INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES BULLETIN
ISSN: (E) 3007-1917 (P) 3007-1909
Volume 3, Issue 12, 2025

LEGALITY OF PRE-EMPTIVE STRIKES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW OF THE USE OF FORCE

Dr. Usman Hameed[*1], Dr. Saira Bashir Dar[2], Ali Shahid[3]

[*1]*Professor of Criminology, University of Lahore*
[2]*Dean Faculty of Law IISAT University Gujranwala*
[3]*Lecturer in law, Grand Asian University, Sialkot*

[*1]usman.hameed@crim.uol.edu.pk, [2]darsairabashir@gmail.com,
[3]ali_shahid1996@hotmail.com

Corresponding Author: *
Dr. Usman Hameed
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18080624

Received	Accepted	Published
29 October 2025	13 December 2025	29 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This article examines whether pre-emptive strikes are lawful under the traditional doctrine of self-defence in international law. It critically analyses the distinction between anticipatory self-defence and preventive self-defence within the framework of the United Nations Charter, customary international law, and post-1945 state practice. Building on the doctrinal foundations laid by the Caroline incident and the jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice, the article traces how claims to anticipatory force have evolved through key historical episodes, including the Cuban Missile Crisis, the 1967 Arab–Israeli War, Israel's 1981 strike on Iraq's Osirak reactor, and United States operations against Libya, Afghanistan, and Sudan. Particular attention is given to the transformative impact of the September 11 attacks and the subsequent articulation of the United States' National Security Strategy (2002), which advanced a controversial doctrine of preventive self-defence. The legality of this doctrine is assessed through the lens of the 2003 Iraq War and later developments, including evolving state responses to terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, cyber operations, and hybrid threats. The article argues that while international law accommodates a narrowly defined right of anticipatory self-defence grounded in necessity, proportionality, and imminence, preventive self-defence remains inconsistent with the UN Charter and lacks sufficient support in customary law. The study concludes that the post-Iraq consolidation of opinio juris reflects resistance to unilateral preventive force and a reaffirmation of collective security under the UN system.

Key words: *Pre-emptive Strikes, Law of the Use of Force, Customary Law, Anticipatory Self Defence, UN Charter.*

1. Introduction

Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter establishes a general prohibition on the threat or use of force in international relations, forming the cornerstone of the post-1945 collective security system (Brownlie, 2008; Cassese, 2005; Gray, 2018). The principal exception to this prohibition is the right of self-defence preserved under Article 51, which recognises an inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member State (Dinstein, 2017; Franck, 2002). The precise scope of this exception, however, has remained one of

the most contested questions in international law.

A central controversy concerns whether self-defence is strictly reactive or whether it extends to situations in which an armed attack is imminent but has not yet materialised. Some scholars argue that the wording of Article 51 confines lawful force to cases where an attack has already occurred, reflecting a deliberate choice to prioritise collective security over unilateral action (Cassese, 2005; Schachter, 1984). Others contend that the reference to an "inherent right" preserves pre-existing customary international law, including a limited right of anticipatory self-defence grounded in necessity and immediacy (Brownlie, 2008; Jennings, 1938; McDougal & Feliciano, 1961).

This debate has intensified in the post–Cold War era, particularly following the rise of transnational terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the increasing speed and opacity of modern military threats (Byers, 2002; Greenwood, 2003; Gray, 2018). Claims to pre-emptive force have been advanced in a range of contexts, from Israel's strike on Iraq's Osirak reactor in 1981 to United States operations against Libya, Afghanistan, Sudan, and Iraq (Sadurska, 1988; McGoldrick, 2004; Brunnée & Toope, 2004).

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 marked a pivotal moment in this evolution, prompting the UN Security Council to recognise the applicability of self-defence to large-scale attacks by non-state actors and emboldening arguments for a more expansive conception of anticipatory action (Murphy, 2002; Falk, 2003). These arguments culminated in the United States' National Security Strategy of 2002, which explicitly advocated a doctrine of preventive self-defence against emerging threats, particularly those involving terrorism and weapons of mass destruction (Yoo, 2003; Taft & Buchwald, 2003).

Against this backdrop, this article examines whether pre-emptive strikes can be reconciled with the traditional doctrine of self-defence in international law. It argues that a clear distinction must be drawn between anticipatory self-defence, which may be permissible under stringent conditions of necessity, proportionality, and imminence, and preventive self-defence, which remains incompatible with the UN Charter framework and unsupported by customary international law (Dinstein, 2017; Gray, 2018; Stromseth, 2003).

2. Anticipatory Self-Defence: Conceptual and Legal Foundations

2.1 Article 51 of the UN Charter and the "Inherent Right" of Self-Defence

Article 51 provides that nothing in the Charter shall impair the inherent right of self-defence if an armed attack occurs. The textual reference to an attack that "occurs" has led some commentators to argue for a strictly temporal interpretation, limiting self-defence to reactive measures. Others contend that the reference to an "inherent right" signals the preservation of pre-existing customary international law, including the right to act in anticipation of an imminent attack (Brownlie, 2008; Dinstein, 2017).

