mainly produces civilian victims (Abad, 2009).

Scholars such as José Salmón (2003) describe 21st-century international relations as marked by growing global interdependence, where state and non-state actors are increasingly interconnected in a complex network of political, economic, and social exchanges (Salmón, 2003).

In this sense, according to the same author, 21st-century wars will unfold between states and non-state actors with sufficient economic and organizational strength. This is what other scholars such as Galtung (1996) have called third-generation conflicts, which, unlike first- and second-generation conflicts involving territorial or ideological issues, involve ethnic, religious, or cultural identities, where perceptions and emotions play a fundamental role (Galtung, 1996).

Terrorism

Terrorism is a violent and political phenomenon that seeks to generate fear and influence through violence or the threat of violence. Abad (2009) defines it as the use of force directed at the civilian population in order to pressure governments or societies to change a policy or power structure. This act of violence is aimed at creating a state of terror that will bring about a change in existing conditions (Abad A., 2009).

Heisbourg (2002) adds that terrorism not only pursues material or territorial objectives, but is also based on deep ideological beliefs that justify the use of violence to achieve power (Heisbourg, 2002).

The motivations that drive terrorist groups are diverse and may be related to politics, religion, nationalism, or even revenge. According to Dómine (2006), terrorist groups sometimes feel marginalized or powerless in the face of larger power structures and resort to violence as a means of resistance. In many cases, extremist ideologies serve as justification for violent acts, whether to liberate a nation or to impose a religious vision (Dómine, 2006).

Finally, Thieux (2005) points out that terrorists often believe that violence is a legitimate response to perceived injustice, which makes their violence seen as a tool for change or liberation (Thieux, 2005).

Evolution of terrorism

Terrorism has its origins in radical movements of the 19th century, when anarchist groups in Europe began to use violence as a means of fighting state oppression.

In the 20th century, terrorism underwent a transformation with the rise of separatist and national liberation groups, such as the Irish Republican Army (IRA) and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which adopted terrorist methods in their struggles for independence in their respective territories.

Dómine (2006) explains that these groups began to use terrorism not only as a means of attack, but also as a way to raise awareness of their causes among the international community. In this context, terrorist violence was perceived, in some cases, as a legitimate response to foreign occupation and political repression (Dómine, 2006).

Throughout history, there have been several cases of terrorism that have stood out both for the magnitude of their attacks and their geopolitical implications. The attack on September 11, 2001, carried out by the terrorist organization Al Qaeda, is probably the most significant and well-known event.

This attack, which resulted in the deaths of nearly 3,000 people, marked a turning point in the global fight against terrorism. Abad (2009) emphasizes that this attack transformed the way the world perceives terrorism, as it showed that terrorist organizations could operate transnationally and carry out attacks with a global impact (Abad A., 2009).

Other notable examples include the March 11, 2004 attacks in Madrid, perpetrated by a radical Islamist group, and the 2005 attacks in London.

According to Thieux (2005), these attacks not only demonstrated the destructive capacity of terrorist groups, but also their ability to mobilize radicalized individuals in various parts of the world (Thieux, 2005).

Similarly, these attacks demonstrated the growing destructuring of traditional terrorist organizations and the emergence of small, autonomous cells operating in a decentralized manner. This change in tactics has been one of the main characteristics of contemporary terrorism.

The evolution of terrorism has been largely influenced by technological advances and globalization. In the early stages of modern terrorism, terrorist groups used relatively simple methods, such as bombs and kidnappings, to achieve their goals. Heisbourg (2002) points out that, although these methods remained effective, globalization allowed terrorist groups to broaden their operational horizons, moving from local attacks to larger-scale actions with an international reach (Heisbourg, 2002).

With the advent of the internet and social media, terrorism has taken on a much more complex global dimension. Dómine (2006) highlights that terrorist groups can now recruit, finance, and coordinate attacks through digital platforms, allowing them to escape the control of national governments (Dómine, 2006).

Similarly, the spread of extremist ideologies online has facilitated the radicalization of individuals around the world, who often operate independently, without being directly connected to large terrorist organizations.

The evolution of tactics has also led to a change in targets. According to Thieux (2005), while terrorist groups in the past focused on specific symbolic or political targets, today's attacks seek to generate a global psychological impact, creating panic and destabilization. In addition, the use of techniques such as suicide bombings and cyberattacks has allowed terrorist groups to adapt to new technological realities, making it more difficult to predict or prevent their actions (Thieux, 2005).

