



**THE PRINCIPLES OF NON-INTERVENTION AND NEUTRALITY
OF THE STATE OF INDONESIA IN ADDRESSING THE U.S.–ISRAEL–
IRAN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW**

Jeffry Latumahina
Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika
(Naskah diterima: 1 Juni 2026, disetujui 31 Juni 2026)

Abstract

The escalation of the armed conflict between the U.S., Israel, and Iran poses serious challenges to the international legal order, particularly regarding the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality. This study aims to analyze the legal framework governing the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality based on the UN Charter, the Hague Conventions V and XIII of 1907, and the 1982 Manila Declaration, while evaluating their implementation within Indonesia's legal framework. The method used is normative legal research employing a statute approach and a conceptual approach. The results of the study indicate that these three legal instruments collectively establish a normative framework that prohibits military involvement with warring parties and promotes the diplomatic resolution of disputes. Indonesia has proven to be consistent as a non-belligerent state through its rejection of unilateral military action and active participation in multilateral forums, despite facing domestic pressure and limited diplomatic leverage. It is recommended that Indonesia strengthen territorial surveillance and preventive diplomacy, as well as develop a national legal doctrine that is adaptable to the threats of cyberattacks and proxy warfare.

Keywords: *International Law; State Neutrality; Non-Intervention*

Abstrak

Eskalasi konflik bersenjata antara AS, Israel, dan Iran menimbulkan tantangan serius bagi tatanan hukum internasional, khususnya terhadap prinsip *non-intervention* dan netralitas negara. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis pengaturan prinsip *non-intervention* dan netralitas berdasarkan Piagam PBB, Konvensi Den Haag V dan XIII Tahun 1907, serta Deklarasi Manila 1982, sekaligus mengevaluasi implementasinya dalam posisi hukum Indonesia. Metode yang digunakan adalah *normative legal research* dengan pendekatan *statute approach* dan *conceptual approach*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ketiga instrumen hukum tersebut secara kolektif membangun kerangka normatif yang melarang keterlibatan militer terhadap pihak bertikai dan mendorong penyelesaian sengketa secara diplomatik. Indonesia terbukti konsisten sebagai *non-belligerent state* melalui penolakan *unilateral military action* dan keterlibatan aktif dalam forum multilateral, meskipun menghadapi tekanan domestik dan keterbatasan *leverage* diplomatik. Indonesia direkomendasikan memperkuat pengawasan wilayah, *preventive diplomacy*, serta mengembangkan doktrin hukum nasional yang adaptif terhadap ancaman *cyberattacks* dan *proxy warfare*.

Kata Kunci : Hukum Internasional; Netralitas Negara; Non-Intervensi

I. INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of armed conflicts involving major powers on the international stage have continued to escalate at an alarming rate in recent years. Globally, the international order based on the supremacy of international law is facing a severe test, particularly as superpowers opt for unilateral approaches over multilateral resolutions. The United Nations (UN) Charter, which serves as the primary foundation for the prohibition on the use of force between states, is increasingly being disregarded in the name of narrow geopolitical interests. In this context, the principles of state sovereignty and the prohibition on intervention, as stipulated in Article 2, paragraphs (1) and (4) of the UN Charter, are becoming increasingly vulnerable to violations by actors possessing dominant military power and diplomatic influence. This situation reflects a broader phenomenon: the weakening of states' adherence to international legal norms that have long been established through universal consensus (Ardiata et al., 2022)

More specifically, the conflict involving the United States (U.S.), Israel, and Iran in the Middle East is one of the most evident manifestations of geopolitical tensions that not only threaten regional stability but also shake the broader international security architecture. Military attacks carried out by the US and Israel against Iranian territory have sparked serious debate among international law experts regarding the legality of such actions, particularly in relation to the principle of the non-use of force, the prohibition of aggression, and the limits on the exercise of the right to self-defense as stipulated in Article 51 of the UN Charter. On the other hand, this conflict also places third-party states, including Indonesia, in a position where, under international law, they have certain rights and obligations as neutral states based on the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions of 1907. The escalation of this conflict directly underscores how crucial the legal framework of neutrality is as a protective instrument for states not involved in hostilities (Budi et al., 2025). These escalating tensions also underscore the importance of mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes, as mandated by the 1982 Manila Declaration (A/RES/37/10), which explicitly enshrines the principles of non-intervention and conflict resolution in accordance with international law.

