

Universal Jurisdiction in Modern International Law:
Expansion of National Jurisdiction for Prosecuting
Serious Crimes under International Law

SCHOOL OF HUMAN RIGHTS RESEARCH SERIES, Volume 19

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

Universal Jurisdiction in Modern
International Law: Expansion of National
Jurisdiction for Prosecuting Serious Crimes
under International Law

Mitsue Inazumi

INTERSENTIA
Antwerpen – Oxford

This Volume is an adapted version of a dissertation defended at Utrecht University on 27 October 2004.

Mitsue Inazumi
Universal Jurisdiction in Modern International Law: Expansion of National Jurisdiction for Prosecuting Serious Crimes under International Law

CRC prepared by: G.J. Wiarda Institute, Utrecht University Institute for Legal Studies, Boothstraat 6, 3512 BW Utrecht

ISBN 90-5095-366-2
D/2005/7849/19
NUR 828

© 2005 INTERSENTIA
www.intersentia.com

Behoudens uitzondering door de wet gesteld, mag zonder schriftelijke toestemming van de rechthebbende(n) op het auteursrecht c.q. de uitgevers van deze uitgave, door de rechthebbende(n) gemachtigd namens hem (hen) op te treden, niets uit deze uitgave worden verveelvoudigd en/of openbaar gemaakt door middel van druk, fotocopie, microfilm of anderszins, hetgeen ook van toepassing is op de gehele of gedeeltelijke bewerking. De uitgevers zijn met uitsluiting van ieder ander onherroepelijk door de auteur gemachtigd de door derden verschuldigde vergoedingen van kopiëren, als bedoeld in artikel 17 lid 2 der Auteurswet 1912 en in het KB van 20-6-'64 (Stb. 351) ex artikel 16b der Auteurswet 1912, te doen innen door (en overeenkomstig de reglementen van) de Stichting Reprerecht te Amsterdam.

Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd en/of openbaar gemaakt door middel van druk, fotocopie, microfilm of op welke andere wijze ook, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgevers.

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research forms the basis of my doctoral dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Law at Utrecht University (the Netherlands). I am greatly indebted to my supervisors Prof. G.J.H. van Hoof and Prof. Cees Flinterman, who generously provided me with the opportunity to work on my doctoral thesis and who inspired me with their valuable comments. I would also like to thank the members of the review committee and my 'highly esteemed opponents' (interlocutors) at the defence of my thesis which took place on 27 October 2004: Prof. Menno Kamminga, Prof. Andre Klip, Prof. Geert Jan Knoops, Prof. Peter Baehr, Dr. Annemarieke Beijer, Prof. Chrisje Brants, Prof. Bas de Gaay Fortman, Prof. Constantijn Kelk, Prof. Titia Loenen, Prof. Sacha Prechal, Dr. Goran Sluiter and Prof. J. Vervaele, for their challenging questions and stirring comments, and am especially grateful to the chairman, Dr. Alfred H.A. Soons, in this regard. I am grateful to my friends Ms. Chiseche Mibenge and Mrs. Maria Nybondas for assisting me and providing encouragement throughout my defence.

During the process of writing this thesis, I also benefited from the encouragement and highly intellectual advice of my friend, Dr. Goran Sluiter. I would also like to express my gratitude to my former colleagues at the Netherlands Institute of Human Rights (SIM) at Utrecht University for welcoming me like their family and offering me a great academic environment, making my stay in the Netherlands comfortable. I also very much appreciate the many efforts of my colleagues at Kanazawa University in Japan, especially my former colleague Prof. Masahiro Igarashi for giving me the time to conduct my research in the Netherlands. Special thanks are extended to the Wiarda Institute of Utrecht University, Mr. Peter Morris, Mrs. Titia Kloos, and Mrs. Willemien Vreekamp for efficiently assisting me in finalizing my text for the book. Finally, I could never have completed my thesis without the warm support and unconditional love of my mother Kiseko and my family.

