

The legal nature of the US position on the Russian-Ukrainian war

الطبيعة القانونية للموقف الأمريكي من الحرب الروسية الأوكرانية

Khalfallah faouzi*, Faculty of law and political science, University of Khenchela

fkhalfallah6@gmail.com

Sakri Saadi, Faculty of Law and Political Science, University of Oum El ouaghi

sakri.saadi@univ-ueb.dz

Received: 11/07 /2025

Accepted: 21/11 /2025

Published: 29/11 /2025

Abstract:

Major powers often interfere in the internal affairs of weak states, relying on some loopholes in international law, primarily to achieve their own interests. This is nothing new in international relations, but what the United States did was surprising when it encouraged Ukraine to continue fighting against Russia through its continued political and material support. The goal behind this was to weaken the Russian side, but this did not happen during the era of President Joe Biden. This is what Donald Trump realized after his coronation as the new president of the United States of America, as he expressed a change in the White House's position on the Ukrainian issue by interfering in Ukraine's internal politics and cutting off aid to it, in order to force it to surrender. All of this opened the door to debate about the legitimacy of American actions towards the Ukrainian issue according to the rules of international law.

Key words: international law, u.s. intervention, united nations charter, national sovereignty.

Introduction:

Since the outbreak of the Ukrainian crisis in 2014 and Russia's annexation of Crimea, and after the armed conflict escalated again in 2022 between the two sides, international relations have witnessed an unprecedented escalation, with Ukraine becoming a focus of conflict between major powers, particularly between Russia on the one hand and the United States and the West on the other. What is striking, however, is American interference in Ukrainian affairs, which is one of the most prominent factors influencing the development of events in the region, whether through military support or political guidance for Ukraine, which has only exacerbated the situation. All of this has sparked widespread controversy over the extent to which this interference is compatible with the principles of international law and national sovereignty, prompting some countries to consider it a violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of states. What is even more surprising, however, is that in 2025, the American position completely changed from support for the Ukrainian issue to support for Russia. All of this has cast doubt on the previous arguments for American intervention, raising several legal questions, all of which lead us primarily to pose the following problem: **How legitimate is American intervention in the Ukrainian issue according to the rules of international law?**

This topic will be addressed in accordance with the requirements of the analytical approach, which is the approach mandated by such studies, as it necessitates the analysis of international legal texts. However, there is nothing preventing us from utilizing other methodologies imposed by the elements of the subject, such as the descriptive and inductive approaches.

The aim of this study is to determine the legal status of U.S. intervention in Ukrainian affairs by examining the U.S. role and how its intervention aligns with the rules of international

*Corresponding Author

law, as well as its contribution to resolving the Russian-Ukrainian crisis in the pursuit of international peace and security, which is the supreme goal of the international community.

To address the topic from all its aspects, this study is divided into two sections. In the first section, we examine the fluctuation of the U.S. stance on the Ukrainian issue by highlighting the justifications for U.S. intervention from the past to the present (Subsection 1) followed by an analysis of the legal framework for U.S. intervention in Ukraine (Subsection 2) The second section is dedicated to evaluating the U.S. intervention from the perspective of international law, through a study of how the U.S. exploits legal gaps in the international system (Subsection 1), and the impact of the intervention on the development of international law (Subsection 2).

1-Tilte I: The US position on the Ukrainian issue has oscillated.

Following the Russian aggression against Ukraine, Western countries, led by the United States, mobilized under the pretext of providing assistance against Russia. However, this support has only increased the scale of material and human losses. Indeed, the situation has become increasingly prescient of a third world war, given the stubbornness of the Russian bear. All of this has led to a shift in the American position with the change in the American administration after the presidential elections, and we will explain this in turn as follows:

1.1-First Subtitle: Justifications for American intervention between past and present

America has always been the primary beneficiary of European wars, as all historical precedents show that the United States has never fought an actual war on its own soil. This is evidence that American policy primarily relies on weakening its adversaries by supporting one side at the expense of the other. This strategy was adopted during the Russia-Ukraine war, where the U.S. supported Ukraine financially and intervened in its political decisions to continue its war effort. However, this position did not last long, as the U.S. side began to feel the threat that could jeopardize its national security. This is what we will examine in this section as follows:

Enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle(Times New Roman, character size 12,Interligne=1).

