

Excusable Evil

An Analysis of Complete Defenses in International Criminal Law

SCHOOL OF HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH SERIES, Volume 50

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

Excusable Evil  
An Analysis of Complete Defenses  
in International Criminal Law

MAARTJE KRABBE



intersentia

Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland

Intersentia Ltd  
Trinity House | Cambridge Business Park | Cowley Road  
Cambridge | CB4 0WZ | United Kingdom  
Tel.: +44 1223 393 753 | [mail@intersentia.co.uk](mailto:mail@intersentia.co.uk)

Maartje Krabbe  
Excusable Evil. An Analysis of Complete Defenses in International Criminal Law

ISBN 978-1-78068-204-4  
D/2014/7849/36  
NUR 828

Cover image: Nadine Maas

© 2014 Intersentia  
[www.intersentia.com](http://www.intersentia.com) | [www.intersentia.co.uk](http://www.intersentia.co.uk)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

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

*To Krabbie and Tineke*



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The extent of support I received in completing this dissertation humbles me. I am immensely grateful to André Klip, for offering me this project and to Gerard de Jonge, for stepping on board. Thank you for your confidence and innovative suggestions. Working with two creative and independent minds like yours has been truly inspirational.

I owe much gratitude to Liesbeth Lijnzaad, Fabián Raimondo, Elies van Sliedregt, Taru Spronken and Harmen van der Wilt for reading and commenting on the text published in this book. It is an honour to have you among my examiners.

Several others proved to be meticulous critics of this book as it was in the making. I am indebted to Jeroen Blomsma, for his comments on sizeable amounts of text in different stages of the writing process. Many thanks as well to Wilma Dreissen for her work on the procedural part of this book. I am grateful to Corine de Ruiter who advised me on the insanity defense. Annemieke van Verseveld, I thank for her help with a number of drafts on the topic of mistake.

During the course of this research, I had fantastic colleagues, both at Maastricht University and at Radboud University. We had many interesting discussions and animated informal lunches. Thank you all for your friendship and support!

Without an army of babysitters, this book would not have been finished. I especially like to thank my in-laws Paul and Jet, and Catleen and Paul. Not only for the babysitting, but also for making me feel at home in Nijmegen.

Regular distraction is an important aspect of thesis writing. It meant the world to me that I had a Monday night escape. Thank you Ricky, for taking me into your circle of Monday night models. Models: thank you for being there!

Many thanks I also owe to my *paranimfen*. Karin, we started our Ph.D. projects together and I'm glad we became friends in the process. Your support has been invaluable. Daphne, although we are well beyond the giggly age, I still consider you my best friend. There is this unconditional touch to our friendship that I deeply appreciate.

Nadine, I'm so happy that it is you who designed the cover image of this book!

Acknowledgements

Tineke and Krabbie, you have contributed to this book in every possible way. Thank you for your unrelenting support at so many levels. What is more: thank you for a magnificent childhood, for which I am grateful beyond words. I dedicate this book to you.

Maarten and Ellis, I feel intensely privileged that your little spirits have come to live with us. If this book is not what it could have been, because of all those days and nights I spend with you, it has been definitely worth it!

Bright, witty and solid as a rock, Robbert, you've been an incredible tower of strength in work and life. Thanks for your help and patience. You truly are a wonderful man.

Lent, October 2013



# CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	vii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i> .....	xxiii

## Part I

<b>A Theory of Complete Defenses</b> .....	1
--	---

### Chapter I

Introduction .....	3
1. Excusable evil? .....	3
2. Relevance of the key question .....	4
3. Key question: Definitions .....	5
3.1. Complete defenses .....	5
3.2. International crimes .....	7
3.2.1. International crimes in general .....	7
3.2.2. Genocide .....	8
3.2.3. Crimes against humanity .....	9
3.2.4. War crimes .....	10
3.2.5. Aggression .....	11
4. Further delineation of present research .....	12
4.1. International courts .....	12
4.2. Sources of international criminal law .....	12
4.2.1. Sources of the active <i>ad hoc</i> tribunals .....	13
4.2.2. Article 21 of the ICC Statute .....	16
4.2.3. Sources of international criminal law included in this research .....	17
4.3. Currency of the manuscript .....	18
5. Structure and method .....	18

