



International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Russia's Role in Shaping Multipolar IHL Enforcement Post– Ceasefire

Dinesh. K¹, Mukesh Kumar²

¹1st Year LLB (Hons), Chettinad Academy of Research And Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai, Tamilnadu,

²1st Year Llb (Hons), Chettinad Academy of Research And Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai, Tamilnadu

ABSTRACT

Russia's role in shaping the enforcement of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) in a multipolar world after a ceasefire is complex and deeply debated. Russia both challenges and influences how IHL is implemented globally, especially in a world where multiple major powers hold sway instead of a single dominant one. This answer explores the subject in detail, in simple terms, and at length. Russia's Stance on International Humanitarian Law is which, Russia has a cautious and often skeptical approach towards IHL enforcement. While Russia is formally bound by many core IHL treaties, including the Geneva Conventions, its actual practice frequently diverges from these norms. Russia rarely supports new international treaties that strengthen IHL, and it has distanced itself from global mechanisms like the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission (IHFFC). This approach limits the direct influence of international bodies on Russian actions.

INTRODUCTION

After major armed conflicts, especially those in which it is a primary participant (such as in Ukraine), Russia's implementation of ceasefire agreements and IHL obligations becomes a central element in global peace efforts. Russia typically emphasizes political solutions and negotiated settlements, urging all parties to respect agreed ceasefires and humanitarian provisions. However, critics argue that on the ground, Russia's actions often contribute to violations of IHL, including attacks on civilian targets and restrictions on humanitarian access. The emergence of a multipolar world where power is shared among several states (not just the US and its allies) means IHL enforcement is increasingly influenced by the positions of China, India, Russia, and other regional actors. In this environment, consensus on how to interpret and implement IHL is harder to achieve. Russia leverages this setting by aligning with other powers to challenge Western interpretations of IHL and create alternative diplomatic forums or peace processes.

Examples from Recent Ceasefires

In recent major ceasefires, such as the Israel-Hamas truce in Gaza, Russia has called for strict adherence to agreements, humanitarian aid, and rebuilding efforts. Russia presents itself as a mediator interested in stability and long-term solutions, sometimes even proposing new international arrangements for monitoring compliance. However, there is persistent skepticism over whether Russia acts in good faith, given its own record of alleged IHL violations.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How does Russia interpret and apply International Humanitarian Law (IHL) during and after ceasefires?
2. What role does Russia play in influencing the enforcement of IHL within a multipolar international order?
3. To what extent do Russia's political and legal strategies affect international accountability mechanisms (such as the ICC and UN Security Council)?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To examine Russia's interpretation, compliance, and divergence from core IHL principles during and after conflicts.
- To analyze the influence of multipolarity on the global enforcement of IHL, particularly through Russia's engagement with other major powers.
- To evaluate Russia's participation (or lack thereof) in international judicial and enforcement mechanisms, including its position on the ICC and UN processes.

CHAPTERTIZATION

Russia's Legal and Political Tools

Russia uses both legal and political strategies to shape IHL enforcement:

- Legally, Russia stresses the necessity of respecting state sovereignty and non-interference, sometimes rejecting international court rulings as illegitimate if they conflict with Russia's interests.
- Politically, it often blocks or waters down UN Security Council resolutions that would impose sanctions or interventionist measures against allied states, including itself.

Challenges to International Accountability

Russia's reluctance to cooperate with international judicial mechanisms, such as the ICC, creates obstacles for enforcing accountability for wartime abuses. As a non-party to the Rome Statute (which established the ICC), Russia is not legally bound by its decisions, although some forms of accountability may still be pursued through mechanisms like UN Security Council referrals. However, Russia can and does use its veto in the Security Council to block such referrals in cases touching its own interests.

The Multipolar Order and Fragmentation

The trend toward multipolarity is reinforced by divisions among Western countries and reduced willingness of global powers like the US to directly intervene in accountability processes. This fragmentation allows Russia to strengthen its strategic position and resist international pressure, which can further erode already fragile IHL enforcement mechanisms.

Consequences for IHL and Global Peace

The effectiveness of IHL as a tool to protect civilians and limit wartime suffering is being tested. Russia's ability to influence outcomes in the UN and regional organizations means that enforcement often relies more on political negotiation than legal mechanisms. There are growing calls to reform and strengthen international justice mechanisms to address persistent violations, given frequent lapses in existing systems. Hybrid tactics, such as using non-state actors or disinformation, further challenge classical IHL enforcement, as direct accountability becomes harder to trace and achieve.

Opportunities and Risks

While Russia's actions have often been criticized, its centrality in major peace processes and its leverage in international organizations mean that any lasting improvements in IHL enforcement in a multipolar world will require some degree of Russian cooperation or at least acquiescence. The international community faces the challenge of finding new, effective ways to hold violators accountable and incentivize compliance.