The First Branch: Justifications for US support under President Joe Biden

The concept of intervention will be addressed in accordance with the rules of international law, and then we will study the most important arguments on which the American side relied in its intervention, as follows:

First: The concept of intervention in international law

International intervention is defined as the direct or indirect influence of a state or group of states on the internal affairs of another state, whether through military, economic, or political means. Intervention is considered a violation of the principle of national sovereignty unless it is justified under international law, such as intervention for humanitarian purposes or based on a UN Security Council resolution¹.

Based on what has been mentioned, international intervention can be classified into several forms, which can be summarized as follows:

1. **Military intervention:** The concept of military intervention is considered a controversial concept in international relations, as it is based on the concept of the right of one state or group of states to intervene militarily against another state to prevent or put an end to serious violations of human rights. The intervention may be for the purpose of protecting citizens and persons threatened with genocide and war crimes. However, in general, humanitarian intervention is considered by observers, researchers, analysts, and even many states to be a violation of the established rules of international law², and includes the direct or indirect use of armed force.

2. **Political interference:** This is manifested in influencing the internal political decisions of another country, by forcing it to do or refrain from doing a certain thing³.
3. **Economic intervention:** This is the imposition of economic sanctions, which are a set of economic and financial measures and procedures imposed by a country, countries, international or regional organizations or bodies on a country, organization or company, on the grounds of committing aggressive acts or threatening international peace and security, in order to force that party to make concessions of a political, economic or military nature. Economic sanctions generally aim to compel the rulers of the targeted countries to modify their policies⁴, or to provide financial support with the aim of changing the policies of the targeted country.

1.2-Second Subtitle : Arguments for US interference in Ukrainian affairs

The United States is Ukraine's largest donor in its war against Russia, with financial support estimated at \$123 billion since the Russian invasion, according to data from the Kiel Institute for the World Economy, a German think tank that tracks aid to Ukraine. President Zelensky did not deny this, stating that military supplies from the United States cover about 40% of Ukraine's defense needs, which include air defense systems, drones, rocket launchers, radars, tanks, and anti-tank weapons⁵.

The United States has relied on several arguments to justify its intervention in Ukrainian affairs, which can be summarized in the following points⁶:

1. **Protecting Ukrainian sovereignty:** Washington considers Russia to have violated Ukraine's sovereignty by annexing Crimea in 2014 and then launching a full-scale invasion of Ukrainian territory in February 2022. Therefore, supporting Ukraine is a means of countering what the US describes as "Russian aggression."
2. **Supporting Democracy:** The United States views Ukraine as a model country striving for democracy and the promotion of freedoms, making its support both strategic and moral.

Security interests: NATO, led by the United States, considers Russia's expansion in Ukraine a direct threat to European security and the stability of the global order. Therefore, the US intervention is part of protecting the alliance's strategic interests

The second branch: The US position has changed under President Donald Trump

The most important background of American support, known to the public and private, is to weaken the Russian side, but this did not happen. Rather, it increased the crisis of the situation even more, to the point that experts began to predict a third world war⁷, this proves that the United States is facing one of the most complex crises since the end of the Cold War⁸. But after the election of President Trump, who remedied the situation by radically changing American policy after being convinced that this war had exhausted its material resources without any benefit, he took another path by directly interfering in Ukrainian affairs by dictating his instructions for Ukraine to surrender and refusing to support it again. Thus, Trump is taking tactical steps that may be strategic in re-engaging with Russia to focus on China, considering that China poses the greatest threat to the United States. Therefore, it is wise to distance Moscow from it, and this means ending the war in Ukraine, even if it comes at the expense of submitting to Russian aggression, abandoning the Ukrainians, and severing relations with European allies⁹. Moreover, the American president accused Zelensky of gambling with a third world war, while his vice president, J.D. Vance, said: "It is inappropriate for you, Zelensky, to come to the Oval Office to try to sue us in front of the American media"¹⁰.

