



Editorial

Certainty of International Law in Uncertain Times: An Evaluation of the US/ Israel and Iran War

BACKGROUND

This edition of the International Journal for Law and Business Transactions (IJLBT) once again presents itself as an instrument of stimulating interest in ongoing conversations around global affairs, and in particular, the operation of the law at both local and global levels. The scholarly works contained in this edition range from public international law, corporate law, international environmental law, to international migration law. The editorial board hopes that these articles will, in the long run, serve as catalysts for the reshaping and recalibration of the prime place of the law in advancing humanity and ensuring a well-ordered society for all, founded on justice, fairness, and mutual respect for everyone. However, before the editorial notes on the various papers in this edition, it is instructive to add the voice of this journal to the burning issue within the Public International Law space, which is the US/Israel and Iran War.

INTRODUCTION

International law is the foundational framework governing relations between states, intending to secure global peace, security, cooperation, and development. International law regulates international institutions; the United Nations is the largest international body in the world.¹ However, in recent times, the effectiveness of these laws has been tested, considering recent wars and attacks by nations against one another, most especially the US/Israel and Iran war.

This paper critically examines international law, its essence in the world, the United Nations as an international body, multilateralism, unilateralism, and the new world order, amongst others. Also, the 2026 US/Israel and Iran war was used as a case study for examining the complexities of international law, the legality of US attacks, and the implications of such actions for the world at large. International law, also known as public international law, is a system of laws, rules, and principles that govern the interactions and relations between sovereign states, international organizations, and other entities in the international space.² International law, as opposed to municipal law, largely operates upon the consent of participating states to such agreements or treaties, which make it enforceable in that nation.³

Article 38 of the International Court of Justice Statute explicitly states four sources of international law: conventions/treaties, customary international law, general principles of law, and judicial decisions.⁴ International law as a concept doesn't exist in a vacuum, as it aims to maintain global peace, facilitate cooperation between states, foster economic growth across countries, regulate conflict, and set standards for human rights and equality of persons.⁵

Over the years, various international organisations have sprung up with specific global goals spanning from trade, investment, to security and healthcare, all of which are regulated by different ideologies.

* Senior Lecturer, College of Law, Caleb University, Lagos, Nigeria. I will like to appreciate Boluwatife Sanu who assisted me in the research of this paper.

¹ See generally, John Dugard, *International Law: A South African Perspective* (3rd Edition, JUTA 2005), Council on Foreign Relations <https://www.cfr.org/articles/major-moments-un-history> (accessed on 28 May 2026)

² Laws Learned <https://lawslearned.com/public-international-law/> (accessed 28 May 2026)

³ Cornell Law School Legal Information Institute [international law | Wex | US Law | LII / Legal Information Institute](https://www.cornell.edu/lseil/international-law/) (accessed on 3 May 2026)

⁴ Article 38 of International Court of Justice [Statute of the Court Of Justice | INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE](https://www.icj.org/statute-of-the-court-of-justice/) (accessed on 3 May 2026)

⁵ Edmarverson A. Santos, *What is International Law?* <https://www.diplomacyandlaw.com/post/what-is-international-law> (accessed on 28 May 2026)

The United Nations is one of these international entities. Established on October 24, 1945, the United Nations saw its birth following the devastation of World War II and the failures of the League of Nations.⁶ The United Nations is built on foundational principles and a commitment to international peace, security, and fostering cooperation in human rights, development, and international law.⁷ Boasting a membership of 193 sovereign states in the world, the United Nations is the largest international organization in the world. In sum, it can be accurately asserted that the United Nations is an avenue for the goals of international law to be fulfilled.⁸

In the global arena, conflict remains a persistent and evolving challenge in our interconnected global landscape, and the UN has not shied away from this, as it has positioned itself as a central figure in global peacekeeping efforts across the globe.⁹ In the 1990s, the UN was involved in peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, Somalia, and Rwanda.¹⁰ However, in recent times, the effectiveness of international law and the UN as an international organisation has come into doubt in the light of recent wars and territorial attacks such as the ongoing Russia- Ukraine war, Sudan Civil war, the Israel- Palestine conflict, and most notably the latest United States/Israel and Iran war.¹¹

These unfolding geopolitical realities expose the growing uncertainty of the reliability and enforceability of international law regarding the territorial integrity and sovereignty of states, as well as global peace. Therefore, these emerging issues will be interrogated in the light of the concepts of multilateralism, unilateralism, and the new world order.