In response to this situation, Indonesia has prioritized the principle of a free and active foreign policy, which has served as a constitutional foundation since the early days of independence. The Indonesian government emphasizes that its stance toward the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict is neutral yet constructive that is, it does not take sides but actively promotes a resolution through diplomatic channels and international law. Nevertheless, the implementation of this “free and active” principle is not always easily and consistently translated into concrete diplomatic actions, especially when domestic pressures and

international commitments clash. Widiastuti (2022) asserts that the principle of non-intervention should not be applied rigidly, as this risks weakening a state's capacity to effectively respond to violations of international norms.

Existing academic studies have tended to discuss Indonesia's position in international conflicts solely from the perspective of international relations, without comprehensively examining it through a framework of international law that integrates three key instruments: the UN Charter, the 1907 Hague Convention, and the 1982 Manila Declaration. Previous studies on conflicts in the Middle East—such as those conducted by Indrawan & Yuliandri (2025)—have largely focused on the geopolitical dimensions and strategic implications for Indonesia, rather than on a normative analysis of the alignment of a state's stance with its international legal obligations. Meanwhile, studies on the principle of non-intervention by previous researchers have largely used the context of ASEAN and the conflict in Myanmar, rather than a three-way conflict such as that involving the U.S., Israel, and Iran, which has its own unique characteristics in terms of both legal structure and the complexity of its actors. The novelty of this research lies in its effort to normatively map how three distinct international legal frameworks interact in shaping Indonesia's legal position as a neutral state that is simultaneously an active participant in global peace diplomacy. This approach makes an original contribution to the development of public international law studies in Indonesia, particularly regarding the issue of state neutrality in the era of contemporary conflicts (Rachmat, 2022; Widiastuti, 2022).

Based on the background described above, this study formulates the following two main research questions: (1) How are the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality regulated under the UN Charter, the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions of 1907, and the 1982 Manila Declaration in the context of international armed conflicts? (2) How does Indonesia implement the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality in addressing the U.S.–Israel–Iran international conflict from the perspective of international law?

In accordance with the research questions established, this study aims to: (2) Analyze and describe the provisions regarding the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality based on the UN Charter, the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions of 1907, and the 1982 Manila Declaration within the framework of international law. (2) To examine and evaluate the implementation of the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality by Indonesia in addressing the U.S.–Israel–Iran international conflict from the perspective of international law.

This study is expected to provide both theoretical and practical benefits. **Theoretically**, this study enriches the body of knowledge in international law, particularly in the development of the field of study on the law of neutrality and the principle of non-intervention amid the dynamics of contemporary armed conflicts. The findings of this study can also serve as an academic reference for other researchers examining the legal positions of developing countries in the face of conflicts involving major powers. **Practically**, this study is expected to provide input for policymakers, particularly the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, in formulating diplomatic stances that are not only aligned with national interests but also consistent with Indonesia's obligations as a subject of international law. Furthermore, this study can serve as a reference for academics, legal practitioners, and observers of international relations in gaining a deeper understanding of the legal implications of Indonesia's neutral stance on the global conflict stage (Budi et al., 2025; Indrawan & Yuliandri, 2025) .

