

Völkerstrafrecht und  
internationales Strafrecht

Edited by / Herausgegeben von

Prof. Dr. iur. Felix Bommer, Universität Luzern

Prof. Dr. iur. Gerhard Fiolka, Universität Freiburg i.Ue.

Prof. Dr. iur. Sabine Gless, Universität Basel

Prof. Dr. iur. Frank Meyer, Universität Zürich

Prof. Dr. iur. Hans Vest, Universität Bern

Dr. iur. Andrea Höhener

**Collective Crimes – Individual  
Responsibility: Joint Criminal  
Enterprise Revisited**

A Diversified Approach to Perpetration



DIKE

# Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgments</b>	VII
<b>Bibliography</b>	XIV
<b>Table of Cases</b>	XXIII
<b>Part A: Introduction and Historical Development of JCE</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Issue	3
1.2 Challenging Circumstances for International Criminal Law	5
1.2.1 Macro-Criminality	5
1.2.2 National Forms of Liability?	8
1.3 JCE in General: A Brief Overview	10
2. Background of the JCE Doctrine	12
2.1 Nuremberg Tribunal	12
2.2 Conspiracy and Membership in a Criminal Organization Doctrine	14
2.2.1 Conspiracy	15
2.2.2 Membership in a Criminal Organization Doctrine	17
2.3 The Importance of these Forms of Liability for the Development of JCE	19
2.4 Common Plan as a Link Between Nuremberg and JCE	19
3. Tadić as a Starting Point Towards the Future	22
4. Conclusion and Perspective: Alternatives to JCE or JCE at the ICC?	29
<b>Part B: Analysis of the Elements of Crime of JCE and the Idea of a “Revised” JCE</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>I. Analysis of the Elements of Crime</b>	<b>35</b>
1. The Objective Elements of Crime of JCE I	37
1.1 Plurality of Persons	38
1.1.1 Level of Organization of a Plurality of Persons	39
1.1.1.1 <i>Case Law</i>	39
1.1.1.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	39
1.1.2 Identifying the Members of a Plurality of Persons	40
1.1.2.1 <i>Case Law</i>	40
1.1.2.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	42
1.1.3 Conclusion	42
1.2 The Principal Perpetrator as Non-Member?	43
1.2.1 Case Law	44
1.2.1.1 <i>Requirement of Membership of the Principal Perpetrator?</i>	44
1.2.1.2 <i>Agreement Between the Accused Member and the Perpetrating Non-Member?</i>	51
1.2.2 Legal Literature	53

## Table of Contents

---

1.2.3 Conclusion	56
1.3 The Common Plan or Purpose	57
1.3.1 Form	58
1.3.1.1 <i>Case Law</i>	58
1.3.1.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	61
1.3.2 Content	64
1.3.2.1 <i>Case Law</i>	64
1.3.2.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	65
1.3.3 Conclusion	66
1.4 Contribution	67
1.4.1 Case Law	68
1.4.1.1 <i>Participation in the Implementation of the Common Plan – the Meaning of “Commission”</i>	68
1.4.1.2 <i>Quality and Form of Commission: “Substantial” or “Significant”</i>	72
1.4.2 Legal Literature	75
1.4.3 Conclusion	78
2. Differences Between JCE I and the Objective Elements of JCE II and JCE III	81
2.1 JCE II	81
2.1.1 Plurality of Persons	82
2.1.1.1 <i>Case Law</i>	82
2.1.1.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	82
2.1.2 Membership of the Principal Perpetrator	83
2.1.2.1 <i>Case Law</i>	83
2.1.2.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	83
2.1.3 The Common Plan or Purpose – the Existence of a System	84
2.1.3.1 <i>Case Law</i>	84
2.1.3.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	85
2.1.4 Contribution	86
2.1.4.1 <i>Case Law</i>	86
2.1.4.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	89
2.1.5 Conclusion	91
2.2. JCE III	92
2.2.1 Membership of the Principal Perpetrator	92
2.2.1.1 <i>Case Law</i>	92
2.2.1.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	93
2.2.2 The Common Plan or Purpose – Natural and Foreseeable Consequence	93
2.2.2.1 <i>Case Law</i>	93
2.2.2.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	94
2.2.3 Contribution	96
2.2.3.1 <i>Case Law</i>	96
2.2.3.2 <i>Legal Literature</i>	96
2.2.4 Conclusion	97
3. Subjective Elements of Crime	100

