

Overview

Abbreviations	21
1. Introduction and scope of inquiry	25
1.1. Motives	25
1.2. An inter-disciplinary and multi-language approach	28
1.3. The Corrie case example	29
1.4. References	30
2. The commission of crimes by business actors	33
2.1. Preliminary remarks: Interpreting the Rome Statute	34
2.2. Commission in Article 25 (3) RS in ICC jurisprudence and scholarship	39
2.2.1. ICC jurisprudence on commission and Article 25 (3) RS	40
2.2.2. Commission and Article 25 (3) RS in scholarly contributions	48
2.2.3. Results and outlook: Implications for the scope of individual business actors' responsibility under the Rome Statute	54
2.3. Review of perspectives on commission in ICC jurisprudence and scholarship	56
2.3.1. The ambivalent text of the Rome Statute	56
2.3.2. The legal certainty perspective: More ambivalence	62
2.3.3. The punishment perspective: A superior expressive capacity of modes of participation as degrees of responsibility?	64
2.3.4. Commission and attribution: A comparative perspective under Article 21 (1) (c) RS?	66
2.3.5. Results and outlook: Towards overcoming ambivalence	75

2.4. Law and reality structures: Re-conceiving commission	75
2.4.1. Commission and the law's subject matter: A typological approach to perpetration	76
2.4.2. The type of commission under the Rome Statute	94
2.4.3. The subject-matter's influence on attribution, criminality, and individual degrees of responsibility	128
2.4.4. Commission and Article 25 (3) RS: Re-visiting the text from a typological perspective	150
2.4.5. Commission and joint criminal enterprise: Lessons learned?	157
2.4.6. Results and outlook: Business actors' individual criminal responsibility for commission	168
2.5. Social value of conduct, Article 21 (3) RS and the ICC as a just global institution	171
2.5.1. The notions of proximity and remoteness	172
2.5.2. Focusing on intent: The Rome Statute's alleged underinclusiveness vis-à-vis acts of business exchange	173
2.5.3. The emergence of the risk standard	201
2.5.4. Risk permissions from a human rights perspective: Liberty vs. security and business activity	212
2.5.5. Results	296
2.5.6. Excursus: A customary law perspective on risk permissions? Business activity post-Nuremberg under Article 21 (1) (b) RS	297
2.6. Conclusion	299
2.7. References	300
3. Business actors as civilian superiors	326
3.1. Civilian «effective authority and control» in scholarship and jurisprudence	326
3.1.1. Scholarly views on business actors as civilian superiors	327
3.1.2. The Bemba case and ad hoc jurisprudence: A critical prognosis	330
3.1.3. Results and outlook	342
3.2. Omission as a type and business actors as civilian superiors	343
3.2.1. Schünemann's typological perspective on omission	343

3.2.2. A typological perspective on omission under the Rome Statute: The genesis of Article 28 RS and the Rome Statute's omission type	344
3.2.3. Results and outlook: Business leaders as civilian superiors and the question of social desirability	359
3.3. A risk permission for civilian superiors?	360
3.3.1. Scholarship on conscious disregard	361
3.3.2. Balancing human rights as principles	362
3.3.3. Result: No risk permission for business leaders as civilian superiors	363
3.4. Conclusion	364
3.5. References	364
4. Corporate criminal responsibility de lege ferenda?	369
4.1. The Rome Conference proposal and its discussion in scholarship	370
4.2. Corporate criminal responsibility under the constraints of reality	372
4.2.1. Criminal sanctions against corporate actors: A disjunction between burden and responsibility?	374
4.2.2. Non-criminal sanctions against corporate actors under the Rome Statute: The Rome Statute as criminal law?	381
4.3. Excursus: The corporate organization as a black box?	384
4.3.1. The «corporate veil»	385
4.3.2. ...and how to lift it	386
4.3.3. Domestic experiences	387
4.3.4. Result	387
4.4. Conclusion	388
4.5. References	389
5. Closing remarks	396
6. Annex: Abstract and Theses	397