II. THEORITICAL STUDIES

The Principle of Non-Intervention and the Prohibition on the Use of Force in the UN Charter

Contemporary international legal theory positions the principle of non-intervention as one of the most fundamental norms underpinning interstate relations in the modern international system. This norm is firmly grounded in the universal recognition of every state's *full sovereignty* over its territory and all its internal affairs, free from external intervention. Legally, the most authoritative basis for this principle is set forth in Article 2(1) of the UN Charter, which affirms that the United Nations and all its members operate on the basis of *the "principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members."* This provision carries clear legal consequences: every state is equal before international law, regardless of its military capacity or economic strength; thus, no state has the legitimacy to unilaterally intervene in the sovereign affairs of another state. From a theoretical perspective, this principle has deep historical roots in the idea that legal values are universal and cannot be diminished by the dynamics of power, even though their substance continues to evolve in line with global social and political changes (Aleshkova, 2021) .

The prohibition on the use of force, as the most concrete manifestation of the principle of non-intervention, is explicitly set forth in Article 2, paragraph (4), of the UN Charter. This provision obligates all member states to refrain from threats or acts of violence directed against the territorial integrity or political independence of another state in any form. This norm is

widely recognized as the principle of the non-use of force, which serves as a structural pillar safeguarding the stability of the international system. Empirical studies demonstrate that the level of interstate violence has not increased significantly following the adoption of the UN Charter, which indirectly indicates that this legal regime continues to function as a meaningful constraint on state behavior (Sukin & Weiner, 2021) . The only recognized constitutional exception to this prohibition is set forth in Article 51 of the UN Charter, which acknowledges the right to self-defense—both individually and collectively—in the event of an armed attack. However, the exercise of this right requires the existence of a real and verified armed attack, an obligation to report immediately to the UN Security Council, and a limitation on the scope of action until the Security Council takes the necessary steps to restore peace.

In the context of the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict, the interpretation of Article 51 has often been the subject of fierce legal debates among the conflicting parties. The three main actors in this conflict consistently invoke claims of self-defense, even though their actions—ranging from targeted killings, cross-border airstrikes, to proxy warfare often exceed the normative limits explicitly defined by international law (Khoirunnisa & Jubaidi, 2025) . This situation creates legal ambiguity that is gradually eroding international norms and undermining the institutional authority of the UN Security Council as stipulated in Article 24 and Articles 39 through 42 of the UN Charter.

Rights and Obligations of Neutral States under the Hague Conventions V and XIII of 1907

The most comprehensive legal instruments on neutrality in the context of armed conflict are the Hague Convention V of 1907 concerning the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land and the Hague Convention XIII of 1907 concerning the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War. These two conventions establish a clear and detailed normative framework regarding the limits of permissible conduct for states not directly involved in the war. Article 1 of the Fifth Hague Convention explicitly affirms that the territory of a neutral state is inviolable, while Article 2 prohibits belligerent parties from moving troops, ammunition, or military supplies through the territory of a neutral state under any circumstances. Article 5 further reinforces this obligation by requiring neutral states to actively prevent any form of military activity by the warring parties from taking place within their territory.

With regard to maritime areas, the Hague Convention XIII establishes provisions consistent with similar fundamental principles. Article 5 prohibits the use of the ports and

waters of a neutral state as *a* naval base of operations, while Article 6 explicitly prohibits a neutral state from supplying warships, ammunition, or combat equipment to the parties to the conflict. As a legal safeguard for these obligations, Article 10 of the Fifth Hague Convention affirms that actions taken by a neutral state to maintain its neutral status—including through the use of armed force, cannot be classified as acts of hostility, a guarantee further reinforced in Article 26 of the Thirteenth Hague Convention.

The relevance of these provisions in the context of the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict remains significant even though warfare technology has undergone a fundamental transformation. The emergence of cyber threats (cyber warfare), long-range unmanned aerial vehicles (drones), and proxy wars presents legal interpretive challenges that were not fully anticipated by the convention texts drafted in the early 20th century. Nevertheless, the spirit of the duty of abstention and respect for the territorial integrity of non-belligerent states remains an unchallenged and consistently relevant principle. This is all the more urgent given that conflicts involving human rights violations and escalating violence against civilian populations demand a consistent normative response from the international community as a whole (Sadiq et al., 2024) .

