Research Article

Adaptive Resilience of International Law: Sustaining Legitimacy, Trust, and Effectiveness in Contemporary Global Conflicts

Imran Shirzay[1], Imranullah Akhtar[2], Mohammad Arif Alikhil[3]

[1]Law & Political Science Faculty, Alfalah University, Nangarhar, Afghanistan.

[2]Research & Scientific Journal, Alfalah University, Nangarhar, Afghanistan.

[3]Law & Political Science Faculty, Al-Taqwa University, Nangarhar, Afghanistan.

Abstract - *In the contemporary international system, the adaptive resilience of international law is one of the most important debates in international relations. After World War II, the UN Charter and the Geneva Conventions were the foundation of peace and humanitarian principles, but the ongoing conflicts of the 21st century, such as the Russia-Ukraine war, the Gaza crisis, and the Afghanistan-Pakistan border disputes, have raised the question of whether international law can still be implemented and is legitimate. The importance of the topic lies in the fact that international law is considered the only legitimate mechanism for balancing the international order, protecting human rights, and resolving conflicts. The study aims to analyze the resilience, legitimacy, and mechanisms of maintaining the trust of states in international law. The study was conducted through quantitative and analytical methods, with the opinions of 167 political science students collected through a questionnaire. Statistical results show that approximately 75% of the participants believe that international law is still effective and capable of change. The mean score ranges from 3.67 to 4.11, indicating a generally positive trend. The results of the study indicate that international law is subject to political influence, but maintains its enforcement resilience through legitimacy, principled pressure, and international mechanisms. It is recommended that international organizations and states establish joint monitoring mechanisms for the implementation of the law, practical policies to prevent violations, and a continuous stream of academic cooperation, so that international law remains effective in promoting peace and justice.*

Keywords - *Adaptive Resilience, Global Conflicts, International Law, Legitimacy, Resilience theory.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary international system, where political relations are increasingly complex and global powers are becoming multipolar, the issue of the adaptive resilience of international law has become one of the most important debates in international relations and political science. International law is considered a fundamental principle of international order, which aims to resolve disputes between states, prevent violence and war, and protect human rights. However, the continuous conflicts of the 21st century, such as the Russia-Ukraine conflict, the Gaza-Israel crisis, the Thailand-Cambodia border conflict, and the ongoing security and political crisis between Afghanistan and Pakistan, have raised the question: Is international law still capable of change and implementation? The background to the issue shows that after the Second World War, the United Nations Charter and the Geneva Conventions laid the foundation for international peace and the protection of humanitarian principles. However, over time, the competition of powers, regional politics, and the limited authority of international organizations have subjected these legal institutions to severe tests. The importance and value of the issue lies in the fact that international law is considered the only legitimate mechanism for resolving conflicts between nations, protecting humanity, and balancing the international order.

If this law loses its enforcement power, the international system will fall victim to power, interests, and geographical competition. The recent scenario, particularly the border violence between Afghanistan and

Pakistan, the Durand Line, and the operations of armed groups, is a new challenge of the effectiveness of international law. External pronouncement of the international principles is common in both countries, yet the actual process of managing the border conflicts reveals the lack of the law enforcement. This demonstrates that the law is there but it is affected by the political realities and interests of the country. This is the point of the issue why the international law is strong in the sense of principles and documents, but it does not work in the way of implementation because of the executive power, the political will of states, and the restricted authority of the international organizations. Thus, the concept of sustainability and enforceability of international law should be assessed to determine whether it can cope with the new 21st century crises, following the 20th century wars such as the Ukraine war, the Gaza crisis and the Afghanistan-Pakistan conflict and uphold the pillars of peace, justice, and legitimacy. Therefore, it is a question of elementary significance to how the future of international law is going to be. Not only is it a question of the power of law, but also whether law remains in its own power over politics or whether international politics is supplanting law with a new base.

A. Resilience Theory and the Resilience of International Law

The concept of resilience is becoming increasingly important in contemporary international relations, particularly in relation to political, social, and legal systems (Morgenstern & Klabbers, 2024). The theory of resilience, applied in this case to international law relates to the ability of law principles and institutions to remain valid and effective in the face of pressure and crisis, as well as to change and evolve (Folke et al., 2010). Resilience in international governance is a factor that guarantees resistance to pressures in addition to adapting to emerging threats and transforming political environments (Keohane, 1988). According to Folke et al. (2010) and Walker et al. (2006), resilience is not merely the opposition to change, but a dynamic process that can include adaptation and learning and self-regulation. In its application to the international law, it implies that the legal rules like the UN Charter, the Geneva Conventions and other multilateral treaties retain their normative power and evolve in accordance with the modern crises (Biermann et al., 2009). Morgenstern & Klabbers (2024) also argue that international law is resilient because of its inherent legitimacy and mechanisms for resolving, enforcing, and monitoring disputes.

