

ЗАРУБЕЖНОЕ И МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЕ ПРАВО

UDC 341.1

Ordinary and extraordinary satisfaction as forms of non-material liability in international law*Z. Sh. Matchanova, M. V. Ignat'eva*

The Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia,
48, nab. r. Moyki, St. Petersburg, 191186, Russian Federation

For citation: Matchanova Zoia Sh., Marina V. Ignat'eva. 2024. "Ordinary and extraordinary satisfaction as forms of non-material liability in international law". *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law 2*: 454–465. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2024.209>

The article explores the forms of non-material liability in international law, namely ordinary and extraordinary satisfaction, through the lens of legal theory and factual analysis. The authors provide an overview of the peculiarities of non-material damage in the context of international relations. The essence of ordinary satisfaction is revealed. To satisfy the political claims of the victim state, various measures are being contemplated, which include making apologies, expressing regret and condolences, rendering honors, and giving assurances. It should be stressed that the measures in question can be employed either individually or collectively, depending on the situation. Examples of the ordinary satisfaction are presented, accompanied by a brief summary of the incident that necessitated the fulfillment of non-material demands. The key requirements for ordinary satisfaction include formality, publicity and transparency, with solemnity and symbolism being highlighted as necessary. It is emphasized that ordinary satisfaction should be adequate and proportional to the damage caused, it is pointed out that the use of forms humiliating to the responsible state is unacceptable. It is worth noting that measures expressed through satisfaction are consistently directed towards the state as a subject of international law. The extraordinary satisfaction, if deemed necessary, not only the temporary restriction of state bodies' powers and the reorganization of certain elements in the political and social system of the violating state but also the temporary occupation of its territory, which highlights the exceptional nature of the measures implemented. The article covers the experience of the victorious allied forces implementing measures to abolish the entire state mechanism of Nazi Germany. It has been established that ordinary and extraordinary satisfaction are significantly distinct in terms of the nature of their impact on

the offender, because both forms represent non-material liability for internationally wrongful acts, which, however, differ fundamentally in terms of their severity.

Keywords: international liability, non-material liability, ordinary satisfaction, extraordinary satisfaction, satisfaction of claims, international offense, international crime.

1. Introduction

The history of mankind has gathered substantial knowledge in fulfilling liability that arises from certain states to others, in connection with the perpetration of unlawful actions, whose nature may vary. The infringement of intangible interests of individual states and their unions, alongside that of tangible ones, can be attributed to the numerous wars, feuds, unfair behavior and violation of agreements, as well as attempts to harm one another. This assertion likely explains the widely held belief that the history of civilization is characterized by a never-ending series of both armed and unarmed conflicts.

Concurrently, peaceful interaction and mutually beneficial cooperation between parties acting as interested entities may coexist with actions impacting political interests and significant intangible values of one party, which are shielded from external encroachments. Moreover, the intangible realm of relationships is perhaps even more sensitive and vulnerable than the tangible one.

International law has broadly classified the liability of subjects into two categories: material and non-material. At times, it is reasonable to discuss the distribution of an extra category — mixed liability, containing both material and non-material aspects. The primary determining factor is the type of damage done, whether it was material, non-material, or a combination of both. Each type of liability can be materialized through a variety of forms. The advancement of international law has resulted in changes in such forms (Krivenkova 2022, 782), the prevalence of certain forms and the criteria for their materialization (Kosareva 2021, 69). Currently, mankind has formulated various forms that satisfy the demands and circumstances of the current era of international relations, and liability for material or non-material damage by one or more actors on another individual or a group can manifest in such forms.

Contemporary experience has revealed that issues of material liability are governed in international law and executed in international relations with greater clarity and comprehensiveness compared to non-material one (Konovalova, Kudriavtseva 2021, 147). The primary reason is that determining the fact of material damage, measuring its size, and identifying the presence or absence of critical components, such as lost profits, are more measurable in every sense, including volume, duration of negative impact, financial losses, and technical difficulties encountered by the victim. When it comes to non-material damage, determining the facts and parameters of the damage may not be entirely objective. In such cases, subjective characteristics and evaluations tend to dominate, if not always. However, it should not be assumed that non-material damage is an abstract concept. Generally, non-material damage incurred by the victim is distinctly and specifically interpreted. The affected subject discerns the violation of their rights and interests, assesses the magnitude of the damage, and can project even the furthest negative repercussions of such damage.

