

Islamic Jus in Bello; perfidy and ruses of war

Ahmed Abdul Rehman

Lecturer of Islamic Thought, History and Culture, AIOU Islamabad.

Ahmed.rehman@aiou.edu.pk

Ahmed Abdullah

Lecturer of Islamic Studies HED KPK

ahmedabdullahqureshi@gmail.com

Muhammad Umar Farooq

Ph.D. Scholar, Islamic Studies, AIOU, Islamabad

Farooqumar914@gmail.com

Abstract

Both perfidy and ruses of war are based on assuring the false belief to an adversary, but perfidy is prohibited being a misuse of law, like the improper use of ICRC emblems. While Ruses of war can be defined as the actions that are devised to make an opponent act recklessly and therefore are allowed if these acts are: not perfidious, do not infringe any rule of IHL, and have intent to deceive the adversary to a situation which is harmful to him corresponding to military advantage. Islamic law is an organized systematic legal system that already had set rulings for both perfidy and ruses of war long before modern international humanitarian law. From the Islamic point of view, the Holy Qur'an forbids breaking oaths after one has freely validated or verified them. The Prophet (PBUH) every time commanded his departing army to fight and prohibited them from cheating and breaking trust. The perfidy is prohibited even in reciprocity. Islamic jus in Bello prohibits almost all the practices which have been adding up to perfidious acts according to international law. There is a concept of "Ama'n" in classical Islamic literature, it means protection, which has detailed rulings. The violation of Ama'n is considered perfidy according to Islamic law. The first caliph of Islamic history Abu Bakr r.a, the conduct of Umar Farooq r.a, Ali r.a (fourth Caliph), and Muawiya r.a (Muslim leader) are most important. The jurists have a detailed discussion on the interpretation of these precedents, for example, Islamic scholars consider suicide attacks as perfidious as well as cyber warfare, based on falsehood is also forbidden.

Keywords: *Perfidy, Ruses of war, Islamic jus in Bello, jus in Bello, IHL, Islamic humanitarian law.*

Introduction

As it is claimed that Islam is a complete code of life. When someone explores Islamic scholarship on different matters, he got surprising facts on those matters, where Islam not only offers practical arrangements but also comprehensive and perfect solutions. This article examines the Islamic legal doctrines for warfare; specifically, the Perfidy and Ruses of war, which lies in the domain of Islamic laws of war. In the seventh century, more than fourteen hundred years ago, when the wars were not at such a big level and disaster level was very low compared to the modern warfare tools, at that time, Islam gave principles that were not only binding from a legal perspective but declare them the moral responsibilities on the individuals. That laws and rules, as we will examine, were very suitable for humanity, give the basis for modern international laws and play a basic role in developing moralities. Hans Kruse deliberately concludes after comparing both the legal systems i.e., Islamic legal teachings for warfare and the modern humanitarian warfare legal boundaries " More than eight centuries later, the positive international law of Europe had not yet attained the high level of humanitarization that the Islamic law of war possessed."

This article examines specifically Perfidy and Ruses of war. Perfidy is a term that is used in international humanitarian law.¹ However, Islamic law did not have this term, therefore in this context, we will take this terminology as it is defined by international law. So, here we will discuss these situations from the perspective of Islamic law. Moreover, we will examine the perfidy

and ruses of war according to the rulings for warfare and the methods of war (*Adaab ul Qital*) as instructed in Islamic law. Perfidy and ruses of war both confuse the adversary in understanding the situation, but perfidy is a misuse of law while the ruses of war do not consist of any such practices.

This research will take a few very important questions to proceed with this research study. For instance, is perfidy prohibited according to the Islamic rulings of warfare? Are ruses of war allowed in Islam? Do the Perfidious acts come into the Public International Law or Private International law from an Islamic perspective? And what does it will result or affect? Is there a need that Perfidy should be redefined based on Islamic jus in Bello? As Many Muslim countries are not participants in the Additional Protocol 1 to the Geneva Convention, is Islamic Law has some different approach or bound them and have restrictions in this regard? What are the Remedies for Perfidy in Islamic Law? These and some other similar questions need to be addressed for a better comprehension of Islamic international law and it will be the source for further research and development in the contemporary theories and practices of modern international law particularly humanitarian law. Modern humanitarian law has a dire need to be studied and researched as modern warfare has been changed in a very disastrous nature. Here, a detailed account has been dedicated to humanitarian law with special attention to the perfidy and ruses of war with a comparison of the humanitarian law of today with the Islamic code of war.