### Chapter II

A theoretical background on complete defenses .....	23
1. Introduction .....	23
2. "I did it": the general requirements for criminal liability .....	24
2.1. General requirements for criminal liability .....	24
2.1.1. Objective element .....	25
2.1.2. Subjective element .....	26
3. "But I should not be punished": Complete defenses and criminal liability ..	31
3.1. Confession and avoidance .....	32

3.2.	Negation of the subjective element . . . . .	33
3.3.	Conclusion . . . . .	33
4.	Categorization of defenses: Justifications and excuses . . . . .	35
4.1.	Justifications, excuses and the relationship between complete defenses and the general requirements for criminal liability . . . . .	38
5.	Procedural issues related to complete defenses . . . . .	39
5.1.	Grounds stated in judgments . . . . .	40
5.2.	Burden and standard of proof . . . . .	40
5.3.	<i>Prosecutor v. Aleksovski</i> . . . . .	45
6.	Conclusion . . . . .	46
<b>Part II</b>		
<b>Complete Defenses in Practice . . . . .</b>		<b>49</b>
Introduction Part II . . . . .		51
Chapter III		
Self-defense . . . . .		55
1.	Introduction . . . . .	55
2.	Self-defense in the Nuremberg Judgment . . . . .	55
2.1.	The verdict on Erich Raeder . . . . .	55
2.1.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	55
2.1.2.	Applicability . . . . .	57
2.1.3.	Scope . . . . .	57
2.1.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	58
3.	Self-defense in the Tokyo Judgment . . . . .	59
3.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	59
3.1.1.	The general part of the Judgment . . . . .	59
3.1.2.	The Verdict on Shigetaro Shimada, Hideki Tojo, Shigenori Togo . . . . .	60
3.2.	Analysis of self-defense in the Tokyo Judgment . . . . .	62
3.2.1.	Applicability . . . . .	62
3.2.2.	Scope . . . . .	62
3.2.3.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	63
4.	Self-defense at the ICTY . . . . .	63
4.1.	<i>Prosecutor v. Kordić and Čerkez</i> . . . . .	63
4.1.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	63
4.1.2.	Applicability . . . . .	67
4.1.3.	Scope . . . . .	68
4.1.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	69
4.2.	<i>Prosecutor v. Stakić</i> . . . . .	71
4.2.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	71
4.2.2.	Applicability and scope . . . . .	73

4.2.3.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	73
4.3.	<i>Prosecutor v. Galić</i> . . . . .	74
4.3.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	74
4.3.2.	Applicability . . . . .	74
4.3.3.	Scope . . . . .	75
4.3.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	75
4.4.	<i>Prosecutor v. Hadžihasanović and Kubura</i> . . . . .	75
4.4.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	75
4.4.2.	Analysis . . . . .	75
4.5.	<i>Prosecutor v. Strugar</i> . . . . .	76
4.5.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	76
4.5.2.	Applicability . . . . .	76
4.5.3.	Scope . . . . .	76
4.5.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	76
4.6.	<i>Prosecutor v. Delić</i> . . . . .	77
4.6.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	77
4.6.2.	Applicability . . . . .	77
4.6.3.	Scope . . . . .	78
4.6.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	78
4.7.	<i>Prosecutor v. Milan Martić</i> . . . . .	78
4.7.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	78
4.7.2.	Applicability . . . . .	79
4.7.3.	Scope . . . . .	80
4.7.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	80
4.8.	<i>Prosecutor v. Boškoski and Tarčulovski</i> . . . . .	80
4.8.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	80
4.8.2.	Applicability . . . . .	81
4.8.3.	Scope . . . . .	81
4.8.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	82
4.9.	<i>Prosecutor v. Đorđević</i> . . . . .	82
4.9.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	82
4.9.2.	Applicability . . . . .	82
4.9.3.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	83
4.10.	<i>Prosecutor v. Gotovina et al.</i> . . . . .	83
4.10.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	83
4.10.2.	Applicability . . . . .	84
4.10.3.	Scope . . . . .	85
4.10.4.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	85
5.	ICC . . . . .	86
5.1.	Applicability . . . . .	86
5.2.	Scope . . . . .	86
5.3.	Nature of self-defense . . . . .	89
6.	Analysis of self-defense . . . . .	90

