Crises of the international legal system and their role in developing principles and norms of international law: Retrospective analysis*

A. A. Dorskaia[1], *A. Yu. Dorskii*[2]

[1] North-Western Branch of the Russian State University of Justice,
5, Alexandrovsky Park, St. Petersburg, 197046, Russian Federation
[2] St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation

For citation: Dorskaia, Aleksandra A., Andrei Yu. Dorskii. 2024. "Crises of the international legal system and their role in developing principles and norms of international law: Retrospective analysis". *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Law* 3: 835–846. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu14.2024.318

The article examines the influence of international legal system crises on the establishment and advancement of generally recognized principles and norms of international law. It is shown that the causes of crisis phenomena in international law can include inconsistency of the norms of international treaties and customs with the proclaimed principles of international law, poor regulation of the critical issues of the world community's life and its institutions; non-implementation of the enshrined principles because of the lack of political will or imperfection of international legal mechanisms. On the example of the principles of conscientious fulfillment of international obligations, the sovereign equality of states and respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty, non-intervention in the internal affairs of states enshrined in the 1945 United Nations Charter, it is shown how the principles undergo changes in different eras, resulting in shifts in emphasis and enabling the evolution of international legal regulation. The terminological discussions, which have spanned centuries, leading to a wide range of interpretations regarding the fundamental principles and norms of international law, including the concept of general recognition, are considered. It has been concluded that numerous principles of international law were established to address crisis situations in international legal affairs. However, sometimes, these principles can inadvertently exacerbate conflicts, as evidenced by the Europe-America tensions in the 19th century. The primary areas of development for the international law principles are revealed: the alignment of specific principles in different international law branches with generally recognized principles and norms, the interplay between principles across different international law branches, which is crucial for regulating a substantial portion of international legal relations and the consolidation of judicial practice from international justice bodies.

Keywords: crisis of the international legal system, international law principles, international law norms, Westphalian system, Congress of Vienna, League of Nations, United Nations.

* The part of the A. A. Dorskaia's research was funded by the Russian Science Foundation (RSF), according to the research project no. 24-28-01860 "Crises of the international legal system and ways to overcome them: historical experience".

1. Introduction

Throughout various historical periods, the international legal system has consistently faced recurring crises. The contemporary era is not exempt from this, leading to the emergence of two perspectives. The state of humanity in the 21st century is regarded by certain experts as a crisis in international relations, which persists even though there are well-established principles and norms of international law that fully align with the goals and objectives of the global community. Consequently, the crisis phenomena witnessed in the international arena are removed from the legal field. Other scholars advocate for the idea of an escalating crisis specifically within the realm of international legal regulation. Moreover, international law is a distinct legal domain that has faced and continues to face denial regarding its legal nature from certain scholars with expertise in both domestic and international law. At most, they limit international legal norms to the realm of international morality.

The ambiguity surrounding the role of crisis phenomena in international law is evident. On the one hand, these phenomena indicate that either the regulation of international (interstate) relations is outdated, or it fails to address emerging issues, or the international legal norms lack a suitable mechanism for enforcement. On the other hand, crises can be viewed as a catalyst for the advancement of international law towards a new phase of development, with the aim of guaranteeing a sustainable and progressive future for humanity.

The discussion surrounding the crisis state of global society and its manifestation in international law is a well-established topic within the world science. It is worth recalling the scholarly work written by the acclaimed Russian historian, jurist, public figure, and professor S. A. Kotliarevskii, over a century ago, nonetheless, there has been an increasing trend of utilizing it in the field of legal research (Kotliarevskii 1922).

Modern Russian legal scholars delve into the complexities surrounding the origins of crises in the international legal system (Ignat'eva 2021), the assessment of a crisis as transitional phase (Beliaev, Denisenko 2017), and the doctrinal, civilizational and geopolitical factors that underlie the crisis of international law (Musaelian 2014), displacement of the idea of the sovereign will of states, which is the foundation of the theory of international law, non-consensual mechanisms (Tolstykh 2022), prospects for the development of certain branches and institutions of international law in a crisis of the international legal system (Matchanova 2020; 2021), the response of national judicial systems to the aggravation of the crisis of international law (Ochered'ko 2023), the interconnection of the digitalization process and crisis phenomena in international law (Cherniad'eva 2023), building a post-crisis world based on respect for culture and law (Aleksandrov 2014), the impact of intrastate crises on crises of the international legal system (Nazariia 2004), the role of interaction between public and private international law in overcoming crisis phenomena, and others.