Perfidy

The perfidy is observed as having a customary character in international humanitarian law.² If we trace its roots in contemporary humanitarian law, the prohibition of perfidy as a formalized and specialized rule of war, evolved in 1863 when Abraham Lincoln, the president of the United States at that time, signed instructions to the armed forces during the civil war to dictate them that how they should conduct themselves during the war. These instructions and orders are known as Lieber code.³ This code was formed and developed as instructions and guidelines to the fighting forces instead of legislation. The prohibition of perfidy under this code closely resembled a set of codified general principles than specific prohibitions of perfidy. However, it was undoubtedly a significant starting point for the prohibition of perfidy in contemporary international law.

The next significant development in this regard was the “Brussels Declaration 1874” and “Oxford Manual 1880” which appeared and addressed perfidy more specifically. Although this was a very significant development in the case of Perfidy on Lieber code, offering somewhat greater specificity, still it lacks a technical definition for perfidy. Both, the 1874 Brussels Declaration, and the 1880 Oxford Manual reflect an important development concerning perfidy, and both greatly influenced the successful attempts to encode the law of war and hostilities. Another milestone achievement in the reforms of warfare and prohibition of unlawful acts was “The Hague Regulations 1899”.

The perfidy and treachery in Hague Regulations are discussed deliberately in Article 23. This article, getting a hint from the enlisted methods of war in Oxford Manual specifically that are forbidden and under this list, it includes causing death or injury of a person from the enemy's army or country deceitfully and “to inappropriate use of military insignia and attire of the enemy, including the national flag and the truce flag, moreover idiosyncratic badges of Geneva Convention.”

We find that the treatment of perfidy in the Hague Regulations is rather generic when we look at the Libeler Code, the Brussels Declaration, and the Oxford Manual. Additionally, it ignores the Manual's and the Libeler Code's allusions to murder and pretended surrender as prime examples of betrayal.

The codification also has been conducted on perfidy and ruses of war in the 1907 Hague Convention on land warfare⁴, which closely routes the definition by the Oxford Manual and the Brussels Declaration. As well as the 1907 Convention presents a few examples of forbidden practices and prohibited conduct, for instance, assassinating or wounding opponents deceptively or by inappropriate use of a sign or flag of truce, as well as acting or doing other similar things.⁵ Finally, in 1977 additional protocol I to Geneva Conventions define perfidy. The Article 37(1) of the Additional Protocol to the Geneva Convention States:

“Killing or capturing the opponent by resorting to deception is

illegal. Any action that means to gain the confidence of the adversary and to bring him in believing situation that he is obliged to do so, or force to act as said, giving them shelter in the international legislation in the time of armed conflicts in order to get his confidence and deceive later is also included in the perfidy.

The following acts are examples of perfidy:

a) Betraying someone with the intention of negotiation under the flag or truce of surrender.

b) The faking of any disability by wounds or sickness.

c) The pretending of civilian, non-combatant status; and

d) the act of pretending to be protected by the use of symbols, uniforms, or signs belonging to neutral, non-conflict-party states or the United Nations.”⁶

Explanation of the definition

An act can be perfidious if that act consists of two things,⁷ first, if it is getting the confidence or trust of an enemy or adversary to make sure him that he is in protection or bound him by the rules of international law applicable in an armed conflict and he is entitled⁸ to and compelled to act accordingly⁸ The second element consists of the intention of betraying the created confidence.

As perfidy is restricted only to those acts that go beyond the misuse of law, is designed to betray a confidence.⁹

Therefore, perfidy consists of three cumulative elements; firstly, there should be an intentional act. According to this, a person will not be considered to have committed a perfidious act until he commits an identifiable act intentionally. Secondly, the action must be done to gain the trust of the enemy to make him believe that he is under protection from attack or get the confidence of the adversary that for protection from the attacker he is obliged to act accordingly. Therefore, under this element, an act will not be considered perfidy if it is not inviting the belief or confidence of the enemy that he is protected or is compelled to accord protection according to the rules of International Humanitarian Law, rather it is assuring him some other type of belief. For example, assuring the adversary that he will get some sort of monetary benefit, or any other thing will not be considered perfidy. As well as those acts will also not be considered perfidy if they are appealing to the belief of the enemy under rules of war other than IHL and not applicable to armed conflict.

