

Analysis of Issues in the International Court of Justice Case of Ukraine v. Russia

Haoyu Wang*

School of Law, China Jiliang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

**Corresponding Author.*

Abstract: In recent years, the international situation has been severe, and the relationships between countries have been a universally concerned issue among scholars worldwide. Ukraine has initiated a lawsuit against Russia at the International Court of Justice in The Hague, claiming in its complaint that it has not engaged in acts of genocide, and therefore, Russia should not militarily intervene under the pretext of preventing and punishing genocide. Additionally, Ukraine has forcibly implicated Russia in the Genocide Convention, compelling Russia to accept the jurisdiction of the International Court. The essence of Ukraine's appeal is whether the use of force in the context of genocide is permitted under international law, which is also the core issue this article aims to address. The question of whether Russia is subject to compulsory jurisdiction regarding the judgment of the International Court is researched through literature review, conceptual analysis, historical research, and case comparison methods. This article argues that Ukraine should not initiate a lawsuit against Russia based on the Genocide Convention. Forcibly involving Russia in such a lawsuit represents an unreasonable application of international law and will have adverse effects on future cases. It must resolutely oppose such conduct.

Keywords: International Court of Justice; Jurisdiction; Convention on the Crime of Genocide

1. Introduction

The global situation has been in a state of peaceful stability over the years, but beneath the surface calm, various issues lurk. The games between nations are no longer conducted in the

form of war as they were in the last century. World security has always been a common pursuit of all humanity, hence the Russia-Ukraine war has become a very hot topic in the international community recently, attracting widespread attention. In 2022, Russia launched a special military operation against Ukraine, and the Russia-Ukraine war is no longer limited to military confrontation between the two countries; it has extended to the political, economic, and cultural games of many countries in the international community. [1] This war situation has accelerated the evolution of the world order, causing profound changes in international strategic forces. Building a universally peaceful and stable world is a common desire of human society and also an eternal proposition of human society. Therefore, the Russia-Ukraine war must be resolved.

On February 27, 2022, Ukraine filed a lawsuit against Russia at the International Court of Justice in The Hague, stating that there was no genocide occurring within its territory, and therefore Russia could not use this as a pretext for armed intervention. It is evident from the complaint that the Ukrainian government has a formidable team of international law experts. Both Ukraine and Russia are contracting parties to the Genocide Convention, and Article 9 of the Convention stipulates: "Disputes between contracting states relating to the interpretation, application, or fulfillment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a state for genocide or for any of the other acts enumerated in Article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any part to the dispute." In the development of contemporary international law, the issue of jurisdiction has always been controversial. As a contracting part to the Convention, Russia is directly subject to the jurisdiction of the International Court. [2] The International

Court issued an order for provisional measures against Russia on March 16, but whether the jurisdiction of the International Court has compulsory power, whether Russia will comply, and the various consequences, are one of the issues to be discussed in this paper.

In the lawsuit filed by Ukraine, many controversial issues have arisen. Although the cessation of war is a common call of scholars from all countries and all of humanity, this paper argues that the lawsuit filed by Ukraine and the jurisdictional judgment made by the International Court are unreasonable. This paper will explore the unreasonable aspects of Ukraine's prosecution and the problems with the judgments made by the International Court in response to the unreasonable prosecution, using methods such as literature review, conceptual analysis, historical research, and case comparison to express opinions and views on solving the problem and draw conclusions.

2. The Case of Ukraine v. Russia

When it comes to the case of Ukraine v. Russia, one cannot help but think of the Russia-Ukraine War, a significant international conflict that occurred in Europe in the post-Cold War era. On February 24, 2022, Russian President Vladimir Putin announced a special military operation against Ukraine, leading to the outbreak of the Russia-Ukraine War.

On February 27, 2022, Ukraine filed a lawsuit against Russia at the International Court of Justice in The Hague, which is the internationally popular case of Ukraine v. Russia.

2.1 Background and Causes of the Ukraine v. Russia Case

The situation of the Russia-Ukraine War is complex, with a multitude of causes, including political, economic, cultural, and historical factors.