Contents

6.1. Applicability . . . . .	90
6.2. Scope . . . . .	91
6.3. Nature of self-defense . . . . .	93
6.3.1. Self-defense in the sphere of <i>ius ad bellum</i> . . . . .	93
6.3.2. Private self-defense. . . . .	94
6.4. Categorization . . . . .	94
6.5. Conclusion on self-defense . . . . .	96
6.6. Preview Part III . . . . .	97
Chapter IV	
Consent . . . . .	99
1. Introduction . . . . .	99
2. Consent in the Nuremberg Judgment . . . . .	99
2.1. The general part of the Nuremberg Judgment in conjunction with the verdict on Konstantin von Neurath . . . . .	99
2.1.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	99
2.1.2. Applicability . . . . .	101
2.1.3. Scope . . . . .	101
3. Consent at the ICTY . . . . .	102
3.1. <i>Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al.</i> . . . . .	102
3.1.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	102
3.1.2. Analysis . . . . .	103
4. Consent at the ICTR . . . . .	104
4.1. <i>Prosecutor v. Gacumbitsi</i> . . . . .	104
4.1.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	104
4.1.2. Analysis . . . . .	106
5. Consent at the ICC . . . . .	107
6. Analysis of consent . . . . .	108
6.1. Applicability . . . . .	108
6.2. Scope . . . . .	109
6.3. Categorization . . . . .	109
6.4. Conclusion on consent. . . . .	110
6.5. Preview Part III . . . . .	110
Chapter V	
Insanity . . . . .	111
1. Introduction . . . . .	111
2. Insanity at the Nuremberg Tribunal . . . . .	111
2.1. The verdict on Rudolf Hess . . . . .	111
2.1.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	111
2.1.2. Analysis . . . . .	112
2.1.3. Expert examination and legal consequences . . . . .	113

3.	Insanity at the ICTY	113
3.1.	<i>Prosecutor v. Erdemović</i>	113
3.1.1.	Relevant passages	113
3.1.2.	Analysis	114
3.2.	<i>Prosecutor v. Mucić et al.</i>	114
3.2.1.	Relevant passages	114
3.2.2.	Applicability	121
3.2.3.	Scope	121
3.2.4.	Expert examination and legal consequences	123
4.	Insanity at the ICTR	124
5.	Insanity at the ICC	124
5.1.	Applicability	124
5.2.	Scope	124
5.3.	Expert examination and legal consequences	126
6.	Analysis of insanity	128
6.1.	Applicability	128
6.2.	Scope	128
6.3.	Categorization	129
6.4.	Expert examination and legal consequences	130
6.4.1.	Expert examination	130
6.4.2.	Legal consequences	131
6.5.	Conclusion on insanity	131
6.6.	Preview Part III	131
Chapter VI		
	Intoxication	133
1.	Introduction	133
2.	Intoxication at the ICTY	133
2.1.	Relevant passages	133
2.2.	Analysis of ICTY case law on intoxication	134
3.	Intoxication at the ICTR	135
3.1.	<i>Prosecutor v. Kamuhanda</i>	135
3.1.1.	Relevant passages	135
3.1.2.	Analysis	135
4.	Intoxication at the ICC	136
4.1.	Applicability	136
4.2.	Scope	136
5.	Analysis of intoxication	139
5.1.	Applicability	139
5.2.	Scope	139
5.3.	Voluntary and involuntary intoxication	140
5.4.	Categorization	141
5.5.	Conclusion on intoxication	143