Mitsue Inazumi
Kanazawa, Ishikawa, Japan
January 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgement | v |
| Chapter I | |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1 Theme of the Study | 1 |
| 2 Central Question of the Study | 3 |
| 3 Aim of the Study | 4 |
| 4 Scope of the Study | 6 |
| 4.1 Jurisdiction over which Crimes? | 6 |
| 4.2 The Time Frame of the Subject of the Study | 7 |
| 4.3 Other Enforcement Mechanisms for Accountability | 8 |
| 4.4 Entity Responsible for Crimes | 9 |
| 4.5 Which Kinds of Jurisdiction? | 10 |
| 4.6 National or International Jurisdiction? | 10 |
| 4.7 International Criminal, Humanitarian, Human Rights Law in Correlation | 11 |
| 5 Method of the Study | 11 |
| 5.1 Theoretical Approach | 11 |
| 5.2 Perspective of Law in Transition | 12 |
| 6 Structure of the Study | 13 |
| Chapter II | |
| Overview of the Modern Jurisdictional Regime | 15 |
| 1 Introduction | 15 |
| 2 Relevant Basic Norms | 15 |
| 2.1 Principle of State Sovereignty | 15 |
| 2.2 The Applicability of International Law to Issues of Jurisdiction | 17 |
| 2.3 Interests Involved | 18 |
| 2.4 Principle of Individual Criminal Responsibility | 20 |
| 3 Bases of Jurisdiction Recognised under International Law | 21 |
| 3.1 Territorial Jurisdiction | 22 |
| 3.2 Non-Territorial Jurisdiction | 23 |
| 3.2.1 Nationality Jurisdiction | 24 |
| 3.2.2 Passive Personality Jurisdiction | 24 |
| 3.2.3 Protective Jurisdiction | 25 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 3.2.4 | Universal Jurisdiction | 25 |
| 3.2.4.1 | The Definition of Universal Jurisdiction | 25 |
| 3.2.4.2 | Universal Jurisdiction <i>in absentia</i> | 26 |
| 3.2.4.3 | Two Aspects Differentiating Understandings of Universal Jurisdiction | 28 |
| 4 | History and Analysis of the Formation of the Jurisdictional Regime | 30 |
| 4.1 | The First Period: The Classical Jurisdictional Regime | 30 |
| 4.1.1 | The <i>Laissez-faire</i> Attitude of International Law | 30 |
| 4.1.2 | The Dominance of Territorial Jurisdiction | 31 |
| 4.1.3 | Uncertainty Tolerated under International Law | 32 |
| 4.2 | The Second Period: After the Second World War up to the End of the 1960s | 33 |
| 4.2.1 | Prosecution of Crimes Committed during the World Wars | 33 |
| 4.2.2 | Becoming Aware of the Shortcomings of the Classical Jurisdictional Regime | 33 |
| 4.2.3 | Failure to Establish an Effective Jurisdictional Regime after the Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals | 35 |
| 4.3 | The Third Period: Expansion of National Jurisdictions in the 1970s and the 1980s | 37 |
| 4.3.1 | Factors that Promoted the Expansion of National Jurisdiction | 37 |
| 4.3.2 | Expansion of National Jurisdiction | 40 |
| 4.4 | The Fourth Period: From the 1990s to the Present | 43 |
| 4.4.1 | International Criminal Jurisdiction in Action | 43 |
| 4.4.2 | Encouraging the Active Exercise of National Jurisdiction | 44 |
| 5 | Conclusion | 46 |
| Chapter III | | |
| Historical Development of Universal Jurisdiction | | 47 |
| 1 | Introduction | 47 |
| 1.1 | Aim of this Chapter | 47 |
| 1.2 | A Reminder of the Different Definitions and the Nature of Universal Jurisdiction | 48 |
| 1.3 | Overview of the Development of Universal Jurisdiction | 48 |
| 2 | The First Period: Universal Jurisdiction in Classical International Law | 49 |
| 2.1 | The Emergence of Universal Jurisdiction: Jurisdiction against Piracy | 49 |
| 2.2 | The Nature of Universal Jurisdiction in Classical International Law | 52 |
| 2.3 | Concluding Observations on the First Period | 55 |
| 3 | The Second Period: After the Second World War up to the End of the 1960s | 55 |
| 3.1 | Universal Jurisdiction Concerning War Crimes | 55 |
| 3.1.1 | Post-WWII Trials | 55 |
| 3.1.2 | The 1949 Geneva Conventions | 57 |
| 3.2 | Universal Jurisdiction and the Genocide Convention | 59 |
| 3.3 | The Eichmann Trial | 63 |

