

Annegret Hartig

Making Aggression a Crime Under Domestic Law

On the Legislative Implementation of Article
8*bis* of the ICC Statute

ASSER PRESS

 Springer

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Relevance of the Topic	2
1.2	Aim, Structure and Approach of this Book	4
1.3	Terminology	6
1.3.1	Crime of Aggression	6
1.3.2	Domestic Implementation	7
1.4	The Practice of the Implementers of the Kampala Amendments	7
1.5	The Particularities of the Crime of Aggression for the Purpose of Implementation	9
1.5.1	Leadership Crime and Based on a State Act	9
1.5.2	Restricted Jurisdictional Regime of the International Criminal Court	10
1.5.3	Limited State Practice	10
1.6	Overview of the Chapters	11
	References	14
2	An Obligation to Criminalize Aggression Under Domestic Law?	17
2.1	Introduction	18
2.1.1	Obligation and Compliance	20
2.1.2	Hardness and Softness of Law: Binding Form, Precision and Enforcement	22
2.1.3	Working Definition of “Aggression”	24
2.2	Domestic Constitutional Law	24
2.2.1	Hard Legal Obligation Under Constitutional Law to Criminalize Aggression	24
2.2.2	<i>A Fortiori</i> Obligation from the Constitutional Prohibition of Incitement to War or Propaganda for War	26
2.2.3	Inference from Other Pacifist Constitutional Provisions	28
2.2.4	Inference from the Duty to Protect Fundamental Rights	29
2.2.5	Conclusion to Domestic Constitutional Law	31

2.3	ICC Statute	32
2.3.1	No Explicit Legal Obligation to Criminalize	33
2.3.2	Implied Legal Obligation to Criminalize Due to the Principle of Complementarity?	36
2.3.3	Coercive Potential of Complementarity Irrespective of an Obligation: The Threat of Judicial Interventions	41
2.3.4	Conclusion to the ICC Statute	46
2.4	International Human Rights Law	48
2.4.1	<i>A Fortiori</i> Obligation from the Obligation to Prohibit Propaganda for War Under Article 20(1) of the ICCPR? ...	50
2.4.2	From the Obligation to Ensure Human Rights to the Obligation to Criminalize Serious Violations	51
2.4.3	Human Rights Relevance of the Crime of Aggression	53
2.4.4	Territorial Scope of the Obligation to Criminalize Aggression	60
2.4.5	Conclusion to International Human Rights Law	64
2.5	Customary International Law	66
2.5.1	The Classical Inductive Approach: State Practice and <i>Opinio Iuris</i>	66
2.5.2	The Relationship Between the Obligation to Criminalize, the Obligation to Exercise Jurisdiction and the Obligation to Prosecute (or Extradite)	67
2.5.3	Limited Aggression-Specific State Practice Supported by <i>Opinio Iuris</i> on the Obligation to Criminalize	68
2.5.4	No General Customary Obligation to Criminalize “Crimes Under International Law” Under Domestic Law	74
2.5.5	Conclusion to Customary International Law	75
2.6	<i>Ius Cogens</i>	76
2.6.1	Definition and Characteristics of a <i>Ius Cogens</i> Norm	77
2.6.2	Methodological Difference of the <i>Ius Cogens</i> Avenue in Comparison to the Customary International Law Avenue	77
2.6.3	Aggression as a Crime Based on a <i>Ius Cogens</i> Norm	78
2.6.4	Effects of a <i>Ius Cogens</i> Norm: An Obligation to (Extradite or) Prosecute and an Inherent Obligation to Criminalize?	82
2.6.5	Conclusion to <i>Ius Cogens</i>	87
2.7	Conclusion	89
	References	90
3	The Core Wrong of the Crime of Aggression	105
3.1	Introduction	106
3.2	Approaching the “Core Wrong” of a Crime	107