Thirdly, the action performed which is to gain the confidence of trust of the adversary must be done in a way that compels the adversary to consciously breach that trust and conviction, however, it should be subjective or objective if it's not clear. According to this element of perfidy, an act will not be perfidious if that is committed in a way that does not enable the striker to

deceive the trust of the enemy. Commentators have observed that the unsuccessful attempts of assassinating, harming, or capturing do not include in the prohibited perfidy.¹⁰

Another result that can be derived from article 37 is that every kind of perfidy is not prohibited. Only deception and that violation of confidence are prohibited which results in killing, injuring, or capturing the enemy. Otherwise, such acts will not fall under the prohibition; no matter whether elements of perfidy are there or not. The committee charged with addressing perfidy's findings ultimately concludes that Article 37 does not prohibit perfidy, it just stops killing, wounding, or capturing the enemy under the resort to perfidy.¹¹ So, we can divide perfidy into two types, first is Normal Perfidy which consists of all actions, doesn't matter what the consequences are, that give an invitation to the opponent to act according to the Laws of war protection, followed by a malicious deception of that trust. The second is complex perfidy which includes perfidious acts that end in murdering, injuring, or capturing the rivals. However, both are not forbidden in international humanitarian law rather the second type is prohibited under contemporary international law.

2. Ruses of War

The Hague Regulations respect the Laws and Customs of War on Land (annexed to Conventions II of 1899 and IV of 1907), Article 24 states that ruses of war are permissible (without defining ruse of war).¹² The recent legal

definition according to the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions (1977). Art. 37 (2) states as follows,

“This clause defines ruses of war as actions intended to mislead an adversary or convince him to take reckless action, but which do not violate any rule of international law pertaining to armed conflict and which are not perfidious since they do not give the impression that an adversary will be protected by that law.”

Explanation

There are three elements for permissible ruses of war. First, the act intends to deceive the adversary into a situation that is harmful to him corresponding to military advantage. The deceiving act must not be in breach of the international law applicable in international armed conflicts.¹³ Last but not least is the exclusion of all acts which fall within the definition of perfidy as defined by the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention.

The distinguishing line

It is very deliberately stated in contemporary humanitarian law that any act cannot be counted as perfidious if that did not result in the capturing, injuring, or killing of an adversary.¹⁴ Both article 23 clause (b) of the Hague Convention and article 37 clause 1 of the Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Convention

are unique in that they essentially do not condemn the act of perfidy, but instead the consequence and result of the perfidious act as a method of warfare.¹⁵ Therefore, it can be observed that the distinguishing and separating line between both is razor thin. For instance, it never prohibits the perfidious act which might result in some sort of disaster other than human lives as the demolition of a military facility, such as a building.¹⁶

The other significant dimension of this debate is the non-international armed conflict, which is still not settled. However, examining the different cases as well as different examples of ruses of war and perfidy result in the opinion that the existing definitions have various ambiguities and severely lack clarity. In the following section, we will go through some case studies to analyze the difference between both, the perfidy and the ruses of war in domestic and international armed conflicts.

Case Studies

This article is analyzing two cases that can be considered very challenging and comprehensive cases. Both cases fall in the blur area between the perfidy and ruses of war as having been defined by modern humanitarian law. In 2008, when Colombian hostage rescue mission has been executed. After a long-armed conflict between the Government of Columbia and the “Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC; Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia)”¹⁷ With the aid of a global humanitarian NGO,

the government intended to gradually persuade the Revolutionary Forces (FARC) to release its hostages. The outcome was the capture of two guerrilla combatants by the Columbian armed forces, who pretended to be journalists and members of an imaginary NGO, drove two white helicopters while flashing a phoney logo, and had one armed soldier don a tabard with an emblem that closely resembled the Red Cross.¹⁸

If we examine the whole process according to the Additional Protocol I's definitions for ruses of war and perfidy. It is observed that this practice was permissible ruses for the Columbian operation unless they captured the two fighters of FARC.¹⁹ This act by the Colombian armed forces is just a sort of perfidy that is prohibited by the definitions of perfidy. Therefore, do only 'Recognized' NGOs Matter?²⁰

Perfidy in Islamic *jus in Bello*

In the literature of Islamic law, we did not find the term perfidy, etc. however, another term is used for some similar cases. In Islamic law, the term *Ghadr* is used for Perfidious acts. *Ghadr* has a broader meaning than Perfidy, in the sense of, it includes the breach of promise and violence of peace constituted or given pledge during the war. The Quran commands, "Alternately if you have cause to believe that someone with whom you have a covenant will betray you, you should fairly return the favor as Allah truly detests betrayers."²¹