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	21
1. Introduction and scope of inquiry	25
1.1. Motives	25
1.2. An inter-disciplinary and multi-language approach	28
1.3. The Corrie case example	29
1.4. References	30
2. The commission of crimes by business actors	33
2.1. Preliminary remarks: Interpreting the Rome Statute	34
2.2. Commission in Article 25 (3) RS in ICC jurisprudence and scholarship	39
2.2.1. ICC jurisprudence on commission and Article 25 (3) RS	40
2.2.1.1. The Lubanga judgment: Commission vs. commission	41
2.2.1.1.1. The Majority's decision by Trial Chamber I: Differentiation, a hierarchy, and collective control in co-perpetration	41
2.2.1.1.2. Judge Fulford: Opposition by way of a plain(er) reading	42
2.2.1.2. The Katanga and Ngudjolo Chui case: Horizontal and vertical perspectives on control	43
2.2.1.2.1. The Majorities' decisions of Pre-Trial Chamber I and Trial Chamber II: Control by means of a power apparatus in indirect perpetration	44
2.2.1.2.2. Judge van den Wyngaert: Opposition in another plain reading	47

2.2.2. Commission and Article 25 (3) RS in scholarly contributions	48
2.2.2.1. Article 25 (3) RS constitutes a hierarchical ordering of degrees of responsibility; (principal) perpetrators are in control over the crime, (secondary) accomplices aren't	49
2.2.2.2. All participants are equal under Article 25 (3) RS; distinctions are made at the sentencing stage	52
2.2.3. Results and outlook: Implications for the scope of individual business actors' responsibility under the Rome Statute	54
2.3. Review of perspectives on commission in ICC jurisprudence and scholarship	56
2.3.1. The ambivalent text of the Rome Statute	56
2.3.1.1. Textual perspectives in ICC jurisprudence	56
2.3.1.2. Textual perspectives in scholarship	57
2.3.1.3. Results: The Statute's ambivalence from a textual perspective	59
2.3.2. The legal certainty perspective: More ambivalence	62
2.3.3. The punishment perspective: A superior expressive capacity of modes of participation as degrees of responsibility?	64
2.3.4. Commission and attribution: A comparative perspective under Article 21 (1) (c) RS?	66
2.3.4.1. Abstraction: Forms of attribution and the scope of commission	67
2.3.4.1.1. Attribution of physical acts and (derivation) of criminality	69
2.3.4.1.2. Implications for the sentencing stage	72
2.3.4.2. Representativeness and consistency	74
2.3.4.3. Results	74
2.3.5. Results and outlook: Towards overcoming ambivalence	75
2.4. Law and reality structures: Re-conceiving commission	75
2.4.1. Commission and the law's subject matter: A typological approach to perpetration	76
2.4.1.1. Roxin's Zentralgestalt: Indirect perpetration and the openness of control	77

2.4.1.2. Schünemann's «base type» of Täterschaft: Law and relevant reality structures	81
2.4.1.2.1. Offense descriptions and the reality structure relevant to the protection of legal interests	82
2.4.1.2.2. The «base type» of perpetration	84
2.4.1.2.3. Perpetration and attribution	87
2.4.1.2.4. Perpetration and criminality	88
2.4.1.3. The law's subject matter and the ICC: A region-specific account of the power apparatus in Katanga	89
2.4.1.4. Results and outlook: A normative-empirical perspective on commission under the Rome Statute	93
2.4.2. The type of commission under the Rome Statute	94
2.4.2.1. Offense descriptions under the Rome Statute: Key figures in genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes	95
2.4.2.1.1. Elements of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes	95
2.4.2.1.1.1. Crimes against humanity	96
2.4.2.1.1.2. Genocide	97
2.4.2.1.1.3. War crimes	99
2.4.2.1.1.4. Results and outlook: The reality of offenses under the Rome Statute as an organized effort	101
2.4.2.1.2. An anatomy of human interaction and involvement in genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes	104
2.4.2.1.3. Results and outlook: Designers and implementers of organized action as key figures	106
2.4.2.2. The Statute's fundamental means-end-relation and its reality structure	107
2.4.2.3. The Statute's commission type	108
2.4.2.3.1. The resource dimension of commission	109