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| 3.4 | Concluding Observations on the Second Period | 66 |
| 4 | The Third Period: The Expansion of Universal Jurisdiction in the 1970s and 1980s | 69 |
| 4.1 | The Expansion of Universal Jurisdiction in Conventional International Law since the 1970s | 69 |
| 4.2 | Efforts to Prescribe Universal Jurisdiction over Genocide in International Law in the 1970s and 80s | 71 |
| 4.2.1 | The Ruhashyankiko Report in the 1970s | 72 |
| 4.2.2 | The Whitaker Report in the 1980s | 73 |
| 4.3 | Restatement (Third) of the American Foreign Relations Law | 75 |
| 4.4 | State Responses: The U.S. Legislation in the 1980s | 77 |
| 4.5 | Demjanjuk Case | 78 |
| 4.6 | Concluding Observations on the Third Period | 81 |
| 5 | The Fourth Period: The Spread of Universal Jurisdiction from the 1990s to the Present | 83 |
| 5.1 | The Ad Hoc Tribunals and Universal Jurisdiction against Crimes related to Yugoslavia and the Rwanda Crisis | 83 |
| 5.2 | The Pinochet Case | 83 |
| 5.3 | The ICC and Universal Jurisdiction | 86 |
| 5.4 | Greater Expectations as Regards Universal Jurisdiction and Some Results | 87 |
| 5.4.1 | The Guatemalan Massacre Case | 88 |
| 5.4.2 | The Hissène Habré Case | 90 |
| 5.4.3 | The Bouterse Case | 91 |
| 5.5 | Universal Jurisdiction in Belgium | 93 |
| 5.5.1 | The Belgian Law of 1993 and 1999 | 93 |
| 5.5.2 | The ICJ Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 | 94 |
| 5.5.3 | Amending the Belgian Law in 2003 | 96 |
| 5.6 | Concluding Observations on the Fourth Period | 97 |
| 6 | Conclusions | 99 |
| | | |
| Chapter IV | | |
| Universal Jurisdiction in a Conceptual Context | | 101 |
| 1 | Introduction | 101 |
| 2 | What is Universal Jurisdiction? | 101 |
| 2.1 | Universal Jurisdiction and Universal Jurisdiction <i>in Absentia</i> | 101 |
| 2.1.1 | Definitions | 101 |
| 2.1.2 | The Different Status under International Law | 103 |
| 2.2 | The Different Characteristics of Universal Jurisdiction | 105 |
| 2.3 | The Rationales for Universal Jurisdiction | 106 |
| 2.3.1 | Reduced Emphasis on the Second Rationale | 106 |
| 2.3.2 | The Effects of a Reduced Emphasis on the Second Rationale: Primacy and Analogy | 107 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| 2.3.3 | Reduced Emphasis on the First Rationale | 108 |
| 2.3.4 | The Relevance of Rationales | 109 |
| 2.4 | The Source of Universal Jurisdiction | 110 |
| 2.4.1 | Territorial or Other National Jurisdiction? | 111 |
| 2.4.2 | Acting on Behalf of the International Community | 113 |
| 2.5 | Universal Jurisdiction and the Jurisdiction of International Criminal Courts | 114 |
| 2.5.1 | The Similarities in Objectives and Rationales | 116 |
| 2.5.2 | Schools of Thought that Consider Universal Jurisdiction and International Criminal Courts to be Theoretically Identical | 117 |
| 2.5.2.1 | Universal jurisdiction as the source of international criminal jurisdiction? | 118 |
| 2.5.2.2 | International criminal jurisdiction as the source of universal jurisdiction? | 118 |
| 2.5.2.3 | Differentiating between universal jurisdiction and international criminal jurisdiction | 119 |
| 2.6 | Universal Jurisdiction and the Principle of <i>Aut Dedere Aut Judicare</i> | 121 |
| 2.7 | <i>Jus Cogens</i> , <i>Obligatio Erga Omnes</i> and Universal Jurisdiction | |
| 2.7.1 | The Notion of <i>Jus Cogens</i> and Obligation <i>Erga Omnes</i> | 124 |
| 2.7.2 | The Correlation between Determinations of <i>Jus Cogens</i> and <i>Erga Omnes</i> | 125 |