Non-material damage is occasionally referred to as political damage, and on occasion, it is denoted as moral damage (Kolosov 2007, 325). Within the realm of international law

theory, the term “non-material damage” is widely regarded as the most comprehensive and far-reaching (Ostapenko, Marochkin 2014, 193), as it serves the crucial role of distinguishing all possible forms of damage caused within international relations from material damage, i. e. damage that pertains to losses of property in various forms. Nevertheless, in the context of describing non-material damage and resultant liability, professionals in the sphere of international law conventionally employ the term “political” (Bekiashev 2014, 231–232). Thus, we believe that it is acceptable to deem these terms as interchangeable, considering the fact that damage of an abstract nature is consistently manifested in detrimental consequences within the political domain for the affected party. It is evident that the political realm is highly complex, interrelated with various facets of society and the state, necessitates meticulous attention, and mandates the safeguarding of the state’s legitimate rights and interests.

The term “moral damage” is less commonly used in the context of international law and international relations. The likely explanation is that the concept of “morality” has conventionally been more relevant to characterizing an individual’s personality or a community of individuals. Furthermore, at this level, moral issues are consistently intertwined with moral dilemmas, along with various social and psychological categories. It is worth noting that international lawyers may utilize the concept of “psychological measures of international legal coercion” when dealing with the offender (Chernichenko 2008, 231). The term “morality” is used cautiously when evaluating the conduct of States and their associations, such as international organizations. In many cases, if we come across a depiction of a state’s conduct as either highly moral or completely immoral, our perception of it is likely to be emotional rather than legal. Although it is widely believed, the prevailing stereotype oversimplifies the issue as the acts of a state or an international organization, whether active or passive, can result in severe damage to other entities by disregarding long-established values, religious and other spiritual and moral social foundations, historical memory of significant events (Dorskaia 2023, 48), and revered figures. Within this context, the utilization of the phrase “moral damage” appears to be an acceptable concept within interstate relations.

2. Basic research

Satisfaction holds a particular research interest among the forms of non-material (political) liability. The term’s original meaning, beyond the international legal context, can be traced back to the Latin word “satisfactio”. It is commonly translated as “satisfaction” and denotes three concepts according to classical encyclopedias: the fulfillment of duty, the receipt of due honor, and the validation of any committed misconduct. Throughout history, this specific expression has solely referred to a duel, whereby an insulter would be obligated to engage in a duel with the insulted as a means of satisfaction and honor for both parties (Prokhorov 1976, 120).

In general, international law has effectively and accurately recognized the fundamental meaning of the concept of “satisfaction” and has translated it to the realm of interstate relations, with necessary modifications to its interpretation, as required by international legal theory and practice.

The concept of satisfaction as a form of non-material liability of states can be utilized in instances where one state has done non-material (political) damage to another

state (Il'iashevich 2016, 105). In international law, there are two types of satisfaction that are distinguished and differ significantly from one another: ordinary and extraordinary (Vertlib 2019, 7). Their choice hinges not solely on the parameters of the damage done, but also on the specific political context.

Ordinary satisfaction (often the word “ordinary” is omitted) is applicable in cases of damage to honor and dignity, international authority and reputation of the state. The concept of “ordinariness” signifies the state’s typical behavior and the ample occurrence of instances that require taking responsibility for it. The absence of quantifiable financial loss does not preclude ordinary satisfaction from being considered a type of non-material liability. In certain instances, however, such recompense becomes indispensable, yet it takes on an entirely distinct form (Gura 2015, 156) — that of remuneration for moral damage, which is unrelated to satisfaction.

States place great importance on their status, as it is essential for achieving long-term authority, reputation, political weight, and influence internationally. At times, the complete history of nations is constructed through a succession of events that establish a momentous status quo. The most crucial aspect of political and diplomatic activity is the defense of political interests and the positioning of the state in the global community. This element is rightly given significant importance. Consequently, the damage to dignity, power, and prestige of a nation, caused by the actions of another, necessitates a fitting response.