2.4.2.3.2. The creative dimension of commission	111
2.4.2.3.2.1. Empirical complexity	112
2.4.2.3.2.2. Fungibility re-visited: On the empirical substrate of the (corporate) power apparatus	119
2.4.2.3.3. The commission type and prerequisite degrees of dimensional expression	122
2.4.2.4. Results and outlook: The commission type and individual criminal responsibility	126
2.4.3. The subject-matter's influence on attribution, criminality, and individual degrees of responsibility	128
2.4.3.1. ICC: A dysfunctional control approach to indirect co-perpetration	129
2.4.3.2. Ambos and Vest: Multi-staged control	132
2.4.3.3. Collective criminality and individual degrees of criminal responsibility at the sentencing stage	137
2.4.3.3.1. Cooperative conduct, shared creatorship of the result and individual quotas of criminality	138
2.4.3.3.2. Sentencing and degrees of criminal responsibility as labels	146
2.4.3.4. Results and outlook	148
2.4.4. Commission and Article 25 (3) RS: Re-visiting the text from a typological perspective	150
2.4.4.1. Commission as an individual?	151
2.4.4.2. Prescriptive terminological elements in a descriptive provision	152
2.4.4.2.1. The regardless- and commission- clauses	153
2.4.4.2.2. (Additional) Intent prerequisites in sub-sections (c) and (d)?	154
2.4.4.3. Results	156

2.4.5. Commission and joint criminal enterprise: Lessons learned?	157
2.4.5.1. JCE responsibility re-visited	158
2.4.5.1.1. Central issues	159
2.4.5.1.2. ... and responses	162
2.4.5.2. JCE, the genesis of Article 25 (3) (d) RS, and collective responsibility	164
2.4.6. Results and outlook: Business actors' individual criminal responsibility for commission	168
2.5. Social value of conduct, Article 21 (3) RS and the ICC as a just global institution	171
2.5.1. The notions of proximity and remoteness	172
2.5.2. Focusing on intent: The Rome Statute's alleged underinclusiveness vis-à-vis acts of business exchange	173
2.5.2.1. Genesis: Purpose as desire intent à la Learned Hand?	175
2.5.2.1.1. Methodological objection: Re-reading the MPC's drafting history	178
2.5.2.1.2. Substantive objection: The purpose prerequisite's deep roots in common law	184
2.5.2.2. Purpose and (the perception of) normalcy	187
2.5.2.2.1. Two scenarios	187
2.5.2.2.2. The issue of normalcy	190
2.5.2.3. Context and ordinary meaning: Purpose as certainty intent?	191
2.5.2.3.1. Vest: The context of Article 25 (3) (c) RS	192
2.5.2.3.2. The ordinary meaning of Article 25 (3) (c) RS: Language differences and certainty intent	194
2.5.2.3.2.1. Dictionary approach	194
2.5.2.3.2.2. Conceptual approach	195
2.5.2.3.2.3. Resolution pursuant to Article 33 VCLT	199
2.5.3. The emergence of the risk standard	201
2.5.3.1. Essential transactions	202

2.5.3.2.	«Substantial» assistance, «significant» contributions, and overbreadth in Prosecutor v. Mbarushimana	203
2.5.3.3.	Ambos and Vest: Limiting (secondary) participation to socially undesirable acts by recourse to a risk standard	206
2.5.3.4.	Heyer: Crime-specific risks and the securing of livelihood	207
2.5.3.4.1.	A utilitarian premise	208
2.5.3.4.2.	... and its implementation in a risk permission	210
2.5.3.5.	Results and outlook	211
2.5.4.	Risk permissions from a human rights perspective: Liberty vs. security and business activity	212
2.5.4.1.	Balancing liberty and security and the fate of the shopkeeper: Exemplary domestic perspectives on risk permissions	214
2.5.4.1.1.	Balancing interests and protecting trust	215
2.5.4.1.2.	The normative value of interests: Constitutionalization and social desirability	219
2.5.4.1.2.1.	Balancing as a method	220
2.5.4.1.2.2.	Criminal law and constitutional law	223
2.5.4.2.	Risk permissions and Article 21 (3) RS: The human rights perspective	224
2.5.4.2.1.	International law, the public law paradigm, and balancing of human rights under Article 21 (3) RS	226
2.5.4.2.1.1.	Global constitutionalism and international law as a coherent system	229