This prompted all EU leaders and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky to hold an emergency summit aimed at strengthening European defense and reassuring Kyiv, in light of the complete shift in US policy and traditional alliances under President Donald Trump, the Russian threat, and the risk of Washington withdrawing its commitment to the European continent¹¹.

The second requirement: The legal framework for US intervention

When analyzing the legal status of the US intervention in Ukraine, one must refer to the principles of international law and the UN Charter, especially Article (2), which prohibits the use of force against the sovereignty of states or interference in their internal affairs¹². However, there are some points through which the US intervention can be evaluated:

The first branch: The legal basis for US interference in Ukrainian affairs

The US side relied on several arguments when intervening in Ukrainian affairs, particularly in its war against Russia, which can be summarized as follows:

1. **Non-use of direct force:** Unlike Russia, the United States did not use direct military force in Ukraine, but rather limited itself to providing military, financial, and diplomatic support¹³. This makes its legal position more acceptable compared to the Russian intervention, which is considered a flagrant violation of Article (2) of the United Nations Charter.
2. **The Right to Self-Defense:** According to the UN Charter, states have the right to defend themselves, individually or collectively, if subjected to armed attack¹⁴. Although Ukraine is not a member of NATO, the United States has relied on the principle of self-defense to provide military assistance, stating that strengthening Ukraine's capabilities contributes primarily to protecting its security¹⁵.
3. **The Responsibility to Protect Civilians:** In recent years, the concept of the Responsibility to Protect Civilians (RtoP) has emerged as one of the principles that may be invoked to justify international interventions¹⁶. However, this concept remains subject to legal controversy, as it requires a clear mandate from the UN Security Council. In the case of Ukraine, such a mandate was not issued due to the Russian veto.

The second branch: Legal criticisms of US interference in Ukrainian affairs

Despite all the justifications offered by the United States, there are legal and political criticisms that stem primarily from its interference in Ukrainian affairs:

1. **Support has further escalated the conflict:** Some analysts believe that continued US support for Ukraine, including the provision of heavy weapons, could escalate the conflict rather than resolve it. This has been proven. Once US support ceased, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky found himself under unprecedented pressure, forcing him to accede to demands for an unconditional ceasefire¹⁷.
2. **Violation of Russian sovereignty¹⁸:** Russia believes that US intervention aims to destabilize and weaken it politically and economically, which it considers a violation of the principle of national sovereignty.
3. **Lack of international authorization:** Legally, any international intervention requires a resolution from the UN Security Council, and due to the veto power, it is impossible to issue a mandate¹⁹. In the absence of such authorization, US intervention becomes legally questionable, especially if the primary goal is to confront Russia and not just protect Ukraine.

In the same context, Article (2/1) of the United Nations Charter affirms the principle of sovereign equality among states, while Article (2/4) stipulates the prohibition of the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, unless the intervention is based on clear legal justifications, which can be limited to the following cases:

- Intervention based on a decision of the UN Security Council (Article 42 of the UN Charter).
- Intervention for humanitarian purposes in the event of gross human rights violations.
- Intervention at the request of the state itself.

It's a strange paradox. While the United States was previously accused of influencing Ukrainian political decisions, such as by pressuring Ukraine not to negotiate with Russia and prolonging the war by continuing military supplies, now, with the US's shifting position, it is

exerting counter-pressure on Ukraine, primarily aimed at halting the war and negotiating with Russia to cede territory and resources.

