



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **The Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court: Certain Contested Issues**

Vagias, M.

### **Citation**

Vagias, M. (2011, May 25). *The Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court: Certain Contested Issues*. Bynkers Hoek Publishing.

Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/17669>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/17669>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

MICHAIL VAGIAS

/ THE TERRITORIAL  
JURISDICTION OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL  
CRIMINAL COURT

**CERTAIN CONTESTED ISSUES**



BYNKERS  
HOEK  
PUBLISHING

PH. D. THESIS



THE TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT  
CERTAIN CONTESTED ISSUES

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. P.F. van der Heijden,  
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties  
te verdedigen op woensdag 25 mei 2011  
klokke 16.15 uur

*door*

Michail Vagias  
geboren te Thessaloniki, Greece  
in 1980

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor: prof. dr. C.J.R. Dugard

Co-Promotor: dr. L.J. van den Herik

Overige leden: prof. dr. L. Zegveld

prof. dr. C. Stahn

prof. dr. E. van Sliedregt (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

dr. C.M.J. Ryngaert (K. U. Leuven, Belgium en Universiteit Utrecht)

Design cover: © Studio Meike Ziegler, Amsterdam

This Ph.D. Thesis was financed by the  
State Scholarship Foundation of the Hellenic Republic (Greece)  
(Scholarship Program for International Law Studies Abroad, 2007-2010)

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the five years of this thesis (2005-2010), the Center of International and European Economic Law in Thessaloniki, the Peace Palace Library (especially Niels van Tol), the New Business School, Amsterdam, The Hague University of Applied Sciences and the Bynkershoek Instituut, The Hague helped each in its own way in its production. I am grateful for the financial support of the Greek State Scholarship Foundation (2007-2010) and Prof. Stilianos Perrakis, for his co-operation as the Scholarship Foundation's Academic Supervisor.

I was extremely fortunate to have John Dugard as my supervisor and Larissa van den Herik as co-supervisor. I am thankful for the discussions of different aspects of my work and the ICC in general with Judge Georgios Pikis, as well as Virginia Lindsay and Melanie O'Brien.

My gratitude for their unwavering support and encouragement to all my friends, including Magnus Lejon, Linus Knutsson and Dennis Persson; from Greece, Hara Aroni, Alex Sarris, Christos Kleisiaris, Sotiris Tezias, Nicholas Bezirgiannis and Agapi Gouziouri, who always kept in touch. The Kyriazis family, Ioannis Kyriazis and Diah Tan, as well as Vasiliki Magoula helped a friend in need of getting out of the phd-way of life.

I was lucky to benefit from the wisdom of Paroula Perraki and Costas Antonopoulos. They made sure I stayed the course in times of ambivalence and doubt. The last few years a number of people put things in perspective; my students, my colleagues at The Hague, including William Worster, Ernst van Bemmelen van Gent and Joris Sprakel from the Bynkershoek Instituut, who also assisted greatly with the Dutch summary and the editing of this book. On that note, a warm 'thank you' goes also to Sotiria Tsoukala.

To my Ph.D. witnesses and friends Axelle Cartier and David Dekker I owe a special debt of gratitude. Last, Thomas Skouteris is largely responsible as a mentor, a friend and a colleague for forming my legal thinking – and professional development.

My family was the solid foundation that made this thesis possible. Nicholas, Niki, Vagias and Sophia Vagias, Anastasios, Cristie, Demosthenis, Barbara, Athena and the late Thomas Teneketzis, as well as Maria Kirtsani, Dimitris Kirtsanis and Stella Stavrousis; they gave me their love, support and unconditional faith in my abilities. Thank you.

The memory of my father, Stergios Vagias, steeled my determination to make this thesis a reality. I will always remember him lovingly.

My sister Efi reminded me through her example that the only way to move forward in life is with hope, perseverance and a good cheer. Words do not suffice to express my gratitude and love for her and my mother, Aiki.

M.V., The Hague, 13 March 2011

*This Ph.D. Thesis is dedicated to my mother, Aiki,  
my sister, Efthimia  
and the memory of my father, Stergios.*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1 - Introduction</b>	11
1.1 Objective	15
1.2 Structure	16
1.3 Methodology	17
<b>Chapter 2 - Definitions and State Territorial Jurisdiction</b>	21
2.1 Introduction	22
2.1.1. Jurisdiction	22
2.1.2 Territorial Jurisdiction	22
2.1.3 Prescriptive, Enforcement and Adjudicative Jurisdiction	23
2.2 The Lotus Case	24
2.3 Principles and Rules of state jurisdiction	27
2.3.1. The territorial principle	29
2.3.2. The principle of connecting links ('the Mann doctrine')	30
2.3.3. Synthesis	34
2.4 Rules of jurisdiction	35
2.4.1. Territoriality and territorial fictions	35
2.4.2. Subjective Territoriality	39
2.4.3. Objective Territoriality/Ubiquity	40
2.4.3.1. Meaning, status	40
2.4.3.2. Scope; defining constituent elements; mens rea, aiding and abetting, incitement to commit a crime	40
2.4.3.3. Ubiquity	46
2.4.4. The effects doctrine	47
<b>Chapter 3 - The Preparatory Works of Article 12(2)(a)</b>	55
3.1. Purpose of the Chapter – Sources – Structure	56
3.2 The International Law Commission's work on the Statute of an International Criminal Court – Territorial Jurisdiction	60
3.3. The Ad Hoc Committee (1995) and the Preparatory Committee (1996-1998)	66
3.4. / Negotiations at the Rome Conference	70
3.5. Conclusions	74
<b>Chapter 4 - Instruments of interpretation of the Rome Statute and Article 12(2)(a)</b>	77
4.1. Introduction	78
4.2. Interpretation and territoriality under Article 12(2)(a)	78
4.2.1. Interpretation of the Rome Statute in accordance with the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties – teleological interpretation	80
4.2.2. Interpretation of the Rome Statute in accordance with the Statute's rules of interpretation	82
4.2.2.1. Interpretation of Article 12(2)(a) of the Rome Statute in accordance with Article 21(3)?	83
4.2.2.2. Interpretation of Article 12(2)(a) of the Rome Statute in accordance with the principle of legality?	86
4.2.2.3. Interpretation of the Rome Statute in accordance with the legal nature of the provision?	92
4.3. Conclusion	94



