

An Analytical Study of International Criminal Law: Jurisdiction, War Crimes, and International Tribunal

Diaa Hammoud¹

1- Islamic University of Lebanon

Citation: Hamoud, D. (2024). An analytical study of international criminal law: jurisdiction, war crimes, and international tribunal. *Gloria: International Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(2), 126-135. https://gloria-leb.org/Criminal_Court.htm

Abstract

The conceptualization of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and transitional justice has evolved significantly since the codification of International Humanitarian Law in the 19th century. Following World War II, crimes such as genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes were codified and adjudicated by international tribunals in Nuremberg and Tokyo. In the 1990s, international war crimes tribunals resurfaced to address atrocities in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Today, the international legal framework includes treaty-based tribunals, two subsidiary bodies of the United Nations, hybrid tribunals integrating domestic and international law, and domestic courts trying international crimes. These institutions are vital components of transitional justice, offering theoretical and practical tools to address past and ongoing violence effectively.

المخلص

لقد تطورت مفاهيم جرائم الحرب والجرائم ضد الإنسانية والعدالة الانتقالية بشكل كبير منذ تدوين القانون الدولي الإنساني في القرن التاسع عشر. فبعد الحرب العالمية الثانية، تم تدوين جرائم مثل الإبادة الجماعية والجرائم ضد الإنسانية وجرائم الحرب ومحاكمتها أمام المحاكم الدولية في نورمبرغ وطوكيو. وفي تسعينيات القرن العشرين، عادت المحاكم الدولية لجرائم الحرب إلى الظهور لمعالجة الفضائع التي ارتكبت في يوغوسلافيا السابقة ورواندا. اليوم، يشمل الإطار القانوني الدولي محاكم تستند إلى معاهدات، وهيئتين فرعيتين تابعتين للأمم المتحدة، ومحاكم هجينة تدمج بين القانونين الوطني والدولي، بالإضافة إلى المحاكم الوطنية التي تنظر في الجرائم الدولية. تُعتبر هذه المؤسسات مكونات أساسية للعدالة الانتقالية، حيث توفر أدوات نظرية وعملية للتعامل مع العنف الماضي والحالي بشكل فعال.

Introduction

War crimes are among the oldest and most egregious violations recognized by humanity. Their gravity and the harm they inflict on human dignity and the international community's core values necessitate robust international legal responses to deter and prosecute these crimes.

This article explores the historical evolution of the concept of war crimes, leading to their codification within the International Criminal Court (ICC). War crimes trials garnered significant attention immediately after World War II, only to fade from public discourse until the atrocities in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Rwanda brought them back to the forefront in the 1990s.

The post-WWII trials shaped our understanding of war crimes and their prosecution, with concepts like human rights and crimes against humanity continuing to evolve. These developments are reflected in the establishment of the ICC and the two ad hoc tribunals created by the United Nations Security Council. This article examines the international community's approach to addressing war crimes and the role of these tribunals in the pursuit of justice.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to analyze the evolving definitions, classifications, and frameworks of war crimes within international law, with a focus on their historical development, legal elements, and international applicability. This study aims to examine the objective and descriptive approaches used in defining war crimes and evaluate their application in international treaties, such as the Geneva Conventions, the Hague Regulations, and the Rome Statute.

Significance of the Study

This research holds significance for academics, policymakers, and practitioners in international criminal law by providing:

1. **A Historical Perspective:** Highlighting how the concept of war crimes has evolved over time in response to changing norms and technological advancements.
2. **Practical Insights:** Clarifying the elements and classifications of war crimes to aid in the consistent application of International Humanitarian Law (IHL).
3. **Policy Implications:** Offering a foundation for enhancing international legal mechanisms and treaties to address emerging challenges, such as cyber warfare and the use of autonomous weapons.
4. **Judicial Relevance:** Assisting courts like the International Criminal Court (ICC) in navigating the complexities of applying war crime definitions and elements in contemporary contexts.