Based on the above, we conclude that the United States uses international law only to suit its own interests. What was legitimate yesterday is now illegitimate. Therefore, the American intervention in Ukraine reflects a double standard in the application of international law, as Washington supports Ukraine militarily while considering the interventions of other countries a violation of international law.

Enter here the text of second subtitle, enter here the text of second subtitle, enter here the text of second subtitle, enter here the text of second subtitle, enter here the text of second subtitle, enter here the text of second subtitle.

2- Tilte I: Evaluating US intervention in Ukrainian affairs from an international legal perspective

US intervention in Ukrainian affairs is a legally complex case. On the one hand, the United States appears to be following a legal framework based on the principles of self-defense and the protection of Ukrainian sovereignty. On the other hand, the absence of a clear international mandate and the risks of military escalation make this intervention controversial. Therefore, we will attempt to examine this intervention according to the rules of international law, as follows:

2.1-First Subtitle: America's exploitation of legal loopholes in the international system

The US intervention in Ukraine demonstrates how major powers can exploit legal gaps in the international system to achieve their goals. It also reflects the tension between the principles of national sovereignty and human rights, which we will attempt to clarify as follows:

The First Branch: The extent to which American intervention is compatible with the principle of state sovereignty

US support for Ukraine is considered legitimate by proponents of intervention because it came at the request of the Ukrainian government, but opponents argue that it goes beyond legitimate assistance to indirect interference in the conflict, complicating diplomatic solutions and leading to an escalation of the war.

According to the United Nations Charter, intervention is prohibited, as stated in Article 2-7, under the principle of non-intervention, which stipulates that states may not intervene in matters that fall primarily within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. This principle aims to preserve the independence of weak states against the interventions and pressures of stronger states. This concept serves as a basis for international relations, and thus applies to relations between states, not to relief activities carried out by neutral humanitarian organizations. The concept of "intervention" in international law is linked to the idea of "interference," and when a state interferes in the internal affairs of another state, this constitutes a violation of the latter's sovereignty²⁰.

International law recognizes only one right to intervene in the internal affairs of a state. This right is stipulated and defined in the Charter of the United Nations. It falls under the jurisdiction of the Security Council when it interprets the behavior of a state as a threat to international peace and security. In such a case, the Council can take a series of measures, including imposing diplomatic or economic sanctions. The Council also authorizes the use of force and may decide that international military intervention is necessary to stop the activities of the state in question²¹.

Based on the above, any US intervention without Security Council authorization or Ukraine's consent, whether by supporting Ukraine in its war against Russia or by pressuring it politically to surrender, is a clear violation of the UN Charter.

The second branch: Analyzing the legitimacy of US sanctions against Russia

US President Joe Biden has imposed economic sanctions on Russia in an effort to deter it from carrying out military action against Ukraine. This is in coordination with his allies in the

European Union, NATO, Japan, Australia, South Korea, and New Zealand. Measures have also been announced aimed at reducing Russia's ability to conduct any commercial transactions in dollars, euros, pounds sterling, or Japanese yen, in an attempt to restrict it within the global economic system. In addition, the United States has decided to ban Russian aircraft from entering US airspace, joining a growing number of European countries that have closed their airspace to Russia, which has prompted Russia to close its airspace to 36 countries²².

To analyze the legitimacy of US sanctions on Russia under international law, several legal aspects must be considered, given that US sanctions were part of a political approach primarily aimed at pressuring countries to cease practices or policies that the United States or its allies consider illegal.

Evidence of this, and in accordance with the rules of international law, is that the United Nations is the primary body that regulates international sanctions, through the Security Council, which has the authority to impose sanctions in cases that threaten international peace and security, in accordance with Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Therefore, sanctions imposed by individual states, such as the US sanctions against Russia, cannot be considered legitimate according to the UN Charter unless they are ratified by the UN. This means that unilateral sanctions may raise legal questions about their compatibility with the provisions of the International Charter and the principle of sovereignty, which means that states enjoy the freedom to make their internal and external decisions without interference from other states.