Islamic Jus in bello; perfidy and ruses of war

The holy prophet (peace be on him) had strictly prohibited treachery or perfidy in all situations, whether normal or during the war is going on. His successors implemented and executed his orders as he instructed without any exception or indulgence. He (peace be on him) has been reported to have reiterated this ban on numerous occasions.²² In the commands to his departing army, he said, “Fight in Allah's way and the name of Allah. Fight back against those who deny Allah. Fight, but do not violate trust or commit fraud, (...).”²³ at any other time, while instructing the army led by Abdul Rahman b. ‘Awf, he said, “O son of ‘Awf! Take it [the flag]. Fight each one of you in the way of Allah, and fight the disbelievers. Never, however, betray trust or act treacherously. (...).This is what Allah has commanded and what His Messenger has done for your guidance. This is what Allah has commanded and what His Messenger has done for your guidance.”²⁴ In the incident of Abu Jandal (d. 18/639), the Prophet (peace be on him) politely advised him, “Treason is unacceptable for us, even if it means saving a Muslim from polytheists.”²⁵

Abu Bakr r.a. (the first Caliph) practiced these and also instructed the guidelines for the warfare one time he stated these words:

“I offer you the Ten Commandments: Stop, O people, so that I can give you ten battlefield guidelines. Avoid deceit and stay on the straight track. (...).”²⁶

Therefore, in the above-stated facts, Perfidy can be defined according to

Islamic law as:

“Any action or hint intended to undermine the adversary's faith that he is entitled to or required to provide protection under any laws or customs that apply in armed combat.”

Accordingly, Islamic *jus in bello* has two types of perfidy acts:

(a) Acts Permanently prohibited as Perfidy:

Imam Muhammad al-Shaybani stated that just as telling a lie is not favored even in the necessary it will be considered perfidy during the war. He argues that what was allowed even in hazardous cases was *taqiyah* (equivocation), not *kidhb* (falsehood).²⁷ It is reported that the Caliph Muawiyah r.a (41–60/661–680), while he was sending his troops to attack his enemies, the Romans, although both parties were in a contract and it was the time when the time of contract was on its end because he intended to launch an attack as soon as it ran out. ‘Amr b. ‘Anbasah (r.a) stopped them and advised caliph Muawiyah r.a as saying these words “Allah is great.” Upon Caliph’s query, He responded by citing a statement made by the Prophet (peace be upon him) to the effect of “There shouldn't be any [unilateral] alterations or changes made to an agreement that someone has made with another organization until its expiration date. Give the other party reciprocal notice of termination of the agreement if there is a chance that they may breach it. By way of this instance,

the jurists decide that it is best to steer clear of any behavior that even somewhat approaches treason.

(b) Acts Prohibited as Perfidy due to Custom or pledge given by Muslim to Adversary:

If there is any pledge given by the Islamic government or any individual from the Muslim army, that is binding on all the Muslims if that does not contradict the customary practices of Muslims, in case that is provided by any individual. If anyone violates that will be considered Ghadr. Any person who violates such a commitment is considered a hypocrite by the holy Prophet (SAWW). (*Munafiq*).²⁸

6. Ruses according to the Islamic Law

It is reported that the Prophet (peace be on him) has described that war is based on a ruse.²⁹ According to Abu Zakariyya Yahya bin Sharaf al-Nawawi (d. 676/1300), “it does not lead to breaching a treaty or a pledge.”³⁰ It has been observed in the life of the holy prophet SAW that his companions used words capable of different meanings. This is called equivocation, [*Tawriyah*’ in Arabic], and is allowed as well.³¹ As well as it is well known in the life of the holy prophet SAW, that he never discloses his destination during the battles but rather chooses a different direction to hide his plans.³²

