ORIGINAL ARTICLE
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30932/1992-3252-2022-20-5-9

World of Transport and Transportation, 2022,
Vol. 20, Iss. 5 (102), pp. 192–198

Humanitarian Legal Regulation of Employment of Hospital Ships under Modern Conditions

Ivan V. KHOLIKOV

Ivan V. Kholikov
Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation, Moscow, Russia.
✉ *iv_kholik@mail.ru.*

ABSTRACT

The article deals with some problematic issues of using hospital ships for transporting the wounded, sick and shipwrecked under the conditions of an armed conflict at sea.

A retrospective analysis refers to emergence and development of legal norms governing the use of hospital ships during armed conflicts. Particular attention is paid to regulation by the standards of international humanitarian law of the issues of protection of hospital vessels from attacks and capture, transport of certain categories of persons and cargo followed by a review of the relevant international legal norms and of the practices of individual states in matters of transporting the wounded and sick, as well as of providing them with medical care at sea. A particular task was to get Journal's audience acquainted with the review of the selected legal commentaries of ICRS on the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea of August 12, 1949 (GC II) and some other provisions of the relevant international humanitarian treaties in the field of hospital ships. The commentaries first ever published in Russian were selected, structured, and additionally elaborated by the author according to the concept of the article, as well as supplemented by the references to the results of modern research.

Based on a study of modern realities, the conclusion is substantiated about the sufficiency of the existing norms of international humanitarian law and the obvious need for adequate use of their potential in relation to the conditions of our times.

Keywords: waterborne transport, hospital ship, international humanitarian law, Geneva Convention, armed conflict, wounded, sick, shipwrecked, transport, treatment.

For citation: Kholikov, I. V. Humanitarian Legal Regulation of Employment of Hospital Ships under Modern Conditions. World of Transport and Transportation, 2022, Vol. 20, Iss. 5 (102), pp. 192–198. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30932/1992-3252-2022-20-5-9.

The text of the article originally written in Russian is published in the first part of the issue.
Текст статьи на русском языке публикуется в первой части данного выпуска.

INTRODUCTION

The change in the paradigm of international relations associated with the crisis of the unipolar world order [1] causes the increased risk of armed conflicts not only on land but also in theatres of naval operations. In this regard, the issues of regulation by humanitarian law of modern military conflicts at sea, ensuring maritime security, use of various means and methods of naval warfare have been more often becoming the subject of attention of both Russian and foreign researchers [2–5].

At the same time, there is concern about the threat of the spread of mass diseases, which is convincingly demonstrated by the epidemics of HIV infection [6], various types of influenza, SARS, Ebola fever [7–9], and the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which has become a global challenge of our times [10].

The foregoing actualises transportation of the wounded and sick by sea under various legal regimes, primarily in emergency situations and during armed conflicts. Russian researchers have paid some attention to the issues of legal regulation of health aspects of transportation activities, including maritime transportation [11], the functioning of transport system in the context of counteracting the coronavirus infection pandemic. In particular, the authors of [12] noted the possibility of applying the experience of using medical ships to combat plague, cholera, and other infectious diseases in modern conditions. At the same time, considering the growing factor of military threats [13], it seems appropriate to consider the issue of transporting the wounded and sick by sea during an armed conflict.

In this situation, after an armed conflict at sea arises, the norms of international humanitarian law (IHL) come into force, including the Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea of August 12, 1949 (GC II). According to them, these persons must be guaranteed humane treatment and care without any discrimination (adverse distinction) founded on such criteria as sex, race, nationality, religion, political opinions, or other similar criteria. Any attempts upon their lives or their persons are strictly prohibited and, in particular, it is forbidden to murder or exterminate them, subject them to torture to biological experiments, wilfully leave them without medical assistance and care, or deliberately create conditions exposing them to contagion or infection. Only urgent medical reasons authorise priority in the order of treatment. It should be immediately noted that the norms of IHL are valid both under the conditions of an international armed conflict and a non-international armed conflict [14].

At the same time, the status of medical ships involved in transportation and assistance to the wounded, sick and shipwrecked is of particular interest.

Thus, the *objective* of the research is to study the features of the legal regulation of transportation of wounded, sick and shipwrecked, as well as the provision of medical care to them by hospital ships during an armed conflict at sea.