To provide a more systematic and comparative overview of the key provisions in both conventions and their relevance to Indonesia's position, the following table presents a comparison of the normative obligations of neutral states based on the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions of 1907.

Mechanisms for Peaceful Settlement and the Principle of Non-Intervention in the 1982 Manila Declaration

The 1982 Manila Declaration, adopted through UN General Assembly Resolution No. A/RES/37/10, is a soft-law instrument that reaffirms the international community's commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes as the primary option. Although it lacks the formal, legally binding force of a treaty, this declaration represents a very broad international consensus regarding the moral and political obligations of states to prioritize diplomatic mechanisms over the use of armed force in resolving disputes. In the context of the principle of non-intervention, the Manila Declaration affirms that any resolution of international disputes must be based on respect for state sovereignty, equal rights, and unimpeded political independence. The mechanisms explicitly recognized in this declaration include negotiation , mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial settlement.

The 1982 Manila Declaration serves as an instrument that both clarifies and reinforces existing obligations under Article 2, paragraph (3), of the UN Charter regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes, as well as Article 33, which lists the dispute resolution mechanisms available to member states. In the context of the U.S.–Israel–Iran trilateral conflict, this instrument serves as a normative reminder that diplomatic channels must be an absolute priority before any party undertakes military action. The urgency of this is reinforced by the fact that Indonesia, through its principle of a free and active foreign policy, is consistently committed to promoting regional stability through active engagement in UN peacekeeping missions and constructive multilateral diplomacy (Sihite et al., 2024) .

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a normative legal approach – also known in academic literature as normative legal research – which is a legal research method that focuses on the analysis of applicable legal norms, principles, and doctrines to systematically and structurally address legal issues. This method was deemed most appropriate given that the primary object of study in this research is normative in nature – namely, analyzing international legal instruments governing the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality, as well as evaluating the consistency of Indonesia’s legal position in the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict based on these provisions. Within the framework of normative legal research, the researcher does not empirically examine social realities in the field but rather studies law as a prescriptive system of norms – that is, how the law ought to apply (*das sollen*) within a specific regulatory framework .

This study employs two complementary main approaches. First, the statute approach,. Second, the *conceptual* approach, which is used to examine the legal concepts underpinning the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality in international law, thereby enabling the researcher to construct a cohesive and structured legal argument.

The legal materials used in this study fall into three categories. Primary legal sources include international treaties, multilateral conventions, UN General Assembly resolutions, and official documents of states and international organizations that are legally binding. Secondary legal materials include international law textbooks, scholarly journal articles, previous research findings, and other academic works that provide explanations and analyses of the primary legal materials. Meanwhile, tertiary legal materials include legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other reference sources that serve to supplement the understanding of technical terms used in the study. The collection of all these legal materials is conducted

through comprehensive library research by searching various sources from scientific journal databases, international law repositories, and official documents from the UN and relevant international legal institutions (Yulis, 2025).

The analysis of legal materials was conducted using a qualitative-prescriptive approach, namely by describing, interpreting, and evaluating the collected legal materials in a logical and systematic manner to generate legal propositions that can address the research questions. With this approach, the study is expected to produce conclusions that not only explain the existing legal situation (*ius constitutum*) but also provide normative recommendations on how Indonesia's legal position in addressing international conflicts should be developed in the future (*ius constituendum*).

IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

Indonesia's Legal and Diplomatic Position: Between Neutrality and Free and Active Foreign Policy

Indonesia occupies a unique and difficult-to-replicate position in the global diplomatic landscape, namely as the country with the world's largest Muslim population that is historically and constitutionally committed to the principle of a free and active foreign policy. In the context of the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict, this position significantly influences the formulation of foreign policy, which must balance objective international legal obligations with domestic pressures—such as demands for solidarity with Palestine and the broader Islamic world (Hakim et al., 2023). Normatively, Indonesia does not align itself with any power bloc but reaffirms its firm commitment to respecting international law, an immediate halt to military escalation, and the resolution of conflicts through diplomatic mechanisms recognized by the international community.

