

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. Manon Céline Simon

The Applicability of the Defence
of Duress to Unlawful Killing
in International Criminal Law

An Analysis of the ICTY *Erdemović* Case and
Article 31(1)(d) Rome Statute

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	XV
Bibliography.....	XIX
Case Law.....	LIII

Part I: Introduction..... 1

1. Scope and outline of the study	1
2. The facts of the <i>Erdemović</i> case.....	3
3. General part of international criminal law	6
3.1 Prior to the Rome Statute.....	6
3.2 Part 3 of the Rome Statute	7
3.3 Concept of crime in international criminal law	8
3.3.1 Offences.....	9
3.3.2 Defences	10
3.3.2.1 Duress	11
3.3.2.2 Superior orders	12
3.3.2.3 Necessity.....	14

Part II: Analysis of *Erdemović* 17

1. Judgement of Trial Chamber I	17
1.1 Findings on duress	18
1.2 Criticism	20
1.2.1 Particularity of crimes against humanity.....	21
1.2.2 Burden of proof.....	22
2. Judgement of the Appeals Chamber	24
2.1 Introductory remarks	24
2.2 Deriving a rule on duress for cases of unlawful killing	26
2.2.1 The sources of international criminal law	26
2.2.2 Customary international law	27
2.2.2.1 International judicial decisions as evidence of customary international law	28
2.2.2.2 Judgement of the IMT at Nuremberg.....	28
a) Moral choice test.....	29
b) Reception of the moral choice test.....	32
2.2.2.3 Other evidence of customary international law	34
2.2.2.4 Conclusion on customary international law	37
2.2.3 General principles of law	38
2.2.3.1 General principles of law recognised by civilised nations.....	38
2.2.3.2 General principles of international (criminal) law	42

2.2.3.3	Case law on crimes committed during World War II	43
a)	US military tribunals	43
b)	UK military tribunals	46
c)	Canadian military tribunal	48
d)	German tribunals	49
e)	Other cases.....	50
f)	Conclusion.....	53
2.2.3.4	Legislation on the punishment of war criminals	53
2.2.3.5	Comparative overview of national laws	54
a)	Duress in the Romano-Germanic legal system	55
	<i>German StGB</i>	55
	<i>Austrian StGB</i>	59
	<i>Swiss StGB</i>	60
	<i>French CP</i>	62
	<i>Italian CP</i>	64
	<i>Spanish CP</i>	65
	<i>Dutch Sr</i>	67
	<i>Law in the Former Yugoslavia</i>	68
	<i>Conclusion</i>	69
b)	Duress in the Anglo-American legal system.....	70
	<i>The law of England and Wales</i>	70
	<i>USA</i>	81
	<i>Canada</i>	85
	<i>Australia and New Zealand</i>	88
	<i>South Africa</i>	90
	<i>Conclusion</i>	92
c)	Conclusion.....	93
2.2.3.6	Conclusion on general principles of law.....	95
2.2.4	Resorting to policy considerations – the approach of MCDONALD/VOHRAH	96
2.2.4.1	Is resorting to policy considerations legitimate?.....	97
2.2.4.2	Considerations to be taken into account	100
a)	Gravity of the crimes	100
b)	Purposes of punishment.....	103
	<i>Deterrence</i>	105
	<i>Retribution</i>	108
	<i>Other purposes</i>	108
	<i>Conclusion</i>	110
c)	Sanctity of human life.....	110
d)	Fairness considerations and the rights of the accused.....	112
2.2.4.3	Conclusion on policy considerations	114
2.3	The nature of duress (justification vs. excuse).....	115
2.3.1	Reasons for and significance of a distinction.....	116
2.3.2	Categorisation of duress.....	118
2.4	Requirements of duress	120
2.4.1	Threat.....	121

2.4.2	Response.....	124
2.4.2.1	Choosing the lesser evil	124
2.4.2.2	Not disproportionately greater	126
2.4.2.3	Reasonableness.....	127
2.4.3	Absence of prior fault	130
2.4.4	Conclusion on the requirements.....	132
2.5	Conclusion on the Appeals Judgement	133
3.	Judgement of Trial Chamber II <i>ter</i> and the impact of <i>Erdemović</i>	133
Part III: Duress according to Article 31(1)(d) Rome Statute		137
1.	Drafting history of Article 31 Rome Statute	137
2.	Structure of Article 31 Rome Statute	140
2.1	Paragraph 1	140
2.2	Paragraph 2	141
2.3	Paragraph 3	143
3.	Raising a defence and burden of proof.....	144
4.	Article 31(1)(d) Rome Statute.....	145
4.1	Drafting history.....	147
4.2	Requirements.....	150
4.2.1	Threat.....	151
4.2.2	Necessary and reasonable response	155
4.2.2.1	Necessary.....	155
4.2.2.2	Reasonable.....	155
a)	Objective proportionality test?.....	156
b)	Special protective duties	158
c)	Killing under duress.....	159
4.2.3	Subjective proportionality.....	160
4.2.3.1	“Greater harm”	160
4.2.3.2	Subjective proportionality and objective reasonableness	160
4.2.4	Absence of prior fault	162
4.3	Cases of unlawful killing at the SPSC	163
4.4	Virtual application of Article 31(1)(d) Rome Statute to the <i>Erdemović</i> facts	165
5.	Proposal for a new wording of Article 31(1)(d) Rome Statute	167
6.	Conclusion on Article 31(1)(d) Rome Statute.....	169
Part IV: Final conclusion.....		171
Annex: Legal Materials		177