

PhD Candidate Abebe Bahiru Bezabh Published Two Papers on Peer Reviewed International Journals

Abebe Bahiru Bezabh is currently a PhD Candidate in the School of Law and Intellectual Property Law at Zhejiang Gongshang University. His major is International Law. Since 2021, Abebe Bahiru Bezabh has published two articles in peer-reviewed international journals. His excellent academic performance includes publication in peer-reviewed journals, work as a journal reviewer at European Scientific Journal, being awarded a certificate for accomplishment training at Nuremberg Academy Young Professionals on international criminal law, participation as a Judge in the Philip Jessup international moot court competition, and many other school activities that have made him a model among international students.



In September 2022, Abebe Bahiru published an article titled “*Challenges of Dispute Settlement through the International Court of Justice (ICJ): the Case of Ukraine v. Russian Federation, the Decision on Provisional Measures on Alleged Violation of Genocide Convention*”, in the Journal of the European Scientific Journal of Humanities. This article aims to study the challenges faced by the ICJ in international dispute resolution processes by analyzing the case of *Ukraine v. Russia* and emphasizing the court's decision on claims of provisional measures to stop Russian military operations in Ukraine. The finding shows that ICJ has been facing challenges, which is also revealed in Ukraine’s case. Challenges including rejection of court jurisdiction, critics of institutional independence, gaps in the election processes of judges, and the involvement of the UN Security Council shadowed the political and ideological influence on the overall court's performance. Then the article suggests solutions that the ICJ should consider for significant change.

In July 2023, Abebe Bahiru published his second article titled “*The Legal Requirements and Impacts of Unilateral Withdrawal from International Treaties: the Case of the Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) between the USA and USSR*” in the Canadian Institute of International Law Journal. This article investigates the legal norms and consequences of unilaterally terminating international treaties by evaluating the United States' unilateral termination of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty signed by the United States and the Soviet Union in 1987. According to the findings, the US terminated the INF pact in 2019 by charging Russia violated the treaty, and the explanation was deemed 'an extraordinary event that jeopardizes supreme interest'. However, the document depicted the termination as being contrary to the purpose of the treaty and that state parties might avoid the termination if they wished to resolve their issue consensually.

The Legal Requirements and Impacts of Unilateral Withdrawal from International Treaties: The Case of Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) between USA v. USSR

Abebe Bahiru Bezabih

Ph.D. Student in International Law at Zhejiang Gongshang University, China, & Lecturer at University of Gondar, School of Law, Ethiopia

(Corresponding Author: abe22be@gmail.com)

This work is distributed under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)



<https://doi.org/10.30439/cijl.2023.394143.1066>

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Receive Date: 21 April 2023

Revise Date: 16 May 2023

Accept Date: 01 June 2023

Online: 01 June 2023

Keywords:

*Unilateral withdrawal, INF, USA,
Russia, Nuclear Weapon*

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, unilateral termination of international treaties is repeatedly exercised and becomes normal and justified by states' strict sense of protection of sovereign interest. This article aims to assess the legal standards and impacts of unilateral termination of international treaties by analyzing the US unilateral termination of the Treaty on Elimination of Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF treaty) signed by the US and the USSR in 1987. The finding shows that the US terminated the INF treaty in 2019 by alleging Russia violated the Treaty, and the justification considered 'an extraordinary event that jeopardizes supreme interest'. This paper argues that the termination negated the purpose of the Treaty and had different alternatives to avoid withdrawal, but options have been overlooked. The termination endangers normative principles of flexibility, good faith, and trust in international law of treaties that can lead parties into dangerous escalation in the intensifying global arms race to provoke a nuclear war.



ESJ Humanities

Challenges of Dispute Settlement through International Court of Justice (ICJ): the Case of Ukraine v. Russian Federation the Decision on Provisional Measures on Alleged Violation of Genocide Convention

Bezabh Abebe Bahiru

PhD Candidate in International Law,
Zhejiang Gongshang University, School of Law, China
Lecturer, University of Gondar, School of Law, Ethiopia

[Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p64](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p64)

Submitted: 12 July 2022

Accepted: 25 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Copyright 2022 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

4.0 OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:

Bahiru B.A. (2022). *Challenges of Dispute Settlement through International Court of Justice (ICJ): the Case of Ukraine v. Russian Federation the Decision on Provisional Measures on Alleged Violation of Genocide Convention*. European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 18 (29), 64.

<https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p64>

Abstract

This article aims to study the challenges faced by the ICJ in the international dispute resolution processes by analyzing the case between Ukraine v. Russia emphasizing the decision of the court on claims of provisional measures to stop Russian military operation in Ukraine. The qualitative approach was utilized in this research referring to both primary and secondary sources. The finding shows that ICJ has been facing challenges which is revealed in Ukraine's case too. Regardless of the marvelous efforts of ICJ, state parties are quitting the jurisdiction of ICJ by rejecting the principle of international law of treaties. Besides, the gap in institutional independence in the process of election of judges has involved the veto power of the Security Council which is a political organ. Even more, the election of ad hoc judges is based on the intention of national representation. To this effect, the verdict on Ukraine's claim has been decided by the split majority vote and judges' individual independence in decision-making has been influenced by national interest, the political orientation of judges, ideology, and diplomatic relations of states. The worst is that the judgment enforcement UN Security Council's structural posture caused failure to execute decisions.