



JUSTICE OR REVENGE: WHY DO WE NEED AN INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE SYSTEM?

Mukhrumbaeva Yulduz Zafar kizi

4th-year student at Tashkent State University of Law

e-mail: yulmuxrumbaeva@gmail.com

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 28 th October 2025	This article explores the distinction between justice and revenge in the context of international criminal law. While revenge is driven by emotional impulses and retribution, justice is based on legal accountability, due process, and the protection of human rights. The study examines the role of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in prosecuting grave international crimes and preventing cycles of violence. Despite practical limitations, international justice remains essential for upholding the rule of law and global stability.
Accepted: 24 th November 2025	

Keywords: International justice system; International Criminal Court (ICC); justice and revenge; international criminal law; accountability; genocide; crimes against humanity; war crimes; crime of aggression; rule of law

INTRODUCTION

The concepts of justice and revenge are deeply intertwined yet fundamentally distinct, especially in the context of the international justice system. This system aims to handle the most serious crimes that the world community is concerned about, such as crimes against humanity, war crimes, and genocide. It is made up of institutions like the International Criminal Court (ICC) and ad hoc tribunals. To fully comprehend the objectives and workings of these institutions, one needs to understand the subtle differences between justice and revenge.

Justice is one of the highest principles of mutual relations between people. The category of moral, legal and socio-political consciousness, the concept of due, associated with historically changing ideas about inalienable human rights. It contains the requirement of correspondence between the real significance of various individuals like social groups and their social status, between their rights and duties, between action and retribution, labor and reward, crime and punishment, etc. The term "justice" has two different meanings, but in everyday usage they often overlap, causing confusion. It is essential to distinguish between these two meanings when we talk about politics and law, and especially about international legal relations. First, "procedural" justice should be highlighted. In this sense, justice refers to a result or decision achieved through a properly functioning mechanism for the administration of law. In the second sense, justice is an appeal to some criterion or set of values that are considered higher than those embodied in the law. Justice in law embodies the idea of a proper balance: an honest court, which, among other things, achieves a proper balance between the defendant's ability to establish innocence and the prosecution's ability to establish guilt.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) is a pivotal institution in the realm of international law, embodying both procedural and substantive justice on a global scale. Established by the Rome Statute in 2002, the ICC aims to prosecute individuals for the most serious offenses of international concern, including genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. By upholding the principles of fairness and due process, the ICC seeks to provide a venue for procedural justice, ensuring that trials are conducted impartially and that both prosecution and defense have equitable opportunities to present their cases.

The efficacy and fairness of justice within the international system are guaranteed by a number of fundamental principles. The rule of law, responsibility, due process, restorative goals, and international cooperation are some of these ideals.

Revenge is deeply emotional and personal. Anger may be the primary driving force for revenge, but eventually, anticipation of pleasure or fulfillment drives it. Acting on the need for revenge will relieve emotions and make us feel better, which is a powerful motivator for taking revenge. It is a basic human instinct that has historically shaped perspectives on justice, even globally. Revenge has frequently fostered cycles of violence and retaliation following battles and crimes, impeding efforts to bring about peace and reconciliation. The desire for vengeance has influenced the dynamics of international relations from prehistoric times to the present, inspiring acts of aggression, retaliation, and protracted conflicts. In order to resolve victim grievances and promote accountability and healing, the field of transitional justice works to confront the legacy of past injustices and atrocities. The quest of long-term stability and healing might be hampered by calls for revenge or punitive actions against offenders.



THE EMERGENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Global justice and accountability have been shifted with the creation of ad hoc tribunals like the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and international criminal courts like the International Criminal Court (ICC). But striking the right balance between honoring the ideals of impartiality and due process and sating victims' thirst for vengeance presents difficulties. The pursuit of revenge in international justice must be balanced by respect for human rights and the rule of law. Violent acts carried out arbitrarily damage the reputation of the justice system and prolong violent cycles. Building faith in the international legal system requires upholding universal ideals of justice, such as accountability, fair trials, and victim restitution. Effective international justice systems work to stop atrocities in the future in addition to addressing previous crimes. The international community can prevent further abuses and contribute to a more just and peaceful world by holding those responsible for violations accountable and encouraging a culture of accountability and respect for human rights.

Revenge within the international justice system presents a complex and multifaceted challenge, intertwining with issues of accountability, reconciliation, and human rights. While victims may find a sense of emotional relief through revenge, its pursuit can obstruct efforts to attain enduring peace and justice. By adhering to principles of accountability, impartiality, and respect for human rights, the international community can work towards a fairer and more harmonious global order.