Terrorism in the 21st Century

Terrorism in the 21st century has taken on more sophisticated and globalized forms. The emergence of groups such as the Islamic State (ISIS) has demonstrated the ability of terrorists to create a virtual caliphate and attract followers from around the world.

Abad (2009) points out that extremist Islamist ideology has spread rapidly, using online platforms to mobilize individuals toward violence. These groups seek not only to impose a religious order, but also to create a global psychological impact by carrying out attacks that affect both Western countries and regions of the Middle East (Abad A., 2009).

The fight against terrorism has also evolved, with an approach that includes stricter security measures and the use of artificial intelligence technologies that allow millions of posts to be filtered to detect extremist content, hate speech, or propaganda videos. Platforms such as Meta or X (Twitter) apply trained algorithms to remove messages that promote violence (OSCE, 2023).

Heisbourg (2002) mentions that it is essential to address the social and economic conditions that fuel terrorism, such as exclusion, poverty, and lack of education, in order to prevent its spread (Heisbourg, 2002). This perspective has influenced the development of international policies focused not only on repression but also on promoting dialogue and global cooperation.

Evolution of international humanitarian law over the last decade

International humanitarian law (IHL) has undergone a remarkable evolution over the last ten years, particularly due to the growth and expansion of terrorist acts worldwide. As the threats of transnational terrorism and the use of new technologies such as cyberattacks intensify, IHL has had to adapt to mitigate the effects of terrorism and provide a legal framework to protect civilians, combatants, and critical infrastructure.

In this context, various international conventions and resolutions, promoted by organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and the Organization of American States (OAS), have been essential in developing regulations to counter these threats.

The rise of international terrorism since the attacks of September 11, 2001, along with the growth of terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda and the Islamic State (ISIS), forced international actors to review and strengthen the legal tools available to address this threat (López J., 2015).

In this context, the UN and other international organizations have played a key role in formulating new resolutions and conventions that seek to mitigate the effects of terrorism in the field of IHL. According to UN Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001), member states have an obligation to implement national measures to prevent and punish the financing of terrorism, the training of terrorist combatants, and international cooperation to carry out transnational

investigations. This resolution marks a significant change in the way international humanitarian law approaches the fight against terrorism.

Another aspect that has changed the context of IHL is artificial intelligence. This has had a significant impact on the areas of security and defense in recent years. In the context of the fight against terrorism, AI is a tool with great potential for preventing, detecting, and responding to terrorist threats. On the other hand, it can present significant challenges from an ethical and legal point of view, particularly in relation to international humanitarian law (IHL) as it applies to armed conflicts.

New International Conventions and Instruments relating to terrorism

One of the main instruments implemented in the last decade in relation to terrorism and IHL is the UN International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted in 1999, but with increasing application over the last ten years. This convention establishes a series of measures and principles that seek to cut off the sources of financing for terrorist organizations, which is essential to weakening their operational capabilities. According to Bassiouni (2014), international cooperation in the implementation of this convention has been key to limiting the resources of terrorist groups and has enabled progress in controlling activities such as money laundering (Bassiouni, 2014).

In addition, Additional Protocol III to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, adopted in 2005, has evolved to incorporate new threats arising from terrorism. Although this protocol is not exclusively focused on terrorism, it establishes rules that protect civilians in times of conflict and sets clear guidelines on the treatment of prisoners of war, including non-state combatants involved in terrorist acts. According to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), this protocol has been essential in ensuring the protection of human rights in the midst of armed conflicts involving acts of terrorism (International Committee of the Red Cross, 2017).

On the other hand, the work of the Organization of American States (OAS) in the fight against terrorism has focused on the adoption of regional frameworks for cooperation and the strengthening of security on the continent. An example of this is the 2002 Inter-

American Convention against Terrorism, which seeks to coordinate efforts among member states to combat terrorism in all its forms.

This convention has been crucial in the implementation of preventive measures and judicial cooperation among countries in the Americas. According to Pérez (2016), the OAS has played a prominent role in strengthening the international response to terrorism by facilitating the exchange of information among countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (Pérez, 2016).

