ADC ICTY TPIY

NEWSLETTER

ISSUE 71

16 July 2014

Head of Office: Isabel Düsterhöft
Assistants: Benjamin Schaefer
Contributors: Isaac Amon, Douglas Chalke, Molly Martin, Garrett Mulrain, Philipp Müller, Yoanna Rozeva, Paul Stokes, Camille Sullivan and Lucy Turner
Design: Sabrina Sharma

ICTY CASES

Cases at Trial

Hadžić (IT-04-75)

Karadžić (IT-95-5/18-I)

Mladić (IT-09-92)

Šešelj (IT-03-67)

Cases on Appeal

Popović *et al.* (IT-05-88)

Prlić *et al.* (IT-04-74)

Stanišić & Simatović (IT-03-69)

Stanišić & Župljanin (IT-08-91)

Tolimir (IT-05-88/2)

ICTY NEWS

Prosecutor v. Hadžić (IT-04-75)

On 3 July, the Defence for Goran Hadžić delivered the opening statement in its case. The Defence will bring evidence to show that Hadžić is neither individually responsible for the crimes alleged in the indictment, nor was he a member of a Joint Criminal Enterprise during the time period of the indictment and that he deserves acquittal on all counts. The Defence has already challenged the evidence of some Prosecution witnesses during cross-examination and will seek to prove that some documents admitted into evidence were false and that certain Prosecution witnesses had lied. The Defence will show that Hadžić entered politics in hopes of changing the system from within, legally and peacefully. In this role, Hadžić did his best to avoid the war and to maintain a working and functional relationship with the Croatian government during a time when crimes were happening everywhere, against anyone, regardless of their ethnicity.

Following Defence Counsel's opening statement, pursuant to Rule 84 *bis*, Hadžić delivered a statement to the Trial Chamber. Hadžić expressed his regret for all the victims, on all sides of the conflict, who suffered in the war. During the conflict and to this day, Hadžić believed that, "wars begin with negotiations and end in negotiations. It's better to negotiate for years than to wage war for one day". Hadžić emphasised that it must be taken into account that prior statements of his were made during war events and that it is his wish not to defend himself, but to testify and assist the Trial Chamber in gaining a realistic picture of the events that

ICTY/MICT NEWS

Also in this issue

unfolded during the conflict. He challenged the Prosecution's submission in its opening statement that he had destroyed churches and mosques, pointing out that not a single mosque existed in the Serb Autonomous Region of Slavonia, Baranja and Western Srem (SAO SBWS) or in the Republic of Serbian Krajina (SRK). He refuted the Prosecution's submission that he had accepted the Vance Plan only out of his own interest. He also highlighted his role in the successful United Nations mission to reintegrate Slavonia, Baranja and Western Srem into Croatia.

Following his statement, pursuant to Rule 85(c), Hadžić took the solemn declaration and will testify as a witness in his own defence for 30 hours. On the first day of his testimony he described the interethnic relations in his hometown of Pačetin before the war, stating that there were no conflicts based on ethnicity and that he was brought up to consider every human equal. Hadžić described his entry into politics as the president of the Serbian Democratic Party (SDS) in the municipality of Vukovar. He was questioned by Defence Counsel on the attitude towards Serbs shown by the group of Croatians referring to themselves as Ustashas, testifying that they were intolerant of the Serbs and very strongly in favour of an independent Croatia. He explained that following the 1990 multiparty elections in Croatia, interethnic relations deteriorated and the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) was dominant at this time, during which there were many physical threats to citizens of Serb ethnicity. Hadžić explained his unexpected elevation to the presidency of the branch office of the SDS in Vukovar, despite his education and employment record.

On 4 July, Hadžić continued his testimony, focusing on the evidence provided by Prosecution witness Borivoje Savić, who was Hadžić's fellow party member in the SDS and close associate. Hadžić disputed the majority of Savić's testimony, describing Savić's claim to have been selected to the SDS for Vukovar prior to its existence as "mind-boggling". Hadžić claimed that Savić was "fantasising" when he claimed that the SDS was weakening in August 1990 – at a time Hadžić states they were going from strength to strength. Hadžić further disputed claims that Savić gave, or had the authority to give him assignments, disputing a portion of Savić's evidence where it is alleged that sometime in mid-May 1990, Savić informed Hadžić that a board for the SAO SBWS would be set up. Hadžić declared that Savić could not have told him this at this time, as the SAO SBWS did not yet exist. It was in early 1991 that the Regional Board for Slavonia and Baranja was eventually established. The term "Western Srem" did not exist before 1991. Hadžić testified that the organs in the Serbian Democratic Party met with Croatian President Franjo Tuđman in March 1991 where he requested that the Serbs in Croatia have "cultural autonomy" and that the Constitution be amended as such. Hadžić described in detail his arrest and beating in Plitvice on his return from negotiations in Obrovac. It was only afterwards that he learned of 25 policemen in Vukovar who had walked out of their service and that it was connected to his detention.

Goran Hadžić

Hadžić opened his third day of testimony, 7 July, with an explanation of the establishment of the Serbian National Council. He stated that while there was a formal link, there was "no practical link" between the Serb National Council in Knin and the Serb National Council in Slavonia, Baranja and Western Srem; they were two completely independent councils. When shown the declaration on sovereign autonomy of the Serb people of Slavonia, Baranja and Western Srem, Hadžić explained that he did not attach much importance to it and that he is unaware of who wrote it, as they had not consulted with him. In establishing the context of the first months of the conflict, Hadžić described that on hearing of the arming of the HDZ, panic spread across the Serb population of Croatia and people "started sending their wives and children to Serbia in an unorganised manner, spontaneously, because they were afraid that the Croats would attack the Serbian villages where they lived". Hadžić recounted how, following his release from detention in Plitvice, he visited United States Ambassador Warren Zimmerman on 12 April 1991 with Veljko Džakula, a Prosecution witness and another official. At this meeting, they discussed the issue of ethnic Serbs being fired from official jobs and that a prerequisite for obtaining a job with the Croatian police was Croatian ethnicity and membership in the HDZ. Additionally, the delegation informed Ambassador Zimmerman

that beatings of Serbs by the Croatian police or civilians and other physical abuse were becoming a daily occurrence. Hadžić informed the U.S. Ambassador that the SDS leaders and Serbs in eastern Croatia did not share the views of Milan Babić and those Serbs from the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina. Hadžić attended the meeting with the hope of learning how to arrive at a solution to the crisis and received assurances from Ambassador Zimmerman that his government would not support any separatist republics and that it would only support a united Yugoslavia.