The theory of resilience also explains how international law maintains the trust of states. Keohane (1988) and Bhat (2024) argue that institutions are resilient when states accept their legitimacy and see the benefit of following them in maintaining order and predictability. The mechanisms of procedural fairness, fundamental human rights protection, and the accountability of the international law reinforce the confidence of states even during the political unrest (Folke et al., 2010). According to Biermann et al. (2009) resilience in international governance implies more than legal robustness but also adaptation to the evolving political interests and power structures.

The strength of the international law is mostly demonstrated during the confrontation of the international conflicts, which occur in the 21st-century, i.e. the war between Russia and Ukraine, the Gaza crisis, and the war between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Through such conflicts they question the law as they put a test on its enforceability. According to the resilience theory, however, legal systems remain as a result of normative pressure, international monitoring strategies, and shifts in normative frameworks. Clark (2005) argues that transnational networks and scholarly collaboration strengthen the resilience of international law, as they facilitate knowledge exchange, enforcement monitoring, and innovative policy development.

Applying resilience theory in this study allows us to scientifically examine how international law maintains its legitimacy, effectiveness, and credibility (Walker et al., 2006). According to the theory, international crises, the behavior of states and legal framework interrelate in a dynamic way (Folke et al., 2010). It also shows the reason why international law is relevant, in spite of its political connotation and violations, as an instrument to resolve conflicts, defend human rights, and maintain international order (Biermann et al., 2009). Resilience in this context is related to legal systems (treaties, enforcement system and institutional design) and enforceability (learning, change and stakeholder participation). In conclusion, resilience theory provides a solid theoretical foundation for studying the resilience of international law, incorporating the perspectives of scholars and researchers, and enabling analysis of the legitimacy, enforceability, and trustworthiness of international law, even in the context of contemporary international conflicts.

B. Resistance to International Law Enforcement

At the global level, states and international institutions are striving not only for economic development and military power, but also for legitimacy and recognition in adhering to international law. This is demonstrated in so-called resilience of international law which implies, in other words, impacting the conduct of states by offering principles and structures as opposed to employing coercive power (Prasetyo et al., 2025). With the conflicts taking place in the world today with the East Europe and the Middle East and the Southeast Asia being the main areas of concern, the question arises whether the customary law is still functional when such situations are being experienced in the world? These wars demonstrate a paradox that despite others believing that the continual breaking of the law is an indication of the fragility of the international law, recent diplomatic victories, including the attainment of ceasefires on different conflicts, demonstrate that international institutions have not yet lost their strength (Latif & Khan, 2025).

Resistance to international law has several key aspects: Even when states violate the law, they are required to provide a legal justification for their actions. As an illustration, the case of Russia-Ukraine war indicates that both parties resort to the principles of the territorial integrity, self-defense, and humanitarian law. It is an indication of the continuity of normative pressure of international law which limits the actions of states (Allison, 2023). The international organizations such as the United Nations, the international court of justice (ICJ) and others offer a framework on how to implement and monitor the law. One such case of interim measures of the ICJ is the Gaza genocide case that gives an obligation to the states that do not demand an immediate ceasefire (Asada, 2025). The concept of war classification and humanitarian law development are all manifestations of the continued use of international law. Geneva Conventions are considered a legal framework of the international armed conflict, including the war between Russia and Ukraine (Gabani, 2025). There are a number of mechanisms of international law to carry out the so-called adaptive resilience: the activity of the International Court of Justice and the Court of Human Rights provides fresh solutions to complicated cases. One example of this is the exercise of the rules by the Gaza ceasefire of January 2025, such as ceasefires, prisoner exchanges, and humanitarian aid (Allison, 2023). The international law assists in solving of disputes by means of negotiations, mediation, and ceasefire. This indicates that the laws are not restricted to infraction, but they, also, form a way of resolution and compromise (Asada, 2025). The international law is in the continuous process of development to address the challenges of new conflicts, technology, and international relation complexity. International law against cyberwarfare, non-violent attacks, and terrorism requires the development of progressive principles (Arce, 2022).

