

Collection dirigée par Samantha Besson et Nicolas Levrat

# International Responsibility

Essays in Law, History and Philosophy

Edited by  
Samantha Besson

With the assistance of  
Matthieu Loup

**LGDJ**  
lextenso éditions

Schulthess § 2017  
ÉDITIONS ROMANDES

# Table of contents

<b>Contents.....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Table of contents.....</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>List of contributors.....</b>	<b>XIII</b>
<b>Foreword .....</b>	<b>1</b>
SAMANTHA BESSON	
<b>International Responsibility: An Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
SAMANTHA BESSON	
<b>PART I: HISTORY AND RESPONSIBILITY.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>The “Historikerstreit” 30 Years Later – From a Responsible Way to Remember to a Dogmatic Standardization of Facing the Past.....</b>	<b>17</b>
CÉCILE BLASER	
Introduction.....	17
I. The historians’ dispute and its relevance today.....	19
II. From the possibility of comparability to standardization of memory.....	25
Conclusion.....	31
<b>Nineteenth-Century <i>Interventions d’Humanité</i> and the Question of Responsibility: A Very Short Historical Overview.....</b>	<b>33</b>
DAVIDE RODOGNO	
Introduction.....	33
I. A few words on nineteenth-century humanitarian interventions.....	34
II. Responsible intervention.....	35
III. Responsible interventions were not neutral; they were against massacre .....	37
IV. Interventions responded to a specific ideological, moral vision and self-appointed responsibility.....	38
V. Responsible intervention and motivation.....	40
VI. Responsible intervention in the context of a particular international system: the European Concert .....	41
VII. Responsible intervention in the aftermath of the First World War; a different system and different actors: the League of Nations and non-governmental organizations .....	42
Conclusion.....	50

**PART II: CAUSATION AND RESPONSIBILITY..... 51**

**Responsibility without Causation? The Public International Law**

**Experiment..... 53**

DÁVID M. PUSZTAI

Introduction .....	53
I. Constructing responsibility without causation .....	54
II. Attribution versus causation.....	57
III. Resurrecting responsibility-grounding causation .....	63
IV. From quasi-accessorial liability to an action theory in international law .....	67
V. The action theory in practice – The example of <i>Bosnia Genocide</i> .....	73
Conclusion.....	74

**Responsibility for International Monetary Stability in the Post-Crisis**

**Era ..... 77**

LUCIA SATRAGNO

Introduction .....	77
I. Monetary stability .....	79
A. Monetary stability – Definition .....	79
B. Monetary stability – Sovereignty and responsibility .....	80
II. Legal and institutional arrangements .....	81
A. Domestic and regional level .....	81
B. International level.....	83
III. Responsibility for international monetary stability – Overlapping domains .....	85
IV. A common concern of humankind approach to monetary stability .....	89
Conclusion.....	92

**PART III: PRIMARY AND SECONDARY RESPONSIBILITIES..... 95**

**State Responsibility Aspects of a Common Concern Based Approach to**

**Collective Action..... 97**

ZAKER AHMAD

Introduction.....	97
I. The problem of regulating global collective action.....	98
II. Understanding the Common Concern framework.....	100
A. Evolution of the expression .....	100
B. Meaning and scope.....	102
C. Should there be a principle of Common Concern? .....	104
D. Normative implications .....	106
III. Common Concern and State responsibility .....	108
A. “Aggravated responsibility” regime in the ARSIWA.....	110
B. Practice on aggravated responsibility: an entitlement or a duty?.....	111
C. Towards a Common Concern based “duty to act” .....	113
Conclusion.....	115

**Theorizing the Retrospectiveness of International Responsibility:  
A Historical Inquiry into *Restitutio in Integrum* ..... 117**  
EDOARDO STOPPIONI

Introduction .....	117
I. A retrospective remedy .....	119
A. The complex Roman law origins of the concept .....	120
1. A praetorian creation to reinstate the <i>status quo ante</i> .....	120
2. <i>Restitutio in integrum, restitutio integri</i> and <i>integra restitutio</i> .....	121
B. The theoretical underpinnings of the remedy .....	123
1. A remedy strictly linked to the jurisdictional function.....	123
2. Eradicating the wrongful act and reinstating substantive justice .....	126
II. A remedy strictly linked to the primary obligation .....	128
A. The decline of <i>restitutio</i> in early international law .....	128
1. Dispelling the chimera of the rareness of <i>restitutio in integrum</i> .....	128
2. A theoretical shift: reparation as reestablishment or alternative of international legality .....	131
B. The corollary of the reestablishment of legality .....	133
1. The elimination of the legal prejudice .....	133
2. An emanation of the power to recall the content of the primary obligation .....	135
Conclusion.....	137