While it is evident that claims must be made against the offending state whenever significant political interests and essential areas of public life are affected, the declaration of pertinent non-material claims is entirely subject to the offending state’s volition, its political stance, and its relations with the affected state.

The inaccurate statements made by politicians from one state about the traditions and values of another state frequently result in damage being done. The situation is rectified by clarifying the meaning of the spoken phrase. It is imperative to clarify that no negative connotations were intended, and the individual in question genuinely holds respect for both the opposing party and the topic of discussion mentioned in the report, speech, conversation, or interview. Thus, the incident shall be deemed resolved, with no inquiry into liability or official measures to be taken. Nonetheless, we are outlining an ideal scenario for the progression of events in which political damage is prevented and satisfaction is pursued in situations where measures to avoid a negative outcome were not implemented.

Ordinary satisfaction serves the purpose of remedying non-material damage by meeting the political demands of the affected state, which can be achieved through the following measures, either individually or collectively: to make apologies; to express regret; to express condolences; to render honors to the victim; to give assurances of non-repetition of a particular behavior in the future.

Making apologies entails asking for forgiveness for unacceptable behavior. Apologies should be made officially, publicly, publicly. Generally, apologies are communicated verbally, however, it is also customary to express apologies in writing. Typically, the process involves the verbal recitation of the written apology by the official representative of the offending state in the presence of the official representatives of the offended state. The procedure requires the participation of one or more distinguished officials of the states in question, whose official status is determined by specific circumstances. Apology stands out as the primary measure in all satisfaction procedures, perhaps.

To provide an instance, in 1994, Poland was obliged to offer an apology to Russia regarding the subsequent incident: upon their arrival in Warsaw at the Eastern Railway Station, a group of Russian citizens fell prey to an armed gang that robbed them as they were aboard a train car. The grounds for satisfaction were attributed to the police's conduct: instead of providing expected aid, the victims were subjected to insults based on their nationality, physical assault and even tear-gassed. The Minister of Internal Affairs of Poland, A. Milczanowski, during his visit to Moscow, made an official apology to the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, V.S. Chernomyrdin, and the Minister of Internal Affairs of Russia, V.F. Erin, acknowledging the severity of a highly outrageous case that could not be ignored. According to the joint communiqué, Poland acknowledges the fault of the police, and Russia is willing to view the incident as resolved¹. Here, we see another significant manifestation of ordinary satisfaction — the recognition of a violation. Surprisingly, but in diplomatic practice, such a step is regarded as a political accomplishment.

Expressing regret is very akin to making an apology. In terms of the content, the only difference is the clearly expressed disappointment of the incident. It is worth mentioning that apologies are of more formal and superficial nature than regret, which is a more complex and profound. Generally, apologies and regrets are conveyed together. Under established diplomatic protocol, official appeals are structured to begin with a brief overview of the incident, followed by a description of the related regret, and concluding with an apology.

In 2013, on the Independence Day of Poland in Warsaw, the Polish nationalists conducted an event named “Independence March”. This event caused significant damage to the property of the Embassy of the Russian Federation. The Russian side estimated the damage to be around \$ 11 000. The occurrence included the destruction of gates, setting employees' vehicles on fire, and the throwing of stones, firecrackers and incendiary mixtures. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation summoned Polish Ambassador W. Zajączkowski to lodge a protest. The Russian government has requested that Poland issue an apology, provide compensation for damages, and conduct an investigation to identify and penalize those responsible. Particularly, the Russian side made allegations against the Warsaw police, who were extremely inoperative and even passive in their response to the riots, possibly intentionally so, and failed to take appropriate measures. The incident elicited a response from two governmental agencies, with the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressing profound regret and the Polish Minister of the Interior B. Sienkiewicz stating, as a defense for his agency's inaction, that such barbarism was impossible to anticipate².