Hadžić then gave his account of the events that occurred on 1 May 1991, when an ethnic Serb was murdered by his Croat neighbour for carrying a Yugoslav flag. Hadžić, together with a local deputy from the Croatian Parliament, Milenko Milinković, worked together to prevent retributive violence from spreading. He then testified as to the events of 2 May 1991 in Borovo Selo where the removal of road blocks resulted in Croatian police entering the town and opening fire. One unarmed volunteer, named Milić, was killed, while the leader of the group of Croat police, Stipo Bošnjak, used a child as a human shield during the clashes, stated Hadžić. Contrary to how it was portrayed in Croatian media, Hadžić stated with "100 per cent certainty that it was not an ambush". Closing the day's testimony, Hadžić identified the SAO SBWS Assembly session decision of 25 June 1991, stating that the people from Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Srem should remain within a single country along with "the other parts populated by Serbs and other Yugoslav nations which want to live in a united Yugoslav state". Hadžić was appointed as the Prime Minister designate of this future government.

Hadžić continued his testimony on 8 July with excerpts of a video produced by the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) counter-intelligence service which shows the Croatian Defence Minister, Martin Špegelj discussing the arming of Croatian forces and advocating the killing of JNA officers. Hadžić confirmed that one of the people involved in the recording of the meeting was Zvonko Ostojić, and that after the video was aired on state television and people learned that the Croatians had begun an arming process, it caused panic among the Serb population. Hadžić confirmed that the constitution of the Great National Assembly of Slavonia, Barnaja and Western Srem came into effect on 16 July 1991, with the Territorial Defence (TO) being set up on the same day. Ilija Kojić was appointed as Commander of the TO but it was mainly an appointment restricted to Borovo Selo as, at that time, Kojić could not co-ordinate with other local staff as they did not have "either the technical or the physical capacities to do that". Hadžić stated that the organisation of village TO staff was done at the village level, with no outside influence. While Hadžić was elected by the Grand National Assembly as President of the Serbian National Council, he testified that he had "absolutely no jurisdiction" over the Territorial Defence.

Hadžić discussed his contacts with General Radojica Nenezić who was "a national hero from World War II". According to Hadžić, when they met in Belgrade in the summer of 1991, the former Commander did not "have his wits about him" due to a stroke he had suffered. The General possessed a military map of the Slavonia and Baranja region and expressed his desire to become Commander of the Serb TO, which Hadžić found to be "absolutely insane". Hadžić verified a story run by the *Politika* paper that Borovo Selo had become a "men-only place" because all of the women and children having departed as refugees.

Hadžić's cross-examination is expected to start in the week of 14 July.

Prosecutor v. Mladić (IT-09-92)

On 25 June, the cross-examination of Stevan Veljović resumed with the Prosecution continuing to focus on the use and accuracy of modified aerial bombs. An order issued by Dragomir Milošević for the use of these weapons in August 1994 was shown to the witness, who explained that whilst he was not in the Corps at this time these bombs were only fired in areas that were forested and inaccessible by civilians. Veljović clarified his testimony from the previous day, stating that aerial bombs are imprecise in the

same way that all artillery is imprecise, as their accuracy is dependent on a range of factors. He testified that there were no Sarajevo Romanija Corps (SRK) orders to target Baščaršija, however, the Prosecution sought to contradict this evidence by tendering orders from Radislav Cvetković and Dragomir Milošević requesting fire plans be drawn up for this area. In response, Veljović maintained that fire was never opened on Baščaršija regardless of these orders, but was again presented with evidence by the Prosecution of a United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) report detailing the destruction and damage in Baščaršija caused by heavy shelling, to which he had no comment.

The Prosecution concluded by questioning Veljović on the relocation of mortars along the Trebinje axis in August 1995. Veljović confirmed that 160 men, of which 80 were from his Brigade, two 120mm mortars and six 82mm mortars were sent to Trebinje from Mount Trebević to assist the Herzegovina Corps on 17 August 1995, before the situation in Markale took place. The Prosecution demonstrated that despite this movement of troops, there remained thirteen 120mm mortars available to Veljović's Brigade, which he confirmed. At the conclusion of Veljović's testimony the Defence reiterated on re-direct examination that the witness had no direct experience with the preparation of modified aerial bombs and therefore little actual knowledge of their accuracy.

ICTY Rules of Procedure and Evidence

Rule 90(E)

Testimony of Witnesses

A witness may object to making any statement which might tend to incriminate the witness. The Chamber may, however, compel the witness to answer the question. Testimony compelled in this way shall not be used as evidence in a subsequent prosecution against the witness for any offence other than false testimony.

Witness Vladimir Radojčić, a Colonel in the Army of the Republika Srpska (VRS) and Commander of the 1st Infantry Ilidza Brigade of the SRK, began his testimony on 25 June. He first received a warning from the bench that under Rule 90(E) he was not required to give evidence that may implicate himself in any criminal activity. In examination-in-chief the witness' testimony was consistent with several of the previous Defence witnesses, asserting that his unit only engaged in defensive operations, that all subordinates were equipped with manuals on the laws of war and orders were given for adherence to the same. He also stated that there was no objective to blockade civilians in Sarajevo, only the 1st Corps of the Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina (ABiH).

Vladimir Radojčić

However, contrary to the Veljović's evidence, Radojčić testified that aerial bombs were in fact more accurate when modified. They were fired three times by his Brigade on targets within Sarajevo with the assistance of firing tables to enhance precision. Finally, Radojčić testified specifically on orders received from "superior command" to disarm and arrest UNPROFOR soldiers who were believed to be collaborating with NATO forces. He explained that he directly communicated with the Ukrainian and French Battalion Commanders to warn them of the situation and they voluntarily laid down their weapons. Radojčić claimed that these soldiers were never actually disarmed by the SRK and his fair treatment of the prisoners won him a personal commendation by the Commander of the French Battalion. The Prosecution questioned Radojčić on cross-examination about whether the UNPROFOR soldiers were actually in a position to agree to be prisoners, to which the witness agreed they were not.

On cross examination Radojčić was questioned extensively on his description of the ABiH and SRK positions in Sarajevo, and in particular his claim that the SRK were surrounded by ABiH forces on both the inside and the outside. The Prosecution demonstrated that ABiH troops only formed a half-encirclement on the outside of the SRK units' positions, and the SRK in fact encircled the ABiH in Sarajevo. Radojčić, mirroring several other Defence witnesses, explained that the enemy soldiers were in fact able to move in and out of the city via the airport runway and an underground tunnel.

