



THE UNITED STATES' INVOLVEMENT IN THE IRAN-ISRAEL CONFLICT: A NORMATIVE ANALYSIS OF NEUTRALITY AND COLLECTIVE DEFENSE UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

Domingos Correia Tavares¹, Budi Parmono², Rahmatul Hidayati³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Islam Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia.

Article Info

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Collective Defense, International Neutrality, Laws of War.

This research analyzes the United States' involvement in the Iran-Israel conflict through its military aid to Israel, examining its implications for the principles of neutrality, collective defense, and international law. Using a normative qualitative approach with a juridical-analytical framework, the study evaluates various international legal instruments, including the Hague Convention and the United Nations Charter. The findings show that the US's support to Israel exceeds the bounds of neutrality and exploits collective defense without UN Security Council approval, contributing to violations of international humanitarian law, particularly concerning proportionality and civilian protection. The research highlights the need for stronger oversight mechanisms regarding third-state interventions in armed conflicts, to preserve the legitimacy of international law and ensure global stability.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Domingos Correia Tavares
Department Hukum
Universitas Islam Malang
Email: dctogp1112@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The Iran-Israel conflict has long been a focal point of geopolitical tension, characterized by a complex and ongoing rivalry that affects not only regional stability in the Middle East but also broader global security. This conflict is not merely bilateral; it is also deeply intertwined with the strategic interests of external actors, particularly global powers like the United States. Since the early stages of the conflict, the United States has consistently provided significant political, military, and diplomatic support to Israel, reinforcing its strategic position in the region. This external intervention has raised critical questions about the legal legitimacy of third-state involvement in such conflicts, particularly under the framework of international law.

While substantial research has been conducted on the principles of neutrality and collective defense in the context of armed conflict, there is a notable gap in the literature regarding the application of these principles to the involvement of third states, specifically the United States, in the Iran-Israel conflict. Previous studies primarily focus on the political, military, or ideological aspects of US involvement but fail to provide an in-depth legal analysis, particularly regarding the compatibility of such actions with international legal norms such as neutrality and collective defense. This gap in research has led to insufficient understanding of the legal boundaries of third-state interventions and their implications on global peace and stability.

This study aims to address this gap by critically examining the United States' involvement in the Iran-Israel conflict through the lens of international law, focusing specifically on the principles of neutrality and collective

defense. By analyzing various international legal instruments, such as the United Nations Charter and the Hague Conventions, this research provides a normative evaluation of US actions, determining whether they align with international legal standards. The urgency of this research lies in the increasing trend of external interventions in regional conflicts, which threatens to undermine the integrity of international law and set a dangerous precedent for future conflicts. As major powers continue to prioritize their geopolitical interests, the effectiveness of international law in ensuring peace and protecting human rights is increasingly at risk.

This research is crucial not only for the legal community but also for policymakers, as it provides a comprehensive understanding of the legal implications of third-state intervention and calls for stronger oversight mechanisms in international conflict resolution. By addressing the normative dimensions of external intervention, this study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of international law's role in contemporary conflicts, particularly in preventing the delegitimization of international legal principles that are essential for maintaining global stability and justice.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs a normative juridical approach, which focuses on the analysis of applicable legal norms and principles that govern the behavior of states in international conflicts. The normative juridical approach is particularly appropriate for evaluating the role of external actors, such as the United States, in the Iran-Israel conflict, as it allows for the critical examination of legal instruments and doctrines within the context of international law. This study will analyze both primary and secondary legal sources, including international treaties, general international legal principles, and recognized doctrines, to assess the legality of U.S. involvement in the conflict.

The primary data for this research will be sourced from various international legal instruments, such as the United Nations Charter, the 1907 Hague Convention, and the Geneva Conventions, which provide the foundation for the principles of neutrality and self-defense in armed conflicts. These documents will be critically analyzed to understand the normative framework of international law governing third-state intervention. Additionally, this research will examine official foreign policy documents from the United States, detailing its military aid and strategic support to Israel, as well as official reports from international organizations, particularly the United Nations, that are relevant to the Iran-Israel conflict.