This specific example demonstrates that satisfaction frequently represents merely one facet of liability concerning a particular international incident. When there is a mixed form of damage, encompassing both material and non-material one, satisfaction only extends to the non-material (political) sphere. Nevertheless, the affected party has the right to request financial restitution and other types of compensation. One should note that almost all incidents involving attacks on diplomatic missions, consular offices, trade

¹ “Press conference of the Ministers of Internal Affairs of Russia and Poland: Viktor Yerin recalled the friendship of peoples”. *Kommersant*. November 11, 1994. Accessed May 25, 2024. <https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/95628?ysclid=llqixg9nsg270116298>. (In Russian)

² “Warsaw riots: Russian embassy attacked”. *RT in Russian*. November 11, 2013. Accessed May 25, 2024. <https://russian.rt.com/article/18124?ysclid=llqi39b3h2124343045>. (In Russian)

missions, and other similar institutions carry a pronounced combination of material and non-material damage. The destruction of buildings, structures, and symbols can be categorized as material damage, whereas the blatantly offensive nature of the actions, and their demonstrative character (for instance, actions that involve offensive shouting and employing inscriptions that contain insulting remarks towards a specific nation), inevitably lead to non-material (political) damage to honor and dignity.

Expressing condolences is required when individuals of a particular country have experienced physical, moral, and (or) psychological harm due to a specific situation. This type of ordinary satisfaction involves the use of words that convey sympathy and empathy. Expressing condolences at an international level implies a shared experience of pain with the victim and a compassionate understanding of the events that occurred. The state that has violated a certain behavior can sometimes admit to it due to imprudence and other circumstances, with no intention of causing harm, and thus can display sympathy. Naturally, in numerous instances we are referring to the formal statements that are necessary for the procedure. However, the history of diplomacy spanning centuries attests to the high efficacy and worth of such reciprocal conduct by parties, particularly in circumstances where issues and contradictions tend to escalate.

In 2015, a tragic incident took place when the US Air Force attacked a hospital situated in the Afghan province of Kunduz. The airstrike led to the death of 22 individuals and the destruction of the building, as well as the medical equipment it housed. Z. R. Al-Hussein, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, stated that in case the unintentional nature of the event is not established, such an attack should be recognized as a war crime³. Despite this, the US authorities reacted promptly by labeling the incident as a tragic mistake. There are numerous recorded instances of tragic errors committed during armed conflicts and operations, where social infrastructure facilities were mistakenly attacked (Bugaev, Chaika 2020, 193), resulting in the loss of innocent lives (Sazonova 2018, 41). However, the prompt and demonstrative presentation of apologies, condolences and explanations in this case sets a textbook example of ordinary satisfaction. The status of the facility may have been a contributing factor: the hospital that was struck by the air raid was operated by the international non-governmental organization Doctors Without Borders / Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), and a dozen of its staff members were on the premises. The President of the United States, Barack Obama, conducted an urgently organized telephone conversation with the President of MSF, Joanne Liu, to express his sincere condolences over the loss of the organization's employees and their patients in Afghanistan, which was caused by the actions of the United States Air Force⁴. When faced with such incidents, the international community has but one question: whether all apologies are proportional to the extent of the tragedy.

Rendering honors to the victim consists in a special expression of respect, reverence, recognition. This format of ordinary satisfaction necessitates adherence to not only conventional requirements like formality, publicity and transparency, but also places importance on the solemnity of the procedure. A certain level of solemnity can be heightened

³ "UN: Kunduz hospital bombing could be a war crime". *RIA Novosti*. October 3, 2015. Accessed May 25, 2024. <https://ria.ru/20151003/1296161801.html?ysclid=llqjfygqsw518307775>. (In Russian)

⁴ "Obama apologizes to Doctors Without Borders for Kunduz hospital attack". *RIA Novosti*. October 7, 2015. Accessed May 25, 2024. <https://ria.ru/20151007/1298430069.html?ysclid=llqjbo1587507707083>. (In Russian)

with the use of appropriate symbolism, particularly when symbols of the victim state are treated with the highest level of respect during the ceremony, or when the symbolism represents an event that has been subjected to encroachments and insults.