2.5.4.2.1.2.	Human rights as principles: A rational account of balancing	230
2.5.4.2.1.3.	Results: Constitutionalization of international law, Article 21 (3) RS and risk permissions	237
2.5.4.2.2.	The scope of internationally recognized human rights in Article 21 (3) RS	238
2.5.4.2.2.1.	Honest unevenness in a «contextual» approach to «internationally recognized»?	239
2.5.4.2.2.2.	Implications: Uneven human rights protection of business actors before the ICC?	241
2.5.4.2.2.3.	«Internationally recognized» and the ICC as a just global institution: A material perspective on global justice within the public law paradigm	247
2.5.4.2.3.	Results and outlook: Re-visiting contextual vs. minimalist readings of «internationally recognized» and implications for acts of business exchange	265
2.5.4.3.	Risk permissions for acts of business exchange in a principled account of balancing	267
2.5.4.3.1.	The protective principle: Individual and collective?	268

2.5.4.3.2.	Individual relations of precedence	272
2.5.4.3.2.1.	The principle of possession and the ability to trust in business partners	274
2.5.4.3.2.2.	The principle of adequate living conditions through work	282
2.5.4.4.	Results: Implementation of an individual risk permission is generally not required	284
2.5.4.5.	Revisiting Heyer's utilitarian account of risk permissions for business actors	284
2.5.4.5.1.	Wresting the singularity of life from the calculus of social interests: The criteria of securing one's livelihood and of organizational competence	285
2.5.4.5.2.	The criterion of risk specificity	292
2.5.4.5.3.	Neutralization and perpetration	295
2.5.5.	Results	296
2.5.6.	Excursus: A customary law perspective on risk permissions? Business activity post-Nuremberg under Article 21 (1) (b) RS	297
2.6.	Conclusion	299
2.7.	References	300
3.	Business actors as civilian superiors	326
3.1.	Civilian «effective authority and control» in scholarship and jurisprudence	326
3.1.1.	Scholarly views on business actors as civilian superiors	327
3.1.2.	The Bemba case and ad hoc jurisprudence: A critical prognosis	330
3.1.2.1.	Ad hoc jurisprudence on civilian «effective control» as the ability to report	331
3.1.2.2.	Musema before the ICTR: «Legal and financial control» as business actors' «effective control»?	335
3.1.2.3.	Nahimana et al. before the ICTR: Analyzing corporate structures	337

3.1.2.4.	Issues raised in ad hoc jurisprudence and by recourse to it	338
3.1.2.4.1.	Substantive issues: The nature and scope of civilian «effective control»	339
3.1.2.4.2.	Methodological issues: Sources of law under Article 21 (1) RS	340
3.1.3.	Results and outlook	342
3.2.	Omission as a type and business actors as civilian superiors	343
3.2.1.	Schünemann's typological perspective on omission	343
3.2.2.	A typological perspective on omission under the Rome Statute: The genesis of Article 28 RS and the Rome Statute's omission type	344
3.2.2.1.	The genesis of Article 28 RS	345
3.2.2.2.	The Statute's omission type and its concretization with a view to conduct of civilian superiors	348
3.2.2.3.	Collective criminality and individual degrees of responsibility at the sentencing stage	353
3.2.2.3.1.	Attribution and criminality in scholarship	353
3.2.2.3.2.	An analogous proposal	355
3.2.3.	Results and outlook: Business leaders as civilian superiors and the question of social desirability	359
3.3.	A risk permission for civilian superiors?	360
3.3.1.	Scholarship on conscious disregard	361
3.3.2.	Balancing human rights as principles	362
3.3.3.	Result: No risk permission for business leaders as civilian superiors	363
3.4.	Conclusion	364
3.5.	References	364
4.	Corporate criminal responsibility de lege ferenda?	369
4.1.	The Rome Conference proposal and its discussion in scholarship	370

Table of Contents

4.2. Corporate criminal responsibility under the constraints of reality	372
4.2.1. Criminal sanctions against corporate actors: A disjunction between burden and responsibility?	374
4.2.1.1. Punishing the corporation	376
4.2.1.2. An epistemological review	376
4.2.1.3. Incompatible perspectives	379
4.2.2. Non-criminal sanctions against corporate actors under the Rome Statute: The Rome Statute as criminal law?	381
4.3. Excursus: The corporate organization as a black box?	384
4.3.1. The «corporate veil»	385
4.3.2. ...and how to lift it	386
4.3.3. Domestic experiences	387
4.3.4. Result	387
4.4. Conclusion	388
4.5. References	389
5. Closing remarks	396
6. Annex: Abstract and Theses	397