| 3 | The Legal Status of Universal Jurisdiction Under International Law | 127 |
| 3.1 | Universal Jurisdiction Under Conventional International Law | 127 |
| 3.1.1 | Primary Obligatory Universal Jurisdiction | 128 |
| 3.1.2 | A Reconfirmation of the Non-exclusive Character of Jurisdiction | 129 |
| 3.1.3 | The Gap between the International Obligation and Reality | 130 |
| 3.1.4 | No Evidence of Universal Jurisdiction <i>in Absentia</i> | 130 |
| 3.2 | Universal Jurisdiction Under Customary International Law | 132 |
| 3.2.1 | Is International Law a Prohibitive or Permissive Rule? | 132 |
| 3.2.2 | Is Universal Jurisdiction Illegal? | 134 |
| 3.2.2.1 | Universal jurisdiction exercised within the territory of the exercising State | 135 |
| 3.2.2.2 | Non-interference in the internal affairs of other States | 136 |
| 3.2.2.3 | The Sovereign equality of States | 136 |
| 3.2.2.4 | The Dominance of territorial jurisdiction | 137 |
| 3.2.2.5 | Conclusion on <i>a priori</i> illegality | 138 |
| 3.2.3 | Permissive Universal Jurisdiction | 139 |
| 3.2.4 | Obligatory Universal Jurisdiction | 141 |
| 3.2.4.1 | Support for obligatory universal jurisdiction | 141 |
| 3.2.4.2 | Objections to obligatory universal jurisdiction | 142 |
| 3.2.4.3 | The Responsibility of States concerning universal jurisdiction deriving from their territorial Sovereignty | 143 |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| 3.2.5 | Universal Jurisdiction <i>in absentia</i> | 144 |
| 3.2.5.1 | Support for universal jurisdiction <i>in absentia</i> | 145 |
| 3.2.5.2 | Opposition to universal jurisdiction <i>in absentia</i> | 146 |
| 3.3 | Conclusion Concerning the Legality of Universal Jurisdiction | 148 |
| 4 | The Status of Universal Jurisdiction over Genocide | 148 |
| 4.1 | Does the Genocide Convention Prescribe Universal Jurisdiction? | 149 |
| 4.2 | Universal Jurisdiction over Genocide under Customary International Law | 150 |
| 4.2.1 | Article 6 of the Genocide Convention and Customary Law | 150 |
| 4.2.2 | The Second Period (Post-WWII to the 1960s) | 151 |
| 4.2.3 | The Third Period (the 1970s and the 1980s) | 153 |
| 4.2.4 | The Fourth Period (the 1990s to the present) | 154 |
| 4.3 | Conclusion on Universal Jurisdiction over Genocide | 156 |
| Chapter V | | |
| Guiding Rules by which to Solve Jurisdictional Conflicts | | 157 |
| 1 | Introduction | 157 |
| 2 | Concurrent Jurisdictional Regime | 157 |
| 2.1 | The Multiplicity of National and International Jurisdictions | 157 |
| 2.2 | The Objective and the Advantage of Concurrent Jurisdictional Regimes | 158 |
| 2.3 | Problem Inherent in a Concurrent Jurisdictional Regime | 158 |
| 2.3.1 | Negative Conflicts | 159 |
| 2.3.2 | Positive Conflicts | 160 |
| 2.4 | The Need for Rules Concerning Jurisdiction | 161 |
| 2.5 | The Applicability of International Law to Jurisdictional Problems | 162 |
| 3 | The Lockerbie Case as an Example of a Jurisdictional Dispute | 163 |
| 3.1 | The Facts | 163 |
| 3.2 | Analysis of the Jurisdictional Aspect | 163 |
| 3.2.1 | Libyan Jurisdiction over the Case | 163 |
| 3.2.2 | The Jurisdiction of the U.S. and the U.K. over the Case | 164 |
| 3.3 | Mutual Distrust of Conducting a Trial in a Fair and Impartial Manner | 165 |
| 3.4 | Different Forums to Settle the Dispute | 166 |
| 3.5 | Final Solution: The Special Trial in the Netherlands | 167 |
| 3.6 | Implications of the Lockerbie Case | 168 |
| 4 | General Observations on Rules Governing the Concurrence of National Jurisdictions | 169 |