3.1 JCE I	100
3.1.1 Intent	100
3.1.1.1 <i>Shared Intent</i>	101
3.1.1.2 <i>Knowledge</i>	102
3.1.2 Conclusion	102
3.2 JCE II	103
3.2.1 Personal Knowledge	103
3.2.2 Intent to Further the System	104
3.2.3 Conclusion	104
3.3 JCE III	106
3.3.1 Intent to Participate in the Common Plan and to Further the Common Plan	106
3.3.2 The Foreseeability of the Un-Concerted Crime	106
3.3.2.1 <i>Objective and/or Subjective Foreseeability</i>	107
3.3.2.2 <i>Level of Intent</i>	108
3.3.2.3 <i>Willingly Taking the Risk of the Un-Concerted                 Crime Despite its Foreseeability</i>	109
3.3.3 Conclusion	109
<b>II. JCE Revisited: Overcoming the Vagueness</b>	111
1. Plurality of Persons	111
2. Membership of the Principal Perpetrator	113
3. Common Plan	114
4. Contribution	116
5. Subjective Elements	119
<b>Part C: The Future of JCE at the ICC and Alternative Forms of Liability</b>	123
<b>I. From the Ad Hoc Tribunals to the ICC</b>	125
<b>II. JCE and the ICC Statute</b>	126
1. Art. 25 (3)(a): Commission as Principal	128
1.1 Commission	130
1.2 Principal versus Accomplice Liability	131
1.2.1 Distinguishing Criterion at the ICTY	131
1.2.2 Distinguishing Criteria at the ICC	136
1.2.3 JCE – Principal or Accomplice Liability?	137
1.3 Conclusion	139
2. Art. 25 (3)(d): Contribution in Any Other Way	140
3. JCE I	141
4. JCE II	143
5. JCE III	144
6. Conclusion	146
<b>III. Towards a Synthesis</b>	148
1. JCE at the ICC: An Alliance worth Campaigning for?	149

## Table of Contents

---

1.1	JCE I and II	150
1.2	JCE III	152
2.	The ICC's Forms of Liability: Differentiation (from JCE) and Possible Combinations	154
2.1	Indirect (Co-)Perpetration – Control of the Will	154
2.1.1	Characteristic of Indirect (Co-)Perpetration – Physical Perpetrator as “Tool”	154
2.1.2	Control: Organized Structures of Power (“OSP”)	156
2.1.2.1	<i>Elements of OSP</i>	157
2.1.2.2	<i>Replaceability</i>	158
2.1.3	Case Law of the ICC with regard to Indirect Co-Perpetration: Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui (PTC) and the Trial Judgments in each the Katanga and Ngudjolo Case	159
2.1.3.1	<i>Common Plan</i>	160
2.1.3.2	<i>Control Over a Hierarchically Organized Organization</i>	161
2.1.3.3	<i>Essential Contribution</i>	161
2.1.3.4	<i>Difference to the Lubanga Case</i>	163
2.2	Co-Perpetration – Functional Control	163
2.2.1	Elements of Co-Perpetration	164
2.2.1.1	<i>Common Plan or Agreement</i>	164
2.2.1.2	<i>Coordinated and Essential Contribution</i>	166
2.2.1.3	<i>Control</i>	169
2.2.1.4	<i>Subjective Elements</i>	170
2.2.2	Case Law of the ICC with Regard to Co-Perpetration Based on Joint Control: Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo	172
2.3	Differentiation of the Presented Forms of Liability	176
2.3.1	Revised JCE v. Co-Perpetration Based on Joint Control	177
2.3.1.1	<i>Plurality of Persons</i>	177
2.3.1.2	<i>Membership of the Principal Perpetrator</i>	179
2.3.1.3	<i>Common Plan or Agreement</i>	180
2.3.1.4	<i>Contribution</i>	180
2.3.1.5	<i>Level of Control</i>	181
2.3.2	Co-Perpetration Based on Joint Control v. Indirect Perpetration	182
2.3.2.1	<i>Plurality of Persons</i>	182
2.3.2.2	<i>Control</i>	183
2.3.3	Revised JCE v. Indirect (Co-)Perpetration	184
2.3.3.1	<i>Plurality of Persons</i>	184
2.3.3.2	<i>Level of Control</i>	184
2.3.3.3	<i>Excesses – Indirect (Co-)Perpetration as a Replacement for JCE III?</i>	185
2.3.4	Overview of the Differences	185
2.4	Combination of Possible Alternatives	187
3.	Determining Factors of the Level of Control	191

3.1 Factual Circumstances – An Overview	193
3.1.1 Protagonists	193
3.1.2 Characteristics of Structures: Typology of Conflict Scenarios	196
3.2 Interdependencies Between Structures and Level of Control	201
4. Conclusion: Diversified Approach – Assignment of Forms of Liability to Categories of Cases	202
4.1 When to Apply Co-Perpetration Based on Joint Control	202
4.2 Situations for Indirect (Co-)Perpetration	203
4.3 Scenarios for JCE I and II	204
<b>IV. JCE – Closing Statement and Positive Outlook</b>	<b>207</b>