During 2015, while engaged in Russia's anti-terrorism operations in Syria, a Su-24 front-line bomber belonging to the Russian Aerospace Forces was downed by a missile launched by a Turkish Air Force fighter jet in the skies over Syria near the Syrian-Turkish border. The crew ejected, but the pilot O. A. Peshkov tragically died after the ejection. The Turkish President, R. T. Erdoğan, ended seven months of silence, which had caused a fair confusion among the Russian authorities and citizens, by sending a message to V. V. Putin. The message contained apologies, deep regret for the incident, and condolences for the death of the Russian military pilot. The Turkish President made it clear that shooting down the Russian plane was not their intention. R. T. Erdoğan also affirmed that a comprehensive investigation will be conducted regarding all aspects of the incident, and the perpetrators will be held accountable. One should note that fulfilling the requirement to conduct an investigation and bringing the perpetrators to justice is also among the measures in the implementation of satisfaction. The Turkish authorities, in a display of high regard towards the Russian side, not only took the body of the deceased pilot from a terrorist group's militants but also arranged pre-burial procedures, observing religious and military rituals, as was stressed, at a level appropriate for Turkish-Russian relations⁵.

Giving assurances of non-repetition of a particular behavior in the future is an encouraging statement, which affirms that all necessary measures will be taken to prevent its recurrence. The measures that may be implemented could involve bringing to justice the individuals directly involved in the act at the national level and effecting the required amendments to the national legislation pertaining to the sphere of interstate relations affected by the intangible damage. It is evident that such assurances require appropriate guarantees of non-repetition.

Such assurances can be seen in the response to the incident that took place in 1965 involving France and the United States. According to the official version, the American representatives of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted a training flight through the airspace of France. Photography was prohibited during the flight as the necessary authorization was not given. While flying over the French isotope and enriched uranium plant in Pierrelatte, a NATO military aircraft captured a detailed photograph of the facility, disregarding a sign posted on the rooftops of the buildings indicating the prohibition of photography. As soon as the French air defense aircraft detected the violation, the French authorities swiftly contacted the NATO command, demanding that American representatives hand over latent films to the French side immediately after the violating aircraft landed. Following a period of time, the French side received the developed films and printed photographs accompanied by an explanation from the American NATO representatives that they no longer possessed any copies. The government of France promptly expressed its protest to the United States (Obichkina 2012, 232). The American side responded to the protest by drafting and publishing an official statement, wherein it expressed regret for the incident and affirmed the undertaking of necessary measures to prevent any future recurrences. The statement, however, did not specify the measures that were taken.

⁵ "Erdoğan apologizes to Putin for downing Su-24". TASS. June 16, 2016. Accessed May 25, 2024. <https://tass.ru/politika/3407975?ysclid=llqjimpngxnw383826570>. (In Russian)

To summarize, the key requirements for ordinary satisfaction include formality, publicity, transparency, and, if required, solemnity and symbolism.

The measures are directed towards the state, which has sustained damage to its reputation, honor and dignity. Concurrently, both insults and other forms of inappropriate behavior can be directed towards:

- a specific person (for instance, a high-ranking government official, an authoritative public figure, etc.);
- groups of persons (for example, representatives of the people inhabiting a particular state, a certain category of population united by any common signs, etc.);
- events (for example, mockery of a tragedy, or, on the contrary, angry expression of negative emotions in connection with a joyful event, celebrated as an achievement).

One should note that measures in the form of satisfaction always pertain to the state as a whole, as it is recognized as both a subject of international law and an actor in international relations. It must be clarified that when we refer to persons and events, we are not only referring to contemporary figures and current sociopolitical circumstances, but also to the history of peoples and states. Encroachments on historical memory, cultural and spiritual values, which are crucial to the state and state policies in various domains (Dorskaia, Dorskii 2023), conscientiously preserved in society and passed on from generation to generation, call for a fitting response. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced within the religious realm of society, particularly when revered religious figures from both past and present, as well as shrines, are subject to acts of disrespect and insults.

Two important conditions must be met for ordinary satisfaction: firstly, it must be adequate and proportional to the political damage caused, and secondly, it must not be humiliating to the party responsible. Such restrictions are certainly necessary and justified, which is why they are reflected in the Draft articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts 2001⁶.