The analysis of crisis phenomena in international law has recently been brought to the forefront in foreign legal science. Particularly noteworthy is the major work published by the prominent legal scholar L. Reed (Reed 2003).

The problem of crisis phenomena in international integration organizations has reached a critical level during the decade of 2010. J. Habermas extensively covered it, using the European Union as a prime example (Habermas 2012).

However, the subject of crises experienced a surge in popularity in 2020, coinciding with the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic (Bhouri 2021). The worldwide spread of the virus has prompted the examination of the issue within the realm of international legal regulation, with numerous sources highlighting the inadequacy of international law in addressing new threats. As an illustration, P. G. Danchin et al. highlights three paradoxes, namely the "patriotism paradox", the "border paradox" and the "equality paradox", that were exposed during the pandemic in the relationship between national and international law. The first one is that the primacy of national law over international law, under current circumstances, does not bolster national sovereignty, but rather diminishes it. The second one is that prioritizing the safeguarding of citizens over non-citizens results in the proliferation of the disease within the citizen population. Third one is that the virus has further intensified preexisting inequality. In other words, the proposed remedy for the global problem was meant to be executed on a worldwide scale. Nevertheless, both states and international organizations were ill-equipped for such an undertaking (Danchin et al. 2020).

The year 2021 saw the release of *Crisis Narratives in International Law*, a book that offers a series of essays by leading international lawyers on the relation between international law and crises (Mbengue, D'Aspremont 2021). In his preface to the publication, P. Sands delved into the history of crises, asserting that comprehending modernity necessitates identifying past analogues: "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose" (Sands 2022, 8). A similar view is shared by Ch. J. Tams in Chapter 11 "Repetitive Renewal: COVID, Canons and Blinkers": "I certainly had a sense, in the immortal words of the great American baseball poet, Yogi Berra, of 'déjà vu all over again'" (Tams 2022, 130).

Nevertheless, the emergence of COVID-19 prompted the questioning not only of the crisis in the international relations regulated by law, but also of the crisis within international law itself. The problem is formulated in such a way in *Law-Making and Legitimacy in International Humanitarian Law*, a book, in which the authors attribute the crisis of international humanitarian law to the growing number of participants in international discourse. Concurrently, the principles upheld by states diverge from those upheld by non-state actors (Kreiger, Püschmann 2021).

N. Zamir and M. D. Kielsgard concentrate on the matter of the correlation between national and international law, attributing it as the fundamental cause of the crisis experienced by the latter (Zamir, Kielsgard 2020).

In his essay, M. Goodale brings attention to an interesting emphasis. He posits that the contemporary erosion of international law is connected, in part, to a public recourse to history, wherein present-day illegal methods are employed to rectify past injustices (Goodale 2021).

The relevance of the study is derived from the fact that, at the current stage, the international community has developed a system of widely accepted principles and norms of international law that have withstood the test of time. However, firstly, some of them are not practically implemented, from time to time, secondly, there is no consensus on the number of such principles and their fixation in international legal instruments, which gives rise to various interpretations, the norms of international law are not always "gauged" for their compliance with the proclaimed principles of international law, although they are the core of the entire international legal system. By addressing the issue of formulating principles and norms of international law during periods of crisis in the international legal

system throughout history, one can gain insights into contemporary issues and evaluate the state of international relations regulation in the 21st century.

This article seeks to retrospectively analyze the crises confronted by the international legal system, evaluating their effects, both positive and negative, on the progression of universally accepted principles and norms of international law.

2. Basic research

The crisis of the international legal system should be understood as such a state of international (interstate) relations in which the norms of international treaties and customs as the main sources of international law either cease to comply with the proclaimed principles of international law and do not ensure the progressive development of international cooperation, the peaceful resolution of international disputes, or do not regulate the most important issues of the life of the world community and its institutions, or are not practically implemented.