In relation to the incident where an aerial bomb landed on a civilian residence in Hrasnica, the witness testified that his troops were not merely firing in the

general area of the town to terrorise civilians. Rather, Radojčić had ordered an attack on either the Aleksa Šantić School, where ABiH troops were trained, or the adjacent post office building which was the command centre of the 104th Brigade, both legitimate military targets. An order from Dragomir Milošević was tendered in which he instructed the SRK troops to select the "highest-yield target with as many human casualties as possible" when firing on Hrasnica. However, Radojčić clarified that, keeping in mind the laws of war, he interpreted this order to refer not to civilian causalities but maximising damage to the enemy army.

Finally, Radojčić admitted to initiating fire on an UNPROFOR convoy travelling along the Igman road. He claimed, however, that at the time of the attack it was dark and he was unable to establish that these were not enemy vehicles, despite the Prosecution presenting solar charts which indicated that the sun had not yet set at the time of the incident. On re-direct the Defence clarified that there was a standing agreement with UNPROFOR that this road would not be used for humanitarian convoys and only used by UNPROFOR during daylight.

On 2 July, the Defence began its direct examination of Slobodan Tuševljak, former Commander of the 1st Platoon in 4th Company of the 1st Sarajevo Motorised Brigade. Like many previous Defence witnesses, Tuševljak insisted that he never received an order to attack civilian targets and that his unit only engaged in defensive operations. In his testimony, Tuševljak emphasised that his unit contained not only Bosnian Serbs, but Muslim and Croat soldiers, as well. In an attempt to show that the Prosecution misrepresented the situation in Sarajevo, the witness stressed that the true victims were those who resisted the Bosnian leadership. On cross-examination, the Prosecution attempted to discredit the witness by highlighting possible discrepancies between his statement and in-court testimony. Tuševljak claimed that the differences are due to him not understanding the law, and consequently not appreciating that his phrasing would mislead others. The Prosecution also focused on the weaponry that Tuševljak's unit had at its disposal. For instance, Tuševljak claimed that when his unit was hit by sniper fire in Ivana Krndelja, it did not have sniper rifles to retaliate. When the Prosecution pressed on why this was the case, the witness said he asked for sniper rifles, but did not receive any. On re-direct, Tuševljak examined a list of the weapons his unit had and said that none of them qualified as sniper rifles.

The next witness to testify for the Defence was Siniša Maksimović, former Company Commander of the Mrkovići Company of the 1st Romanija Brigade. The witness discussed an incident in Sedrenik where a Serb sniper allegedly shot a 14-year old boy. Maksimović argued that it was unlikely that the boy was hit by a Serb sniper since they did not have adequate weapons or soldiers with adequate training to shoot from that distance. The witness, however, was not actually present at the time of the incident, so the Prosecution argued that Maksimović could not actually know what had occurred. The witness also spoke about the shelling of the Markale town market on 5 February 1995, which the Prosecution argues was done by the Bosnian Serb Army, but several Defence witnesses have argued was staged by the Muslims. Maksimović said that he was in contact with many of the soldiers who were present and they were all convinced that the incident was staged by the Muslim side. However, again, the Prosecution noted that Maksimović was not actually present when the incident took place, so could not know what transpired.

Upon the completion of Maksimović's testimony, Blaško Rašević, former Commander of the Hreša Battalion took the stand. Familiarly, Rašević testified that his unit only engaged in defensive operations, and never received an order to fire upon civilians. He also testified that the ABiH fired at Serb targets from mortars placed next to schools, kindergartens, and hospitals. On cross-examination, the Prosecution questioned the witness about his time at Špicasta Stijena, and whether his unit fired at civilians in Sedrenik. Rašević testified that his unit was close enough that soldiers could communicate with their friends in Sedrenik and some soldiers warned their friends to be careful, but that none ever did fire on civilians while he was there. The Prosecution also tendered evidence of non-Serbs being bussed from areas under Serb control to areas in Sarajevo that were under siege. Rašević said that he was aware of such an action. However, the witness also said that he was told that civilians were being transferred safely and at their own request.

The Defence then called Luka Dragičević, who was Commander of Morale, Religious and Legal Affairs during the war. On direct examination, the witness suggested that UNPROFOR was biased in favour of the ABiH. Dragičević said he ceased to trust UNPROFOR when they refused to investigate an incident at Dobrovoljačka Street where Serbs allegedly suffered a massacre at the hands of the Bosnian military and police of the Party of Democratic Action Patriot League, and Green Berets. The Prosecution focused much of its cross-examination on SRK forces capturing members of UNPROFOR. The Prosecution suggested that this was illegal hostage taking, whereas Dragičević argued that these UNPROFOR members had sided with their enemy and were taken as legal prisoners of war to protect against NATO bombings. The witness did concede, however, that tying the UNPROFOR members to military targets violated international criminal law.

Prosecutor v. Šešelj (IT-03-67)

On 17 and 20 June, the Accused Vojislav Šešelj and the Office of the Prosecutor made submissions in response to the Trial Chamber's order of 13 June, in which it had envisaged the possibility of granting *proprio motu* provisional release and invited the parties to present their views on the matter. The order had been issued after Judge Niang had indicated to the Chamber that he will need additional time to familiarise himself with the record of the case, which led to a deferral of the judgement for an unforeseeable period of time. Judge Niang had initially given himself a period of six months, starting from January 2014, to acquaint himself with the facts of the case after having been assigned to the trial bench on 31 October 2013.

The Defence, which filed its submissions on 17 June, stated that it "reject[ed] any guarantee from the treasonous pro-Western government in Belgrade" and that Šešelj would not accept any conditions or restrictions except that he shall not leave the territory of the Republic of Serbia. It informed the Chamber that, if Šešelj was to be granted provisional release, he would not report periodically to the police or wear a tracking device, he would take part in public affairs and political life in Serbia, he would give interviews to the media and he would publicly criticise the Tribunal.

The Prosecution, on its part, responded that in its view, continued detention was not incompatible with any medical treatment that the Accused might require, and suggested that the activities Šešelj intended to perform subsequent to his conditional release would suggest that he is, in fact, in good health. Furthermore, it reiterated the Appeals Chamber's findings that the length of the proceedings, including that the extended period of detention since Šešelj's voluntary surrender to the Tribunal on 24 February 2003 had not violated the Accused's fair trial rights. Last, the Prosecution emphasised that it considered it a crucial requirement for provisional release that the Trial Chamber impose conditions to ensure that Šešelj would not endanger victims, witnesses, or other persons, and that he will return to the Tribunal upon order of the Chamber.

