

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL
LAW PRACTITIONER
LIBRARY • VOLUME II

ELEMENTS OF CRIMES UNDER
INTERNATIONAL LAW

GIDEON BOAS, JAMES L. BISCHOFF
AND NATALIE L. REID

This page intentionally left blank

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL LAW PRACTITIONER LIBRARY

Volume II of the International Criminal Law Practitioner Library series focuses on the core categories of international crimes: crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes. The authors present a comprehensive and critical review of the law on the elements of these crimes and their underlying offences, and examine how they interact with the forms of responsibility discussed in Volume I. They also consider the effect of the focus in early ICTY and ICTR proceedings on relatively low-level accused for the development of legal definitions that are sometimes ill-suited for leadership cases, where the accused had little or no physical involvement in the crimes. The book's main focus is the jurisprudence of the ad hoc Tribunals, but the approaches of the ICC and the various hybrid tribunals are also given significant attention. The relevant jurisprudence up to 1 December 2007 has been surveyed, making this a highly useful and timely work.

GIDEON BOAS, a former Senior Legal Officer at the ICTY, is a Senior Lecturer in Law at Monash University Law Faculty and an international law consultant.

JAMES L. BISCHOFF, a former Associate Legal Officer at the ICTY, is an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of the Legal Adviser of the United States Department of State.

NATALIE L. REID, a former Associate Legal Officer at the ICTY, is an Associate with Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, New York.

ELEMENTS OF CRIMES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

International Criminal Law Practitioner Library Series

VOLUME II

GIDEON BOAS
JAMES L. BISCHOFF
NATALIE L. REID

The views expressed in this book are those of the authors alone. They do not necessarily reflect the views or official positions of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the United Nations in general, the United States Department of State, or the United States government.



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521878302

© Gideon Boas, James L. Bischoff and Natalie L. Reid 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2009

ISBN-13 978-0-511-47454-5 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-87830-2 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Foreword</i> | <i>page xv</i> |
| <i>Table of Authorities</i> | <i>xviii</i> |
| 1 An overview of crimes under international law | 1 |
| 1.1 Legal sources for definitions of crimes under international law | 5 |
| 1.2 Structure of crimes under international law | 9 |
| 2 Crimes against humanity | 14 |
| 2.1 Evolution of crimes against humanity | 18 |
| 2.1.1 Development through the Second World War | 18 |
| 2.1.2 Post-Second World War development | 22 |
| 2.1.3 Developments through the <i>ad hoc</i> Tribunals and beyond | 26 |
| 2.2 Elements of crimes against humanity | 31 |
| 2.2.1 Requirements unique to the <i>ad hoc</i> tribunals | 32 |
| 2.2.1.1 ICTY: armed conflict as a jurisdictional requirement | 32 |
| 2.2.1.2 ICTR: discriminatory basis as a jurisdictional requirement | 33 |
| 2.2.2 General requirements | 35 |
| 2.2.2.1 Preliminary question: whose conduct and mental state may satisfy the contextual general requirements? | 35 |
| 2.2.2.2 The attack requirement | 41 |
| 2.2.2.3 The targeting requirement | 42 |
| 2.2.2.3.1 The definition of a ‘civilian’ | 43 |
| 2.2.2.3.2 The definition of a ‘civilian population’ | 49 |
| 2.2.2.3.3 The meaning of ‘directed against’ | 50 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| 2.2.2.4 | The ‘widespread or systematic’ requirement | 51 |
| 2.2.2.5 | The first contextual requirement: the underlying offence as part of the attack | 53 |
| 2.2.2.6 | The second contextual requirement: the knowledge that the offence is part of the attack | 54 |
| 2.2.3 | Underlying offences | 56 |
| 2.2.3.1 | Murder | 57 |
| 2.2.3.2 | Extermination | 60 |
| 2.2.3.3 | Enslavement | 65 |
| 2.2.3.4 | Deportation | 68 |
| 2.2.3.4.1 | The displacement of persons was caused by expulsion or other coercive acts | 69 |
| 2.2.3.4.2 | The persons displaced were lawfully present in the area | 70 |
| 2.2.3.4.3 | The displacement occurred without grounds permitted under international law | 71 |
| 2.2.3.4.4 | Is intent that the removal be permanent an element of forcible displacement? | 72 |
| 2.2.3.4.5 | Additional element for deportation | 73 |
| 2.2.3.5 | Imprisonment | 75 |
| 2.2.3.6 | Torture | 78 |
| 2.2.3.6.1 | The severity requirement | 80 |
| 2.2.3.6.2 | The prohibited purpose requirement | 83 |
| 2.2.3.7 | Rape | 84 |
| 2.2.3.8 | Persecution on political, racial, and religious grounds | 88 |
| 2.2.3.8.1 | Specific requirements for persecution as a crime against humanity | 89 |
| | The equal gravity requirement | 90 |
| | The requirement of discrimination ‘in fact’ | 91 |
| | The discriminatory intent requirement | 94 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 2.2.3.8.2 | Underlying offences qualifying as persecution as a crime against humanity | 97 |
| 2.2.3.9 | Other inhumane acts | 99 |
| 2.2.3.9.1 | Specific requirements for inhumane acts as crimes against humanity | 99 |
| | The suffering or attack on dignity requirement | 100 |
| | The similar gravity requirement | 101 |
| | The requirement of direct or indirect intent | 102 |
| 2.2.3.9.2 | Underlying offences qualifying as inhumane acts as crimes against humanity | 102 |
| 2.3 | Crimes against humanity in the International Criminal Court and Internationalised Tribunals | 104 |
| 2.3.1 | The International Criminal Court | 104 |
| 2.3.1.1 | The Rome Statute | 104 |
| 2.3.1.2 | The elements of crimes | 110 |
| 2.3.2 | The Internationalised Tribunals | 115 |
| 2.3.2.1 | Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) | 115 |
| 2.3.2.2 | East Timor: Special Panels for Serious Crimes (SPSC) | 120 |
| 2.3.2.3 | The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) | 128 |
| 2.3.2.4 | Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal (SICT) (also known as the Iraqi High Tribunal (IHT)) | 132 |
| 3 | Genocide | 138 |
| 3.1 | Evolution of genocide as an international crime | 144 |
| 3.1.1 | Development through the Second World War | 144 |
| 3.1.2 | Post-Second World War development | 146 |
| 3.1.3 | Developments in the <i>ad hoc</i> Tribunals and beyond | 153 |
| 3.2 | Elements of genocide | 154 |
| 3.2.1 | General requirements | 156 |
| 3.2.1.1 | Preliminary question: who must have the genocidal intent? | 157 |
| 3.2.1.2 | Genocidal intent | 159 |
| 3.2.1.2.1 | Specific intent | 160 |
| 3.2.1.2.2 | Material destruction | 164 |