The issue surrounding the correlation between principles and norms of international law is highly intricate. The principles of law play a huge role in the functioning of any legal system, but for international law they are of exceptional importance, because international legal regulation implies different levels — universal, multilateral, bilateral; at the same time they should all be connected by common principles that create a certain unity and cement the international legal system as a whole. The Art. 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice justifiably prioritizes international conventions, international customs, and general principles of law recognized by civilized nations as primary sources of international law applied by the Court[1]. Despite this, there is currently no universally accepted framework for the terminology and classification of principles within the realm of international law. In particular, there are proposals to divide the principles not only into generally recognized ones and branch ones, but also into generally recognized ones (branch principles and norms of international law) and basic ones (generally recognized norms of international law of the most general nature, of an imperative nature, applied in all spheres of relations between states, containing obligations with respect to all and each of the members of the interstate community) (Snegireva, Snegireva 2018, 168–169). Therefore, even the notion of general recognition can be a topic of debate. Therefore, even the notion of universal recognition can be a topic of debate, despite the fact that the inclusion of "general principles of law recognized by civilized nations" was first established in the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice[2] in 1920 (Romashev 2021, 149).

The inception of the principles of international law can be traced back to the Ancient World. Nevertheless, this particular path proved to be arduous and occasionally perplexing for a variety of reasons.

First reason is that the establishment of certain principles of international law originated at the domestic level before gaining international recognition. As an illustration, the principle of ambassadorial immunity was initially declared in ancient Egypt and was later recognized as a principle of international law during the Middle Ages.

[1] "Statute of the International Court of Justice (1945)". *International Court of Justice*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://www.icj-cij.org/statute#CHAPTER_II.

[2] "Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice (1920)". *UN Library*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://www.un-ilibrary.org/content/books/9789210559096s003-c002.

The second reason is the parallel development of the norms of certain branches of international law, which only over time have acquired a more or less systematic nature. For example, the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* and the principle of "a state that has declared its neutrality in a war should not provide any assistance to the belligerents" were not initially linked, because the first reflected more the trade sphere and the second the military, but gradually it became clear that they both reflect the contractual sphere in which there should be uniform principles, despite the differences in the subject of the treaty.

Third reason lies in the limited interconnection between states. The principles and norms of international law have historically had a localized character, originating in specific regions such as Ancient China, Ancient India, Mesopotamia, the Nile Valley and the Mediterranean.

The fourth reason pertains to the fact that a portion of the principles were developed under the framework of canon law and later assimilated into secular law. As an illustration, in the first half of the 12th century, the above-mentioned principle of *pacta sunt servanda* was further supported with references to the Gospel of Matthew, papal epistles, and decrees of Church councils. Subsequently, Thomas Aquinas's works began to regard the breach of a promise as an oath-crime (Batyrev 2020, 88). Nevertheless, beginning in the 17th century, notable philosophers and jurists have examined it within a legal framework, specifically within the context of natural law theory (such as T. Hobbes and G. Grotius). As a result, these transformations naturally resulted in significant changes to the content of the principle.

The emergence of the principles of international law was undeniably connected to the crises that arose during the development of the international legal system.

Let's examine this process using the example of the principle of sovereign equality of states and the respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty, as currently established in the United Nations (UN) Charter[3].

The emergence of this principle is connected to the crisis that unfolded in Europe during the 17th century and resulted in the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648) — indeed, the first pan-European war. This war posed two important problems for European countries: religious one, since the war period was characterized by clashes in the Holy Roman Empire between Protestants and Catholics, monarchs tried to free themselves from the power of the Pope, and political one associated with the struggle of states for legal equality in the European arena, for which it was necessary to overcome the dominance of the house of Habsburg.

Consequently, at the Congress of Westphalia of 1648, which summed up the war, a system of political equilibrium was created in Europe, based on the establishment of state borders, including by creating new states (Switzerland and the Netherlands), the development of a theory of recognition that made it possible to consider a state as a subject of international law from the moment of its inception, the recognition of the equal rights of states regardless of their state structure and the religious beliefs held by the peoples who inhabited them (Tiunov 2014, 9).

Naturally, the essence of this principle markedly diverged from that one, which currently exists, as it revolved around two key aspects: the embodiment of the sovereignty

[3] "United Nations Charter (1945)". *United Nations*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter.

of a state in its monarch and the prioritization of the autonomy of royal authority over religious one.