After having received the submissions, the Trial Chamber, pursuant to Rule 65 (B) of the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure and Evidence, invited the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Serbia on 24 June 2013 to present their comments with regard to guarantees for a possible provisional release of the Accused. The Chamber considered that the Republic of Serbia would be the natural destination for provisional release of Šešelj and that it must, in light of its role as the protector of the rights of

ICTY Rules of Procedure and Evidence

Rule 65(B)

Provisional Release

Release may be ordered at any stage of the trial proceedings prior to the rendering of the final judgement by a Trial Chamber only after giving the host country and the State to which the Accused seeks to be released the opportunity to be heard and only if it is satisfied that the accused will appear for trial and, if released, will not pose a danger to any victim, witness or other person. The existence of sufficiently compelling humanitarian grounds may be considered in granting such release.

the Accused, ensure that provisional detention is limited strictly to the requirements of the proceedings. Consequently, it ordered that the Republic of Serbia should confirm whether it was able, *inter alia*, to take Šešelj into custody upon his release by the Dutch authorities at the airport in the Netherlands, as well as return him to the Dutch authorities as soon as he is required to appear before the Chamber again. Serbia was further asked to confirm that it could ensure that Šešelj will be placed in home confinement, that it could provide police escort for him whenever he would be required to leave his home for medical treatment, that Šešelj will be arrested immediately if he violated the terms of his home confinement, that his passport and travel documents will be taken during the period of his confinement, and that Šešelj will be prevented from establishing any contact with victims and witnesses.

On 2 July, the Republic of Serbia declared itself capable of providing the guarantees requested by the Trial Chamber given that Šešelj formally commits to respect the conditions of his release. On the following day, the Chamber thus issued another order inviting the Accused to state his commitment to respect the guarantees the Chamber had asked the Serbian authorities to provide for. Judge Jean-Claude Antonetti appended a separate opinion in which he stated that he would have added the consideration that, should Šešelj fail to formally state his commitment to comply with the conditions of his release, the Trial Chamber would be forced to automatically withdraw the provisional release *proprio motu*. In his view, if Šešelj refused to comply with the conditions of his release, the Chamber would "have no other choice but to find that he should remain in detention awaiting a judgement for which no one knows the date of delivery". On 8 July, Šešelj requested the Pro Se Legal Liaison Officer of the Court Support Services Section to inform the Chamber that he did not intend to formally express his commitment to comply with the conditions set by the Trial Chamber, and that he would not be making a submission on the matter.

Prosecutor v. Prlić *et al.* (IT-04-74)

On 27 June, the Appeals Chamber in the *Prlić et al.* case issued its *Decision on Praljak's Request for Stay of Proceedings*, in which the Chamber denied Praljak's request to stay proceedings and instructed the Registry to assign him Appellate Counsel in the interests of justice.

Praljak has been in an ongoing dispute with the Tribunal regarding his ability to afford Counsel and to remunerate the Tribunal for legal aid services provided since 2005. Payment of legal aid to Praljak's Defence was terminated following the rendering of the Trial Judgement on 29 May 2013, though Praljak retained *Pro Bono* Counsel for procedural matters. In October 2013, Praljak filed motions for a stay of appellate proceedings until his receipt of the essential documents for his appeal, including his and the other parties' Notices of Appeal, the Trial Judgement and the transcript, in a language he understands (Croatian), and for assignment of Counsel in the interests of justice. In April 2014, the Appeals Chamber denied both motions, finding that Praljak was not in fact self-represented and that, in particular, his motion for a stay of proceedings until receipt of the requested documents in Croatian was premature because he in fact had assistance from *Pro Bono* Counsel.

Following this decision, Praljak sent a confidential *ex parte* letter to the President of the Tribunal on 28 April, which was made public by the Pre-Appeal Judge on 21 May. In this letter, Praljak withdrew power of attorney in his *Pro Bono* Counsel and indicated that he would represent himself. He further renewed his now-ripe request for a stay of proceedings pending his receipt of translations of the documents essential for his appeal in Croatian. In response to Praljak's letter, the Registry reiterated its translation policy, highlighted the resources and time that would be spent if his translation requests were granted and requested that Praljak be required to bear the cost of any translations provided beyond those covered by the Registry's Translation Policy. The

Slobodan Praljak

Prosecution responded that Praljak should be assigned Counsel in the interests of justice due to the magnitude and complexity of the case, Praljak's expressed desire to be represented by Counsel and Praljak and his Co-Accused's right to fair and expeditious proceedings.

The Appeals Chamber's recent decision on this matter reviewed the history of Tribunal activity related to Praljak's representation and the applicable law with regard to his recent decision to represent himself and renewed request for a stay of proceedings. In its analysis, the Appeals Chamber highlighted that the right to self-representation is not absolute and must be assessed on a case-by-case basis. In doing so here, the Chamber was satisfied that Praljak does not understand the working languages of the Tribunal sufficiently to represent himself on appeal and thus would need translations that would take years, causing extensive delays and significant costs to the Tribunal.

Further, because the *Prlić* case raises considerably complex legal and factual issues and Praljak has no legal training, practical legal skills, or relevant legal knowledge, he is most likely unable to manage his appeal without any current form of legal assistance in an adequate and timely manner. The delays caused would negatively affect not only Praljak but his Co-Appellants. As a result of the above concerns, the Appeals Chamber directed the Registry to assign Praljak Counsel, denied the request for a stay of proceedings and indicated that, because it had already decided that Praljak had sufficient means to afford Counsel, he was still responsible for remunerating the Tribunal for legal assistance already provided and to be provided during the appeal.

MICT News

Prosecutor v. Ngirabatware (MICT-12-29)

On 30 June, the Appeals Chamber of the Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals (MICT), composed of Presiding Judge Theodor Meron, Judge Liu Daqun, Judge Christoph Flügge, Judge Burton Hall and Judge Bakone Justice Moloto, heard the oral arguments filed by Augustin Ngirabatware in the appeal against the Trial Judgement rendered by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda on 20 December 2012, which was filed in writing on 21 February 2013. Ngirabatware was the Rwandan Minister of Planning during the indictment period.

Augustin Ngirabatwe

Based on his speech in February and April 2014 at a roadblock on the Cyanika-Gisa road in Nyamyumba Commune, as well as his participation in the distribution of weapons, Ngirabatware was convicted of committing direct and public incitement to commit genocide, as well as of instigating and aiding and abetting genocide. He was further convicted of rape as a crime against humanity under the extended form of Joint Criminal Enterprise and sentenced to 35 years.

