



INTERIM MEASURES IN THE FACE OF ARMED CONFLICTS: THE PROTECTION OF COLLECTIVE INTERESTS IN THE PRACTICE OF REGIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COURTS

This article examines the evolution of provisional measures in international adjudication in light of the growing use of interim protection to safeguard collective interests in armed conflict. Starting from the recent orders of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) concerning the Genocide Convention, particularly *South Africa v. Israel* and *Ukraine v. Russia*, the study compares the ICJ's approach with the practice of major regional human rights courts: the European Court of Human Rights, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, and the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights. The analysis shows that, in armed-conflict settings, the traditional requirements for the indication of provisional measures – plausibility, urgency, and risk of irreparable harm – are applied with greater flexibility, as the severity of the circumstances often makes judicial intervention appear unavoidable. At the same time, the article highlights a structural tension between the need for effective protection and the difficulty of formulating precise and enforceable measures when beneficiaries are large, indeterminate groups of individuals. The study argues that provisional measures are increasingly moving beyond their classical ancillary function of preserving the effectiveness of the final judgment and are assuming a broader role in the immediate protection of fundamental values and collective human rights. Nevertheless, significant challenges remain regarding the specificity, implementation, and overall effectiveness of such measures in practice.