A completely different type of satisfaction is *extraordinary satisfaction*. The extraordinary nature of this form of non-material liability, as highlighted by its very name, stems from the fact that the actions taken against the offending state are entirely unique in their substance, unattainable in any other scenario, and solely mandated due to the gravest nature of the deeds committed by the state in question. The only commonality shared by ordinary and extraordinary satisfaction is the underlying principle of satisfaction serving as a way to satisfy the politically essential, just, and reasonable demands of the offended state. The achievement of extraordinary satisfaction entails exceptional measures, which are solely possible as an indispensable reaction by the representatives of the global community to the perpetrated international crime. To solely perceive extraordinary satisfaction as a form of punishment applied by the injured subjects to alleviate anger, resentment for their sufferings, and grief from losses would be a narrow and myopic approach. Throughout history, the notion of justice in punishment has been influenced by “the innate desire for revenge”, though (Egorova 2021, 986). Extraordinary satisfaction serves another purpose, which is to eliminate the causes of international crime and establish preventive measures against its recurrence. Extraordinary measures entail various types of temporary restrictions on the sovereignty and legal capacity of the state accountable

⁶ “Draft articles on Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts, with commentaries”. *United Nations Office of Legal Affairs*. 2001. Accessed May 25, 2024. https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/commentaries/9_6_2001.pdf.

for the commission of an international crime (Abdrashitov 2005, 59) or several crimes (Sashnikova 2003, 124), such as a series of war crimes.

Evidently, the commission of international crimes necessitates a well-established sociopolitical, ideological, informational, and, of course, manpower base, along with scientific, technical, military, financial, and other potential of a material nature. The offending state has constructed the entire system, including all levels of power, to execute their criminal objectives and strategies. This is applicable not solely to mechanisms of state politics, but also to the activities of public institutions.

Given the specified specifics, the following steps can be taken as part of extraordinary satisfaction:

- temporary suspension or restriction of the powers of state bodies;
- reorganization of certain elements of the political system of the offending state;
- abolition of public institutions whose activities contributed to the commission of an international crime;
- temporary occupation of the territory (or its part) of the state that has committed an international crime.

Throughout history, there have been examples of the application of such measures to states. The actions of the Allies in relation to Germany and Japan following World War II provide the most complete and legally verified evidence. Let us examine the implementation of emergency satisfaction in the context of the complete dismantling and destruction of Nazi Germany's state apparatus by the victorious allied forces in the World War II.

In order to evaluate the critical significance and indispensability of the measures implemented, we shall summarize the fundamental principles of this mechanism's operation:

- rigid centralization of all state structures (or the unification of political life under the slogan: "one people — one Reich — one Führer"), which actually exercised the dictatorship of the most reactionary elements of German society (Galkin 1989, 234–264);
- an absolute hegemony of the Nazi party;
- actual merging of the party with state apparatus;
- subordination of all state institutions (local government, courts, army, etc.) to the Nazis;
- militarization of government structures and the whole society;
- an extensive apparatus of violence and terror;
- establishment of a huge network of whistleblowers, ensuring tight control over each citizen;
- reprisals against dissenters and intimidation of the regime opponents;
- nazification of all areas of culture and science (Mel'nikov, Chernaia 1991, 222–242).

The three key elements of the state mechanism in Nazi Germany were the party-state bureaucratic apparatus, the largest industrial and financial groups and a very powerful Nazi ideology and propaganda (Roanov 1964, 214–268).

The manpower potential was strikingly impressive, as evidenced by the following numbers reached during World War II: SS (Schutzstaffeln or "protection squadrons") — up to 1 million people; public police — 140 thousand people; SD (Sicherheitsdienst) — up to 70 thousand people, Gestapo (Geheime Staatspolizei) — 40 thousand people. The number of individuals in the NSDAP (Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei) was as high as 7 million individuals, while the overall membership count of all Nazi organizations in the country was 25 million individuals (Mel'nikov, Chernaia 1991, 237). Specifically,

the SS detachments, which originated within the framework of the SA (Sturmabteilung or “assault division”), constituted a potent, extensively networked entity and functioned as the primary instrument of the state-sponsored terror under the Nazi regime. From the very moment of its creation until the unconditional surrender of Hitler’s Germany, SS detachments were tasked with special punitive functions within Germany itself and in all temporarily occupied territories of the Soviet Union and European states (Fomin 1978, 210–235).