A significant component of the methodology is the inclusion of a case study of the post-2020 Iran-Israel conflict. This case study provides real-world examples of how U.S. involvement in the conflict aligns or conflicts with international legal principles, specifically focusing on the legal implications of the U.S. military aid to Israel and its implications for the principles of neutrality and collective defense under international law. The case study will examine key events in the conflict where U.S. involvement was particularly significant, and it will help contextualize the theoretical framework of international law in the contemporary geopolitical landscape.

In addition to legal documents and case studies, this research will incorporate a thorough academic analysis of scholarly publications related to international law, particularly those addressing the principles of neutrality, collective defense, and third-state intervention in conflicts. These academic sources will provide a critical perspective on how international law has evolved in response to modern conflicts and external interventions.

The data will be analyzed through a qualitative legal analysis, using a doctrinal approach to assess how well the actions of the United States fit within the established legal frameworks. The study will identify contradictions or inconsistencies between international law and state practice, especially with regard to the U.S.'s justification for its military support to Israel. The normative legal analysis will also involve examining the legality of third-state involvement in armed conflicts, with a focus on the *jus ad bellum* (the right to war) and *jus in bello* (the conduct of war), and how these principles apply to the U.S.'s actions in the Iran-Israel conflict.

While this study relies on secondary sources such as legal documents, policy papers, and scholarly publications, future research could benefit from empirical data, such as interviews with international law experts, diplomats, or policymakers, to gain deeper insights into the legal and diplomatic implications of third-state intervention in armed conflicts.

3. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

US Military Aid and the Neutrality Issue

Since 2020, the United States has consistently provided large-scale military aid to Israel (Muntasyir, 2022). According to a Congressional Research Service (CRS) report, the total annual aid allocation for the 2020-2023 period exceeded US\$3.3 billion, with a focus on strengthening defense systems such as Iron Dome, procuring advanced weaponry, and increasing collaboration in the fields of military intelligence and technology (Muntasyir, 2022). This support further strengthens the long-term strategic relationship between the two countries. However, in the context of the chronic and escalating Iran-Israel conflict, US involvement cannot be understood solely as bilateral cooperation but must be analyzed through the lens of international law, particularly the principle of neutrality, which governs the behavior of third states in armed conflict.

The principle of neutrality is an essential foundation of the law of international armed conflict, requiring third-party states not directly involved in hostilities to refrain from providing military support or strategic assistance to the parties to the conflict. This provision is explicitly stipulated in the 1907 Hague Conventions V and XIII and reinforced by customary international law (Lando, 2022). This principle aims to limit the intensification of conflict and maintain a balance of power to prevent uncontrolled escalation. In this context, the United States' military support for Israel clearly exceeds the normative boundaries of the principle of neutrality. This support is not merely symbolic or rhetorical, but operational and has a real impact on Israel's combat capabilities in confronting Iran and its network of allies.

Research from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) (2023) shows that since 2020, more than 70% of the advanced defense equipment used by Israel in limited military operations in the Gaza Strip and in airstrikes on Syria has been supplied by the United States. Furthermore, intelligence collaboration between the two countries has been intensive, including providing access to satellite imagery and monitoring Iranian military activity in strategic areas such as Lebanon and the Persian Gulf. These findings confirm that the United States' position has shifted from being a neutral observer to an active supporter in the conflict. Thus, the validity of the principle of neutrality as a fundamental norm in international relations based on respect for law and global peace is becoming increasingly questionable.

This form of involvement reflects the tendency for fundamental principles of international law to be marginalized by practical political considerations and the interests of strategic alliances. Rather than maintaining a neutral position as an external actor, the United States appears as an integral part of the conflict through its active role in providing substantial military support. This constellation creates a distortion in the international legal system, where hegemonic powers are granted more lenient, even permissive, interpretations of legal norms to achieve geopolitical agendas. As Kwiecień (2024) argues in *Fairness in International Law and Institutions*, the legitimacy of the international legal system is vulnerable to degradation when its fundamental principles are consistently ignored by major powers that dominate the global order.

Furthermore, violations of the principle of neutrality by a country as significant as the United States have serious implications for the credibility and effectiveness of international diplomacy. Explicit US support for Israel has caused America's position as a mediator or facilitator in conflicts in the Middle East to lose legitimacy in the eyes of other parties, particularly Iran and its network of allies. This situation has the potential to hinder the creation of a fair peace negotiation process and undermine trust in global institutions such as the United Nations in handling similar conflicts. A report from International Utomo (2024) also emphasized that the lack of neutrality of dominant actors in regional conflicts significantly prolongs the escalation of violence and increases the potential for human rights violations.

