ppi 201502ZU4645
Esta publicación científica en formato digital es continuidad de la revista impresa
ISSN-Versión Impresa 0798-1406 / ISSN-Versión on line 2542-3185Depósito legal pp
197402ZU34

CUESTIONES POLÍTICAS

Instituto de Estudios Políticos y Derecho Público "Dr. Humberto J. La Roche"
de la Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Políticas de la Universidad del Zulia
Maracaibo, Venezuela

Vol.41 *Nº 78*
Julio
Septiembre
2023

Cuestiones Políticas Vol. 41, Nº 78 (2023), 690-747
IEPDP-Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Políticas - LUZ

Expropriation and other forms of reparation in terms of compensation for damage caused as a result of war crimes: International legal experience

DOI: https://doi.org/10.46398/cuestpol.4178.49

Liydmyla Panova *
Ernest Gramatskyy **
Dmytro Baranenko ***
Dmytro Sichko ****
Oleksiy Ulianov *****

Abstract

As a result of international armed conflicts, questions always arise about the payment of post-war reparations. Although the process of reparation for damages caused as a result of war crimes, in most cases, begins only after the end of such a conflict, its duration and effectiveness depend on the preliminary analysis and choice of an existing reparation or development of a new model. The purpose of the work was the analysis of existing mechanisms for the payment of post-war reparations, and the search for the most effective models of compensation for Ukraine by Russia for the damage caused as a result of military aggression and the commission of international crimes. The dialectical, systemic-structural, historical, comparative, logical-formal, comparative-legal and systemic-functional methods were used. In the results, the legal nature and historical mechanisms of reparation of damage are explained, as well as problematic issues of this institution of the law of international liability are outlined. In the conclusions, different mechanisms of reparation that can be used by the State and those available to individuals, victims of violations of international crimes committed on their territory and mixed models are considered.

* Ph. D., Associate Professor of Civil Law Department, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine). ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1393-8626

** Ph. D., Associate Professor of Civil Law Department, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine). ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1260-2888

*** Doctor of Legal Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Theory and History of State and Law of Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding (Ukraine). ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9626-9607

**** Ph. D., Associate Professor of the Department of Civil and Criminal Law and Procedure of the Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University (Mykolayiv, Ukraine). ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7872-9120

***** Ph.D., in Law, Associate Professor, Honored Worker of Science and Technology of Ukraine (Odesa State University of Internal Affairs, Odesa, Ukraine.). ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3397-0965

Recibido el 21/04/23 Aceptado el 07/07/23

Keywords: expropriations; reparations; compensation; international liability; war crime.

Expropiación y otras formas de reparación en términos de compensación por daños causados como consecuencia de crímenes de guerra: Experiencia jurídica internacional

Resumen

Como resultado de los conflictos armados internacionales, siempre surgen interrogantes sobre el pago de las reparaciones de posguerra. Si bien el proceso de reparación de daños causados como resultado de crímenes de guerra, en la mayoría de los casos, comienza solo después del final de dicho conflicto, su duración y efectividad dependen del análisis preliminar y la elección de una reparación existente o desarrollo de una nueva modelo. El propósito del trabajo fue el análisis de los mecanismos existentes para el pago de las reparaciones de posguerra, y la búsqueda de los modelos de compensación más efectivos para Ucrania por parte de Rusia, por los daños causados como resultado de la agresión militar y la comisión de crímenes internacionales. Se utilizaron los métodos dialécticos, sistémico-estructural, histórico, comparativo, lógico-formal, comparativo-jurídico y sistémico-funcional. En los resultados, se explica la naturaleza jurídica y los mecanismos históricos de la reparación del daño, así como se esbozan cuestiones problemáticas de esta institución del derecho de la responsabilidad internacional. En las conclusiones, se consideran diferentes mecanismos de reparación que puede utilizar el Estado y los que están a disposición de los particulares, víctimas de violaciones de crímenes internacionales cometidos en su territorio y modelos mixtos.

Palabras clave: expropiaciones; reparaciones; indemnizaciones; responsabilidad internacional; crimen de guerra.

Introduction

Taking into account the position of the Russian Federation, which consists of its reluctance to be responsible for committing international crimes and the need to receive compensation for damage by Ukraine, it is important to carry out a deep analysis of the possibilities of paying reparations to the aggressor. On the one hand, Ukraine should not count on

voluntary payment of reparations by the aggressor. Even if the corresponding provision is established in the ephemeral cease-fire agreement, it seems unlikely that Russia will cover the damage caused by Russia.