Measures of extraordinary satisfaction against Nazi Germany are reflected in a number of documents, but the most crucial one is the Declaration regarding the defeat of Germany and the assumption of supreme authority with respect to Germany by the governments of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom, and the Provisional government of the French Republic (hereinafter — the Declaration) adopted on June 5, 1945 and became the international legal basis for the legislative, executive and other activities of the occupation authorities on German territory in the first years after the end of the war⁷.

Thus, under the Declaration:

— Germany was deprived of state sovereignty, state authorities were abolished, power was transferred to the Allied Control Council;

— the NSDAP was abolished, all Nazi institutions were dissolved in order to eradicate the idea of Nazism and prevent the revival of Nazi ideology;

— the armed forces, SS, SA, SD, public police, Gestapo were liquidated, military schools and military organizations were abolished in order to prevent the revival of German militarism, civilian police units armed by the allies were created;

— the activities of diplomatic, consular, trade missions and institutions ceased, all foreign relations were carried out by the Allied Representatives;

— the German territory was occupied to ensure the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany by the Allied armies, including the elimination of all industry that can be used for military purposes, the Allied Control Council consisted of the Allied military commanders was in charge of all issues.

In general, extraordinary satisfaction endeavors to normalize the behavior of a state that has committed international crimes, synchronize its public policy and daily life with international standards, and, most importantly, prevent future international crimes.

3. Conclusions

The conducted research allowed drawing the following conclusions:

— it is important to acknowledge that ordinary and extraordinary satisfaction differ significantly in terms of the nature and intensity of the impact on the offender. This is because they represent a form of non-material liability for internationally wrongful acts that, however, have fundamentally distinct levels of severity;

— ordinary satisfaction, in addition to traditional measures involving apologizing and expressing regrets, also include such important components as recognition of a vio-

⁷ “The People’s Commissariat for Foreign Affairs of the USSR”. 1955. *Collection of existing treaties, agreements and conventions concluded by the USSR with foreign states*. Vol. 11, 85–90. Moscow, Gospolitizdat Publ. (In Russian)

lation, the requirement to investigate and prosecute perpetrators, that is, they are by no means limited to public statements only, and often require quite practical actions;

— one should emphasize that extraordinary satisfaction is an exceptional type of international legal liability. Its distinctive nature is duly reflected in its name and firmly entrenched in international legal theory.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that satisfaction is a fundamental form of non-material (political) liability in modern international law. As such, it requires close attention from both the academic and practical communities in the field of international relations. Furthermore, it mandates a more comprehensive examination at the international legal level, factoring in the accumulated positive and negative experience in this area.

