



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Prosecuting environmental harm before the International Criminal Court

Gillett, M.G.

Citation

Gillett, M. G. (2018, June 19). *Prosecuting environmental harm before the International Criminal Court*. s.n., S.l. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/62738>

Version: Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/62738>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/62738> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Gillett, Matthew Grant

Title: Prosecuting environmental harm before the International Criminal Court

Date: 2018-06-19



Universiteit
Leiden

Prosecuting Environmental Harm before the International Criminal Court

Matthew Grant Gillett

Prosecuting Environmental Harm before the International Criminal Court

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van

de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof. mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,

volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties

te verdedigen op dinsdag 19 juni 2018

klokke 15.00 uur

door

Matthew Grant Gillett

geboren te Auckland, Nieuw Zeeland

in 1979

Promotor: prof. dr. L.J. van den Herik

Co-promotor: dr. D.A. Dam-de Jong

Promotiecommissie: prof. dr. C. Stahn

prof. dr. P.N. Okowa (Queen Mary University of London, UK)

dr. R.J.M. Lefeber (University of Amsterdam)

prof. dr. J.W. Ouwerkerk

dr. J.C. Powderly

To my daughter Eloise, who inspired me to seek means to defend the natural environment for the sake of present and future generations

Acknowledgements

A depth of gratitude must be expressed to my patient supervisors, prof. dr. Larissa van den Herik and dr. Daniëlla Dam-de Jong, for their insightful guidance. At the same time, it would have been impossible to complete this work without the astute and dedicated support of the brilliant dr. Marina Lostal, who also happens to be my wife.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW OF PROSECUTING ENVIRONMENTAL HARM BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT	13
A. Introduction	13
B. Research questions	18
C. Approach	20
1. Sources of law	20
2. Structure of this study.....	26
3. Adjudicative coherence	26
4. Three paradigmatic forms of harm to the environment	28
(a) Attacks causing excessive harm to the environment during armed conflict.....	30
(b) Unlawful transboundary movement and storage of hazardous substances (toxic dumping).....	33
(c) Wildlife exploitation	39
D. Definitional, theoretical, and legal underpinnings.....	45
1. The natural environment	45
2. Anthropocentrism	46
3. Eco-centrism.....	47
4. The historical development of international law relevant to prosecuting environmental harm.....	49
(a) Development of Environmental Law	50
(b) Development of International Criminal Law addressing Environmental Harm.....	54
II. ENVIRONMENTAL HARM AND THE ICC'S SUBSTANTIVE FRAMEWORK .	58
A. Introduction	58
B. The Preamble of the Rome Statute and environmental harm	59
C. Prohibitions in the Rome statute relevant to environmental harm	60
1. Genocide	60
2. Crimes Against Humanity	63
(a) Contextual Elements	63
(b) Other inhumane acts	64
(c) Persecution	65
(d) Deportation and forcible transfer	67
(e) Murder and extermination	68
(f) Other crimes against humanity	69
3. War Crimes	70
(a) Contextual elements	70
(b) Underlying crimes.....	71
(i) Pillage	73
(ii) Destruction of property	76
(iii) Intentionally directing attacks against civilians and civilian objects	78
(iv) Intentionally using starvation of civilians as a method of warfare	79
(v) Using poisonous weapons, or asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, liquids, materials or devices.....	80
4. Aggression.....	81
D. Applying the regulatory framework to three paradigmatic cases of environmental harm	83
1. Attacks causing excessive harm to the environment during armed conflict.....	83
(a) Genesis and background of article 8(2)(b)(iv)	84
(b) Elements of article 8(2)(b)(iv)	86

