



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Rome Statute as Evidence of Customary International Law

Tan, Y.

Citation

Tan, Y. (2019, April 9). *The Rome Statute as Evidence of Customary International Law*. *Meijers-reeks*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/71143>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/71143>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/71143> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Tan, Y.

Title: The Rome Statute as Evidence of Customary International Law

Issue Date: 2019-04-09

The Rome Statute as Evidence of Customary International Law

To my grandma Dazhen Zhang (张达珍)

The Rome Statute as Evidence of Customary International Law

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 9 april 2019
klokke 10.00 uur

door

Yudan Tan

geboren te Sichuan, China

in 1988

Promotor: prof. dr. W.A. Schabas

Co-promotor: dr. R.W. Heinsch

Promotiecommissie: prof. dr. C. Stahn

prof. dr. L.J. van den Herik

dr. E. Irving

prof. dr. A.H. Klip (Maastricht University)

prof. dr. C. Kreß (University of Cologne, Germany)

Lay-out: AlphaZet prepress, Bodegraven

Printwerk: Ipskamp Printing

© 2019 Yudan Tan

Behoudens de in of krachtens de Auteurswet van 1912 gestelde uitzonderingen mag niets uit deze uitgave worden veeelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën, opnamen of enig andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de auteur.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission of the author.

Acknowledgements

I could not have completed this dissertation without the assistance of many people and institutions in the past five years.

Firstly, I am much obliged to my two PhD supervisors, Prof. William A. Schabas and Dr. Robert W. Heinsch at Leiden University. I was fortunate enough to have Prof. Schabas, a leading authority in international criminal law, as my PhD supervisor. It was my honour to work with him. I would like to express my great appreciation to him for his wide insight and encouraging supervision during the past five years. In addition, I would like to offer my thanks to my second supervisor Dr. Heinsch, for his patient guidance during the planning and development of my research and for his careful reading of all drafts. This dissertation would not have been completed without their critical, constructive and swift feedback.

Secondly, I was fortunate to present part of this research on several occasions. My gratitude goes out to many people whom I met at conferences, workshops and symposia, in particular, Judge LIU Daqun, a judge of the UN Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals. I benefited from their views and comments. Appreciation also goes to Stephen Machon for his careful proofreading. Of course, the responsibility for any errors or omissions in the text remains entirely my own.

Thirdly, I owe my sincere gratitude to the China Scholarship Council, the Grotius Centre for International Legal Studies and the European Society of International Law for their financial support. My thanks are extended to our secretariats and the staff of the Leiden Law Library and the Peace Palace Library for all tangible and intangible resources. I am also grateful to the Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Criminal Law in Freiburg for providing me with a research stay when I was finalising the manuscript.

Special thanks go out to my friends and colleagues for their support and company. I would like to thank my lovely colleagues Hilde Roskam and Sophie Starrenburg for their careful reading and translation of the summary. Thanks to Linlin, Xuechan, Yang, Floris, Franke, Andrea, and others for challenging me to articulate my positions more clearly as well as for organising several PhD events and drinks. Thanks to my working roomies Mette, Hilde, Cale and Arjen for chatting with me and for tolerating my messy desk. I would like to thank all my friends in the Netherlands for sharing part of their life with me.

Finally, I am particularly indebted to my family for their unconditional support of me and my academic endeavours. Thanks are especially owed to Weichun, for his encouragement and patience during my days of struggling.