Based on the above, we realized that justice is a principle rooted in fairness, moral, legal, and socio-political consciousness. Justice aims to establish a balanced and equitable society by ensuring that actions are appropriately rewarded or punished in accordance with established laws and moral codes. It focuses on the broader societal good, restoring order, and upholding human rights. It involves a structured and impartial mechanism for decision-making, such as courts or tribunals. Justice seeks to uphold due process, fairness, and the rule of law, ensuring that all parties have equitable opportunities to present their cases. While, the desire for revenge and one's own feelings are what motivate retribution. Anger and the need for relief or self-satisfaction are the main drivers of revenge. It frequently ignores larger societal effects in favor of punitive measures that have the potential to prolong

violent cycles and often leads to further conflict and violence. It can damage the integrity of the justice system and impede efforts to achieve lasting peace and reconciliation. Revenge typically satisfies immediate emotional needs but fails to address underlying issues or promote long-term harmony.

The pursuit of revenge and justice symbolize two radically dissimilar strategies for righting wrongs and upholding law and order. Justice aims to maintain equity, due process, and social harmony; revenge, on the other hand, is motivated by anger and the need for instant retribution. Within the field of international law, organizations such as the International Criminal Court (ICC) try to demonstrate the fundamental and procedural justice principles, guaranteeing responsibility and the rule of law while promoting world peace and harmony. It is still difficult to strike a compromise between the victims' need for justice and their need for revenge. Maintaining universal values of justice, like human rights and accountability, is essential to establishing confidence in the global legal system and promoting a more equitable and peaceful global community.

Establishment of the ICC

The term "international justice system" refers to a convoluted web of judicial agencies and procedures intended to deal with and bring cases against those who perpetrate major transnational crimes, including aggression, war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. Ensuring accountability for these serious human rights breaches and advancing global peace, reconciliation, and the rule of law are the main objectives of the international justice system.

A key element of the international justice system is the International Criminal Court (ICC)¹, a permanent institution founded in 2002 and located in The Hague, Netherlands. The ICC holds jurisdiction over individuals charged with the most severe international crimes and functions independently of the United Nations. As a court of last resort, it intervenes when national courts are unable or unwilling to prosecute those responsible for international crimes. International commissions of inquiry, truth and reconciliation commissions, and hybrid courts are additional tools in the International Justice System. These organizations are essential in looking into and recording violations of human rights, compensating victims, and making sure the truth about past atrocities is made public. Even while the International Justice System has made great progress in making people answerable for transnational crimes,

¹ <https://online.lincoln.ac.uk/what-is-the-role-of-international-criminal-justice-systems/>



there are still issues and complaints with the way it operates. These difficulties include problems with the application of arrest warrants, the boundaries of universal jurisdiction, the politicization of international law, and the requirement that states cooperate more when it comes to turning over individuals.

Despite these obstacles, the International Justice System continues to be a vital instrument for advancing fairness, responsibility, and the defense of human rights globally. The International Justice System is essential to preventing future tragedies and maintaining the values of justice and the rule of law in the international community because it sets up procedures for the prosecution and punishment of those who commit international crimes.

The International Criminal Court was established under the Rome Statute² as the first permanent international court created through a treaty to combat impunity for the numerous grave crimes committed in the 20th century. Following the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials in 1948, the United Nations General Assembly acknowledged the necessity of establishing a permanent international court to address similar atrocities. Discussions surrounding the creation of such a court have taken place within and outside the United Nations since then.

In the 20th century, definitions for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes were formally adopted. The Nuremberg and Tokyo trials focused on prosecuting individuals for war crimes, crimes against peace, and crimes against humanity committed during World War II.

In July 1998, in Rome, 120 member states of the UN adopted the Rome Statute, which established the International Criminal Court as a permanent judicial institution. The Rome Statute came into force on July 1, 2002, following the ratification by 60 countries.

The International Criminal Court holds the distinction of being the first permanent legal body with the authority to prosecute individuals accountable for genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. As a result, the Court has the jurisdiction to hold responsible those individuals who have committed the most serious crimes of concern to the international community, distinguishing it from the International Court of Justice, which resolves disputes between states at an international level.