Multilateralism, Unilateralism, and the New World Order

In international law, there are two approaches to foreign policy, each founded on contrasting

ideologies and aimed at achieving specific goals. This part of this paper will examine the history and philosophy of unilateralism and multilateralism.

i. Multilateralism

Multilateralism in international law involves three or more states collaborating to solve shared problems or manage global relations through consensus and common rules.¹² Multilateralism is often guided by organizations like the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Multilateralism offers a framework through which nations can address similar challenges, facilitate global standards, and enhance the legitimacy of international actions.¹³ Its origins can be traced to the Peace of Westphalia, which established state sovereignty and equality as key principles of international relations.¹⁴

In the 19th century, multilateralism evolved through collective diplomacy following the Congress of Vienna and the establishment of early international unions to facilitate technical cooperation. A major shift occurred after World War I with the establishment of the League of Nations, introducing formal mechanisms for collective security, though it ultimately failed. Multilateralism became firmly established after World War II with the creation of the United Nations, which expanded international law into areas such as human rights, peace, and development.¹⁵ Today, it remains central to addressing global issues through treaties and international institutions, ensuring benefits and responsibilities are shared across borders.¹⁶

ii. Unilateralism

In contradistinction, unilateralism occurs when a state acts independently, often bypassing international institutions or the consent of other nations to prioritize its own national or legal

⁶ United Nations Official Website [History of the United Nations | United Nations](#) (accessed on 4 May 2026)

⁷ *ibid*

⁸ The Role of International Organisations in the Development of International Law: An Analytical Assessment of the United Nations (2023). *Law and World*, 9(28), 40-66. <https://doi.org/10.36475/9.4.4> (accessed on 28 May 2026)

⁹ CFR Education <https://education.cfr.org/learn/reading/what-international-law> (accessed on 28 May 2026)

¹⁰ World History Journal [The History of the United Nations: A Comprehensive Overview - World History](#) (accessed on 4 May 2026)

¹¹ ReliefWeb [Ten Challenges for the UN in 2025-2026 - World | ReliefWeb](#) (accessed on 28 May 2026)

¹² Robert O. Keohane (1990). "Multilateralism: An Agenda for Research." *International Journal*, [Multilateralism: An Agenda for Research on JSTOR](#) (accessed on 28 May 2026)

¹³ G8 Online [What is Multilateralism? Definition, History and Role in Global Governance — G8 Online](#) (accessed on 28 May 2026)

¹⁴ Leo Gross (1948). "The Peace of Westphalia, 1648–1948." *American Journal of International Law*, [The Peace of Westphalia, 1648–1948 | American Journal of International Law | Cambridge Core](#) (accessed on 28 May 2026)

¹⁵ Oxford Public International Law: Unilateralism/Multilateralism <https://opil.ouplaw.com/display/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e1682> (accessed on 4 May 2026)

¹⁶ *ibid*

interests.¹⁷ Historically, in the Westphalian era, following the Peace of Westphalia, international law was decentralized and state sovereignty supreme. States possessed a broad unilateral right to wage war (*jus ad bellum*), with minimal legal restraint.¹⁸

The Caroline Affair further shaped unilateralism by establishing the “necessity” principle, permitting self-defence where the threat was instant and overwhelming. After World War II, the creation of the United Nations marked a decisive attempt to restrict unilateralism. Article 2(4) of the UN Charter prohibited the unilateral use of force, allowing only a narrow exception under Article 51 for self-defence. However, during the Cold War, unilateral actions persisted under the guise of ideological blocs and spheres of influence.¹⁹

The post–Cold War “unipolar moment” saw a resurgence of unilateralism, particularly by the United States. Interventions such as the NATO intervention in Kosovo and the 2003 Iraq War expanded justifications for unilateral action, including humanitarian intervention and pre-emptive self-defence.²⁰

iii. The New World Order

The new world order refers to the transformation of the international system after the Cold War, which ended the bipolar rivalry between the two superpowers (the United States and the Soviet Union) and led to a largely unipolar system dominated by the United States.²¹ As the world’s leading military and economic power, the US has played a major role in shaping international policies.