This position is substantially aligned with Article 2(1) of the UN Charter regarding *the sovereign equality* of states and Article 2(4) regarding the prohibition on the use of force. Indonesia consistently rejects any form of unilateral military action that lacks clear and verifiable international legal legitimacy. From the perspective of the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions, Indonesia can be accurately categorized as a non-belligerent state that possesses both the right and the obligation of neutrality: it does not provide military support to any of the warring parties, does not permit the use of its national territory for combat operations, and has the right to demand full respect for its territorial sovereignty. An analysis of the dynamics of Indonesia's free and active foreign policy through the Non-Aligned Movement reinforces the argument that this non-aligned orientation is not merely a fleeting

political pragmatism, but rather a reflection of a diplomatic identity deeply rooted in Indonesia's diplomatic tradition (Sadewa & Hakiki, 2023) .

Evaluation of the Consistency of Indonesia's Stance on the International Legal

Framework

An evaluation of the consistency of Indonesia's position based on the three international legal instruments that form the basis of this analysis, namely, the UN Charter, the Hague Conventions V and XIII, and the 1982 Manila Declaration reveals a picture that is generally relatively positive but not entirely free from internal challenges and tensions. First, Indonesia has consistently supported the UN's collective mechanisms and respected the institutional authority of the Security Council as stipulated in Articles 24 and 39 of the UN Charter. Indonesia's diplomatic statements in various international forums have consistently called for an end to escalation and the resolution of disputes through constructive dialogue, rather than through military confrontation that exacerbates the situation.

Second, within the framework of the Hague Conventions, there is no verifiable empirical evidence that Indonesia has provided military aid, ammunition, warships, or combat- facilities to the U.S., Israel, or Iran during the ongoing conflict. Nor is there any indication that Indonesia has permitted the deployment of foreign forces or the use of its national territory as a transit route for any party's forces. This, taken as a whole, meets the normative standards set forth in Articles 2, 4, and 5 of the Fifth Hague Convention and Article 6 of the Thirteenth Hague Convention. Furthermore, humanitarian aid provided to victims of the conflict cannot be classified as a form of prohibited intervention as long as it is not intended to strengthen the combat capabilities of any party.

Third, from the perspective of the 1982 Manila Declaration, Indonesia actively utilizes strategic multilateral forums such as ASEAN and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) to promote international consensus on the importance of sustainable peaceful resolutions. Indonesia's defense diplomacy during this period of regional uncertainty demonstrates sustained and structured efforts to maintain a balance between formal neutrality and *responsible strategic engagement* (Putri et al., 2025) . However, this consistency faces real pressure from domestic demands that push for moral solidarity with Palestine and the Islamic world, requiring great caution so as not to cross the critical line between permissible diplomatic solidarity and operational involvement that could nullify Indonesia's neutral status under international law.

To provide a more structured and comprehensive evaluative overview of the level of

consistency in the implementation of Indonesia's principles of non-intervention and neutrality with respect to each of the analyzed international legal instruments, the following table presents an evaluation of the consistency of Indonesia's stance.

Table 1.

Evaluation of the Consistency of Indonesia's Implementation of the Principles of Non-Intervention and Neutrality in the U.S.–Israel–Iran Conflict Based on Three International Legal Instruments