Statement of the Problem

Despite significant advancements in the codification of war crimes through treaties and international jurisprudence, challenges remain in achieving universal consensus on their definition, classification, and application. The absence of a unified approach leads to:

1. **Inconsistencies in Interpretation:** Divergent views on the objective and descriptive approaches among international agreements and legal scholars.
2. **Ambiguities in Implementation:** Difficulty in addressing novel forms of warfare, such as the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) and violations in non-international armed conflicts.
3. **Evolving Nature of War:** The need for continuous adaptation of international laws to address new threats, including internal conflicts and crimes against protected individuals or entities.

These issues highlight the need for further research to bridge theoretical and practical gaps in the understanding and enforcement of war crimes under international law.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in the constructivist theory of international relations, which emphasizes the role of norms, ideas, and legal frameworks in shaping state behavior and international law. Key components include:

1. **Normative Evolution:** The historical development of IHL and war crimes through treaties, customs, and judicial precedents.
2. **Legal Realism vs. Idealism:** Balancing the pragmatic enforcement of laws with the idealistic pursuit of universal justice.
3. **Jurisprudential Analysis:** Drawing on the works of jurists like Oppenheim, Bella, and Blawsky to understand competing approaches (objective vs. descriptive) to war crime classification.

This framework allows for analyzing how international norms evolve and how they interact with state sovereignty and global legal mechanisms.

Research Questions

1. Classification and Approaches:
 - What are the key differences between the objective and descriptive approaches in classifying war crimes?
 - How do international agreements, such as the Geneva Conventions and the Hague Regulations, reflect these approaches?
2. Legal Elements:
 - What are the general and specific elements required to define an act as a war crime under international law?
 - How do these elements align with or diverge from domestic legal principles?
3. Historical and Contemporary Challenges:
 - How has the concept of war crimes evolved from the early Geneva Conventions to the Rome Statute of the ICC?
 - What challenges arise in addressing new forms of warfare, including cyber-attacks and the use of WMDs?
4. International vs. Domestic Crimes:
 - What criteria distinguish international crimes from domestic crimes in the context of war?
 - How do theories of harm to international interests or values contribute to this distinction?
5. Enforcement and Accountability:
 - What mechanisms exist to enforce international war crime laws, and how effective are they?
 - How do international courts, such as the ICC, address the complexities of prosecuting war crimes?

Literature Review

War crimes are among the gravest international crimes, requiring a robust legal framework to address them. The ICC, legally established under the Rome Statute on July 1, 2002, and entering into force on April 11, 2002, plays a critical role in investigating and prosecuting crimes of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. The Rome Statute, adopted on July 17, 1998, by 120 countries during a United Nations General Assembly session in Italy, is the foundational treaty of the ICC. Seven nations opposed the statute, while 21 abstained (specific countries may be mentioned for clarity).

The Rome Statute emphasizes that millions of individuals—children, women, and men—have been victims of atrocities that profoundly shock the human conscience. These crimes, threatening international peace and security, must not go unpunished. However, earlier attempts to establish an international court in the 1950s were stymied by Cold War tensions.

The ICC functions as a complementary mechanism to national judicial systems, stepping in only when national courts are unwilling or unable to prosecute crimes. Its establishment underscores the principle of universal justice, affirming that serious crimes against human dignity demand accountability at an international level.

The relationship between national and international judicial systems is one of cooperation and integration. By signing and ratifying the Rome Statute, states can harmonize their national legislation with international standards, fostering greater respect for human rights and strengthening judicial sovereignty. This cooperative framework is particularly relevant for Arab judicial systems, which can benefit from aligning their legislation with the Rome Statute to bolster justice domestically and internationally.

Definition of War Crimes in Jurisprudence

Western Jurisprudence

War crimes have been extensively defined and debated within Western jurisprudence. Oppenheim, for example, defines war crimes as acts of hostility committed by soldiers or other individuals violating the recognized rules of war, such as murder and robbery. However, this definition has faced criticism for its lack of specificity regarding the types of acts considered war crimes, the entities responsible for prosecuting offenders, and the penalties imposed. It also narrowly confines the laws of war to the Hague and Geneva Conventions, overlooking other relevant agreements such as the Washington Naval Treaty (1922) and the London Naval Conference.