The events that took place during the French Revolution had a substantial influence on the development of the principle of sovereign equality of states, not only theoretically, since it was also touched upon in its developments by C.-F. de Chasseboeuf, comte de Volney, the deputy of the National Assembly, who presented his famous "project" to the Assembly on May 18, 1790, and H. Grégoire (l'abbé Grégoire), the author of Déclaration du droit des gens[4], which proclaimed that peoples are mutually independent and sovereign, whatever the size of the population and the size of the territory they occupy[5], that every people has the right to organize and change the form of his government[6], that a people has no right to interfere in the government of others[7] (Guseva 1992, 16), but also in terms of legislative consolidation at the national level (Décret concernant le droit de faire la paix et la guerre, May 22–27, 1790; Chapter VI of the French Constitution of 1791). Consequently, during the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815), the matter of state sovereignty was examined exclusively in terms of the legitimacy of monarchical governance. As a result, nations that experienced revolutionary events were not acknowledged as subjects under international law. In order to implement this new principle, the Holy Alliance was established, consisting of the Russian Empire, Austria, and Prussia. Their role was to ensure and preserve the established world order. Thus, the most serious European crisis resulting from the Napoleonic wars also facilitated the establishment of a new concept of state sovereignty.

Following the First World War, humanity once again started reconsidering the principle of state sovereignty due to a series of crisis phenomena that had developed over several decades on the global stage. Once again, humanity began to revise the principle of state sovereignty after the First World War, which was the result of numerous crisis phenomena that had grown over several decades in the international arena. The Covenant of the League of Nations of 1919[8] did not mention the sovereign equality of states, since the colonial system and the division of peoples into civilized and uncivilized ones remained, however, in relation to the first group of countries, the need to create a system of international relations based on the principles of justice and honor was emphasized, and in relation to the second group, which as a result of the First World War ceased to be under the sovereignty of a particular country (primarily, the former German colonies and lands of the Ottoman Empire), it was decided to establish the tutelage exercised by advanced nations.

Furthermore, the researchers stress the significance of Art. 17–20 of the Covenant, which address the cooperation between the League of Nations and non-member states, highlighting the unequal conditions imposed on third countries in comparison to member states (Leiko 2018, 135).

---

[4] "Déclaration du droit des gens de l'abbé Grégoire (1793–1795)". Le Monde. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1950/12/15/la-declaration-du-droit-des-gens-de-l-abbe-gregoire_2055493_1819218.html.

[5] Les peuples sont respectivement indépendants et souverains, quels que soient le nombre d'individus qui les composent et l'étendue du territoire qu'ils occupant.

[6] Chaque peuple a droit d'organiser et de changer les formes de son gouvernement.

[7] Un peuple n'a pas le droit de s'immiscer dans le gouvernement des autres.

[8] "Covenant of the League of Nations (1919)". *UN Geneva*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://libraryresources.unog.ch/ld.php?content_id=32971179.

As per the renowned Russian international lawyer V. A. Kartashkin, the League of Nations' interpretation of the principle of state sovereignty hindered the global community's ability to intervene in cases of widespread human rights abuses witnessed in Germany during the rule of the Nazi regime, as well as in Romania and Hungary (Kartashkin 2015).

Undoubtedly, the Versailles Treaty, which incorporates the Covenant of the League of Nations, sparked a novel crisis in international relations and the field of international law. This is because it fostered the emergence of revanchist sentiments among populations in countries that suffered defeat in the First World War, experienced territorial losses, and were burdened with reparations, among other factors. This is the reason why the principle of the sovereign equality of states, which was established in the UN Charter shortly after the conclusion of World War II, represented a shift in focus from sovereignty of states to their sovereign equality. Undoubtedly, this document played a significant role in paving the way for the downfall of the colonial system between the 1940s and 1970s, fostering harmonious coexistence among both capitalist and socialist nations. The absence of this principle would have rendered the process of universalizing international law, which gained significant momentum in the latter half of the 1980s, unattainable.