Abbreviations

AATA	Administrative Appeals Tribunal of Australia
AC	Appeal Cases (the UK cases)
A Ch	Appeals Chamber
AI	Amnesty International
AJCL	American Journal of Comparative Law
AJIL	American Journal of International Law
Am U Intl L Rev	American University International Law Review
Am U L Rev	American University Law Review
ARIEL	Austrian Review of International and European Law
art(s)	Article(s)
ASP	Assembly of States Parties
Australian J HR	Australian Journal of Human Rights
Australian Ybk Intl L	Australian Yearbook of International Law
British Ybk Intl L	British Yearbook of International Law
California L Rev	California Law Review
Canadian Ybk Intl L	Canadian Yearbook of International Law
Cardozo L Rev	Cardozo Law Review
Case W Res J Intl L	Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law
Chicago J Intl L	Chicago Journal of International Law
Chinese J Intl L	Chinese Journal of International Law
Cir	Circuit (the US cases)
CLB	Commonwealth Law Bulletin
CLF	Criminal Law Forum
CLR	Commonwealth Law Reports (Australia)
Columbia L Rev	Columbia Law Review
Cornell Intl LJ	Cornell International Law Journal
Crim Law & Philos	Criminal Law & Philosophy
CUP	Cambridge University Press
Dalhousie LJ	Dalhousie Law Journal
Denver J Intl L& P	Denver Journal of International Law and Policy
DePaul L Rev	DePaul Law Review
DLR	Dominion Law Reports
Doc	Document
Duke LJ	Duke Law Journal
ECCC	Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
ed(s)	editor(s)

edn	edition
EJCCLCJ	European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
EJIL	European Journal of International Law
Emory Intl L Rev	Emory International Law Review
et al	Et alii (and others)
EWCA Crim	Court of Appeal Criminal Division (the UK)
F 3d	Federal Reporter, Third Series (the US Circuit Court of Appeals)
FC	Federal Court (Canada)
FCA	Federal Court of Appeal (Canada)
FCAFC	Federal Court of Australia-Full Court
Finnish Ybk Intl L	Finnish Yearbook of International Law
fn	Footnote
Fordham Intl LJ	Fordham International Law Journal
GA	General Assembly
GAOR	General Assembly Official Records
Georgetown LJ	Georgetown Law Journal
GSU L Rev	Georgia State University Law Review
Harvard Intl LJ	Harvard International Law Journal
Harvard J on Legis	Harvard Journal on Legislation
HMSO	Her Majesty's Stationery Office
Houston J Intl L	Houston Journal of International Law
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICJ Rep	ICJ Report
ICLQ	International and Comparative Law Quarterly
ICLR	International Criminal Law Review
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICT	International Crimes Tribunal (Bangladesh)
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
ILC	International Law Commission
ILA	International Law Association
ILDC	International Law in Domestic Courts
ILM	International Legal Materials
ILR	International Law Reports
Intl J HR	International Journal of Human Rights
IOLR	International Organizations Law Review
IRRC	International Review of the Red Cross
Israel Ybk HR	Israel Yearbook on Human Rights
J Armed Conflict L	Journal of Armed Conflict Law
J Conflict & Security L	Journal of Conflict and Security Law
J Crim L & Criminology	Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology
Jewish Ybk Intl L	Jewish Yearbook of International Law

JICJ	Journal of International Criminal Justice
Leiden J Intl L	Leiden Journal of International Law
LJN	Landelijk Jurisprudentie Nummer (country case number) (the Netherlands)
LPICT	Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals
LQR	Law Quarterly Review
LRTWC	Law Reports of the Trials of the War Criminals
MJECL	Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law
Melbourne J Intl L	Melbourne Journal of International Law
Melbourne U L Rev	Melbourne University Law Review
Michigan J Intl L	Michigan Journal of International Law
Military L & L War Rev	Military Law and the Law of War Review
Military L Rev	Military Law Review
MPEPIL	Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law
MPUNYB	Max Plank Yearbook of United National Law
Netherland Intl L Rev	Netherland International Law Review
No.	Number
Nordic J Intl L	Nordic Journal of International Law
OUP	Oxford University Press
p(p)	Page(s)
Pace Intl L Rev	Pace International Law Review
para(s)	Paragraph(s)
PTC	Pre-Trial Chamber
Recueil des cours	Recueil des cours de l'Académie du droit international de la Haye (Collected Courses of The Hague Academy of International Law)
Res	Resolution
SC	Security Council
SCSL	Special Court for Sierra Leone
SPSC	Special Panels for Serious Crimes
Stanford J Intl L	Stanford Journal of International Law
STL	Special Tribunal for Lebanon
Supp	Supplement
TC	Trial Chamber
Tilburg L Rev	Tilburg Law Review
TMWC	Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunals: Nuremberg
TWC	Trials of the War Criminals Before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals Under Control Council Law No. 10
U Pa L Rev	University of Pennsylvania Law Review
U.S.	United States Reports (United States Supreme Court)