5.6. Preview Part III . . . . .	143
<b>Chapter VII</b>	
Mistake . . . . .	145
1. Introduction . . . . .	145
2. Mistake at Nuremberg . . . . .	145
2.1. Hermann Göring and Erich Raeder: Crimes Against Peace (Mistake of fact) . . . . .	145
2.1.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	145
2.1.2. Applicability . . . . .	147
2.1.3. Scope . . . . .	147
2.2. The occupation of Bohemia and Moravia . . . . .	148
2.2.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	148
2.2.2. Applicability . . . . .	149
2.2.3. Scope . . . . .	149
3. Mistake at the ICTY . . . . .	150
3.1. <i>Prosecutor v. Mucić et al.</i> . . . . .	150
3.1.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	150
3.1.2. Applicability . . . . .	150
3.1.3. Scope . . . . .	151
3.2. <i>Prosecutor v. Dragomir Milošević</i> . . . . .	151
3.2.1. Relevant passages . . . . .	151
3.2.2. Analysis . . . . .	152
3.2.3. Scope . . . . .	152
3.3. Mistake of fact mentioned in other cases . . . . .	152
4. Mistake at the ICTR . . . . .	153
5. Mistake at the ICC . . . . .	153
5.1. Applicability . . . . .	153
5.2. Scope . . . . .	153
5.2.1. The distinction between mistake of fact and mistake of law . . . . .	154
5.2.2. Mistake of fact (article 32(1)) . . . . .	156
5.2.3. Mistake of law . . . . .	158
5.2.4. General comments on article 32 . . . . .	159
5.2.5. <i>Prosecutor v. Lubanga Dyilo</i> . . . . .	162
6. Analysis of mistake . . . . .	166
6.1. Applicability: Mistake of fact . . . . .	166
6.2. Applicability: Mistake of law . . . . .	167
6.3. Scope: Mistake of fact . . . . .	167
6.4. Scope: Mistake of law . . . . .	168
6.5. Categorization . . . . .	168
6.6. Conclusion on mistake . . . . .	169
6.7. Preview Part III . . . . .	170

Chapter VIII	
Superior orders and prescription of law . . . . .	171
1. Introduction . . . . .	171
2. Superior orders and prescription of law in the Nuremberg Judgment . . . . .	172
3. Superior orders and prescription of law in the Tokyo Judgment . . . . .	174
4. Superior orders and prescription of law at the ICTY . . . . .	175
5. Superior orders and prescription of law at the ICTR . . . . .	176
6. Superior orders and prescription of law at the ICC . . . . .	176
6.1. Applicability . . . . .	176
6.2. Scope . . . . .	177
6.3. Relationship with article 32. . . . .	181
6.4. Superior orders and superior responsibility . . . . .	181
7. Analysis of superior orders . . . . .	182
7.1. Applicability . . . . .	182
7.2. Scope . . . . .	182
7.3. Categorization . . . . .	183
7.4. Respondeat superior or strict liability? . . . . .	183
7.5. Conclusion on superior orders. . . . .	184
7.6. Preview Part III. . . . .	184
Chapter IX	
Necessity and duress. . . . .	185
1. Introduction. . . . .	185
2. Nuremberg. . . . .	186
2.1. The general part of the Judgment: Plunder . . . . .	186
2.1.1. Relevant passages. . . . .	186
2.1.2. Applicability . . . . .	186
2.1.3. Scope . . . . .	187
2.1.4. Necessity/duress . . . . .	187
2.2. The verdict on Karl Dönitz . . . . .	187
2.2.1. Relevant passages. . . . .	187
2.2.2. Applicability . . . . .	188
2.2.3. Scope . . . . .	188
2.2.4. Necessity/duress . . . . .	188
3. Tokyo . . . . .	189
3.1. The verdict on Shigenori Togo . . . . .	189
3.1.1. Relevant passages. . . . .	189
3.1.2. Applicability . . . . .	189
3.1.3. Scope . . . . .	189
3.1.4. Necessity/duress . . . . .	190
3.2. The verdict on Kenji Dohihara . . . . .	190
3.2.1. Relevant passages. . . . .	190