Political Aspect: Since gaining independence following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, Ukraine has remained under the political and economic influence of Russia. In 2014, the "Eurasian dispute," also known as the "Ukrainian crisis," erupted when former President Yanukovich abruptly refused to sign a cooperation agreement with the European Union, siding with Russia instead. This triggered widespread protests and political

turmoil, leading to Yanukovich's ouster. Subsequently, Russia annexed the Crimean Peninsula and supported separatists in the eastern Ukrainian regions of Donetsk and Luhansk. The Ukrainian government took a tough stance, labeling these actions as aggression and vowed to defend the country's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

Economic Aspect: Situated at the crossroads of Eurasia and part of the "Eurasian land bridge," Ukraine has been a significant economic partner to Russia, with strong economic ties between the two nations. However, Ukraine's economy has been relatively weak, with slow development, low per capita income, and a significant wealth gap. Against this backdrop, the Ukrainian government sought to diversify its economic channels and engage in closer cooperation with the European Union and other Western countries, threatening Russia's economic interests. Consequently, Russia responded to the political crisis in Ukraine with military intervention and economic sanctions.

Cultural Aspect: Ukraine possesses a unique cultural heritage and historical background. It was once the heartland of the Christian Orthodox faith, with a rich array of artistic expressions in literature, music, and dance. While Ukrainian and Russian cultures share many intersections and similarities, they also have distinct differences. As the educational level and cultural awareness of the Ukrainian population have increased, there has been a growing emphasis on national independence and cultural autonomy, with the perception that Russia has exerted too strong a cultural influence and suppression over Ukraine.

Historical Aspect: Throughout history, Ukraine has been part of various nations, including Poland, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Soviet Union, and has experienced rule and invasion from different countries during different historical periods. This has led to a heightened appreciation for national independence and sovereignty among the Ukrainian people, along with a heightened vigilance against external threats. Additionally, Ukraine's historical background and cultural traditions differ significantly from those of Russia, further deepening the divisions and conflicts between the two nations.

Due to these various reasons, the Russia-Ukraine War erupted. Subsequently,

Ukraine filed a lawsuit against Russia, focusing on Russia's military actions against Ukraine, and initiated proceedings at the International Court of Justice in The Hague.

Ukraine filed a lawsuit against Russia. The application also involved disputes between Ukraine and the Russian Federation regarding the interpretation, application, and fulfillment of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. As Ukraine stated: Russia falsely claimed that acts of genocide had occurred in the Luhansk and Donetsk regions of Ukraine, and on this basis, recognized the so-called "People's Republic of Donetsk" and "People's Republic of Luhansk." It then announced and carried out a "special military operation" against Ukraine, with the stated purpose of preventing and punishing unfounded acts of genocide. Concurrently, Russia was accused of invading Ukraine based on these allegations, severely violating the human rights of the Ukrainian people. Ukraine categorically denied that such genocide had occurred, using the application to prove that Russia had no legal basis for military action within Ukraine to prevent or punish genocide. [3]

2.2 Positions of Various Parties in the Ukraine v. Russia Case

Regarding Ukraine's lawsuit, the International Court of Justice ruled on this: (1) Russia must immediately suspend military operations against Ukraine; (2) Russia must ensure that armed groups or personnel under its control, direction, or support also do not take further military action; (3) both sides must exercise restraint to prevent the dispute from escalating further. However, there is significant disagreement within the international community, particularly among international law scholars, regarding the manner in which Ukraine filed the lawsuit and the outcome of the ICJ's judgment.

The mainstream views of foreign countries on the "Genocide Convention" involved in Ukraine's lawsuit are as follows:

(1) Latvia expressed its views on the interpretation of Article 9 of the "Genocide Convention" related to jurisdictional issues, as well as on Articles 1, 2, 3, and 8 related to the substantive issues of the case. Regarding Article 9 of the Convention, Latvia believes that how to interpret the scope of Article 9 is

very important because it relates to Ukraine's attempt to establish the court's jurisdiction.