| 4.1 | A Prerequisite: Legality | 169 |
| 4.2 | Difficulty in Finding Rules Concerning the Venue of a Trial | 171 |
| 4.3 | Obligation Under Conventional Law | 172 |
| 4.4 | Customary International Law | 172 |
| 5 | Looking for Evidence of Guiding Rules | 173 |
| 5.1 | Extradition Law | 173 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| 5.2 | The Third Restatement | 176 |
| 5.3 | The Princeton Principles | 177 |
| 5.4 | The Brussels Principles | 178 |
| 6 | Compilation of Guiding Rules | 178 |
| 6.1 | The Nexus Rule | 179 |
| 6.1.1 | Preference for Territorial Jurisdiction | 179 |
| 6.1.2 | Nationality Jurisdiction | 181 |
| 6.1.3 | Exceptions to the Nexus Rule | 182 |
| 6.1.4 | The Nexus Rule and Responsibility | 183 |
| 6.2 | Weighing of Interests | 185 |
| 6.3 | Comparing the Gravity of the Crime | 186 |
| 6.4 | The Date of Initiating the Proceedings | 186 |
| 6.5 | Fairness and Impartiality of a Trial | 186 |
| 6.5.1 | Emphasis on Fairness and Impartiality | |
| 6.5.2 | The Influence of the Fair Trial Requirement on International Criminal Courts | 187 189 |
| 6.5.3 | The Content of the Criterion | 189 |
| 6.5.3.1 | The Human Rights Aspect | 193 |
| 6.5.3.2 | The Institutional Guarantee | 194 |
| 6.6 | Summarising of the Guiding Rules | 195 |
| 7 | Tentative Conclusions | |
| | | |
| Chapter VI | | |
| Some Effects Relating to the Application of the Guiding Rules | | |
| 1 | Introduction | 197 |
| 2 | Application of the Guiding Rules to Non-Territorial Jurisdiction | 197 |
| 2.1 | Arguments Against the Exercise of Non-territorial Jurisdiction | 198 |
| 2.1.1 | Legality | 198 |
| 2.1.2 | Causing Instability and Damaging Peace within a State | 198 |
| 2.1.3 | Danger of Causing New Disputes | 199 |
| 2.1.4 | Arbitrary Prosecution | 200 |
| 2.1.5 | Possibility of Undermining the Suspect's Rights | 200 |
| 2.1.6 | Problems with the Gathering of Evidence | 200 |
| 2.1.7 | Lack of Specialized Institutions | 201 |
| 2.2 | Evaluating Non-territorial Jurisdiction in Accordance with the Guiding Rules | 201 |
| 2.2.1 | Legality | 202 |
| 2.2.2 | Particular Rules in Conventions | 202 |
| 2.2.3 | The Nexus Rule | 203 |
| 2.2.4 | Weighing and Comparing the Interests | 204 |
| 2.2.5 | Fairness, Impartiality, and the Observance of Human Rights | 207 |
| 2.2.6 | Other Criteria | 209 |
| 2.2.7 | General Assessment | 209 |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|-----|
| 3 | How should Universal Jurisdiction be Exercised? | 209 |
| 3.1 | Why the Exercise of Universal Jurisdiction is Desirable | 209 |
| 3.2 | Some Problems in Exercising Universal Jurisdiction | 210 |
| 3.2.1 | The Lack of Willingness on the Part of States | 211 |
| 3.2.2 | The Absence or Inadequacy of National Legislation | 213 |
| 3.2.3 | Problems of Impartiality | 215 |
| 3.3 | When is Universal Jurisdiction Appropriate? | 217 |
| 3.3.1 | Supplemental Universal Jurisdiction | 217 |
| 3.3.2 | Consideration Criteria in Deciding whether or not to Exercise Universal Jurisdiction | 219 |
| 4 | The Controversial Nature of Evaluating Appropriateness of Jurisdiction with Reference to the Guiding Rules | 221 |
| 5 | Some Peripheral Effects of the Guiding Rules | 223 |
| 5.1 | Change in the Function of Extradition | 223 |
| 5.1.1 | The Classical Function of Extradition | 223 |
| 5.1.2 | New Features | 224 |
| 5.1.3 | The Significance of the Power to Decide | 226 |
| 5.1.4 | The Rule of Non-Inquiry | 228 |