- 3.2.1 The Offense Definition and the “International Element” 107
 - 3.2.2 The Theory on Protected Legal Interests (*Rechtsgüterlehre*) 109
 - 3.2.3 Protected Legal Interests and Type of Attack 110
- 3.3 State Sovereignty as a Protected Legal Interest 112
 - 3.3.1 The State Interests Mentioned in Article 8bis(2) of the ICC Statute 112
 - 3.3.2 The Underlying Acts Against Another State in Article 8bis(2) of the ICC Statute 113
 - 3.3.3 The Need to Move Beyond the Bilateral Sphere 114
- 3.4 International Peace as a Protected Legal Interest 114
 - 3.4.1 The Multifaceted Concept of Peace 115
 - 3.4.2 The Preambular Presumption of the ICC Statute: Peace as an Overarching Protected Legal Interest 116
 - 3.4.3 The Underlying Prohibition of the Use of Force as a Means to Protect Peace 116
 - 3.4.4 The Crime of Aggression as the Post-Nuremberg Version of the “Crime Against Peace” 118
- 3.5 Individual Interests as Protected Legal Interests 119
 - 3.5.1 The Protection of Individual Interests by Crimes Under International Law? 120
 - 3.5.2 The Humanization of International Law 122
 - 3.5.3 Humanized Sovereignty: The Protection of State Sovereignty to Protect Rights of Those Living Within the State 125
 - 3.5.4 The “Manifest” Threshold Cannot be Fulfilled Without Affecting Individuals 127
 - 3.5.5 Lower Level of Protection of Individual Interests by Triggering International Humanitarian Law 133
 - 3.5.6 Conclusion to Individual Interests as Protected Legal Interests 136
- 3.6 The Type of Attack on the Protected Legal Interests 138
 - 3.6.1 Use of Armed Force *by* a State 138
 - 3.6.2 The *Aggressive* Use of Armed Force: A Manifest Violation of the *Ius ad Bellum* 140
 - 3.6.3 Committed by Persons from the Leadership Circle of a State 144
 - 3.6.4 Conclusion to the Type of Attack 147
- 3.7 Conclusion 148
- References 150

4 Mapping the Normative Gaps Under Domestic Law	159
4.1 Introduction	160
4.1.1 An Illustration of the Limits of the “Minimalist Approach” to Implementation	161
4.1.2 Types of Criminal Offenses Under Domestic <i>Lex Lata</i>	162
4.1.3 The Reference and the Comparative Factors for the Gap Analysis	163
4.1.4 No Normative Gaps Due to the Direct Applicability of Aggression as a “Crime Under International Law”?	164
4.2 Treason	165
4.2.1 General Understanding of Treason	165
4.2.2 Protected Interests: “Oldest Crime Against the State”	166
4.2.3 Type of Attack: Force of a Certain Threshold, Attack “from Within”, Owing Allegiance	166
4.3 Other Ordinary Criminal Offenses	167
4.3.1 Criminal Offenses that Capture Individual Acts that Make Up the State Act of Aggression	168
4.3.2 Protected Interests: Primarily Individual Interests	169
4.3.3 Type of Attack: No Integration in a State Act or of <i>Ius ad Bellum</i> Considerations	169
4.3.4 The Combatant’s Privilege as an Obstacle?	169
4.3.5 Conclusion to Other Ordinary Criminal Offenses	172
4.4 The “Preliminary Offenses” of Incitement to War and Propaganda for War as Informed by the ICCPR	173
4.4.1 General Understanding of Incitement to War and Propaganda for War	173
4.4.2 Protected Interests: In Principle the Same as Those Violated by War	174
4.4.3 Type of Attack: Preliminary Crime, Communicative Conduct, No Leadership Clause	175
4.5 The Crime of Aggressive War Modelled on the Nuremberg and Tokyo Precedents	177
4.5.1 General Understanding	177
4.5.2 Protected Legal Interests: In Principle the Same as Those Protected by the Kampala Definition	178
4.6 Genocide, Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes as By-Products of Crimes of Aggression	180
4.7 Crime of Aggression as a War Crime: “Excessive Attack” as a Gateway for <i>Ius ad Bellum</i> Considerations?	182
4.7.1 General Understanding	183
4.7.2 Protected Interests: Civilians and International Peace	184
4.7.3 Type of Attack: <i>Ius ad Bellum</i> Violation Reflected in “Excessive Attack”?	185
4.7.4 Conclusion to the Crime of Aggression as a War Crime	190

4.8 Crime of Aggression as a Crime Against Humanity:
“Other Inhumane Acts” as a Gateway for *Ius ad Bellum*
Considerations? 191