(2) The United Kingdom stated its interpretive position on the relevant provisions of the Convention from both jurisdictional and substantive perspectives in its declaration.

On the issue of jurisdiction, the UK believes that Article 9 entitles the ICJ to corresponding jurisdiction in declaring and confirming the requesting state's fulfillment of Convention matters. In this regard, the UK specifically responded to some judges' doubts or reservations on this issue in the provisional measures order of the ICJ.

On substantive issues, when a country takes action to prevent genocide based on Article 1 of the Convention, it is required that the country determine in good faith whether genocide is occurring; if it is not confirmed in good faith, the country has no right to invoke the Convention as the basis for its actions. The "undertake to prevent" in Article 1 shall not be interpreted in any situation as allowing a country to engage in aggression, commit war crimes, or commit crimes against humanity. The "undertake to punish" in Article 1 is only related to punishing individuals and cannot be used as an excuse to take action against a state. Judge Xue of the ICJ provided a good summary of China's views on the issues involved in Ukraine's lawsuit, believing that (1) Russia's special military operations are not based on the "Convention," but on Article 51 of the United Nations Charter regarding the exercise of the right to collective self-defense; (2) behind the special military operations, there are other political reasons in addition to the allegations of genocide. Accordingly, since Ukraine is essentially questioning the legality of Russia's attack, if the attack itself does not constitute genocide, then its legality issue does not fall within the scope of interpretation, application, or implementation of the "Convention," and the dispute resolution mechanism under the "Convention" should not be applied. [4]

2.3 Summary of the Analysis of the Ukraine v. Russia Case

Although the Russia-Ukraine War is still ongoing and has not yet reached a complete end, with both sides making continuous small moves, the conflict has extended from military warfare to political, economic, and cultural

games. What kind of impact will the Russia-Ukraine War have on the global stage? In terms of Russia-Ukraine relations, I believe this war will lead these two nations, with their intricately intertwined relationships, towards a complete split. Post-war, while Ukraine may not join NATO, it is highly likely to join the EU, leaning more towards integrating with Europe's developmental path. [5] Under the sanctions of the international community, Russia may enter a relatively isolated state, further marginalized in the global economy and international political system. At the same time, the Russia-Ukraine War has also brought many issues and challenges to international relations. Firstly, this conflict has triggered tensions between Russia and Western countries, exacerbating the division and confrontation in global politics. Secondly, the war has revealed the dilemmas and disputes the international community faces when dealing with similar crises, such as issues of sovereignty, territorial integrity, human rights, and diplomacy. [6] Additionally, the Russia-Ukraine War has had a profound impact on regional security and stability. It has led to a long-term stalemate between the Ukrainian government and the Donbas region, making the resolution of the conflict in that area exceptionally difficult. Moreover, the tense relations between Russia and Ukraine have, to some extent, affected the stability and development of the European region. The war has also intensified tensions and instability in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, triggering strategic and security considerations for neighboring countries. [7]

The lawsuit brought by Ukraine against Russia has reached a temporary conclusion so far, and the International Court of Justice has issued its order for provisional measures. Whether Russia will accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court and implement the court's provisional measures will be discussed in the latter half of this paper.

3. The Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the Ukraine v. Russia Case

The International Court of Justice (ICJ), as an important judicial institution for dispute resolution within the United Nations, plays a significant role. Established in the Peace Palace in The Hague, Netherlands, and

commencing operations in 1946, the authority of the ICJ has grown alongside disputes over its jurisdiction. In the process of handling cases, whether the ICJ has jurisdiction to adjudicate a case is often a contentious issue among nations. The primary confirmation is its jurisdiction over the case; only states can be parties to proceedings before the ICJ, and the Court has the right to hear cases only when the parties involved accept its jurisdiction. [8]

In the case of *Ukraine v. Russia*, numerous procedural issues in international law have arisen. One such issue is the intervention rights of states based on Article 63 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. An unprecedented number of states have chosen to intervene in the *Ukraine v. Russia* case based on Article 63 of the Statute. Another issue, which is the focus of this paper, is the jurisdictional issues related to the *Ukraine v. Russia* case, including whether the ICJ has jurisdiction over the case, the basis upon which it exercises jurisdiction, and whether Russia will accept the jurisdiction of the ICJ, among other issues.