UK	United Kingdom
UKHL (now SC)	United Kingdom House Lord (now Supreme Court)
UKTS	United Kingdom Treaty Series
UN	United Nations
UNTS	United Nations Treaty Series
UNWCC	United Nations War Crimes Commission
US	United States
USC	United States Code
USGPO	United States Government Printing Office
v	Versus (against)
Vand J Transnatl L	Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law
Virginia J Intl L	Virginia Journal of International Law
Vol(s)	Volume(s)
WLR	Weekly Law Reports (the UK)
YIHL	Yearbook of International Humanitarian Law
ZAGPPHC	South Africa North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria
ZASCA	South Africa Supreme Court of Appeal
ZIS	Zeitschrift für Internationale Strafrechtsdogmatik (Journal for International Doctrine in Criminal Law)
§(§)	section(s)

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
ABBREVIATIONS	VII
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 The role of customary international law in the International Criminal Court	2
1.2 Aim, questions and scope of this research	7
1.3 Methodology and terminology of this research	16
1.4 Structure of this research	18
1.5 Merits and limits of this research	20
2 METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THIS RESEARCH	25
2.1 Introductory remarks	25
2.2 Interpreting provisions of the Rome Statute	25
2.3 Methodology: the two-element approach to identifying customary rules	30
2.3.1 A flexible formula for identifying the existence of a customary rule	30
2.3.2 The two elements	35
2.3.2.1 Practice and <i>opinio juris</i> : quantity and quality	35
2.3.2.2 Practice: forms of evidence	37
2.3.2.3 <i>Opinio juris</i> : forms of evidence	42
2.3.3 Other indicators for the identification of customary law	44
2.3.4 Summary	45
2.4 Terms: treaty was or is of a 'declaratory' nature of custom	45
2.4.1 The role of treaties as evidence of the state of customary law	46
2.4.2.1 Baxter's concept of 'declaratory' nature of custom	47
2.4.2.2 Baxter's concept of 'constitutive' nature of custom	47
2.4.2.3 Assessment and conclusions	49
2.4.2 Terminology: declaratory	52
2.5 Preconditions for this research	54
2.5.1 A treaty rule of a declaratory nature in 1998: any obstacles in the Rome Statute?	54
2.5.2 A treaty rule develops into custom: any obstacles on the passage?	57
2.6 Concluding remarks	59

3	WAR CRIMES IN NON-INTERNATIONAL ARMED CONFLICT: ARTICLE 8 OF THE ROME STATUTE AND CUSTOM	61
3.1	Introductory remarks	61
3.2	War crimes in non-international armed conflict in the Rome Statute	63
3.3	War crimes in armed conflict	65
3.3.1	Stocktaking of war crimes and war crimes trials: 1919–1945	65
3.3.2	War crimes trials after World War II: 1945–1949	67
3.3.3	Common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocol II of 1977: 1949–early 1990s	72
3.3.3.1	Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions	73
3.3.3.2	Additional Protocol II of 1977	74
3.3.3.3	Summary	77
3.3.4	Shifts since the establishment of the two UN <i>ad hoc</i> tribunals: 1993–1996	77
3.3.4.1	Statutes of the two UN <i>ad hoc</i> tribunals	77
3.3.4.2	<i>Tadić</i> Appeals Chamber decision on jurisdiction	81
3.3.4.3	Shifts subsequent to the <i>Tadić</i> Appeals Chamber Decision on Jurisdiction	86
3.3.5	The work of the International Law Commission	88
3.3.5.1	Draft Code of Offences (Crimes)	89
3.3.5.2	1993 and 1994 drafts of the International Law Commission for an International Criminal Court	92
3.3.5.3	Summary	96
3.3.6	Assessment and conclusions	96
3.4	War crimes in non-international armed conflict: were articles 8(2)(c) and (e) declaratory of custom?	99
3.4.1	<i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee 1995 sessions	100
3.4.2	Preparatory Committee sessions and intersessional meetings: 1996–1998	101
3.4.2.1	1996 sessions	102
3.4.2.2	1997-February-session	104
3.4.2.3	Subsequent sessions and intersessional meetings	105
3.4.3	Crystallisation of war crimes committed in non- international armed conflict in Rome: 1998	108
3.4.3.1	The inclusion of war crimes in non- international armed conflict	108
3.4.3.2	Thresholds of non-international armed conflict	114
3.4.4	Conclusions	118
3.5	Further recognition of war crimes in non-international armed conflict: are articles 8(2)(c) and (e) declaratory of custom?	119
3.5.1	Preparatory Commission: Elements of Crimes	119