International Legal Instruments	Relevant Provisions	Indicators of Indonesia's Compliance	Level of Consistency	Challenges Faced
UN Charter	Article 2, paragraph (1): <i>Sovereign equality</i> among states	Indonesia does not take sides with any power bloc and recognizes the equal sovereignty of all states involved in a conflict	High	Domestic pressure to take a firmer stance in defending the interests of the Islamic world and Palestine (Hakiem et al., 2023)
UN Charter	Article 2, paragraph (4): Prohibition on <i>the use of force</i>	Indonesia has consistently rejected the legitimacy of unilateral military actions without a UN mandate in various official diplomatic statements	High	Indonesia's inability to compel the warring parties to adhere to these norms (<i>enforcement gap</i>)
UN Charter	Article 51: The right to <i>self-defense</i> and its limitations	Indonesia supports a strict interpretation of Article 51, which requires an actual <i>armed attack</i> as a prerequisite for its exercise	Moderate–High	The ambiguity of <i>self-defense</i> claims by the U.S., Israel, and Iran complicates an objective legal evaluation (Khoirunnisa & Jubaidi, 2025)
UN Charter	Articles 24 & 33: The Authority of the Security Council and Mechanisms for Peaceful Settlement	Indonesia fully supports UN collective mechanisms and actively calls for resolution through dialogue in various multilateral forums	High	<i>Deadlock</i> in the Security Council due to the <i>veto</i> power of major powers blocking effective resolutions (Sukin & Weiner,

						2021)
The Hague Convention V (1907)	Articles 1–5: <i>Inviolability</i> of territory and prohibition on military transit	1–5: There is no evidence that Indonesia has permitted the “ ” transit of belligerent forces or ammunition through its national territory	High			Risk of unlawful use of territory by non-state actors, which is difficult to detect early on
The Hague Convention V (1907)	Article 6: Prohibition on supplying military equipment	6: There is no indication that Indonesia supplies weapons, ammunition, or combat equipment to any of the warring parties	High			Commercial pressure from certain trading partners that could create a conflict of interest
The Hague Convention XIII (1907)	Articles 5–6: Prohibition on the use of ports and waters for military operations	5–6: There is no indication that warships of the warring parties are using Indonesian ports as operational or logistical bases	High			The complexity of monitoring Indonesia’s strategic waters, which cover a vast area, including the Strait of Malacca
The Hague Convention XIII (1907)	Articles 25–26: Defensive actions by a neutral state	25–26: Indonesia has the capacity and the right to take defensive measures to protect the sovereignty of its waters	Moderate			The lack of adequate <i>maritime</i> surveillance resources throughout Indonesia’s maritime jurisdiction
The 1982 Manila Declaration	The principles of peaceful settlement and <i>non-intervention</i>	Indonesia actively promotes a consensus on peace through ASEAN, the OIC, and UN multilateral mechanisms	High			Conflicts involving major powers are difficult to resolve through a multilateral approach based solely on consensus
The 1982 Manila Declaration	Mechanisms for negotiation, mediation, and conciliation	Indonesia actively participates in diplomatic forums and supports international mediation	Moderate–High			Limitations on Indonesia’s diplomatic <i>leverage</i> vis-à-vis powerful

efforts facilitated by the UN	actors such as the U.S. and Israel, which possess dominant structural power (Sihite et al., 2024)
----------------------------------	--

Sources: UN Charter (1945); Hague Convention V (1907); Hague Convention XIII (1907); 1982 Manila Declaration (A/RES/37/10); adapted from (Sukin & Weiner, 2021) ; (; S (Sadewa & Hakiki, 2023) ; (Khoirunnisa & Jubaidi, 2025) ; (Putri et al., 2025) ; (Sihite et al., 2024) .

Based on the evaluative mapping in Table 2 above, it is consistently evident that Indonesia demonstrates a relatively high level of consistency in complying with the normative provisions of the three international legal instruments analyzed. This consistency is most strongly evident in the aspects of rejecting the unilateral *use of force*, prohibiting the provision of military aid to warring parties, and actively supporting multilateral peaceful settlement mechanisms. The most prominent challenges lie in the limitations of Indonesia's diplomatic *leverage* over the major powers involved in the conflict, as well as the potential tension between domestic ideological-religious solidarity and the demands for formal neutrality under applicable international law.