On the other hand, Ukraine needs to take into account the limited list of international mechanisms that will allow it to receive compensation, as well as to ensure the availability of sources where such compensation can be obtained. However, despite the lack of compensatory instruments and the inefficiency of the institutional security system in Europe and the world in general (Tkalych and Arbelaez Encarnacion, 2022), we can analyze some potential opportunities for collecting reparations from the aggressor country.

By its legal nature, reparations are full or partial compensation by the state that launched the aggressive war for the damage caused to the state that was attacked. That is, if one country attacked another, occupied its territory in whole or in part, destroyed part of the population, or destroyed industry and infrastructure, it must pay for it and compensate for the damage caused.

That is, international law guarantees victims of aggression adequate compensation - reparations. In turn, expropriation consists of nationalization, requisition, and/or confiscation. Currently, Ukraine, together with its partners, is developing mechanisms for expropriation and other forms of reparations. In general, international law only in general terms regulates the principles of recovery of assets, and therefore the correct legal procedure is a task for states.

Given the above, it is important to examine existing models of reparations collection, as well as those models historically used by states to obtain reparations.

The article analyzes the mechanisms for obtaining compensation, namely, attention is paid to how many there should be, who created them, and how their activities are regulated. The political side of such actions is also noted.

The methods of obtaining compensation are analyzed in detail, including lawsuits to the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), the International Court of the United Nations, and the International Criminal Court, consideration of the issue of compensation within the relevant UN committees.

Also, the possibilities of contractual settlement of reparations and the peculiarities of the functioning of compensation mechanisms within the framework of the UN Security Council were investigated by the authors. Prospective directions for reforming reparations collection mechanisms and problematic issues in this aspect were noted.

1. Theoretical Framework or Literature Review

During the study of the international legal experience of the application of expropriation and other forms of reparations in terms of compensation for damage caused as a result of war crimes, the works of the following researchers were analyzed: Volyanska, Koshman, Pavlovska, Rashevska, Sudachek, Khutor, Shapovalova, Shulyak, Emerson, Blockmans, Lawder.

In the work of Volyanska (2022), a step-by-step algorithm for compensation for damages caused by the armed aggression of the Russian Federation is considered. In particular, the lawyer draws attention to the fact that there are additional factors that affect the destruction of property, and therefore the introduction at the legislative level of the presumption of guilt of the Russian Federation for the destruction of the property of Ukrainian legal entities and individuals as a result of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation is necessary because it affects the establishment of causal consequence and resolution of the issue of compensation for losses at the expense of the Russian Federation.

Koshman (2022) conducted a review of national and international mechanisms for the protection of property rights violated due to Russian aggression. The researcher analyzed judicial and extrajudicial methods of protecting property rights, as well as investigated potential mechanisms for compensation of damages and concluded that currently there is no clear, unequivocal answer to the question of which court or which competent authority it is advisable to contact to receive real compensation.

Poland's experience in receiving reparations from Germany was analyzed by Pavlovska (2022). Rashevska (2022a, 2022b) studied in detail both judicial and contractual mechanisms for reparations and analyzed international models and mechanisms for payment of reparations: international experience and ideas for Ukraine. The author concluded that regardless of which model of compensation Ukraine chooses to receive reparations from the Russian Federation, it is important to take into account the specifics of the existing situation, as well as the fact that the Russian Federation remains a permanent member of the UN Security Council with the right of veto, and also preserves the existing political regime, and therefore, the reparations payment mechanism must have a sound legal basis.

In the opinion of the author, it is considered most expedient to provide a corresponding obligation for the Russian Federation in the future Ceasefire Treaty, which would contain a clause on the mandatory jurisdiction of the UN IC. The aforementioned agreement should also introduce a special body (for example, the Compensation Commission), in which Ukraine's Western partners would act as members and guarantors.

Also, in the author's opinion, the existing multi-link system of compensation funds at the national level should be reviewed, simplified as much as possible, sources of income diversified, transitioned from volunteer foundations to investment, and finally harmonized with initiatives at the international level.