3.2.2.	Applicability . . . . .	190
3.2.3.	Scope . . . . .	191
3.2.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	191
3.3.	The verdict on Seishiro Itagaki . . . . .	191
3.3.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	191
3.3.2.	Applicability . . . . .	192
3.3.3.	Scope . . . . .	192
3.3.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	192
3.4.	The Verdict on Iwane Matsui . . . . .	192
3.4.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	192
3.4.2.	Applicability . . . . .	193
3.4.3.	Scope . . . . .	193
3.4.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	193
4.	Necessity and duress at the ICTY . . . . .	193
4.1.	<i>Prosecutor v. Erdemović</i> . . . . .	193
4.1.1.	The facts of the case . . . . .	194
4.1.2.	Trial Chamber I . . . . .	194
4.1.3.	Appeals Chamber, Joint Separate Opinion of Judge McDonald and Judge Vohrah and Separate and Dissenting Opinion of Judge Li . . . . .	197
4.1.4.	Separate and dissenting opinion of Judge Cassese . . . . .	202
4.1.5.	Separate and Dissenting Opinion of Judge Stephen . . . . .	205
4.1.6.	Trial Chamber II . . . . .	207
4.1.7.	Conclusion on <i>Prosecutor v. Erdemović</i> . . . . .	208
4.2.	<i>Prosecutor v. Aleksovski</i> . . . . .	212
4.2.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	212
4.2.2.	Applicability . . . . .	214
4.2.3.	Scope . . . . .	214
4.2.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	214
4.3.	<i>Kvočka et al.</i> . . . . .	215
4.3.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	215
4.3.2.	Applicability . . . . .	216
4.3.3.	Scope . . . . .	217
4.3.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	217
4.4.	Other ICTY references to necessity/duress . . . . .	218
5.	Necessity and duress at the ICTR . . . . .	220
5.1.	<i>Prosecutor v. Kajelijeli</i> . . . . .	220
5.1.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	220
5.1.2.	Applicability . . . . .	221
5.1.3.	Scope . . . . .	221
5.1.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	221
5.2.	<i>Prosecutor v. Kamuhanda</i> . . . . .	221
5.2.1.	Relevant passages . . . . .	221



5.2.2.	Applicability . . . . .	222
5.2.3.	Scope . . . . .	223
5.2.4.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	223
5.3.	Other ICTR references to necessity/duress . . . . .	223
6.	Necessity and duress at the ICC . . . . .	224
6.1.	Applicability . . . . .	224
6.2.	Scope . . . . .	224
6.3.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	228
7.	Analysis of necessity/duress . . . . .	228
7.1.	Applicability . . . . .	228
7.1.1.	In principle . . . . .	228
7.1.2.	In <i>casu</i> . . . . .	229
7.1.3.	Mitigation . . . . .	229
7.1.4.	Other legal consequences . . . . .	230
7.2.	Scope . . . . .	230
7.3.	Necessity/duress . . . . .	231
7.4.	Categorization . . . . .	232
7.5.	Conclusion on necessity/duress . . . . .	234
7.6.	Preview Part III . . . . .	234
Chapter X		
	Belligerent reprisals . . . . .	235
1.	Introduction . . . . .	235
2.	Reprisals at the ICTY . . . . .	235
2.1.	<i>Prosecutor v. Kupreškić</i> . . . . .	235
2.1.1.	Facts of the case . . . . .	235
2.1.2.	Applicability . . . . .	235
2.1.3.	Scope . . . . .	237
2.2.	<i>Prosecutor v. Milan Martić</i> . . . . .	238
2.2.1.	Facts of the case . . . . .	238
2.2.2.	Applicability . . . . .	238
2.2.3.	Scope . . . . .	239
3.	Reprisals at the ICC . . . . .	240
4.	Analysis of reprisals . . . . .	240
4.1.	Applicability . . . . .	240
4.2.	Scope . . . . .	241
4.3.	Categorization . . . . .	241
4.4.	Conclusion on reprisals . . . . .	242
4.5.	Preview Part III . . . . .	242