Therefore, by examining the development of the principle of sovereign equality of states, one can observe how its meaning evolved in response to various challenges at both the national and global levels. Occasionally, the adoption of the principle's interpretation as a means of resolving the crisis can lead to the occurrence of new crisis phenomena. The global community has surely endeavored to derive historical insights by converting the concept of sovereignty of states into the notion of their sovereign equality and respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty. Nevertheless, this process remains ongoing. To provide an instance, presently, a weighted voting system is seen as contravening the principle of sovereign equality of states. This arises when a country's voting power is determined by its financial contributions to the organization or other factors like the imposition of unilateral sanction (Chesnokova 2023).

When examining the crises of the international legal system, it is important to analyze the development and progression of the principle of "non-intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state". This principle, as experts suggest, is responsible for a significant number of disputes (Maleev, Larina 2016, 38). The inclusion of this principle in Art. 2 of the UN Charter of 1945 was imperative as it guaranteed the peaceful coexistence of the capitalist and socialist blocs, which were bound to clash on the global stage following their joint triumph over fascism. Additionally, it facilitated the individual development of each nation based on its unique historical characteristics and specificities.

The principle of non-intervention in the internal matters of sovereign states was predominantly manifested in national legislations until the second half of the 19th century, such as during the French Revolution, or through the signing of bilateral international treaties (thus, in Para. 7 of the Treaty of Nystad signed on August 30, 1721, which summed up the results of the Northern War (1700–1721), it was enshrined that, in particular, the Russian Tsar would intervene, directly or indirectly, in domestic affairs of the Kingdom of Sweden, its form of government and the inheritance issues)[9].

[9] "Treaty of Nystad (1721)". *Histdoc.net.* Accessed August 7, 2024. https://histdoc.net/nystad/nystad_sv.html.

During the initial half of the 19th century, the prominent European powers overtly interfered in the internal matters of other nations. As an illustration, the aforementioned Holy Alliance was designed with the intention of curbing the proliferation of the revolutionary movement across Europe. Nonetheless, a new trend has come to light. In the address delivered by President J. Monroe to Congress on December 2, 1823, he urged European nations to refrain from intervening in the affairs of American countries, while also pledging that the United States would reciprocate this commitment (known as the Monroe Doctrine). Consequently, the principle of refraining from intervention in the domestic matters of nations was extended from the realm of bilateral relations to the global stage (Dovgan' 2002, 32). Nonetheless, the perceptions of the Monroe Doctrine have consistently diverged. More precisely, the renowned Soviet lawyer N. A. Ushakov posited that it was through this doctrine that the United States solidified its dominance in intervening in the matters of Western Hemisphere nations. Nonetheless, the perceptions of the Monroe Doctrine have consistently diverged. More precisely, the renowned Soviet lawyer N. A. Ushakov posited that it was through this doctrine that the United States solidified its dominance in intervening in the matters of Western Hemisphere nations (Ushakov 1971, 9).

During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a debate emerged regarding the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of states. An illustration of this can be seen in the actions of Carlos Calvo, an Argentine lawyer and diplomat in 1868. In response to recurrent interventions by European nations in Latin America and the resulting crises, Calvo declared the principle that the diplomatic or armed intervention of states to recover international debts for their subjects is unacceptable.

In 1874, L. A. Kamarovskii, a prominent international lawyer of the Russian Empire, authored *Non-Intervention Fundamentals*. This work provides a genre-based analysis on the concept of independence as a defining characteristic of a state, while also opposing the viewpoints of the German scientist K. A. von Kamptz, who believed in the legitimacy of intervention in any aspect of another country's state affairs, and the French statesman F.-R. de Chateaubriand, who denied the existence of common principles of non-intervention (Kamarovskii 1874, 2, 4–5). This subject held significant importance, as it was particularly pressing during the Polish uprising of 1863. Supporters of the rebels were present both within the Russian Empire and abroad, openly expressing their willingness to engage in active measures that could potentially lead to a substantial international crisis.

In December 1902, during the outbreak of the Venezuelan conflict, Argentine Foreign Minister L. M. Drago devised his doctrine, which was founded on the principle of C. Calvo: "The public debt cannot occasion armed intervention nor even the actual occupation of the territory of American nations by a European power" (Drago, Nettles 1928, 209).