The International Criminal Court, unlike other international and hybrid criminal courts, is a permanent

establishment with jurisdiction over crimes committed after the Rome Statute's entry into force. Funding for the Court primarily comes from assessed contributions from States parties and voluntary contributions from various entities. States become parties to the ICC upon ratifying the Rome Treaty, making crimes committed by their nationals or on their territory subject to the Court's jurisdiction. As of July 1, 2012, there were 33 African States, 19 are Asia-Pacific States, 19 are from Eastern Europe, 28 are from Latin American and Caribbean States, and 25 are from Western European and other States. The Russian Federation signed the Rome Statute in 2000 but has not ratified it, thus not being an ICC State party. Several countries, including the United States, China, India, Israel, and Iran, oppose the ICC's concept, fearing it encroaches on state sovereignty and grants vast powers to the Court.

Jurisdiction and Principles of the ICC

The Rome Statute, as a key international treaty, includes a Preamble, 13 chapters, and 128 articles. Right from the preamble of the Statute, an essential principle guiding the Court's structure, known as the principle of complementary jurisdiction, is emphasized: "The International Criminal Court, as defined in this Statute, shall act in addition to national criminal justice institutions." The Court's role is to support national judicial systems if they are lacking or unable to address certain crimes. This signifies that the Court does not hold precedence over national courts and certainly does not have exclusive jurisdiction. In contrast to the ad hoc UN tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, national courts take precedence over the international court in terms of competence.

The Statute includes current international standards and principles of criminal prosecution. For example, no one will be prosecuted or punished by the Court in connection with an act that was not a crime or did not provide for such punishment at the time of its commission (Articles 22, 23). The Statute ensures the right to a fair trial. For instance, the accused must be present during the trial (Article 63); the accused is presumed innocent until proven guilty in court under applicable law (Article 66.1); the burden of proof lies with the Prosecutor to convince the Court of the accused's guilt beyond any doubt (Article 66.2, 66.3). Article 67 outlines the accused's rights to a fair and public hearing following standards set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and other widely recognized international documents. The

² <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/rome-statute-international-criminal-court>



protection of vulnerable witnesses and victims is also ensured throughout legal proceedings, with the Court deciding what evidence is admissible or not (Articles 68, 69). Additionally, the Court has the authority to prosecute individuals who attempt to obstruct justice, such as by providing false testimony, offering bribes to judges, or threatening them (Article 70).

Core International Crimes Under the Rome Statute

The Rome Statute limits the court's jurisdiction to the most serious crimes, including first at all genocide, which refers to the intent to completely or partially exterminate a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group by killing its members, causing serious physical or mental harm, creating living conditions for their destruction, preventing childbearing, or forcibly transferring children (as stated in Article 6). The Statute aligns with the 1948 Genocide Convention but does not cover political destruction of groups in its current definition. Nevertheless, such actions can still be prosecuted as crimes against humanity.

Secondly, crimes against humanity constitute some of the most serious violations of international law concerning systematic attacks on civilians committed during war or in peacetime. As a complex act, crimes against humanity, together with genocide, war crimes and the crime of aggression, are among the most serious international crimes or are the most serious international crimes of concern to the entire international community. Having appeared for the first time in the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal in 1945, the category of crimes against humanity has become an innovation in international law.

In paragraph "c" of Article 6 of the Charter, it was defined as "murder, extermination, enslavement, exile and other atrocities committed against the civilian population before or during the war, or persecution for political, racial or religious reasons". In 1993, crimes against humanity were included in the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), and in 1994 it was included to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR).

Let's look at some historical examples of genocide and crimes against humanity and the measures taken by the international community to prevent and punish them.

One of the most famous and large-scale crimes against humanity is the events in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. During the breakup of Yugoslavia, there were numerous acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing and other crimes against humanity committed by various parties to the conflict. One of the most horrific episodes was

the Srebrenica genocide in 1995, when Bosnian Serbs killed more than 8,000 Bosnian Muslims. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), established by the United Nations in 1993, has reviewed many cases related to these crimes and sentenced many of the perpetrators. The ICTY has become an important step in the development of international criminal justice and ensuring justice for victims.

Another example is genocide Khmer Rouge regime³ under the leadership of Pol Pot between 1975 and 1979. The Khmer Rouge sought to create an agrarian communist society and used brutal methods to achieve their goals. As part of their policy, urban people were forcibly relocated to rural areas to work in the fields. Anyone who resisted, or even was simply suspected of disloyalty to the regime, was arrested, tortured and executed.