Also, it has occasionally acted unilaterally, bypassing and disregarding international laws and frameworks, ultimately pursuing its national interests. The new world order is regulated by institutions such as the United Nations, which promotes collective security and cooperation among states. The International Criminal Court is another relevant institution of this period, reflecting

a commitment to international justice and the rule of law.²²

A Case Study of the United States/Israel and Iran War

On February 28, 2026, U.S. and Israeli forces began conducting joint strikes on Iran, numbering nearly 900 in just the first 12 hours of what the United States dubbed Operation Epic Fury.²³ The attacks targeted Iranian missiles and air defences, other military infrastructure, and Iranian leadership. These attacks resulted in the death of the Iranian regime's Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei, and several top officials, which triggered extensive retaliatory attacks by Iran using ballistic missiles and drones against U.S. military bases, embassies, and allied countries across the Middle East.²⁴

These strikes affected several states, including Gulf countries and strategic locations hosting American forces. Iran also targeted vital oil infrastructure and disrupted maritime trade by threatening and effectively closing the Strait of Hormuz, a critical global shipping route through which a significant portion of the world’s oil supply passes, leading to fuel shortages in parts of Asia and rippling effects across the global economy.²⁵

The conflict left enormous damage, thousands of people dead in Iran and Lebanon, dozens of deaths in Israel and the Gulf Arab states, and millions of people displaced in the region, including more than one-sixth of the population in Lebanon, after the war prompted the resumption of the Israel-Hezbollah war.²⁶

As of April 7, 2026, a two-week ceasefire agreement had been reached following Pakistan's intervention.²⁷ However, this agreement came with conditions to be satisfied. Under the deal, Iran agreed to reopen the Strait of Hormuz for two weeks, after more than one month of imposing a blockade in the vital trading channel, in exchange for a halt to US military strikes in Iran.²⁸ Pakistan's Prime Minister Shehbaz Sharif declared the

¹⁷ Number Analytics [Understanding Unilateralism in Global Politics](#) (accessed on 28 May 2026)

¹⁸ Leo Gross (n 14)

¹⁹ Robert Y. Jennings (1938). “*The Caroline and McLeod Cases*.” *American Journal of International Law*, [The Caroline and McLeod Cases on JSTOR](#) (accessed on 28 May 2026)

²⁰ Chapter 13 Multilateralism and Unilateralism, James A. Helis, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12024.15> Page 188 (accessed on 4 May 2026)

²¹ Thomas W. McShane “International Law and the New World Order: Redefining Sovereignty.” *U.S. Army War College Guide to National Security Policy and Strategy*, edited by J. Boone Bartholomees, Strategic Studies

Institute, US Army War College, 2006. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep12025.9>. (accessed 28 May 2026.)

²² *ibid*

²³ Britannica Encyclopaedia 2026 [Iran war | Explained, United States, Israel, Strait of Hormuz, Map, & Conflict | Britannica](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

²⁴ *ibid*

²⁵ American Jewish Committee [The Iran Strikes, Explained: How We Got Here and What It Means | AJC](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

²⁶ Britannica (n 23)

²⁷ BBC News [Why did US and Israel attack Iran and how long could the war last?](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

²⁸ *ibid*

ceasefire was in effect "immediately" and agreed to host delegates in Islamabad to mediate talks between both sides with an aim to peace.²⁹

Although there have been reports of 'dual blockade' where the US Navy is blockading Iranian ports while Iran continues to restrict traffic through the Strait of Hormuz, it could be safely assumed that the ceasefire is still ongoing.³⁰ This follows the recent reports of US Secretary of State Marco Rubio, who stated that the offensive stage of the war with Iran is 'over'.³¹

The confrontation took place after years of rising tension over Iran's nuclear programme, its ballistic missiles, and its military reach across the Middle East. Attempts to renegotiate a nuclear deal (after the collapse of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action [JCPOA]) in 2025 and 2026 were unsuccessful.³² Meanwhile, Iran's posture was in a weakened state after years of sanctions, recent destabilizing protests, damage inflicted during the 12-day War with Israel in June 2025, and the diminished position of Iran's allies during the Israel-Hamas War.³³

The military confrontation between the US/Israel and Iran raises fundamental questions about the legality of the use of force by the United States and the level of states' adherence to international law, particularly the United Nations Charter.³⁴ Article 2(4) of the UN charter explicitly states, 'all members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.'³⁵

However, this provision is not absolute as the Charter provides two exceptions to this rule: first, the use of force authorized by the UN Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security; and second, the inherent right of self-defence under Article 51 in response to an armed attack.³⁶

As a justification for its use of force, the US under Trump's administration has argued that Iran posed a threat to the US with its missile programme and its development of nuclear weapons, thereby endangering global security.³⁷ Additionally, Trump asserted that the goal of the war is to 'defend the American people by eliminating imminent threats from the Iranian regime'. Implicit in these arguments is the idea of preventive action—essentially that the use of force was necessary to stop a future threat before it fully materialized.