Although international law has shown resilience, it also has several limitations: laws are not immediately enforceable without national and international pressure. Violent reprimands are usually associated with political choices (Asada, 2025). Powerful states can violate the principles of international law or interpret them to their own advantage (Allison, 2023). There are several powerful states in the world that create disagreements in the implementation of the law (Arce, 2022). Regardless of these constraints, the international law has the value of adaptive resilience and enhances the possibility of solving disputes based on innovation, diplomatic practice, and a judicial system. Adaptive resilience of international law is a scientific and practical notion that demonstrates that international law is not a rigid system, but it sustains its worth via inventive, fieldwork, and political endeavors (Ahmed et al., 2025). This resilience is reflected in the defense of human rights, the regulation of the actions of the state, and categorizing the conflicts (Oliinyk, 2025). Despite the fact that the international law is not always applicable, the mechanisms of adaptive resilience are critical in continuity, implementation, and legitimacy of the law (Skochylyas, 2025). In short, international law provides a flexible, resilient, and human rights-protecting framework in the contemporary world that has practical value in the management of wars and conflicts.

C. The Normative Power of International Law in Contemporary Conflicts

The norms and rules of international law are not only considered as a legal framework for the behavior of states, but also as a means of moral and normative pressure (Ahmed et al., 2025). This compulsion is crucial in the legitimacy of the actions of the states, the respect of human rights, and the establishment of serious limitations to the international community (Vorng, 2025). States, in modern wars, including the war in Russia-

Ukraine, Israel-Gaza crisis, and the military confrontation between India and Pakistan, make use not only of their national but also international values to defend their deeds, which is evidence of the moral force of international law (Asada, 2025).

The moral power of international law lies in the fact that states are required to provide legal reasons for their actions, even if these actions are based on powerful national interests (Allison, 2023). This pressure has three significant impacts: International law is significant in determining the boundaries of operation of states. Indicatively, Russia justifies its military intervention through the right to self-defense and the code of international law. Laws establish the kind of warfare, human rights respect, and armed action regulations against which states have to comply. Also, the provision of legal grounds is one of the ways in which states can become internationally legitimate, despite possible short-term implementation restrictions (Cavandoli &Wilson, 2020). Normative pressure does not mean the direct use of the law but limits the states by principles and values. Such pressure has some mechanisms, international organizations, including the United Nations, can watch the behavior of the states and release reports on their violations, and states have to explain their actions (Vorng, 2025). International law violations affect the credibility of states, and thus, it attempts to respect the principles. States both in wars and in other cases explain their actions by reference to self-defense, human rights, or international treaties, which evidence the power of international law morally (Cavandoli &Wilson, 2020).

The power of Normative Power is illustrated by several examples: the Russia-Ukraine war justifies its actions based on international principles and the right to sovereignty. Russia appeals to the right to self-defense and Ukraine appeals to the international precepts to defend its sovereignty (Vorng, 2025). The normative and moral aspect of international law is manifest in the way the Israel-Gaza war, under the interim rules of the ICJ, compelled Israel to respect human rights and permit relief (Elena, 2025). The IndiaPakistan war should be a reason to take military action based on the standards of the international law that is used by the international community as a leisure and pressure tool and bind states (Ahmed et al., 2025). The Normative Power of international law may be evaluated with references to legal, political, and social factors: legal perspective, acts of law stipulate the typology of war, protection of human rights, and boundaries of the state action (Gorobets, 2020). Politically, states must give legal justifications of their action in order to enjoy international legitimacy. In the socio-international network, states are observed by the international community through the principles and values formulating indirect pressure (Hadzic, 2023). Normative and moral power of international law: States have a duty to act by international law and draw legitimacy upon their acts even in acts of violations. The international law does not lose its influence regardless of whether it is applied directly or indirectly, and it is an essential part of the state behavior, conflict regulation, and the relations between states. Normative power introduces a very loose and valuable model to curtail the conflict, safeguard human rights, as well as international legitimacy (Gorobets, 2020; Elena, 2025; Hadzic, 2023).