For this, general scientific and special legal research *methods* used in the research comprised, namely, historical-legal, formal-legal, comparative-legal methods, as well as the method of interpreting legal norms. An interdisciplinary approach was also widely used.

RESULTS

Historical Background

Even at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, ships accompanying naval forces in order to collect, treat and transport the wounded and shipwrecked were a common feature[1], while examples of employment of military hospital ships had been known before (see, e.g. [15]). Military hospital ships were also deployed near the coast of territories where fighting was going on in order to provide care to the wounded in the field. During the Second World War, military hospital ships «began by general consent to undertake the transport of casualties from land warfare» [16].

The protection of hospital ships first found its way into the Additional Articles relating to the Condition of the Wounded in War. Although the Additional Articles never became binding provisions of law of treaties, they were clearly born out of the general belief that military hospital ships had already enjoyed special protection under customary international humanitarian law. According to the Additional Articles, military and neutral hospital ships enjoyed the character of neutrality, that is, protection from attacks, if they did not commit acts harmful to the enemy.

At the first Hague International Peace Conference in 1899, it was considered that the Additional Articles might constitute the best basis for the « adaptation

[1] Convention (II) for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea. Geneva, 12 August 1949. Commentary 2017. Article 22 – Notification and protection of military hospital ships. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/gcii-1949/article-22/commentary/2017. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

to naval war of the stipulations of the Geneva Convention of 1864»[2, 3].

Accordingly, Article 1(1) of the 1899 Hague Convention III stipulated that «Military hospital ships, that is to say, ships constructed or assigned by States specially and solely for the purpose of assisting the wounded, sick or shipwrecked, and the names of which shall have been communicated to the belligerent Powers at the beginning or during the course of hostilities, and in any case before they are employed, shall be respected and cannot be captured while hostilities last»[4].

The delegates to the Second Hague Peace Conference in 1907 did not find it necessary to significantly alter the 1899 provisions. Therefore, Article 1(1) of the Hague Convention X of 1907, practically identical to the preceding norm of 1899, was adopted without discussion[5]. Article 1 of the Hague Convention X of 1907 was perceived as a prohibition not only of the capture of hospital ships, but also of attacks on them, as long as they serve exclusively to fulfil their humanitarian task, although it did not explicitly prohibit this[6].

The Hague Convention III of 1899 and the Hague Convention X of 1907 strengthened the legal protection of military hospital ships, but the First and Second World Wars revealed the need for gradual development of more detailed IHL rules applicable to such ships. During two world wars, there were many attacks on hospital ships. Some of these attacks were attributed to difficulties in identifying or to employment of such ships close to the area of hostilities at sea, while others were deliberate because the parties to the conflict supposed that these ships were employed illegitimately, or that they were not entitled to protection or lost such a right by acts harmful to the enemy [17; 18]. In particular, the lack of agreement on minimum tonnage turned out to be one of the main reasons why the protection of military hospital ships was not as effective as the drafters of the Hague Conventions had assumed. After the end of World War II, it was time to make the protection of hospital ships more effective.

Legal Regulation at the Present Stage

The Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea of August 12, 1949 (GC II) distinguishes between military hospital ships of parties to the conflict, on the one hand, and hospital ships utilised by national Red Cross or Red Crescent Societies, officially recognized relief societies or private persons of a belligerent state or neutral states, on the other.

The word «military» means that hospital ships must be operated by or under the exclusive control of the armed forces of a State Party to the Convention. This requirement is met if such vessels are categorized as either «warships», or «auxiliary ships» as defined in international treaty and customary law. This requirement is met if they qualify as either «warships» or «auxiliary vessels» as defined in international treaty law and customary law. This term is broad enough to apply equally to «warships» and to «auxiliary vessels», as long as they are in fact operated by, or under the exclusive control of, the armed forces. The interpretation of Article 22, according to which States are free to use either auxiliary vessels or warships as military hospital ships, is confirmed by State practice. The *Peace Ark* is operated by the People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) of the People's Republic of China under the command of a duly commissioned officer and manned by a crew under regular armed forces discipline. Hence, it qualifies as a warship. However, the PLAN considers it to be an 'auxiliary vessel' since it is specially and solely built and equipped as a hospital ship. The US Naval Ship (USNS) *Comfort* and the USNS *Mercy* are operated by the US Military Sealift Command, with a civilian master and crew, but the medical staff is under the command of an officer of the medical corps. The same holds true for the Russian Federation's naval hospital ships Irtysh, Svir and Yenisey. The Russian and US hospital ships thus qualify as auxiliaries. It is clear that, notwithstanding the technical qualification of