Consequently, in 1907, the Hague Convention Respecting the Limitation of the Employment of Force for the Recovery of Contract Debts[10] was adopted, effectively prohibiting the recourse to armed force for the recovery of contract debts.

During the 1930s, Latin American states actively employed the principle of non-interference in internal affairs to resist Spanish colonization. To provide an instance, the Con-

[10] "Hague Convention Respecting the Limitation of the Employment of Force for the Recovery of Contract Debts (1907)". *The Avalon project: Documents in law, history and diplomacy (Yale Law School)*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/hague072.asp.

vention on the Rights and Duties of States[11] was signed in Montevideo in 1933 (Bredikhin 2023, 127).

While formulating the UN Charter, the international community encountered a challenging circumstance. It was imperative to consider the adverse lessons from the 1930s, wherein the absence of international legal measures allowed the propagation of fascist ideology and the perpetration of aggressive acts against sovereign nations. Conversely, the establishment of a system that facilitates interaction among all nations, regardless of their governmental structure, political system, ideological orientation, and so forth, was imperative. All these difficulties were reflected in Para. 7 of Art. 2 of the UN Charter, according to which the United Nations shall not have the right to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter.

The difficulty of implementing this principle in practice is demonstrated by the fact that the global community had to repeatedly resort to its clarification after 1945: on December 20, 1965, Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty[12] was adopted; in 1970, it was clarified in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations[13], and in 1975 — in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe[14]; on December 9, 1981, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States[15] was signed, etc.

Consequently, the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of states has undergone extensive development, occasionally giving rise to crisis phenomena in relations, such as those between European and American nations, while also serving as a means to address crises within international legal regulation.

Despite the longstanding history of the formation and development of international law principles, new challenges continually arise, necessitating prompt resolutions.

The fragmentation of international law is identified as one of the key challenges to modern international law, indicating the emergence of crisis phenomena. This phenomenon, which gained attention in the 21st century, poses a threat to the integrity of the international legal system by disregarding generally recognized principles and norms of international law. An adequate response to this issue is the "bonding" of special principles of various branches of international law. As an illustration, contemporary studies highlight the interplay between the principles of international humanitarian law, established

[11] "Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States (1933)". *The International Law Students Association*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://www.ilsa.org/Jessup/Jessup15/Montevideo%20Convention.pdf.

[12] "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty (1965)". *UN Digital Library*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/203886?ln=ru&v=pdf.

[13] "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (1970)". *UN Digital Library*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/202170?v=pdf.

[14] "Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Final Act, 1975)". *OSCE*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/5/c/39501.pdf.

[15] "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States (1981)". *UN Digital Library*. Accessed August 7, 2024. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/27066?v=pdf.

during the latter half of the 19th century, and international environmental law, which has been evolving since the mid-20th century (Makarov 2022).

The practice of international justice bodies is of utmost importance at this current stage. These bodies, while making decisions, engage in the interpretation of international law principles, identification of contradictions, and exploration of new approaches to resolve them.

3. Conclusions

The history of international law has witnessed numerous crises at various levels, ranging from crisis phenomena in the regulation and implementation of specific international legal institutions to global conflicts such as world wars.

The role of crises in shaping and advancing the international legal system is ambiguous. This is because they can arise from either undue signing of necessary international treaties, non-compliance with established principles and norms of international law, or the continued adherence to outdated international legal customs that are no longer practiced. Conversely, they intensify preexisting contradictions and expedite the process of resolving them.

Over the course of centuries, numerous generally recognized principles and norms of international law have been established, undergoing significant transformations during times of crisis, serving as a means to overcome such crises.

During periods of crisis, the significance of international legal principles typically intensifies, as they enable the preservation of developmental continuity and serve as the foundation for international legal regulation. Moreover, these principles "gauge" the appropriateness of newly implemented norms, ensuring their integration into the existing framework of international law without undermining it.

At the same time, the principles can undergo significant changes over time, both in terms of meaning and linguistic forms, placing greater emphasis on crucial nuances that align with the contemporary requirements of the global community. As an illustration, the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* has undergone a transformation, now referred to as the principle of conscientious fulfillment of international obligations. Similarly, the principle of sovereignty of states has been replaced by the principle of sovereign equality of states.