3.5.2	Practice of States	120
3.5.3	Post-Rome instruments and cases at the ICC and other tribunals	124
3.5.4	Assessment and conclusions	126
3.6	Concluding remarks	127
4	CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY: ARTICLE 7 OF THE ROME STATUTE AND CUSTOM	129
4.1	Introductory remarks	129
4.2	Provisions on crimes against humanity in the Rome Statute	130
4.3	Crimes against humanity as international crimes under customary law	132
4.3.1	Revisiting the origins of crimes against humanity as international crimes	133
4.3.2	The definitions of crimes against humanity beyond the Nuremberg Charter	141
4.3.3	Assessment and conclusions	143
4.4	No nexus with an armed conflict: was and is article 7(1) declaratory of custom?	143
4.4.1	The nexus issue in article 7(1) of the Rome Statute	143
4.4.2	A nexus with an armed conflict and its disappearance in custom	147
4.4.2.1	The nexus with an armed conflict	147
4.4.2.2	The disappearance of the nexus with an armed conflict	154
4.4.3	Assessment and conclusions	159
4.5	The policy element: was and is article 7(2)(a) declaratory of custom?	160
4.5.1	Policy as a legal element in article 7(2)(a) of the Rome Statute	160
4.5.1.1	The notion of policy	161
4.5.1.2	Policy as a legal element in the Rome Statute	162
4.5.2	Policy as a legal element of crimes against humanity in custom	166
4.5.2.1	Policy as a legal element before 1998	167
4.5.2.2	Policy as a legal element in the jurisprudence of the two UN ad hoc tribunals	173
4.5.2.3	Policy as a legal element in customary international law after 1998	178
4.5.3	Conclusions	181
4.6	Concluding remarks	181
5	INDIRECT CO-PERPETRATION: ARTICLE 25(3)(A) OF THE ROME STATUTE AND CUSTOM	183
5.1	Introductory remarks	183
5.2	The attribution of liability to individuals at the leadership level	184