Sudachek (2022) investigated the post-war reconstruction of the Federal Republic of Germany in the context of the payment of reparations and the restoration of Ukraine. The author states that the history of the restoration of the Federal Republic of Germany can hardly be a model for Ukraine.

The very approach of the post-war economic reconstruction of Germany was based on the consistent structural development of democratic practices, which formed the basis of the new Constitution, to avoid the rise to power of authoritarian (and communist) forces, and the Marshall Plan became an important impetus for the economic development of Germany, but a much larger role was played by competent monetary policy and the political will to implement all other reforms (in particular, the launch of the free market).

Khutor (2022) analyzed the peculiarities of the confiscation of property of Russians and Belarusians on the territory of Ukraine. Thus, the author noted the essence of the law and the idea of sanctions: a collection of assets belonging to individuals or legal entities, as well as assets that they can directly or indirectly dispose of, into state income.

The activity of the International Criminal Court, as well as the International Court of the United Nations in solving war crimes, in particular, the problems of compensation for damage caused by such crimes, was considered by Stupnyk *et al.,* (2022).

The peculiarities of the functioning of the international register of damages as a prerequisite for the payment of reparations were analyzed by Shapovalova (2023). The author noted that after the Supreme Court indicated that Russia does not have judicial immunity in tort claims as a result of armed aggression against Ukraine, and the dispute about compensation for damages can be considered and resolved by a court of Ukraine, Ukrainian citizens and businesses filed more than 150 lawsuits against Russia about compensation for damages to the courts of Ukraine.

Also, the author noted that the reparation mechanism for Ukraine will work with the careful documentation of damages by an independent international institution, and therefore it is important that a compensation commission and a fund for timely payment of victims' claims be created as quickly as the registry. At the same time, potential applicants need to understand that the process of gathering evidence, proving the facts, and the extent of the damage is up to them.

Shulyak (2022) analyzed the peculiarities of the evaluation of objects destroyed and damaged as a result of the military aggression of the Russian Federation. In the work of Emerson and Blockmans (2022), proposals were put forward for compensation for the damage caused by war crimes of the Russian Federation. The same ideas are considered in the work of Lawder (2022) taking into account foreign experience.

2. Methodology

The use of the dialectical and systemic-structural method of learning about social processes made it possible to consider reparations in their systemic connection with other ways of compensation for damage caused by military armed aggression by the Russian Federation. In addition, the use of the dialectical method of cognition allows one to understand the legal nature of various models of reparations collection in their development and cause-and-effect relationship. At the same time, the application of the system-structural method, which is based on the consideration of the object as a whole set of elements and a set of relations and connections between them, served as a method not so much for solving, but for setting tasks.

Through the application of historical and comparative methods, the genesis of the use of such a compensation mechanism as reparations was studied, and it was also noted what conditions and historical events contributed to the implementation of effective tools for compensation for damage caused by war. In general, a historical method is based on the study of the emergence, formation, and development of objects in chronological order.

Thanks to the use of the historical method, a deeper understanding of the essence of the problem is achieved and it becomes possible to formulate more reasonable recommendations for the new object. Therefore, the historical method was used in the study of the historical prerequisites for the implementation of various mechanisms for the collection of reparations in international law at various stages of its development.

The formal-logical method served as a guiding principle that contributed to clarifying and clarifying the content of certain concepts and research categories (reparation, compensation for damage, armed conflict). Thus, the formal-legal method allows you to define legal concepts, identify their features, carry out classification, interpret the content of legal prescriptions, etc.

Its specific feature is a distraction from the essential aspects of the law, and the task that is set at the same time is to clarify and explain the current legislation, in its systematic presentation and interpretation for law-making

and law-enforcement practice. Therefore, the content of the formal legal method includes legislative techniques and methods of interpretation of legal norms, as well as the study of those factors and conditions in which these norms operate and which affect their nature.

The considered method consists of the study of categories, definitions, and constructions used in law by special legal methods. It provides an opportunity to study in detail the technical, legal, and regulatory aspects of law and, on this basis, to professionally engage in legal activities. Therefore, with the help of this method, an analysis of the norms of current legislation, both national and international, was carried out, which contributed to the identification of gaps in it and made it possible to formulate proposals for improving the legislative regulation of the mechanism of recovery of damages for violations and destruction due to war.