Thus, considering the evolution of the principles and norms of international law in periodically arising crises of the international legal system, one can conclude that these principles hold immense importance as they reflect the values of the international community during a particular stage of its advancement. As such, they serve as the bedrock for all international legal regulations and enforcement efforts within a specific historical period.

References

Aleksandrov, Aleksei A. 2014. "Temporary and eternal: Culture and law in an international crisis". *Pravo i upravlenie. XXI vek* 2 (31): 98–101. (In Russian)

Batyrev, Georgii T. 2020. "Pacta sunt servanda: Evolution and ambiguity of internal content". *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriia 11: Pravo* 1: 86–94. (In Russian)

Beliaev, Maksim A., Vladislav V. Denisenko. 2017. "Review of the international scientific conference 'The crisis of law in a transitional society'". *Rossiiskii zhurnal pravovykh issledovanii* 3/1 (10): 259–263. (In Russian)

Bhouri, Habiba. 2021 "Public economic law constrained by the number(s)? About the pandemic crisis and its consequences". *International Journal of Public Law and Policy* 7 (4): 364–375.

Bredikhin, Aleksei L. 2023. "The principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of the state in the teachings of N. A. Ushakov". *Uchenye zametki TOGU* 14 (2): 125–128. (In Russian)

Cherniad'eva, Natal'ia A. 2023. "Digital technologies and human rights: THE era of interdependence or the crisis of the international human rights system?" *Pravoporiadok: istoriia, teoriia, praktika* 2 (37): 164–172. (In Russian)

Chesnokova, Mariia V. 2023. "The problem of implementing the principle of sovereign equality of states in modern times". *Nauchno-issledovatel'skaia deiatel'nost' v klassicheskom universitete — 2023: traditsii i innovatsii: materialy Mezhdunarodnogo nauchno-prakticheskogo festivalia.* Ed. by Aleksei A. Malygin, 1001–1005. Ivanovo, Ivanovskii gosudarstvennyi universitet Publ. (In Russian)

Danchin, Peter G., Jeremy Farrall, Shruti Rana, Imogen Saunders. 2020. "The pandemic paradox in international law". *American Journal of International Law* 114 (4): 598–607.

Dovgan', Elena F. 2002. "On the relationship between the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and State sovereignty". *Belorusskii zhurnal mezhdunarodnogo prava i mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii* 3: 31–36. (In Russian)

Drago, Luis M., Henry Edward Nettles. 1928. "The Drago doctrine in international law and politics". *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 8 (2): 204–223.

Goodale, Mark. 2021. "After international law: Anthropology beyond the 'Age of human rights'". *AJIL Unbound* 115: 289–293.

Guseva, Elena V. 1992. "Impact of the Great French Revolution on the development of international law". Abstract of PhD Thesis in Law, Kazanskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. (In Russian)

Habermas, Jürgen. 2012. "The crisis of the European Union in the light of a constitutionalization of international law". *The European journal of international law* 23 (2): 335–348.

Ignat'eva, Marina V. 2021. "Causes of the crisis in international law: Diversity of views". *Effectiveness of international legal regulation and overcoming crisis phenomena in international law. Collective monograph.* Eds Valentina Iu. Smorgunova, Aleksandra A. Dorskaia, 96–100. St. Petersburg, Asterion Publ. (In Russian)

Kamarovskii, Leonid A. 1874. *Non-intervention fundamentals*: *Considerations*. Moscow, Universitetskaia tipografiia Publ. (Katkov i K° Publ.). (In Russian)

Kartashkin, Vladimir A. 2015. "Changing the normative content of the basic principles of modern international law". *Moskovskii zhurnal mezhdunarodnogo prava* 1 (97): 29–39. (In Russian)

Kotliarevskii, Sergei A. 1922. "Crisis of international law". *Pravo i zhizn'* 1: 80–82. (In Russian)

Kreiger, Heike, Jonas Püschmann, eds. 2021. *Law-Making and Legitimacy in International Humanitarian Law*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publ.