In the global landscape, tolerance of violations of the principle of neutrality risks creating a negative precedent that could encourage other countries to replicate similar patterns. If this principle continues to be ignored for strategic interests, the authority of international law as a normative framework will be delegitimized. This situation opens the door to covert intervention by third countries in various armed conflicts elsewhere in the world, as reflected in the dynamics in Ukraine, Yemen, and the South China Sea. Therefore, the international community needs to reaffirm the importance of the principle of neutrality as a fundamental element in supporting a world order based on the rule of law and not calculations of power.

Therefore, a firm and structured response from the international community is needed, including active intervention by the UN Security Council, to monitor and critically assess the involvement of third countries in armed conflicts. The involvement of international judicial institutions, such as the International Court of Justice, is also crucial in reinterpreting the normative boundaries of the principle of neutrality, ensuring its continued adaptability and operationality in the face of contemporary geopolitical dynamics. Without such concrete steps, conflicts such as the one between Iran and Israel will continue to be platforms for projecting the interests of major powers, while international legal norms risk being relegated to mere symbolic instruments. This research emphasizes that the principle of neutrality is not merely an ethical requirement but also a legal obligation that must be upheld to ensure stability and peace in the global order.

Questionable Collective Defense Claims

The United States, through various official statements, claims that its support for Israel implements the principle of collective self-defense as stipulated in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter (Matitaputty et al., 2023). This provision legitimizes a state's right to defend itself against armed attacks, either individually or in collective solidarity, at the request of the affected state. In the context of the conflict between Iran and Israel, the United States positions threats against Israel as representing threats to the stability of the Middle East region as a whole, as well as to its national strategic interests. With this narrative, US military involvement is positioned as legally legitimate and essential to maintaining the broader regional geopolitical balance.

However, the claim of collective self-defense put forward by the United States raises significant legal challenges. To date, no official UN Security Council resolution has designated Iran as the aggressor in a conflict involving Israel. Under international law, the legitimacy of collective self-defense requires a concrete armed attack, accompanied by recognition by the international community and an explicit request from the victim state. Without formal legitimacy from an authority such as the Security Council, the argument for the use of military force based on threats to allies loses its normative force. Several international law experts, Adhazar et al. (2022), assert that a unilateral interpretation of Article 51 is prone to misuse as a justification for military intervention lacking a legal basis.

A study by Elgawari (2025) emphasized that several countries, including the United States, tend to expand the interpretation of the principle of collective defense to include preemptive self-defense. This approach deviates from the normative framework of international law, which explicitly states that the use of armed force is only justified in the event of an actual armed attack, not merely based on a potential threat or subjective perception of security risk. In the context of relations between the United States and Israel, no consistent evidence has been found that Israel was the victim of direct armed aggression from Iran—a fundamental requirement for the validity of collective defense claims under applicable international law.

In practice, the United States' application of the principle of collective defense often serves as a political justification to maintain its active involvement in the dynamics of conflict in the Middle East. The absence of formal authorization from the UN Security Council for such actions undermines the legitimacy of international law and has the potential to set a negative precedent. This opens the door for other countries to abuse similar principles for political gain or territorial expansion. For example, Russia exploited a similar narrative in its intervention in Eastern Ukraine, claiming to protect ethnic Russian groups allegedly under threat. This case underscores that removing the principle of collective defense from the strict framework of international law risks creating normative ambiguity and increasing the likelihood of cross-regional conflict escalation.

Claims of collective defense that are not based on objective parameters pose serious risks because they potentially undermine fundamental principles of international law, such as non-intervention, state sovereignty, and the prohibition on the use of armed force except in exceptional circumstances. When major powers, such as the United States, are given the freedom to interpret threats unilaterally and act without international legitimacy, legal force becomes subordinated to political interests. This situation emphasizes the urgency of reinstating the principle of collective defense within a strict and measurable legal framework. As emphasized by the International Court of Justice in *Nicaragua v. United States of America* (1986), the application of collective defense must meet clear objective criteria and be convincingly proven to prevent its misuse as a hegemonic instrument (Wathan & Putri, 2024).