D. Sustaining Legitimacy and Trust in International Law

International law and principles are not only a means of regulating the behavior of states and regulating conflicts, but also a source of legitimacy and trust within the international community (Ahmed et al., 2025). Legitimacy means that the actions of states and international organizations are legally and principledly supportable in the light of international law, and trust is the psychological and social power that states feel to comply with legal frameworks (Fisk et al., 2020). Maintaining the legitimacy of international law is vital for it to have a lasting impact on the management of international conflicts, the implementation of ceasefires, and the observance of human rights (Menon, 2021). The legitimacy of international law has several mechanisms: international law sets the limits of state actions, classifies conflicts, and guarantees human rights principles. These legal frameworks form the basis of legitimacy (Abdulkarim & Garba Musa, 2023).

The UN, ICJ, and other organizations monitor the actions of states, publish reports on violations, and encourage compliance with the law. Even if violations occur, this monitoring strengthens the legitimacy of the legal framework (Subramanian, 2022). Non-compliance with international rules is countered through diplomatic pressure and international credibility. States are required to provide legal justification for their actions to maintain legitimacy (Ahmed et al., 2025). The element of trust is complementary to legitimacy. Trust is built between states and international organizations that abide by legal principles, even in difficult conflict situations.

Abide by international standards and agreements. Provide international justification for the legitimacy of their actions (Noyon et al., 2023). An important example of trust maintenance is the activities of criminal courts and human rights monitoring mechanisms. When international institutions pursue the application of the law against states, these states are required to prove the legitimacy of their actions, and thus trust is maintained in the international community (Hough, Mike & Sato, 2011).

Even when states violate international law, legitimacy and trust are maintained in the following ways: States provide references to international principles and treaties for their actions, which help to gain legal legitimacy (Noyon et al., 2023). The international community and institutions monitor the behavior of states in the light of principles, which establish legitimacy as an indirect pressure (Subramanian, 2022). International laws and institutions create mechanisms that can be applied to new conflicts and crises, such as ceasefire mediation, temporary protection of human rights, and amendment of international treaties (Abdulkarim & Garba Musa, 2023). The Russian military action conflicted with international principles, but international law and the right to self-defense were invoked to maintain legitimacy (Vorng, 2025).

The ICJ's interim measures strengthened the legitimacy of the law in terms of implementing the ceasefire and respecting human rights (Elena, 2025). The India-Pakistan conflict strengthens the legitimacy of its actions in the light of international principles, even if there have been limited violations in practice (Fatemi Nejad, 2025). The legitimacy and credibility of international law are assessed from three perspectives: from the legal perspective, laws ensure the limits of state action, the classification of conflicts, and the respect for human rights. From a political perspective, states are required to provide legal justification for their actions to maintain international legitimacy. From the socio-international perspective, the international community monitors the behavior of states in the light of principles, which provide indirect protection of trust and legitimacy.

The legitimacy and credibility of international law are vital for the management of international conflicts, the enforcement of ceasefires, and the protection of human rights. Even when states violate the law, legitimacy and credibility are maintained through legal justification, principled pressure, and enforcement mechanisms. Overall, legitimacy and credibility are considered essential for the continued effectiveness of international law, the regulation of state behavior, and the stability of international relations (Krieger, 2018; Clapham, 2016; Marukhovska-Kartunova et al., 2024; Thomas, 2013).

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted to analyze the opinions of 167 eighth-semester students of political science faculties of private universities in Nangarhar province and has a descriptive and cross-sectional survey design. The study aims to analyze the mechanisms of resistance to international law, legitimacy, and maintaining trust in states. The data collection tool was a structured questionnaire with seven questions, and it had a Likert scale and multiple-choice format. The data were collected face-to-face, and all information was kept confidential.

Data analysis was conducted through descriptive statistics, which included distribution frequency, central tendency (Mode, Median, Mean), and dispersion indicators (Range, Standard Deviation), and Microsoft Excel was used for analysis. During the study, the consent of the participants was obtained, the confidentiality of the data was maintained, and the results were used for academic purposes only. The limitations of the study include that the sample is limited to eighth-semester students in political science faculties at private universities, convenience sampling may limit the generalizability of the results, and the accuracy of the responses depends on the participants' willingness to participate.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the study show that international law has maintained its legitimacy and effectiveness in the face of international conflicts, political changes, and humanitarian crises, and approximately 75–85% of participants expressed confidence that international law plays a vital role in maintaining order, human rights, and justice. The mean score and low standard deviation indicate that students broadly support the applicability and resilience of international law. We can now elaborate on each of the following in tables:

Table 1: In your Opinion, is International Law Still a Vital Framework for Global Relations and State Behavior?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Strongly Agree: 58 (34.7%) Agree: 69 (41.3%) Neutral: 29 (17.4%) Disagree: 9 (5.4%) Strongly Disagree: 2 (1.2%)
Central Tendency	The center or typical value of the data	Mode: Agree (69 students) Median: Agree Mean (numerical coding 1–5): ≈4.03
Variability / Spread	The dispersion or spread of the data	Range: 1–5 Standard Deviation: ≈0.84

According to the table, most students of the Faculty of Political Science (about 76%) agree or strongly agree that international law is still the basic framework for regulating international relations. The high level of mean (Mean = 4.03) and median (Median = Agree) indicates that the general trend is positive. The standard deviation (SD ≈ 0.84) is relatively low, indicating a relative consistency of the participants' opinions.

Table 2: In your Opinion, How Does International Law Maintain its Value, Effectiveness, and Legitimacy in the Face of a Changing Global Environment, Conflicts, and State Violations?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Strongly Agree: 54 (32.3%) Agree: 72 (43.1%) Neutral: 28 (16.8%) Disagree: 10 (6.0%) Strongly Disagree: 3 (1.8%)
Central Tendency	The center or typical value of the data	Mode: Agree (72 students) Median: Agree Mean (numerical coding 1–5): ≈4.05
Variability / Spread	The dispersion or spread of the data	Range: 1–5 Standard Deviation: ≈0.85

According to the table, the opinions of 167 political science students show that the majority believe in international law and believe that it maintains its value, effectiveness, and legitimacy in the face of a changing global environment, wars, and state violations. About 75% of the students "Agree" or "Strongly Agree," while only a small number are skeptical about the effectiveness of the law. The mode and median indicate "Agree," and the standard deviation indicates that the difference in opinions is small. Overall, the students consider international law important for regulating the behavior of states and protecting human rights.

Table 3: In your Opinion, How Effective is International Law in its Implementation and Enforcement through Global Institutions?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Strongly Agree: 37 (22.2%) Agree: 68 (40.7%) Neutral: 36 (21.6%) Disagree: 21 (12.6%) Strongly Disagree: 5 (3.0%)
Central Tendency	The center or typical value of the data	Mode: Agree (68 students) Median: Agree Mean (numerical coding 1–5): ≈3.67
Variability / Spread	The dispersion or spread of the data	Range: 1–5 Standard Deviation: ≈0.91

According to the statistics of the table, approximately 63% of the students believe that international law is still effective in its implementation and effectiveness, although not fully. The results of Mean = 3.67 and Mode = Agree indicate that there is a moderate positive tendency towards the implementation of the law. However, the slightly higher value of Standard Deviation (0.91) indicates that there is a difference of opinion among the students that is, some believe that international law is effective, and some are skeptical due to the weakness of its implementation.

Table 4: In your Opinion, do Recent Global Conflicts (e.g., Russia–Ukraine, Gaza–Israel, Thailand–Cambodia, Afghanistan-Pakistan) Demonstrate the Continuing Relevance of International Law?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Strongly Agree: 51 (30.5%) Agree: 71 (42.5%) Neutral: 28 (16.8%) Disagree: 13 (7.8%) Strongly Disagree: 4 (2.4%)
Central Tendency	The center or typical value of the data	Mode: Agree (71 students) Median: Agree Mean (numerical coding 1–5): ≈3.92
Variability / Spread	The dispersion or spread of the data	Range: 1–5 Standard Deviation: ≈0.87

According to the statistics of the table, approximately 63% of the students believe that international law is still effective in its implementation and effectiveness, although not fully. The results of Mean = 3.67 and Mode = Agree indicate that there is a moderate positive tendency towards the implementation of the law. However, the slightly higher value of Standard Deviation (0.91) indicates that there is a difference of opinion among the students that is, some believe that international law is effective, and some are skeptical due to the weakness of its implementation.