[2] Hague Peace Conference [in Russian], p. 444. [Electronic resource]: https://runivers.ru/enc/tematicheskiy-katalog/vneshnepoliticheskaya-istoriya-rossii/mirnye_dogovory/591401/. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

[3] Convention (III) for the Adaptation to Maritime Warfare of the Principles of the Geneva Convention of 22 August 1864. The Hague, 29 July 1899. Historical treaty. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/hague-conv-iii-1899?activeTab=historical. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

[4] Convention (III) for the Adaptation to Maritime Warfare of the Principles of the Geneva Convention of 22 August 1864. The Hague, 29 July 1899. Article 1. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/hague-conv-iii-1899/article-1?activeTab=historical. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

[5] Convention (X) for the Adaptation to Maritime Warfare of the Principles of the Geneva Convention. The Hague, 18 October 1907. Historical treaty. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/hague-conv-x-1907?activeTab=historical. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

[6] Convention (X) for the Adaptation to Maritime Warfare of the Principles of the Geneva Convention. The Hague, 18 October 1907. Article 1. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/hague-conv-x-1907/article-1?activeTab=historical. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

a vessel – be it as a warship or auxiliary vessel – once it fulfils the requirements of a hospital ship, it is entitled to the special protection due to it under the law[1].

Protection Against Attack and Capture

In order to be able to exercise their functions, military hospital ships under IHL enjoy special protection «in any circumstances», independently of the presence on board of the wounded, sick or shipwrecked (if only those ships do not commit acts harmful to the enemy). They may not be attacked or captured but shall at all times be respected and protected on condition that their names and descriptions have been notified to the Parties to the conflict ten days before those ships were employed.

The prohibition of attack applies to every act of violence aimed at destroying, sinking or otherwise inflicting damage on a military hospital ship. It is not limited to the use of common naval weaponry, such as a warship's guns, torpedoes, naval mines or missiles [19], but applies to the use of all methods and means of warfare and to all measures that may have a negative impact on the functioning of a military hospital ship. Prohibited attacks are therefore not limited to the use of conventional weapons that have kinetic effects. They also include the use of means and methods that, by whatever mechanisms or effects, severely interfere with the functioning of the equipment necessary for the operation of a military hospital ship, such as so-called «cyber-attacks» [20; 21].

Because they are specifically constructed or equipped with a view to assisting the wounded, sick and shipwrecked, military hospital ships are often complex platforms. Their structure, components and equipment are to a considerable extent interdependent and are, individually or in their interaction, essential for the performance of their humanitarian functions. Hence, the prohibition of attacks against military hospital ships must be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, having regard to the object and purpose of the prohibition. Furthermore, it applies not only to acts that actually damage or destroy ships or their equipment, but also to acts that have remained unsuccessful or are intercepted or repelled[1].

However, the prohibition does not apply to damage accidentally or unavoidably inflicted on a hospital ship or its equipment. Rather, the prohibition of attack is limited to intentional attacks and to those launched in neglect of the obligation to take feasible precautions. According to Article 30(4), (military) hospital ships «during and after an engagement… will act at their own risk»[1].

The object and purpose of the prohibition against capturing enemy military hospital ships is to avoid the consequences usually attached to their status as enemy auxiliaries (or warships) and hence as legitimate booty of war, and to safeguard, for the duration of an armed conflict at sea, the performance of their humanitarian functions[1].

In the naval context, the prohibition of capture applies to all acts of asserting control over a vessel to the exclusion of the flag State concerned. Usually, this will be achieved by deploying a boarding team that will then exercise control over the ship and its crew. Since captured enemy government vessels, as booty of war, need not be adjudicated on by a prize court, ownership passes to the captor as soon as capture has been accomplished[1] [22].

Capture must be distinguished from the measures provided for in Article 31(1), i.e., diversion (in the sense of «ordering off»), control and search, and detention. Although all these measures result in an exercise of control, they are temporary and do not aim at an appropriation of the ship[1].