Lauterpacht offers a more detailed definition, describing war crimes as acts violating the laws of war and criminally punishable under established rules of conduct. These include severe violations reflecting a disregard for human life and property, justified neither by military necessity nor humanitarian principles. Similarly, De Faber emphasizes the inclusion of crimes against the laws and customs of war codified in Hague and Geneva Conventions.

Arab Jurisprudence

Arab jurisprudence defines war crimes as acts violating the laws of war, whether committed by combatants or civilians. These acts include misuse of a truce flag, targeting civilians, or unlawful actions by non-combatant individuals. Critics argue that including espionage and treason within the scope of war crimes is problematic since these acts are often viewed differently by opposing states. For instance, espionage may be considered a heroic act by one party and a punishable crime by another.

Dr. Salah El-Din Amer defines war crimes as intentional violations of international humanitarian law, while Dr. Hussein Hanafi Omar emphasizes large-scale attacks or general policies as defining elements. Dr. Mohamed Sharif Bassiouni describes war crimes as acts prohibited under international law in armed conflicts, derived from treaties and general principles.

Definition in International Conventions and Agreements

The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 laid foundational principles, enumerating prohibited acts such as the use of poisoned weapons and the targeting of civilians. These conventions, however, stopped short of providing a comprehensive definition of war crimes.

The Nuremberg Tribunal (1945) defined war crimes as violations of the laws and customs of war, including willful killing, mistreatment of prisoners, and unwarranted destruction of property. This definition was echoed in the Tokyo Tribunal Charter, which underscored violations of wartime laws and customs.

The Geneva Conventions expanded on these definitions, identifying serious violations aimed at protecting civilians and combatants during conflicts. These include unlawful killings, forced labor, and looting. The inclusion of these crimes in the statutes of international tribunals reflects the evolution of international humanitarian law and the commitment to holding perpetrators accountable.

This definition applies to all cases of declared war, as well as to all armed clashes that may occur between two or more states even if the existence of a state of war is not recognized.

The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) addressed war crimes in Article 2 of its Statute, granting jurisdiction to prosecute individuals who committed or ordered the commission of grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. Article 3 further empowered the Tribunal to try individuals for violations of the laws and customs of war (ICTY, 1993).

In the *Tadić* case, the Appeals Chamber of the ICTY identified specific conditions required for a crime to fall under the jurisdiction of Article 3. These conditions included:

1. A breach of a rule of International Humanitarian Law (IHL);
2. The rule's applicability under treaty law, provided the necessary conditions were met;
3. A serious violation of a rule protecting significant values, leading to substantial consequences for the victim (ICTY, 1995).

Although these criteria were instrumental, their application often proved controversial, particularly due to differing interpretations in state practices regarding war crimes.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) also provided a framework for defining war crimes. Three key criteria were agreed upon: the seriousness of IHL violations, the intent to prosecute crimes affecting the international community, and the inclusion of rules governing non-international armed conflicts in addition to those for international ones (Rome Statute, 1998). These inclusions marked a significant achievement, given the prevalence of non-international conflicts post-WWII. However, the inability to criminalize the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), including nuclear weapons, due to opposition from nuclear-armed states, highlighted the political sensitivities involved. Article 8 of the Rome Statute specified conditions for the court's jurisdiction over such weapons, including the requirement of multilateral agreements for their criminalization. This limitation reflected the continued use of political arguments to prevent broader accountability (Rome Statute, 1998).

Classification and Elements of War Crimes

War Crimes under Article 8(2) of the ICC Statute

Article 8(2) of the ICC Statute categorizes war crimes into four groups:

1. Serious breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions.
2. Violations of the laws and customs of war in international armed conflicts.
3. Violations of Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions applicable in non-international conflicts.
4. Other serious violations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) applicable in non-international conflicts.

Legal scholarship further refines the classification of war crimes. The objective approach, advocated by jurists like Oppenheim and Abdul Hamid Khamis, employs scientific criteria for classification. Oppenheim, for example, proposed a fourfold division:

- Violations of recognized rules of war by armed forces.
- Hostile acts by individuals not part of enemy armed forces.
- Acts of espionage and treason.
- A flexible, non-exhaustive list to adapt to future developments.