5.2.1	The rationale to attribute liability to high-level leaders	184
5.2.2	Approaches to attribute liability to high-level leaders	186
5.3	Is indirect co-perpetration encompassed in article 25(3)(a) of the Rome Statute?	188
5.3.1	The text of article 25(3)(a): three forms of perpetration	188
5.3.1.1	Direct perpetration and co-perpetration	188
5.3.1.2	Indirect perpetration	189
5.3.2	Indirect co-perpetration at the ICC	191
5.3.2.1	A 'literal' reading of article 25(3)(a) in <i>Katanga & Ngudjolo</i>	191
5.3.2.2	Observations and assessment of indirect co-perpetration	195
5.3.3	Assessment and conclusions	198
5.4	Indirect co-perpetration: was article 25(3)(a) declaratory of custom?	199
5.4.1	Post-World War II instruments	199
5.4.2	Post-World War II trials	200
5.4.2.1	Liability for the offence of conspiracy, conspiracy liability, and complicity through association	200
5.4.2.2	'Concerted actions' in Hong Kong and Australia's war crimes trials	205
5.4.3	Assessment and conclusions	206
5.5	Indirect co-perpetration: is article 25(3)(a) declaratory of custom?	207
5.5.1	<i>Tadić</i> joint criminal enterprise: 1999 Appeals Chamber Judgment	208
5.5.2	Indirect (co-)perpetration in the UN <i>ad hoc</i> tribunals	213
5.5.2.1	Co-perpetratorship in <i>Stakić</i> : 2003 Trial Chamber judgment and 2006 Appeals Chamber judgment	213
5.5.2.2	Indirect co-perpetration: 2006 <i>Milutinović et al</i> Trial Chamber decision	215
5.5.2.3	Co-perpetratorship: 2006 <i>Gacumbitsi</i> Appeals Chamber judgment	217
5.5.2.4	Observations and summary	218
5.5.3	<i>Brđanin</i> joint criminal enterprise liability	219
5.5.3.1	JCE: 2004 <i>Brđanin</i> Trial Judgment and subsequent constructions	219
5.5.3.2	The <i>Brđanin</i> formulation of JCE: 2007 <i>Brđanin</i> Appeals Chamber Judgment	222
5.5.3.3	Observations and summary	223
5.5.4	Modes of liability: national legislation and cases	228
5.5.4.1	National criminal codes and implementation legislation	229
5.5.4.2	National case law	236

5.5.5	Other international tribunals and special national tribunals: instruments and cases	240
5.5.6	Assessment and conclusions	242
5.6	Concluding remarks	243
6	AN EXCEPTION TO PERSONAL IMMUNITY FOR INTERNATIONAL CRIMES: ARTICLE 27(2) AND CUSTOM	245
6.1	Introductory remarks	245
6.2	Immunity under international law	246
6.2.1	Regime of immunity in international law	246
6.2.2	Challenges to immunity for committing international crimes	249
6.2.2.1	Challenges to immunity	249
6.2.2.2	Theories to repudiate immunities	251
6.3	Personal immunity: article 27(2) of the Rome Statute	254
6.3.1	Understanding of articles 27(1) and (2): personal immunity	254
6.3.2	Scope of personal immunity in article 27(2)	259
6.3.3	Structure of the Rome Statute and article 19 of the Relationship Agreement	261
6.3.4	Assessment and conclusions	263
6.4	Non-availability of personal immunity for international crimes: was article 27(2) declaratory of custom?	266
6.4.1	1919 Report of the Commission on Responsibilities and Treaty of Versailles	267
6.4.2	Article 7 of the Nuremberg Charter and article 6 of the Tokyo Charter	268
6.4.3	Post-World War II practice	270
6.4.4	1946 GA Resolution and 1950 Nuremberg Principle III	271
6.4.5	Assessment and conclusions	271
6.5	Non-availability of personal immunity for committing international crimes: is article 27(2) declaratory of custom?	272
6.5.1	Immunity for international crimes: national and international cases	273
6.5.1.1	1999 <i>Pinochet</i> case (the UK) and 2001 <i>Gaddafi</i> case (France)	273
6.5.1.2	The ICJ: 2002 <i>Arrest Warrant</i> case (<i>Belgium v Congo</i>)	275
6.5.1.3	The SCSL and the ICTY: <i>Charles Taylor</i> and <i>Milošević</i>	277
6.5.1.4	Pre-Trial Chambers of the ICC: <i>Al Bashir</i> cooperation decisions	279
6.5.2	National reactions to personal immunity for committing international crimes	285
6.5.2.1	National laws	285
6.5.2.2	Practice of States Parties	290

6.5.2.3 Practice of non-party States	294
6.5.3 The UN Security Council and its resolutions	295
6.5.4 The work of the International Law Commission	299
6.5.5 Assessment and conclusions	300
6.6 Concluding remarks	301
7 CONCLUSIONS	303
7.1 Synthesis	304
7.2 Discussions and concluding remarks	309
SAMENVATTING (DUTCH SUMMARY)	313
TABLE OF TREATIES	315
UNITED NATIONS DOCUMENTS	317
TABLE OF CASES	323
BIBLIOGRAPHY	339
CURRICULUM VITAE	353