| | | | |
|-------|-----------|--|-----|
| | 3.2.1.2.3 | Definitions of the protected group and the targeted group | 168 |
| | 3.2.1.3 | Requirement of actual membership in the group? | 173 |
| 3.2.2 | | Underlying offences | 176 |
| | 3.2.2.1 | Killing | 178 |
| | 3.2.2.1.1 | Physical elements | 178 |
| | 3.2.2.1.2 | Mental element | 178 |
| | 3.2.2.2 | Causing serious bodily or mental harm | 181 |
| | 3.2.2.2.1 | Physical elements | 181 |
| | 3.2.2.2.2 | Mental element | 183 |
| | 3.2.2.3 | Deliberate infliction of eventually destructive conditions of life | 183 |
| | 3.2.2.3.1 | Examples of qualifying conduct | 183 |
| | 3.2.2.3.2 | Mental element? | 186 |
| | 3.2.2.4 | Prevention of births | 186 |
| | 3.2.2.4.1 | Examples of qualifying conduct | 186 |
| | 3.2.2.4.2 | Mental element? | 187 |
| | 3.2.2.5 | Forcible transfer of children | 187 |
| | 3.2.2.5.1 | Mental element? | 188 |
| 3.3 | | Elements of conspiracy to commit genocide | 188 |
| 3.4 | | Elements of direct and public incitement to commit genocide | 191 |
| 3.5 | | Elements of attempt to commit genocide | 197 |
| 3.6 | | Genocide in The International Criminal Court and Internationalised Tribunals | 198 |
| | 3.6.1 | The International Criminal Court | 198 |
| | 3.6.1.1 | The Rome Statute | 198 |
| | 3.6.1.2 | The Elements of Crimes | 201 |
| | 3.6.2 | The Internationalised Tribunals | 206 |
| | 3.6.2.1 | Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) | 206 |
| | 3.6.2.2 | East Timor: Special Panels for Serious Crimes (SPSC) | 206 |
| | 3.6.2.3 | The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) | 207 |
| | 3.6.2.4 | Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal (SICT) (also known as the Iraqi High Tribunal (IHT)) | 210 |
| 4 | | War crimes | 213 |
| | 4.1 | Evolution of war crimes | 219 |
| | 4.1.1 | Ancient to modern conceptions of war crimes | 219 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| 4.1.2 | The birth of modern international humanitarian law sanctioning war crimes | 223 |
| 4.1.3 | The distinction between international and non-international armed conflict in war crimes law | 227 |
| 4.1.4 | Contribution of the <i>ad hoc</i> Tribunals to the development of war crimes law | 230 |
| 4.2 | Elements of war crimes | 232 |
| 4.2.1 | General requirements for war crimes | 232 |
| 4.2.1.1 | Existence of an armed conflict | 233 |
| 4.2.1.1.1 | Is knowledge of the existence of the armed conflict an element of war crimes? | 236 |
| 4.2.1.2 | Nexus between the underlying offence and the armed conflict | 239 |
| 4.2.1.3 | Additional general requirements for grave breaches of the Geneva conventions: war crimes committed in international armed conflict | 243 |
| 4.2.1.3.1 | The requirement of an international armed conflict | 244 |
| | Knowledge of the nature of the armed conflict | 248 |
| 4.2.1.3.2 | The protected persons or property requirement | 250 |
| 4.2.1.4 | Additional general requirement for violations of Common Article 3 and Additional Protocol II under Article 4 of the ICTR Statute: war crimes committed in non-international armed conflict | 256 |
| 4.2.1.5 | Additional general requirements for violations of the laws or customs of war under Article 3 of the ICTY Statute: war crimes committed in any armed conflict | 258 |
| 4.2.1.5.1 | The alleged underlying offence infringes a rule of customary or conventional international humanitarian law | 260 |
| 4.2.1.5.2 | The violation is ‘serious’ | 262 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| 4.2.1.5.3 | The violation of the rule entails the individual criminal responsibility of the person breaching the rule | 262 |
| 4.2.1.5.4 | Knowledge of status of targets of underlying offences | 263 |
| 4.2.2 | Underlying offences | 263 |
| 4.2.2.1 | Destruction of property | 264 |
| 4.2.2.1.1 | Extensive destruction under Article 2(d) of ICTY Statute | 264 |
| 4.2.2.1.2 | Wanton destruction and unjustified devastation under Article 3(b) of the ICTY Statute | 266 |
| 4.2.2.1.3 | Destruction or wilful damage to institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, historic monuments and works of art and science under Article 3(d) | 268 |
| 4.2.2.2 | Hostage-taking | 270 |
| 4.2.2.3 | Inhuman treatment or cruel treatment | 271 |
| 4.2.2.4 | Murder or wilful killing | 273 |
| 4.2.2.5 | Outrages upon personal dignity | 275 |
| 4.2.2.6 | Plunder, pillage, or extensive appropriation | 278 |
| 4.2.2.7 | Rape | 280 |
| 4.2.2.8 | Slavery or unlawful labour | 281 |
| 4.2.2.9 | Terror | 281 |
| 4.2.2.10 | Torture | 284 |
| 4.2.2.11 | Unlawful attack on civilians and civilian objects | 285 |
| 4.2.2.12 | Unlawful confinement | 287 |
| 4.2.2.13 | Unlawful deportation or transfer | 288 |
| 4.2.2.14 | Violence to life and person | 288 |
| 4.2.2.15 | Wilfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health | 290 |
| 4.2.2.16 | Other underlying offences | 290 |
| 4.3 | War crimes in the International Criminal Court and Internationalised Tribunals | 291 |
| 4.3.1 | The International Criminal Court | 291 |
| 4.3.1.1 | The Rome Statute | 291 |
| 4.3.1.2 | The Elements of Crimes | 297 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----|
| 4.3.2 | The Internationalised Tribunals | 304 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) | 304 |
| 4.3.2.2 | East Timor: Special Panels for Serious Crimes (SPSC) | 310 |
| 4.3.2.3 | The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) | 312 |
| 4.3.2.4 | Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal (SICT) (also known as the Iraqi High Tribunal (IHT)) | 314 |
| 5 | Cumulative convictions and sentencing | 318 |
| 5.1 | Cumulative and alternative charging | 319 |
| 5.2 | Cumulative convictions | 324 |
| 5.2.1 | Pre- <i>Čelebići</i> jurisprudence | 324 |
| 5.2.2 | The February 2001 <i>Čelebići</i> appeal judgement | 326 |
| 5.2.3 | Application of the <i>Čelebići</i> test to different statutory crimes ('inter-article' convictions) | 331 |
| 5.2.4 | Application of the <i>Čelebići</i> test to different underlying offences of the same statutory crime ('intra-article' convictions) | 334 |
| 5.2.4.1 | Intra-article convictions for crimes against humanity | 335 |
| 5.2.4.2 | Intra-article convictions for war crimes | 348 |
| 5.2.4.3 | Intra-article convictions for genocide | 349 |
| 5.2.5 | Effect of trial chamber error in failing to convict cumulatively when cumulative convictions are available | 354 |
| 5.3 | Sentencing | 356 |
| 5.3.1 | No coherent sentencing practice | 359 |
| 5.3.2 | No hierarchy of crimes | 363 |
| 5.3.3 | The Appeals Chamber's interference in sentence determination by trial chambers | 367 |
| 6 | Conclusion | 370 |
| 6.1 | The content and context of international crimes | 371 |
| 6.1.1 | Definitions of the crimes should not refer only to the accused or the physical perpetrator | 372 |
| 6.1.2 | The elements of the crimes and the elements of the forms of responsibility answer separate legal inquiries | 373 |
| 6.1.3 | Judgements should specify, in their dispositions, the precise conduct for which the accused has been convicted | 374 |
| 6.2 | The relative importance of the crimes in the different courts and tribunals | 375 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 6.3 | Variations in the definitions of crimes in the different courts and tribunals | 379 |
| 6.4 | The need for a more coherent conviction and sentencing practice | 383 |
| | <i>Annex: Elements of core international crimes and sample combinations with forms of responsibility</i> | 387 |
| 1. | Common underlying offences | 390 |
| 1.1 | Arbitrary deprivation of liberty | 390 |
| 1.2 | Destruction of real or personal property | 390 |
| 1.3 | Forcible displacement | 390 |
| 1.4 | Murder | 391 |
| 1.5 | Rape | 391 |
| 1.6 | Torture | 391 |
| 2. | Crimes against humanity | 391 |
| 2.1 | General requirements for crimes against humanity | 391 |
| 2.2 | Murder as a crime against humanity | 392 |
| 2.3 | Extermination as a crime against humanity | 392 |
| 2.4 | Enslavement as a crime against humanity | 392 |
| 2.5 | Deportation as a crime against humanity | 393 |
| 2.6 | Imprisonment as a crime against humanity | 393 |
| 2.7 | Torture as a crime against humanity | 393 |
| 2.8 | Rape as a crime against humanity | 393 |
| 2.9 | Persecution as a crime against humanity | 394 |
| 2.10 | Other inhumane acts as crimes against humanity | 396 |
| 3. | Genocide and related crimes | 397 |
| 3.1 | General requirements for genocide | 397 |
| 3.2 | Genocide by killing | 397 |
| 3.3 | Genocide by causing serious bodily harm | 397 |
| 3.4 | Genocide by causing serious mental harm | 398 |
| 3.5 | Genocide by deliberate infliction of eventually destructive conditions of life | 398 |
| 3.6 | Genocide by prevention of births | 398 |
| 3.7 | Genocide by forcibly transferring children to another group | 399 |
| 3.8 | Conspiracy to commit genocide | 399 |
| 3.9 | Direct and public incitement to commit genocide | 399 |
| 3.10 | Attempt to commit genocide | 399 |
| 4. | War crimes | 399 |
| 4.1 | General requirements for all war crimes | 399 |
| 4.2 | Additional general requirements for grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 | 400 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.3 | Additional general requirements for war crimes arising from breaches of Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions ('Common Article 3') or Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions ('Additional Protocol II') | 400 |
| 4.4 | Additional general requirements for violations of the laws or customs of war under Article 3 of the ICTY Statute | 400 |
| 4.5 | 'Extensive destruction of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly' as a grave breach | 401 |
| 4.6 | 'Wanton destruction' of property as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 401 |
| 4.7 | 'Unjustified devastation' of property as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 402 |
| 4.8 | 'Destruction or wilful damage to institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, historic monuments and works of art and science' as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 402 |
| 4.9 | Hostage-taking as a grave breach | 403 |
| 4.10 | Hostage-taking as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 403 |
| 4.11 | Inhuman treatment as a grave breach | 403 |
| 4.12 | Cruel treatment as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 404 |
| 4.13 | Wilful killing as a grave breach | 404 |
| 4.14 | Murder as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 404 |
| 4.15 | Outrages upon personal dignity as a violation of Additional Protocol II / the laws or customs of war | 405 |
| 4.16 | 'Extensive appropriation of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly' as a grave breach | 405 |
| 4.17 | Plunder as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 406 |
| 4.18 | Rape as a grave breach | 406 |
| 4.19 | Rape as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 406 |
| 4.20 | Slavery as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 407 |
| 4.21 | Unlawful labour as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 407 |
| 4.22 | Terror as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 407 |
| 4.23 | Torture as a grave breach | 408 |
| 4.24 | Torture as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 408 |
| 4.25 | Unlawful attack on civilians as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 408 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.26 | Unlawful attack on civilian objects as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 409 |
| 4.27 | Unlawful confinement of a civilian as a grave breach | 409 |
| 4.28 | Unlawful confinement as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 409 |
| 4.29 | Unlawful deportation or transfer as a grave breach | 410 |
| 4.30 | Wilfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health as a grave breach | 410 |
| 5. | Sample combinations of elements of crimes and forms of responsibility | 410 |
| 5.1 | Torture as a crime against humanity | 411 |
| 5.2 | Murder as a form of persecution as a crime against humanity | 415 |
| 5.3 | Genocide by killing | 421 |
| 5.4 | Extensive destruction of property as a grave breach | 424 |
| 5.5 | Plunder as a violation of the laws or customs of war | 429 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 435 |

Foreword

International criminal law has developed substantially in the past two decades largely due to the creation of the *ad hoc* Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda and the International Criminal Court. Although much attention has been devoted to the International Criminal Court (ICC) since 1998, on the ground that it is a truly international tribunal, international criminal law has developed mainly through the jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR). Unlike the ICC, which at the time of writing has delivered few judgments, the *ad hoc* Tribunals have been operating actively as criminal law tribunals for more than a decade. Lengthy, carefully researched, and thoroughly reasoned judgments have been handed down by judges from different countries with different judicial experience. These judgments have created a new international or transnational criminal law that draws on the experience of the Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals and national courts, and successfully integrates national and international criminal law, humanitarian law and human rights law.

The ICTY and ICTR have succeeded in developing both procedural law and substantive international criminal law. A host of orders have been given on questions of procedure designed to ensure that due process of law is respected; and many judgments have been rendered on questions of substantive law that advance international criminal justice. The first two volumes of the *International Criminal Law Practitioner Library*, written by three young international criminal lawyers who have all worked in the ICTY and been directly involved in the evolution of the law before this tribunal, deal largely with issues of substantive law. Volume I examined the law of individual criminal responsibility and focused on joint criminal enterprise, superior orders, aiding and abetting, and the planning and instigation of international crime. Volume II – *Elements of Crimes Under International Law* – examines the jurisprudence of the core crimes of international criminal law: genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes, and the subject of cumulative

convictions and sentencing. Although the ICTY and ICTR provide much of the jurisprudence described in the present volume, the jurisprudence of other tribunals is not ignored. The law of Nuremberg and Tokyo features prominently, and the law and structure of other international and internationalised tribunals – the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL), the Special Panels for Serious Crimes in East Timor (SPSC), the Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal (SICT), the Extraordinary Chambers of the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) and, of course, the International Criminal Court – are also examined.

Most of Volume II is devoted to a study of the core crimes of crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes, as applied and interpreted by the ICTY and ICTR. The evolution of each crime and its elements are addressed in the context of the jurisprudence of the *ad hoc* Tribunals, and then considered in the light of decisions of other international tribunals. Contemporary history in the form of the major criminal trials of the past two decades involving events in the Balkans, Rwanda, and Iraq are brought alive in the language of the law.

Volume II also contains a very useful Annex of the elements of core international crimes and sample combinations with forms of responsibility. This Annex will prove of great assistance to the practitioner. It will also assist the student as its detailed portrayal of the elements of each crime serves to underscore the complexities of these crimes in a jigsaw-like puzzle from which a coherent picture of each crime emerges.

The final part of Volume II deals with the vexed question of cumulative convictions and sentencing. Like national criminal courts, the ICTY, and to a lesser extent the ICTR, have grappled with the problem of cumulative and alternative charging and cumulative convictions. Whether the tribunals have reached satisfactory solutions on these subjects is carefully examined – and doubted – by the authors. The coherency – or incoherency! – of sentencing practice and policy is also described and analysed.

The authors provide an accurate portrayal and description of the law. But their study achieves much more. The approaches of different tribunals, and the approaches of different judges within the same tribunal, are contrasted and compared; and decisions are carefully analysed and criticised. This makes the study a critical portrayal of the jurisprudence of the *ad hoc* Tribunals. One need not agree with all the criticisms of the authors (indeed this writer does not!), but one must welcome their reasoned criticisms. For too long, scholars have sought to protect international tribunals (both criminal and non-criminal) from criticism on the ground that the novel and fragile nature of these institutions requires them to be sheltered from criticism to enable them to survive in the harsh world of international politics. There is no substance in such a view. International judicial institutions, like national courts, must not be beyond criticism if they are to grow and prosper. Careful

and reasoned criticism, of the kind found in this volume, contributes to the development of international criminal law and is to be welcomed.

Gideon Boas, James Bischoff and Natalie Reid are to be congratulated on a study that informs us about the content and complexities of the core crimes, and the problems of cumulative convictions and sentencing, but which at the same time makes us aware that international criminal law, like other branches of the law, is the product of the judicial search for reason and coherence in the context of legal sources and legal principle.

John Dugard
The Hague, July 2008

Table of Authorities

International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) materials

Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons
Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law

Committed in the Territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991 31, 57–65
Art. 2 215–216, 217–218, 232, 264–266, 270–273, 278–280, 284–285, 287–288,
290, 332–333, 334, 363–369

Art. 3 56, 120–128, 216–217, 219–232, 258–263, 260–261, 264, 266–273, 274,
275, 278–280, 284–285, 332–333, 334, 363–369

Art. 4 156–157, 176–177, 210–212, 256, 257, 349–354

Art. 5 31–69, 75–78, 90, 99, 101, 102, 105–106, 115, 274, 275, 332–333,
363–367

Prosecutor v. Aleksovski, Case No. IT-95-14/1

Trial Judgement 231, 258, 276, 277, 278

Appeal Judgement 55, 72, 244, 247, 253, 275–277, 324, 341, 342, 344, 345,
357, 361

Prosecutor v. Blagojević and Jokić, Case No. IT-02-60

Decision on Motion of Accused Blagojević to Dismiss Cumulative Charges 322

Trial Judgement 4, 32, 39, 42, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52–57, 59, 61, 69, 71, 72, 73, 90,
92, 95, 97–103, 155, 156, 161–163, 165, 166, 168, 169, 171, 173, 175–179,
181–183, 185, 233, 236, 241, 258, 261, 273, 274, 332, 333, 335–337, 342,
347, 351, 354

Appeal Judgement 94, 156, 157, 167, 186

Prosecutor v. Blaškić, Case No. IT-95-14

Second Amended Indictment 288

Trial Judgement 36, 37, 71, 92, 95, 97, 100, 101, 122, 125, 226, 236, 240, 241,
246, 248, 252–256, 264–266, 268–273, 278, 280, 289, 290, 357, 366