The travaux préparatoires of the Charter offer limited guidance, leaving room for divergent interpretations. What is clear, however, is that Article 51 was intended as an exception to a comprehensive prohibition on force and must therefore be interpreted narrowly.

2.2 The Caroline Incident and Customary International Law

The nineteenth-century Caroline incident remains the foundational authority for anticipatory self-defence. In 1837, British forces destroyed the Caroline, a vessel used by Canadian rebels operating from U.S. territory. In the ensuing diplomatic exchange, U.S. Secretary of State Daniel Webster articulated criteria that have since become canonical: the necessity of self-defence must be "instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation," and the response must be proportionate (Jennings, 1938).

Although the incident pre-dates the UN Charter, its formulation of necessity, proportionality, and imminence continues to inform contemporary legal analysis. These criteria are widely regarded

as reflecting customary international law applicable to all claims of self-defence.

2.3 Necessity, Proportionality, and Imminence

Necessity requires that force be used only as a last resort, when no reasonable peaceful alternatives are available. Proportionality limits the scale and scope of defensive action to what is required to repel or prevent the attack. Imminence functions as the temporal bridge that distinguishes anticipatory self-defence from unlawful preventive force.

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) has repeatedly affirmed that necessity and proportionality are inherent requirements of self-defence under customary international law (Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, 1996). While the Court has been cautious in addressing anticipatory self-defence directly, it has not rejected the relevance of these criteria.

2.4 Scholarly Debate and Competing Views

Proponents of anticipatory self-defence argue that requiring states to absorb the first blow in an age of nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and non-state actors would render the right of self-defence meaningless (McDougal & Feliciano, 1961). Critics respond that loosening the temporal threshold invites abuse and undermines collective security (Cassese, 2005).

A middle-ground position distinguishes between anticipatory and interceptive self-defence, permitting force only where an attack has entered an irreversible operational phase (Dinstein, 2017). This approach seeks to reconcile realism with restraint.

3. State Practice Since 1945

3.1 General Observations

Post-1945 state practice provides mixed evidence regarding anticipatory self-defence. While states have occasionally claimed the right to use force in anticipation of threats, the overwhelming tendency has been to justify action either as a response to an actual attack or under Security Council authorisation. Importantly, even powerful states have generally framed their actions within the traditional language of necessity and imminence.

3.2 The Cuban Missile Crisis (1962)

The U.S. naval quarantine of Cuba was widely acknowledged to constitute a use of force. Although the United States avoided explicit reliance on anticipatory self-defence, the Security Council debates suggest that some states were prepared to accept the legality of action in response to an imminent nuclear threat. The absence of formal condemnation has been interpreted by some as tacit acceptance, though others caution against reading too much into political compromise (Sadurska, 1988).

3.3 The 1967 Arab–Israeli War

Israel's pre-emptive strike against Egypt and other Arab states was justified as anticipatory self-defence in response to troop mobilisations and blockades. While some commentators regard this as a paradigmatic case of lawful anticipatory action, the Security Council stopped short of endorsing the doctrine, focusing instead on ceasefire and withdrawal.

3.4 The Osirak Strike (1981)

Israel's destruction of Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor marked a clear claim to preventive self-defence. The Security Council unanimously condemned the attack, rejecting Israel's argument that a future nuclear capability constituted an imminent threat. This episode is frequently cited as evidence that preventive self-defence lacks legal support.

3.5 U.S. Actions Against Libya (1986) and Terrorist Targets (1998)

U.S. strikes against Libya and later against targets in Afghanistan and Sudan were justified as self-defence against terrorism. International reactions were divided, but many states characterised the actions as retaliatory reprisals rather than necessary anticipatory measures. The emphasis remained on proportionality and evidentiary sufficiency.

4. September 11 and the Reconfiguration of Self-Defence

4.1 Terrorism as an Armed Attack

The attacks of 11 September 2001 marked a watershed. Security Council Resolutions 1368 and 1373 recognised the inherent right of self-defence in response to terrorist attacks, implicitly accepting that large-scale attacks by non-state actors could constitute armed attacks under Article 51 (Murphy, 2002).

4.2 Afghanistan and Anticipatory Elements

The U.S.-led intervention in Afghanistan was widely supported, not because it embodied preventive self-defence, but because it responded to an actual armed attack and an ongoing threat. The Taliban's harbouring of al-Qaeda was treated as sufficient nexus to justify self-defence, signalling a modest evolution in attribution standards.

4.3 Limits of the Post-9/11 Consensus

Crucially, the post-9/11 consensus did not amount to endorsement of a general preventive doctrine. Support was grounded in the factual context of prior attacks and clear necessity, not in a sweeping redefinition of imminence.

5. The National Security Strategy (2002) and Preventive Self-Defence

5.1 Core Claims of the Strategy

The U.S. National Security Strategy (2002) asserted a right to act pre-emptively against emerging threats, particularly rogue states and terrorists seeking WMDs. It explicitly sought to relax the requirement of imminence, arguing that the nature of modern threats required anticipatory action before dangers fully materialised.