One of the most terrifying places was the S-21 prison in Phnom Penh, known as Tuol Sleng. About 20,000 people, including men, women and children, were tortured and killed in this former educational institution. The victims were not only intellectuals, officials and former soldiers, but also ordinary people suspected of disloyalty. It is estimated that about 1.7 - 2 million people out of an estimated 8 million people in Cambodia died during the reign of the Khmer Rouge. These deaths occurred as a result of mass executions, starvation, exhaustion, disease and forced labor.

In conclusion, genocide and crimes against humanity, which are typified by deliberate assaults on civilians in both times of war and peace, are among the gravest transgressions of international law. The category has changed since it was first introduced in the 1945 Nuremberg Tribunal Charter, to include crimes including murder, extermination, enslavement, and persecution due to political, racial, or religious beliefs. Addressing tragedies such as those that occurred in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s and under the Khmer Rouge regime in Cambodia has been made possible in large part by this legal framework. The creation of international tribunals, like the ICTY and ICTR, emphasizes the importance of justice and accountability in the international community and highlights the worldwide commitment to preventing and punishing such crimes. These efforts not only seek to bring perpetrators to justice but also to provide a measure of solace and recognition to the victims and survivors, reaffirming the collective dedication to upholding human rights and international law

³ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Khmer-Rouge>



Thirdly, war crimes⁴ are violations of the laws and customs of warfare which dictate the conduct of armed groups during conflicts, with the aim of safeguarding civilians, prisoners of war, cultural heritage, among others. These crimes encompass grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions and other regulations applicable in international armed conflicts, as well as in non-international conflicts when carried out on a large scale or as part of a premeditated plan or policy.

Looking at war crimes in a more comprehensive way, they can be categorized as: a) crimes against individuals in need of special protection; b) crimes against individuals involved in providing humanitarian aid and peacekeeping efforts; c) crimes against property and other entitlements; d) methods of warfare that are forbidden; and e) means of warfare that are prohibited. Examples of war crimes include intentional attacks on civilian populations or individual non-combatant civilians, attacks on buildings, medical facilities, or vehicles marked with distinctive emblems under the Geneva Conventions, deliberate targeting of humanitarian aid providers or peacekeeping missions as defined by the United Nations Charter, destruction of religious, educational, or historical sites that are not military objectives, looting of cities during wartime, sexual violence, recruitment of children under fifteen into armed groups, forced displacement of civilians, treacherous killing of enemy combatants, and causing harm to prisoners of war through non-essential medical or scientific experiments. Such acts, unless required by immediate military necessity, constitute war crimes as per the Rome Statute.

Article 8 of the Rome Statute categories war crimes as follows:

Grave breaches of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, related to international armed conflict;

Other serious violations of the laws and customs applicable in international armed conflict;

Serious violations of Article 3 common to the four 1949 Geneva Conventions, related to armed conflict not of an international character;

Other serious violations of the laws and customs applicable in armed conflict not of an international character.

Unlike genocide and crimes against humanity, war crimes can target a variety of victims, be they combatants or non-combatants, depending on the specific nature of the offense. International armed conflicts involve victims such as injured military personnel on land and sea, prisoners of war, and civilians. In non-international armed conflicts,

protection extends to individuals not actively participating in the hostilities, including soldiers who have surrendered and those incapacitated by illness, injury, detainment, or other reasons. Additionally, both types of conflicts provide safeguarding for medical professionals, religious figures, humanitarian aid workers, and civil defense personnel.

One of the most war crimes is The Nanjing Massacre, also called the Rape of Nanjing, is regarded as one of the most horrific instances of mass violence in contemporary history. It took place during the Second Sino-Japanese War, starting on December 13, 1937, when Japanese forces captured the Chinese capital of Nanjing. This period was characterized by extreme acts of mass murder, mass rape, and widespread devastation, leaving an enduring mark on the memory of China and the international community. The magnitude of the massacre is immense, with estimates of the Chinese death toll ranging from 100,000 to over 300,000. Victims consisted of unarmed soldiers, civilians, and individuals seen as threats. Executions were carried out with eerie efficiency, often targeting groups of prisoners who were systematically put to death. Alongside mass killings, Japanese soldiers committed widespread sexual violence, with tens of thousands of women, spanning various ages, being subjected to rape. Many of these women were subsequently killed, adding to the horror and cruelty of the occupation. The significant extent of sexual violence in Nanjing has left a particularly distressing legacy, shedding light on the vulnerabilities experienced by women in times of conflict.