The express prohibition of attacks against military hospital ships only makes sense if they are of enemy nationality. Neutral military hospital ships are warships or auxiliaries, enjoying sovereign immunity, and an attack against them or visiting and searching them would constitute a violation of the flag State's rights[1]. Neutral non-military hospital ships, i.e. those operated by neutral National Red Cross or Red Crescent Societies, officially recognized relief societies or private individuals, are regulated by Article 25 of GC II, which states that they shall have the same protection as military hospital ships and shall be exempt from capture, on condition that they have placed themselves under the control of one of the Parties to the conflict, with the previous consent of their own governments and with the authorization of the Party to the conflict concerned, in so far as the provisions of Article 22 concerning notification have been complied with There was no reference to hospital ships belonging to, or operated by, a neutral flag State.

Military hospital ships shall be built and equipped «specially and solely with a view to assisting the wounded, sick and shipwrecked, to treating them and to transporting them». It follows from this provision and from the context of Articles 30 and 34 of GC II that military hospital ships should be engaged in exercise of exclusively The obligation to «protect» qualifying personnel of hospital ships, and their crews, entails, at a minimum, an obligation to take steps to ensure that they can carry out their work and to refrain from unduly interfering with their

work, such as by arresting them simply for performing their assigned duties[7]. More broadly, in the context of Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), of 8 June 1977 (further referred to as Additional Protocol I[8]), this entails an obligation to comply with Art. 16 («General protection of medical duties «). This obligation applies to medical personnel, both one's own and those of the enemy, for example, when their members are at the mercy of the opposing side.

As with the obligation to «respect», the obligation to «protect» applies both to the State and to its organs, each of which may bear responsibility under applicable international law, i.e., be it State responsibility or individual criminal or disciplinary responsibility. The overarching objective of the obligation to «protect» is to ensure that the persons entitled to such treatment can reach those in need – that is, in the case of medical personnel, the wounded and sick[7].

Specifics of Medical Transport, Transportation of Civilians and Assistance to Them

This means that a military hospital ship qualifies for protected status so long as it performs two distinct and cumulative humanitarian functions: first, to treat, and second, to transport victims of armed conflict. In any event, every wounded, sick or shipwrecked person who has been taken aboard a military hospital ship will of necessity be transported and, to a greater or lesser extent, provided with the necessary medical care. It is therefore the ability to perform these two tasks that distinguishes hospital ships from coastal rescue craft and other medical transports that are usually limited to providing expeditious transport to a medical facility and basic life-sustaining measures.

The primary functions of hospital ships are to collect, treat and transport those in need of assistance at sea. The evacuation of wounded and sick members of land forces, while certainly a lawful and protected activity, does not imply that hospital ships may in an unlimited and exclusive manner deliver medical items or that they can be used as transport ships for medical personnel and items. Hence, the carriage of surplus medical stores and supplies 'must be subordinate to the dominant object of the voyage, i.e., to pick up casualties at its destination. This finding is supported by Article 35(5). Although the transportation of medical personnel and equipment over and above their normal requirements may not be considered as depriving hospital ships of their protection, it does not mean that they may be used exclusively for the transportation of a disproportionate quantity of medical personnel and equipment[1].

Although the carriage of wounded, sick and shipwrecked civilians goes beyond the primary functions of specially protected hospital ships, it is still to be considered as the performance of a genuinely humanitarian function and, for that reason, does not deprive a hospital ship of its protected status under international humanitarian law.

Article 35(4) of GC II justifies the conclusion that hospital ships are allowed to assist wounded, sick and shipwrecked civilians. This certainly holds true if they are wounded, sick or shipwrecked as a result of naval action. As far as the requirements flowing from the Second Convention are concerned, every wounded, sick or shipwrecked civilian found at sea may be taken on board a military hospital ship, if it is on the scene. It does not matter whether the shipwreck has been caused by armed hostilities, a collision, grounding, bad weather or sea conditions[1]. In modern conditions, military personnel and civilians may be struck down on the same spot and by the same act of war. In such cases, they must be able to be treated by the same orderlies. Since the causes of sickness, injuries or shipwreck are irrelevant, every civilian found at sea may benefit from the services of a hospital ship or sickbay, whether sick or wounded or not. Moreover, sick or wounded civilians may be taken on board a military hospital ship in port[9].