While this may appear to be a reasonable cause of action, the actions of the United States are largely unjustified and unlawful, as it violates Article 2(4), and neither of the exceptions outlined above has been sufficiently satisfied.³⁸ The legality of use of force arguably largely depends on evidence of an actual armed attack or weapons, or at least, an imminent threat to such an attack; none of which the US has been able to prove.³⁹

Accordingly, Rebecca Ingber, a professor at Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University who previously served as an adviser to the US Department of State, noted that Trump himself had said that the June 2025 US attacks on Iran 'obliterated' the country's nuclear programme.⁴⁰ Therefore, the 2026 attack may have been unnecessary; it amounted to flogging a dead horse. It is also important to note that there was no actual attack by Iran using these alleged nuclear weapons, so it is doubtful under the extant international law regime if the US can validly claim self-defence.⁴¹ The Charter does not recognise a doctrine of preventive war based on anticipated future capabilities.⁴² Nor does it permit unilateral enforcement of international norms through armed force in the absence of Security Council authorisation.⁴³

Notwithstanding the above argument, the US and some other commentators have argued for a more flexible interpretation of 'imminent threat',

²⁹ *ibid*

³⁰ BBC News [US Secretary of State Marco Rubio says offensive stage of Iran war is 'over' - BBC News](#) (accessed 5 May 2026)

³¹ *ibid*

³² American Jewish Committee (n 25)

³³ American Jewish Committee (n 25)

³⁴ Aljazeera News [Are US-Israeli attacks against Iran legal under international law? | US-Israel war on Iran News | Al Jazeera](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

³⁵ Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter <https://legal.un.org/repertory/art2.shtml> (accessed on 6 May 2026)

³⁶ Article 51 of the United Nations Charter <https://legal.un.org/repertory/art51.shtml> (accessed on 6 May 2026)

³⁷ Aljazeera News (n 34)

³⁸ Diplomacy and Law [USA-Iran War and the Use of Force under International Law](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

³⁹ *ibid*

⁴⁰ Aljazeera News (n 34)

⁴¹ Aljazeera News (n 34)

⁴² Diplomacy and Law (n 38)

⁴³ Diplomacy and Law (n 38)

especially in the light of alleged nuclear weapons and missiles.⁴⁴ This begs the question of whether a state should wait until there is an actual attack on its territory, or the prediction of an imminent threat or attack suffices to justify the use of force. The position of international law is unclear and remains unsettled as far as this argument is concerned.⁴⁵ However, the absence of UN authorization and the lack of clear evidence of an imminent threat clearly violate the principles of the UN Charter, as the US/Israeli attack has been widely condemned as a unilateral action bypassing international legal rules intended to regulate international affairs by scholars globally.

Enviably Pathways for International Law in these Uncertain Times

In these uncertain times, it appears that international law lacks the necessary ingredients and force of law to invoke its enforcement mechanisms and the ability to implement sanctions on erring states.⁴⁶ As a matter of fact, its efficacy and continuous use in the global arena are currently being debated. It is therefore imperative to recommend ways through which international law can be firmly established, adhered to by all international actors, and regain its arguably lost place.⁴⁷ This is in a bid to ensure global peace, security, and cooperation, as the continuous blatant violation of international laws without resultant consequences will surely lead to chaos and disruption of the global order. The following recommendations in the interim are offered:

Compulsory Submission to the Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (ICJ)

According to Article 36(2) of the ICJ statute, the jurisdiction of the court is based on: voluntary declaration of acceptance of the court's jurisdiction, special agreement by the parties before it to accept its jurisdiction, matters provided for in treaties and conventions, as well as *forum prorogatum*.⁴⁸ Although Paragraph 2 of Article 36 allows states to make a declaration recognizing the Court's jurisdiction as compulsory, this provision

is optional, so courts could decide to opt out or limit the Court's jurisdiction. It is therefore suggested that compulsory jurisdiction should be accorded to the ICJ to hear all contentious matters between states, as this will ensure a significant reduction in the breach of international law by countries.⁴⁹ In addition, this will promote a more consultative approach to conflict, such as dialogue and mediation.