Given the specifics of the formal legal method, it is important to find out the specifics of the prerequisites for compensation of damages to study the cause-and-effect relationships, taking into account the laws of logic, because this contributes to the reliability of the results.

The application of the comparative legal method contributed to a comprehensive study of the content of the norms that are the basis for the application of expropriation and reparation in the countries and territories affected by the war. In the general sense, the comparative legal method is a method of studying the legal systems of different states by comparing the legal norms, institutions, principles of the same name and the practice of their application.

The use of the comparative legal method is necessary during the study of world experience, and knowledge of constitutional and legal phenomena in the context of existing concepts of legal understanding. Also, the application of this method made it possible to understand how to effectively establish the obligation to compensate for the damage caused. Turning to the system-functional method made it possible to distinguish types of methods of reparations regulation, as well as problematic issues in this context.

3. Results and Discussion

In the modern conditions of military aggression of the Russian Federation and the commission of war crimes on the territory of Ukraine, the legislative regulation regarding the seizure and confiscation of the assets of the aggressor state is changing.

In particular, a law was adopted, the implementation of the norms which allows for the compulsory seizure in favor of the state of objects of property rights of the Russian Federation, its residents, natural persons – citizens

of the Russian Federation, persons who are not citizens of the Russian Federation, but have a close connection with the aggressor (occurring residence or are engaged in the main activity in the Russian Federation), legal entities working in Ukraine, but whose beneficiary is the Russian Federation, and legal entities in Ukraine, in which the Russian Federation directly or indirectly owns a share in the capital or is the founder or beneficiary (Law 2116-IX, 2022). At the same time, there are international mechanisms for collecting reparations.

Let's consider the possibilities for collecting reparations on the example of international legal experience.

According to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the UN Security Council has the authority to act on threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. Within such powers, a multilateral commission or mechanism may be established to manage the reparations process. At the same time, Russia's right of veto, as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, makes this mechanism practically ineffective (Unated Nations, 1945). However, the competent authority, including for consideration of the issue of compensation for damages, may be the consideration of an interstate case at the UN International Court of Justice. It is worth noting that during its existence, the International Court of Justice of the United Nations only made decisions on monetary compensation 4 times, of which only once the case concerned military actions.

Thus, in February 2022, the International Court of Justice of the United Nations issued a decision in the case of the Democratic Republic of the Congo against Uganda. Following an oral hearing in April 2021, the UN International Court of Justice issued its judgment on reparations on 9 February 2022, awarding US$225,000,000 for personal injury, US$40,000,000 for property damage, and US$60,000,000 for damage related to natural resources. The amount of compensation awarded was only 3% of the declared 11 billion dollars, in particular, Congo's demands for compensation for macroeconomic damage to the state were rejected due to failure to prove a causal link between military actions and damage to the Ugandan economy (Koshman, 2022).

No less interesting is the experience of collecting reparations from Poland from Germany. The Sejm of the Republic of Poland called on Germany to take responsibility — political, historical, legal, and financial — for all the consequences of the Second World War. The unilateral statement of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic from 1953 on the settlement of claims for losses in the war has significant legal flaws because it was adopted under pressure from the USSR and signed by a body that did not have the authority to make such decisions. In addition, the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic renounced claims to the then GDR, not all of Germany (Pavlovska, 2022).

As for bringing responsibility for war crimes, the experience of using international tribunals is no less interesting (Table 1).