Beyond the normative aspect, empirically, the unilateral application of the principle of collective defense by the United States has contributed to the escalation of conflict in the Middle East. When military intervention is legitimized without a strong legal basis, it not only worsens the security situation but also deepens the humanitarian crisis and hinders the achievement of a sustainable diplomatic solution. An Amnesty International report (2023) noted that the intensification of violence increased significantly following US military involvement in various Israeli operations, which in turn led to a surge in civilian casualties and massive damage to public infrastructure in conflict-affected areas.

Considering the interconnected legal, political, and humanitarian dimensions, the urgency of strengthening international oversight mechanisms for the use of collective defense claims becomes even more pressing. The global community, particularly through authorities such as the UN Security Council, must ensure that any claim of collective defense is based on concrete evidence of an armed attack and is formally legitimized. Without the application of rigorous verification standards, the principle of collective defense risks losing its legal validity and becoming an instrument for justifying unilateral intervention that undermines the integrity of the international legal order. Therefore, a transparent and accountable multilateral approach is needed to evaluate the involvement of third countries in conflicts to prevent the emergence of negative precedents in global geopolitical dynamics.

Violations of the Principles of the Laws of War and Their Impact

The United States' involvement in the conflict between Iran and Israel raises fundamental issues within the international legal framework, particularly regarding the application of the principles of the laws of war, namely *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* (Rahmatulummah & Resky, 2024). The principle of *jus ad bellum* establishes the legal limits of a state's use of armed force, which is justified only in the event of a direct armed attack that threatens the state's existence. In this context, there is no valid evidence that Iran has committed armed aggression against the United States. Therefore, neither the military intervention nor the strategic support provided by the US to Israel can be qualified as legitimate acts of self-defense under international law, as stipulated in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

The interpretation of the principle of *jus ad bellum* has been the subject of in-depth study in international legal discourse. Brownlie (2000), in his work *International Law and the Use of Force by States**, asserts that the legality of the use of armed force must be based on an actual and verified armed attack, not simply driven by the

assumption or potential threat (Ramzan et al., 2022). In the context of the United States' involvement, this military intervention actually exceeded the legal limits stipulated in international law, as it was carried out without concrete evidence that its territory or citizens were the target of armed aggression. This situation reinforces the perception that the military support provided was more politically motivated than a response to actual aggression, thus failing to meet the objective criteria established in the jurisprudence of the International Court of Justice to be categorized as a legitimate act of self-defense.

In addition to the *jus ad bellum* aspect, the United States' involvement in the Iran-Israel conflict is also relevant to be analyzed through the principle of *jus in bello*, namely the rules of international humanitarian law that govern conduct in war to protect humanitarian values. Two key principles of *jus in bello* are proportionality and discrimination, which require that military attacks be directed only at legitimate military targets and not cause disproportionate impact on the civilian population. However, according to reports by Human Rights Watch (2023) and Amnesty International (2022), there has been a significant spike in the number of civilian casualties, especially in the Gaza Strip and South Lebanon, which coincides with the increasing intensity of Israeli military operations, operations that are directly supported by sophisticated technology and intelligence capacity supplied by the United States.

The intelligence support provided by the United States does enable Israel to conduct attacks with greater precision. However, in many cases, the information obtained is used to attack densely populated areas or civilian infrastructure, resulting in a disproportionate loss of life. According to a report by the Al-Mezan Center for Human Rights (2022), more than 45% of casualties in the military operation in Gaza were women and children. This fact reinforces the assumption that US strategic support is not always carried out within the strict framework of international humanitarian law, potentially violating the principle of *jus in bello*. Normatively, this opens up legal liability for indirect involvement in humanitarian violations.