Following the conclusion of World War II, those responsible for the Nanjing Massacre faced trial at the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE) in Tokyo from 1946 to 1948. This legal process sought to hold Japanese leaders accountable for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against peace, with the Nanjing Massacre playing a significant role in the proceedings. The events in Nanjing and the subsequent war crimes trials underscore the profound impact of wartime atrocities on international law and human rights. They emphasize the crucial need for accountability and justice in the aftermath of such atrocities, establishing essential legal precedents that continue to shape the prosecution of war crimes today. The massacre serves as a poignant reminder of the depths of human cruelty and emphasizes the enduring significance of remembrance and education in preventing similar atrocities in the future.

⁴ <https://www.icc-cpi.int/about/how-the-court-works>



Fourth, the crime of aggression is clearly defined in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC). It encompasses the planning, preparation, initiation, or execution of an act of aggression by an individual in a position of power within a state. This act of aggression must be of such gravity, scale, and character that it represents a blatant violation of the principles outlined in the Charter of the United Nations. An act of aggression, as per the definition, involves the use of armed force by one state against the sovereignty, territorial integrity, or political independence of another state. This use of force is not in line with the principles established in the UN Charter. Some examples of acts of aggression include invasion, military occupation, annexation through force, and blockades of ports or coasts.

The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court specifically addresses the crime of aggression in articles 8 bis 1 and 2. These articles outline the parameters of what constitutes the crime of aggression and specify that individuals who are in positions of authority and who are responsible for planning or executing acts of aggression can be held accountable under international law.

Overall, the Rome Statute's inclusion of the crime of aggression reflects the global community's commitment to upholding international peace and security and holding individuals accountable for actions that threaten the stability of the international system.

The annexation of Crimea by Russia in 2014⁵ is considered a clear example of aggression and a violation of international law, as it involved the use of military force to exert control over a region that was internationally recognized as a part of Ukraine. The events surrounding the annexation of Crimea continue to have implications for the stability and security of the region, as well as for international relations more broadly.

International Cooperation and Enforcement Challenges

The ICC relies on collaboration with countries worldwide for various tasks, such as arrests, transfers of individuals to The Hague, asset freezing, and sentence enforcement, since it does not possess its own law enforcement resources. Although it is not a UN entity, the ICC has a cooperation arrangement with the United Nations. In instances where the Court lacks jurisdiction, the United Nations Security Council can refer cases to the ICC, as seen in Darfur (Sudan) and Libya. The ICC actively promotes understanding and

cooperation globally through events like seminars and conferences, engaging with both States Parties and non-States Parties.

Lastly, cooperation can develop both within the framework of existing structures and involve the emergence of new governing bodies. The United Nations (UN) was established with the aim of developing cooperation between States in preserving peace and preventing wars. Initially, it consisted of 50 member states of the anti-Hitler coalition, but later the UN united almost all the internationally recognized states of the world.

International cooperation in the fight against crime is an important component of the international legal system. It is necessary to effectively counter transnational crimes such as terrorism, drug trafficking, cybercrime, human trafficking and smuggling. The main areas of international cooperation include the creation of international treaties, information exchange, legal assistance and coordination of law enforcement agencies in various countries.

International cooperation in the fight against crime is understood as combining the efforts of States and other participants in international relations in order to increase the effectiveness of crime prevention, combating them and correcting offenders. The need to expand and deepen international cooperation in the fight against crime is due to both qualitative and quantitative changes in crime itself, the growth of "foreign investments" in the total mass of crimes of individual States.

Organizationally, international cooperation in the field of combating crime is headed by the United Nations. From the content of Article 1 of the UN Charter,¹ it follows that, among other tasks, this organization is called upon to ensure international cooperation of States. The implementation of this task, according to Chapter 10 of the UN Charter, is entrusted to the UN Economic and Social Council. Among the subjects of cooperation in the fight against crime, non-governmental organizations with consultative status with the United Nations, as well as Interpol, are also distinguished. Currently, the United Nations and other international intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations are making great efforts to organize and implement effective international cooperation in crime prevention and control. They possess colossal data banks, regulatory materials, criminological and criminal law data, and criminal policy research that can be used

⁵ <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9968/>



by each country in order to more effectively combat national and transnational crime.