The use of new technologies and cyberattacks: Challenges for IHL

Over the last ten years, one of the greatest challenges for international humanitarian law has been the emergence of new forms of terrorism, such as cyberattacks. Terrorist groups such as ISIS have used technology to carry out not only physical attacks, but also digital ones, which have affected both critical infrastructure and the stability of government and economic systems.

In this regard, Cyber-IHL, which refers to the use of International Humanitarian Law in the digital sphere, has emerged as a new area of focus. Although IHL did not traditionally cover cyber attacks, in the last decade it has been necessary to incorporate principles of proportionality, distinction, and necessity, also applied to cyber operations (Miller, 2019).

The UN has worked to create guidelines for applying IHL rules in cyberspace. In 2013, the UN Group of Governmental Experts issued a report on the application of international law in cyberspace, recognizing that cyberspace can be considered a modern battlefield in which IHL rules can and should be applied. This report has been fundamental to the evolution of international humanitarian law, as it establishes a framework in which cyberterrorist acts, such as attacks on energy systems or critical infrastructure, can be prosecuted and addressed on the basis of international law (UN, 2013).

On the other hand, the emergence of artificial intelligence in the field of defense and security has sparked a debate about its benefits and risks. AI could be considered a relevant ally for countries fighting terrorism, as it allows them to anticipate threats, dismantle extremist networks, and optimize military operations. However, it can also pose a direct challenge to the validity of international humanitarian

law, as terrorist groups use AI to create sophisticated propaganda and spread violent ideologies on a global scale (EFE, 2025).

Additionally, IHL establishes that parties to a conflict must distinguish between combatants and civilians and avoid disproportionate collateral damage. However, lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS), which can select and attack targets without human intervention, call into question the ability to comply with these principles (Pinho de Oliveira & Bueno Montilla, 2025).

Various organizations, including the ICRC, warn that machines lack moral judgment and empathy, and therefore cannot assess the humanitarian context of their actions. In 2023, more than 60 countries signed a Declaration on the Responsible Use of AI in the Military Field, reaffirming that human control must remain a non-negotiable principle.

In the field of warfare, AI optimizes target recognition, logistics, and tactical support. Autonomous or semi-autonomous drones, equipped with computer vision, are capable of carrying out surveillance, attack, or rescue missions with minimal human intervention (Moré Gili, 2023).

On the other hand, machine learning algorithms make it possible to identify patterns of suspicious behavior in large volumes of data, anticipating possible attacks. This predictive capability is based on the integration of information from multiple sources: digital communications, financial movements, and social media activity.

Big data analysis has made it possible to uncover terrorist cells before they act. However, the effectiveness of these systems depends on the quality of the data, which raises the risk of false profiling and discrimination against certain ethnic or religious groups (OSCE, 2023).

Conclusions

International humanitarian law (IHL), despite being an essential and well-established body of law, faces a landscape marked by unprecedented conflict. The evolution of armed conflicts, now characterized by terrorism, the participation of non-state actors, and the use of new technologies, has highlighted the limitations of IHL in responding effectively to these contemporary realities.

Although IHL has evolved since its inception with the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols, its capacity to regulate and protect victims in modern conflicts is insufficient in the face of new challenges. This regulatory gap not only jeopardizes the effectiveness of existing provisions, but also calls into question the relevance of IHL in an increasingly complex and dynamic global context.

In turn, this situation also highlights a crisis in the implementation and effectiveness of IHL, which, although it establishes clear principles on the distinction and protection of civilians, fails to ensure compliance in practice. This reality raises fundamental questions about the political will and capacity of States and other actors to enforce these rules.

82

Furthermore, the phenomenon of terrorism represents one of the greatest challenges to IHL. The decentralized and transnational nature of terrorist groups, together with their disregard for international norms, makes it difficult to regulate them under the traditional framework of IHL.

These actors not only employ tactics that deliberately target the civilian population, but also operate outside the reach of conventional mechanisms of sanction and accountability. In addition, the use of technology to carry out remote attacks, such as drones and autonomous weapons, raises ethical and legal questions that IHL has not comprehensively addressed.

While customary law and developments in international courts have attempted to fill these gaps, the speed at which conflicts evolve exceeds the capacity of the international legal system to adapt.