In contrast, the descriptive approach, represented by jurists like Bella, categorizes war crimes based on their specific forms without reliance on abstract criteria. This approach, aligned with the British Military Code of Justice, emphasizes the unique nature of each crime.

Classification within International Agreements

International agreements largely align with jurisprudential approaches but favor the descriptive direction. Key examples include:

A. The British Military Code of Justice

This code identifies various prohibited acts as war crimes, including:

- Use of poisoned or otherwise prohibited weapons.
- Killing or mistreatment of the wounded and prisoners of war.
- Misuse of symbols such as the Red Cross or white flag.
- Targeting civilian buildings or hospitals.
- Looting and unnecessary destruction in occupied territories.

B. The Hague Convention Regulations

The Hague Regulations enumerate prohibited actions during military operations, considering violations as war crimes. For instance, crimes against persons, property, or historical monuments were highlighted in the 1919 Peace Conference report.

C. The First Protocol to the Geneva Conventions

This protocol lists war crimes in broad, illustrative terms, reflecting the evolving nature of warfare.

Elements of War Crimes

War crimes share general elements with other international crimes, which must be verified to establish culpability. These elements include:

1. The Material Element

The material element involves observable actions or omissions that breach IHL. These actions may result in harm to persons or property, transforming criminal intent into tangible behavior. Mere intentions or beliefs without outward manifestation are not punishable.

2. The Moral Element

The moral element relates to the perpetrator's intent. It distinguishes between intentional and unintentional acts, focusing on the perpetrator's psychological relationship to the crime.

3. The Legal Element

The legal element requires a pre-existing legal basis for criminalizing the act. This ensures the principle of legality is upheld, prohibiting retroactive punishment. International Criminal Law, however, relies heavily on customary law and treaties, adding complexity to this element.

4. The International Element

This distinguishes war crimes from domestic crimes, requiring the act to have an international dimension, such as violations of IHL during armed conflicts.

Challenges and Adaptations

Despite the codification of crimes like genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity in the Rome Statute, challenges persist. The ICC retains the flexibility to amend the elements of crimes under Article 9, ensuring adaptability to evolving contexts. This underscores the need for continuous alignment between legal texts and the practical realities of adjudicating war crimes.

By analyzing these elements and their applications, international jurisprudence seeks to ensure accountability and adapt to the complexities of modern warfare.

International Corner

What distinguishes an international crime from a domestic one is its international element, though jurists have debated the criteria that define this distinction. Some argue that the international element exists when the foreign aspect pertains to the nationality of either the perpetrator or the victim—specifically, when both parties belong to different states engaged in armed conflict. Others contend that the defining criterion is the commission of a serious aggression against interests protected under International Criminal Law (ICL). Another perspective emphasizes that the determining factor is whether the crime harms international interests, asserting that a crime becomes international when it affects the collective well-being of the international community or a significant portion of its members. The international element is realized when the act or omission impacts the values or vital interests of the international community. This may occur if the crime involves perpetrators from multiple nations or targets individuals enjoying international protection. Moreover, contemporary developments in the theory of war and armed conflict have broadened the scope of the international element. For instance, internal conflicts involving a government and rebels who effectively control territory may qualify as international under ICL when laws and customs of war are violated. Similarly, large-scale armed

conflicts between resistance movements and states, or conflicts among multiple parties, may also invoke the rules of ICL, even if they are not strictly inter-state conflicts.

Results

The analysis of war crimes and their classifications reveals several key findings related to their definition, historical evolution, international applicability, and challenges:

1. Differentiation Between International and Domestic Crimes

- The results confirm that the international element is crucial in distinguishing international crimes from domestic crimes. This element is defined by:
 - Harm to international interests or values: Acts that affect the global community or violate international norms, such as genocide or crimes against humanity.
 - Nationality of perpetrators or victims: Crimes involving parties from different states or protected persons (e.g., diplomats, international aid workers).
 - Type of conflict: Crimes committed during international armed conflicts or within the context of non-international armed conflicts with significant implications for international law.