Economic sanctions may be unlawful because they cause severe humanitarian harm to ordinary citizens. The Geneva Conventions prohibit the use of economic sanctions that unjustifiably affect civilian lives²³. However, economic sanctions targeting the government or individuals associated with the political system may be considered more internationally acceptable.

It is noteworthy that the US sanctions on Russia have sparked legal controversy. Washington considers them legal measures based on the principle of protecting national security while Russia describes them as illegal unilateral sanctions that violate international law because they were not issued by a Security Council resolution. Consequently, there are concerns about their negative impact on civilians and the international community.

Since the United Nations is the only body authorized to issue legally binding sanctions, and given Russia's presence as a permanent member of the Security Council, the possibility of issuing resolutions endorsing US sanctions has been obstructed, making the conflict subject to international power struggles rather than international law. Therefore, in our view, US sanctions against Russia are more of a political measure than a legal one.

Enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle, enter here the text of first subtitle.

2.2-Second Subtitle: The impact of US intervention in Ukraine on the international order

In this section, we will examine the position of the major powers on the American intervention in Ukraine, and then explain its impact on the development of international law, as follows:

The First Branch: Positions of major countries

- Russia considers the US intervention a "proxy war" through which Washington seeks to weaken Moscow²⁴. Legally, this could be considered a violation of Russian sovereignty, but it is not considered a "proxy war" in the full sense, as a proxy usually refers to a conflict carried out through a third party that carries out hostilities²⁵.
- The European Union continues to support Ukraine, but at the same time, it prefers diplomatic solutions to avoid escalating the conflict and achieve stability in the region. Therefore, the EU adopts a policy of balancing military support, economic sanctions, and

incentives for negotiation, while being careful to avoid direct military escalation²⁶, which could deepen the crisis and lead to unintended consequences.

- China calls for a peaceful resolution and opposes Western military intervention in Ukraine. It affirmed that it will maintain a firm position on the Ukrainian issue and referred to the four principles put forward by Chinese President Xi Jinping in this regard: respect for sovereignty, adherence to the UN Charter, consideration of the concerns of all parties, and the use of peaceful means for settlement²⁷.

The second branch: The impact of intervention on the development of international law
US intervention in Ukrainian affairs could influence the development of several concepts of international law, the most important of which are:

First: Reconsidering the boundaries between military support and direct involvement in hostilities

The Ukrainian conflict may lead to a reconsideration of the rules of international law that have allowed the principle of non-intervention to be weakened by political interests. Therefore, the door must be opened to amendments to international sanctions mechanisms and the imposition of stricter rules against unjustified military interventions.

This intervention reflects a clear shift in the rules of the international system regulating the use of force in international relations, opening the door to ongoing debates about the legitimacy of foreign interventions. From our perspective, we view this type of intervention as part of Western hegemony.

The US intervention in Ukraine is an example of a modern type of proxy warfare. Such interventions could spark debate about the legitimacy of state support for certain parties to a conflict, opening the way for the development of clearer legal standards regarding international responsibility in conflicts involving third parties providing military or material support.

Second: The development of the concept of sovereignty

Some new concepts have emerged in the new world order that have affected the traditional principle of sovereignty, due to the development of the concept of interference in the internal affairs of states that have become restricted in managing their affairs, when the legitimacy of interference was given under the names and pretexts of protecting human rights, providing aid, and combating terrorism and drugs. Thus, the intervening state has transcended the principle of sovereignty, which was in the past a major element in international law²⁸.

Despite all the rules that protect state sovereignty, some major powers continue to interfere in the affairs of others without strong legal justification, leading to the politicization of international law. This has led some countries to call for reform of the Security Council to ensure the fair application of international law²⁹.

A recent case in point is the US intervention in Ukraine, which may redefine the concept of sovereignty in the contemporary world and may lead to discussions about how to strengthen the principle of state sovereignty within the context of modern political and military developments.