So, as far as the requirements flowing from the GC (II) are concerned, refugees and migrants found in distress at sea may be assisted by military hospital ships even though they may have decided to take to sea for reasons unrelated to the armed conflict. In this context it is important to emphasize, however, that rules of

[7] Convention (II) for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea. Geneva, 12 August 1949. Commentary 2017. Article 36 – Protection of the personnel of hospital ships. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/gcii-1949/article-36/commentary/2017?activeTab=undefined. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

[8] Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), 8 June 1977. Text and commentaries. https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/api-1977?activeTab=1949GCs-APs-and-commentaries. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

[9] Convention (II) for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea. Geneva, 12 August 1949. Commentary 2017. Article 35 – Conditions not depriving hospital ships of protection. [Electronic resource]: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/gcii-1949/article-35/commentary/2017?activeTab=undefined. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

international law outside the international humanitarian law, and this depending on the circumstances, may have the effect that such persons found in distress at sea must be taken on board a military hospital ship[1]. These include the provisions of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982; International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) of 1974; International Convention on Salvage (adopted in 1989, enter into force in 1996); 1979 International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue (SAR, adopted in 1979, entered into force in 1985); as well as a number of IMO and UNHCR documents.

In addition, Article 22(1) of the Additional Protocol I, provides that (military) hospital vessels may carry «civilian wounded, sick and shipwrecked who do not belong to any of the categories mentioned in Article 13 of the Second Convention»[8].

There is, however, one category of civilians that have not right to benefit from the assistance provided by military hospital ships: civilians in port or on land who are neither wounded nor sick. The wording of Article 35(4) of the GC II is clear on this point. Civilians taken on board a military hospital ship must be in need of assistance because of their physical condition. Although women, children and the elderly are, in principle, considered as vulnerable and thus entitled to special respect and protection, they cannot be considered as wounded or sick unless they are «in need of immediate medical assistance or care» within the meaning of the article 8(a) of Additional Protocol I. The same applies to civilians who may find themselves in a desperate situation (e.g., refugees on land). The only available remedy is a cartel ship or aircraft, i.e., a specific vessel or aircraft that the Parties to the conflict have, in an agreement, identified as being entitled to transport civilians and refugees without being interfered with by the enemy[1].

CONCLUSION

Currently, only few States use military hospital ships within the meaning of GC II. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the construction and equipment of military hospital ships is a very expensive undertaking. In addition, such ships (and, if any, helicopters on them) are difficult to protect against modern high-tech weapons [23], including unmanned maritime systems [24] and aircraft [25]. Some states, notably the United Kingdom, have decommissioned their former military hospital ships from the regular navy because they were not apt to continue to expose them to the danger of accidental or deliberate attack. Instead, they have begun equipping some of their warships with medical aid compartments, thereby converting them into «primary casualty receiving ship» [26] that do not qualify for special protection under Article 22 of GC II. These new practices deprive the victims of armed conflict of a convenient platform where they can receive prompt and effective medical care at sea. In addition, without hospital ships, states will not be able to provide medical care to victims of international armed conflicts between other states. According to Art. 22(2)(a) AP I, military hospital vessels may be provided to a party to the conflict by « by a neutral or other State which is not a Party to that conflict».

These trends seem to be rather alarming, since they violate the already fragile balance between the practical needs and the limited possibilities of their legal regulation. Given the obvious sufficiency of the existing rules of international humanitarian law, there is no need to adopt new ones in the foreseeable future. At the same time, there remains a need to make adequate use of existing instruments of the international humanitarian law in order to ensure the safety of medical facilities, including hospital ships, and their personnel, designed to provide impartial assistance to all the victims of armed conflicts, regardless of where they occur – on land or at sea.

REFERENCES

1. Konurov, A. I., Kholikov, I. V. International legal and military political issues of contemporary world order. *Vestnik Akademii voennykh nauk*, 2015, Iss. 4 (53), pp. 7–18. [Electronic resource]: https://www.avnrf.ru/index.php/zhurnal-qvoennyj-vestnikq/arkhiv-nomerov/789-vestnik-avn-4–2015 [access restricted for subscribers only].