Prospects and Normative Recommendations for Indonesia's Future Legal Position

Based on a comprehensive analysis of the three international legal instruments used in this study, Indonesia actually possesses a very strong normative foundation to develop its role as an "*active neutral state*"—that is, a state that maintains formal neutrality in accordance with applicable international law, while simultaneously actively facilitating peace through constructive and measured diplomatic initiatives. This concept is fully aligned with the character of Indonesia's free and active foreign policy, which has been a hallmark of its diplomatic identity since the era of independence, including its role as one of the influential founding members of The Non-Aligned Movement (Sadewa & Hakiki, 2023) .

From a normative perspective, there are three strategic recommendations that require serious attention from policymakers. First, Indonesia needs to significantly strengthen oversight of the use of its territory, ports, and national facilities to ensure they are not exploited for the military logistical interests of warring parties, as explicitly mandated by Article 5 of the Fifth Hague Convention and Articles 5 and 25 of the Thirteenth Hague Convention. Second, Indonesia needs to substantially increase the intensity of preventive diplomacy through UN mechanisms to promote inclusive negotiations and mediation, in accordance with Article 33(1)

of the UN Charter and the normative spirit of the 1982 Manila Declaration. Third, Indonesia's capacity as a contributor to UN peacekeeping forces (UN peacekeeping contributor) must be continuously strengthened through improvements in the quality of human resources, more synergistic interagency coordination, and a more focused and comprehensive policy framework (United Nations International Law Fellowship Programme, 2008) .

The challenges faced by Indonesia lie not only at the purely technical-diplomatic level but also in the increasingly complex legal dimension resulting from the emergence of new forms of conflict—such as cyberattacks, *proxy* operations, and *drone-based* interventions—which have not yet been fully anticipated by existing classical instruments of international law (Schindler & Toman, 2021; The Hague Convention, 1907) . These conditions require Indonesia to develop a more adaptive and responsive national doctrine of international law, so that the principles of *non-intervention* and neutrality can be consistently implemented in various evolving contemporary conflict scenarios. The three legal instruments analyzed in this study—namely, the UN Charter, the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions, and the 1982 Manila Declaration— collectively provide a solid normative foundation for Indonesia to maintain its position as a credible and consistent “*active neutral state*” that makes a tangible contribution to international stability and peace (Khoirunnisa & Jubaidi, 2025; Sukin & Weiner, 2021) .

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of a normative analysis of three key instruments of international law, namely, the UN Charter, the Fifth and Thirteenth Hague Conventions of 1907, and the 1982 Manila Declaration—it can be concluded that the international legal framework has provided a comprehensive normative foundation for regulating the principles of non-intervention and state neutrality in armed conflicts. Collectively, these three instruments establish a system of obligations that prohibits all forms of military involvement on the side of the warring parties, while simultaneously encouraging the resolution of disputes through diplomatic channels. Indonesia's implementation of these principles in addressing the U.S.–Israel–Iran conflict demonstrates a relatively high degree of consistency, reflected in its rejection of unilateral military action, the absence of military aid to any party, and active engagement in multilateral forums. Normatively, Indonesia can be classified as an “*active neutral state*” that combines formal neutrality with constructive peace diplomacy.

The Indonesian government needs to strengthen surveillance of its land and maritime territories to prevent illegal use by warring parties, increase the intensity of preventive diplomacy through UN, ASEAN, and OIC mechanisms, and develop a national doctrine of

international law that is adaptable to contemporary threats such as cyberattacks and proxy warfare.