Table 5: In your Opinion, Does the Future of International Law Depend on its Adaptability and the Collective Commitment of States to Humanitarian Principles?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Strongly Agree: 64 (38.3%) Agree: 72 (43.1%) Neutral: 19 (11.4%) Disagree: 9 (5.4%) Strongly Disagree: 3 (1.8%)
Central Tendency	The center or typical value of the data	Mode: Agree (72 students) Median: Agree Mean (numerical coding 1–5): ≈4.11
Variability / Spread	The dispersion or spread of the data	Range: 1–5 Standard Deviation: ≈0.79

The results of Section 4 show that approximately 81% of students agree or strongly agree that the future of international law depends on its flexibility and the shared humanitarian commitments of states. The values of Mean = 4.11 and Mode = Agree indicate a strong positive trend, and the low Standard Deviation (0.79) indicates that participants are closely aligned in this view. Students believe that the survival of international law depends on its evolving structure and a shared commitment to protecting human dignity. This finding supports the contemporary view of international relations that the future of international law is based on cooperation, not competition.

Table 6: To what Extent do you Consider the Concept of International Law's "Adaptive Resilience" to be Realistic?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Very Realistic: 63 (37.7%) Moderate: 79 (47.3%) Unrealistic: 25 (15.0%)
Central Tendency	Indicates the center or typical response value among participants	Mode: Moderate (79 students) Median: Moderate Mean (numerical coding 1–3): ≈ 2.23
Variability / Spread	Shows the dispersion or diversity in students' opinions	Range: 1–3 Standard Deviation: ≈ 0.61

The results of the table show that most political science students (about 85%) consider the concept of "adaptive resilience" in international law to be realistic and practical. Of these, 47.3% of students considered the concept to be moderately or moderately realistic, and 37.7% considered it to be very realistic. Only 15% of the participants considered the concept to be unrealistic. According to the statistical indicators, the mean is ≈ 2.23, and both the mode and median are "medium", which indicates that the opinions of most students are clustered at an average level of realism. The low standard deviation (Standard Deviation) ≈ 0.61 indicates that the differences in opinions among the participants are small, meaning that their views are mostly the same and close. Overall, these findings indicate that students believe that international law still has the capacity to change and adapt and can adapt to contemporary international conflicts and political changes, while maintaining the foundations of human rights and international principles.

Table 7: Do you Agree that International Law is Capable of Evolving to Manage the Conflicts of the 21st Century?

Measure Category	Description	Value / Observation (Based on 167 Political Science Students)
Frequency Distribution	Students' responses based on counts and percentages	Yes: 94 (56.3%) To Some Extent: 58 (34.7%) No: 15 (9.0%)
Central Tendency	Indicates the center or typical response value among participants	Mode: Yes (94 students) Median: To Some Extent Mean (numerical coding 1–3): ≈ 2.47
Variability / Spread	Shows the dispersion or diversity in students' opinions	Range: 1–3 Standard Deviation: ≈ 0.69

The results of the table show that most political science students believe that international law has the potential to change and can adapt to the new international conflicts and challenges of the 21st century. The statistical data show that 56.3% of the participants said yes completely, and 34.7% said yes to some extent, meaning that almost 91% of the students agree with the potential of international law to progress. Only 9% of the participants said no, indicating a slight degree of skepticism or pessimism. According to the mean values, the Mode is the "yes" category, and the Median is "to some extent", which indicates that most of the participants believe in the possibility of change, but some remain cautious due to practical obstacles. The Mean ≈ of 2.47 and the Standard Deviation ≈ of 0.69 indicate that the difference in opinions among the participants is small and the general trend is positive. Overall, these results indicate that students believe that international law has a flexible and evolving structure that is adaptable to the evolution of the new international order, technology, and human rights.

The statistical results of the study show that the concept of adaptive resilience of international law is a real and effective mechanism from the perspective of most students. According to the statistics in the tables, approximately 75 to 85 percent of the participants expressed their belief that international law is capable of adapting to contemporary conflicts and can maintain its value for protecting international order and humanitarian principles. The presence of medium-level values (Mean = 3.67 to 4.11) and low standard deviation (SD ≈ 0.79) indicates a positive trend and relative consensus among the participants. These figures clearly support the research question "Is international law still capable of adaptation and change?" because the participants not only confirmed the effectiveness of the law but also believed in its continued flexibility and legitimacy. The results of this study are consistent with previous studies and have some new findings. Latif & Khan (2025) and Gabani (2025) studies have emphasized that the normative power of international law still constrains the behavior of states, although political interventions have affected the level of implementation. The results of this study also confirm this point, but as a new finding, they show that, according to students, the future of international law depends on the shared humanitarian commitments of states and mechanisms of cooperation. Conversely, other past researches (Skochylyas, 2025) have also been pessimistic on the efficacy of international law, however the statistical data of this research has proven that the inclination of the new generation of academics is optimistic towards enhancing and modifying international law. It means that the international law is not considered as a fixed framework but a developing framework which is able to change according to conflicts, technology and international relations. Analytically, this paper argues in favor of the belief that the international law is founded on the persistence of legitimacy and trust. States are obliged to give legal argumentation to their actions even in cases where they go against the law, which is an assertion of the moral power of international law. The paper comes to the conclusion that the international law is a capable, supple, and collaborative construct in the presence of the transformations, political games, and humanitarian emergency of the modern international system that continues to be a key constituent of the creation of justice and peace.