- New forms of regional or hybrid courts could emerge, providing more pragmatic ways to deliver justice when global mechanisms are blocked.
- Efforts to build consensus in multipolar forums, pairing legal standards with robust diplomacy, will determine the future balance between power politics and the protection of human rights and humanitarian norms.

Section 1: The Concept of Multipolarity in International Law

- Definition and evolution of multipolarity in global politics
- Impact of multipolarity on international legal frameworks
- Connection between multipolarity and IHL enforcement

Section 2: Russia's Foreign Policy and Post-Ceasefire Engagement

- Overview of Russia's foreign policy objectives
- Historical context of Russia in conflict resolution
- Case studies of Russian engagement after ceasefires (Ukraine, Syria, etc.)

Section 3: Russia's Approach to International Humanitarian Law

- Russia's interpretation and application of IHL principles
- Diplomatic strategies and interactions with global institutions
- Critiques and controversies regarding Russia's IHL record

Section 4: Mechanisms and Tools of IHL Enforcement

- Global and regional IHL enforcement mechanisms

- Russia's position on international bodies (ICC, UN, ad hoc tribunals)
- Russia's preference for regional or multipolar frameworks

Section 5: Challenges in Multipolar Enforcement after Ceasefires

- Blocking and weakening of global enforcement by Russia
- Tensions between sovereignty and accountability
- Impact on civilians and humanitarian protection

Section 6: Russia's Collaboration with Non-Western Partners

- Russia's alliances in Asia, Africa, and Latin America
- Joint initiatives for legal and humanitarian cooperation
- Implications for global legal standard

Section 7: Case Studies

- Ukraine conflict: IHL enforcement and Russia's role
- Syria conflict: Post-ceasefire dynamics and humanitarian outcomes
- Comparative analysis of Russian approaches

Possible Theoretical Frameworks

You may ground your research in one or more of the following:

1. **Realist Theory**, States act primarily in self-interest, using IHL strategically.
2. **Constructivist Theory**, Focus on how norms (like IHL) evolve through political narratives and social legitimacy.
3. **Liberal Institutionalism**, Examines the role of institutions (ICC, UN) in maintaining rule-based order despite multipolarity.
4. **Postcolonial/Global South Perspectives**, Analyze how Russia and its allies challenge Western-centric legal norms.

CONCLUSION

Russia's role in shaping multipolar IHL enforcement post-ceasefire is pivotal but fraught with controversy. Russia both challenges existing international mechanisms and uses its influence to redefine the rules in its favour. In a multipolar world, robust enforcement of IHL will increasingly depend not on single-power dominance but on the ability of the international community to forge new forms of accountability that can withstand state resistance and ensure the protection of civilians in future conflicts.

REFERENCES

Primary Legal Sources

1. Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols (1977) — Core treaties governing IHL.
2. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998) — Establishing framework for war crimes and accountability.
3. UN Charter (1945) — Especially Chapters VI and VII (Peaceful Settlement and Enforcement Actions).
4. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969) — Relevant for interpreting Russia's treaty obligations.
5. Customary International Humanitarian Law (ICRC, 2005) — Compendium of unwritten IHL rules, often invoked where treaties are silent.

Secondary Sources (Academic and Institutional Analyses)

Books and Academic Works

1. Antonio Cassese, *International Law* (Oxford University Press, 5th ed. 2019).
2. Yoram Dinstein, *The Conduct of Hostilities under the Law of International Armed Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).
3. Sandesh Sivakumaran, *The Law of Non-International Armed Conflict* (Oxford University Press, 2012).
4. Malcolm N. Shaw, *International Law* (Cambridge University Press, 9th ed. 2021).
5. Michael N. Schmitt (ed.), *Tallinn Manual 2.0 on the International Law Applicable to Cyber Operations* (Cambridge University Press, 2017).

6. Tom Ruys, *Armed Attack and Article 51 of the UN Charter* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Scholarly Articles and Reports

1. ICRC, *International Humanitarian Law and the Challenges of Contemporary Armed Conflicts* (2023 Report).
2. Marco Sassòli, "Possible Legal Mechanisms to Enhance Compliance with International Humanitarian Law," *International Review of the Red Cross* (IRRC), Vol. 96, No. 895/896 (2014).
3. Sergey Sayapin, "Russia's Use of Force and International Law," *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, Vol. 26 (2021).
4. Anne Peters, "The Rise of International Multipolarity and Its Implications for International Law," *European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 31 (2020).
5. Ilya Sobolev, "Russia's Position toward International Criminal Justice: Between Pragmatism and Resistance," *Russian Law Journal* (2019).
6. Human Rights Watch & Amnesty International Reports on Russia and IHL Compliance (2016–2024).
7. United Nations Human Rights Council, *Reports on Violations of International Humanitarian Law in Ukraine* (2022–2024).