We conclude that the US intervention in Ukraine has had multiple implications for the development of international law, particularly in the areas of the use of force, human rights, and international humanitarian law. The US intervention also reinforces debates about proxy wars, military alliances, and the concept of sovereignty in the contemporary world.

Conclusion:

Intervention in the internal affairs of states has contributed to the development of international law by expanding legal concepts and developing new mechanisms. However, it has also revealed inconsistencies in the application of these rules, particularly with some states using the concept of intervention to achieve political objectives. Consequently, international

law continues to evolve to address these challenges and ensure a balance between sovereignty and legitimate intervention.

In this research, we conclude that the US intervention in Ukraine carries complex legal dimensions, ranging from legitimate support to indirect intervention that impacts state sovereignty and international relations. Furthermore, economic sanctions remain a subject of legal controversy, especially given the lack of international consensus on their legitimacy. Based on this research paper, the study yielded several results, which we will mention as follows:

- The US intervention has legal grounds based on Ukraine's request for assistance, but it also contradicts the principle of maintaining international peace and security, as the intervention lacks a UN mandate.
- US pressure on Ukraine, whether to continue the war against Russia or to surrender, is a clear violation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of states.
- The change in the US position on the Ukrainian issue is further evidence of the manipulation of the interpretation of international law by major powers to suit their political interests.
- US economic sanctions on Russia lack international legitimacy because they were not issued by a Security Council resolution.
- It has become clear that US military support has exacerbated the humanitarian situation in Ukraine and could lead to an escalation of global conflicts.

Based on the above, a series of recommendations can be made:

- Strengthening the role of the United Nations in setting clear legal restrictions on foreign interventions.
- Establish a new legal mechanism to regulate economic sanctions so that they are not used as a purely political tool.
- Developing a legal framework that prevents major powers from exploiting regional conflicts to serve their geopolitical interests.
- Strengthening the role of the General Assembly by making its decisions binding, at least like the Security Council, when there is a conflict between the interests of the permanent members of the Council, which always use the right of veto.

Citations:

¹ Practical Dictionary of International Humanitarian Law, to intervene, Accessed at 22:14 on: 19 March 2025. Available at the link: <https://ar.guide-humanitarian-law.org/content/article/5/tdkhwul/>

² Khaira Bin Abdul Aziz and Hisham Abdul Karim, Humanitarian Military Intervention: A Study of its Principles and Theoretical Dimensions, Al-Baheth Journal for Academic Studies, Algeria, Volume 2, Issue 1, 2015, p. 193.

³ Lingelbach, "The Doctrine and Practice of Intervention in Europe", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Volume 16, ISSN:0002-7162.

⁴ economic sanctions, wikipedia the free encyclopedia, Accessed at 00:14 on: 20 March 2025. Available at the link: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_sanctions

⁵ What do we know about the military aid the US provided to Ukraine before Trump's decision to suspend it?, publish Saturday, March 8, 2025, arabic.cnn, Accessed at 02:00 on: March 18, 2025. Available at the link:

<https://arabic.cnn.com/world/article/2025/03/09/arming-ukraine-a-closer-look-at-us-military-aid-as-trump-freezes-further-shipments>

⁶ Ahmed Galal Mahmoud Abdo, US Policy towards the Russian Military Intervention in Ukraine and its Repercussions on NATO, Journal of the Faculty of Politics and Economics, Issue No. 16 - October 2022, p. 425.

⁷ Khalfallah faouzi, The challenges of the General Assembly before the right of veto in resolving the Russian-Ukrainian crisis, Journal of Legal and Political Thought, University of Laghouat, Algeria, Volume 07, Issue 01, 2023, p 928

⁸ Jeffrey Mankoff, Russia's War in Ukraine Identity, History, and Conflict, Center for Strategic and International Studies, APRIL 2022, p 01.