IV. CONCLUSION

The statistical and analytical findings of the study revealed that international law has retained its legitimacy, effectiveness, and enforceability in the face of contemporary international conflicts, political changes, and humanitarian crises. Approximately 75 to 85 percent of the respondents said that they believed the international law was a dynamic and strong structure that is very crucial in enhancing international order, human rights, and justice. The large mean score (Mean = 3.67-4.11) and the small standard deviation (SD ≈ 0.79) concern the fact that students are generally in favor of the efficacy and the validity of international law. Such findings show that the international law is still a valid system to be used in the regulation of the behavior of states, the promotion of the humanitarian principles, and the resolution of international conflicts. Despite political interference and power struggles that put impediments in the way of implementation, the principled pressure of the law, the directive role of the international organizations, and even the arguments by states to justify that they are lawful, show that law has not been rendered useless. The current study holds immense practical implications to the field of political science, international relations, and international law.

The resistance to implementation of international law is a scientific study used by the study of international law to have a balance between the international principles, legitimacy and trust by the students, the researchers, and the policymakers. The research will add value to the analytical knowledge of the international relations practitioners in terms of practical decision-making, mediation, and law enforcement. Political influences, economic pressures, and cultural issues should also be investigated in future studies as to their impact on the application of international law. The question of applied resistance is to be investigated on the basis of comparative studies with references to the experience of various countries (like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Ukraine, and Palestine) to define the actual approach to implementing international law. Overall, this study concludes that international law, despite the instability and political pressures of the contemporary international system, remains a living foundation of legitimacy, trust, and principled resistance a framework that is vital for the continuation of justice, peace, and human dignity.

V. REFERENCES

1. A. Abdulkarim, and I. G. Musa, "The Legitimacy of International Law: Challenges and the Emerging Issues," *Journal of Global Social Sciences*, vol. 4, pp. 14–34, 2023. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
2. S. Ahmed, Z. Sadiq, A. Mohammed, Z. Dahsh, and A. Ali, "The Effectiveness of International Law in Resolving Climate Change Disputes: Case Law, Compliance, and Equity Perspectives," *Environment and Social Psychology*, vol. 10, 2025. Publisher Link
3. R. Allison, "Russia's Case for War Against Ukraine: Legal Claims, Political Rhetoric, and Instrumentality in a Fracturing International Order," *Problems of Post-Communism*, vol. 71, no. 3, pp. 271–282, 2023. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
4. D. Arce, "Cybersecurity for Defense Economists," *Defense and Peace Economics*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 705–725, 2022. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
5. M. Asada, "The War in Ukraine Under International Law: Its Use of Force and Armed Conflict Aspects," *International Community Law Review*, vol. 26, no. 1–2, pp. 5–38, 2024. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
6. I. Bhat, "Book Review: Robert O. Keohane, "After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation*, vol. 10, pp. 168–171, 2014. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
7. F. Biermann, M. Betsill, J. Gupta, N. Kanie, L. Lebel, D. Liverman, H. Schroeder, B. Siebenhuener, K. Conca, L. Ferreira, B. Desai, S. Tay, and R. Zondervan, "Earth System Governance: People, Places and the Planet," *Science and Implementation Plan of the Earth System Governance Project*, 2009. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
8. S. Cavandoli, and G. Wilson, "Distorting Fundamental Norms of International Law to Resurrect the Soviet Union: The International Law Context of Russia's Invasion of Ukraine," *Netherlands International Law Review*, vol. 69, pp. 383–410, 2022. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
9. A. Clapham, The Challenge of Non-State Actors, Google Scholar | Publisher Link
10. G. Clark, "Book Review: A New World Order, by Anne-Marie Slaughter," *Journal of Planning Education & Pensions Europe*, vol. 24, 2005. Google Scholar | Publisher Link
11. E. Katselli Proukaki, "Enforcing Collective/Community Interests Through Essential Security Clauses and Solidarity Measures in the Context of Russia's Aggression Against Ukraine," *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 175–201, 2025. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