It is reported that when ‘Ali b. Abi Talib r.a (d. 40/661) dueled with ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Wud (d. 05/626) in the Battle of Ditch in the year 5/626, Ali r.a. said to 'Amr, "I came out to fight you solely," as he peered over his shoulder. Amr turned around to see who 'Ali was referring to, and 'Ali profited from that turn of events and said: “War is all about the ruse.”³³ Another incident of this battle of trench, was when the Meccans with their supporter Arab tribes gathered, to attack Madinah, and besieged the holy city of Medina. The Prophet (peace be on him) had a treaty with the Jewish tribe of *Banu Quraysh*. However, on the persuasion of the Jewish tribes in the coalition they, betraying the Prophet (peace be on him), silently allied themselves with the Meccans. Meanwhile, Nuaym bin Masud r.a (d. 36/656), came to the holy prophet (peace be on him) to accept Islam. He told the Prophet (peace be on him) that *Banu Quraydah* had betrayed the Muslims and had allied with the Quraysh. The Prophet (peace be on him) asserted, “Maybe we have made them do so” Nuaym returned to Abu Sufyan (d. 32/652), [head of the Quraysh] and said, “Muhammad believes that he has asked *Banu Quraydah* for that” Abu Sufyan asked Nuaym, “have you heard Muhammad said that?” Nuaym’s affirmative answer put Abu Sufyan in a dilemma, whether to trust *Banu Quraydah* or not, which finally became the cause of the nullification of the accord. The Prophet (peace be on him) used the word which gave the whole sentence dual meanings, and it gave the needed results giving the allied forces an impression as if his alliance with *Banu Quraydah* is still intact and they must not fully

7. The differentiating line between the Perfidy and Ruses in Islamic jus in bello

Imam Al-Nawawi reported that there is almost a consensus among the jurists that ruses are allowed in a war as long as these do not breach a treaty or a pledge. This has been stated in a hadith narrated by Numan bin Bashir (r.a) that Legal and unlawful items are both evident, but there are also some questionable (suspect) things between the two. Therefore, anyone who abandons those dubious topics out of fear of sinning will undoubtedly stay away from what is obviously against the law. As well as whosoever, commit these suspicious things or doubtful matters deliberately, is likely to do what is illegal explicitly. Sins are Allah's Hima or private pasture, and everyone who herds (his sheep) close to it runs the risk of entering it at a sandy moment.³⁵

8. Islamic mechanism for the rule of law in war

As we know this fact Islam has outlawed all types of wars except the Jihad. Jihad is consisting of some restrictions and bindings which force the armed forces under jihad to not commit any kind of activity which is Islamically not allowed. The first caliph of Islam and his companions, following the teachings of the holy Qur'an and the sunnah of the holy prophet

(SAW), laid down a detailed account of specific rules and regulations for warfare in the context of holy combat and war to establish justice.³⁶ These rulings are also applicable to the persons who are participating in the battle on an individual level because its status of being jihad is a kind of worship and bound to some specific hard and fast rules which may be called the war ritual.³⁷

While discussing this phenomenon, Majid Khadduri states that “If the siyar is seen to represent the Islamic law of nations, it is merely one chapter of the Islamic corpus juris and applies to both those who sought to uphold Islamic justice and those who did not.”³⁸ According to the Islamic point of view, these rules are supposed to be applicable on a reciprocity basis but are binding as being the orders and guidelines of the almighty Allah to the individuals for the sake of the almighty. These principles and norms are reflected throughout the life of the Holy Prophet (peace be on him) and his Caliphs as well as all the companions during their wars. In the words of Majid Khadduri: “The siyar was a self-imposed code of conduct with moral or religious punishments that were binding on its adherents even when the rules would have been against their best interests. Except in cases where non-Muslims desired to employ Islamic justice, it was not largely founded on reciprocity or consent.”³⁹ The Islamic rules applied when Muslim nations go to war. However, mere non-observance of a rule does not render it useless.

Conclusions

This study concluding remarks observed that Perfidy and Ruses of war in modern *jus in bello* rely on results, while Islamic *jus in bello* prohibits the act from the very beginning if the intent is wrong. As well as almost all the contemporary definitions could not grasp an adequate criterion that can make a clear distinguishing line between the perfidy and ruses of war. Obviously, due to the lack of an adequate distancing line between both, modern international law or more concisely humanitarian law fails to provide the combatant forces a clear direction to control their conduct and practices on the battlefield. Furthermore, the existing definitions and their justification were created using outdated ideas about what combat is. They are particularly unprepared to handle contemporary problems like drone warfare, cyberwarfare, and unconventional fighting forces. And can be done more adequately by taking the principles of Islamic *jus in Bello*. Islamic principles are very clear without any ambiguity, as well as have practical examples in history.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