2. Kholikov, I. V. Countering criminal encroachments on international maritime security [*Protivodeistvie prestupnym posyagatelstvam na mezhdunarodnuyu morskuyu bezopasnost*]. In: Crime in XXI century. Priority areas of counteraction. Ed. by O. V. Damaskin, Yu. V. Nikolaeva. Moscow, LLC Publishing house «Uniti-Dana», 2020, 559 p., pp. 431–459. ISBN 978-5-238-03423-2.

3. Okocha, V. A., Kholikov, I. V. The use of armed force by private maritime security companies: dynamics of boundaries and specifics of legal regulation in the modern world. *Journal of Russian Law*, 2020, Iss. 12, pp. 147–158. DOI: 10.12737/jrl.2020.154.

4. Kraska, J., Pedrozo, R. International Maritime Security Law, 2013, 939 p. ISBN 978-90-04-23356-0.

5. Heintschel, von H., W. Unmanned Maritime Systems: Does the Increasing Use of Naval Weapon Systems Present a Challenge for IHL? In book: Dehumanization of Warfare, 2018, pp. 119–126. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-67266-3_7 [access restricted for subscribers only].

6. Melnichenko, P. I., Damaskin, O. V., Kholikov, I. V., Parshin, M. Zh. Organizational-and-law problems of acting against HIV/AIDS spread among the servicemen. *Voenno-meditsinskiy zhurnal*, 2005, Vol. 326, Iss. 2, pp. 50–54.

7. Sazonova, K. L., Kholikov, I. V. International legal aspects of responsibility of states and international organizations for the spread of epidemics, pandemics and mass diseases. *Voenno-meditsinskiy zhurnal,* 2015, Vol. 336, Iss. 8, pp. 51–57. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=26458389. Last accessed 12.09.2022.

8. Sazonova, K. L., Kholikov, I. V. The Ebola Response Team Deployment in the Guinea Republic: Organizational, Ethical, Legal Issues and a Problem of Responsibility. In: Ethical Challenges for Military Health Care Personnel. Ed. by D. Messelken, D. Winkler. New York, Routledge, 2018, pp. 38–51. DOI: 10.4324/9781315580258-3 [access restricted for subscribers only].

9. Zhdanov, K. V., Kholikov, I. V. Disease caused by the Ebola virus: from theory to practice. *Journal Infectology*, 2015, Vol. 7, Iss. 1, pp. 5–17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22625/2072-6732-2015-7-1-5-17.

10. Kholikov, I. V. The spread of epidemics, pandemics, and mass diseases as a contemporary global challenge. *Puti k miru i bezopasnosti*, 2020, Iss. 2 (59), pp. 27–40. DOI: 10.20542/2307-1494-2020-2-27-40. [Electronic resource]: https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=44414969. Last accessed 12.09.2022.

11. Kholikov, I. V. International legal aspects of implementation of the transport strategy of the Russian Federation in the field of medical support in transport [*Mezhdunarodno-pravovie aspekty realizatsii transportnoi strategii Rossiiskoi Federatsii v sfere meditsinskogo obespecheniya na transporte*]. *Transportnoe pravo i bezopasnost*, 2018, Iss. 4 (28), pp. 93–99. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=36782509. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

12. Chernogor, N., Zemlin, A., Kholikov, I., Mamedova, I. Impact of the spread of epidemics, pandemics and mass diseases on economic security of transport. *E3S Web of Conferences,* 2020, Vol. 203 (107), pp. 05019. DOI: 10.1051/e3sconf/202020305019. [Electronic resource]: https://www.e3s-conferences.org/articles/e3sconf/pdf/2020/63/e3sconf_ebwff2020_05019.pdf. Last accessed 19.08.2022.

13. Kholikov, I. V. International legal aspects of countering military threats in modern conditions [*Mezhdunarodno-pravovie aspekty protivodeistviya voennym ugrozam v sovremennykh usloviyakh*]. *Sovremennoe pravo*, 2003, Iss. 6, pp. 27–31.

14. Kholikov, I. V. Norms of international humanitarian law and the practice of their implementation in modern conditions [*Normy mezhdunarodnogo gumanitarnogo prava i praktika ikh realizatsii v sovremennykh usloviyakh*]. In: State policy of reforming social and humanitarian education: a comparison of the experience of post-socialist states: Collection of scientific articles based on the materials of the International Scientific and Practical Seminar. Orenburg, Orenburg State University, 2014, pp. 294–307. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=21985270. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

15. Hanson, N. The Confident Hope of a Miracle: The True History of the Spanish Armada, Vintage, 2003, P. 407. [Electronic resource]: https://archive.org/details/confidenthopeofm00hans [access restricted for subscribers only].