3.1 Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the Case.

This paper argues that although the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has established preliminary jurisdiction over the case of *Ukraine v. Russia*, whether the ICJ can exercise jurisdiction over subsequent parts of the case remains a question that needs further examination.

Firstly, it is important to distinguish between the ICJ's compulsory jurisdiction and its jurisdiction based on agreements. The Statute of the International Court of Justice is part of the United Nations Charter, and the member states of the United Nations are, of course, parties to the Statute. The operations of the ICJ are conducted in accordance with the Statute. The jurisdiction of the ICJ is clearly stipulated in the Statute.

Known as "optional clause" jurisdiction, means that whether a state accepts this clause is entirely up to the will of the state and is "optional." Once a state declares its acceptance of this jurisdiction, it becomes "compulsory," hence the term "optional clause" jurisdiction. However, neither Ukraine nor Russia has declared acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction. Therefore, based solely on the Statute of the

International Court of Justice itself, it is impossible to determine whether the case "Ukraine v. Russia" has jurisdiction.

On this basis, there is also the issue of judicial jurisdiction. A state's non-recognition of unconditional compulsory judicial jurisdiction over all legal disputes does not mean that it also does not recognize such jurisdiction over a specific issue. [9] States can agree through special agreements or international agreements to submit a particular issue to an international tribunal for resolution. Therefore, to conduct an in-depth analysis of the ICJ's jurisdiction, it is necessary to clarify the specific reasons for Ukraine's lawsuit against Russia and determine the court's jurisdiction based on the agreements signed by both Russia and Ukraine regarding the specific issues of the lawsuit.

Currently, the content of Ukraine's lawsuit against Russia has been publicly displayed on the official website of the International Court of Justice. According to the complaint, Ukraine's lawsuit concerns disputes over the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

3.2 Controversy Over the International Court's Exercise of Jurisdiction in the Case

The basis for the International Court of Justice (ICJ) to exercise jurisdiction over the case of Ukraine v. Russia is the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which was the first international convention on human rights issues formulated under the auspices of the United Nations and was unanimously adopted at the United Nations General Assembly held in Paris in 1948. The main content of the Convention states that acts of genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, are international crimes which the present Convention is intended to prevent and to punish; genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group; conspiracy to commit genocide, incitement to commit genocide, attempts to commit genocide, and complicity in genocide are all punishable; persons committing genocide shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals. Both Ukraine and Russia have acceded to Article 9 of the Convention. It is noteworthy

that both Ukraine and Russia entered reservations to Article 9 of the treaty when they joined, but later withdrew these reservations.

Thus, the jurisdictional issue in this case hinges on whether Russia and Ukraine can reach an agreement to submit the dispute to the International Tribunal, which they have done, agreeing to submit disputes concerning the interpretation, application, and execution of the Genocide Convention to the International Court. Subsequently, Unlike Ukraine's claim, Russia argues that the dispute in this case concerns the legality of the use of force, which does not fall within the scope of disputes covered by the dispute resolution provisions of the Genocide Convention, and thus the Court has no jurisdiction. In its legal submissions, Russia points out that both its purposes and objectives indicate that it only defines, prevents, and punishes genocide, without regulating the legality of the use of force, which should be governed by the Charter and international customary law. If the Genocide Convention were interpreted as a regulation on the use of military force, it would "radically alter and distort the purposes and objectives of the Convention." Russia also notes that the sole reason for its use of force is to exercise the right of self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and customary law, and thus claims that there is no legal dispute between the two countries under the Convention, and therefore the Court lacks jurisdiction. Additionally, Russia points out that Putin has never explicitly mentioned the Genocide Convention, genocide, or the concept within the Genocide Convention in his statements, and therefore, Russia's dispute over the Genocide Convention is considered settled. Russia further emphasizes that the issue of the use of force and the issues triggered by the Genocide Convention are two completely different matters, as if to say that the Genocide Convention does not empower Ukraine, and Ukraine is not qualified to request the Court to take temporary protective measures for Ukraine's interests. [10]