Ngirabatware is represented by ADC members Mylène Dimitri and Guénaël Mettraux and argues that the Trial Chamber committed numerous errors of law and fact, requesting the Appeals Chamber to overturn the conviction and acquit him or, alternatively, reduce his sentence. The Prosecution contends that the appeal should be dismissed in its entirety. The Ngirabatware appeal hearing is the first of the MICT since its establishment and launch in July 2012 in Arusha and in July 2013 in The Hague.

LOOKING BACK...

Special Tribunal for Lebanon

Five years ago…

On 10 July 2009, Secretary-General of the United Nations Ban Ki-Moon appointed David Tolbert of the United States of America as the second Registrar for the Special Tribunal for Lebanon (STL). Tolbert succeeded Robin Vincent who served in the capacity of Registrar from March 2008 until June 2009.

Preceding his appointment to the STL, Tolbert already had extensive experience working in the administration of international justice. From 1998 through 2008 he served in several senior roles of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), as the Chef de Cabinet to the President of Chambers, several positions in the Registry, and as Deputy Chief Prosecutor. He also participated in the United Nations Assistance to the Khmer Rouge Trials as the Special Expert to the Secretary-General.

Tolbert served in the the capacity as Registrar for the STL until March of 2010, and currently holds the position of President of the International Center for Transitional Justice in New York.

International Criminal Court

Five years ago…

On 3 July 2009, at its Thirteenth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government in Sirte, Libya, the African Union (AU) formally announced that it would not cooperate with a warrant for war crimes and crimes against humanity issued by the ICC against President Omar al-Bashir of Sudan. Furthermore, the AU urged the United Nations Security Council to delay the case against al-Bashir.

The Decision, unanimously agreed to by the Heads of State and Government, would allow al-Bashir to travel across Africa without fear of being arrested and sent to The Hague for prosecution. However, 30 countries that signed on to the Decision are members of the Rome Statute and thus have an obligation under Article 59 to arrest al-Bashir if he should step foot on their territory. However, many countries, including members of the Rome Statute, believe that if al-Bashir were to be arrested it could not only leave a power vacuum in Sudan but also derail the peace process between North and South.

In a further turn of events, officials from Botswana and Chad accused Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi of forcing the Assembly to accept the Resolution without allowing debate. Both countries said, the Resolution notwithstanding, they would arrest al-Bashir if he attempted to enter their countries.

The AU, composed of 53 countries on the continent, with the exception of Morocco, refused to cooperate with the Court because it believes that the Court is politically biased as all situations currently before the ICC involve solely African countries. Furthermore, the AU is concerned that indictments of African leaders will not just be destabilising but that the process could be abused and misused.

Ultimately, while the African Union argued that al-Bashir as Head of State has sovereign immunity, Luis Moreno-Ocampo, the Chief Prosecutor at the ICC, stated, “There is no sovereign right to commit genocide or crimes against humanity”.

ICC Statute **Article 59** *Individual Criminal Responsibility*

A State Party which has received a request for provisional arrest or for arrest and surrender shall immediately take steps to arrest the person in question in accordance with its laws and the provisions of Part 9.

International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia

Ten years ago…

On 16 July 2004, a formal indictment was signed by Judge El Mahdi against Goran Hadžić for Crimes Against Humanity and Violations of the Laws or Customs of War. It was alleged that Hadžić participated in a joint criminal enterprise as a co-perpetrator.

At the time of the crimes listed in the indictment Hadžić was President of the self-proclaimed Serbian Autonomous District of Slavonia, Baranja, and Western Srem (SAO SBWS), as well as President of the Republic of Serbian Krajina (SRK). The indictment alleged that Hadžić and his co-perpetrators had conspired for "the removal of a majority of the Croat and other non-Serb population from approximately one-third of the territory of the Republic of Croatia in order to make them part of a new Serb-dominated state through the commission of crimes in violation of Articles 3 and 5 of the Statute of the Tribunal". The indictment went on the accuse Hadžić of playing a role that "significantly contributed to the overall objective of the enterprise", along with other important figures in the Serbian Nationalist movement such as Slobodan Milošević and paramilitary groups like the Četniks.

Hadžić was charged on the basis of individual criminal responsibility, Article 7(1) of the ICTY Statute with: eight counts of crimes against humanity and six counts of the violations of the laws or customs of war. His trial is currently being continued after two amended indictments have been filed by the Prosecution. He is represented by Zoran Živanović and Christopher Gosnell.

NEWS FROM THE REGION

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnian Serb Acquitted Again of Killing Civilians in 1993

Ratko Lavrnić has, for the second time in two years, been acquitted of charges that he killed three civilians in the Ključ municipality in 1993. Lavrnić was a member of the 17th Ključ Light Infantry Brigade of the Republika Srpska Army (VRS) during the war in the early 1990s. In 2012, Lavrnić was found not guilty for the deaths of Ramiza Adžemović and Fatima and Hata Risović in Rejzovići (Ključ municipality, Bosnia and Herzegovina) on 10 February 1993. The Trial Chamber of the Cantonal Court in Bihać held that the charges against him had not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

At the time, the Cantonal Prosecution announced its intent to appeal, and in March 2014, the Supreme Court of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina quashed the 2012 verdict of acquittal, noting that the Trial Chamber failed to provide a complete and specific explanation of its factual findings.

Lavrnić's retrial began in the spring of 2014 in the Bihać Cantonal Court, and Lavrnić has maintained his innocence. During the pronouncement of the Judgement of acquittal on 7 July, the Trial Chamber once again noted that the prosecution failed to prove the allegations in the indictment beyond a reasonable doubt, indicating that there was a lack of sufficient evidence. This re-acquittal verdict can be appealed by the Prosecution, though it is not yet clear whether they will seek to appeal the verdict against Lavrnić again.

Bosnian Issues Indictments Against Two Former Soldiers for War Crimes

Bosnian Prosecutors announced on 7 July that they have issued a set of indictments against Bosnian soldiers for alleged crimes committed during the wars in the early 1990s. Prosecutors announced the indictments of Jasmin Čoloman and Dragan Maksimović.

Čoloman was a member of the Reconnaissance Squad of the Bosnian Army's 7th Muslim Brigade in 1993. He

is alleged to have attacked Croat civilians detained at the Poculice Youth Centre (near Vitez) in central Bosnia on 24 April 1993. Three Croats were killed and nine wounded when he allegedly opened fire on the door to the centre when a guard refused him entrance. He has been remanded to custody since his 25 June arrest as a potential flight risk and suspected risk of witness or accomplice tampering.