However, the activities of these organizations are very strictly regulated by numerous regulations governing the international fight against crime. Since the approval and ratification of these regulations, in most cases, is the sovereign business of a particular state, it can be assumed that all these organizations are still very limited in their capabilities and means, and cannot always act effectively. In addition, these organizations may be dependent on specific States – due to the participation of States in their financing, or due to the factor of their location on the territory of a particular State.

The international fight against crime is one of the many areas of cooperation between States. Like all cooperation, it develops on the unified basis of the basic or general principles of their communication historically established in international law. These principles are specified normatively in two large groups of documents: 1) International pacts, agreements and conventions that form the general principles and vectors of international cooperation in the field of combating crime. A special place in the international environment belongs to the documents adopted by the United Nations.

2) Treaties that shape the policy and practice of States in their joint fight against crime

The problem of improving international cooperation in the field of combating crime is currently one of the most urgent in the activities of law enforcement agencies in developed countries of the world. Modern crime has acquired qualitatively new forms, its mercenary orientation has increased, the number of crimes with international connections has increased significantly, and an increasing number of international criminal groups are being discovered. It can be assumed that major international organizations, primarily the United Nations, have the greatest potential in countering modern crime. This is due to both regulatory and legal, as well as social factors.

International cooperation in the fight against crime includes the participation of various countries and organizations in joint efforts to prevent and suppress criminal activity. Here are some examples of countries and their participation:

1. USA and Canada:

- Border cooperation: The United States and Canada are working together on border protection and countering cross-border crime, including drug trafficking and illegal migration. An example is Integrated border Management (Integrated Border Enforcement Teams, IBETs).

2. Germany and France:

- Europol: Both countries actively cooperate within the framework of Europol to combat organized crime, terrorism and cybercrime. Europol coordinates operations and information exchange between EU police agencies.

3. Japan and South Korea:

- Joint operations to combat organized crime: Cooperation in the fight against mafia groups and cross-border human trafficking, as well as the exchange of advanced technologies and investigative techniques. These examples illustrate how countries around the world are coming together to fight crime using various platforms and methods of international cooperation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, international cooperation in the fight against crime is a crucial and complex component of the global legal framework, aiming to enhance the effectiveness of crime prevention and enforcement across borders. The establishment of bodies like the United Nations has been instrumental in fostering such cooperation, evolving from its initial 50 member states to a near-universal membership that addresses a myriad of transnational criminal activities. The main areas of international cooperation encompass the creation of treaties, information exchange, legal assistance, and coordinated law enforcement efforts. Despite the regulatory limitations and dependence on state cooperation and funding, significant strides have been made by organizations such as the UN, Interpol, and various non-governmental organizations in pooling resources, data, and expertise to combat modern crime. Examples of effective cooperation include the USA and Canada's border initiatives, Germany and France's collaboration through Europol, and joint operations between Japan and South Korea. These instances highlight the diverse and dynamic nature of international partnerships aimed at curbing crime, illustrating the vital role of collaborative efforts in enhancing global security and justice.

Finally, we realized that all these arguments show why an international justice system is necessary. The International Criminal Court plays a key role in ensuring peace and tranquility by preventing and suppressing serious crimes such as genocide, crimes against humanity and aggression. It provides victims with the opportunity to be heard and receive compensation for the suffering they have suffered. It is important to note that the activities of the ICC contribute to building trust between States and stimulate international cooperation in the fight against impunity. In addition, the ICC plays an important role in the development of international



law by establishing precedents and norms that contribute to the further improvement of legal standards. This, in turn, helps countries to implement more effective mechanisms for the protection of human rights and the prevention of crime at the national level. It is worth emphasizing that the ICC operates on the basis of the principles of justice, objectivity and independence. His work demonstrates that even the most powerful individuals and States cannot escape responsibility for their actions. This message serves as an important warning to those who may be considering committing serious crimes. The cooperation efforts of the international community aimed at supporting and strengthening the ICC are crucial for creating a global justice system that not only punishes the perpetrators, but also prevents future crimes. Only through international cooperation and solidarity can we hope to create a world in which the rule of law, justice and respect for human dignity become fundamental principles.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. <https://online.lincoln.ac.uk/what-is-the-role-of-international-criminal-justice-systems/> (Role of International Criminal Justice System)
2. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/rome-statute-international-criminal-court> (Rome Statute - International Criminal Court)
3. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Khmer-Rouge> (Khmer Rouge regime)
4. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/about/how-the-court-works> (About International Crimes)
5. <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9968/> (Conflict in Ukraine)