Leiko, Ol'ga I. 2018. "Development of the principle of sovereign equality of States in international law during the existence of the League of Nations". *Upravlenie v sotsial'nykh i ekonomicheskikh sistemakh* 27: 135–136. (In Russian)

Makarov, Vladislav A. 2022. "System of principles of international humanitarian law and their interaction with principles of international environmental law". *Perspektivnye issledovaniia v sfere obrazovaniia, kul'tury i obshchestva: sbornik statei mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii.* Ed. by Ekaterina L. Romanova, 49–51. St. Petersburg, Mezhdunarodnyi institut perspektivnykh issledovanii imeni Lomonosova Publ. (In Russian)

Maleev, Iurii N., Flora Sh. Larina. 2016. "Coups d'état and revolutions and the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of states". *Moskovskii zhurnal mezhdunarodnogo prava* 4 (104): 38–47. (In Russian)

Matchanova, Zoia Sh. 2020. "Prospects for the development of international labour law in the context of the study of the crises of international law in the 21st century". *Chernye dyry v rossiiskom zakonodatel'stve* 3: 20–22. (In Russian)

Matchanova, Zoia Sh. 2021. "International humanitarian law at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries in the light of a study of crises in international law". *Chernye dyry v rossiiskom zakonodatel'stve* 2: 36–38. (In Russian)

Mbengue, Makane M., Jean D'Aspremont, eds. 2021. *Crisis Narratives in International Law*. Leiden, Brill; Nijhoff.

Musaelian, Leva A. 2014. "Some consideration of the crisis of international law". *Piatyi permskii mezhdunarodnyi kongress uchenykh-iuristov: materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*. Ed. by Ol'ga A. Kuznetsova, 248–250. Perm', Permskii gosudarstvennyi natsional'nyi issledovatel'skii universitet Publ. (In Russian)

Nazariia, Sergei M. 2004. "Kosovo crisis and international law". *Moskovskii zhurnal mezhdunarodnogo prava* 3: 48–66. (In Russian)

Ochered'ko, Viktor P. 2023. "Russian judicial protection of the rights of economic entities in the context of the aggravation of the crisis of international law". *Leningradskii iuridicheskii zhurnal* 2 (72): 118–135. (In Russian)

Reed, Lucy. 2003. *Mixed private and public international law solutions to international crises*. Leiden, Brill; Nijhoff.

Romashev, Iurii S. 2021. "General principles of law in the system of international law". *Pravo. Zhurnal Vysshei shkoly ekonomiki* 3: 148–174. (In Russian)

Sands, Philippe. 2022. "Crisis and its curators: A preface". *Crisis Narratives in International Law.* Eds Makane M. Mbengue and Jean D'Aspremont, 7–9. Leiden, Brill; Nijhoff.

Snegireva, Natal'ia I., Dar'ia E. Snegireva. 2018. "Relationship between 'basic principles of international law' and 'basic principles of international space law'". *Aktual'nye problemy gosudarstva i prava: opyt, problemy, resheniia: sbornik materialov Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*. Comp. by Aleksei V. Samoilov, Mar'iam A. Salikhova, 168–174. Kursk, Regional'nyi otkrytyi sotsial'nyi institut Publ. (In Russian)

Tams, Christian J. 2022. "Repetitive renewal: COVID, canons and blinkers". *Crisis Narratives in International Law.* Eds Makane M. Mbengue and Jean D'Aspremont, 122–131. Leiden, Brill; Nijhoff.

Tiunov, Oleg I. 2014. "Sovereign equality of states in the system of basic principles of international law". *Zhurnal rossiiskogo prava* 5: 5–21. (In Russian)

Tolstykh, Vladislav L. 2022. "Crisis of international law: Diagnosis". *Zakon* 12: 122–133. (In Russian)

Ushakov, Nikolai A. 1971. *Non-intervention in the internal affairs of States*. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia Publ. (In Russian)

Zamir, Noam, Mark D. Kielsgard. 2020. "Teaching international law in jurisdictions with international law crisis". *ICL Journal. Vienna Journal on International Constitutional Law* 13 (3): 259–280.

Received: April 15, 2024
Accepted: April 29, 2024

Authors' information:

Aleksandra A. Dorskaia — Dr. Sci. in Law, Professor; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8723-8673, adorskaya@yandex.ru
Andrei Yu. Dorskii — Dr. Sci. in Philosophy, Professor; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0991-2941, dorski@yandex.ru