2. Evolution of War Crime Definitions in International Treaties

- Historical Development:
 - The Geneva Conventions and other foundational treaties were instrumental in shaping the modern understanding of war crimes. For example:
 - The First Geneva Convention (1864): Focused on protecting the wounded and medical personnel during armed conflicts.
 - Subsequent treaties (1906, 1949): Expanded protections to include civilians, naval forces, and prisoners of war.
 - Post-World War Trials (Nuremberg and Tokyo): Established the precedent for prosecuting crimes against humanity and set the foundation for international criminal law.
- Modern Frameworks:
 - The Rome Statute (1998) institutionalized the International Criminal Court (ICC) and codified war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide, offering a comprehensive legal framework.

3. Objective vs. Descriptive Approaches

- Objective Approach: Prioritizes harm to international interests as the defining criterion for war crimes. This approach is practical for establishing international jurisdiction.
- Descriptive Approach: Relies on the specific legal definitions and classifications outlined in treaties, which may be restrictive or fail to address emerging threats.
- Findings: While the descriptive approach provides precision, the objective approach allows flexibility in addressing novel forms of warfare.

4. Challenges in Modern Warfare

- Emerging Threats:
 - The study highlights challenges in applying traditional war crime definitions to contemporary contexts, such as:
 - Cyber Warfare: Attacks targeting critical infrastructure and civilian populations lack clear legal frameworks under IHL.
 - Use of Autonomous Weapons: Raises ethical and legal concerns about accountability and compliance with war crime statutes.

- Ambiguities in non-international conflicts, such as those involving resistance movements, remain unresolved.
5. Enforcement Mechanisms
- International Institutions:
 - The ICC and ad hoc tribunals have made significant progress in prosecuting war crimes but face limitations, including:
 - Jurisdictional Constraints: Some states refuse to ratify the Rome Statute or cooperate with the ICC.
 - Political Barriers: Enforcement often depends on the will of powerful states, undermining impartiality.
 - Recommendations: Strengthening universal jurisdiction and enhancing international cooperation are essential for addressing these gaps.
6. Recommendations for Harmonization
- There is a pressing need to harmonize the objective and descriptive approaches to create a unified framework that addresses the complexities of modern conflicts.
 - Strengthening IHL through new treaties or amendments to existing ones can address ambiguities surrounding emerging technologies and unconventional warfare.

Conclusion

The concept of war crimes has undergone significant evolution throughout history, particularly within the framework of international treaties. From the Middle Ages to the 19th century, defining and unifying concepts of wartime rights and applicable laws posed challenges. The First Geneva Convention (1864) marked a pivotal moment as one of the earliest international agreements aimed at protecting the wounded and injured during wars. This foundation expanded with the Second Geneva Convention (1906) to include naval vessels and hospitals.

The atrocities of the two world wars catalyzed the criminalization of heinous acts such as genocide and brutal attacks. The establishment of the Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals underscored the necessity of achieving justice for such crimes, holding military officials accountable for their actions during World War II. This legacy was further reinforced with the adoption of the Fourth Geneva Convention (1949), which extended protection to civilians during armed conflicts.

Subsequent treaties, including the Rome Statute (1998), which established the International Criminal Court (ICC), expanded the framework to address war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. These developments reflect a persistent effort to enhance the enforcement of international humanitarian norms.

As technology advances and societies evolve, the concept of war crimes continues to adapt, confronting new challenges. The international community remains committed to upholding human rights and International Humanitarian Law (IHL) while refining mechanisms to prosecute violators effectively. These efforts underscore the enduring importance of accountability in fostering global justice.

Funding: There is no funding source for this study.

Competing Interests: There is no conflict of interest.