Maksimović was a member of the 1st Bircanska Brigade of the Republika Srpska Army (VRS) in 1992, when he is accused of entering a house in the village of Caparde (near Kalesija) with the aim of finding and killing Bosniaks. He allegedly used an automatic weapon to kill five civilians, two women and three children.

Both indictments have been forwarded to the state court for confirmation of charges.

Kosovo

Alleged Victim Testifies Against Former KLA Commander Accused Again of Wartime Abuses

Sylejman Selimi, former Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) Commander and current Kosovo Ambassador to Albania, is once again accused of war crimes in Kosovo by the European Rule of Law Mission (EULEX) Prosecutor. Previously, Selimi was accused of assaulting two ethnic Albanian women while they were being held at the KLA's detention centre in Likovac; he was acquitted of all charges in May 2014, with Presiding Judge Phillip Kanning commenting on the complete lack of credible evidence that Selimi had anything to do with the alleged assaults or even that he had any interaction with the alleged victims. See ADC-ICTY Newsletter Issue 69.

Now Selimi, along with six Co-Defendants – the Drenica Group – is on trial for a separate accusation of involvement in the abuse of Albanian civilians detained at Likovac in 1998. This trial began in May in North Mitrovica; subsequently, motions to move the trial to Pristina, due to security concerns in North Mitrovica, have been denied. Selimi is represented by past ADC-ICTY President Gregor Guy-Smith. The indictment alleges that the members of the Drenica Group, some not yet in custody, violated the bodily integrity and health of Albanian civilians detained at Likovac.

On 8 July, Witness A, a protected witness, testified in the Drenica Group trial via video-link, claiming that while detained at Likovac in 1998, Selimi accused him of being a Serbian spy and assaulted him with his fists and wooden sticks. He further claims that Selimi directed another detainee, Witness B, to assault him. Witness A testified that he has persistent health problems as a result of the alleged abuses. Selimi and the other members of the Drenica Group have pleaded not guilty to the charges against them. The trial will continue in

NEWS FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL COURTS

International Criminal Court

The views expressed herein are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the ICC.

SITUATION IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

THE PROSECUTOR V. GERMAIN KATANGA

The Trial Chamber of case no. ICC-01/04-01/07 *The Prosecutor v. Germain Katanga* took note of the decision of the Accused to discontinue his appeal against the Article 74 Judgement of Conviction of Trial Chamber II from 7 March. Similarly, The Office of the Prosecutor (OTP) recognized the decision of the Accused to discontinue his appeal of the sentence given by the Trial Chamber in the Article 76 Sentencing Decision from 23 May.

The OTP affirmed that Germain Katanga accepted the decision from Article 74 Judgement regarding his role and conduct and the sentence itself. The OTP also noted the sincere regret shown by Germain Katanga about all who "have suffered as a result of his conduct, including victims of Bogoro".

ICC Statute

Rule 152(1)

Discontinuance of the Appeal

Any party who has filed an appeal may discontinue the appeal at any time before judgement has been delivered. In such case, the party shall file with the Registrar a written notice of discontinuance of appeal. The Registrar shall inform the other parties that such a notice has been filed.

Pursuant to Rule 152(1) of the Rules and Procedure of Evidence, the OTP has decided to put an end to its appeal against the Article 74 Judgement regarding Germain Katanga.

Germain Simba Katanga has been in detention since 2005 and was convicted on five counts regarding the Bogoro attack on 7 March 2014:

1. Murder, crimes against humanity,
2. Murder, war crimes,
3. Attack on civilian population as such or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities, constitutive war crimes,
4. Destruction of enemy property, war crimes,
5. Looting, war crimes.

Katanga was informed by his Defence Counsel about the legal consequences of his decision. He was also informed that with his choice to discontinue his appeal he voluntarily gives away his right to appeal and that consequently it will not be possible to renew the appeal and that his conviction for each charge shall be final.

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda

The views expressed herein are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the ICTR.

The Appeals Chamber of the ICTR, composed of presiding Judge Theodor Meron, Judge Liu Daqun, Judge Carmel Agius, Judge Khalida Rachid Khan and Judge Bakhtiyar Tuzmukhamedov, rendered its Appeals Judgment in the case against Augustin Bizimungu on 30 June 2014.

Augustin Bizimungu was the Commander of the military operations for Ruhengiri Sector between January and March 1994, after which he was promoted from Colonel to Major General and finally made Chief of Staff of the Rwandan Army. He was arrested on 2 August 2002 in Angola after being originally indicted together with Augustin Ndindiliyimana, François-Xavier Nzuw and Innocent Sagahutu. On 7 February 2014, the Appeals Chamber of the ICTR issued an order severing the case of Bizimungu and hence separating it from that of his Co-Accused.

In May 2011, Bizimungu was sentenced to 30 years imprisonment by the Trial Chamber on counts of genocide, murder, extermination and rape as crimes against humanity. He was also convicted of "murder and rape as serious violations of Article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions and of Additional Protocol 2 based on attacks in Rwankeri Sector in Ruhengeri Prefecture, the Josephite Brothers compound in Kigali prefecture, the *École des sciences infirmières de Kabgayi*, the TRAFIPRO Center, and the Musambira Commune office and dispensary in Gitarama Prefecture, the Cyangugu Prefecture Stadium, as well as the Butare Prefecture Office and Episcopal Church of Rwanda in Butare Prefecture in April, May and June 1994".

The Appeals Chamber, in part, affirmed Bizimungu's original conviction on the above-mentioned counts, but concluded that the Trial Chamber erred in its evaluation of the evidence relating to the killings in Rwankeri Sector, the killings and rape at the Butare Prefecture office and the EER. The Appeals Chambers also concluded that the evidence for the killings and

rapes for the Musambira Commune office and rapes at the Musambira dispensary was also assessed wrongly. The Chamber reversed Bizimungu's conviction in relation to the Trial Chamber's findings that the Accused exercised superior responsibility over *Interahamwe*. Nevertheless, with regard to the severity of the crimes, the Appeals Chamber did not alter the sentence and affirmed 30 years of imprisonment. This Appeals Judgment is the 41st to be rendered by the ICTR, with four cases remaining under the jurisdiction of the Tribunal.

Special Tribunal for Lebanon

STL Public Information and Communications Section.

The views expressed herein are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the STL.