REFERENCES

- Aleshkova, I. A. (2021). The concept of “principle” as an element of law. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5 (S3), 1586–1596. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns3.1829>
- Ardiata, Z. F., Dantes, K. F., Ardhya, S. N., & Setianto, M. J. (2022). The perspective of international humanitarian law on the Israeli-Palestinian armed conflict. *Ganesha Law Review*, 4(2), 24–32.
- Budi, N. S., Gultom, E., & Widjayanto, J. (2025). Implications of the Iran-Israel Conflict for Indonesia’s Defense Policy (A Historical Reflection on Lessons from the Diponegoro War for National Resilience). *Bappenas Working Papers*, 8(3), 405–421.
- Hakim, F. N., Putri, L. D. M., & Gustianti, N. A. (2023). The Impact of the Normalization of Diplomatic Relations Between Israel and Arab Countries on Indonesia’s Foreign Policy in the Middle East. *Jurnal Dinamika Global*, 8 (2), 305–318. <https://doi.org/10.36859/jdg.v8i2.1883>
- Indrawan, J., & Yuliandri, P. (2025). The Israel-Iran Conflict as a Catalyst for the Outbreak of World War III: Its Impact on Indonesia. *Politeia: Journal of Political Science*, 17 (2), 125–135. <https://talenta.usu.ac.id/politeia/article/view/17199>
- Irwansyah, A. Y. (2021). Selected Legal Research: Methods & Practices in Writing Articles (Revised Edition). *Yogyakarta: Mirra Buana Media*, 1st ed., 4.
- Khoirunnisa, & Jubaidi, D. (2025). Between Power and Principle: A Study of Legal Legitimacy under International Law in the Iran–Israel–U.S. Trilateral Conflict. *Global Insight Journal*, 10 (01), 25–49. <https://doi.org/10.52447/gij.v10i2.8559%0A>
- Putri, D. A., Anwar, S., & Sudibyo, S. (2025). Indonesia’s Defense Diplomacy Amid Regional Uncertainty: Between Neutrality and Strategic Engagement (2023–2025). *Syntax Imperatif Journal: Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 6 (4), 1072–1077. <https://doi.org/10.54543/syntaximperatif.v6i4.793>
- Rachmat, A. N. (2022). Opportunities and Challenges for Indonesia’s Leadership in the Political-Security Domain within ASEAN During the 2021 Political Crisis in Myanmar. *Global Dynamics: Journal of International Relations*, 7 (02), 180–200. <https://ejournal.fisip.unjani.ac.id/index.php/GIJ/article/view/2489>
- Sadewa, D. P., & Hakiki, F. (2023). The Dynamics of Indonesia’s Free and Active Foreign Policy through the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). *Journal of the Indonesian National Defense University*, 11 (1), 13–28. <https://jurnal.lemhannas.go.id/index.php/jkl/article/download/422/293/>
- Sadiq, Z., Jamil, S., & Hanna-e-Kalbi. (2024). Human Rights Violations in the Iran-Israel Conflict: An Examination of International Law and Humanitarian Response. *Human Rights Violations in the Iran-Israel Conflict*, 3 (3). <https://prjss.com/index.php/prjss/article/view/307>
- Schindler, D., & Toman, J. (2021). Convention (V) Respecting the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers and Persons in Case of War on Land. *The Laws of Armed Conflicts*, October, 1399–1406. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047405238_116
- Sihite, G. M., Ichsan Malik, I Gede Sumertha KY, & Pujo Widodo. (2024). Enhancing Indonesia’s Participation in UN Peacekeeping Missions Through Indonesian Civilian Peacekeepers. *International Journal of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 3 (5), 2375–2384. <https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v3i5.828>
- Sukin, L., & Weiner, A. S. (2021). War and Words: The International Use of Force in the United Nations Charter Era. *Oxford University Press*.

- https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3862024
- The Hague Convention. (1907). Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in Naval War. *The Hague Convention*, XIII, 654–668.
- United Nations International Law Fellowship Program. (2008). Manila Declaration on the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes. *United Nations*, 1–3. www.un.org/law/avl
- Widiastuti, A. (2022). ASEAN's Perspective on the Principle of Non-Intervention. *USM Law Review Journal*, 5 (1), 377–388. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v5i1.4802>
- Yulis, S. (2025). Legal Research Methodology as a Framework for Analyzing Contemporary Legal Issues. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, 4 (9), 808–818. <https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v4i9.800> 1.