4.8.1 General Understanding: “Controlled Use of Analogy”
for Assessing “Other Inhumane Acts” 192

4.8.2 Protected Legal Interests: Civilians, Humanity
and International Peace 193

4.8.3 Type of Attack: *Ius ad Bellum* Violation Reflected
in “Other Inhumane Act”? 193

4.8.4 Conclusion to the Crime of Aggression as a Crime
Against Humanity 196

4.9 Conclusion 198

References 200

5 The Restricted Jurisdictional Regime of the International
Criminal Court 207

5.1 Introduction 208

5.1.1 Why the Jurisdictional Reach of the International
Criminal Court Matters for Domestic Implementation 208

5.1.2 The Restrictions of the “Ordinary” Jurisdictional
Regime Depending on the Operationalization
of Consent 209

5.1.3 The Requirement of Consent from the Perspective
of International Adjudication and Criminal
Adjudication 210

5.1.4 Chronological Structure and Focus on Jurisdictional
Regime upon State Referral and *Proprio Motu*
Investigations 212

5.2 The Rome Compromise: Single-Ratification Regime 213

5.2.1 Ratification by the Territorial State or National State
of the Accused 213

5.2.2 Drafting History: Compromise Between Universal
Jurisdiction and More Consensual Forms
of Jurisdiction 214

5.2.3 Inclusion of Nationals of Non-States Parties Under
Territorial Jurisdiction 215

5.2.4 Inclusion of Territory and Nationals of Non-States
Parties by *Ad Hoc* Acceptance, Article 12(3)
of the ICC Statute 217

5.2.5 Difference in Reach in Case of a UN Security Council
Referral 217

5.2.6 Critical Account of the Jurisdictional Reach Under
the Single-Ratification Regime 218

5.3 The Kampala Compromise: Soft Consent-Based Regime
for States Parties 221

5.3.1	In Principle: Single-Ratification Regime	222
5.3.2	Ability for States Parties to Opt Out, Article 15 <i>bis</i> (4) of the ICC Statute	223
5.3.3	Categorical Exclusion of Territory or Nationals of Non-States Parties, Article 15 <i>bis</i> (5) of the ICC Statute	229
5.3.4	Possibility for Non-States Parties to Declare an <i>Ad Hoc</i> Acceptance Under Article 12(3) of the ICC Statute?	230
5.3.5	Difference in Reach in Case of UN Security Council Referral, Article 15 <i>ter</i> of the ICC Statute	231
5.3.6	Critical Account of the Jurisdictional Reach Under the Soft Consent-Based Regime for States Parties	232
5.4	The New York City Resolution: Strict Consent-Based Regime with Opt-Out Option for States Parties?	235
5.4.1	Content of the Activation Resolution	237
5.4.2	Drafting History: No Compromise between Strict Consent-Based Regime and Opt-Out Regime	238
5.4.3	Legal Value of the Activation Resolution	242
5.4.4	Interpretation of Article 15 <i>bis</i> (4) of the ICC Statute in Light of Its Amendment Procedure	245
5.4.5	Critical Account of the Jurisdictional Reach Under the Strict Consent-Based Regime with Additional Opt-Out Option for States Parties	250
5.5	Conclusion	252
	References	255
6	Options for Incorporating the Definition of the Crime of Aggression into Domestic Law	263
6.1	Introduction	264
6.1.1	The Principle of Complementarity and the Decisions of Whether and How to Implement	265
6.1.2	Implementation as an Act to Integrate an International Crime Definition into the Domestic Legal Order	266
6.1.3	The Advantages of Complete Implementation and Modified Implementation	268
6.1.4	The Different Understandings of the Principle of Legality as a Source of Tension	270
6.2	Implementation by Copying	273
6.3	Implementation by Reference	274
6.3.1	Different Types of References as Illustrated by the Samoan Implementation	274
6.3.2	Tensions with the Principle of Legality?	276
6.3.3	Conclusion	280
6.4	Modified Implementation	281