- Appeal Judgement 35, 37, 42–44, 46–48, 50–56, 59, 60, 72, 73, 88, 90, 91, 94, 95, 97, 98, 103, 163, 233, 244, 252–254, 256, 261, 270–273, 278, 281, 289, 332, 333, 336, 345, 357, 362, 369
- Prosecutor v. Brđanin and Talić*, Case No. IT-99-36
- Decision on Objections by Momir Talić to the Form of the Amended Indictment 322
- Decision on Motion for Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 98 *bis* 62
- Trial Judgement 11, 33, 42, 48, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57–64, 69–73, 79, 80, 82–84, 87, 88, 90–92, 95, 97, 103, 155, 156, 160–163, 168, 169, 171, 173–175, 177–179, 182–184, 189, 236, 240, 244, 245, 247, 248, 250, 252, 255, 258, 262, 264–267, 269, 273, 274, 285, 298, 299, 330, 332, 333, 335–337, 339, 341
- Appellant Brđanin’s Brief on Appeal 80
- Appeal Judgement 11, 63, 79–82, 90, 238, 244, 248, 269, 341
- Prosecutor v. Delalić, Mucić, Delić and Landžo*, Case No. IT-96-21 (‘Čelebići Case’)
- Trial Judgement 82, 84–86, 100, 141, 228, 232, 235, 240, 248, 253, 260, 273, 275, 278, 280, 290, 293, 295, 298
- Appeal Judgement 247, 248, 252, 253, 256, 260, 262, 273, 288, 290, 321–324, 326–334, 336, 338, 340–345, 348, 349, 351–357, 361, 362, 366, 367
- Prosecutor v. Erdemović*, Case No. IT-96-22
- Sentencing Judgement 360
- Sentencing Appeal Judgement 363, 365
- Prosecutor v. Furundžija*, Case No. IT-95-17/1
- Decision on the Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Counts 13 and 14 of the Indictment (Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction) 280
- Trial Judgement 31, 37, 79, 84, 86, 87, 151, 228, 258, 261, 278, 295, 335
- Appeal Judgement 79, 84, 86, 87, 357, 361, 363, 366, 367
- Prosecutor v. Galić*, Case. No. IT-98-29
- Indictment 282
- Trial Judgement 41, 43, 47, 56, 99, 102, 259, 262, 263, 265, 274, 282, 283, 284, 286, 309, 321, 330, 331, 348
- Appeal Judgement 7, 46, 47, 72, 231, 233, 261, 262, 282–286, 296, 309, 321, 327, 330, 332, 333, 345, 348, 357–361, 363, 366–369
- Prosecutor v. Hadžihasanović and Kubura*, Case No. IT-01-47
- Amended Indictment 288
- Third Amended Indictment 260
- Decision on the Form of the Indictment 289, 322
- Decision on Motions for Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 98 *bis* of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence 293
- Decision on Joint Defence Interlocutory Appeal of Trial Chamber Decision on Rule 98 *bis* Motions for Acquittal 226

- Trial Judgement 226, 236, 240, 259, 262, 264, 266–269, 273, 274, 279, 280, 357, 376
- Prosecutor v. Halilović*, Case No. IT-01-48
 Indictment 260
 Trial Judgement 45, 48, 241, 258, 259, 262, 263, 376
- Prosecutor v. Jelisić*, Case No. IT-95-10 365
 Trial Judgement 37, 44, 48, 59, 154, 156, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 175, 178, 179, 273
 Appeal Judgement 141, 154, 160–163, 177, 299, 329–331, 333, 341, 345, 348, 355, 357, 365
- Prosecutor v. Kordić and Čerkez*, Case No. IT-95-14/2
 Decision on the Joint Defence Motion to Dismiss the Amended Indictment for Lack of Jurisdiction Based on the Limited Jurisdictional Reach of Articles 2 and 3 261
 Trial Judgement 32, 76, 77, 99–101, 103, 117, 226, 236, 244–247, 253–255, 264–267, 269–275, 279, 280, 290, 306, 332, 338, 341, 365, 368
 Decision Authorising Respondent’s Brief to Exceed the Limit Imposed by the Practice Direction on the Length of Briefs and Motions and Granting an Extension of Time to File Brief 343
 Appeal Judgement 7, 37, 389, 42, 44, 47, 50–57, 59, 60, 76, 77–90, 95, 97–103, 105, 124, 234, 236, 246–249, 252, 253, 262, 265, 266, 268, 271, 272, 274, 278–280, 285, 286, 288, 299, 306, 327, 330–334, 336–338, 341–349, 355, 360, 385
- Prosecutor v. Krajišnik*, Case No. IT-00-39
 Trial Judgement 42, 48, 55, 90, 156, 158, 163, 165, 168, 169, 176, 178, 182, 184, 238, 256, 259, 263, 269, 342, 347, 360
- Prosecutor v. Krnojelac*, Case No. IT-97-25
 Decision on the Defence Preliminary Motion on the Form of the Indictment 319
 Trial Judgement 41, 43, 54–56, 58, 65, 66, 69, 70, 73, 75–77, 79, 80, 82–84, 88, 90–94, 100, 102, 103, 134, 272, 273, 281, 335
 Appeal Judgement 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 75, 90, 91, 93–95, 98, 108, 163, 330, 337–339, 341, 343, 345, 355
- Prosecutor v. Krstić*, Case No. IT-98-33
 Amended Indictment 339
 Decision on Defence Preliminary Motion on the Form of the Amended Indictment 320
 Trial Judgement 59, 61–63, 69, 70, 73, 147, 156, 158, 162, 165, 169, 171–174, 176, 178, 179, 181–183, 233, 273–275, 290, 338, 339
 Appeal Judgement 54, 64, 141, 155–158, 160, 162, 165–170, 172, 173, 176, 185, 186, 327, 330, 333, 336–339, 341, 343, 345–348, 355, 356, 360, 361, 365–367, 385

- Prosecutor v. Kunarac, Kovac and Vuković*, Case No. IT-96-23 & IT-96-23/1
Trial Judgement 36, 41–43, 47, 52, 54, 55, 65–67, 75, 79, 8486, 87, 101, 109, 242, 275–277, 280, 335, 365
Appeal Judgement 32, 33, 35, 36, 42, 50–56, 66–68, 75, 79–82, 84, 86, 87, 101, 106, 117, 141, 233, 240–244, 258, 259, 261, 262, 276, 277, 295, 326, 327, 330–333, 335, 336, 345, 347, 348, 357, 363
- Prosecutor v. Kupreškić, Kupreškić, Kupreškić, Josipović and Šantić*, Case No. IT-95-16
Decision on Defence Challenges to Form of the Indictment 320
Decision on Evidence of the Good Character of the Accused and the Defence of *Tu Quoque* 41
Trial Judgement 31, 32, 38, 41, 43, 47, 48, 54, 56, 59, 90, 91, 95, 98, 99, 103, 104, 123, 273, 275, 293, 320, 325–327, 336–337
Appeal Judgement 60, 89, 321, 322, 330, 331, 333, 337, 341, 345, 346, 355, 361, 367
- Prosecutor v. Kvočka, Radić, Žigić and Prcać*, Case No. IT-98-30
Decision on Preliminary Motions filed by Mlado Radić and Miroslav Kvočka et al. Challenging Jurisdiction 261
Decision on Defence Preliminary Motions on the Form of the Indictment 320, 323
Trial Judgement 80, 82, 84, 92, 101, 272, 273, 276, 277, 295, 338, 339
Appeal Judgement 90, 91, 94, 95, 98, 274, 275, 280, 336, 337, 342, 357, 360, 367
- Prosecutor v. Limaj, Bala and Musliu*, Case No. IT-03-66
Decision on Prosecution’s Motion to Amend the Amended Indictment 322
Trial Judgement 32, 41–43, 47–51, 53, 55, 79, 234–236, 240, 241, 258, 262, 273, 285, 298, 300, 306, 332, 348
Appeal Judgement 237, 273
- Prosecutor v. Martić*, Case No. IT-95-11
Amended Indictment 347
Trial Judgement 32, 41, 47, 53, 55, 75–77, 107, 238, 240, 259, 261, 263, 278–280, 285–287, 336, 342, 347
- Prosecutor v. Dragomir Milošević*, Case No. IT-98-29/1 282
- Prosecutor v. Mrkšić, Radić and Šljivančanin*, Case No. IT-95-13
Review of Indictment Pursuant to Rule 61 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence 36, 37, 47, 51
Third Amended Indictment 260
Trial Judgement 32, 36, 43, 44, 46, 47, 51, 54–56, 79, 83, 107, 228, 234, 236, 238–241, 272, 273, 331
- Prosecutor v. Naletilić and Martinović*, Case No. IT-98-34
Decision on Defendant Vinko Martinović’s Objection to the Indictment 319, 323

- Trial Judgement 42, 44, 72, 79, 82, 90, 93, 94, 99, 100, 103, 226, 231, 236, 240, 241, 246, 251, 254–256, 264–266, 268, 269, 272, 273, 278–281, 288, 290, 321, 323, 338
- Appeal Judgement 73, 74, 82, 83, 94, 233, 237, 239, 249, 250, 256, 281, 299, 321, 323, 330, 333, 342–345, 347, 355, 360, 367
- Prosecutor v. Dragan Nikolić*, Case No. IT-02-60 359–360, 361, 363
- Prosecutor v. Momir Nikolić*, Case No. IT-02-60 359, 361, 367
- Prosecutor v. Plavšić*, Case No. IT-00-39 & 40 360, 384
- Prosecutor v. Popović, Beara, Nikolić, Borovčanin, Miletić, Gvero, and Pandurević*, Case No. IT-05-88
- Indictment 186, 347
- Decision on Further Amendments and Challenges to the Indictment 350
- Prosecutor v. Šešelj*, Case No. IT-03-67
- Decision on the Interlocutory Appeal Concerning Jurisdiction 28, 33
- Decision on Motion for Reconsideration of the Decision on the Interlocutory Appeal Concerning Jurisdiction Dated 31 August 2004 33, 37
- Prosecutor v. Simić, Tadić, and Zarić*, Case No. IT-95-9
- Trial Judgement 42, 55, 65, 69, 70–73, 76, 77, 79, 82–84, 90, 97–100, 103, 233, 252, 272, 278–281, 287, 338, 339, 342
- Appeal Judgement 73, 77, 342, 366
- Prosecutor v. Stakić*, Case No. IT-97-24 51, 56–104, 114, 163–164, 185, 342–343, 354–356, 359
- Trial Judgement 33, 41, 50, 51, 54, 55, 61, 62, 63, 65, 69, 72, 73, 79, 92, 94–96, 98, 101–103, 141, 155, 156, 171, 177, 179, 181–186, 192, 233, 236, 266, 273, 274, 338, 355
- Appeal Judgement 41, 61–65, 72–74, 90, 96, 102, 103, 107, 157, 160, 161, 163–165, 172, 186, 240, 330, 331, 338, 342–344, 347, 355, 356, 359, 366
- Prosecutor v. Strugar*, Case No. IT-01-42 267, 269–270, 348–349
- Third Amended Indictment 260
- Decision on Interlocutory Appeal 261
- Trial Judgement 225, 226, 231, 240, 241, 258, 259, 262, 264–270, 273, 286, 332, 348, 349, 376
- Decision on Strugar’s Request to Reopen Appeal Proceedings 349
- Prosecution’s Addendum on Recent Case-Law Pursuant to Order of 23 August 2007 269
- Prosecutor v. Tadić*, Case No. IT-94-1
- Decision on Defence Motion for Interlocutory Appeal on Jurisdiction 28, 32, 34, 116, 127, 216, 217, 225, 227–231, 233, 239, 240, 244, 250, 252, 258, 259, 261–263, 279, 282, 297–300, 332

- Decision on the Form of the Indictment 41, 320
Trial Judgement 32, 37, 43, 45–49, 56, 58, 91, 94, 103, 106, 108, 126, 234–236, 240, 243, 248, 293, 298
Sentencing Judgement 294, 365
Appeal Judgement 32, 33, 36, 41, 42, 51–53, 55, 56, 163, 236, 244–248, 252, 253, 324
Judgement in Sentencing Appeals 141, 324, 366–365
- Prosecutor v. Trbić*, Case No. IT-94-1
Indictment 189, 351
Decision on Referral of Case Under Rule 11 *bis* with Confidential Annex 141–142, 189, 351, 363
- Prosecutor v. Vasiljević*, Case No. IT-98-32
Amended Indictment 288
Trial Judgement 50, 55, 61–64, 92, 100, 103, 117, 241, 272, 273, 289, 330, 331, 338
Appeal Judgement 90, 91, 94, 100, 330, 333, 337–339, 341, 343, 345, 355