Therefore, after the ICJ confirmed its preliminary jurisdiction, disputes arose over the subsequent jurisdiction of the case, which can be divided into two situations. The first situation is that Ukraine and Russia dispute whether acts of genocide have occurred and

whether Russia acknowledges its armed actions as a response to genocide within Ukraine; this dispute is a factual dispute and is not subject to the jurisdiction of international law. Therefore, in this case, the ICJ cannot establish jurisdiction over the subsequent progress of the case. The second situation is that the two countries dispute what kind of actions should be included within the scope of the Genocide Convention, which is a legal issue and should be within the scope of international law adjustment. Therefore, the ICJ can confirm its jurisdiction over the subsequent part of the case.

The Russia-Ukraine War has been ongoing for so long, and the factual investigation of the case has not yet ended; thus, the issue of jurisdiction over the case remains a matter that needs to be proven and resolved with sufficient facts.

3.3 The Rationality and Executability of the ICJ's Judgment Based on the Genocide Convention

On March 16, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) announced its judgment on the case of *Ukraine v. Russia*, which primarily demanded that Russia immediately cease all military operations within Ukraine, ensure no further military actions are taken, and urge both parties not to escalate the dispute. From this, it appears that the Court largely supported Ukraine's position. The ICJ determined that the evidence preliminarily showed that the statements of the parties involved "sufficiently clearly invoked the subject matter of the Genocide Convention," thus "enabling Ukraine to invoke the provisions on jurisdiction in this document to determine its jurisdictional scope." The Court also mentioned that, according to the statements of two national institutions and high officials in the case, there were indeed disagreements between the two countries on the following two issues: whether Ukraine's actions in Eastern Ukraine constituted genocide as defined by the Genocide Convention; and whether Russia could use force against Ukraine under Article 1 of the Genocide Convention. [11]

This paper expresses its views on the ICJ's judgment regarding the case of *Ukraine v. Russia*, fully agreeing with the cessation of military actions by Russia within Ukraine, but

reserving opinions on the first two provisional measures of the judgment. It also believes that the measures in the ICJ's judgment are unrelated to the powers that Ukraine can claim under the Genocide Convention. Given the complex situation between Ukraine and Russia, unilaterally demanding Russia to cease military actions will not fundamentally resolve the conflict between Ukraine and Russia. Despite China and Russia both voting against the judgment at the ICJ, it was ultimately passed with an overwhelming majority of 13 to 2.

Regarding the rationality of the ICJ's judgment based on the Genocide Convention, this paper believes that the important criteria for determining rationality lie in whether the judgment complies with legal procedures and actual circumstances, and whether it is practically helpful to the case. My view is roughly the same as Judge Xue's, which is that the main issue in this case involves whether there is a dispute between the two countries over the interpretation and application of the Genocide Convention. On the other hand, at least the applicant's claims must reach a credible degree, meaning that the legal basis for Ukraine's lawsuit is likely to support the applicant's claims. In this case, Ukraine believes that Russia has no right to use force based on the Genocide Convention, arguing that Russia has violated its obligations under the Genocide Convention, while Russia has consistently denied this, arguing that the Genocide Convention does not apply to its military actions. Thus, there is indeed a dispute between Ukraine and Russia over the interpretation and application of Article 9 of the Genocide Convention. According to the United Nations Charter and customary law, Russia cannot use force in international relations except with the permission of the Security Council or in the exercise of self-defense, so its use of force based solely on the Genocide Convention would be illegal. However, it is clear that Russia's actions, while implementing self-defense, also took into account the prevention and punishment of genocide, so its inherently legal actions do not become illegal merely because of additional purposes. Therefore, there are doubts about Ukraine's lawsuit. [12] As is well known, according to international law, a precondition for a court to adjudicate disputes covered by a

treaty's jurisdiction clause is that the court does not have jurisdiction over disputes that another court has no jurisdiction over. Therefore, it can be determined that when the court has no jurisdiction over disputes based on the United Nations Charter and customary law regarding self-defense actions, it also cannot have jurisdiction over disputes arising from the Genocide Convention.