Use of tribunal mechanisms to prosecute war criminals	
The Nuremberg Tribunal	operated in Nuremberg from November 1945 to October 1946 against the leaders of Hitler's Germany and showed the possibility of international justice against a criminal political regime, not against a country and a people.
Tokyo Tribunal	The International Military Tribunal for the Far East (3/05/1946-12/11/1948) over Japanese war criminals, following the Nuremberg trials in the Eastern region (International organization for migration, 2008).
International tribunals under the auspices of the UN	**International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (1993)** investigated crimes committed during the wars in the former Yugoslav republics in 1991-2001. Permanent judges of the tribunal were elected by the UN General Assembly, deputy judges were appointed by the UN Secretary General on the recommendation of the UN General Assembly. In addition, the tribunal for the former Yugoslavia introduced the principle of command (hierarchical) responsibility - military commanders or officials could be tried for the fact that they did not prevent crimes committed by their subordinates or did not punish them. The jurisdiction of the tribunal included: violations of the Geneva Conventions, which define the standards of treatment of civilians, prisoners, and wounded; violation of the rights and customs of warfare; crimes against humanity (murder, extermination, deportation, imprisonment, torture, rape, persecution for political, racial or religious reasons); genocide. The territorial jurisdiction of the tribunal extended to all former Yugoslav republics except Slovenia. (USAID, 2022)
	International Tribunal for Rwanda (1994) In April-July 1994, the leadership of Rwanda, represented by politicians and soldiers from the Hutu people, carried out the mass extermination of several hundred thousand people from the Tutsi tribe by the Tutsi and the opposition Hutus. Rebels from the Rwandan Patriotic Front, representing ethnic Tutsi, recaptured most of the country and the capital by July 1994, prompting a mass exodus of Hutu to the neighboring Democratic Republic of Congo. Among the fugitives were Hutus, who gave orders to exterminate Tutsis and many perpetrators of murder and rape. Rwanda's new government has asked the United Nations to create a judicial body to try people who committed crimes during the Rwandan genocide. In the resolution of the UN Security Council of November 8, 1994, it was decided to create a tribunal to punish those involved in genocide and violations of international humanitarian law. The tribunal was located in the city of Arusha, in Tanzania, neighboring Rwanda, and the appeals chamber was located in The Hague. In terms of organizational structure, this tribunal differed little from the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. He was empowered to prosecute people accused of violating international humanitarian law on the territory of Rwanda and to prosecute Rwandan citizens who committed such violations on the territory of neighboring states. (Crimes committed from January 1 to December 31, 1994). The jurisdiction of the tribunal included: genocide, crimes against humanity, and violations of the provisions of the Geneva Conventions, which related to internal military conflicts. Crimes against humanity included assaults on physical and psychological well-being, hostage-taking, terrorism, rape, forced prostitution, looting, robbery, slavery, the slave trade, etc. as well as threats of such actions. During its 20 years of operation, the Rwandan tribunal has indicted 96 people. 61 of them were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, 14 were acquitted, and 10 cases were transferred to courts of national jurisdiction. Proceedings against 8 defendants were suspended due to various circumstances. In 2016, the tribunal stopped working. (USAID, 2022)

	Special Tribunal for Lebanon (2007) Prosecutes individuals guilty of terrorism for the first time in history. It is about the murder of former Prime Minister of Lebanon Rafik Hariri and 21 other people. (USAID, 2022)

Table 1. International experience of international tribunals. Source: own elaboration based on the sources consulted.

So, as can be seen from the above, the models of international tribunals have been quite effective in prosecuting international crimes.

Separate contracts regarding reparations are worthy of attention (Table 2). Let's consider them in more detail.

Model	Essence	Implementation
Versailles Peace Treaty (1919)	reparations to civilians	declared Germany responsible for the outbreak of the war, and also obliged her, despite limited resources, to pay reparations in full, including covering all damages that were caused to the civilian population and their property during the war. Annex I to the Treaty lists the categories of damage that should have been covered by the aggressor state: 1) regarding deprivation of the right to life as a result of military actions and/or their consequences, including bombings or other attacks on land, at sea or in the air, as well as any military operations of both sides of the conflict in any place - to relatives and dependents; 2) regarding acts of cruelty, violence or inhuman treatment (including encroachment on life or health, as a result of imprisonment, deportation, internment or evacuation, abandonment at sea or forced labor) - to victims and their relatives/dependents; 3) regarding damage to health, work capacity and honor of persons and their relatives/dependents; 4) regarding the inhumane treatment of prisoners of war; 5) payment of pensions and awards to soldiers, victims of war, disabled, wounded, sick or disabled and persons supported by the victims; 6) deduction of aid to prisoners of war, their families or persons they supported; 7) assistance to families and dependents of mobilized and military personnel; 8) regarding damage caused to civilians as a result of the imposed obligation to work without fair payment; 9) in respect of any property (except military or naval fortifications and materials) that has been captured, seized, or damaged, as well as in respect of any damage caused to such property as a result of hostilities; 10) damages caused by Germany in the form of taxes, fines, and similar compulsory charges to the detriment of the civilian population.