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) materials

- Statute of the International Tribunal for Rwanda 31, 57–65, 379–383
Art. 2 156–157, 176–177, 210–212, 349–354
Art. 3 31, 33–34, 41, 56, 68–75, 78–80, 90–91, 99, 101, 105–106, 115
Art. 4 56, 120–128, 217–218, 231–232, 264, 270–273, 274–275, 280, 282–285, 288–289, 290–291
- Prosecutor v. Akayesu*, Case No. ICTR-96-4
Amended Indictment 257
Trial Judgement 37–38, 42–44, 48, 52, 57, 59, 67, 78, 82, 85–87, 90, 92, 99, 101, 109, 122, 140, 143, 148, 153–155, 159–162, 164, 165, 169, 171, 174, 177–179, 181–184, 187, 188, 192–194, 196, 202, 228, 233, 234, 236, 242, 256, 257, 261, 278, 323–325, 352, 354, 365
Appeal Judgement 29, 34, 38, 115, 240, 242
- Prosecutor v. Bagilishema*, Case No. ICTR-95-1A
Amended Indictment 258
Trial Judgement 35, 42–43, 48, 57, 59, 61–63, 155, 160, 161, 168, 171, 175, 177, 179, 181, 182, 232, 256
- Prosecutor v. Bagosora, Kabiligi, Nsengiyumva and Ntabakuze*, Case No. ICTR-98-41 (*‘Military I Case’*) 90, 231, 256, 258, 322
- Prosecutor v. Gacumbitsi*, Case No. ICTR-2001-64 87–88, 367–368
Trial Judgement 34, 35, 41, 52, 92, 157, 158, 161, 168, 180, 350
Appeal Judgement 37, 52, 53, 56, 64, 87, 88, 157, 160, 161, 367, 368

- Prosecutor v. Kajelijeli*, Case No. ICTR-98-44-A
 Amended Indictment 258
 Decision on Kajelijeli's Motion for Partial Acquittal Pursuant to Rule 98 *bis* 232
 Trial Judgement 34, 61, 62, 64, 92, 102, 103, 161, 171, 174–176, 189, 193, 350–352
- Prosecutor v. Kambanda*, Case No. ICTR-97-23
 Trial/Sentencing Judgement 140, 141, 200, 352, 359, 363, 365, 366
 Appeal Judgement 352
- Prosecutor v. Kamuhanda*, Case No. ICTR-99-54A 169
 Indictment 258
 Trial Judgement 61, 62, 64, 102, 169, 181, 232, 243, 256
- Prosecutor v. Kayishema and Ruzindana*, Case No. ICTR 95-1
 Indictment 257
 Trial Judgement 36, 43, 48, 59, 61–64, 100, 102, 117, 123, 155, 160–162, 165, 168, 170, 176, 177, 179–181, 183, 184, 187, 188, 232, 234, 240, 242, 243, 256, 274, 320, 324, 325, 350, 351, 365
 Appeal Judgement 158, 163
- Prosecutor v. Mpambara*, Case No. ICTR-01-65
 Decision on the Defence Preliminary Motion Challenging the Amended Indictment 322, 323
 Trial Judgement 61, 157, 160, 168, 171
- Prosecutor v. Musema*, Case No. ICTR-96-13
 Decision on the Prosecutor's Request for Leave to Amend the Indictment 323
 Amended Indictment 258
 Trial Judgement 42, 4459, 63, 85, 86, 141, 160, 165, 171, 175, 177, 179, 181–184, 187–189, 200, 232–234, 256, 274–277, 280, 352–353, 359, 366
 Appeal Judgement 321, 330, 331, 333, 345, 353
- Prosecutor v. Muvunyi*, Case No. ICTR-00-55A
 Trial Judgement 35, 48, 51, 56, 87, 92, 99, 102, 103, 154, 158, 160–163, 168, 171, 175, 176, 178, 181, 183, 193, 197, 235, 352, 354
- Prosecutor v. Nahimana, Barayagwiza, and Ngeze*, Case No. ICTR-96-11 ('Media Case')
 Decision on the Prosecutor's Request for Leave to File an Amended Indictment 279–280
 Trial Judgement 61, 156, 180, 181, 189, 190, 192, 194–197, 200, 321, 353, 354
 Appeal Judgement 41, 42, 52–54, 62, 90–92, 99, 158, 160, 175, 177, 180, 189–193, 195–196, 330, 333, 342, 343, 348, 352, 354

- Prosecutor v. Nindabahizi*, Case No. ICTR-01-71
Trial Judgement 61, 161, 168, 175, 274, 275, 321, 333
Appeal Judgement 323
- Prosecutor v. Nindiliyimana, Bizimungu, Nzuwonemeye and Sagahutu*, Case No. ICTR-00-56 ('*Military II Case*') 232, 235, 258
- Prosecutor v. Niyitegeka*, Case No. ICTR 96-14
Decision on Defence Motion on Matters Arising from Trial Chamber Decisions and Preliminary Motion Based on Defects in the Form of the Indictment and Lack of Jurisdiction 319
Decision on Prosecutor's Request for Leave to File an Amended Indictment 323
Amended Indictment 258
Trial Judgement 37, 38, 52, 53, 87, 90, 104, 171, 178, 180, 189, 190, 193, 194, 232, 350, 352, 354, 359
Appeal Judgement 141, 163, 171, 177, 366
- Prosecutor v. Ntagerura, Bagambiki and Imanishimwe*, Case No. ICTR-99-46 ('*Cyangugu Case*') 77-78, 169, 257
Trial Judgement 77-78, 107, 157, 160-162, 169, 176, 177, 181, 183, 235, 256, 257, 272
Appeal Judgement 330, 333, 355
- Prosecutor v. Ntakirutimana and Ntakirutimana*, Case Nos. ICTR-96-10 and ICTR-96-17
Bisesero Indictment 258
Trial Judgement 37, 38, 52, 170, 189, 289, 321, 333, 350, 354
Appeal Judgement 37, 38, 52, 61, 62, 64, 163, 330, 331, 333, 335
- Prosecutor v. Rutaganda*, Case No. ICTR-96-3
Indictment 258
Trial Judgement 42, 44, 59, 61, 63, 99, 107, 126, 141, 155, 160, 171, 174, 175, 177, 181-184, 187, 188, 234, 236, 242, 243, 256, 257, 300, 366
Appeal Judgement 141, 232, 240, 243, 298, 330, 355, 363
- Prosecutor v. Semanza*, Case No. ICTR-97-20
Third Amended Indictment 258
Trial Judgement 34, 35, 38, 42, 43, 50-52, 54, 59, 64, 79, 82, 84, 87, 90-92, 97, 101, 157, 158, 160, 161, 165, 168, 174, 175, 178-181, 189, 233, 236, 240, 243, 256, 257, 274, 275, 335-337
(Appeal) Decision 344, 345
Appeal Judgement 53, 161, 235, 240, 321, 330, 331, 333, 336, 344, 355
- Prosecutor v. Simba*, Case No. ICTR-2001-76 162
Amended Indictment 350
Trial Judgement 4, 48, 61, 160-163, 168, 176, 177, 350
Appeal Judgement 160, 162

International Criminal Court (ICC) materials

- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court 5–9, 104–114, 198–201, 373–374, 381–383
- Art. 6 198
- Art. 7 104–110, 115
- Art. 8 291–303
- Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court,
First Session: Official Records, Part II(B): Elements of Crimes 203
- Prosecutor v. Lubanga*, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/06 114, 302–303
- Situation in Darfur, Sudan*, Case No. ICC-02/05
- Warrant of Arrest for Ahmad Harun 114
- Warrant of Arrest for Ali Kushayb 114
- Situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, Case No. ICC-01/04-01/07
- Warrant of Arrest for Germain Katanga 114
- Situation in Uganda*, Case No. ICC-02/04-01/05
- Warrant of Arrest for Joseph Kony 114

Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) materials

- Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone
- Art. 2 115–120
- Art. 3 304–310
- Art. 4 304–310
- Prosecutor v. Brima, Kamara and Kanu*, Case No. SCSL-04-16 (‘AFRC Case’) 108, 115, 117–120, 291, 305–310, 319, 330, 331, 333
- Prosecutor v. Fofana and Kondewa*, Case No. SCSL-04-14 (‘CDF Case’) 107, 115, 117–118, 291, 305–310, 319, 330, 331, 376
- Prosecutor v. Norman*, Case No. SCSL-2004-14 304–305
- Prosecutor v. Sesay, Kallon, and Gbao* (‘RUF Case’), Case No. SCSL-2004-15 305
- Prosecutor v. Taylor*, Case No. SCSL-2003-01 116–117, 305

Special Panels for Serious Crimes (SPSC, East Timor) materials

- United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor, Regulation No. 2000/15
on the Establishment of Panels with Exclusive Jurisdiction over Serious
Criminal Offences 120, 206–207, 311
- Prosecutor v. Armando dos Santos*, Case No. LI-07-99-SC 122–124

Prosecutor v. Joni Marques, Manuel da Costa, João da Costa, Paulo da Costa, Amélio da Costa, Hilário da Silva, Gonsalo dos Santos, Alarico Fernandes, Mautersa Monis and Gilberto Fernandes, Case No. 09/12000 ('Los Palos Case') 125–128

Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) materials

Law on the Establishment of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia for the Prosecution of Crimes Committed during the Period of Democratic Kampuchea 128–130, 208–209, 312–314, 372–373, 380–381
Co-Prosecutors v. Ieng Sary, Investigation No. 002/19-09-2007 131
Co-Prosecutors v. Ieng Thirith, Investigation No. 002/19-09-2007 131
Co-Prosecutors v. Kaing, Investigation No. 001/18-07-2007 131
Co-Prosecutors v. Khieu, Investigation No. 002/19-09-2007 131–132
Co-Prosecutors v. Nuon, Investigation No. 002/19-09-2007 131
 Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia, Internal Rules, 12 June 2007 130
 Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia, Statement of the Co-Prosecutors, 18 July 2007 209–210
 Report of the Group of Experts for Cambodia Established Pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 52/135 130, 208, 312, 370–375, 377

Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal (SICT) materials

Statute of the Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal
 Art. 11 210–211
 Art. 12 132–133, 314–317
 'Anfal Case' 136–137, 211–212, 316–317
 Trial Judgement
 Appeal Judgement
 'Dujail Case' 133–136, 211, 316, 375–379

Other international cases

Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro, 26 February 2007 ('*Bosnia v. Serbia* Judgement on Merits') (not yet published) 153, 206–207
Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Yugoslavia, (1993) ICJ Rep. 325 151, 189, 192–197
Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Yugoslavia ('*Bosnia v. Yugoslavia* Preliminary Objections Judgement'), (1996) ICJ Rep. 565 153, 203–204
Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Belgium, (2002) ICJ Rep. 3. ('*Arrest Warrant Case*') 30–31, 36–57

- France, Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, and United States v. Göring, Bormann, Dönitz, Frank, Frick, Fritzsche, Funk, Hess, Jodl, Kaltenbrunner, Keitel, von Bohlen und Halbach, Ley, von Neurath, von Papen, Raeder, von Ribbentrop, Rosenberg, Sauckel, Schacht, von Schirach, Seyss-Inquart, Speer, and Streicher*, International Military Tribunal, Judgment and Sentence, 1 October 1946 ('Nuremberg Judgement') 24, 101–102, 145, 170
- Nicaragua v. United States*, (1986) ICJ Rep. 14 245, 290–291
- United States v. Altstötter, von Ammon, Barnickel, Cuhorst, Engert, Joel, Klemm, Lautz, Meetgenbert, Nebelung, Oeschey, Petersen, Rothaug, Rothenberger, Schlegelberger and Westphal*, ('Justice Judgement') 146, 172–173
- United States v. Pohl, Frank, Georg Lörner, Fanslau, Hans Lörner, Vogt, Tschentscher, Scheide, Kiefer, Eirenschmalz, Sommer, Pook, Baier, Hohberg, Volk, Mummenthey, Bobermin and Klein* ('Pohl case') 958 67
- Yugoslavia v. Belgium* (1999) ICJ Rep. 124 153, 207–210
- Reservations to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, Advisory Opinion, (1951) ICJ Rep. 15, 19. 30, 54–56, 150, 187, 201–205

National cases and legislation

- Attorney-General of the Government of Israel v. Eichmann*, Supreme Court, 12 December 1961, (1961) 36 ILR 5 150–151, 152, 188, 197
- Blockburger v. United States*, 284 U.S. 299 (1932) 325–326, 349–354
- Jorgić*, Bundesgerichtshof, Case No. 3 StR 215/98, 30 April 1999 151, 188–191

Treaties and other international agreements

- 1948 Genocide Convention 6, 11–12, 26, 30, 53–54, 102, 139–144, 147–153, 149–150, 176–177
- Art. 2 139, 140, 142, 144–154, 156–157, 183–186
- Art. 3 139–140, 142, 144–146, 149, 157–173, 183, 186, 199–201
- Art. 9 149–150, 187
- Convention Against Torture (CAT) 78, 81–82, 83–84
- Declaration Renouncing the Use, in Time of War, of Explosive Projectiles Under 400 Grammes Weight, 11 December 1868 ('St. Petersburg Declaration') 223–224, 251
- Geneva Conventions
- 1864 Convention 3, 223, 250–256
- 1949 Conventions 3, 6, 10–11, 43, 91–94, 99, 224, 226–227, 250–251, 256–257, 260–262, 314–317