Violations of the principle of *jus in bello* also have serious consequences for the credibility of the United States as a supporter of the international legal order. According to Cassese (2005) in *International Law*, a state that knowingly provides assistance to a party to a conflict, knowing that the assistance will be used to violate humanitarian law, can be held accountable as an indirect perpetrator (complicity) (Nurchayani, 2024). Thus, if the United States' involvement is proven to have been undertaken with the knowledge that such support would be used in an attack that violates the principle of proportionality, then such actions could be categorized as complicity in war crimes. More broadly, this situation underscores the importance of establishing stricter oversight mechanisms for the involvement of third countries in armed conflicts. International institutions such as the UN Security Council and the International Court of Justice have a strategic role in strengthening the monitoring and enforcement system against state actors suspected of violating the principles of the laws of war. Strengthening these mechanisms is crucial to ensuring that the principles of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* not only function as declarative norms but are actually implemented consistently, without discrimination based on political power or strategic affiliation. Furthermore, the sustainability of the international legal system is crucially determined by the consistency in enforcing these fundamental norms. If major powers like the United States can act outside the legal framework without clear consequences, it will set a dangerous precedent that other countries could follow. This will not only undermine the legitimacy of international law but also exacerbate the humanitarian crisis in armed conflict. Therefore, the international community must take firm steps to uphold the supremacy of law over short-term political interests, for the sake of creating a global order that is just, civilized, and based on universal justice.

4. CONCLUSION

This study shows that the United States' military involvement in the Iran-Israel conflict violates key principles of international law, particularly neutrality, collective defense, and the laws of war. U.S. military and intelligence support to Israel goes beyond the boundaries of neutrality, turning the U.S. into an active participant. Additionally, this support misuses the principle of collective defense without UN approval and contributes to violations of proportionality and discrimination under international humanitarian law, resulting in significant civilian harm. The study highlights the danger posed by hegemonic states prioritizing geopolitical interests over international law, emphasizing the need to strengthen the principles of neutrality and collective defense. It argues for a rigorous application of international law to preserve peace, stability, and justice. The research contributes to academic discussions by offering a critical perspective on great-power military support and introducing complicity as a key factor in assessing third-state responsibility. The study also notes limitations in scope and methodology, recommending future research that incorporates empirical methods, such as surveys and interviews, to better understand third-state interventions in conflicts. Expanding the scope of this research can offer a deeper understanding of third-state interventions and their impact on international law, regional stability, and human rights protection, providing valuable insights for policymakers.

