

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to analyse the adherence to the basic rules of International Humanitarian Law in asymmetric conflicts between Israel and Palestine and between Morocco and Western Sahara. The main research question is: "Do weaker or stronger actors of these conflicts tend to violate the norms of IHL more than their counterparts?" Hypothesis is that the weaker actors violate the provisions of IHL more than their stronger counterparts. The comparative case study is used as a research method and the thesis contains detailed description and operationalization of the rules of IHL, which are applicable to these particular conflicts. These are the following: Common Article 3 of Geneva Conventions, the Principle of Military Necessity, the Principle of Distinction, the Principle of Proportionality and the Principle of Prohibition on the Infliction of Unnecessary Suffering. Afterwards, based on the data derived from international databases of armed conflicts and also on the information from scientific publications, the adherence to these norms during the hostilities of researched conflicts is analyzed. The analysis revealed that all actors of these conflicts violated some of the basic IHL norms. It was not found out, that the weaker or the stronger actors violate IHL more than their adversaries; hence, the hypothesis was disproved. To some extent the actors of the middle-eastern conflict violated the same IHL rules, but by different conduct. On the contrary, the parties of the Western Saharan conflict violated the same rules by the same conduct.