Testimonies of Two Prosecution Expert Witnesses

On 1 July, the Prosecution opened the hearing by introducing Professor Fouad Hussein Ayoub, an expert in oral pathologies and identifying deceased bodies. Ayoub's testimony continued on 2 July.

Professor Ayoub, who testified via video link, first explained his role following the 14 February 2005 attack. Ayoub's assistance was requested by the Lebanese authorities to participate in the investigation of the crime scene as a human identification expert.

Dental recollection was and still is one of the most effective techniques used by experts to identify deceased bodies, especially victims of an explosion where the blast causes body deteriorations.

Professor Ayoub investigated the remains of an individual believed to be the suicide bomber, in an effort to establish whether or not the person is Abu Adass. Abu Adass appeared in a video shortly after the 14 February 2005 attack, claiming responsibility for the bombing. According to the Prosecution, the video was a false claim of responsibility aimed deliberately to derail the investigations. Ayoub testified that he compared the DNA samples found on the crime scene with the DNA extracted from Abu Adass's toothbrush, as well as the DNA of one of his siblings. He confirmed that the samples did not match.

Professor Fouad Hussein Aoub

On 3 July, Prosecution expert witness Doctor Issam Mansour, an expert in human identification, paternity and forensic testing, testified in the courtroom. Mansour has experience in developing software for crime scene management, forensic calculations and samples archiving.

In his testimony, Mansour stressed the complexity of DNA profiling and stated that the probability of two people having the same DNA profile is less than 1 in 10 billion. Mansour received several items of an unidentified victim from Professor Ayoub, among which human remains, hair and a piece of cloth with blood stains. After several tests, he confirmed that there was not enough DNA on those items to extract a DNA profile.

After hearing both witnesses, the Defence cross-examined them. The Trial Chamber Presiding Judge, Judge Re, adjourned the hearing until Tuesday 15 July at 10 AM.

All scheduled hearings can be found on the STL's court calendar.

DEFENCE ROSTRUM

Human Security and The Common European Asylum System—Part I

By Garrett Mulrain

On 4 July, the T.M.C. Asser Instituut coordinated their efforts with the Centre for the Law of EU External Relations (CLEER) to offer the public a conference entitled "Using Human Security as a Legal Framework to Analyse the Common European Asylum System". The high calibre of both academics and civil servants focused on the concept of "Human Security" and how it could potentially forge a framework for enhancing EU foreign security and migration policies.

The first speaker of the morning session, Claudio Matera, a researcher at the Asser Instituut, outlined a few introductory remarks. He stated that there are three key concepts that guide the European Union in terms of refugee and asylum assistance: (1) defining who is a refugee by the Qualification Directive (2004), (2) the rise of third country nationals at the EU borders and (3) the actual content of the protection offered. Each of these dimensions could theoretically be adjusted to encompass a human security dimension.

The EU frequently changes its practice to adjust for new security threats (famine, climate change, terrorism, etc.). Individual migrants crossing international borders are also sometimes viewed as a threat and this often provokes an anti-immigrant mentality by the nationals of that state. Claudio Matera's perspective is a simple one: do not view the individuals crossing the border as a threat that must be repelled, view the group as a challenge that must be accounted for.

Critics have often stated that human security is a dimension that has "no teeth" or a substantial enforcement mechanism. However, at a policy level, the notion of human security can be utilised to strengthen the operation of fundamental rights. Claudio Matera's final point is a simple as it is sensible; since refugee protection is about the protection of human dignity, linking human security to human dignity could help to enhance the current protection regime.

The next speaker of the conference was Myrthe Wijnkoop from the Dutch Council for Refugees. She analysed the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and the other regimes of protection at an EU level for refugees and asylum seekers. Wijnkoop opened with the question, "what exactly is human security?" As a concept, this terminology only exists in theory and carries an extremely limited basis in international law. The most concrete definition stems from the United Nations Development Programme's "Human Development Report" (1994), stating that working towards human security comes from ensuring the "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear" for all persons. This concept is seen as a milestone publication within its field, since it suggests the first concrete steps at addressing global insecurity.

The notion of "freedom from want/fear" provided a strong transition into Wijnkoop's story of a Somali refugee she had interviewed. Most can imagine the harrowing journey from Somalia, across East and the Northern Africa as a refugee. Many can also imagine the harsh travel across the Mediterranean Sea, on a tiny, ill-equipped and unsafe boat. What many do not know, however, is the quality of facilities that exist when a refugee reaches an EU Member State. Greece in this case, overburdened with their ongoing refugee crisis, had extreme difficulty offering food and water to this particular refugee. She was frequently beaten and harassed by police, never informed about asylum procedures and kept in tattered detention cells, all before she was released to end up sleeping in the streets of Athens. The European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) case of *M.S.S. v. Belgium & Greece* [2011] highlighted a lot of these issues and ultimately blocked "asylum limbo", where EU Member States bounced asylum seekers to and from other Member State's, in an attempt to shirk responsibility.

Following this story, Wijnkoop outlined much of the relevant law. The Tampere Programme ran from 1999 to 2004 and provided the first level playing field for refugee protection in two phases. The first phase involved common minimum standards and procedures across all EU Member States, provided temporary protection where necessary for influxes of refugees and created the Dublin II/EURODAC principles. The second phase involved the Common Asylum Proce-

dure, whose goal was to avoid practices of "asylum shopping" and the obvious human rights debacle that such an action would cause. These programmes proved problematic, because they ultimately left major discretion on the Member States, who were hesitant to implement adequate human-rights provisions into domestic legislation.

The second portion of the legal realm fell within the Hague Programme (2004-2009), followed by the Stockholm Programme (2009-2014). The former has a similar aim to the Tampere Programme, addressing the lack of a common asylum procedure, yet this time incorporating a human-rights-based approach. This programme unfortunately suffered the same faults, leaving too much discretion to the Member States and ultimately nullifying ten years of attempted asylum progress. The Stockholm Programme did, however, prove a bit more helpful. Formed on the basis of solidarity and responsibility (Article 80 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union), Stockholm brought about consolidation and practical cooperation. The European Asylum Support Office was also formed and protection standards at external borders have significantly increased.

These developments, as well as the Lisbon Treaty of 2009, the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and the role of the European Court of Justice, allowed for a strong overall CEAS to implement enforceable procedures, compared to what it once was. Looking back on the past fifteen years, Wijnkoop notes that there are still improvements to be made. The different EU Institutions are not nearly effective enough, and national interests remain the focus of domestic policy procedures. For moving into the future, she recommends permanent health and quality checks into Member State facilities, an increased role for civil society, more strategic use of litigation and a "protection-sensitive" policy approach. The European Union still lacks the true Member State solidarity when it comes to refugee protection, and according to Wijnkoop, "if we do not do anything in practice … it [CEAS] is just an empty shell".