- Common Article 3 43–44, 94–96, 100–101, 260–261
 Convention I 224, 251–317
 Convention II 224, 251
 Convention III 45, 105, 224, 251–252
 Convention IV 72, 144, 168–173, 252, 253–254
 Additional Protocol I 3, 10, 44–45, 104, 285–286
 Art. 50 44, 45, 46, 49–50, 51, 75–76, 97–99, 104
 Hague Conventions 3, 10, 224–226, 256–257, 258–263
 Martens Clause 16, 18–19
 International Declaration Concerning the Laws and Customs of War, 27 August 1874 (‘Brussels Declaration’) 224, 254–255
 Treaty of Peace Between the Allied and Associated Powers and Turkey (‘Treaty of Lausanne’), 24 July 1923, 28 LNTS 11 21, 22–26
 Treaty of Peace Between the Allied and Associated Powers and Turkey (‘Treaty of Sèvres’), 10 August 1920, reprinted in (1921) AJIL Supp. 179 20–22
 Treaty of Peace Between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany, 28 June 1919, 226 Consol. T.S. 188 (‘Treaty of Versailles’) 20, 21

Other international and United Nations materials

- Agreement for the Prosecution and Punishment of Major War Criminals of the European Axis, and Establishing the Charter of the International Military Tribunal, Annex, 8 August 1945 (‘IMT Charter’) 22–24, 26, 27, 31, 33–35, 49–50, 51, 104
 Commission on the Responsibility of the Authors of War and on Enforcement of Penalties, ‘Report Presented to the Preliminary Peace Conference, March 29, 1919’ 19, 20
 Control Council Law No. 10, Punishment of Persons Guilty of War Crimes, Crimes Against Peace and Against Humanity, 20th December 1945 24–26, 42–43, 49–50, 146, 171–172
 Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind
 1954 Draft Code 6–8, 9, 28–29, 52, 152, 198–201
 1991 revised version 6–8, 9
 1996 revised version 6–8, 9, 29–30, 31, 52, 57–60, 164, 170, 193
 Draft Statute for an International Criminal Court
 1991 revised version 6–8, 9
 Final Report of the Commission of Experts Established Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 780 (1992), annexed to UN Doc. S/1994/674 (1994). 45–46, 49
 General Assembly Resolution 96(I), UN Doc. A/RES/96(I) (1946) 147, 148, 173–176, 181–183

- Report of the *Ad hoc* Committee on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court, UN Doc. A/50/22, 6 September 1995 203–204
- Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the United Nations Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1564 of 18 September 2004, 25 January 2005 ('Darfur Commission Report') 205
- Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on East Timor to the Secretary-General, UN Doc. A/54/726, S/2000/59, 31 January 2000 310–311
- Report of the Secretary-General on the Establishment of a Special Court for Sierra-Leone, UN Doc. S/2000/915, 4 October 2000 206
- Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Security Council Resolution 808 (1993), UN Doc. S/25704 (1993) 150, 187
- Security Council 1315, UN Doc. S/RES/1315 (2000), 14 August 2000 206
- Security Council Resolution 827, UN Doc. S/RES/827 (1993) 150, 188
- Statute of the International Court of Justice 3, 5
- United Nations War Crimes Commission, History of the United Nations War Crimes Commission and the Developments of the Laws of War (1948) 18–31, 50–51

Selected secondary sources

- M. Cherif Bassiouni and Michael Wahid Hanna, 'Ceding the High Ground: The Iraqi High Criminal Court Statute and the Trial of Saddam Hussein' (2006–07) 39 *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 21, 132, 315
- M. Cherif Bassiouni, 'Crimes Against Humanity', in M. Cherif Bassiouni, *International Criminal Law* (2nd edn 1998) 19, 21–22, 26–31, 32–33, 102–104
- Iain Bonomy, 'The Reality of Conducting a War Crimes Trial', (2007) 5 *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 348, 362, 374–375, 384
- Antonio Cassese, *International Criminal Law* (2003) 25, 43–49, 108, 217, 230–231
- Carl Philipp Gottlieb von Clausewitz, *Total War* (1832) 222, 239–243
- Robert Cryer, *Prosecuting International Crimes: Selectivity and the International Criminal Law Regime* (2005) 115–116
- William J. Fenrick, 'Should Crimes Against Humanity Replace War Crimes?' (1999) 37 *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 767, 16–18
- Tristan Gilbertson, 'War Crimes', (1995) 25 *Victoria University Wellington Law Review* 315, 17–18, 19–20
- Leslie C. Green, *Essays on the Modern Law of War* (1985) 219–263
- Christopher Greenwood, 'Historical Development and Legal Basis', in Dieter Fleck (ed.), *The Handbook of Humanitarian Law in Armed Conflicts* (1995) 220, 221, 232–233
- Hugo Grotius, *De jure belli ac pacis: libri tres* (1625) 221, 236–239

- Mark B. Harmon and Fergal Gaynor, 'Ordinary Sentences for Extraordinary Crimes', (2007) 5 *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 683, 362
- Herman von Hebel and Darryl Robinson, 'Crimes with the Jurisdiction of the Court' in Roy S. Lee (ed.), *The International Criminal Court: The Making of the Rome Statute* (1999) 68–69, 105–106, 107
- Hersch Lauterpacht, 'The Problem of the Revision of the Law of War', (1952) 29 *British Yearbook of International Law* 360 230, 267
- Raphaël Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (1944) 145, 147, 169, 178–181
- Francis Lieber, *Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field* ('Lieber Code') (1881) 223, 243–256
- Timothy L. H. McCormack, 'From Sun Tzu to the Sixth Committee: the Evolution of an International Criminal Regime', in Timothy H. L. McCormack and Gerry J. Simpson (eds.), *The Law of War Crimes: National and International Approaches* (1997) 220, 232
- Allison Marston Danner, 'Constructing a Hierarchy of Crimes in International Criminal Law', (2001) 87 *Virginia Law Review* 415, 365
- Guénaél Mettraux, *International Crimes and the Ad Hoc Tribunals* (2005) 141, 153–154, 358
- Valerie Oosterveld, 'The Elements of Genocide: Introduction', in Roy S. Lee (ed.), *The International Criminal Court: Elements of Crimes and Rules of Procedure and Evidence* (2001) 202
- Dianne F. Orentlicher, 'The Law of Universal Conscience: Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity', paper presented at the conference Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity: Early Warning and Prevention on 9 December 1998 16, 19, 23, 24, 32–41
- Jean Pictet (ed.), *Commentary I Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field* (1952) 251
- Jean Pictet (ed.), *Commentary II Geneva Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea* (1960)
- Jean Pictet (ed.), *Commentary IV Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War* (1958) 44, 72, 254
- Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Genocide, UN ESCOR, 7th Sess., UN Doc. E/74 (1948) 147, 148, 178, 181–183
- Steven R. Ratner and Jason S. Abrams, *Accountability for Human Rights Atrocities in International Law: Beyond the Nuremberg Legacy* (2nd edn 2001) 130
- Darryl Robinson, 'The Elements of Crimes Against Humanity', in Roy S. Lee (ed.), *The International Criminal Court: Elements of Crimes and Rules of Procedure and Evidence* (2001). 112, 113
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Social Contract* (1772) 222, 238–239

- Yves Sandoz, 'Penal Aspects of International Humanitarian Law', in M. Cherif Bassiouni, *International Criminal Law* (2nd edn 1988), p. 406. 1, 2–4
- William A. Schabas, *Genocide in International Law* (2000) 22, 28–30, 144, 150, 151–152, 165–167, 187, 190, 192–193
- William A. Schabas, *The UN International Criminal Tribunals: The Former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone* (2006) 379, 383–385
- Egon Schwelb, 'Crimes Against Humanity', (1946) 23 *British Yearbook of International Law* 181, 24, 41–42
- Robert D. Sloane, 'Sentencing for the "Crime of Crimes": The Evolving "Common Law" of Sentencing of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda', (2007) 5 *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 713, 359, 367
- James G. Stewart, 'Towards a Single Definition of Armed Conflict in International Humanitarian Law: A Critique of Internationalized Armed Conflict', (2003) 85 *International Review of the Red Cross* 313, 228, 262–263
- Bert Swart, 'Internationalized Courts and Substantive Criminal Law' in Cesare P. R. Romero, André Nollkaemper and Jann K. Kleffner (eds.), *Internationalized Criminal Courts and Tribunals: Sierra Leone, East Timor, Kosovo and Cambodia* (2004) 120
- Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* 219–220, 263–291
- Jamie A. Williamson, 'The Jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda on War Crimes', (2005) 12 *New England Journal of International and Comparative Law* 51, 242–243, 288
- Salvatore Zappalà, *Human Rights in International Criminal Proceedings* (2003) 363–364

1

An overview of crimes under international law

| | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| 1.1 | Legal sources for definitions of crimes under international law | page 5 |
| 1.2 | Structure of crimes under international law | 9 |

Yves Sandoz once wrote: ‘It has often been said that one of the most pressing tasks for international criminal law is to set out clearly what violations are punishable under that law and to define them in specific terms.’¹ This second volume in the *International Criminal Law Practitioner Library* examines the elements of crimes under international law, primarily as they have been defined in the jurisprudence of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) (collectively, the ‘*ad hoc* Tribunals’). This jurisprudence has contributed greatly to the nuanced definitions of the core categories of crimes under international law applied in current and future international adjudication, and is the richest body of contemporary applications of the law on elements to the actual facts of cases. Despite this contribution, the specificity referred to by Sandoz appears elusive: the case law is frequently contradictory or obscure, and thus requires analysis to explain the legal principle clearly, or at least to identify what is unclear and in need of further jurisprudential development. Such an analysis is the fundamental goal of this book, as it is of this series.

Two consequences flow from our focus on the judicial interpretation of the scope and content of crimes under international law. First, like the first volume in this series, this volume does not seek to repeat the extensive and well-considered literature on the Statute and Elements of Crimes of the International Criminal Court (ICC), although each chapter contains a brief examination of how those instruments and those of the Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL), the East Timor Special Panels for Serious

¹ Yves Sandoz, ‘Penal Aspects of International Humanitarian Law’, in M. Cherif Bassiouni, *International Criminal Law* (2nd edn 1998), p. 406.

Crimes (SPSC), the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC), and the Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal (SICT)² define crimes, and highlights the important differences between the approaches of the *ad hoc* Tribunals and those of the other tribunals. Second, this volume only discusses the crimes or categories of crimes against the person or against property that are provided for in the Statutes of the *ad hoc* Tribunals. As will be seen in the sections of [Chapters 2](#) and [4](#) dealing with the ICC and the internationalised criminal tribunals, the respective lists of underlying offences of crimes against humanity and war crimes vary somewhat from tribunal to tribunal. While there is considerable academic literature on some of the offences that do not appear in the *ad hoc* Statutes – especially the many additional offences in the lengthy war crimes provision of the Rome Statute of the ICC – these offences have not, as yet, been the subject of much judicial interpretation. To the extent that they have been the subject of judicial interpretation, this jurisprudence is touched upon in the respective sections on the ICC and the internationalised tribunals in [Chapters 2](#) to [4](#).

On one view, an international crime could be defined as any offence that requires international cooperation for its prosecution and therefore involves more than one domestic jurisdiction, or which requires cross-border movements or transactions, such as money laundering or trafficking in narcotics. This book, however, focuses on crimes under international law – that is, conduct that violates international law, and is punishable as such with the imposition of individual criminal liability – rather than all crimes that have an international aspect. Moreover, it is not an exhaustive analysis of all conduct that may constitute a crime under international law, but rather a focused study of those ‘core’ categories of crimes – crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes – for which a wealth of judicial exposition exists.

The question of what constitutes the corpus of law with which international criminal law is concerned is not definitively settled. While the Nuremberg and

² The Iraqi National Assembly changed this Tribunal’s name from its original appellation, ‘Iraqi Special Tribunal’, and there has been confusion about how to translate the new Arabic name into English. See Michael P. Scharf and Gregory S. McNeal (eds.), *Saddam on Trial: Understanding and Debating the Iraqi High Tribunal* (2006), p. 57. The Tribunal’s name in Arabic is al-Mahkama al-Jina’iya al-’Iraqiya al-’Uliya. These words translate as ‘Iraqi’, ‘High’ or ‘Higher’, and ‘Criminal Court’ or ‘Tribunal’. According to Scharf and McNeal, the Tribunal subsequently issued an official statement in which it said its name in English is ‘Iraqi High Tribunal’ (although they provide no citation to this official statement), and this is the name Scharf and McNeal chose to use in their book. *Ibid.* By contrast, M. Cherif Bassiouni and Michael Wahid Hanna use the translation ‘Iraqi High Criminal Court’ in their article. See M. Cherif Bassiouni and Michael Wahid Hanna, ‘Ceding the High Ground: The Iraqi High Criminal Court Statute and the Trial of Saddam Hussein’, (2006–07) 39 *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 21, 57. For consistency with Volume I of this series, we follow the practice of Human Rights Watch in employing the translation ‘Supreme Iraqi Criminal Tribunal’. See Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2006, Iraq*, available at www.hrw.org/english/docs/2006/01/18/iraq12215.htm. Although the SICT is not, strictly speaking, a hybrid or internationalised tribunal, it is included in these comparative analyses because it has jurisdiction over the core crimes under international law, and the definitions of these crimes in its Statute are clearly modelled on those of the Rome Statute of the ICC. Though its practice and jurisprudence are limited, and its proceedings criticised and often chaotic, discussion of the manner in which the law on the core crimes has been applied by the SICT is nevertheless useful for illustrating the difficulties of adapting international practice and jurisprudence to a particular kind of domestic context.