6.4.1	Over-Inclusive and Under-Inclusive Implementations	281
6.4.2	Modifications with Respect to the Underlying Act of Aggression	283
6.4.3	Modifications with Respect to the “Manifest” Threshold	288
6.4.4	Modifications with Respect to the Leadership Clause	299
6.4.5	Modification with Respect to the Individual Conduct	304
6.4.6	Conclusion to Modified Implementation	309
6.5	Conclusion	311
	References	313
7	Legislative Specification of the Geographical Ambit of Domestic Criminal Jurisdiction	321
7.1	Introduction	322
7.1.1	Jurisdiction and Its Various Expressions	323
7.1.2	The <i>Lotus</i> Case and the Framework of International Law for Domestic Criminal Jurisdiction	325
7.1.3	Consequences of Excessive Implementation	327
7.2	The Principles of Jurisdiction and Their Broader Categorization	328
7.2.1	The Nature of the Crime and Principles of Jurisdiction	329
7.2.2	Principles of Territorial and Extraterritorial Jurisdiction	330
7.2.3	“Aggressor State Jurisdiction” and “Other State Jurisdiction”?	331
7.3	Principle of Territoriality	333
7.3.1	General Understanding and Applicability to the Crime of Aggression	333
7.3.2	The <i>Locus Delicti</i> of the Crime of Aggression: Even “Third State” Jurisdiction due to the Ambiguous Constituent Element of “Gravity”?	334
7.4	Nationality Principle	336
7.4.1	General Understanding and Applicability to the Crime of Aggression	336
7.4.2	The Nationality of the Aggressor: Does Aggressor State Jurisdiction Equal Nationality Jurisdiction?	337
7.5	Protective Principle	338
7.5.1	General Understanding and Applicability to the Crime of Aggression	338
7.5.2	Whose Interests Are Affected: The Victim State and Its Allies?	340
7.6	Passive Personality Principle	341
7.6.1	General Understanding	341
7.6.2	Applicability to the Crime of Aggression: A Crime Committed Against Individuals?	342

7.7	Universal Jurisdiction	344
7.7.1	General Understanding	344
7.7.2	Closely Related Principle of Representation and Principle of Treaty-Based Jurisdiction	345
7.7.3	Methodological Framework for Determining the Applicability to the Crime of Aggression Under Customary International Law	347
7.7.4	Inductive Approach: Aggression-Specific State Practice and <i>Opinio Iuris</i>	352
7.7.5	Deductive Approach: Principle-Based Reasoning	375
7.7.6	Conclusion: Applicability of Universal Jurisdiction to the Crime of Aggression	386
7.8	Conclusion	386
	References	390
8	Legal Challenges for Foreign Adjudicative Jurisdiction	403
8.1	Introduction	404
8.1.1	Legal Challenges as a Response to the Unique Character of the Crime of Aggression?	406
8.1.2	Sovereignty as the Origin of Most Legal Challenges	408
8.1.3	Presumption of Congruency Between Prescriptive and Adjudicative Jurisdiction Unless Prohibitive Rule	408
8.2	The Principle of <i>Par in Parem non Habet Imperium</i>	410
8.2.1	The Claim in Article 8 of the 1996 Draft Code of Crimes of the International Law Commission	410
8.2.2	A Principle with a Different Original and an Uncertain Current Understanding	411
8.2.3	No General Practice Accepted as Law in Support of the Claimed Restriction to the Aggressor State	413
8.2.4	Conclusion to the Principle of <i>Par in Parem non Habet Imperium</i>	417
8.3	Personal Immunity from Foreign Criminal Jurisdiction	418
8.3.1	Rationale: Smooth Conduct of International Relations	419
8.3.2	Limited Personal, Limited Temporal and Absolute Material Scope	419
8.3.3	Applicability Even If Commission of Crime of Aggression	421
8.3.4	Conclusion to Personal Immunity	421
8.4	Functional Immunity from Foreign Criminal Jurisdiction	422
8.4.1	Rationale: Consequence of State Immunity or Something Else?	424
8.4.2	Limited Material, Broad Personal and Broad Temporal Scope	425

- 8.4.3 Methodological Framework for Determining the (In-)Applicability to the Crime of Aggression Under Customary International Law 427
- 8.4.4 Legal Nature of Functional Immunity 429
- 8.4.5 Inductive Approach: Aggression-Specific State Practice 430
- 8.4.6 Deductive Approach: Principle-Based Reasoning 449
- 8.5 The *Monetary Gold* Doctrine 457
 - 8.5.1 The Origin of the Doctrine: Contentious Proceedings of the International Court of Justice 458
 - 8.5.2 Extension of the Doctrine to All International Tribunals? 458
 - 8.5.3 Extension to Domestic Aggression Proceedings? 459
- 8.6 Conclusion 461
- References 463
- Summary and Final Conclusions 473**
- Annex: Domestic Legislation 481**
- Index 507**