16. Mossop, J. C. Hospital Ships. In: Commentary on the Second Geneva Convention, Chapter III, 1947, pp. 398–406. [Electronic resource]: https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/commentary-on-the-second-geneva-convention/hospital-ships/B18460F4981F63C083F45585172D6431 [access restricted for subscribers only].

17. Galloy, J. L'Inviolabilité des Navires-Hôpitaux et l'expérience de la Guerre de 1914–1918. Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1931. [Electronic resource]: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law/article/abs/linviolabilite-des-navireshopitaux-et-lexperience-de-la-guerre-19141918-by-j-galloy-paris-librairie-du-recueil-sirey-1931-pp-192-fr-30/D178DA89BB9DFABEB375A035E638AF2D [access restricted for subscribers only].

18. Oppenheim's International Law. Edited by H. Lauterpacht. 7th ed. Longmans, Vol. 2. London, Green and Co., 1952. [Electronic resource]: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/cambridge-law-journal/article/abs/international-law-by-l-oppenheim-volume-2-disputes-war-and-neutrality-seventh-edition-edited-by-h-lauterpacht-london-longmans-green-co-1952-liii-and-883-and-index-56-pp-80s-net/CC326CCE62A5AFF654697F5EA3F0AD92 [access restricted for subscribers only].

19. Likhovidov, Kholikov, I. V., K. S., Plaksa, V. N. Current trends in international legal regulation of armed conflicts at sea. *Voenniy akademicheskiy zhurnal*, 2019, Iss. 4 (24), pp. 144–149. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=42421357. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

20. Plaksa, V. N., Kholikov, I. V. International legal protection of civilian population and civilian infrastructure in cyber warfare. *Voennoe pravo*, 2020, Iss. 5 (63), pp. 200–213. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=44024087. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

21. Kudashkin, A. V. Military law: Monograph in 3 volumes [*Voennoe pravo: Monografiya v 3 t.*]. Under the general ed. A. N. Savenkov, A. V. Kudashkin. Vol. 3: Main problems and promising areas of military legal research. Moscow, Centre for Legal Communications, 2022, 712 p. ISBN 978-5-6042565-1-0.

22. Dinstein, Y. Booty in Warfare. In: Use of Force. War and Neutrality Peace Treaties (A–M), 1982, pp. 66–68. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-444-86234-1.50028-X [access restricted for subscribers only].

23. Grimord, D. L., Riggs, G. W. The Unique and Protected Status of Hospital Ships under the Law of Armed Conflict. In: International Law and Military Operations, International Law Studies, U. S. Naval War College, 2006, Vol. 80, No. XIV, pp. 263–269. [Electronic resource]: https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1272&context=ils. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

24. Kholikov, I. V. Some problematic issues of international legal regulation of employment of unmanned maritime systems for military purposes. *Voennoe pravo*, 2019, Iss. 6 (58), pp. 276–282. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=41493037. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

25. Sazonova, K. L., Kholikov, I. V. International legal responsibility in the context of legal regulation of the military employment of unmanned aerial vehicles [*Mezhdunarodno-pravovaya otvetstvennost v kontekste pravovoi reglamentatsii voennogo ispolzovaniya bespilotnykh letatelnykh apparatov*]. *Voennoe pravo*, 2017, Iss. 4 (44), pp. 217–226. [Electronic resource]: https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=29952934. Last accessed 14.09.2022.

26. Smith, A. M. Has the Red-Cross-Adorned Hospital Ship Become Obsolete? *Naval War College Review*, 2005, Vol. 58, Iss. 3, pp. 121–131. [Electronic resource]: https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2052&context=nwc-review. Last accessed 14.09.2022. ●

Information about the author:

Kholikov, Ivan V., *Ph.D., D.Sc. (Law), Col. (ret.), Professor, Senior Researcher at the Section of International Law, Professor at the Department of International and European Law of the Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation; Legal Advisor to the Secretary General of the International Committee of Military Medicine, Moscow, Russia, iv_kholik@mail.ru.*

Article received 12.09.2022, approved 03.10.2022, accepted 10.10.2022.