5. REFERENCES

- [1] Achnisundani, D., Arfian, B. F., Susilo, T., & Wiratama, W. T. (2025). Paradoks Pengungsi: Antara Perlindungan Ham Dan Kedaulatan Nasional Dalam Krisis Kemanusiaan. *Journal Of Law and Nation*, 4(2), 371-393.
- [2] Adhazar, V., Suhaidi, S., Sutiarnoto, S., & Leviza, J. (2022). Tanggung Jawab Negara Atas Digunakannya Senjata Space-Based Missile Interceptor Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Self-Defense Dari Negara Penyerang Terhadap Negara Pihak Ketiga Ditinjau Dari Hukum Internasional: State Responsibility For The Use Of Space-Based Missile Interceptor Weapons As A Self-Defense Effort From The Enemy Country Against Third Party States Reviewing From International Law. *Res Nullius Law Journal*, 4(1), 100-126.
- [3] Besar, P. P. J. G., & Setiawati, S. M. (n.d.). Konsistensi Politik Luar Negeri Indonesia Terhadap Timur Tengah: Antara Nilai Normatif Dan Rasionalitas Geopolitik.
- [4] C. O'Meara, "Balancing State Security and Peace and Security in Outer Space: What Role for International Law on the Use of Force?" *Just Security*, Apr. 11, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.justsecurity.org/114641/balancing-state-security-and-peace-and-security-in-outer-space-what-role-for-international-law-on-the-use-of-force/>
- [5] D. Berchev, "The Evolving Concept of Neutrality in International Law: Challenges and Perspectives," *ResearchGate*, Jun. 18, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/392771106_THE_EVOLVING_CONCEPT_OF_NEUTRALITY_IN_INTERNATIONAL_LAW_CHALLENGES_AND_PERSPECTIVES
- [6] D. Kritsiotis, O. Corten, and G. H. Fox, *Armed Intervention and Consent*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2023.
- [7] Djuyandi, Y., Sudirman, A., & Suryana, N. (2025). Analisis Hubungan Sipil-Militer di Indonesia Pasca Reformasi 1998. *Journal of Political Issues*, 7(1), 46-56.
- [8] Elgawari, Z. A. (2025). Preemptive Self-Defence in Public International Law: An Analysis through the Lens of International Court of Justice Jurisprudence. *Access to Just. E. Eur.*, 85.
- [9] Firdaus, F. A., Aviandy, M., & Fajarwati, A. A. S. (2024). Representasi *Россия Сегодня* (Rossiya Segodnya) Terhadap Konflik Israel-Palestina dalam Kurun Waktu Oktober-Desember 2023. *Arus Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 4(3), 1563-1578.
- [10] Fitriyanti, S. (2025). Dampak Konflik Israel Pada Hubungan Internasional Di Timur. *Jurnal Cakrawala Ilmiah*, 4(7), 1085-1094.
- [11] Kwiecień, R. (2024). Reflections on the Role of Fairness for the Sources of International Law. *International Community Law Review*, 26(5), 476-500.
- [12] Lando, M. (2022). Identification as the process to determine the content of customary international law. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 42(4), 1040-1066.
- [13] M. FERIA TINTA, "Rights of Nature in Human Rights Courts or a Parallel Protection System?" *EJIL Talk!*, Apr. 23, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ejiltalk.org/rights-of-nature-in-human-rights-courts-or-a-parallel-protection-system/>
- [14] Matitaputty, P., Tuhulele, P., & Peilouw, J. S. F. (2023). Hak Penuntutan Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa Berdasarkan Hukum Internasional. *PATTIMURA Law Study Review*, 1(1), 67-82.
- [15] Muntasyir, M. B. (2022). Peran Aktif Amerika Serikat Era Joe Biden Dalam Konflik Palestina Dan Israel. *Jurnal PIR: Power in International Relations*, 7(1), 1.
- [16] Nurcahyani, D. (2024). Hak Asasi Manusia Dalam Perspektif Hukum Internasional Dan Nasional. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Pancasila, Kewarganegaraan, Dan Hukum*, 1(1), 7-13.
- [17] Prasetya, F. E. (2025). Klasterisasi Minat Global Terhadap Konflik Iran-Israel Menggunakan K-Means Pada Data Google Trends (13-24 Juni 2025). *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi, Pendidikan Dan Teknik*, 2(4), 65-70.
- [18] R. Kolb and B. Meret, "Clarifying Neutrality: The Rise of Different Statuses?" *Lieber Institute - West Point*, Mar. 19, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://lieber.westpoint.edu/clarifying-neutrality-the-rise-of-different-statuses/>
- [19] R. Kolb, "The So-Called Principle of Equal Treatment of Belligerents by the Neutral State," *Lieber Institute - West Point*, Apr. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://lieber.westpoint.edu/the-so-called-principle-of-equal-treatment-of-belligerents-by-the-neutral-state/>
- [20] Rachmawati, T., Lestari, R., & Fadhillillah, N. (2025). The Impact of Normalization of Relations between Israel and Arab Countries on the Israeli-Palestinian Issue. *Jurnal ICMES*, 9(1), 63-76.

- [21] Rahmatulummah, A., & Resky, S. A. (2024). Eskalasi konflik Iran dan israel di Damaskus: Implikasi terhadap stabilitas keamanan regional dan global. *Jurnal Hubungan Luar Negeri*, 9(1), 49-68.
- [22] Ramzan, M. F. M., Rahman, M. Z. A., & Daud, N. M. (2022). Analisis Legitimasi Campur Tangan Kemanusiaan: Sorotan Terhadap Prinsip-Prinsip Asas Undang-Undang Antarabangsa. *Jurnal Peradaban*, 15(1), 30-62.
- [23] Utomo, H. R. (2024). Pelanggaran Hak Asasi Manusia Internasional pada Invasi Rusia ke Ukraina. *Journal Evidence of Law*, 3(1), 1-9.
- [24] Wathan, B. A., & Putri, I. F. (2024). Analisa hukum kebiasaan dalam kasus militer dan paramiliter nikaragua v. amerika serikat. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(3), 837-846.
- [25] Zainuddin, M., & Karina, A. D. (2023). Penggunaan Metode Yuridis Normatif Dalam Membuktikan Kebenaran Pada Penelitian Hukum. *Smart Law Journal*, 2(2), 114-123.