The ICJ also refuted Russia's arguments: Russia based its defense on Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and customary law. The Court ruled that "certain acts or omissions may give rise to disputes falling within the scope of more than one treaty," and disputes arising under different treaties shall not prevent the Court from conducting a preliminary examination of the dispute submitted to it, considering it related to the interpretation, application, or execution of the Genocide Convention. For the aforementioned reasons, the Court established three provisional measures: Russia must immediately suspend military operations, ensure that the military complies with this order, and avoid the escalation or enlargement of the dispute between the parties. It should be noted that there is a difference in language between the provisional measures finally adopted by the Court and the application submitted by Ukraine: it does not require Russia to stop "military actions aimed at preventing genocide" as Ukraine requested, but only requires Russia to stop "military actions begun on February 24." This change in language effectively prevents Russia from evading the Court's provisional measures by arguing that "its military actions are not aimed at preventing genocide." The Court also emphasized that its "provisional measures ordered under Article 41 of the Statute are binding" and thus "constitute an international legal obligation for any part to whom the provisional measures are addressed."

For the case of *Ukraine v. Russia*, I believe that Ukraine is well aware of the purposes of its lawsuit, and the ICJ is also fully aware of the disputes involved in this case. However, it is surprising that the ICJ's judgment on this case did not discuss the implicit dispute matters, but simply demanded that Russia cease military actions. The conclusion of the Court's provisional measures order is equivalent to artificially recognizing a rule that

contradicts the existing legal system, outside the logically sound provisions of the Charter and customary law. This may help to achieve some political intention of promoting peace in this case, but it is a damage to the certainty and logical consistency of international law.

Since there are many unreasonable aspects in the ICJ's judgment on the case of *Ukraine v. Russia*, whether Russia will accept and implement the ICJ's judgment is also a question that needs to be examined. I believe that in this case, the executability of the international tribunal's ruling mainly has two points: the first is the validity of the tribunal's ruling; Russia must not refuse to accept the binding force of the ruling on the grounds of its absence from the trial, because if the defendant does not appear in court, the court has the right to make a legally binding judgment in absentia. Secondly, it is necessary to discuss whether the provisional measures order has legal binding force and the legal consequences that Russia may face if it does not comply. Since the court's adoption of provisional measures does not absolutely determine its jurisdiction, many opinions believe that provisional measures should not have binding force; otherwise, countries may be subject to the court's orders without agreeing to the court's jurisdiction, eroding national sovereignty. The court determined that, in essence, the legal force of provisional measures does not stem from the consent of states to the court's jurisdiction in the case, but from Article 41 of the Statute itself, because provisional measures are part of the judicial power itself, aimed at ensuring that judicial power is effectively exercised. Therefore, the correct understanding of Article 41 should be: to achieve this goal, it allows certain restrictions on the sovereignty of the states involved in the early stages of the case. Based on this, the consequences of non-compliance were discussed. In the substantive hearing stage of the case, the plaintiff may request the court to determine whether the defendant has violated its international obligations to comply with the "Provisional Measures Order" and to bear corresponding state responsibilities. In addition, the obligation of the defendant state to comply with the provisional measures order and the substantive obligations it is prosecuted for are two completely different obligations; even if the plaintiff's substantive claims are

rejected, the court may still determine that the defendant has violated the obligation. However, the plaintiff state may not take countermeasures against the defendant state on the grounds that it has not complied with the provisional measures order. Moreover, according to Article 94(2) of the Charter and relevant practices, contracting states can only request the Security Council to enforce the court's "judgments," not to implement provisional measures orders. Of course, in armed conflicts, the Security Council can decide based on its own judgment whether the actions of the disputing parties constitute a "threat to peace" and decide whether to take provisional measures accordingly.