**The Content of State Responsibility under the European Convention on  
Human Rights – Some Reflections on the Court’s Approach to General  
International Law on State Responsibility ..... 139**  
MATTHIEU LOUP

Introduction .....	139
I. The content of responsibility under general international law .....	141
A. The duty of cessation.....	142
B. The duty to provide assurances and guarantees of non-repetition .....	143
C. The duty to provide reparation .....	144
II. The content of State responsibility under the ECHR .....	146
A. The duty to adopt individual measures .....	148
1. The duty to put an end to ongoing violations.....	148
2. The duty to provide reparation.....	149
3. The duty to pay the just satisfaction awarded by the Court .....	152
B. The duty to adopt general measures .....	155
III. Beyond terminological divides: International State responsibility transposed to the ECtHR’s needs.....	157
Conclusion.....	158

**PART IV: NON-STATE ACTORS AND RESPONSIBILITY ..... 159**

**The Importance and Difficulties of Establishing and Clarifying the International Legal Personality and Responsibility of Non-State Armed Groups ..... 161**

HELEEN M. HIEMSTRA

Introduction ..... 161

I. Defining non-State armed groups ..... 163

    A. Minimum level of organization ..... 163

II. The notion of responsibility in international law ..... 164

III. Non-State armed groups as subjects of international law ..... 166

    A. The interplay between legal personality and obligations ..... 167

    B. Obligations under international humanitarian law ..... 168

IV. “Indirect” responsibility of non-State armed groups ..... 170

    A. State responsibility for the conduct of non-State armed groups ..... 170

    B. Individual criminal responsibility ..... 173

V. Filling the gaps: moving towards direct responsibility ..... 174

Conclusion ..... 177

**Targeted Killings and the Punishment of Enemy Leaders ..... 179**

FRANCESCO ROMANI

Introduction – Targeted killings and the fate of the enemy ..... 179

I. Israel and the notion of direct participation in hostilities ..... 181

    A. The *Public Committee* case: the dynamics of dynamic interpretation ..... 181

    B. Israeli practice at the turn of the century ..... 183

II. The United States and the doctrine of continuing imminent threat ..... 185

    A. Obama’s *Presidential Policy Guidance*: moving beyond 9/11? ..... 185

    B. *Ius ad bellum* and *in bello*: getting lost in the shuffle ..... 188

III. The meaning of responsibility in the practice of targeted killings ..... 190

    A. From collective to individual forms of responsibility ..... 190

    B. Targeting and responsibility: *les liaisons dangereuses* ..... 193

Conclusion – Blessing and harm of individuation ..... 195

---

**PART V: INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITY ..... 197**
**Immunities and Responsibilities of International Organizations: Two Sides of the Same Coin or Two Separate Coins? ..... 199**

AURÉLIE GALETTO

Introduction – Beyond the coin’s metaphor: mapping the issue .....	200
I. Immunity and responsibility: between parallelism and convergence .....	203
A. Immunity and responsibility as multifaceted instruments .....	203
1. Immunity as a procedural exception .....	203
2. Responsibility as the consequence of a breach of an obligation .....	204
B. The (different) nature of the institutions.....	205
C. The convergences behind the differences .....	206
1. Immunities and responsibility as procedural institutions.....	206
2. ... Procedural institutions that can communicate.....	207
II. The relativity of and between the concepts .....	208
A. The relativity of the concepts themselves.....	208
1. Responsibility and immunity as results of triadic relationships.....	208
2. The variability and the balancing inherent to immunity and responsibility .....	209
B. The relativity between the concepts .....	210
1. In practice: cross-references and separation .....	210
2. In theory: an intrinsic relationship? .....	212
III. The possible qualifications of the relationship between responsibility and immunity ...	214
A. Answerability as a condition for immunity?.....	214
1. The “formal” interpretation .....	214
2. The human rights interpretation.....	215
B. Systemic integration and/or interstitial norm? .....	216
1. A comprehensive interpretation of responsibility and immunity .....	216
2. Interstitial norm: <i>de lege lata</i> or <i>ferenda</i> ?.....	217
Conclusion.....	218

**Challenging the Presumption of “Non-Responsibility” of Member States of International Organizations ..... 221**

ODETTE MURRAY

Introduction .....	221
I. The development of the “non-responsibility” thesis .....	224
A. The <i>Westland</i> and <i>Tin Council</i> cases .....	224
B. The resolution of the <i>Institut de Droit International</i> .....	228
II. The “non-responsibility” thesis after <i>Tin Council</i> and <i>Westland</i> .....	233
III. Debating member State responsibility in the International Law Commission .....	236
Conclusion.....	242