Luxembourg Agreement between Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany (Feldman, 2019)	Compensation payments to victims of the Nazi regime.	According to the Luxembourg Agreement, the total amount of 3.45 billion German marks was to be paid over 14 years: 1/3 – for funds from the supply of German goods, the other third – through oil purchases, and the rest – in cash payments.

Table 2. Models of contractual recovery of reparations. Source: own elaboration based on the sources consulted.

Appeal to the International Criminal Court is an equally progressive mechanism for collecting reparations. In particular, after the indictment enters into force, the Trial Chamber of the International Criminal Court (1998) may decide on compensation for victims of international crimes, the guilty party. In advance, victims must submit a request for compensation using standard application forms. Review of applications is a lengthy process, and the specific amount and generally the possibility of compensation remain at the discretion of the Court.

Measures that are intended for reparation can be individual or collective (given to groups of victims) and include monetary compensation, restitution of property, and satisfaction in the form of a public apology or commemoration. The Court's reparations activities required the establishment in 2004, according to Article 79 of the Rome Statute, of an independent Trust Fund for Victims.

So, as we can see, international practice provides some possibilities for collecting compensation, which has its characteristics.

Regarding the prospects of Ukraine's recovery, scientists Michael Emerson and Steve Blokmans raised the topic of the growing scale of Russia's destruction of Ukrainian infrastructure, as well as the question of how these losses will be compensated, and at what cost the reconstruction will take place. In this situation, the confiscation of the assets of the Russian Central Bank for about 300 billion dollars, which are frozen in the EU and other G7 states, became an "extremely obvious solution", provided that it is possible to exclude from the immunity of sovereign assets in international law, which is applied in foreign jurisdictions.

The authors note that in the absence of codified international law, there are compelling arguments for expanding the legal doctrine regarding the temporary freezing and confiscation of such assets, the origin of which can be proven as sources of international criminal activity. The contribution is especially thorough. The authors of the study confirm that it is necessary to proceed without delay with executive and judicial actions to confiscate

Russian assets for 300 billion euros and use them to compensate Ukraine as compensation for the losses caused by the war (Website of the International Renaissance Foundation, 2022).

In this context, it is worth noting that losses from Russian aggression are increasing and their total amount (direct documented losses to residential and non-residential real estate, and other infrastructure of Ukraine) as of November 2022 is almost 136 billion dollars. (At replacement cost) (Kyiv School of Economics, 2022).

Currently, intending to collect reparations for the damage caused as a result of war crimes of the Russian Federation, Ukraine is developing mechanisms for collecting funds. In particular, Ukraine is improving the sale of confiscated Russian assets.

Ukraine is improving the procedure for selling confiscated Russian assets. In particular, the management of assets confiscated from the Russians and their henchmen requires significant expenditures from the state budget, and as experience shows, the state is not an effective owner. In connection with this and problems with the management of confiscated assets, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine adopted Resolution No. 125 on February 10, which regulates the sale of confiscated Russian assets and property, the funds from which are one of the sources of filling the Fund for liquidation of the consequences of armed aggression of the Russian Federation.

Also, Ukraine is working to involve other countries in the development of legal mechanisms for the seizure and confiscation of sanctioned Russian assets. One such country is Japan, where the assets of 12 Russian banks and four Belarusian banks are frozen. Ukraine cooperates with Japan on the creation of a compensation mechanism for Ukraine and the confiscation of Russian assets in foreign countries, the issue of forming an international register of losses, and cooperation with international partners in this direction.

Work is underway to block Russian assets in the US. The US Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) has imposed full blocking sanctions on several countries linked to sanctions evasion that supports Russia's military-industrial complex. As a result, all assets and interests in property of said such persons that are located in the United States or owned or controlled by US persons are attached. In addition, any entity that owns, directly or indirectly, 50% or more of one or more blocked legal entities is blocked.

All transactions by these persons in or within (or transiting) the United States involving any property or interest in the property of designated or blocked persons are prohibited. OFAC noted that these actions were taken as part of the U.S. Treasury Department's commitment to the Russian

Elites, proxies, and oligarchs (REPO) Task Force, which seeks to identify, freeze, and seize the assets of sanctioned Russians throughout the world (Ukrainian Energy website, 2023).

The most important issue on the agenda is not whether Russia will pay reparations to Ukraine, but when and how. Therefore, it is important to analyze effective mechanisms for the payment of reparations and to work on developing new ways of collecting funds for compensation, caused by criminal actions of the Russian Federation.