Therefore, considering this point, the Russia-Ukraine War is likely to have ended by the time the court makes its final ruling, so the issue of compensation becomes a debatable topic. However, this dispute involves a permanent member of the Security Council, and the Security Council cannot play a coercive role, which means that Ukraine's chances of obtaining a ruling are slim, and Ukraine's unilateral sanctions against Russia will not have much effect.

Overall, although the rulings of the international court are binding, they do not have the ability to enforce compliance, so Russia will not comply. Russia has notified the international court in advance that it will not attend the hearing and stated that it does not have jurisdiction. Considering that the contradictions between Ukraine and Russia are very complex and did not erupt overnight, simply sanctioning Russia cannot fundamentally solve the problem. The best solution is to resolve the issue through negotiations.

4. Conclusion

The impact of the Russia-Ukraine War is global, affecting numerous countries worldwide to varying degrees, be it in terms of economy, politics, military, or global situation. The question of when and how the Russia-Ukraine War will come to a complete end remains to be seen. This also serves as a reminder that although peaceful times may seem calm, struggles and confrontations are ever-present. The Western bloc, led by the United States, is determined to maintain its hegemonic status and interests. It must remain

vigilant at all times, for in times of war or other special circumstances, these dormant Western "pawns" may emerge at any moment to stab us in the back. The People's Liberation Army was able to achieve victory in numerous battles despite being generally outmatched in weapons and equipment, due to the core unity of purpose and effort from all levels. Today, it must still adhere to our original aspirations, stand united, guard against Western infiltration, and only in this way can we defeat any enemy in war.

At the same time, regarding the issues involved in the Ukraine v. Russia case, on one hand, I view Ukraine's litigation methods with a critical attitude. This paper believes that such improper litigation methods can affect the dignity and order of international law. On the other hand, I have a semi-opposed attitude towards the International Court's judgment and the provisional measures ordered based on Ukraine's unreasonable litigation requests. I support the part that calls for Russia to cease military actions, but I oppose the overall judgment and the jurisdictional issues. This paper argues that the International Court has exercised jurisdiction over the case based on a flawed foundation, effectively forcing the recognition of a rule that contradicts the existing legal system, which can damage the certainty and logical consistency of international law.

References

- [1] Liu Yang. On the Prohibition of the Use of Force in International Law. *Journal of International Relations*, 2005(06): 27-32.
- [2] Ding Feng. Research on the International Legal Issues of the Principle of Prohibition of the Use of Force. Southwest University of Political Science and Law, 2004.
- [3] Yang Shuai. On the Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and Its Enlightenment to Our Country. *Legal Application*, 2013, (11): 117-120.
- [4] Andreas Zimmermann. Human Rights Treaty Bodies and the Jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. *The Law & Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, 2013.
- [5] Ge Haojie. A Study on the Participation System of Article 62 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. China

- Foreign Affairs University, 2014.
- [6] Wang Jue. A Study on the Jurisdiction Issues of the International Court of Justice. Jilin University of Finance and Economics, 2015(05).
- [7] Michail Vagias. Questions of Jurisdiction and Admissibility before International Courts. Leiden Journal of International Law, 2018.
- [8] Xue Hanqin. Challenges to International Rule of Law. Chinese Journal of International Economic Law, 2021(03).
- [9] Shi Cun. A Study on the Application of the Principle of Consent of the Parties in the International Court of Justice. Liaoning University, 2022(05).
- [10] Song Jie. The Case of Ukraine v. Russia: China Needs to Seriously Consider Participating in the Lawsuit According to Article 63 of the Statute. 2022.
- [11] Antonio Cassese. International Law. Translated and published by Oxford University Press and Law Press, 2009.
- [12] Song Jie. A Study on the Issues of Judicial Interference in International Law. China University of Political Science and Law Press, 2018.