

Framing the Conflict · How the UK treats the terrorism label in policy on Sri Lanka — MP Evidence Pack

Citation-only audit framework on whether UK accountability policy on Sri Lanka treats Tamil political grievances independently of the LTTE Schedule 2 listing — and on whether the UK has articulated a doctrinal position on remedial self-determination, on the IHL/CT distinction the ICRC sets out, and on the international-law definition of terrorism after the STL Ayyash decision and the Saul / Ambos rebuttals. Pack does not invite, support, or glorify any proscribed organisation (UK Terrorism Act 2000 §12). The question is doctrinal: whether the UK's policy architecture engages the international-law authorities on its own terms.

Citation-only audit framework on whether UK accountability policy on Sri Lanka treats Tamil political grievances independently of the LTTE Schedule 2 listing — and on whether the UK has articulated a doctrinal position on remedial self-determination, on the IHL/CT distinction the ICRC sets out, and on the international-law definition of terrorism after the STL Ayyash decision and the Saul / Ambos rebuttals. Pack does not invite, support, or glorify any proscribed organisation (UK Terrorism Act 2000 §12). The question is doctrinal: whether the UK's policy architecture engages the international-law authorities on its own terms.

Audience

- UK MPs
- Lords
- FCDO South Asia
- Home Office
- APPG for Tamils
- Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation

Best used for

- FCDO written questions on whether UK accountability policy on Sri Lanka separates Tamil political grievances from the LTTE proscription status
- FCDO written questions on the UK's articulated position on remedial self-determination after Kosovo AO 2010
- Home Office written questions on guidance distinguishing support for a proscribed organisation from support for a political grievance the organisation claimed to represent
- FCDO submissions on the IHL/CT interaction (per ICRC) in protracted internal armed conflicts

Tier-A evidence anchors

- Aaland Islands · 1920 Jurists Report and 1921 Rapporteurs Report
- Western Sahara, Advisory Opinion, ICJ 1975
- Reference re Secession of Quebec [1998] 2 SCR 217
- Katangese Peoples' Congress v Zaire, ACHPR 1995
- Kosovo Advisory Opinion, ICJ 2010 §§79–84
- Cassese · Self-Determination of Peoples (OUP 1995)
- Buchanan · Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-Determination (OUP 2004)
- UNGA Res 2625 (XXV) · Declaration on Friendly Relations 1970
- Weller · Escaping the Self-Determination Trap (Brill 2008)

- Guruparan · UCL PhD thesis (2019)
- Ananthavinayagan · PHRG / Brill NJIL (2018)
- Sterio · The Right to Self-Determination Under International Law (Routledge 2013)
- UN Ad Hoc Committee on a Comprehensive Convention (since 1996)
- UNGA Res 51/210 (1996)
- STL-11-01/I · Interlocutory Decision 16 February 2011 (Cassese P)
- Saul · Defining Terrorism in International Law (OUP 2006)
- Ambos · Judicial Creativity at the STL (LJIL 2011)
- UN SC Res 1373 (2001)
- UN SC Res 1566 (2004)
- Pejic · Terrorism and IHL (IRRC, ICRC)
- OHCHR A/HRC/60/21 (28 August 2025)
- HRC Resolution 60/1 — OSLap renewal through 2027

Policy asks

- UK Government (FCDO): Set out whether and how UK accountability policy on Sri Lanka treats Tamil political grievances independently of the Schedule 2 listing of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam.
- UK Government (FCDO): Set out whether the United Kingdom has articulated a position on remedial self-determination consistent with the reasoning of the Supreme Court of Canada in Reference re Secession of Quebec [1998] 2 SCR 217 and the International Court of Justice in its Advisory Opinion of 22 July 2010 in respect of Kosovo.
- UK Government (Home Office): Set out whether Foreign Office or Home Office written guidance distinguishes between (a) inviting or expressing support for a proscribed organisation under section 12 of the Terrorism Act 2000, and (b) supporting the political grievance the organisation in question claimed to represent.
- UK Government (FCDO): Set out the training given to British diplomatic and consular staff in the reporting of protracted internal armed conflicts in relation to the distinction between international humanitarian law and the counter-terrorism legal framework, as set out by the International Committee of the Red Cross (see Pejic, IRRC).

Draft parliamentary questions

- [FCDO] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, whether and how United Kingdom accountability policy in respect of Sri Lanka treats Tamil political grievances independently of the Schedule 2 listing of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam under the Terrorism Act 2000, having regard to the findings of the OHCHR in document A/HRC/60/21 of 28 August 2025 and the mandate renewed by Human Rights Council Resolution 60/1.
- [FCDO] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, whether the United Kingdom has articulated a position on remedial self-determination consistent with the reasoning of the Supreme Court of Canada in Reference re Secession of Quebec [1998] 2 SCR 217 and the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 22 July 2010 in respect of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in respect of Kosovo.
- [Home Office] To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether Foreign Office or Home Office written guidance distinguishes between (a) inviting or expressing support for a proscribed organisation under section 12 of the Terrorism Act 2000 and (b) supporting the political grievance which the organisation in question claimed to represent.

- [FCDO] To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, what training is given to British diplomatic and consular staff in the reporting of protracted internal armed conflicts in relation to the distinction between international humanitarian law and the counter-terrorism legal framework, as set out by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Civic remembrance

This pack does not adopt 'national liberation movement', 'state terrorism' or 'civil war' in its own voice. It asks UK policy to engage the international-law authorities on their own terms — the Quebec / Kosovo doctrinal frame; the unfinished international-law definition of terrorism (UN Ad Hoc Committee since 1996; STL Ayyash 2011 and the Saul / Ambos rebuttals); and the IHL/CT distinction set out by the International Committee of the Red Cross. UK Terrorism Act 2000 §12 applies on every page.

Pack rules

- Never invites, supports, or glorifies any proscribed organisation (UK Terrorism Act 2000 §12).
- Never adopts 'national liberation movement' or 'state terrorism' as a TLTE finding.
- Never asserts that Tamil Eelam is lawful under international law or that recognition is owed.
- Always frames the question as procedural and doctrinal — whether UK policy engages the international-law authorities on their own terms.
- Always pairs at least one international-law authority (ICJ, ACHPR, STL, ICRC) with one Tamil legal scholar (Guruparan, Ananthavinayagan, Sterio).
- Always publishes the Honest Ceiling on remedial self-determination alongside any argument that draws on the Quebec / Kosovo doctrinal frame.

Transparency

Published under the UK Transparency of Lobbying Act 2014 posture. TLTE C.I.C. is a community interest company, not a state, party or charity. Era: Aarambam (founding).