5.2 Legal and Normative Objections

The Strategy was criticised for conflating anticipatory and preventive self-defence and for undermining the collective security framework. Many states expressed concern that unilateral determinations of threat would erode the prohibition on force and invite reciprocal claims.

5.3 Failure to Generate Customary Law

Despite its prominence, the Strategy failed to generate widespread state practice or opinio juris supporting preventive self-defence. Subsequent reactions indicate resistance rather than acceptance.

6. The Iraq War (2003)

6.1 The Preventive Argument

The invasion of Iraq was justified politically by reference to WMD proliferation and terrorism, but legally it relied primarily on alleged Security Council authorisation. Preventive self-defence was not consistently advanced as a formal legal basis.

6.2 International Response

The widespread opposition to the invasion and subsequent findings regarding the absence of WMDs severely undermined the credibility of preventive self-defence. Scholarly and governmental assessments overwhelmingly rejected its legality.

7. Developments After Iraq: Contemporary Perspectives

7.1 ICJ Jurisprudence and State Responsibility

Post-Iraq cases, including Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo and Oil Platforms, reaffirmed restrictive interpretations of self-defence and emphasised evidence and proportionality.

7.2 Cyber Operations and Emerging Threats

Recent debates on cyber operations have revisited imminence and necessity, but leading views maintain that anticipatory responses must still meet stringent thresholds (Schmitt, 2017).

7.3 The Bethlehem Principles and Their Reception

The Bethlehem Principles (2012) proposed a refined understanding of imminence. While influential, they have not altered the fundamental legal distinction between anticipation and prevention.

8. Conclusion

Pre-emptive strikes are lawful under international law only within the narrow confines of anticipatory self-defence, as defined by necessity, proportionality, and imminence. Preventive self-defence, by contrast, lacks a legal foundation in the UN Charter or customary law. State practice since 1945, reinforced by post-Iraq developments, demonstrates a consistent reluctance to accept unilateral preventive force. The resilience of the Charter framework lies in its capacity to adapt cautiously without abandoning collective control. Expanding self-defence beyond imminence risks eroding the prohibition on force and destabilising the international legal order.

REFERENCES

Arend, A. C., & Beck, R. J. (2003). *International law and the use of force* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Bethlehem, D. (2012). Principles relevant to the scope of a state's right of self-defense against an imminent or actual armed attack by nonstate actors. *American Journal of International Law, 106*(4), 770–777.

Brownlie, I. (2008). *Principles of public international law* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Brunnée, J., & Toope, S. J. (2004). The use of force: International law after Iraq. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 53*(4), 785–806.

Brunnée, J., & Toope, S. J. (2010). *Legitimacy and legality in international law*. Cambridge University Press.

Byers, M. (2002). Terrorism, the use of force and international law after 11 September. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 51*, 401–414.

Cassese, A. (2005). *International law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Dinstein, Y. (2017). *War, aggression and self-defence* (6th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Falk, R. (2003). What future for the UN Charter system of war prevention? *American Journal of International Law, 97*, 590–598.

Franck, T. M. (2002). *Recourse to force: State action against threats and armed attacks*. Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, R. N. (2003). Neither Bush nor jurisprudence. *American Journal of International Law, 97*, 585–590.

Gray, C. (2018). *International law and the use of force* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Greenwood, C. (2003). International law and the war against terrorism. *San Diego International Law Journal, 4*, 1–38.

ICJ. (1986). *Military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America)*. ICJ Reports.

ICJ. (1996). *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons (Advisory Opinion)*. ICJ Reports.

ICJ. (2003). *Oil platforms (Islamic Republic of Iran v. United States of America)*. ICJ Reports.

Jennings, R. Y. (1938). The Caroline and McLeod cases. *American Journal of International Law, 32*, 82–99.

McGoldrick, D. (2004). *From 9–11 to the Iraq War 2003*. Hart Publishing.

McDougal, M. S., & Feliciano, F. (1961). *Law and minimum world public order*. Yale University Press.

Murphy, S. D. (2002). Terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon. *American Journal of International Law, 96*, 237–248.

Sadurska, R. (1988). Threats of force. *American Journal of International Law, 82*, 239–268.

Schachter, O. (1984). The right of states to use armed force. *Michigan Law Review, 82*, 1620–1635.

Schmitt, M. N. (2017). *Tallinn Manual 2.0 on the international law applicable to cyber operations*. Cambridge University Press.

Sofaer, A. D. (2003). On the necessity of pre-emption. *European Journal of International Law, 14*, 209–226.

Stromseth, J. (2003). Law and force after Iraq: A transitional moment. *American Journal of International Law, 97*, 628–642.

Taft, W. H., & Buchwald, T. F. (2003). Preemption, Iraq, and international law. *American Journal of International Law, 97*, 557–563.

Wedgwood, R. (2003). The fall of Saddam Hussein: Security Council mandates and preemptive self-defense. *American Journal of International Law, 97*, 576–585.

Yoo, J. (2003). International law and the war in Iraq. *American Journal of International Law, 97*, 563–576.