Tokyo Charters included the crime of aggression, modern international criminal law – as embodied in the Statutes of the ICTY, ICTR, ICC, and other international and internationalised tribunals, and developed in their jurisprudence – tends to focus exclusively on the three core categories of crimes: crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes.³ Because these crimes are almost invariably (although not necessarily) prosecuted in the context of an armed conflict, the proposition that ‘international humanitarian law’ is synonymous with these core crimes holds some attraction.

International humanitarian law is generally understood to cover two bodies of law: first, ‘Geneva Law’, which derives from a range of Geneva Conventions dating back to 1864, but in particular the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols of 1977; and which seeks to ameliorate the suffering of those not directly involved in combat;⁴ and second, ‘Hague Law’, which derives mainly from a number of the Hague Conventions, particularly those of 1899 and 1907, as well as Additional Protocol I of 1977; and which seeks to regulate the means and methods by which war is conducted.⁵ Crimes against humanity and genocide have traditionally been viewed as outside the definition of international humanitarian law, and separately associated with international criminal law because their proscription gives rise to individual criminal responsibility. This is no doubt in part because these categories of crimes can occur in times of peace as well as war, and because they were developed in the post-Second World War context of the Nuremberg and subsequent post-war trials as distinct species of criminality from war crimes proper, which are violations of international humanitarian law considered to be so serious that they entail not only state responsibility, but also individual criminal responsibility.⁶

³ Accordingly, we will not discuss aggression (also labelled ‘crimes against peace’), even though that crime is included in the Rome Statute of the ICC and the International Law Commission’s latest Draft Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Mankind. See Draft Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Mankind, in Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of Its Forty-eighth Session, UN Doc. A/51/10 (1996) (‘1996 ILC Draft Code’), Art. 16; Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 17 July 1998, entered into force 1 July 2002, UN Doc. A/CONF. 183/9, 37 ILM 1002 (1998), 2187 UNTS 90 (‘Rome Statute’), Art. 5(2) (providing that the ICC ‘shall exercise jurisdiction over the crime of aggression once a provision is adopted in accordance with articles 121 and 123 defining the crime and setting out the conditions under which the Court shall exercise jurisdiction with respect to this crime’).

⁴ For a detailed discussion of Geneva Law, see Chapter 4, text accompanying notes 43–45, and 58–63.

⁵ For a detailed discussion of Hague Law, see Chapter 4, text accompanying notes 43–57. Frits Kalshoven writes that the term ‘international humanitarian law’ came into common usage around the time of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and that the International Committee of the Red Cross used the term to refer to Geneva Law, but not Hague Law or crimes against humanity, let alone genocide. See Frits Kalshoven, ‘From International Humanitarian Law to International Criminal Law’, (2004) 3 *Chinese Journal of International Law* 151, 153. Additional Protocol I of 1977 finally dissipated any real distinction between Geneva Law and Hague Law, fusing legal rules concerning the protection and treatment of civilians, prisoners of war, and persons *hors de combat* with those regulating the use of certain weapons and certain means of warfare; it thereby merged these two historically distinct strands of law into one. See Kalshoven, *supra*, p. 153; see also Chapter 4, note 45.

⁶ See Chapter 2, section 2.1 (discussing the origins and evolution of crimes against humanity); Chapter 3, section 3.1 (discussing the origins and evolution of genocide); Chapter 4, section 4.1 (discussing the origins and evolution of war crimes).

There is sense in the treatment of these categories of genocide and crimes against humanity as not falling within the realm of international humanitarian law. The overwhelming bulk of international humanitarian law concerns the responsibility of states (and, sometimes, armed rebel groups) in respect of armed conflict, and has nothing to do with individual criminal responsibility, whereas genocide and crimes against humanity, strictly speaking, are in the first instance categories of international crimes, that may also give rise to state responsibility in certain circumstances. Nevertheless, genocide and crimes against humanity are much more likely to occur in the context of an armed conflict than in times of peace, so they invariably overlap considerably with international humanitarian law. As such, they have increasingly come to be considered as forming part of that body of law, *de facto* if not *de jure*. A salient example can be seen in the Statutes of some of the international and internationalised criminal courts and tribunals, which provide for jurisdiction over ‘serious violations of international humanitarian law’, understood in those instruments to cover not only war crimes, but also crimes against humanity and genocide.⁷ The jurisprudence of the *ad hoc* Tribunals and the SCSL has reinforced this conceptualisation of international humanitarian law on many occasions.⁸ It may well be that, as international criminal law evolves, the distinctions between these differently conceived bodies of law will gradually disappear.

It is no surprise that crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes have been included within the jurisdiction of the contemporary international and internationalised

⁷ This point is well made by Kalshoven, *supra* note 5, pp. 153–4. See also Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991, (1993) 32 ILM 1159, as amended by Security Council Resolution 1660 of 28 February 2006 (‘ICTY Statute’), Art. 9(1); Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, (1994) 33 ILM 1602, as amended by Security Council Resolution 1534 of 26 March 2004 (‘ICTR Statute’), Art. 1; Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, 2178 UNTS 138, UN Doc. S/2002/246, 16 January 2002, Appendix II (‘SCSL Statute’), Art. 1(1); see also Law on the Establishment of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia for the Prosecution of Crimes Committed During the Period of Democratic Kampuchea, as amended on 27 October 2004, Doc. No. NS/RKM/1004/006, unofficial translation by the Council of Jurists and the Secretariat of the Task Force, revised on 26 August 2007 (‘ECCC Law’), Art. 2 new. Perhaps tellingly, however, the Rome Statute of the ICC does not use the term ‘serious violations of international humanitarian law’ in this sense, preferring instead the terms ‘most serious crimes of concern to the international community’ or, simply, ‘international crimes’. See Rome Statute, *supra* note 3, preambular paras. 4, 6. The constitutive instrument of the East Timor SPSC similarly employs the term ‘serious criminal offences’. See United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor, Regulation No. 2000/15 on the Establishment of Panels with Exclusive Jurisdiction over Serious Criminal Offences, UN Doc. UNTAET/REG/2000/15, 6 June 2000 (‘UNTAET Regulation’), Section 1.3.

⁸ See, e.g., *Prosecutor v. Blagojević and Jokić*, Case No. IT-02-60-T, Judgement, 17 January 2005, para. 834 (noting that ‘[a]ll crimes falling within the jurisdiction of this Tribunal are characterise[d] as “serious violations of international humanitarian law”’, and that ‘[t]he crimes for which the Accused in this case have been convicted’ – that is, complicity in genocide, several crimes against humanity, and murder as a violation of the laws or customs of war – ‘clearly warrant such a label’); *Prosecutor v. Simba*, Case No. ICTR-2001-76-T, Judgement, 13 December 2005, para. 431 (‘All crimes under the [ICTR] Statute are serious violations of international humanitarian law.’); *Prosecutor v. Fofana and Kondewa*, Case No. SCSL-04-14-J, Judgement, 2 August 2007, para. 93 (noting that, as ‘[n]o crimes under Sierra Leonean law [had been] charged in the Indictment ... , [t]he Chamber [would] therefore consider only serious violations of international humanitarian law’, by which it meant war crimes and crimes against humanity).

courts and tribunals, for they represent the worst excesses and atrocities in human conflict, and have characterised to varying degrees the situations to which each of the temporary courts reviewed in this volume is a response.⁹ In addition, as outlined below and discussed in detail at the beginning of Chapters 2, 3, and 4, the development and codification of the rules of international law underlying these crimes has been one of the hallmarks of the progressive development of international law over the last century. It is in prohibiting the conduct that constitutes these crimes, and in providing effective means to enforce those prohibitions with individual penal sanctions, that international criminal law seeks to contribute to an international rule of law.

1.1 Legal sources for definitions of crimes under international law

The classic statement of the sources of international law, in Article 38(1) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, refers to three primary sources and one subsidiary source: international agreements, treaties, or conventions (collectively, ‘conventional international law’); customary international law, or the consistent practice of states undertaken in the belief that the conduct is permitted, required, or prohibited by international law; the general principles of law recognised by, and typically derived from the domestic legal systems of, states; and the subsidiary source of the collected commentaries on international law provided by judicial decisions and academic writings of the ‘most highly qualified publicists’.¹⁰ International criminal law demonstrates the interplay among these different sources, and thus provides a particularly robust example of how these types of legal instruments and practices relate to and build on each other in the effort to define and enforce the core categories of crimes under international law.

⁹ In the constitutive instruments of the courts and tribunals discussed in this series, these core categories include other offences that are also given separate treatment under international law. Certain of the internationalised tribunals in fact include some of these offences as separate crimes. See, e.g., UNTAET Regulation, *supra* note 7, Section 7 (freestanding torture provision); ECCC Law, *supra* note 7, Art. 8 (provision on crimes against diplomatic staff). Except to the extent that breaches of norms of international law constitute war crimes or underlying offences of crimes against humanity, this volume will generally not discuss other international norms – such as the prohibitions against torture, hostage-taking, enforced disappearance, apartheid, the various manifestations of slavery, forced labour, and acts of terrorism – indicating or suggesting that individuals may or should be held responsible for their breach, and that such responsibility may or should be criminal. Other norms of this nature, also not treated in this volume, include mercenarism and piracy.

¹⁰ Statute of the International Court of Justice, (1945) 39 *AJIL Supp.* 215, Art. 38(1). This traditional list of the sources of international law has been criticised as under-inclusive and overly focused on the role of states as international actors, as it is now generally accepted that there are other entities and persons that have international legal personality and should therefore play a role in providing the content and shaping the development of international law. See, e.g., Maurice H. Mendelson, ‘Formation of Customary International Law’, in (1998) 272 *Recueil des Cours* 165, 188, 203; Jonathan Charney, ‘Universal International Law’, (1993) 87 *American Journal of International Law* 529 (‘Rather than state practice and *opinio juris*, multilateral forums [where representatives of states and other interested groups come together to address important international problems of mutual concern] often play a central role in the creation and shaping of contemporary [customary] international law.’). In particular, the role of international and non-governmental organisations in the field of international criminal law has been especially pronounced in the preparations for, establishment, and initial functioning of the ICC.

International treaties from the turn of the last century represent the earliest efforts to create a code of conduct for interstate hostilities, while post-war agreements between and among victor and vanquished states at the end of the First and Second World Wars laid the foundations for individual criminal liability for violations of that code, and the first comprehensive international effort to bring the worst individual offenders to justice.¹¹ Developments before, between, and after the major wars of the twentieth century were reflected in burgeoning norms of customary international law, which were in turn codified in later international treaties. In particular, growing acceptance of the need for clearer restrictions on permissible military tactics and protection of vulnerable populations led to the 1949 Geneva Conventions,¹² while widespread revulsion at the Holocaust resulted in the rapid drafting and entry into force of the 1948 Genocide Convention.¹³

Yet the international criminal tribunals, from Nuremberg up to the creation of the ICC and the internationalised tribunals, have experienced some difficulty in marrying these traditional sources of international law with their jurisdictional peculiarities as criminal courts. Perhaps the most important issue confronting their legitimacy has been the fact that their constitutive statutes, which give them jurisdiction and set forth much of the law they must apply, were all promulgated after the commission of the alleged crimes that are the subject of prosecutions,¹⁴ with one exception and one partial exception: (1) the ICC, which has jurisdiction only over crimes committed subsequent to the Court's July 2002 establishment,¹⁵ and (2) the ICTY, with respect to crimes allegedly committed after the 1993 promulgation of that Tribunal's Statute, most notably in and around Srebrenica in 1995 and Kosovo in 1999. Consequently, the Statutes of the various courts and tribunals, drawing inspiration from the Nuremberg Tribunal,¹⁶ grant jurisdiction over certain international crimes but do not themselves prohibit criminal conduct or

¹¹ See Chapter 2, section 2.1; Chapter 3, section 3.1; Chapter 4, section 4.1; see also Gideon Boas, James L. Bischoff, and Natalie L. Reid, *Forms of Responsibility in International Criminal Law* (2007), pp. 145–8.