<b>Chapter 5 - 'the conduct in question'</b>	99
5.1. Introduction	100
5.1.1. The problem – Post-Rome negotiations in the 2008-2009 Aggression Working Group	100
5.1.2. The doctrinal conditions	102
5.1.2.1. State territory as connecting link	102
5.1.2.2. The inherent power of the Court to decide on its jurisdiction (compétence de la compétence/ kompetenz kompetenz)	103
5.1.2.3. Interpretation of ICC jurisdiction, delegation of authority and limitations	105
5.1.2.4. The usefulness of international law rules	107
5.1.2.5. The usefulness of national law	108
5.2. "Conduct in question" as conduct, including act or omission	109
5.3. 'Conduct in question' as 'crimes in question'	115
5.4. Interim Conclusion	120
5.5. Localization of criminal activity	122
5.5.1. Delimiting the Court's territorial jurisdiction on the basis of consequences or ubiquity and the application of rules and principles of international law	122
5.5.2. Delimiting the Court's territorial jurisdiction on the basis of consequences or ubiquity and the application of general principles of law	129
5.5.3. Delimiting the Court's territorial jurisdiction on the basis of consequences or ubiquity and the application of human rights rules	136
5.5.3.1. The existence of jurisdiction	137
5.5.3.2. The exercise/interpretation of jurisdiction	140
5.5.3.3. Concluding observations	143
5.6. Conclusion	144
<b>Chapter 6 - The effects doctrine</b>	147
6.1. The problem and the structure of the argument	148
6.2. Should the Court adopt the effects doctrine of jurisdiction?	149
6.3. The argument	154
6.3.1. Criminal jurisdiction – the form of liability	155
6.3.2. Territorial jurisdiction	161
6.3.3. Effects – criminal and antitrust – classifications	163
6.3.4. Over-regulation and jurisdictional conflicts	165
6.3.5. Pacta tertiis – violation of sovereignty of States not Parties	166
6.3.6. Practical aspects: collection of evidence	167
6.4. Conclusion	168
<b>Chapter 7 - Belligerent Occupation and ICC territorial jurisdiction</b>	171
7.1. Introduction	172
7.2. The problem and the role of international rules	174
7.3. The Territorial Application of the Rome Statute as an international treaty - Article 29 VCLT	176
7.4. Occupation and territory – the prohibition of annexation	178
7.4.1. The Applicable Legal Framework	178
7.4.1.1. Occupation: definition	179
7.4.1.2. The temporary character of occupation	180
7.4.1.3. The prohibition of annexation	180
7.4.2. The impact of the fact of occupation to the delegation of territorial jurisdiction by the occupied state to the ICC	182
7.4.3. The existence of jurisdiction	184
7.4.3.1. Criminal Jurisdiction as an attribute of state sovereignty	184
7.4.3.2. Prescriptive criminal jurisdiction	185
7.4.3.3. Enforcement criminal jurisdiction	189
7.4.4. The capacity to conclude treaties	193
7.4.5. Conclusion: basic principles and rules	197
7.5. The application of article 12(2)(a) in State Party territories occupied by another State Party	198
7.6. The Application of Article 12(2)(a) in State Party territories occupied by a State not Party	203
7.7. The Application of Article 12(2)(a) in the territory of a State not Party occupied by a State Party	205

7.7.1. “within the territory” meaning “under their control” in Article 12(2)(a) Rome Statute? – the effect of Article 21(3) Rome Statute - The policy argument	206
7.7.2. “within the territory” meaning “under their control” in Article 12(2)(a) Rome Statute? – the effect of Article 21(3) Rome Statute - The legal argument	210
7.7.2.1. An example	210
7.7.2.2. The main issue	211
7.8. Conclusions	217
<b>Chapter 8 - Conclusions</b>	219
8.1. Introduction	220
8.2. Foundations	222
8.3. Article 12(2)(a) and territorial approaches; from strict territoriality to the effects doctrine and beyond?	223
8.4. Article 12(2)(a) in situations of military occupation	225
8.5. Conclusion	228
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	230
1. Books	230
2. Articles and Book contributions	235
3. Table of Cases	249
<b>Annex</b>	259
Nederlandse samenvatting	259
De territoriale rechtsmacht van het Internationale Strafhof – Enkele betwiste kwesties	259
Summary	262
The Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court – Certain Contested Issues	262
Curriculum Vitae	264