References

- Abdrashitov, Vagip M. 2005. "Liability of states for international crimes and the protection of human rights". *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 9 (4–1): 58–60. (In Russian)
- Bekiashev, Kamil' A. 2014. "Liability in international law". *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo*. Ed. by Kamil' A. Bekiashev, 227–243. Moscow, Prospekt Publ. (In Russian)
- Bugaev, Valerii A., Andrei V. Chaika. 2020. "Criminal liability for humanitarian crimes in international law and its reflection in Russian national legislation". *Uchenye zapiski Krymskogo federal'nogo universiteta imeni V. I. Vernadskogo. Iuridicheskie nauki* 6 (2): 190–196. <https://doi.org/10.37279/2413-1733-2020-6-2-190-196> (In Russian)
- Chernichenko, Stanislav V. 2008. "Coercion and liability in international law". *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo*. Eds Aleksandr A. Kovalev, Stanislav V. Chernichenko, 230–243. Moscow, Prospekt Publ. (In Russian)
- Dorskaia, Aleksandra A. 2023. "The official remembrance policy: a comparative analysis of the legislation and judicial practice of modern states". *Zhurnal zarubezhnogo zakonodatel'stva i sravnitel'nogo pravovedeniia* 19 (1): 46–54. <https://doi.org/10.12737/jzsp.2023.006> (In Russian)
- Dorskaia, Aleksandra A., Andrei Yu. Dorskii. 2023. "Historical commemoration in the USSR and the Russian Federation: The similarities and differences in legal approaches". *Vestnik Moskovskogo gorodskogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. Seriya: Iuridicheskie nauki* 1 (49): 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.25688/2076-9113.2023.49.1.01> (In Russian)
- Egorova, Tat'iana I. 2021. "Justice of punishment: Theoretical format and law enforcement practice". *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law* 12 (4): 984–1002. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2021.411> (In Russian)
- Fomin, Vasilii T. 1978. *Fascist Germany in World War II*. Moscow, Nauka Publ. (In Russian)
- Galkin, Aleksandr A. 1989. *Germanic fascism*. Moscow, Nauka Publ. (In Russian)
- Gura, Galina M. 2015. "International liability of the state as a legal means of ensuring compliance with international law". *Territoriiia nauki* 3: 155–159. (In Russian)
- Il'iashevich, Marianna V. 2016. "Satisfaction as a form of liability of states for an internationally wrongful act". *Zakon i pravo* 3: 105–106. (In Russian)
- Kolosov, Iurii M. 2007. "International liability". *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo*. Eds Iurii M. Kolosov, Emiliia S. Krivchikova, 324–338. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia Publ. (In Russian)
- Konovalova, Ekaterina A., Larisa V. Kudriavtseva. 2021. "Liability of states for violation of international law". *Epomen* 64: 144–151. (In Russian)
- Kosareva, Vladislava V. 2021. "Kinds and forms of country's liability for violations of international law". *Zhurnal pravovykh i ekonomicheskikh issledovaniï* 1: 68–71. <https://doi.org/10.26163/GIEF.2021.71.91.012> (In Russian)
- Krivenkova, Mariia V. 2022. "On the progressive development of the principles of international liability law". *Voprosy rossiiskogo i mezhdunarodnogo prava* 12 (10–1): 779–786. <https://doi.org/10.34670/AR.2022.82.76.048> (In Russian)
- Mel'nikov, Daniil E., Liudmila B. Chernaia. 1991. *Criminal No. 1. Nazi regime and its Führer*. Moscow, Novosti Publ. (In Russian)

- Obichkina, Evgeniia O. 2012. *French foreign policy from De Gaulle to Sarkozy (1940–2012)*. Moscow, Aspekt-Press. (In Russian)
- Ostapenko, Dmitrii D., Sergei Iu. Marochkin. 2014. “International liability”. *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo*. Eds Gennadii V. Ignatenko, Oleg I. Tiunov, 186–206. Moscow, Norma Publ. (In Russian)
- Prokhorov, Aleksandr M., ed. 1976. *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*. 3rd ed. Vol. 24, book 1. Moscow, Sovetskaia entsiklopediia Publ. (In Russian)
- Rozanov, German L. 1964. *Germany under fascism*. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia Publ. (In Russian)
- Sashnikova, Ol’ga V. 2003. “Liability for war crimes in international law and its implementation: material and procedural aspects”. *Rossiiskii iuridicheskii zhurnal* 3 (39): 123–126. (In Russian)
- Sazonova, Kira L. 2018. “Prospects for holding states internationally liable for violations of international humanitarian law”. *Pravoiaia paradigma* 17 (1): 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.15688/lc.jvolsu.2018.1.6> (In Russian)
- Vertlib, Feliks O. 2019. “Some issues of the doctrine of international law on state liability”. *Mezhdunarodnyi zhurnal grazhdanskogo i torgovogo prava* 3: 5–9. (In Russian)

Received: September 27, 2023

Accepted: January 19, 2024

Authors’ information:

Zoia Sh. Matchanova — PhD in Law; zoya2310@yandex.ru

Marina V. Ignatèva — PhD in Law, Associate Professor; imarina.79@mail.ru