¹² See Chapter 4, section 4.1.2. ¹³ See Chapter 3, section 3.1.1.

¹⁴ See ICTY Statute, *supra* note 7, Art. 8 (temporal jurisdiction from 1 January 1991 onward); ICTR Statute, *supra* note 7, Art. 7 (temporal jurisdiction from 1 January 1994 to 31 December 1994); UNTAET Regulation, *supra* note 7, Section 2.3 (SPSC temporal jurisdiction from 1 January 1999 to 25 October 1999); ECCC Law, *supra* note 7, Art. 2 new (temporal jurisdiction from 17 April 1975 to 6 January 1979); Law No. 10 (2005), Law of the Iraqi Higher Criminal Court, 18 October 2005, reprinted in Scharf and McNeal (eds.), *supra* note 2, pp. 283 *et seq.*, Art.1(2) (temporal jurisdiction from 17 July 1968 to 1 May 2003); SCSL Statute, *supra* note 7, Art. 1(1) (temporal jurisdiction from November 1996 onward). The SCSL has already indicted all of its accused, all for crimes allegedly committed before the Court's establishment.

¹⁵ Rome Statute, *supra* note 3, Art. 24(1) ('No person shall be criminally responsible under this Statute for conduct prior to the entry into force of the Statute.').

¹⁶ The indictment at Nuremberg listed a number of international treaties as a basis for the law the Charter included in the Tribunal's jurisdiction, most notably the 1899 and 1907 Hague Conventions. See *France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, and United States v. Göring, Bormann, Dönitz, Frank, Frick, Fritzsche, Funk, Hess, Jodl, Kaltenbrunner, Keitel, von Bohlen und Halbach, Ley, von Neurath, von Papen, Raeder, von Ribbentrop, Rosenberg, Sauckel, Schacht, von Schirach, Seyss-Inquart, Speer, and Streicher, International Military Tribunal, Judgment and Sentence*, 1 October 1946, in *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg*, vol. 1, pp. 84–92.

create individual liability.¹⁷ Rather, the primary prohibitive rules, generally identifying the conduct that violates international law, and secondary attributive rules, identifying which individuals may be held personally responsible for those violations, must usually exist in customary international law before they may be enforced.¹⁸ A significant part of the body of decisional law of the *ad hoc* Tribunals is therefore an exercise in divining and clarifying customary international law, and the effect the Tribunals will have on the jurisprudence of the ICC will further advance that project.

The Rome Statute of the ICC is arguably the most important treaty in contemporary international criminal law, owing to its relative comprehensiveness and to the fact that it was agreed upon by a large body of states. In addition, because the Court enjoys only prospective jurisdiction, the legal basis for its jurisdiction is far less controversial than that of its predecessors.¹⁹ Like the *ad hoc* Tribunals, the ICC owes a significant debt to customary international law.²⁰ First, the *travaux préparatoires* of the Rome Statute at times reveal intense debate between a range of international actors over how far a specific requirement or prohibition had developed in customary international law,²¹ with the result that the final text represents a partial codification of custom, partial progressive development of the

¹⁷ As such, it is important to note that judgements of the *ad hoc* Tribunals are technically incorrect, and certainly imprecise, when they refer to alleged crimes as ‘violating’ a given Article of their Statutes.

¹⁸ For the ICTY and the ICTR, see Boas, Bischoff, and Reid, *supra* note 11, pp. 27 & n. 100, 112–13 & n. 640; Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Security Council Resolution 808 (1993), UN Doc. S/25704, 3 May 1993, (‘Secretary-General’s ICTY Report’), para. 33 (noting that the subject matter jurisdiction of the ICTY includes international humanitarian law, which ‘exists in the form of both conventional law and customary law’, and that ‘while there is international customary law which is not laid down in conventions, some of the major conventional humanitarian law has become part of customary international law’); *ibid.*, para. 35 (explaining that ‘the part of conventional international humanitarian law which has beyond doubt become part of international customary law’ includes the Geneva Conventions and the Genocide Convention); Letter Dated 1 October 1994 from the Secretary-General Addressed to the President of the Security Council, UN Doc. S/1994/1125, 4 October 1994 (attaching the report of the Commission of Experts appointed to investigate the events in Rwanda, and noting the Commission’s conclusion that violations of the Geneva Conventions and the Genocide Convention, as well as crimes against humanity, were committed in Rwanda). While the ICTY Appeals Chamber has held that the relevant legal rules may also be found in conventional international law binding on Yugoslavia at the time of the alleged crimes, see, e.g., *Prosecutor v. Kordić and Čerkez*, Case No. IT-95-14/2-A, Judgement, 17 December 2004, paras. 43–46, chambers at both levels in both *ad hoc* Tribunals generally also undertake or rely on analyses of customary international law. See *Prosecutor v. Galić*, Case No. IT-98-29-A, Judgement, 30 November 2006, para. 83 (noting that ‘in most cases, treaty provisions will only provide for the prohibition of a certain conduct, not for its criminalisation, or ... will not sufficiently define the elements of the prohibition they criminalise and customary international law must be looked at for the definition of those elements’).

¹⁹ See Alexander Zahar and Göran Sluiter, *International Criminal Law: A Critical Introduction* (2007), pp. 80–91.

²⁰ The Rome Statute was adopted by the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court and opened for signature by all states on 17 July 1998. It entered into force on 1 July 2002, and as of 1 December 2007 had 139 signatories and 105 parties. See Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General, available at <http://untreaty.un.org/ENGLISH/bible/englishinternetbible/part1/chapterXVIII/treaty11.asp>. One of the main bodies of the ICC is the Assembly of States Parties, in which each state party is represented and to which signatories may send observers. See Rome Statute, *supra* note 3, Art. 112.

²¹ See, e.g., Chapter 2, notes 476–477 and accompanying text; Chapter 3, notes 323–329, 346 and accompanying text; Chapter 4 notes 439–445, 459–464, 474–477 and accompanying text.

law, and a partial compromise between the different participants in the process. Second, much of the content of the Statute and the accompanying Elements of Crimes is derived from or influenced by the jurisprudence of the *ad hoc* Tribunals.

The role that states play in the lawmaking process at the international level is complemented by the contribution that their domestic criminal legal systems make to the growing sophistication of international criminal law. Although relatively few prosecutions for crimes under international law have taken place at the domestic level,²² the procedural rules of international criminal adjudication are based on – and are in fact an attempt to take the best practices from – the rules in the principal legal systems of the world.²³ Moreover, the most fundamental principles of international criminal law are in fact derived from the general principles of criminal law accepted in domestic legal systems. *Nullum crimen sine lege* and *nulla poena sine lege* are the principles that no conduct can be subject to criminal sanction unless prohibited and penalised by law.²⁴ In the context of international criminal law, these principles are interpreted as requiring that, at the time the alleged conduct was committed, it was a breach of international law and was subject to the imposition of individual criminal penalties.²⁵ As such, they are important limiting principles that guide judicial findings and pronouncements of guilt or innocence. In particular, they require that chambers at the *ad hoc* Tribunals ground their analysis firmly in customary international law – a responsibility that is observed to varying degrees by different chambers.²⁶

²² See, e.g., *Fédération Nationale des Déportés et Internés Résistants et Patriotes et Autres v. Barbie* (French Cour de Cassation, Chambre Criminelle, 20 December 1985), 1985 Bull. Crim. No. 407, 1053, (1990) 78 ILR 124; *Affaire Touvier* (French Cour de Cassation, Chambre Criminelle, 27 November 1992), 1992 Bull. Crim. No. 294, 1085; *Public Prosecutor v. Menten* (Dutch Hoge Raad 1981), 75 ILR 362, 362–363; *Regina v. Finta* (Canadian Supreme Court 1994), 1 SCR 701, 814; *Chilean Genocide* case (Spanish Audiencia Nacional, 5 November 1998), translation reprinted in Reed Brody and Michael Ratner (eds.), *The Pinochet Papers: The Case of Augusto Pinochet in Spain and Britain* (2000); see also Chapter 2, note 53 (citing crimes against humanity cases in Canada, Australia, Germany, Austria, and Israel).

²³ See generally Patrick L. Robinson, ‘Fair but Expeditious Trials’, in Hiram Abtahi and Gideon Boas (eds.), *The Dynamics of International Criminal Justice: Essays in Honour of Sir Richard May* (2005), p. 169; Gideon Boas, ‘A Code of Evidence and Procedure for International Criminal Law? The Rules of the ICTY’, in Gideon Boas and William A. Schabas (eds.), *International Criminal Law Developments in the Case Law of the ICTY* (2002), pp. 31–33; Daryl A. Mundis, ‘From “Common Law” Towards “Civil Law”’: The Evolution of the ICTY Rules of Procedure and Evidence’, (2001) 14 *Leiden Journal of International Law* 367.

²⁴ See generally Guillaume Endo, ‘*Nullum crimen nulla poena sine lege* principle and the ICTY and ICTR’, (2002) 15 *Revue québécoise de droit international* 205.

²⁵ See, e.g., Robert Cryer, Håkan Friman, Darryl Robinson, and Elizabeth Wilmshurst, *International Criminal Law and Procedure* (2007), pp. 12–16; William A. Schabas, *The UN International Criminal Tribunals: The Former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Sierra Leone* (2006), pp. 155–156; Gerhard Werle, *Principles of International Criminal Law* (2005), pp. 190–195; Salvatore Zappalà, *Human Rights in International Criminal Proceedings* (2003), pp. 195–197; Christoph Safferling, *Towards an International Criminal Procedure* (2001), p. 88.

²⁶ See Theodor Meron, ‘Reflections on the Prosecution of War Crimes by International Tribunals’, (2006) 100 *American Journal of International Law* 551, 566–567 (asserting that ‘to forestall ... criticisms’ similar to those levelled at the Nuremberg trials, ‘the *ad hoc* tribunals take pains to explain the customary and conventional underpinnings of their decisions’, and that ‘[c]onsequently, judgments of the ICTY are helping to revitalize customary law and to anchor international law firmly in both codified law and judicial decisions’); Secretary-General’s ICTY Report, *supra* note 18, para. 34 (expressing the view that the *nullum crimen sine lege* principle

Finally, the efforts of renowned international scholars – most notably in the form of the work of the International Law Commission (ILC) – cannot be underestimated. In 1950, the ILC presented its codification of the Principles of International Law Recognized in the Charter of the Nürnberg Tribunal and in the Judgment of the Tribunal;²⁷ in 1954, its first draft criminal code, the Draft Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind;²⁸ in 1991, a revised and updated version of that Code;²⁹ in 1994, the Draft Statute for an International Criminal Court that was eventually considered by the conference of plenipotentiaries in Rome;³⁰ and in 1996, the revised Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind.³¹ Each of these documents included invaluable commentaries that explored and explained the relevant principles of the nascent and developing field of international criminal law. Collectively, they have had a remarkable influence on the establishing instruments and the evolving case law of the contemporary international and internationalised criminal courts and tribunals.

1.2 Structure of crimes under international law

The complex variety of sources from which international criminal law derives its substantive content is matched by the complicated structure of the crimes themselves. In certain domestic criminal regimes, for example, each crime is typically a comprehensive description of the conduct justifying the imposition of penal sanctions, bundling together the physical act or omission, the accused's role in the crime, and sometimes any aggravating or mitigating factors.³² In international criminal law, however, those components are disaggregated, and must be independently evaluated and then combined in order to determine whether the accused on trial

'requires that the international tribunal should apply rules of international humanitarian law which are beyond any doubt part of customary law so that the problem of adherence of some but not all states to specific conventions does not arise'). But see, e.g., [Chapter 3, note 178](#) and accompanying text (noting, for example, that the *Akayesu* Trial Chamber cited almost no authority for its descriptions of the various bases on which a protected group under the Genocide Convention may be defined).

²⁷ 5 UN GAOR Supp. (No. 12) at 11, UN Doc. A/1316 (1950).

²⁸ See Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of Its Sixth Session, UN Doc. A/2963 (1954).

²⁹ See Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of Its Forty-third Session, UN Doc. A/46/10 (1991).

³⁰ See Report of the International Law Commission on the Work of Its Forty-sixth Session, UN Doc. A/49/10 (1994).

³¹ See 1996 ILC Draft Code, *supra* note 3.