In this context, it is crucial to strengthen IHL enforcement mechanisms and encourage their adaptation to new realities. This implies not only a review of existing norms, but also greater integration with other legal systems, such as human rights and international criminal law. The convergence of these areas could provide a more comprehensive framework for addressing violations in armed conflicts and ensuring broader protection for victims. However, this process requires a firm commitment on the part of the international community and effective cooperation between States, international organizations, and civil society.

For its part, 21st-century terrorism represents a complex challenge that requires a comprehensive approach and a coordinated response at the global level. Instruments such as UN Security Council Resolution 1373, which obliges States to prevent and punish the financing of terrorism, are important advances. However, challenges remain in relation to cooperation between States, limited resources, and differences in national legal systems.

For these reasons, it is recommended that international cooperation between countries be strengthened, as it is essential for combating terrorism, especially in the areas of financing, attack prevention, and the capture of those responsible. International organizations should promote strategic alliances that include the exchange of intelligence, technology, and resources.

Artificial intelligence represents an unprecedented technological advance that is redefining international security and defense mechanisms against terrorism. Its ability to process massive amounts of data, detect patterns, and anticipate threats offers states an effective tool for preventing attacks. However, it also raises ethical and legal dilemmas that challenge the structure of international humanitarian law (IHL), especially regarding the protection of the civilian population and the responsibility of the actors involved (Cotino Hueso & Gómez de Ágreda, 2024). As the United Nations (2023) points out, AI can strengthen global peace and security only if it is developed under principles of transparency, meaningful human control, and respect for fundamental rights.

On the other hand, the use of lethal autonomous systems and predictive algorithms in military operations poses a risk of dehumanizing conflict. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC, 2023) warns that machines lack moral judgment and empathy, which are essential for applying the principles of distinction, proportionality, and humanity that underpin IHL. Similarly, the rise of AI-driven cyberattacks and mass surveillance jeopardizes basic rights such as privacy, freedom of expression, and personal integrity. In this sense, technology can become a double-edged sword: capable of protecting, but also of violating the humanitarian values it should safeguard.

Given this scenario, it is imperative that the international community adopt regulatory frameworks to govern the use of AI in war and counterterrorism contexts. It is necessary to promote technological

governance that guarantees accountability, algorithmic transparency, and effective human control at all stages of AI development and application (Pinho de Oliveira & Bueno Montilla, 2025). Likewise, cooperation between states, international organizations, and private actors must be strengthened to build a more secure and responsible digital environment. Only by striking a balance between innovation and ethics will it be possible to ensure that artificial intelligence truly contributes to the protection of humanity and the consolidation of sustainable peace (UN, 2023; OSCE, 2023).

It is imperative to strengthen IHL regulations to include specific provisions addressing modern forms of terrorism, such as cyberattacks. This involves developing protocols to protect critical infrastructure and digital systems, while ensuring respect for human rights.

This last recommendation would go hand in hand with the need to strengthen regional mechanisms such as the OAS, which should play a more active role in coordinating regional efforts, harmonizing legal frameworks, and strengthening the capacities of States.

The evolution of armed conflicts has tested the ability of IHL to adapt and respond to contemporary challenges. While it remains an essential legal framework, its future relevance will depend on its ability to innovate and consolidate itself as a dynamic and robust system. The fight against terrorism cannot be limited to repressive measures; it is necessary to address the structural causes of extremism, ensuring decent living conditions and equal opportunities for all people.

Ultimately, only through a comprehensive, multidimensional, and long-term strategy will it be possible to mitigate the impact of terrorism and ensure a more secure and stable future for generations to come.

References

- Abad, A. (2009). *El terrorismo y sus raíces profundas*. Editorial Universitaria.
- Abad, M. (2009). *TERRORISMO, DERECHO INTERNACIONAL HUMANITARIO Y CONFLICTOS ARMADOS ACTUALES*. Madrid.
- Aguilar, J. M. (Enero de 2021). *Revista de Estudios*