The second session of the morning focused on what role the concept of human security could play when it came to managing the EU's external borders. This portion of the conference started with Dr. Jorrit Rijpma of Leiden University, who focused on the operational aspects of human security considerations. This portion of the conference addressed truly critical content since over the past few years it would seem that Member States have hardened their border control procedures, effectively hampering a large influx of refugees. These migrants come for a variety of reasons, including climate change, worsening economic conditions and tyrannical domestic regimes in their home states. The Syrian Crisis alone has caused an influx of over two million refugees to flee their home state, with many heading to the EU border. This deferring practice at the borders often impedes refugees and asylum seekers from even questioning their legal rights, let alone being informed about them.

Accountability has been lax in regards to border control issues. Irregular migrants often put themselves at huge risk when facing narrow state-policy initiatives. These fundamental violations have been dealt with, but not substantially. One positive case, however, is ECHR case *Hirsi Jamaa and Others v. Italy* [2012], which resulted in legal sanctions against the Italian Government for its practice of intercepting Somali and Eritrean migrants at sea and *refouling* them to Libya. This practice was held to constitute a violation by exposing the individuals to a risk of ill-treatment and amounted to collective expulsion.

Despite this legal development, the political focus seems to remain at strict border control. The policy dialogue that exists heavily focuses on the fear of terrorism, which is thought to move its way past more relaxed border policies. It is through this lens, that Member States operate "search and rescue" operations, which (ironically enough) are often framed in terms of human security. The "search and rescue" regime focuses on saving lives at its core, yet operates through ambiguous standards of a boat in distress versus one that it advises to reach a "place of safety", generally away from its own Member State.

Jorrit Rijpma made final remarks about the European External Border Surveillance System (EuroSUR). He commented on the positive developments of Frontex, which despite originally being intended to combat organised crime has a strong potential to become a centralised hub for refugee file sharing. In conclusion, human security remains difficult to apply, largely due to lack of concrete legal standing, as well as Member State apprehension. Having said that, however, Rijpma believes that this new dimension could "give soft-law a hard approach" and significantly enhance long-term complementary protection standards.

BLOG UPDATES AND ONLINE LECTURES

Blog Updates

Michael G. Karnavas, **The Diligence That Is Due—Part II: How to Make the Record**, 29 June 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/n5gwh7e.

Adam Nossiter and Marlise Simons, **African Leaders Grant Themselves Immunity in Proposed Court**, 2 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/lfkbzef .

Julien Maton, **ECHR: French Burqa Ban Does Not Breach the Convention**, 4 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/mtk3e2o.

Ian Henderson and Bryan Cavanagh, **Military Members Claiming Self-Defence During Armed Conflict—Often Misguided and Unhelpful**, 8 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/mk6a9sj

Online Lectures and Videos

"The Influence of American Diversity and Values Through the Rule of Law", by Alberto Gonzales, 3 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/qd3r2et.

"Challenges Raised by Increasingly Autonomous Technologies", by the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, 7 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/pd4cohj.

"Exploring New Frontiers in Peacebuilding: Urban Violence and Cross-Border Criminal Activity", by the U.S. Institute of Peace, 8 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/lzbdkp6.

"A Conversation with Patricia de Lilli", by the Council on Foreign Relations, 8 July 2014, available at: http://tinyurl.com/myn6tr6.

PUBLICATIONS AND ARTICLES

Books

Ingrid Detter (2013), *The Law of War Third Edition*, Ashgate Publishing.

Mathew Saul (July 2014), *Popular Governance of Post-Conflict Reconstruction: The Role of International law*, Cambride University Press.

Christine Evans (July 2014), *The Right to Reparation in International Law for Victims of Armed Conflict*, Cambridge University Press.

Articles

Nikolas M. Rajkovic (2014), "Rules, Lawyering, and the Politics of Legality: Critical Sociology and International Law's Rule", *Leiden Journal of International Law*, Vol. 27, No. 2.

Leonoardo Baccini and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi (2014), "Why do States Commit to International Labor Standards? Interdependent Ratification of Core ILO Conventions, 1948-2009", *World Politics*, Vol. 66, No. 3.

Kirsten J. Fisher (2014), "Purpose-Based or Knowledge-Based Intention for Collective Wrongdoing in International Criminal Law?" *International Journal of Law in Context*, Vol. 10, No. 2.

CALL FOR PAPERS

The **International Law Association** has issued a call for paper for a special edition of their International Law Review titled "Syrian Crisis and International Law".

Deadline: 15 August 2014 More Info: http://tinyurl.com/nyl8r3v

The **Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy** has issued a call for papers in various topics of sustainable development for its fall publication.

Deadline: 31 August 2014 More Info: http://tinyurl.com/meylon9

HEAD OFFICE

ADC-ICTY

ADC-ICTY
Churchillplein 1
2517 JW The Hague
Room 085.0870

Phone: +31-70-512-5418
Fax: +31-70-512-5718

Any contributions for the newsletter should be sent to Isabel Düsterhöft at iduesterhoeft@icty.org

WWW.ADC-ICTY.ORG

NEW WEBSITE

GOODBYE

The ADC-ICTY would like to express its appreciation and thanks to Camille Sullivan for her hard work and dedication to the Newsletter. We wish her all the best in her future endeavours.

EVENTS

International and European Environmental Law: Facing the Challenges?

Date: 25-29 August 2014

Location: T.M.C. Asser Instituut, The Hague

More Info: http://tinyurl.com/lg9tpom

Countering Terrorism in the Post 9/11 World: Legal Challenges and Dilemmas.

Date: 25-29 August 2014

Location: T.M.C. Asser Instituut, The Hague

More Info: http://tinyurl.com/m78x7y5

International Law Association Regional Conference

Date: 11-12 September 2014

Location: Lisbon, Portugal

More Info: http://tinyurl.com/poyqzpb

OPPORTUNITIES

Associate Research Officer, (P-2), Vienna

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes

Closing Date: 18 July 2014

Associate Human Resources Officer, (P-2), The Hague

Registry, International Criminal Court

Closing Date: 20 July 2014

Associate Legal Officer, (P-2), New York

Department of Management

Closing Date: 26 July 2014

Join Us!

ADC-ICTY

Affiliate Membership

For more info visit:

http://adc-icty.org/home/membership/index.html

or email:

iduesterhoeft@icty.org