³² See, e.g., Carl Erik Herlitz, *Parties to a Crime and the Notion of a Complicity Object* (1992), p. 89 (describing the traditional common-law structure of felonies, which distinguished between the participants in a crime by, *inter alia*, the concepts of first-degree and second-degree principals; for murder, for example, those who physically committed the crime would be guilty of first-degree murder, while those who were merely present and aided its commission would be guilty of second-degree murder); *American Jurisprudence: Criminal Law*, vol. 21 § 187 (2nd edn 2007) (treatise on criminal law in the United States, noting that while '[s]ome jurisdictions today continue the common-law distinction in liability' between the participants in a crime, in most state jurisdictions, no such distinction is recognised, and '[a]ll persons involved in the crime are equally guilty of the completed offense, and all are liable for the conduct of each person').

may be convicted. As will be seen below and throughout this volume, the result is that the various elements of an international crime may, in the circumstances, be fulfilled by different actors involved in the bringing to fruition of a given crime.

Broadly speaking, there are three substantive components to international crimes: (1) the underlying offence; (2) the general requirements of each core category of crimes under international law; and (3) the specific requirements for certain crimes. A fourth component – the form of responsibility, or method through which a given individual participates in the crime – must be supplied before an accused can be subject to criminal penalties. This critical fourth component is the subject of the first volume in this series.³³ Though all the elements of a crime may be satisfied by the accused's conduct, international law does not require that a person physically commit the offence in order to be held responsible for the crime. With limited exceptions for certain requirements where their satisfaction may be determined as a matter of law,³⁴ the prosecution must prove all elements of all four components beyond reasonable doubt before a conviction may be entered.

The **underlying offence** is the conduct that produces the result, or is intended to produce the result, that is prohibited by international law. Such conduct is usually also prohibited by domestic law. Examples include murder; rape; physical assault or beating; and theft or destruction of property. In the contexts in which international crimes are generally committed, such as international or non-international armed conflicts, or actions by military or security services against civilian populations, there are frequently many people at different levels in the political or military hierarchy who are involved in the preparation and execution of the criminal activity. In such circumstances, it is often the lowest-level actor, the foot soldier, who carries out the underlying offence. In order to form the basis of an international crime, such conduct will almost always have to be criminal itself,³⁵ as such, it will have its own physical and mental elements. In order to avoid confusion, we restrict the use of the terms '*actus reus*' and '*mens rea*' to these physical and mental elements of the underlying offences.

The **general requirements** are the elements that must be satisfied before an underlying offence constitutes a crime of international significance. These elements vary according to which core category of crimes is alleged, and generally correspond to the context in which the underlying offence was committed or the intent that accompanies the offence: for example, war crimes must occur in an armed

³³ See generally Boas, Bischoff, and Reid, *supra* note 11.

³⁴ For example, the equal gravity requirement for persecution as a crime against humanity, and the gravity requirement for violations of the laws or customs of war. See Chapter 2, text accompanying note 399; Chapter 4, section 4.2.1.5.2.

³⁵ The sole exception being certain forms of persecution as a crime against humanity. See Chapter 2, note 397 and accompanying text.

conflict;³⁶ crimes against humanity must be committed in the context of a widespread or systematic attack on a civilian population;³⁷ and the defining element of genocide is the specific intent to partially or completely destroy a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group (a ‘protected group’).³⁸ The general requirements are the elements that distinguish each category of crimes; that is, any underlying offence must satisfy one set of general requirements if it is to constitute a war crime, a different set of general requirements before it becomes a crime against humanity, and yet another set of general requirements if it is to qualify as genocide.³⁹ Using one example from the paragraph above, the underlying offence of murder is a crime against humanity if the victim is a civilian, the murder is committed in the context of a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population, and either the physical perpetrator⁴⁰ or another relevant actor knows that the murder is part of that attack.⁴¹ That same underlying offence becomes the war crime of wilful killing, a grave breach of the Geneva Conventions, if it is committed in territory controlled by one of the parties to an international conflict, is closely related to that conflict, and the victim is a person protected by the Geneva Conventions.⁴² Finally, this underlying offence constitutes genocide by killing if the physical perpetrator or other relevant actor intends by that murder (and presumably, others) to contribute to the partial or complete destruction of a protected group.⁴³

The **specific requirements** are elements that must also be fulfilled if an underlying offence is to constitute one of a small subset of international crimes that are characterised by unique physical and mental elements, such as discriminatory intent and discrimination in fact for persecution, or the three cumulative criteria for ‘other

³⁶ See generally Chapter 4, section 4.2.1.1. There are also subcategories of war crimes, each defined by its own additional general requirements. See *ibid.*, sections 4.2.1.3–4.2.1.5.

³⁷ See generally Chapter 2, sections 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.4. ³⁸ See generally Chapter 3, section 3.2.1.2.

³⁹ Under the Statutes of the *ad hoc* Tribunals, the elements that characterise each category of crimes include certain jurisdictional requirements that do not exist in customary international law. See Chapter 2, section 2.2.1. In addition, the ICTY Statute has two separate provisions on war crimes; Article 2 grants jurisdiction over grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, and Article 3 over violations of the laws or customs of war. There are therefore several references in *ad hoc* judgements to the fact that these articles share certain general or *chapeau* requirements – referring to the *chapeau* paragraph of each article. See, e.g., *Prosecutor v. Brđanin*, Case No. IT-99-36-T, Judgement, 1 September 2004, paras. 139–143 (making ‘findings in respect of the general requirements common to Articles 2, 3 and 5’). Under customary international law, however, each core category of crimes is characterised by a distinct set of general requirements.

⁴⁰ As in Volume I of this series, the term physical perpetrator is used throughout this volume to refer to the person who physically carries out the *actus reus* of the underlying offence. See Boas, Bischoff, and Reid, *supra* note 11, p. 5 (citing judgements alternatively deeming this person the ‘principal perpetrator’, the ‘principal offender’, the ‘immediate perpetrator’, and the ‘physical perpetrator’). Recently, the ICTY Appeals Chamber expressed its preference for the term ‘principal perpetrator’. See *Prosecutor v. Brđanin*, Case No. IT-99-36-A, Judgement, 3 April 2007, para. 362. We choose to retain our terminology, as the word ‘principal’ may erroneously imply that this person must be one of the more important persons involved in a criminal transaction, when in fact he may occupy a very low place in the hierarchy.

⁴¹ See generally Chapter 2, section 2.2.2; see also Annex, section 2.2.

⁴² See generally Chapter 4, sections 4.2.1.1–4.2.1.3, 4.2.2.4; see also Annex, section 4.13.

⁴³ See generally Chapter 3, section 3.2.1; see also Annex, section 3.2.

inhumane acts'.⁴⁴ Both these examples are crimes against humanity, and an underlying offence must satisfy both the general requirements for crimes against humanity and these additional specific requirements before it may constitute either of these crimes. Again using the example of the underlying offence of murder, in order to qualify as murder as a form of persecution as a crime against humanity, the following general and specific requirements must be satisfied: it must be committed in the context of a widespread or systematic attack directed against a civilian population; either the physical perpetrator or another relevant actor must know that the murder is part of that attack; the victim must be a civilian; and he or she must be targeted on the basis of political, racial, or religious identity.⁴⁵ These crimes, and the specific requirements that distinguish them, are among the most difficult aspects of international criminal law to understand and apply correctly. This difficulty is compounded by the inconsistent and confusing manner in which the chambers of the *ad hoc* Tribunals have treated these crimes, in particular persecution as a crime against humanity.⁴⁶ In our view, persecution as a crime against humanity is not a single undifferentiated crime, but rather a convenient label that is applied to a cluster of underlying offences that share those distinguishing characteristics. In order to determine whether an accused charged with responsibility for 'rape as a form of persecution as a crime against humanity' may be convicted, a trial chamber must first determine whether the crime occurred; in order to do that, it must evaluate the elements of each component of the crime, that is, the elements of the underlying offence (in this example, rape), the specific requirements for persecution, and the general requirements for crimes against humanity. It is a daunting and time-consuming task, but it is one that must be executed assiduously, or an accused could be unfairly punished, or a fundamental breach of international law go unrecognised.

As mentioned above, the fourth component to an international crime is the form of responsibility, which describes the manner and extent of an individual's participation in the realisation of the crime. Before they may convict an accused of a crime under international law, the courts and tribunals discussed in this series must combine the elements of the underlying offence, the general requirements for the charged category of crimes, any specific requirements for particular crimes, and the elements of the charged form or forms of responsibility. For example, in order to conclude that an accused aided and abetted the commission of murder as a form of

⁴⁴ See Chapter 2, sections 2.2.3.8.1, 2.2.3.9.1.

⁴⁵ See Chapter 2, sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3.8.1; see also Annex, section 2.9.b. As explained in Chapter 2, the jurisprudence is not very clear on whether the victim must actually be a member of a group defined by one of these characteristics, or whether the subjective belief of the physical perpetrator or other relevant actor is sufficient. See Chapter 2, text accompanying notes 408–415.

⁴⁶ See Chapter 5, section 5.2.4.1.

persecution as a crime against humanity,⁴⁷ a trial chamber must find that (1) murder was committed, that is, that the death of an individual (the ‘victim’) was caused by the conduct of another person (the ‘physical perpetrator’ or ‘killer’), who acted with intent to kill or intent to harm with acceptance of the reasonable likelihood of death; (2) the murder was part of a widespread or systematic attack directed at a predominantly civilian population, and either the killer or another relevant actor knew that it was a part of that attack; (3) the victim was targeted on the basis of his or her of political, racial, or religious identity; and (4) the accused was aware of the essential elements of the crime, including the persecutory elements, and intentionally lent practical assistance, encouragement, or moral support to the killer, with knowledge or awareness that it would have a substantial effect on the commission of the murder.⁴⁸ As increasingly higher-ranking accused are charged and tried in international criminal proceedings, international courts and tribunals will have to grapple directly with the question of which elements of crimes must be fulfilled by the accused in front of them, and which may be satisfied by the conduct of the physical perpetrator, an intermediate civilian superior or military commander, or another relevant actor.⁴⁹ The annex to this volume, which combines the elements of the forms of responsibility and the elements of the crimes, will specify which elements must be satisfied by an accused in order to hold him responsible for a particular crime under a particular form of responsibility.

Notwithstanding – or perhaps because of – the completion strategies at the two *ad hoc* Tribunals,⁵⁰ their chambers remain extremely active, releasing interlocutory decisions and judgements relevant to the core crimes at least once a month. In addition, the newer courts and tribunals have begun to, or will soon, produce relevant jurisprudence and judgements. As a consequence, readers should note that this analysis is current as of 1 December 2007.

⁴⁷ The elements of the various components of the crime listed in this sentence generally follow the jurisprudence of the *ad hoc* Tribunals. See Chapter 2, sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.8.1; see also Annex, section 5.2.5. There are minor variations in the definitions, both within the Tribunals and in the instruments and case law of the other courts and tribunals discussed in this series.

⁴⁸ See generally Boas, Bischoff, and Reid, *supra* note 11, pp. 303–327.

⁴⁹ See Chapter 2, section 2.2.2.1; Chapter 3, section 3.2.1.1.

⁵⁰ See Security Council Resolution 1534, UN Doc. S/RES/1534 (2004), 26 March 2004, p. 2, para. 5; Security Council Resolution 1503 UN Doc. S/RES/1503 (2003), 28 August 2003, pp. 1–2.

2

Crimes against humanity

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------------|
| 2.1 | Evolution of crimes against humanity | <i>page</i> 18 |
| 2.1.1 | Development through the Second World War | 18 |
| 2.1.2 | Post-Second World War development | 22 |
| 2.1.3 | Developments through the <i>ad hoc</i> Tribunals and beyond | 26 |
| 2.2 | Elements of crimes against humanity | 31 |
| 2.2.1 | Requirements unique to the <i>ad hoc</i> Tribunals | 32 |
| 2.2.1.1 | ICTY: armed conflict as a jurisdictional requirement | 32 |
| 2.2.1.2 | ICTR: discriminatory basis as a jurisdictional requirement | 33 |
| 2.2.2 | General requirements | 35 |
| 2.2.2.1 | Preliminary question: whose conduct and mental state may satisfy the contextual general requirements? | 35 |
| 2.2.2.2 | The attack requirement | 41 |
| 2.2.2.3 | The targeting requirement | 42 |
| 2.2.2.3.1 | The definition of a ‘civilian’ | 43 |
| 2.2.2.3.2 | The definition of a ‘civilian population’ | 49 |
| 2.2.2.3.3 | The meaning of ‘directed against’ | 50 |
| 2.2.2.4 | The ‘widespread or systematic’ requirement | 51 |
| 2.2.2.5 | The first contextual requirement: the underlying offence as part of the attack | 53 |
| 2.2.2.6 | The second contextual requirement: the knowledge that the offence is part of the attack | 54 |
| 2.2.3 | Underlying offences | 56 |
| 2.2.3.1 | Murder | 57 |
| 2.2.3.2 | Extermination | 60 |