Chapter XI	
<i>Tu quoque</i> .....	243
1. Introduction .....	243
2. <i>Tu quoque</i> at Nuremberg .....	243
2.1. The verdict on Karl Dönitz .....	243
2.1.1. Relevant passages .....	243
2.1.2. Applicability .....	244
2.1.3. Scope .....	244
2.2. The verdict on Erich Raeder .....	245
2.3. Other sources on <i>tu quoque</i> at Nuremberg .....	245
3. <i>Tu quoque</i> at the IMTFE .....	245
4. <i>Tu quoque</i> at the ICTY .....	246
4.1. <i>Prosecutor vs. Kupreškić</i> .....	246
4.1.1. Facts of the case .....	246
4.1.2. Applicability .....	246
4.1.3. Scope .....	247
4.2. <i>Prosecutor v. Kordić and Čerkez</i> .....	247
4.2.1. Relevant passages .....	247
4.2.2. Applicability .....	248
4.2.3. Scope .....	248
4.3. <i>Prosecutor v. Milan Martić</i> .....	248
4.3.1. Relevant passages .....	248
4.3.2. Applicability .....	248
4.3.3. Scope .....	249
4.4. Other sources on <i>tu quoque</i> at the ICTY .....	249
5. <i>Tu quoque</i> at the ICTR .....	249
5.1. <i>Prosecutor vs. Bagosora et al.</i> .....	249
5.1.1. Relevant passages .....	249
5.1.2. Applicability .....	250
6. <i>Tu quoque</i> at the ICC .....	250
7. Analysis of <i>tu quoque</i> .....	251
7.1. Applicability and scope .....	251
7.2. Categorization .....	252
7.3. Conclusion on <i>tu quoque</i> .....	253
7.4. Preview Part III .....	253
Chapter XII	
Other possible complete defenses in international criminal law .....	255
1. Introduction .....	255
2. Other possible complete defenses at the ICTY and ICTR .....	255
3. Other possible complete defenses at the ICC .....	256
4. Conclusion .....	257
5. Preview Part III .....	258

<b>Analysis Part II</b>	
Analysis of complete defenses in international criminal law in general . . . . .	259
1. Introduction . . . . .	259
2. General recognition of complete defenses . . . . .	260
3. How are defenses raised? . . . . .	262
4. The applicability of complete defenses . . . . .	262
5. <i>A priori</i> rejection: Reasons . . . . .	265
5.1. Self-defense <i>ad bellum</i> . . . . .	265
5.2. Consent . . . . .	265
5.3. Superior Orders . . . . .	265
5.4. Necessity/duress . . . . .	266
5.5. Reprisals . . . . .	266
5.6. <i>Tu quoque</i> . . . . .	266
5.7. Conclusion on reasons for <i>a priori</i> rejection . . . . .	267
6. Recognition in principle (explicit recognition) . . . . .	267
7. Grounds for rejection on merits (implicit recognition) . . . . .	267
7.1. Self-defense . . . . .	267
7.2. Consent . . . . .	268
7.3. Insanity . . . . .	268
7.4. Mistake . . . . .	268
7.5. Necessity/duress . . . . .	268
7.6. Reprisals . . . . .	269
7.7. Conclusion . . . . .	269
8. Complete defenses and mitigating circumstances . . . . .	269
9. Legal consequences of complete defenses . . . . .	270
10. The scope of complete defenses . . . . .	271
10.1. Requirements . . . . .	271
10.2. Analysis of the scope of complete defenses . . . . .	273
11. Categorization of complete defenses . . . . .	275
12. Concluding remarks . . . . .	279
 <b>Part III</b>	
<b>Recommendations</b> . . . . .	281
Introduction Part III . . . . .	283
 <b>Chapter XIII</b>	
Should complete defenses apply to international crimes? . . . . .	285
1. Introduction . . . . .	285
2. Arguments pro the availability of complete defenses in international criminal law . . . . .	285
2.1. Introduction . . . . .	285