Conclusions

As a result of the study of the international legal experience of the application of expropriation and other forms of reparations in the conditions of compensation for damage, as a result of an international armed conflict, the following conclusions were made.

1. International law provides for various possibilities for payment of compensation for damages caused by the armed aggression of another state through judicial or quasi-judicial mechanisms. Some claims for compensation for material damages can be brought in national courts and the International Criminal Court or the International Court of the United Nations, state courts of foreign countries, or in specially created funds or commissions.
2. The mechanism of obtaining compensation for damage caused to property, according to the decisions of national courts, has legal obstacles. Among them, are the limitation of the jurisdictional immunity of a foreign state in cases of damages and the availability of sufficient funds for the execution of decisions. Not only leading international lawyers, scientists, and politicians are looking for optimal ways to confiscate Russian assets.
3. Currently, there is no clear legal way to create an appropriate and effective mechanism for real compensation for the losses incurred, but it is still important to record the losses and establish a cause-and-effect relationship concerning their being caused by Russia's armed aggression.

Regarding further scientific research, we consider it necessary to analyze in detail the problematic issues of collecting reparations and ways of solving them, taking into account international experience.

Bibliographic References

EMERSON, Michael; BLOCKMANS, Steven. 2022. The $300 Billion Question: how to get Russia to pay for Ukraine's reconstruction. CEPS. Available online. In: https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/the-300-billion-question/. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION. 2022. Ukraine: The Commission proposes rules on freezing and confiscating assets of oligarchs violating restrictive measures and of criminals. Available online. In: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_22_3264. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

FELDMAN, Llily. 2019. The September 1952 Reparations Agreement between West Germany and Israel: The Beginning of a Remarkable Friendship. American Institute for Contemporary German Studies. Available online. In: https://hmn.wiki/uk/Reparations_Agreement_between_Israel_and_West_Germany#cite_note-honig-2. Consultation date: 12/03/23.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT. 1998. The Rome Statute. Available online. In: https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/RS-Eng.pdf. Consultation date: 14/03/2023.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION. 2008. Property restitution and compensation. Practices and experiences of claims programs. Available online. In: https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/property_restitution_compensation.pdf. Consultation date: 01/03/2023.

KHUTOR, Tetiana. 2022. The law on the confiscation of property of Russians and Belarusians has been adopted: how will it work. Economic Truth website. Available online. In: https://www.epravda.com.ua/publications/2022/05/12/686976/. Consultation date: 16/03/2023.

KOSHMAN, Andrii. 2022. Overview of national and international mechanisms for the protection of property rights violated by the aggression of the Russian Federation. Kyiv: Pravo-Justice. Available online. In: https://pravojustice.eu/storage/app/media/Report%20PJ%20Template.pdf. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

KYIV SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS. 2022. As of November 2022, the total amount of damage caused to the infrastructure of Ukraine is almost $136 billion. Available online. In: https://kse.ua/ua/about-the-school/news/na-listopad-2022-roku-zagalna-suma-zbitkiv-zavdana-infrastructuri-ukrayini-skladaye-mayzhe-136-mlrd/?fbclid=IwAR21X -ebeUaD-8jEk_GHnV25GnTLJqK2imxevs-bEp02E3Sp86b8eswmHxQ. Consultation date: 17/03/23.

LAW OF UKRAINE. 2022. 2116-IX, On the main principles of forced seizure in Ukraine of objects of property rights of the Russian Federation and its residents. Bulletin of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, Available online. In: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2116-20#Text. Consultation date: 04/03/23.

LAWDER, David. 2022. Yellen: Not legal for U.S. to seize Russian official assets. Available online. In: https://www.reuters.com/world/yellen-not-legal-us-government-seize-russian-central-bank-assets-2022-05-18/?fbclid=IwAR2nbCc1cu7-6YgyG0CmUWjq_CsMvKRh3VMpAaLj_LMOl7RXz7v8mMAQksI. Consultation date: 13/03/23.

PAVLOVSKA, Yuliia. 2022. Poland's reparations from Germany: five arguments, how it will help Ukraine. News site LIVE. Available online. In: https://world.novyny.live/reparatsii-polshi-ot-germanii-piat-argumentov-kak-eto-pomozhet-ukraine-55968.html. Consultation date: 22/03/23.