⁹ "What's the strategy behind Trump's pivot to Russia?" - The Washington Post, bbc News Arabic, 13March 2025 , Accessed at 03:46 on: 18 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://www.bbc.com/arabic/articles/c4g0wzw4gl7o>

¹⁰ US media: Washington suspends all military aid to Ukraine, Publication date: 04.03.2025, RT channel, Accessed at 03:46 on: 18 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://arabic.rt.com/world/>

¹¹ An emergency European summit with Zelenskyy's participation in light of the changing US position on Ukraine., france24, 06/03/2025, Accessed at 03:46 on: 18 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://www.france24.com/ar/>

¹² See Article 2 of the United Nations Charter of 1945.

¹³ Ahmed Galal Mahmoud Abdo, op cit,P 425.

¹⁴ See Article 51 of the United Nations Charter of 1945.

¹⁵ Washington resumes military aid to Ukraine after months of suspension and political disputes, France24, Published in:25/04/2024 , Accessed at 00:17 on: 19 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://www.france24.com/ar/>

¹⁶ Responsibility to Protect, United Nations Facts,September 11, 2017, Accessed at 00:52 on: 19 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://www.un.org/ar/chronicle/article/20075>

¹⁷ Surrendering to Trump: How Ukraine Survived the White House Storm in One Week, Ahmed Mohamed Fall, 17/3/2025, aljazeera.net, Accessed at 01:23 on: 23 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://www.aljazeera.net/politics/>

¹⁸ The theme of sovereignty is inexhaustible because the concept is as vague as it is widely used. Like all fundamental notions of human life, sovereignty is also a vague, imprecise, and indeterminate symbol. In the words of K. Benyekhulef, it is a plural, fluid, elusive, dynamic, and evolving notion. For more see Lider BAL, The Myth of Sovereignty in International Law, State Sovereignty in the Face of Changes in the International Legal Order, Thesis, University of Strasbourg, 2012, pp. 17–29.

¹⁹ Rawa Almakky, the role of international organizations in the development of international law: an analytical assessment of the united nations, international journal of law "Law and World“, European University law institute, Volume 9; Issue 4, 2023.

²⁰ The Practical Guide to Humanitarian Law, Home, Accessed at 04:47 on: 20 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://guide-humanitarian-law.org/content/index/>

²¹ See Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter of 1945.

²² Ahmed Galal Mahmoud Abdo, US Policy towards the Russian Military Intervention in Ukraine and its Repercussions on NATO, Journal of the Faculty of Politics and Economics, Issue No. 16 - October 2022, p. 429.

²³ See: Article 33 of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949.

²⁴ The Ukrainian Counteroffensive: World War, Nuclear Missiles, and a Coup Against Putin... A Tragic Scenario for a Shocking Russian Response?, Published in: 09/14/2022, france24, Accessed at 04:02 on: 21 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://www.france24.com>.

²⁵ Although the Geneva Conventions (1949) do not define “proxy warfare,” they do address practices such as supporting parties to armed conflicts or using non-state forces. For example, Article 1 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions states that wars must be between recognized parties, and that persons fighting on behalf of other parties may be considered part of the conflict.

²⁶ European Security - What is the new European mechanism for strengthening security and defense?, European Centre for Counterterrorism and Intelligence Studies, 19 March 2025 , Accessed at 04:39 on: 21 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://en.europarabct.com/>

²⁷ China calls for lasting peace in Ukraine, Publication date: 14.03.2025 , arabic RT, Accessed at 03:28 on: 24 March 2025, Available at the link: <https://arabic.rt.com>.

²⁸ Shoaib Rabbia. Dandani Dawia, The Impact of International Humanitarian Intervention on National Sovereignty in the Light of the New World Order, Journal of Legal and Economic Research, Algeria, Volume 5, Issue 1, 2022, p. 627.

²⁹ Daas Asiya, Reforming the UN Security Council, Afak Journal for Research and Studies, Algeria, Volume 5, Issue 2, 2022, p. 376.