2.2.	Individual criminal responsibility . . . . .	285
2.3.	Customary status . . . . .	287
2.4.	Objectives of criminal law . . . . .	287
2.5.	Availability under national law . . . . .	290
2.6.	Credibility of international criminal courts . . . . .	291
3.	Arguments contra complete defenses in international criminal law . . . . .	292
3.1.	Introduction . . . . .	292
3.2.	Ethical reasons . . . . .	292
3.2.1.	Introduction . . . . .	292
3.2.2.	The abhorrent nature of international crimes . . . . .	293
3.2.3.	Absolute character of international crimes . . . . .	294
3.2.4.	Meeting the requirements of complete defenses in case of international crimes . . . . .	295
3.3.	Technical arguments . . . . .	296
3.4.	Practical arguments . . . . .	298
3.4.1.	Big fish . . . . .	298
3.4.2.	System criminality . . . . .	299
3.4.3.	Acquittal is not a popular option . . . . .	300
3.4.4.	Guilty pleas . . . . .	301
3.4.5.	Practice . . . . .	301
3.4.6.	Discussion . . . . .	301
3.5.	Conclusion . . . . .	302

## Chapter XIV

	How should complete defenses be applied under international criminal law (in general)? . . . . .	305
1.	Introduction . . . . .	305
2.	A system of complete defenses? . . . . .	305
3.	A system of complete defenses: The basics . . . . .	308
3.1.	A distinction between justifications and excuses . . . . .	308
3.2.	The definition of justification and excuse . . . . .	310
3.2.1.	Justifications: The definition from case law . . . . .	310
3.2.2.	Excuses: The definition from case law . . . . .	313
3.3.	The definition of justifications and excuses . . . . .	313
3.3.1.	Justifications . . . . .	313
3.3.2.	Excuses . . . . .	316
3.3.3.	A model of justifications and excuses . . . . .	326
4.	The effect of justifications and excuses on the crime charged . . . . .	327
5.	Failed complete defenses in mitigation . . . . .	331
6.	Conclusion . . . . .	331

Chapter XV	
How should complete defenses be applied under international criminal law (for each defense)?	333
1. Introduction	333
2. Self-defense	333
3. Consent	338
4. Insanity	341
5. Intoxication	344
6. Mistake	346
7. Superior orders	349
8. Necessity/duress	351
9. Lawful belligerent reprisals	357
10. <i>Tu quoque</i>	359
11. Other possible defenses in international criminal law	360
12. Conclusion	365
Chapter XVI	
Summary and conclusion	367
Part I Theory	367
Part II Practice	368
Part III Recommendations	369
Final Words	372
<i>Samenvatting</i>	375
<i>Bibliography</i>	383



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABiH	Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina
CAH	crimes against humanity
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECCC	Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ICL	international criminal law
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
ILC	International Law Commission
IMT	International Military Tribunal of Nuremberg
IMTFE	International Military Tribunal for the Far East
JNA	Yugoslav People's Army
ROE	Rules of Engagement
RPE	Rules of Procedure and Evidence
RPF	Rwandan Patriotic Front
SCSL	Special Court for Sierra Leone
SPSC	Special Panels for Serious Crimes within the District Court of Dili
SRK	Sarajevo Romanija Corps
STL	Special Tribunal for Lebanon
VRS	Bosnian Serb Army