| 5.1.5 | Prospects for the New Function of Extradition | 230 |
| 5.2 | Effect on the Principle of Ne bis in Idem | 230 |
| 6 | Conclusion | 232 |
| Chapter VII | | |
| Conclusion | | 233 |
| 1 | Introduction | 233 |
| 2 | Overview of the Study | 233 |
| 3 | Propositions | 236 |
| 3.1 | Gross and serious human rights violations are strictly prohibited under any circumstance | 236 |
| 3.2 | It is within the interest of the international community to end the impunity of individuals who are responsible for gross human rights violations | 237 |
| 3.3 | Notwithstanding the existence of various international criminal courts, the primary forum for prosecution is still the national courts | 238 |
| 3.4 | The modern jurisdictional regime is formulated as a concurrency of various bases of jurisdiction, enhanced by the expansion of jurisdiction | 239 |
| 3.5 | In discussing universal jurisdiction, the following distinctions should be made for the purpose of precision | 239 |
| 3.5.1 | Universal Jurisdiction and International Criminal Jurisdiction | 239 |
| 3.5.2 | Universal Jurisdiction and Universal Jurisdiction <i>in Absentia</i> | 240 |
| 3.5.3 | Different Nature of Universal Jurisdiction (whether it is permissive or obligatory, and supplemental or primary) | 240 |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 3.6 | National jurisdictions, even universal jurisdiction <i>in absentia</i> , are not prohibited under international law unless stated otherwise or unless their exercise would be in breach of other rules of international law | 241 |
| 3.7 | It is possible that international law concerning obligatory universal jurisdiction may develop in the near future since law and practice relating to universal jurisdiction are still in transition | 242 |
| 3.8 | The principle of State sovereignty should prompt a State where a suspect is present to be under a moral and legal obligation to exercise its jurisdiction | 243 |
| 3.9 | Jurisdictional conflicts should be resolved in a peaceful manner in accordance with the UN Charter and other rules under international law | 243 |
| 3.10 | The venue of a trial may be decided by taking into consideration the legality of the particular jurisdictions in question as well as the appropriateness of exercising them | 244 |
| 3.11 | The Prosecution and punishment of individuals must take place in a fair and impartial trial | 245 |
| 3.12 | States should fulfil their obligation under treaties and conventions on gross human rights violations that they have ratified | 245 |
| 3.13 | Future conventions on gross human rights violations and other serious crimes should allow for multiple bases of jurisdiction (including universal jurisdiction) in order to dispense with safe havens for criminals | 245 |
| 3.14 | The international community should assist States to accomplish a fair and impartial exercise of territorial jurisdiction | 246 |
| 4 | Reappraisal of Territorial Jurisdiction | 246 |
| 4.1 | Status of Territorial Jurisdiction within the Modern Jurisdictional Regime | 246 |
| 4.1.1 | The Traditional Preference for and the Problems Involved in the Exercise of Territorial Jurisdiction | 246 |
| 4.1.2 | Reliance on Non-Territorial or International Jurisdiction | 247 |
| 4.2 | The Role of Territorial Jurisdiction and the Importance of Assisting its Exercise | 248 |
| 5 | Is the Role of Non-Territorial Jurisdiction Auxiliary? | 252 |
| | Nederlandse samenvatting | 255 |
| | Selected Bibliography | 263 |
| | About the Author | 269 |