(i) International armed conflict	86
(ii) Attack	88
(iii) Natural environment	89
(iv) Widespread, long-term, and severe damage	91
(v) <i>Mens rea</i>	94
(vi) Proportionality	96
(c) Additional limitations on the ambit of article 8(2)(b)(iv)	105
(d) Additional provisions violated by excessive environmental harm during armed conflict	105
2. Unlawful transboundary movement and storage of hazardous substances (toxic dumping)	107
(a) Assessing the unlawfulness of toxic dumping	108
(i) The Basel Convention	108
(b) Prosecuting toxic dumping under the Rome Statute	111
(i) Toxic dumping as genocide	111
(ii) Toxic dumping as crimes against humanity	111
(iii) Toxic dumping as a war crime	116
3. Wildlife exploitation	120
(a) Assessing the unlawfulness of wildlife exploitation	120
(i) Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	120
(b) Prosecuting wildlife exploitation under the Rome Statute	121
(i) Wildlife exploitation as genocide	122
(ii) Wildlife exploitation as crimes against humanity	122
(iii) Wildlife exploitation as war crimes	125
E. Conclusion	131
 III. ENVIRONMENTAL HARM AND JURISDICTIONAL AND PROCEDURAL CHALLENGES	133
A. Introduction	133
B. The ICC's jurisdiction and admissibility framework and environmental harm	135
1. Jurisdiction	135
2. Trigger mechanisms	138
3. Admissibility and complementarity	141
4. Gravity	145
C. Investigation, fact-finding and evidence in relation to environmental harm at the ICC	147
1. ICC procedural framework	147
(a) Investigation and fact-finding	147
(i) Preliminary examination	148
(ii) Investigation	149
(iii) Judicial involvement in investigations	157
(iv) State cooperation in the investigation of environmental harm	160
(b) Confirmation of charges, commencement of trial, and expeditious proceedings at the ICC	164
(i) Arrest warrant, initial hearings and confirmation of charges	164
(ii) Trial proceedings	165
(c) Ensuring expeditious proceedings in the case of environmental harm	166
(d) Conclusion on investigations and evidence gathering	168
2. Evidentiary challenges in environmental harm cases	169
(a) Approach to admission of evidence	170
(i) Hearsay evidence	173
(ii) The admission of documents through witnesses	173
(iii) Bar table motions	174
(iv) Exclusionary rules concerning evidence	175
(b) Standards and burdens of proof applicable to environmental harm cases	176
(i) The applicability of the precautionary principle	177

(c) Order of presentation of the case.....	179
(d) Proving key elements of environmental harm.....	181
(i) The nature of the wrongful act.....	182
(ii) The extent of the damage resulting from the wrongful act	186
(iii) The person or persons responsible for the causative act and the manner in which they brought about the act.....	190
(iv) The knowledge and intent of the accused	193
(e) Expert evidence concerning environmental harm	198
(i) The definition of an expert at the international criminal court.....	199
(ii) The subject-matter of expert testimony in environmental harm cases	200
(iii) The role of the expert: neutral interlocutor or partisan witness?.....	201
(iv) Expert evidence on environmental matters: the judicial view.....	203
D. Conclusions on the ICC's procedure concerning environmental harm	205
 IV. ENVIRONMENTAL HARM AND VICTIM PARTICIPATION AND REPARATIONS BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT.....	211
A. Introduction	211
B. Victim participation	213
1. Rules and principles governing victims' participation	213
(a) The Preamble	213
(b) The definition of victims: key provisions	214
(c) Rules on modalities of victims' participation.....	215
C. Victim reparations	217
1. The law on victim reparations at the ICC	217
2. Individual vs collective reparations	222
3. Implementation: The Trust Fund for Victims.....	223
D. Applying the ICC's regulatory scheme for victim participation and reparations to environmental harm	225
1. Harm to the environment <i>per se</i> vs. harm to individual humans or organizations as a result of environmental destruction	226
(a) The environment as a victim <i>per se</i>	226
(b) Individual persons who suffer due to environmental harm as victims	229
2. Causation required for reparations for environmental harm	231
3. Quantifying reparations for environmental harm	232
4. Applying the victims' participation and reparations framework to three types of environmental harm	234
(a) Military attacks that result in disproportionate environmental harm.....	234
(i) Victim status and participation.....	234
(ii) Reparations for victims of attacks causing excessive harm to the environment during armed conflict	237
(b) Unlawful transboundary movement and storage of hazardous substances (toxic dumping).....	241
(i) Victim status and participation.....	241
(ii) Reparations for victims of toxic dumping.....	243
(c) Wildlife exploitation	246
(i) Victim status and participation.....	246
(ii) Reparations for victims of wildlife crime	248
E. Adjudicative incoherence arising from the application of the ICC rules on victim participation and reparations to environmental harm.....	249
F. Conclusion	255

V. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE WAY FORWARD	257
A. Orientation of the Court	258
B. Adjudicative (in)coherence	259
C. Policy options	262
VI. SUMMARY	267
VII. SAMENVATTING (SUMMARY IN DUTCH)	270
VIII. ANNEXES	273
A. Bibliography	273
B. Table of Cases	311
C. Conventions and Protocols	327
IX. <i>CURRICULUM VITAE</i>	334