RASHEVSKA, Kateryna. 2022a. From peace by a thread: how Ukraine can collect reparations from the Russian Federation (court block). Lexinform website. Available online. In: https://lexinform.com.ua/dumka-eksperta/z-myru-po-nyttsi-yak-ukrayina-mozhe-styagnuty-z-rf-reparatsiyi-sudovyj-blok/. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

RASHEVSKA, Kateryna. 2022b. Reparations Payment Models and Mechanisms: International Experience and Ideas for Ukraine. Available online. In: http://www.baltijapublishing.lv/omp/index.php/bp/catalog/download/237/6348/13384-1. Consultation date: 11/03/23.

SHAPOVALOVA, Khristina. 2023. The International Registry of Damages – a step towards the payment of reparations. Ukrainian truth site. Available online. In: https://www.epravda.com.ua/columns/2023/02/28/697502/. Consultation date: 17/03/23.

SHULYAK, Olena. 2022. Evaluation of objects destroyed and damaged as a result of military aggression: how it will take place. Website of the Judicial and Legal Gazette. Available online. In: https://sud.ua/ru/news/publication/240258-otsinka-obyektiv-znischenikh-i-poshkodzhenikh-vnaslidok-viyskovoyi-agresiyi-yak-vona-bude-vidbuvatisya. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

STUPNYK, Iaroslav; LISITSYNA, Yuliya; AVRAMENKO, Oleksiy; ABAKINA-PILIAVSKA, Liudmyla; KHYLCHENKO, Anastasiia. 2022. The international criminal court and the un criminal court in resolving war crimes: Legal realities and future prospects. Available online. In: https://amazoniainvestiga.info/index.php/amazonia/article/view/2224/3122. Consultation date: 14/03/2023.

SUDACHEK, Daryna. 2022. Post-war reconstruction of Germany. Dniester Center website. Available online. In: https://dc.org.ua/news/reconstruction-germany. Consultation date: 19/03/23.

TKALYCH, Maxym; ARBELÁEZ-ENCARNACIÓN, Tanya Fernanda. 2022. The world in 2023: continuing uncertainty. Available online. In: https://amazoniainvestiga.info/index.php/amazonia/article/view/2186/3064. Consultation date: 23/03/23.

TREATY OF VERSAILLES. 1919. Paris: Librairie Militare Berger-Levrault. Available online. In: https://www.herodote.net/Textes/tVersailles1919.pdf. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

UKRAINIAN ENERGY WEBSITE. 2023. Payback is inevitable: the world is working on financing schemes for the reconstruction of Ukraine. Available online. In: https://ua-energy.org/uk/posts/rozplata-nemynucha-svit-pratsiuie-nad-skhemamy-finansuvannia-vidnovlennia-ukrainy. Consultation date: 10/03/23.

UNATED NATION. 1945. Charter. Available online. In: https://unic.un.org/aroundworld/unics/common/documents/publications/uncharter/UN%20Charter_Ukrainian.pdf. Consultation date: 15/03/2023.

USAID. 2022. International experience of reparations. Rada site: the next generation. Available online. In: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00ZKWZ.pdf. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

VOLYANSKA, Olena. 2022. Compensation for damages caused by the armed aggression of the Russian Federation: we act step by step. LCF website. Available online. In: https://lcf.ua/thought-leadership/bankruptcy-and-restructuring/vidshkoduvannya-zbitkiv-zavdanih-zbrojnoyu-agresiyeyu-rf-diyemo-pokrokovo/. Consultation date: 03/03/23.

WEBSITE OF THE INTERNATIONAL RENAISSANCE FOUNDATION. 2022. Monitoring of initiatives regarding the confiscation of Russian assets for the reconstruction of Ukraine. Available online. In: https://dixigroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/2022_12_ruassetswatch_dixigroup.pdf. Consultation date: 02/03/23.

UNIVERSIDAD DEL ZULIA

CUESTIONES POLÍTICAS

Vol.41 Nº 78

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital y publicada en julio de 2023, por el ***Fondo Editorial Serbiluz, Universidad del Zulia. Maracaibo-Venezuela***

www.luz.edu.ve
www.serbi.luz.edu.ve
www.produccioncientificaluz.org