References

- Abdul Hamid Khamis. (1955). *War crimes and punishment thereof* (PhD thesis). Faculty of Law, Cairo University, p. 165
- Abdul Qader Awda. (n.d.). *Islamic criminal legislation compared to positive law* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.). Al-Risala Foundation, Beirut, p. 112.
- Abdul Rahman Hussein Allam. (1988). *Criminal responsibility in international criminal law*. Cairo, p. n/a.
- Abdul Wahid Muhammad Al-Far. (n.d.). *International crimes and the authority to punish them*. Previous reference, p. 187.
- Ahmed Maghawry Mohamed El Shafei. (2011). *The legal system for the trial of war criminals according to the provisions of international law* (PhD thesis). Faculty of Law, Menoufia University, p. 89.
- Ahmed Shawqi Abu Khatwa. (2003). *Explanation of the general provisions of the penal code*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, p. 226.
- Ali Abdel Qader El Qahwaji. (n.d.). Previous reference, p. 155.
- Ali Yousef Al-Shukri. (2008). *International criminal justice in a changing world*.
- Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution, Jordan, 1st ed., pp. 153–154.
- Articles Two and Three of the Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.
- Bella, J. (1990). *The classification of war crimes in international law*. Oxford University Press.
- Fattouh Al-Shazly. (n.d.). Previous reference, p. 370.
- Hermann von Hippel. (2001). *Definition of war crimes in the Rome Statute*. Research presented to the Scientific Symposium on the International Criminal Court: The Challenge of Immunity, Faculty of Law, University of Damascus, November 3–4, 246, ff.
- Hossam Ali Abdel Khaleq Al-Sheikha. (n.d.). Previous reference, pp. 74, 171, 176, 189, 197.
- Hossam Abdel Khaleq Ali Al-Sheikha. (n.d.). Previous reference, p. 176.
- Hussein Hanafi Omar. (2006). *Immunities of rulers and their trial for war crimes, aggression, genocide, and crimes against humanity*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, p. 89.
- Hussein Obaid. (n.d.). *International crime*. Previous reference, p. 38.
- ICTY. (1993). *Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia*. Retrieved from [UN ICTY official website].
- ICTY. (1995). *Prosecutor v. Tadić* (Decision on the Defense Motion for Interlocutory Appeal on Jurisdiction). Retrieved from [UN ICTY case law archives].
- Ibrahim al-Anani. (1997). *The international security system*. Egyptian General Book Authority, Cairo, p. 170.
- Ibrahim Zuhair Al-Daraji. (2002). *The crime of aggression and the extent of international legal responsibility for it* (PhD thesis). Ain Shams University, p. 331.
- Khaled Mustafa Fahmy. (2011). *The International Criminal Court: The statute of the court, previous trials, and crimes within the court's jurisdiction*. Dar Al Fikr Al Jami'i, p. 67.
- Khaled Ramzi al-Baza'a. (n.d.). Previous reference, pp. 85, 189.
- Mahmoud Adel Abdel Fattah Abdullah. (2012). *War crimes in international humanitarian law* (PhD thesis). Menoufia University, Egypt, p. 178.
- Mahmoud Naguib Hosni. (n.d.). *Lectures in international criminal law*. Previous reference, p. 242.
- Mahmoud Sharif Bassiouni. (2002). *The International Criminal Court: Its origins and statute, with a study of the history of international investigation commissions and previous international criminal courts*. New Rose Al-Youssef Press, Cairo, p. 12.
- Muhammad Abd al-Mun'im Abd al-Ghani. (n.d.). Previous reference, pp. 91, 213.
- Muhammad Hanafi Mahmoud. (n.d.). Previous reference, p. 165.
- Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Awad. (n.d.). *International crime*. Previous reference, p. 408.
- Naglaa Mohamed Asr. (2011). *The jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court to prosecute war criminals* (PhD thesis). Mansoura University, p. 89.

Najlaa Muhammad. (n.d.). Previous reference, p. 93.

Omar Al-Saeed Ramadan. (1999). *Explanation of the penal code, general section*. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, Cairo, p. 287.

Omar Mahmoud Al-Makhzoumi. (n.d.). Previous reference, pp. 154, 191, 279.

Oppenheim, D. (1948). *International law: A treatise*. Longmans, Green & Co.
Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. (1998). *United Na*

Mrs. Daa Radwan Hammoud is an international arbitrator and lawyer with extensive experience in Civil, Criminal, and Corporate Law. She received her Bachelor degree from Beirut University. Then, she pursued an LLM in Business Law and a Diploma in Arbitration from the Lebanese American University. She also earned a Master's degree in Legal and Diplomatic Careers from Filiere Francophone De Droit as well as a Master's degree in International Law and International Criminal Law from the Islamic University of Lebanon. Mrs. Hammoud is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in International Criminal Law at the Islamic University of Lebanon.