Modernization of international legal principles

The rules of international law, particularly the UN Charter, should be periodically amended, especially considering modern threats and trends such as cyber warfare and terrorism. The clarification of certain guidelines, most especially the rules on the use of force and right to self-defence in respect to future or imminent threats, would go a long way in aiding the certainty of the law, thereby avoiding ambiguity and informing states on what is attainable globally. Since law is often regarded as a living instrument, its continuous recalibration to meet the lived reality of the people it is meant to serve is non-negotiable as far as international law is concerned.

Accountability of all International Actors

All international actors should hold one another to a greater level of accountability in addressing and condemning human rights violations and the violation of international norms. Increased cooperation among states will go a long way in improving the implementation of international law. A stronger sense of responsibility among world leaders will promote compliance with international laws. Powerful states must also lead by example by respecting international legal obligations and crossing long-established red lines in international law. This is all in a bid to maintain world peace, as without the existence of an effective law, life would be 'brutish, short and nasty' as asserted by Thomas Hobbes.

⁴⁴ The Guardian [What is the legality of the US and Israeli attacks on Iran? | International law | The Guardian](#) by Haroon Siddique (accessed on 5 May 2026)

⁴⁵ *ibid*

⁴⁶ The Guardian [Are we witnessing the death of international law? | International law | The Guardian](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

⁴⁷ TRT World Research Centre [Reclaiming Order: Why International Law Still Matters - TRT World Research Centre](#) (accessed on 29 May 2026)

⁴⁸ ICJ Statute, Article 36(2) [Statute of the Court Of Justice | INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE](#)

⁴⁹ Julius Chukwudi, [Implementation of International Law: Challenges and Way Forward](#) (April 03, 2023). Available at SSRN: [Implementation of International Law: Challenges and Way Forward by Julius Chukwudi :: SSRN](#) (accessed 5 May 2026).

SUMMARY

In summary, this note examines the operation of International Law within the context of the recent conflict involving the United States, Israel, and Iran, with particular emphasis on the role of the United Nations. Despite all the challenges international law faces, its necessity in today's world cannot be disputed, as it exists to ensure global peace and cooperation. International law is just as important as municipal laws, and should be strictly adhered to by states regardless of their foreign policies. For international law to remain relevant, there is a need for stronger enforcement mechanisms and greater commitment by states to uphold its principles. Without this, its ability to effectively regulate international conflicts will continue to be challenged by erring states. Therefore, in these uncertain times, international law cannot afford to be uncertain; its position must be clear and uncompromising, if the fragile peace the world enjoys will not be corroded.

Overview of this Inaugural Issue

This section summarises the contributions that make up this inaugural issue:

Separation of the Chairman/ CEO Roles in Nigerian Public Companies: A Review of the Impact on Board Independence and Governance Outcomes - Anayochukwu Precious Paschal Mbagwu (2026)

Mbagwu's article provides a focused doctrinal analysis of Nigeria's statutory requirement to separate the roles of Chairman and Chief Executive Officer in public companies. It traces the evolution of governance reforms from early non-binding codes to the binding provisions of CAMA 2020 and the NCCG 2018, and evaluates whether this structural separation has meaningfully improved board independence. By engaging with both agency and stewardship theories, the paper highlights the tension between formal compliance and practical effectiveness, noting that the *de jure* separation of roles does not always translate into *de facto* independence.

The article contributes meaningfully to corporate governance scholarship by showing that the statutory separation of the Chairman and CEO roles, while essential, is not in itself sufficient to guarantee effective board independence. It

advances the conversation by showing that governance reforms must extend beyond structural design to address deeper behavioural, cultural, and institutional realities that shape how boards operate in practice. By highlighting the persistent gap between *de jure* compliance and *de facto* effectiveness, the author reframes the debate over what truly drives improved governance outcomes in emerging markets such as Nigeria. Mbagwu's article, therefore, enriches existing literature by shifting attention from the mere existence of regulatory mandates to the conditions necessary for those mandates to produce genuine accountability, transparency, and ethical corporate conduct.

The Intersection of Irregular Migration and Human Trafficking in Nigeria: Statutory, Policy, and Enforcement Challenges under the Immigration Act, 2015 - Osawaru A. Erimwinorosee, Esq. (2026)

Erimwinorosee provides a focused analysis of how irregular migration and human trafficking intersect within Nigeria's migration system, using the Immigration Act, 2015, as its central analytical lens. Through his article, the author starts by noting that Nigeria's "porous and weakly monitored borders facilitate cross-border movements that often blur the lines between irregular migration and human trafficking," a theme upon which the paper is founded. The author draws on statutory provisions, case law, and national policies to expose persistent enforcement gaps, including overlapping mandates of NIS and NAPTIP, weak border governance, and inadequate victim-screening procedures. The article also highlights how regional frameworks, such as the ECOWAS Free Movement Protocol, unintentionally create opportunities for traffickers.