- ¹ Article 37(1), Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions.
- ² Henckaerts, Jean-Marie, and Louise Doswald-Beck. "The Principle of Distinction." *Customary International Humanitarian Law* 1 (2005): 1-76.
- ³: Articles 16 and 101 thereof read thus: "*Military necessity . . . admits of deception, but disclaims acts of perfidy and, in general, military necessity does not include any act of hostility which makes the return to peace unnecessarily difficult. While deception in war is admitted as a just and necessary means of hostility and is consistent with honorable warfare, the common law of war allows even capital punishment for clandestine or treacherous attempts to injure an enemy, because they are so dangerous, and it is difficult to guard against them.*" *Lieber code 1863*.
- ⁴ The earlier code which prohibits perfidy is Lieber Code 1863, Art. 16. and Art. 101. Therefore, The Code does not define treachery, or perfidy for that matter.
- ⁵ Convention between the United States and Other Powers Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land art. 23(b).
- ⁶ *Geneva Conventions Additional Protocol I* (1977); Art. 37 (1).
- ⁷ Max Planck Encyclopaedia of Public International Law, s.v "Perfidy" (Vera Ruslnova).
- ⁸ *Id.*
- ⁹ *Id.*
- ¹⁰ Morris, Matthew G. "Hiding amongst a Crowd and the Illegality of Deceptive Lighting." *Naval L. Rev.* 54 (2007): 235.
- ¹¹ XV 1977 Additional Protocols Official Records, Supra note 45(382)
- ¹² Convention between the United States and Other Powers Respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land art. 24, Oct. 18, 1907, 36 Stat. 2277.
- ¹³ Max Planck Encyclopaedia of Public International Law, s.v "Ruses of War" (Knut Ipsen).
- ¹⁴ Erickson, Richard John. "Protocol I: A Merging of the Hague and Geneva Law of Armed Conflict." *Va. J. Int'l L.* 19 (1978): 557.
- ¹⁵ Henderson, Ian, Jordan Den Dulk, and Angeline Lewis. "Emerging Technology and Perfidy in Armed Conflict." (2015). 22.
- ¹⁶ Matthew J. Greer, "*Redefining Perfidy*", *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 242-277.
- ¹⁷ John C. Dehn, *Permissibly Perfidy? Analyzing the Colombian Hostage Rescue, the Capture of Rebel Leaders and the World's Reaction*, 6 J. INT'L CRIM. JUST. 627, 629-30 (2008).
- ¹⁸ *Id.*
- ¹⁹ *Id.* at 642.
- ²⁰ Matthew J. Greer, "*Redefining Perfidy*", *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 242-277.
- ²¹ Al-Quran 8/58.
- ²² Muhammad Munir, "Suicide Attacks and Islamic Law," *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 90, no. 1 (2008), 82-84.
- ²³ Al-Shawkani, *Nayl al-Awtar*, vol. 7, 246.

²⁴ Abdul Malik Ibn Hisham, *al Shrah al-Nabawiyyah*, vol 2, 632.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ Al-Sarkhasi, *Sharh al Siyar al Kabir*, vol. 1, 184–185.

²⁸ Muslim bin al Hajjaj, *Sahih Muslim*, Kitab al Jihad wal Siyar, Bab Tahrim al Ghadr.

²⁹ Muhammad bin Ismail al Bukhari, *Sahih Al Bukhari*, Kitab al Jihad wal Siyar, Bab al-harb Khudaah.

³⁰ Abu Zakariyya Yahya bin Sharaf al Nawawi, “*Al Minhaj*”, vol 9, 218.

³¹ Muhammad Munir. "The Prophet (Peace Be on Him)'S Merciful Reforms in the Conduct of War: The Prohibited Acts. *“Insights 2*, No. 2/3 (2009): 221.

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Al-Sarakhsi. "*Sharh kitab al-siyar al-kabir li-Muhammad Ibn Al-Hassan Al Shaybani.*" Ma'had al-makhtutat bi-gami'at al-duwal al-'arabiyyah, Cairo (1971). 90.

³⁵ *Sahih Bukhari*, 1929, narrated by Nau'man bin Bashir.

³⁶ Abdullahi Ahmed An-Na'im, *Islamic Law, International Relations, and Human Rights: Challenge and Response*, 20 *Cornell Int'l L.J.* 317-324.

³⁷ Karima Bennoune, "Humanitarian Law in Islamic Jurisprudence." *Mich. J. Int'l L.* 15 (1993): 605.

³⁸ Khadduri, Majid. *The Islamic law of nations: Shaybānī's Siyar*. Johns Hopkins Univ Pr, 1966.

³⁹ Majid Khadduri, *The Islamic law of nations: Shaybānī's Siyar*. Johns Hopkins Univ Pr, 1966.