12. S. A. Fatemi Nejad, "De-Escalating the India-Pakistan Conflict in the Shadow of Nuclear Weapons: A 27-Year History," *Journal of World Sociopolitical Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 519–558, 2025. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

13. K. Fisk, A. Cherney, M. Hornsey, and A. Smith, "Rebuilding Institutional Legitimacy in Post-Conflict Societies: An Asia-Pacific Case Study," *Interphase*, pp. 1–2, 2011. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

14. C. Folke, S. Carpenter, B. Walker, M. Scheffer, and J. Rockström, "Resilience Thinking: Integrating Resilience, Adaptability, and Transformability," *Ecology and Society*, vol. 15, 2010. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

15. I. Gabani, "International Information in Law Enforcement: The Role of Digital Technologies in Cooperation Between the Legal Profession and Law Enforcement Agencies," *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, vol. 4, pp. 371–377, 2025. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

16. K. Gorobets, "The International Rule of Law and the Idea of Normative Authority," *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, vol. 12, pp. 227–249, 2020. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

17. F. Hadžić, "Governing the International Wars: Theory, Legislation, Human Rights, Critical Human Security, and Ethics," *Equinox Journal of Economics, Business and Political Studies*, vol. 10, pp. 160–194, 2023. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

18. M. Hough, and M. Sato, "Trust in Justice: Why It Is Important for Criminal Policy, and How It Can Be Measured," 2011. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

19. R. O. Keohane, "Alliances, Threats, and the Uses of Neorealism," *International Security*, vol. 13, pp. 169–176, 1988. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

20. H. Krieger, "International Law and Governance by Armed Groups: Caught in the Legitimacy Trap?" *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 563–583, 2018. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

21. A. Latif, and A. Khan, "Focus on the Responsibility of States Under International Law for Environmental Damages That Cross Borders," *Review of Education, Administration & Law*, vol. 8, pp. 207–218, 2025. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

22. O. Marukhovska-Kartunova, A. Bozhkov, V. Romanchuk, O. Bazov, D. Grytsyshen, and V. Opanasiuk, "International Law (SDGs): Regulation of Conflicts and International Relations," *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, vol. 4, 2024. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

23. S. Menon, "Arbitration's Blade: International Arbitration and the Rule of Law," *Journal of International Arbitration*, vol. 38, pp. 1–26, 2021. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

24. F. Morgenstern, and J. Klabbers, "Legal Problems of International Organizations: Reissue With New Foreword by Jan Klabbers," 2024. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

25. L. Noyon, L. Ansems, T. Riesthuis, and R. Tinnevelt, "Legitimacy of Institutions for Conflict Resolution: An Introduction," *Utrecht Law Review*, vol. 19, pp. 1–12, 2023. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

26. Y. Oliinyk, "Protection of Human Rights During Armed Conflicts: Challenges and Opportunities for the Implementation of International Humanitarian Law," *Veritas: Legal and Psychological-Pedagogical Research*, vol. 1, pp. 51–58, 2025. Publisher Link

27. B. Prasetyo, J. Tan, and R. Chan, "Implementation of International Law Principles in Indonesian National Law," *Rechtsnormen Journal of Law*, vol. 3, pp. 67–79, 2025. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

28. L. Skochylyas, "Crisis of International Law: Types, Levels, Spheres, and Approaches to Classification," 2025. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

29. S. R. Subramanian, "UN Security Council and Human Rights: An Inquiry Into the Legal Foundations of the Responsibility to Protect in International Law," *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 20–40, 2022. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

30. C. Thomas, "The Concept of Legitimacy and International Law," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2013. Google Scholar | Publisher Link

31. P. Vorng, "International Dispute Resolution in the XXI Century," *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 2025. Publisher Link

32. B. Walker, D. Salt, and W. Reid, "Resilience Thinking: Sustaining Ecosystems and People in a Changing World," *Bibliovault OAI Repository, University of Chicago Press*, 2006. Google Scholar | Publisher Link