- Internacionales de la Universidad de Chile*. Obtenido de Retos y oportunidades en materia de ciberseguridad de América Latina frente al contexto global de ciberamenazas a la seguridad nacional y política exterior: <https://revistaei.uchile.cl/index.php/REI/article/view/57067/67159>
- Bassiouni, M. (2014). *International terrorism and the law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cassese, A. (2024). *International Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Comité Internacional de la Cruz Roja . (2004). *¿Qué es el derecho internacional humanitario?* Ginebra.
- Comité Internacional de la Cruz Roja . (2017). *International humanitarian law and the fight against terrorism*. .
- Comité Internacional de la Cruz Roja . (2018). *Torture in the fight against terrorism: A violation of international humanitarian law*.
- Comité Internacional de la Cruz Roja (CICR). (2023). *Las ciberoperaciones durante los conflictos armados*. <https://www.icrc.org/es/derecho-y-politicas/las-ciberoperaciones-durante-los-conflictos-armados>
- Dómine, J. (2006). *Terrorismo, política y sociedad: una reflexión crítica*. Ediciones AKAL.
- Cotino Hueso, L., & Gómez de Ágreda, Á. (2024). Criterios éticos y de derecho internacional humanitario en el uso de sistemas militares dotados de inteligencia artificial. *Novum Jus*, 18(1), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.14718/NovumJus.2024.18.1.9>
- EFE. (2025, 20 de agosto). *La ONU alerta de que el Estado Islámico usa la IA para reclutar yihadistas*. SWI swissinfo.ch. <https://www.swissinfo.ch/spa/la-onu-alerta-de-que-el-estado-isl%C3%A1mico-usa-la-ia-para-reclutar-yihadistas/89868225>
- Fernández de Casadevante Romani, C. (2009). *Las víctimas y el Derecho Internacional*. Universidad de Navarra .
- Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. Reino Unido : Sage Publications.
- Gussing-sapina, A. (2007). *Curso introductorio sobre derecho internacional humanitario*.
- Heisbourg, F. (2002). *El terrorismo: mitos y realidades*. Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.
- Ibarz, E. (s.f.). La guerra justa en la era del terror. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 81.
- Kalshoven, F., & Zegveld, L. (2012). *Constraints on the Waging of War, An Introduction to International Humanitarian Law*. Cambridge University Press.

- Leiva, E. (2015). Estrategias Nacionales de Ciberseguridad: Estudio Comparativo Basado en Enfoque Top-Down desde una Visión Global a una Visión Local. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ingeniería de Software*, 162.
- López, J. (2015). *Derecho Internacional Humanitario y terrorismo: retos contemporáneos*. Editorial Jurídica .
- Meron, T. (2006). *The Humanization of International Law*.
- Miller, R. (2019). *Cyber warfare and international humanitarian law*. Oxford University Press.
- Moré Gili, J. (2023, 5 de junio). *Inteligencia Artificial en el campo militar. La aterradora realidad*. Saturdays.AI. <https://saturdays.ai/2023/06/05/inteligencia-artificial-campo-militar/>
- Organización para la Seguridad y la Cooperación en Europa (OSCE). (2023). *Artificial Intelligence and P/CVERLT: Challenges and Opportunities – Key Findings*. <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/4/f/575877.pdf>
- ONU. (2013). *Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security*.
- ONU. (2019). *The protection of civilians in armed conflict: Addressing the challenges of contemporary warfare*.
- ONU. (2023). *Recomendación sobre la Ética de la Inteligencia Artificial*. París: UNESCO.
- Pérez, L. (2016). *La lucha contra el terrorismo en América Latina: El papel de la OEA*. Editorial OEA.
- Pinho De Oliveira, M. F., & Bueno Montilla, A. (2025). Aportes teóricos sobre el uso de la inteligencia artificial en los sistemas de armas autónomas desde la perspectiva del Derecho Internacional Humanitario. *Derecho Global. Estudios sobre Derecho y Justicia*, 10(29), 479–511. <https://doi.org/10.32870/dgedj.v10i29.809>.
- Pons Gamón, V. (2017). Internet, la nueva era del delito: cibercrimen, ciberterrorismo, legislación y ciberseguridad. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios de Seguridad*.
- Salmón, J. (2003). *Las relaciones internacionales en el siglo XXI: Retos y perspectivas*. Editorial Universitaria.
- Sancho Hirare, C. (2017). Ciberseguridad. Presentación del dossier. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios de Seguridad*, 8-9.
- Swinarski, C. (1984). *Studies and essays in international humanitarian law and Red Cross principles in honour of Jean Pictet*. Geneva: International Committee of the the Red Cross.

Thieux, M. (2005). *La lucha contra el terrorismo: Nuevas estrategias y desafíos*. Editorial Planeta.