However, Erimwinorosee's most significant contribution in this article is his integrated analysis of two phenomena often treated separately in Nigerian legal scholarship. By demonstrating the continuum between irregular migration and trafficking, and linking this to statutory ambiguity and enforcement failures, it offers a more realistic understanding of Nigeria's migration challenges. Its comparative insights and policy recommendations further enhance its value for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners seeking rights-based, regionally coordinated solutions.

An Overview of the International Legal Framework for the Control of Automobile Emissions in Nigeria - Jacob Osariemen Abusomwan, & Ayeoritsesan Omolayo Obadiah (2026)

The authors addressed an under-served question, and their treatment of treaty domestication is the real strength of their article. The handling of the dualist constraint, section 12 of the 1999 Constitution, *Abacha v Fawehinmi*, the contrary finding of the African Commission on the same facts, and the two competing readings of section 7(c) of the NESREA Act show genuine command of the material. It reviews key treaties, including the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, and Copenhagen Accord, and evaluates their relevance to Nigeria's transport sector emissions, which remain a major source of greenhouse gas emissions and public health risks. The authors through their work expose the persistent gaps in the implementation of international environmental laws, which include weak enforcement, outdated emission standards, and the non-domestication of environmental treaties, all of which undermine their effectiveness at the domestic level.


The article makes a valid scholarly contribution to existing body of knowledge by showing that ratification alone is insufficient; international environmental treaties become effective tools for emissions control only when domesticated and operationalized/implemented through national legislation. It reframes the discourse by emphasizing that Nigeria's progress depends not merely on global commitments but on translating those commitments into enforceable domestic standards, supported by institutional capacity and political will. In doing so, the paper enriches existing literature on environmental governance in developing countries and offers a practical roadmap for strengthening Nigeria's regulatory response to vehicular emissions.

CONCLUSION

While it is incontestably true that law remains an evolving phenomenon, the need to continue interrogating its evolution and application must be a never-ending enterprise. Therefore, it is submitted that the various recommendations that have been offered by scholars in this edition of the IJLBT will continue to shape policy directions and guide relevant players in the field. Furthermore, it is submitted that the works contained in this edition would be of immense help to those researching, learning, or highly inquisitive about the development of the legal issues addressed therein. Most importantly, the general theme of this edition of the IJLBT, which is "Certainty of International Law in Uncertain Times: An Evaluation of the US/Israel and Iran War," offers another opportunity for global players to subscribe to a rule-based society, rather than a society where might is allowed to trump international law at the detriment of global peace, and the economic wellbeing of all.

Acknowledgments: We are deeply grateful to all those authors from various institutions all over the world who contributed to this maiden edition of the IJLBT. Their robust and uniquely different learned works have made this edition a grand success. For your papers to have been selected as worthy of being published in this maiden edition speaks volumes about the relevance of your research in ongoing legal discourses globally. Also, our appreciation goes to the indefatigable members of the editorial board, whose industry and priceless efforts ensured the timely publishing of the edition. Furthermore, we cannot but be enormously grateful to all the reviewers who, despite their extremely busy schedules, were able to review the papers, and their insightful comments immensely helped in the quality of the paper published in this maiden edition of the IJLBT. Indisputably, it is your joint efforts that have laid the foundational stones for the future success of the IJLBT.

About Founding Editor

Dr. Bamisaye Olutola  is the founding Editor of the *International Journal for Law and Business Transactions (IJLBT)*. He is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Public Law, College of Law, Caleb University, Lagos, Nigeria. Dr Olutola holds a LLD (Doctor of Laws) degree and an LLM (Master of Laws) degree from the University of Pretoria, South Africa. Dr Olutola acts as a consultant and reviewer to several learned journals, and he has to his credit papers published in books and journals. His recent paper, *Advancing Youth Right to Development: Challenges and Prospects*, was published by Brill as a book chapter in the book titled *International Covenant on Right to Development: Implications for Developing Countries and the Global Balance of Power* (Carol Chi Ngang, ed. 2025). Dr Olutola's research interests include public international law, international human rights, comparative constitutional law, migration, climate, and environmental justice issues. He is an international scholar who is interested in seeing that conversations on the workings of the law remain active through the publishing of learned articles for the benefit of humanity.